

Intentions and Significance of the Symposium Held at the Shinto Research Institute of the Kogakkan University in 1997; Searching for a Direction and a Method to Present the Whole Picture (2).

NITTA Hitoshi

**KOGAKKAN RONSO No.2, Volume 54
July, 2021**

4. Supplementary information from symposiasts

In this chapter, I present the main points of the supplements which made by each symposiasts after they listened to the responses by the other symposiasts and the comments by the commentators. I will then add the impact of the supplements on my subsequent research.

The main points of the supplements by Ōishi Makoto

1. The significance of studying the French system lies in the fact that France has experienced all the main relationship between government and religions: national religion system, public religion system and separation system of government and religions. Moreover, the France system was not changed by constitutional amendment, but by detailed articles in law. This makes it easier to understand the features of each system (p.27).
2. Regarding the public religion system, Oda Yorozu, a scholar of French law, systematically explains its privileges and special supervisions. First, privileges are that expenses are paid or subsidized by the government, that the maintenance and preservation of religious buildings is a public burden, and that the work of the clergy is regarded in the same way as that of officials. Special supervisions, on the other hand, are the involvement of the government in the formulation of religious regulations and the appointment and dismissal of the clergy, and the existence of 'public prayer', as it is called in the USA. And the absence of all these is the basic feature of a system of separation of government and religions (p.27).
3. Dr. Momochi raised priests belonging to the army as a feature of Prussia's public religion system, but it also exists in the USA and France, which have adopted a system of separation of government and religions, so it is

necessary to carefully examine whether it can be called the feature of the public religion system (p.28).

4. With regard to the relationship between government and religions under the Meiji Constitution, it is true that there were few academic theories or court precedents that considered Shrine Shinto to be a national religion, but the question is how the national religion was defined. Today, the scope of religion has been greatly expanded due to the influence of the concept from religious studies, but how was it defined at the time? Without clarifying the question, it will not be clear what is meant by the fact that there were few theories that interpreted Shrine Shinto as a national religion (p.28).

◎Impact of Ōishi Makoto's supplements on my research

Stimulated by his supplement of [1], I embarked on a study of Oda Yorozu. The results of the work are "Oda Yorozu no Cyosaku niokeru Seikyōkankei Ruikeiron no Henka nitsuite [On the Changes in the Typology of Relationship between government and religions in the Writings of Oda Yorozu] " (*Meiji Seitoku Kinenn Gakkai Kiyō*, No.28 from reissue, December 1999) and "Oda Yorozu's 'Shrine Public Corporation' Theory and 'Shrine Non-Religious Organization' Theory" (*Kokugakuin Zasshi*, Volume 104, No.11, November 2003). However, there remains much more to be discussed about Oda.

The main points of the supplements by Momochi Akira

1. With regard to the national religion system, I consider the definition as a matter of law only, not a matter of fact. It consists the matters that a particular religion is defined by law as the national religion, that the head of state is its adherent and defender, and that the national religion is granted some privileges (p.28).
2. With regard to religion, also, I consider it only as a matter of the legal system, and the national religion as a system concerning a specific religious group (church). Speaking of Inoue Kowashi's understanding of Prussia from this perspective, he referred to 'Christianity' as the national religion of Prussia. However, Prussia did not consider denominations such as Catholicism or Protestantism as national religions, each of which was an public religion. He would have considered the whole of Christianity, which encompassed them, to be the national religion (p.29).
3. Oda Yorozu saw the relationship between government and religions under the

Meiji Constitution as a system of separation of government and religions. The reason for this is that he saw the separation of government and religions as the separation of politics and religion. From this perspective, the scope of separation of government and religions would be very wide. Therefore, I (Momochi) proposed to understand the separation of government and religions by dividing it into 'separation of government and religions in a broad sense' and 'separation of government and religions in a narrow sense' (p.29).

4. I defined 'separation of government and religions in a broad sense' as the separation between the work of government and the work of religion, separating the duties and roles of the two organizations so that they do not intervene or interfere with each other. On this principle, the UK has adopted a national religion system and the US has banned national religion (p. 29).
5. The plaintiffs in the separation of government and religions litigation have contended that freedom of religion cannot be guaranteed unless complete separation of government and religions (separation of government and religions in a narrow sense) is achieved. However, it can be understood from the types of countries that freedom of religion can be established even without a system of complete separation of government and religions (pp.29-30).
6. The idea under the Meiji Constitution was that a national religion system in the sense of enforcing faith and denying the existence of heresy could not be acceptable in a modern state (p.30).

5. Moderator's questions to symposiasts and symposiasts' answers

In response to the symposiasts' supplements and to further the discussion, I, as moderator, asked the symposiasts the following four questions again (pp.30-31).

- (i). What is the significance of discussing the typology of the relationship between government and religions?
- (ii) . What is the relationship between the types and religious freedom?
- (iii) . What is the typology you are considering?
- (iv). Which type do you think modern Japan's political and religious relations fit into?

The symposiasts' answers to these questions were as follows.

