

The position of *Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū*; in relation to my methods and issues.

NITTA Hitoshi

KOGAKKAN RONSO No.4, Volume 53

January, 2021

□ Summary

I will explain the position that my doctoral thesis, *Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū* [A basic study of relationship between government and religions in modern Japan] (Tokyo: Daimeidō, 1997), occupies in my own research history. The methods used in this thesis were threefold; (1). Contrasting the academic theories at the time of writing the doctoral thesis with the actual situation in the past: (2). Contrasting the theories of the time with those of the past: (3). Examining a group of theories as an object of historical research from the perspective of their emergence, development and completion, and clarifying their problems. The conclusions of the doctoral thesis are as follows; (1) .It is inappropriate to use the 'State Shinto' as a term that encompasses the entirety of relationship between government and religions in modern Japan: (2). Instead of 'State Shinto', it is proposed that the term 'Official Religion System' or 'Japanese-style Official Religion System' should be used. Finally, the issues that have emerged from the compilation of this thesis are explained.

□ Keywords

State Shinto, Official Religion System, The Method of Interpretation, The Method of Retraction

Introduction

The following is a summary of what has been said in my articles 'Summarizing a Career of Research on "State Shinto": An Awareness of Its Necessity and a Perspective on Summarizing It' and 'The Beginning of Summarizing a Career of Research on "State Shinto" and an Encounter with Katō Genchi' published in this journal so far.

1. After my appointment to Kogakkan University in April 1988, I began to feel the

need to organize the history of “State Shinto” research. When I began this work, I once again began to feel doubts about the theory of “State Shinto”, which considers it self-evident that “State Shinto” was the source of the war.

2. To answer this question, I began to examine the “Shinto Directive”, which is said to have dismantled the “State Shinto” as the source of the war.

3. This examination led me to the works of W. P. Woodard, the first researcher of the “Shinto Directive”, who claimed that what the “Shinto Directive” sought to abolish as the source of the war was not “State Shinto” but “Kokutai Cult”.

4. To incorporate Woodard's view, I considered the method of organizing the study of “State Shinto” using terms other than “State Shinto”, but I could not ignore the state of research at the time, when his arguments were completely ignored.

5. In order to solve this problem, I decided to organize the history of “State Shinto” research using the terms “State Shinto in A Broad Sense” and “State Shinto in A Narrow Sense”, referring to the conceptual distinction between “Separation of Religion and State in A Broad Sense” and “Separation of Religion and State in A Narrow Sense” as argued by Momochi Akira.

6. The outlook in '5' above was, in fact, almost firmly established as early as 1990. I presented it as a tentative theory at the conference of the Shinto-Shi-Gakkai [Shinto History Society] (3 June 1990) under the title "On the Concept of 'State Shinto'".

7. It took me just under nine years to turn this presentation into a paper. The reasons are that I needed to finish my research on Woodard first, and also that because I began to feel the need to establish the point of origin of “State Shinto in A Broad Sense”, at first, I started research on Katō Genchi.

8. I began my identification of the origins of “State Shinto in A Broad Sense” from Kato's works for two reasons. One was because Woodard, as early as 1965, equated “Kokutai Cult” with “State Shinto” advocated by Katō. The other reason was that researchers of the “Shinto Directive” had said that Katō's theory of “State

Shinto” influenced it. The research on Katō's works convinced me of two things. One was that he was the person at the origin of the theory of “State Shinto in A Broad Sense”. The other was that the theory was an “illusion”.

These are the things I had reached by 1995¹. If things had continued as they were, in 1996 I was supposed to work on compiling the presentation, "On the Concept of 'State Shinto'" in 1990, a paper. However, the actual publication of the paper was not completed until 1999. The reason was that one of my supervisors, Dr. Sakamoto Koremaru, recommended that I compile the theses I had written up to that point into a doctoral thesis, which took me a year to write². As a result of the work, I identified a number of issues that needed to be resolved before I could write my organization of the history of "State Shinto" research, which I had to tackle first. The purpose of this paper is to explain what these issues were and what the writing of my doctoral thesis meant for my own research history.