● Main points of the responses by Ōishi Makoto

1. One of the significance of discussing the typology of the relationship between government and religions is purely for academic and theoretical purposes. In order to accurately understand our lives and political systems, it is necessary to know exactly how they have changed in the past (p.31).
2. The other is to deduce the purposes and intents of previous policies and legislations. If they were not clearly written, it is necessary to understand the typology which the legislators had in mind (p.31).
3. Regarding the relationship between typology and religious freedom, whether there was or was not coercion of faith is a fairly significant point when considering the national religion system. Professor Ichimura Mitsue of Kyoto University referred to it that did not allow other faiths as 'absolute national religion system', whereas it that allowed other faiths as 'relative national religion system (public religion system)'. Inoue Kowashi, in his 'Syūkyō Syobun Iken [An Opinion on the Management of Religions]', used the classification of Kotenteki-Kokkyō-Syugi [classical national religion system], Seikyō-Bunri-Syugi [separation of government and religions] (using the French concept of religious freedom) and then Syūkyō-Hogo [public religion system], and considered that Britain system used to be a national religion system but now belonged to one of public religion system and was particularly protective of one religion. In other words, he believed that the Britain system had changed from 'absolute national religion system' to 'relative national religion system'. Therefore, the element of coercion or oppression is a fairly large component when finding 'de facto' (pp.31-32).
4. I think that the relationship between government and religions under the Meiji Constitution was at least a public religion system. The element of coercion was added to this system not from the beginning, but from around 1932, and its addition seems to have changed it into something else. As to the cause of this, we have to consider a number of factors (p.32).

©Impact of Ōishi Makoto's responses on my research

The suggestion in Respons [4] that Japan may have changed from an public religion system to a national religion system in the classical sense after around 1932, together with the suggestion in Supplement [1] that France had changed its relationship between government and religions by laws, formed the basis for my own classification of the period of relationship between government and religions in modern Japan ("Kindai Nihon Seikyō-Kankei no Jidai-Kubun nitsuite

[On the Period Classification of Relationship between Government and Religions in Modern Japan]", Kindai Konpō eno Toikake [Inquiries into Modern Constitutions], Tokyo: Seikeidō, July 1999).

● Main points of the responses by Momochi Akira

1. I believe that an analysis and organization of the relationship between government and religions requires a today's perspective. Therefore, it is appropriate today to consider the three categories on the basis of freedom of religion (pp.32-33).
2. Oda Yorozu classified both Britain and Germany at the time as public religion systems, and Japan as a system of separation of government and religions. He described Britain as special as a 'Kōsetsu-kyō-syugi [an official church system]', but I disagree that he put Britain and Germany in the same category. (p.33).
3. Today, in Japan, there is an opinion that a system of separation of government and religions is the most desirable in terms of guaranteeing religious freedom to the fullest extent. However, Professor Noda Nobuo of Kyoto University argues that the reality is that religion has often been corrupted as a result of being left to its own devices as a private matter, and with it in mind, a public religion system is one of appropriate systems. I also do not agree with the idea that because faith of religion is a private matter, it should be left to its own devices (p.33).
4. It is my position that 'State Shinto' refers to Shrine Shinto and is distinct from Imperial Ritual or Imperial Shinto. The grounds for this are as follows (pp.33-34).
 - ①. The two were very different in terms of the legal system.
 - ②. Even GHQ, which issued the Shinto Directive, interfered little with Imperial Rituals.
 - ③. The Imperial Household cannot be equated with religious organizations such as Buddhism or Christianity.
 - ④. It is unnatural to regard the Emperor as a professional religious figure.
 - ⑤. Imperial Rituals cannot be considered as religious ceremonies of one religion or sect.
 - ⑥. The Shinto Dictionary, supervised by Anzu Motohiko and Umeda Yoshihiko, classifies Shinto into five categories: Shrine Shinto, Imperial Shinto (Shinto in the average family may also be included in this category), Sectarian

Shinto, Scholastic Shinto and common people's faith (folk belief). These categories include not only Shinto as religious organizations, but also Scholastic Shinto and Shinto in the average family. In a parliamentary reply, Deputy Director Uryū of the Imperial Household Agency stated that Imperial Rituals were like a big Shinto altar in an average family. I can think of them in that dimension.

- ⑦ .The Syōten [people who execute the Imperial Rituals] cannot be considered as professional religious people. The head priest at the funeral of Prince Takamatsu was the president of the Japanese Red Cross Society, a layman. It was also a layman at the funeral of Prince Chichibu. According to an article in *Jurist* (No. 974), which contained materials on the Daijōsai [Accession rite for emperor in Shinto style] , about half of the 14 female orderlies who brought in the offerings during the rite were Christians. If so, it would mean that pagans were at the heart of a very important rite. Given this peculiarity, the Imperial Rituals cannot simply be described as a religion.

©Impact of Momochi Akira's responses on my research

1. The premise of Momochi's argument to distinguish between Imperial Rituals or Imperial Shinto and 'State Shinto' is a criticism of Murakami Shigeyoshi's definition of State Shinto as being a direct link between Imperial Shinto and Shrine Shinto. Murakami's theory of the 'direct link' was examined in Chapter 4 “Inoue Kowashi no Kōsō to Maimusyō no Seisaku [Inoue Kowashi's plan and the policy of the Ministry of Interior]” and Chapter 6 “Jinja Kaisei no Ken'nikansuru Shiryō no Honkoku to Bunseki [Reprinting and Analysis of Historical Documents on the 'On the Reform of Shrines']” in my book, *Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū* [A basic study of relationship between government and religions in modern Japan](Tokyo: Daimeidō, 1997), which proved that the theory did not hold true for the period from the early Meiji period until the enactment of the Imperial Constitution. And although I was not aware of it at the time of writing the book, I was made aware by Momochi's respons that Chapters 7 “Hozumi Yatsuka no Seikyō Kankei Ron [Hozumi Yatsuka's Theory of Government and Relations]”, 8 “Uesugi Hinkichi no Seikyō Kankei Ron [Uesugi Hinkichi's Theory of Government and Relations]”, and 9 “Katō Genchi no 'Kokkateki Shinto' Ron [Katō Genchi's Theory of 'State Shinto']” in the book proved that even in the period from the enactment of the Imperial Constitution until defeat of Japan in 1945, there were no arguments

affirming the 'direct link' between Imperial Rituals and Shrine Shinto¹.

2. [4-⑦], which pointed out the syncretistic nature of the National Polity, was one of the reasons for my later inclusion of the section 'A Syncretism called as *Kokutai* [National Polity]' in Chapter 6 of Part 2 of *The illusion of Living God "Arahitogami" and "State Shinto"* (February 2003 edition, pp.259-261; April 2006 edition, pp.263-264)².

It was also the premise for my following criticism, when Shimazono Susumu, who had proposed the forging back of the Murakami's 'State Shinto', put the 'sanctification of the state centered on the Emperor' at the heart of 'State

¹ Katō Gentchi argued 'Kokutai Shinto [National Polity Shinto]' as an important component of 'State Shinto', which could also be paraphrased as 'Tennō-Kyō [Faith in the Emperor] or 'Cyukō-Kyō [Loyalty Faith]' (*Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū*, p.294), the 'intangible essence, metaphysical direction' of State Shinto (ibid., p.298), which was different from 'Imperial Rituals' as materialistic concrete representation of the metaphysical. Inoue Tetsujirō used the term "Kokutai Shinto" earlier than Katō, but which meant "national rituals centered on the imperial household" and described it as the "most important part" of Shinto (ibid., p.293). However, Inoue stated that "ordinary people have no opportunity to come into contact with Kokutai Shinto" (ibid., p.293) and did not consider it to be 'directly' connected with 'Shrine Shinto'.

² Going further back, Sakamoto Koremaru had made this point; "Needless to say, the ideas and ideologies that formed and supported the modern Emperor System of Japan were not only Shinto ideas and doctrines. Not only the traditional religions of Buddhism and Confucianism, but also Christianity and the new religions, or the popular moral thought since the early Edo period, as well as the Western-style tyrannical Enlightenment and Rationalist thought, were certainly present in the Modern Emperor State, each functioning as a powerful ideology and its own device." (*Kokka Shinto Keisei-Katei No Kenkyū [The Study On The Formation Process Of State Shinto]*, Tokyo: Iwanamisyoten, 1994, p.6).

In June 2000, when then Prime Minister Mori Yoshirō's "Kami-no-Kuni [Our Country under God] " statement came under criticism, I wrote, "Jijitsu wo Fumaete Kami-no-Kuni wo Ronzeyo! [Discuss 'Our Country under God' based on the facts!]" (*Tōkai no Ibuki*, extra special edition, June 2000. *Itō Ryōdan – Sensei Motto Benkyō Shinasai-*, Tokyo: Kokusyo-kankōkai, reprinted, March 2002, pp.245-254). In this article, I explained the 'Our Country under God' theory from the perspective of the 'syncretistic thought', pointing out the fact that the founder of Nichiren Buddhism, the Jyōdo Shinsyū sect and Japanese Christians used to claim that Japan was a 'Country under God'.

Shinto' and presented the scheme of 'Shinto ideas = the idea of an Emperor who is holy because he is a descendant of God'; "With regard to the 'sanctification of the state centered on the Emperor', the existence of various schools of thought, including Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, religious studies, modern jurisprudence and political science, as well as mythology, has been confirmed. How these elements were combined and how the combinations changed over time should be empirically studied by setting up a field of study that should be called 'National Polity Thought'" ("Shimazono Susumu 'Kokka Shinto' Ron no Ginmi II [An Examination of Shimazono Susumu's theory of 'State Shinto' II], *Meiji Seitoku Kinen Gakai Kiyō*, No.37 from reissue, June 2003).

I might add that new facts, interpretations and issues regarding the syncretistic nature of the National Polity were later pointed out by Yamaguchi Teruomi, who was a panelist at the symposium, especially in terms of the relationship between Buddhism and the Imperial Household ("Facing Religion: The 19th and 20th Centuries", *Tennou no Rekishi 09; Tennou to Syūkyō*, edited and written by Ogura Shigeji and Yamaguchi Teruomi, Tokyo: Kōdansya, September 2013).

6. Moderator's opinion and questions to the commentators and commentator's responses to them

In response to the panelists' answers, I offered my own views and posed questions to the commentators

● Opinions and questions from the moderator to commentators

1. Dr. Momochi was told that Imperial Rituals are to be understood as the same as average family rituals to the altar. However, Imperial rituals have a relationship with officials. At the time of the enactment of the Meiji Constitution, there was a debate over the visit of government officials to the *Kahikodokoro* [A Shrine dedicated to Amaterasu in the Imperial Palace]. Therefore, is it unreasonable to consider them totally removed from the type of religious system? (p.34).
2. Dr. Ōishi said that France changed its relationship between government and religions by law or decree, not by constitution. What happens if we think about modern Japan from the perspective? (p.4)

3. I would like to ask Dr. Sakamoto how the obligation to visit shrines for officials should be considered in relation to the typology (pp.34-35).