1. Determination of the basic structure of the doctoral thesis and its implications for my research

The work process for preparing the doctoral thesis was as follows;

① . Divided my articles, which I had published up to that point, into several

¹ During this year I wrote “W · P · Woodard no ‘Kokutai Kyōshin Syugi’Ron [W. P. Woodard's ‘Kokutai Cult’ theory] ”(*Tani Sheigo Sensei Taisyoku Kinen Shinto-gaku Ronbunshū* [Professor Tani Sheigo's Retirement Commemorative Collection of Articles on Shinto Study] , Tokyo: Kokusyo-kankō-kai, July) and "Katō Genchi no Kokka Shintō Kan [Katō Genchi's View of State Shinto] " (*Syūkyōhō* [Religious Law] , No.14, October). In the same year, I reprinted and wrote a commentary for the students of Kōgakukan University on a long out-of-print book, *Meiji-ishin to Tōyō no Kaihō* [Meiji Restoration and The Freedom of The East Asia] , by Ashizu Uzuhiko (Mie: Kōgakukan University Press, August). And in September, Sakamoto Takao's *Syōcyō Tennōsei to Nihon no Raireki* [The Symbolic Emperor System and the History of Japan (Tokyo: Toshi-syuppan) was published, which I also read. My involvement with these two books during this period was one of the foundations of my book, *The Illusion of Living God “Arahitogami” and “State Shinto”*, published in February 2003.

² *Kindai Seikyōkankei No Kisoteki Kenkyū*, Tokyo: Taimeidō, April 1997. Hereafter, the number of pages in () in this paper refers to the number of pages in the book, unless otherwise noted.

groups according to the commonality of the issues and the subjects they dealt with.

- ② . Organized the groupings in the form of sections and chapters, and revised the text to make the interrelationships between the papers clearer.
- ③ . Clarified the issues that run through the entire doctoral thesis and considered the title of the thesis.
- ④ . Presented tasks of the whole thesis and each part and chapter in the introduction, and the conclusions and future tasks in the final chapter.

After completing the work process, I listed the following three points as the main points of the doctoral thesis in "Final Chapter: Conclusion and Future Tasks" (pp.342-346).

- ① . The research I had conducted up to that point "was a work to break down the existing theoretical system" that had been constructed under the term "State Shinto".
- ② . As a result of the dismantling work, I had come to the conclusion that it is inappropriate to use the term "State Shinto" as a term that encompasses the entirety of relationship between government and religions in modern Japan.
- ③ . Therefore, I felt the need to establish an alternative term for "State Shinto", and proposed using the term "Official Religions System" or "Japanese-style Official Religions System" for the time being.

The dismantling work in ① has a four-part structure, but in terms of differences in method, it could be divided into three parts.

Part I, "On the Government Policy toward Shinto and Jyodō Shinsyū in the Meiji Period," and Part II, "On the Relationship between Government and Religions around the Time when the Meiji Constitution was enacted," take the approach of clarifying the problems with today's theories by contrasting the theories of the time of writing the paper with the actual conditions of the past.

Part III, "On the Theories of Relationship between Government and Religions which were advocated by Theorists who advocate Emperor's Sovereignty," takes the approach of clarifying the problems with today's theories by contrasting them with those of the past.

Part IV, "The Two Origins of the Theory of "State Shinto," uses the following approach; On the one hand, I determine the origin of a certain group of theories, with the aim of understanding them in terms of their emergence, development,

and completion: On the other hand, in order to secure a critical base for the group of theories, I clarify the significance of a theory that was not mainstreamed. In this way, I relativize a certain group of theories as a object of historical research and clarify their problems.

The method described in Part I and Part II is a common method in historical studies, and I have been using it since writing my master's thesis³. The method described in Part III has been used under circumstances such as those explained in "Summarizing a Career of Research on "State Shinto": An Awareness of Its Necessity and a Perspective on Summarizing It " (Vol. 53, No. 2 of this journal). I am not sure about other fields, but I am probably the only one who uses this method in the field of the relationship of government and religions in modern Japan, or at least I am the first one who started using this method in this field⁴.

In my papers after writing my doctoral thesis, the three aforementioned methods are combined in a single paper. A typical example of this is *The Illusion of Living God "Arahitogami" and "State Shinto": What did invoke Absolute God?* (PHP Research Institute, February 2003). However, I dare to classify the individual papers in terms of the three methods as follows.

³ My master's thesis, "Meiji Zenhannki no Syūkyō Gyōsei no Hensen to Sono Igi [On the Changes in Religious Administration in the First Half of the Meiji Era and Their Significance]" (submitted to the Graduate School of Political Science, Waseda University, December 1984). The position and significance of this thesis will be discussed in a separate article.

⁴ My doctoral thesis was awarded the Tagami Jōji Prize by the Japan Association for Comparative Constitutional Law. This was a prize from an academic association that is dedicated to comparative research with foreign constitutions. Certainly, this thesis dealt with the period when the Meiji Constitution was enacted, and the relationship between government and religions and the separation of government and religions are major issues in constitutional law. I also mentioned the need for comparison with foreign constitutions. However, since I was not making comparisons with foreign constitutions per se, at the time I received the prize, I felt some discomfort as well as a sense of gratitude. However, now that I think about it again, the fact that I expanded the possibilities of the "comparative" method and attempted to clarify the problems with today's theories from a multifaceted comparative perspective makes me think that this thesis would be appropriate for the prize of the academic association.