● Responses by Sakamoto Koremaru

1. Imperial rituals were discussed in cases such as the ceremonies for the promulgation of the Imperial Constitution, the swearing-in of members of the Imperial Diet and the opening of the Privy Council. In all cases, it was agreed that it was not a religious matter, as the Emperor and the attendants were merely expressing reverence to the Emperor's ancestors. This logic has been consistent since 1875, when *Nishi Honganji* [A branch of the Jyōdo Shinsyū sect] and Shimaji Mokurai decided that reverence for Amaterasu was not a religious matter (p.35).
2. The forced shrine visit referred to by Dr Ōishi is the Sophia University incident. This was an incident in which an army instructor who had been dispatched to the university for military training attempted to lead students to visit Yasukuni Shrine, but some students refused to visit it because of their religious beliefs, so the army tried to suspend the dispatch of the instructor. At the time, military instruction had the privilege of reduced military service, and the inability to conduct military instruction deeply affected student recruitment. Therefore, the Ministry of Education and the Vatican discussed the matter and treated it as a patriotic issue. The instructors' intention was to express respect for the people enshrined, not to force the students to believe in Yasukuni Shrine, and the Vatican agreed his intention. Whether it was coercion of worship or not should be considered in light of these circumstances (p.35).
3. The visit to shrines by officials means that they were performing the role of delivering offerings to shrines [*Heihaku-Kyōshin-shi*] as part of the administrative work of the state and not that they were forced to worship shrines (p.35).
4. Regarding the meaning of the abolition of the *Kyōdōsyoku* [priests and monks who were engaged in national education movement] in 1884, it is necessary to understand the history of hardships in the shrines and priests up to that time. It is true that in early Meiji era, some people in the government attempted to make Shinto the national religion. However, due to opposition from the *Nishi Honganji* and others, by the seventh or eighth year of Meiji, the government came to realize that it was impossible to make Shinto the national religion and that it was outdated for the government to propagate it.

This conclusion led to the abolition of the *Kyōdōsyoku* (pp.35-36).

5. Inoue Enryō, who was well known as a religious scholar and philosopher, stated follows in 1889, when freedom of religion was guaranteed by the Imperial Constitution; Sectarian Shinto and Buddhism were officially recognized: However, this meant a system of separation of government and religions was adopted, and the best form of the separation in Japan would be the European rather than the American style (p.36).
6. Why did the various incidents referred to by Dr Hirano occur? It is necessary to clarify one by one in what social, ideological and political context they occurred (p.36).

◎Impact of Sakamoto Koremaru's responses on my research

By the response [1], I was once again aware of that the 'Syūmon Kyōgi Jō ni Aimotori Sourō Tai [Main reasons against sectarian doctrine]'³, drafted by Shimaji Mokurai and submitted by Nishi Honganji to Grand Minister Sanjō Sanetomi in the name of Ōtani Kōson in March 1875, had a decisive influence on the subsequent interpretation of the Imperial Shinto. Therefore, in *The Illusion of Living God "Arahitogami" and "State Shinto"*, I wrote: "The government recognized the claim of the True Pure Land Sect and allowed them to separate from the Daikyōin, and this would have a significant impact later " (p.21, edition of June 2009). However, in hindsight, I think I should have written more clearly that "this would have a significant impact later, especially on the Interpretation of Imperial Shinto".

●Moderator's opinions and questions to the commentators

1. There were in fact significant differences between Buddhism, Sectarian Shinto, Christianity and New Religions, which were said to be officially recognized by the government. I will ask you to discuss this point later (p.36).
2. With regard to the issue of forced belief, one has to consider the change in the public's perception of religion. It is inconceivable that the perception remained the same from the Meiji to the Syōwa period. Katō Genchi argued that the theory of shrine non-religion was valid as early as 1882, but that it was no longer valid from the Taisyō to the Syōwa period, as the public became more knowledgeable. It is possible that this change meant that what was not perceived as coercion before was perceived as coercion later on. I

³ Originally published in *Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū*, p.57.

would like to ask Mr. Yamaguchi what you think about the change of concept of religion (p. 36).

● Yamaguchi Teruomi's responses

1. Roughly speaking, there was basically no concept of “religion” in Japan in the pre-modern period (p.36).
2. In the Meiji decade, the argument that shrines and Shinto were not religions was widely asserted regardless of religious, academic or political position. Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Jōdoshinsyū*, missionaries, Kume Kunitake and others. In the 19th century, it was a very commonly accepted proposition (p.37).
3. Later, the transformation of the concept of “religion” made the Shinto non-religious theory less convincing, and how to deal with it became a problem of the twentieth century (p.37).

● Opinions and questions from the moderator

1. It is very dangerous to apply our present concepts to the past and proceed with the argument on the assumption that they already existed at that time. The introduction of new cultures and civilizations from abroad in modern times has forced changes in native ones, and the concept of “religion” would be probably one of them (p.38).
2. The concept of separation of government and religions was introduced at this time, and in response to this concept, the contents of 'religion' had to be clarified and policies had to be formulated to deal with the contents. It was out of this confusion that the concept of 'religion' as we hold it today was generated, and it does not mean that what was recognized as religion was deliberately not treated as religion (p.38).
3. I would like to ask Dr Sakamoto for your opinion on new religions and public religions in relation to the typology (p.38).

● Sakamoto Koremaru's responses

1. The legal system for religion began in 1884 with the abolition of the *Kyōdōsyoku*, the granting of autonomy to religious organizations and the introduction of the system of delegation to the head to religious organizations (p.38).
2. Legal entities did not come into existence until the Civil Code was enacted, so in the Meiji 30s (p.38).

- 3.It was the Syōkyōdantaihō [Religious Organizations Law] that explicitly gave juridical personality to religions, in 1940 (p.38).
- 4.Christianity was officially made a subject of religious administration by Ministry of Interior Order No. 41 of July 1899. This was a measure in connection with the revision of treaties and the abolition of extraterritoriality. Thus, Shinto, Buddhism and Christianity became the subject of religious administration (p.38).
- 5.However, there were objections by Buddhism being treated on the same level as Christianity and the opinion that new religions such as *Ōmotokyō*, which emerged from Sectarian Shinto, could not be treated as 'religion'. Under these circumstances, the government attempted to create a comprehensive Religion Law, but it went to the Syōwa period without being realized (p.38).
7. One person involved in the enactment of the Religious Organizations Act said, 'I have nothing but criticism for this law, but please just recognize the fact that this has made religious organizations solid' (pp.38-39).

●Moderator's opinion

In the pre-war period, even those who strongly advocated freedom of religion did not recognize the *Ruiji-syūkyō* [so-called New Religions] as 'religion'. This means that there had been another non-religious theory, which could be called the 'New Religion non-religious theory'. It was under this conception that the incidents that are spoken of today as religious repression had occurred. There is a need for deeper research at the empirical level in terms of the reflection of this awareness in institutions and policies (p.39).

◎Impact of Sakamoto Koremaru's responses on my research

- 1.His point that Buddhism refused to be treated on an equal footing with Christianity, even after Christianity became the subject of religious administration in 1899, made me realize that some aspect of religious administration cannot be seen solely in terms of government suppression of religion.
2. His point that there was an idea that the *Ruiji-syūkyō* [so-called New Religions] could not be treated as 'religion' made me realize the existence of another 'non-religious theory', which could be called the 'New Religions non-religious theory', and which was different from the 'Shrine Shinto non-religious theory'. This realization also served to strengthen my interest in the binding

and oppressive nature of 'ideas' or 'conception'.

7. Exchange of views after the break

● Questions raised by the moderator to the panelists and to Dr Sakamoto

Koremaru

1. we would like you to tell us again how we should organize the definition of State Shinto, the scope of State Shinto and the inner reality of State Shinto from now on (p.39).
2. Before discussing these issues, I would like to ask Dr Sakamoto for your opinions on the issues of Imperial Rituals and forced Shinto Shrine visits in schools (p.39).

● Answers by Dr Sakamoto Koremaru

1. What we now call as Imperial Rituals and Imperial Shinto did not exist from ancient times (p.39).
2. Even considering the Edo period, there were many court nobles and emperors whose object of faith and devotion was Amida and Yakushinyorai. Apart from those beliefs, Shinto-style rituals were performed in Kashikodokoro [a shrine dedicated to Amaterasu in the emperor's household] and Ise Grand Shrine (p.39).
3. The common people likewise performed both Buddhist and Shinto rituals, rather than choosing between the two. According to Sakurai Tokutarō's research, there were many examples of residents of areas with strong influence of Jōdoshinsyū, which took a monotheistic position, also participating in shrine rituals because of respect for the righteous *Kami* (pp.39-40).
4. It is problematic to talk about Japanese religions on the basis of the modern Western conception of religions as belonging exclusively to one denomination, without taking such a Japanese climate into account (p.40).
5. Mr Sakurai Katsunoshin, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kogakkan University, also commented: "The Religious Institutions Law defines religious organizations as those which propagate doctrines. However, we should consider whether there is any doctrine in Imperial Rituals, what kind of doctrines and teachings are being spread at Yasukuni Shrine for the comfort of the war dead. Aren't they merely performing rituals for happiness or

comfort?" (p.40).

◎Impact of Sakamoto Koremaru's responses on my research

From the time I heard Sakamoto's answers, I became aware that, in addition to the perspective of conceptual transition that I had noticed through my research on Katō Genchi, the paradigm of thinking that "Western concepts and institutions = universal and orthodox" and "Japanese concepts and institutions = particular, heretical, deviant and distorted" existed implicitly, without being examined yet. At the same time, interest in when and how this imprinting came about added to my research⁴.

● A Question raised by the moderator to Dr Ōishi Makoto

What should we think about the distinction between State Shinto and Sate Shinto System raised by Dr Hirano (p.40)?