- ① . A paper by first method; “Shimazono Susumu ‘Kokka Shinto’ Ron Saikō; Naimusyō Jinja Kyoku Hen *Kokutai Ron Shi* (Taisyō Jyūnen Ichigatsu) no Imisurumono wa Nanika [Reconsideration on 'State Shinto' Theory by Shimazono Susumu: What is the Meaning of *History of the Theory of National Polity* (edited by the Shrine Bureau of the Ministry of Interior, January 1926)] ” (*Bulletin of the Meiji Seitoku Kinen Gakkai*, Reissued No. 51, November 2014).
- ② . Papers by second method; “Oda Yorozu no Cyosaku niokeru Seikyō Kankei Ruikeiron no Henka nitsuite [On the Changes in the Category Type Theory of Relationship between Government and Religions in the Writings of Oda Yorozu]” (*Bulletin of the Meiji Seitoku Kinen Gakkai*, Reissued No. 28, December 1999): “Oda Yorozu no ‘Jinja Kōhōjin’ Setsu to ‘Jinja Hisyūkyōdantai’ Setsu [‘Shrine Public Corporation’ Theory and ‘Shrine Non-Religious Organization’ Theory by Oda Yorozu] ”(*Bulletin of Kokugakuin University*, Vol.104, No. 11, November 2003): "Shinkyū Kōshitsu Tenpan niokeru ‘Kōtō’ no Imi nitsuite [On the Meaning of 'Imperial Lineage' in the New and Old Imperial Household Laws] ” (*Nihon Hōgaku*, Vol.82, No.3, December 2016): "Meiji Kenpō Ka no Seikyō Kankei [The Relationship between Government and Religions under the Meiji Constitution] ” (*Constitutional Law Study*, No.51, June 2019).
- ③ . Papers by third method; "‘Kokka Shinto’ Ron no Keihu [The Genealogy of the 'State Shinto' Theory] (1)" (*Kōgakukan Ronsō*, Vol.32, No.1, February 1999): "‘Kokka Shinto’ Ron no Keihu [The Genealogy of the 'State Shinto' Theory] (2)" (*Kōgakukan Ronsō*, Vol.32, No.2, April 1999): " ‘Kokka Shinto’ Kenkyū Shi no Seiri [Organizing Research on 'State Shinto'] ” (*Journal of Shinto History*, Vol.53, No.1, June 2005): "Saikin no Dōkō wo humaeta ‘Kokka Shinto’ Kenkyū no Saiseiri [Reorganizing Research on 'State Shinto' in Light of Recent Developments] ” (*Religion Law*, No.32, October 2013).

In light of the above arrangement, it is clear that I used the second method mainly in analyzing the works of scholars in the field of constitutional and administrative law. The third method was born from the purpose of organizing the history of "State Shinto" research, and in my doctoral thesis, after identifying the final destination of the “State Shinto” theory (Murakami Shigeyoshi’s "State Shinto" theory), I confirmed its starting point (Katō Genchi’s "State Shinto" theory) and presented a perspective to relativize and critically examine them (W. P. Woodard’s "Kokutai Cult" theory). Therefore, the next natural step was to connect

the final destination point with the starting point and describe what have happened after the final destination point, but the reason I did not do so immediately was that there were issues to be resolved before it.

2. Basic problem consciousness and individual issues of each section and chapter

In the previous chapter, I explained my methodology, which I became aware of through writing my doctoral thesis, and how it led to my later achievements. In this chapter, I will once again confirm the problem consciousness that was the basis of my methodology and describe how this basic problem consciousness is connected to each of the subjects under consideration.

First, in the introduction chapter, "Themes and Structure of this Thesis," I stated that this thesis focused on the term "State Shinto," which was used when discussing the relationship between government and religions in modern Japan, and that my purpose was to examine the "State Shinto" theories of Murakami Shigeyoshi, a religious historian, and Miyazawa Toshiyoshi, a constitutional scholar, who shaped common sense regarding this terminology. Next, I explained that the method used to verify the appropriateness of the two scholars' theories was to extract the main points of their arguments and compare them to the reality of the past.

Part I and II implemented this method directly. What was addressed and examined in Part I was the position of Buddhism as "oppressor, resister, and unwilling collaborator," which was almost automatically assumed by the use of the term "State Shinto" and therefore had not been examined before my research. The subject of this research was the thoughts and actions of Shimaji Mokurai, a representative Buddhist of the early Meiji period, famous for his advocacy of freedom of religion and separation of government and religions. To be more specific, I examined his ideas and their changes in his views on relationship between government and religions and on Shinto, how the government came to adopt his "Shinto non-religious theory," and the role of the Jyōdo Shinsyū Order in the formation process of relationship between government and religions in the early Meiji period.