● Answers by Dr Ōishi Makoto

- 1.A distinction should be made between State Shinto, as defined in the Shinto Directive, and regimes and social systems. Those who deal with jurisprudence should not flirt with ambiguity in language. A distinction should be made between the understanding of the legal system and the understanding of the situation of our society before the war (p.40).
- 2.Regarding the theory of shrine non-religion, leading intellectuals wrote unanimously before the war that Shrine Shinto was not a religion. What were the reasons for this? What is being done today may provide a clue. Take, for example, the silent prayers at high school baseball games on the anniversary of the end of the war. This can be considered a religious event if one adopts a broad religious concept. However, this is not how most people perceive it. On

⁴ I decided to tackle this issue in earnest when I was struck by the author Isomae Junichi's bizarre writing style in his article "Joron: Chinmoku no Manazashi no Mae de [Introduction: In Front of the Eyes of Silence]" in *Syūkyō To Kōkyō-Kūkan: Minaosareru Syūkyō No Yakuwari* [Religion and Public Space: The Role of Religion Under Review] (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, July 2006) . This feeling of discomfort led me to look again at Dr Isomae's works, and further back to Edward W. Said's *Orientalism* and other works, and I became aware of the role played by modern Japanese official academia, centered on the University of Tokyo, in what I would call its "dedication to Western imperialism through the import, authorization and spread of Western concepts". And I understood the reasons for Isomae's unrest and modulation. I will discuss this again in another paper.

the day of the atomic bombing, the city of Cyōfu calls for a silent prayer over the loudspeaker. This is clearly an official compulsion. It is an external compulsion against the autonomous work of the individual. In this sense, it should be discussed as a matter of freedom of thought, apart from the question of whether it is religious event or not (pp.40-41).

3. We are involved in certain regimes on a daily basis. However, those involved in jurisprudence should avoid making expansive interpretations in a way that flirts with the ambiguity of the language and using those for various movements ⁵(p.41).

● A Question raised by the moderator to Dr Sakamoto Koremaru

You have been studying the relationship between government and religions in modern Japan, using the definition of the Shinto Directive as a working hypothesis at a starting point. What problems do you feel about expanding the definition? Or, rather, do you think it would be better to expand your definition (pp.41-42)?

● Answers by Dr Sakamoto Koremaru

1. My position is somewhere between the State Shinto System including the

⁵ I had a vague sense at the time that 'State Shinto' was a term for a political 'movement'. However, it was through the process of the revelation that the true intention of Shimazono Susumu, who had publicly stated that he would rework the term academically, was a 'movement' that I clearly understood that this aspect was the essence of the term (See my articles; "Shimazono Susumu *Kokka Shinto To Nohonjin* wo Kensyō Suru [Verifying Shimazono Susumu's 'State Shinto and Japanese']", *Seikyō Kankei wo Tadasu Kai Kaihō* [Bulletin of the Association for the Correction of Relationship between Government and Religions], No.39, June 2011: "Syohyō to Syōkai; *Shimazono Susumu Kokka Shinto To Nihonjin* [Book Review and Introduction; Shimazono Susumus 'Stato Shinto and Jajanese']", *Syūkyō Kenkyū* [Journal of Religious Studies], Vol.85, No.2, September 2011; "Futari no 'Kokka Shinto Fukkatsu' Ronja no Dōki nitsuiteno Suiron [Reasoning about the Motives of the Two 'State Shinto Revival' Theorists]", *Seikyō Kankei wo Tadasu Kai Kaihō*, No.48, June 2016). Subsequently, as an extension of my accumulated researchs, *Sengoshi No Nakano 'Kokka Shinto'* [The 'State Shinto' in Postwar History] edited by Yamaguchi Teruomi, which once again critically examined the Murakami's 'State Shinto' theory from the perspective of a 'movement', appeared.

ideology of the Emperor System, which referred by Dr Hirano, and the legal system referred to by Dr Ōishi. This is because a system is always accompanied by an ideology, there is no system without an ideology and an ideology is always institutionalized (p.42).

- 2.The theory of shrine non-religion is also a kind of ideology, which has been institutionalized. The theory of shrine non-religion referred by Jyōdo-shinsyū, the theory referred by Christianity, the theory referred by the military police and the theory referred by the Ministry of Education, each of which is slightly or very different. However, they have been institutionalized (p.42).
- 3.The system based on shrine non-religious theory was transformed after the Manchurian Incident. I once asked Mr. Asizu Uzuhiko about the reasons for this, but he replied that he did not know for sure (p.42).
- 4.The issue raised by Mr.Yamaguchi in this regard is very important. Changes and expansion of religious concept. Until the end of the Meiji period, Jyōdoshinsyū and others did not complain much, but from the Taisyō to the Syōwa period they began to protest about even trivial matters. Hamada Kunimatsu, a member of parliament elected for the ISE constituency, also annoyed the government by actively questioning on the issue of jingū-taima [amulets of Ise Grand Shrine]. The government struggled with the issue of whether shrines are religious, but in the end, the war was lost without a resolution, and State Shinto came to an end (pp.42-43).
- 5.There are various factors behind the end without a resolution, including the problems of new religions, Christianity and the problem of confronting global powers. Ignoring them and centralizing the problem into the issue of State Shinto and the regime is, as pointed out by Mr. Ashiizu, an overestimation of State Shinto (p.43).

● A Question raised by the moderator to Dr Momochi Akira

I would like to hear your opinion on Dr Sakamoto's Answers (p.43).

● Answers by Dr Momochi Akira

- 1.Dr Hirano's idea of distinguishing between State Shinto and the State Shinto System was expressed in his paper in 1995. The reason for this may have been a kind of the collapse of argument as the traditional theory of State

Shinto was no longer valid, and in the result, the theory of the State Shinto System came to be advocated as an alternative to it (p.43).

2. Originally, the issue of State Shinto came out of the realm of the theory of separation of government and religions, and GHQ also basically regarded it as an issue of separation of government and religions. Its field of study should not be expanded unintentionally (p.43).
3. The visits to shrines organized by schools before the war cannot immediately be regarded as a compulsion of faith. They did not force those who were unwilling to do so for religious reasons to perform religious acts (p.43).

● Questions raised by the moderator to Mr. Yamaguchi Teruomi

1. In Dr Hirano's discussion, he talks about the coercion of school events as "unwittingly taking students in the direction of worshipping shrines". However, is there such a thing as coercion that is not perceived as coercion? Doesn't the existence of coercion presuppose the existence of an awareness of being coerced? Is it reasonable for later people to assess as coercion what people in the past did not perceive as coercion? (pp.43-44)
2. Mr. Yamaguchi's point about changes in social consciousness is important in this respect. However, when it comes to the issues of inner mind, consciousness and social awareness, it may be very difficult to confirm such changes. (p.44)

● Answers by Mr. Yamaguchi Teruomi

1. I used to think that there were two different types of State Shinto. One is the theory of Murakami Shigeyoshi, which centers on shrine rituals or the combination of Shrine Shinto and Imperial Rituals. The other is Hirano's theory, which is built around the non-religious theory of shrines. Recently, however, more and more people have built their theories on the definition of the Shinto Directive, and there are not many who have taken over Murakami's theory as it is. This tendency is thought to be because State Shinto research has advanced to some extent and strict definitions are now required. (p.44)
2. However, if we look at the earlier period on the basis of what was defined at the last stage, it is easy to get an image of the development of State Shinto. However, there are challenges here as well, considering the kind of

transformation that has taken place in the intervening years. (p.44)

3. In a culture like Japan, where both Shintoism and Buddhism are compatible, I do not think that the meaning of enforcing a certain faith is the same as that of not allowing any faith other than a certain faith. (p.44)
4. There are individual differences in the way people feel and perceive coercion. There is also the question of how to evaluate the difference. (p.45)

● An opinion of the moderator

Minobe Tatsukichi insisted that 'the duty of subjects' was not 'believe in Shrine Shinto', but 'don't disrespect to it'. He also said that the worship of Shrine Shinto could not be enforced. It is very important to consider the Japanese spiritual background underlying his argument. (p.45)

● Opinions of Dr Ōishi Makoto

1. Mr. Yamaguchi's point that it is necessary to add the element of 'Japanese spiritual background' to the typology of religious systems is important. (p.45)
2. "Unknowingly", as Dr Hirano points out, is also an important factor when considering the overall résumé. In Europe, Christian morality and a sense of order are very commonly inculcated by the education system. It is because of such tendency that the neutrality of public schools is discussed. (p.45)
3. However, I am not comfortable with the term 'State Shinto', and I cannot accept the argument that while it is acceptable to unknowingly educate people about religion in Europe, it is not acceptable in Japan, because it would be a double standard. (p.45)
4. I agree with Dr Hirano that there should also be a broader discussion of the overall résumé or the atmosphere around the system. (p. 45)

● Opinions of Dr Sakamoto Koremaru

1. Twenty years after the Meiji Restoration, when the Constitution and the Imperial Rescript on Education were promulgated, the Shinto rituals such as the *Kannamesai* [Ritual at Ise Grand Shrine to offer new grain to Amaterasu] were incorporated into national holiday chants and school ceremonial songs. People at that time did not feel any discomfort about these. In addition, since

shrine cleanups and village Shinto festivals were a natural custom, people did not feel any discomfort when they were incorporated into school events. (p.46)

2. However, as the late Meiji, Taisyō, and Syōwa eras progressed, an increasing number of people began to feel a sense of discomfort. This was related to the emergence of people who denied the very system of the state itself, such as Marxism and anarchism. (p.46)
3. Against this trend, the Police Department and the Justice Department, which initially cracked down only on anarchists and communism, later included liberalism in their crackdowns and even the realm of academia. (p.46)
4. I am struggling with how to evaluate these changes. It is because I don't want to be misunderstood and be subjected to humiliating term as "the creator of the State Shinto Exemption" as before. (p.46)

● An opinion of the moderator

I am not convinced by the explanation that the causes of later changes were present from the beginning. For example, repeated events and performances. If a change occurred, the cause should have been the addition of a new element that was not there at the beginning. The theory that the essence of what existed from the beginning was gradually exposed is not satisfactory as an empirical idea, let alone theology⁶. (p.47).

8. Reflections on the discussion by each participant

● Dr Momochi Akira

1. I was able to recognize that the problems surrounding the theory of shrine

⁶ Although I did not anticipate it at the time, Shimazono Susumu's "State Shinto" theory at the later emergence was precisely the same explanation. As of 2019, it has become a rigid monistic theory that the root of all the ills of the prewar period was the idea of a "Shinsei-Tennō [Sacred Emperor]" (*Shinsei-Tennō no Yukue; Kindai Nihon no Kijiku* [Where did the Sacred Emperor Go?; The Basis of Modern Japanese Society, Tokyo: Chikuma-syobō, April 2019. *Meiji Taitei no Tanjō; Teito no Kokka Shinto ka* [The Birth of the Great Emperor Meiji; The State Shintoization of the Imperial Capita], Tokyo: Shunjū-sya, May 2019).

non-religion arose as the definition and concept of religion itself changed and public consciousness changed after the Meiji period. (p.47)

2. Even when discussing the legal system from today's perspective, it is impossible to talk about the relationship between government and religions in our country without mentioning the changes in public consciousness and historical background. (p.47)
3. In litigation over the separation of state and religions, there are cases in which the intolerance of Shinto is mentioned. The argument is that Shinto is tolerant of those who accept Shinto, but intolerant of those who reject it. However, to put it another way, some of the litigants are more intolerant and are not afraid to say publicly that they are fighting idolatry. It is impossible to say that we should be tolerant even of those who say so. (p.47)
4. In Japan, some criticize that there are harassments against litigants. However, it is written in Professor Hayakawa Takeo's *Amerika Hō no Saizensen* [The Frontiers of American Laws] that there are much more intense persecutions in U.S.A. It is not appropriate to ignore the cases and exaggerate only what happens in Japan. (p.48)

● Mr. Yamaguchi Teruomi

1. Dr Sakamoto Koremaru's researches have revealed the institutional aspects of State Shinto in considerable detail. (p.48)
2. Based on this premise, there is an atmosphere of rethinking the résumé. (p.48).
3. In the field of historical studies, there are considerably fewer people using the concept of State Shinton and more people using the concept of national unity and Michel Foucault's theory of power. This tendency has led to less interest in religion. For my part, I would like to take them into account and consider the extent of the territory of Shrine Shinto in society. (p. 48)
4. What we have discussed today is that the Japanese began to think things through the term of religion in the modern era, and that this was a series of painful steps. I believe that it is necessary to take a serious look at religion, or at the concept of religion itself, once again. (pp. 48-49)
5. I felt that the progress of research has led to a great deal of what is shared around researchers. (p.49)

● Dr Ōishi Makoto

1. I realized once again that there are various views on the relationship between government and religions in modern Japan, and that fruitful discussion will not be possible without proper conceptualization. (p.49)
2. One of the reasons why fewer and fewer people are relying on the Murakami's theory is the lack of study by constitutional scholars. There is an atmosphere that avoids talking positively about religion. Even when I say that a distinction should be made between atheistic separation of government and religions and theistic separation of government and religions, it is not understood. (p.49)
3. It seems that those who have drawn a picture of the State Shinto System were very good at making it easy to understand. If you want to counter it, you need to reconstruct the such picture as the antithesis. (p.49)

● Dr Sakamoto Koremaru

For the first time in my life, I felt that I was glad to have participated in such a symposium and that I had learned a lot from it. (p.49)

● Opinions of the moderator

1. One of today's issues was to approach the consciousness of people in the past. Conversely, it was to eliminate the assumptions of the people of the present. It is dangerous to try to interpret history based on the assumptions of the present, relying only on logic and facts favorable to ourselves. (p. 49)
2. Itō Takashi states that the application of the Public Security Law to religious people was initially "unimaginable," and that the reason it happened was to maintain the organization of the Special Higher Police, which was created to control the Communist Party, after its destruction. As can be seen from this, it is dangerous to determine the cause based on the assumptions of the people of the present⁷. (p.49)
3. As far as "unconsciously" is concerned, it is doubtful that even those who actively performed certain acts in a certain period of time were aware that

⁷ I took up this point again in *The Illusion of Living God "Arahitogami" and "State Shinto"* (pp.221-222, 2003). However, in the revised and enlarged edition (2006), I omitted that part (p.224), which I now regret. For this reason, I have registered both books in the Academic Repository of the Kogakkan University.

they were intentionally manipulating something. It is conceivable that they were unconscious. This point also needs to be clarified empirically.

Last Chapter

Mr. Yamaguchi Teruomi, one of the participants, made the following two points about the significance of this symposium.

1. It was a rare opportunity those who were at the forefront of the study of modern Japanese relationship between government and religions developed their own theories, taking into account the differences of opinion among them.
2. This symposium is not conclusive, nor is it intended to be so from the outset. However, this symposium may serve as a guide for those who wish to consider the relationship in the future. What are currently being considered at the forefront of the research and how do they relate to each other? This symposium brought these issues into sharp relief. (p.53)

As Mr. Yamaguchi points out, I still believe that this symposium was a milestone in the study of modern Japanese political and religious relations. And because the existence of this symposium is not well known, some researchers have ended up in discussions that have regressed considerably from this point in time, and some fields have not progressed at all. In order to overcome these problems, I have presented the main points of the symposium in this paper, after posting the record of the symposium in the Academic Repository of the Kogakkan University.

However, the original purpose of this paper was to confirm the significance of this symposium in my research history. The individual meanings of issues discussed in this symposium are described in the form of "Impact on my research" in the main text, so I will not repeat them here. I will also discuss how this symposium as a whole relates to my subsequently published papers in a separate paper.