What was addressed and examined in Part II was the interpretation of the Constitution of the Empire of Japan, which formed the core of Murakami Shigeyoshi's "State Shinto System" theory. Murakami's theory argued that the Imperial Constitution established a "State Shinto system" in which "State Shinto" "reigned over" the recognized religions of Sectarian Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity as a "super-religious state ritual". And the "State Shinto" that formed the superstructure of this "State Shinto System" was said to have been formed through a "direct link" between Shrine Shinto and the Imperial Household Shinto. Therefore, with the key words of this "State Shinto System" theory, "super-religion," "reign over," and "direct link" in mind, I examined the actual situation during the period of the enactment of the Imperial Constitution in terms of the following three points.

- ① . What was the Shinto policy concept of Inoue Kowashi, the central figure in the formulation of the Imperial Constitution, and what was the Shinto policy concept of the Ministry of Interior, the government agency in charge of religious administration at the time (Chapter 4)?
- ② . What was the intention behind the Kancyō-seido, which officially recognized Sectarian Shinto and Buddhism (Chapter 5)?
- ③ . What was the intention of the policy shift to Shrine Shinto just prior to the enactment of the Constitution (Chapter 6)?

What was addressed and examined in Part III was the interpretation of the Constitution of the Empire of Japan, which formed the core of Miyazawa Toshiyoshi's "State Shinto" theory. According to Miyazawa, the Meiji Constitution was a constitution based on the sovereignty of the emperor, and because the sovereignty was based on an Shincyoku [Amaterasu's Edict] , Shrine Shinto was given the status of national religion and the worship was enforced on the people. If this theory was correct, the scholars who advocated the Emperor's sovereignty should have developed an argument that justified the forced the worship on the people by the basis of the Edict. Therefore, I examined the arguments of Hozumi Yatsuka (Chapter 7) and Uesugi Shinkichi (Chapter 8), two representative prewar theorists of the emperor's sovereignty. In the "introduction chapter", I stated that I would examine the Miyazawa's theory to see whether or not was an argument in line with the actual situation, but I realized while writing this paper that the method I actually used was not (1) but (2).

In Part IV, as a subject of historical research, I attempted to clarify the point of origin of the "State Shinto" theory or the keyword "State Shinto" itself and the point of origin of objections to this theory. For the former, I took up Katō Gentchi's theory of "State Shinto" (Chapter 9), and for the latter, W.P. Woodard's theory of "Kokutai Cult" (Chapter 10).

3. Conclusion and Issues

In this chapter, I will describe what had become clear from the aforementioned examination and what issues had emerged for further consideration, based on "Conclusion and Future Issues" (pp.342-346) in the last chapter of this doctoral thesis.

After the examination in Part I, I had come to the conclusion that Jyodō Shinsyū Order should be given the status of a shaping entity of modern Japanese political and religious relations. The reason for this was that the two major principles of modern Japanese political and religious relations, the "Shrine Shinto nonreligious" theory and the Kancyō-seido (Public Religions System), were both adopted by the government in line with Jyodō Shinsyū Order claims, rejecting the demands of Shrine Shinto and other orders of Buddhism. Based on this conclusion, I argued that it is inappropriate to use the term "State Shinto," which cannot express this status of Jyodō Shinsyū Order, as a term that encompasses the entirety of political and religious relations in modern Japan.

After the examination in Part II, I had concluded that the argument that "State Shinto" was created by a "direct link" between Shrine Shinto and the Imperial Household Shinto did not hold water. This is because by the time the Imperial Constitution was enacted, the vast majority of shrines had been placed in a state of irrelevance to the government, and even for major shrines, separation from state finances had become the default, and the government did not adopt even a modest attempt to directly link even a small number of major shrines with the imperial household. It became also clear from records of discussions in the Cabinet and Privy Council that the government had no intention of turning "Imperial Household Shinto" or "Shrine Shinto" into "super-religious state rituals. Furthermore, an examination of historical documents concerning the adoption of the Kancyōseido revealed that the government did not intend for "Imperial

Household Shinto" or "Shrine Shinto" to "reign over" Sectarian Shinto, Buddhism, or Christianity. Therefore, Murakami's theory that the "State Shinto system" was established around the time of the enactment of the Imperial Constitution did not hold water, and I raised the issue that rather it was a time when the government was most "cold" toward shrines, even in the prewar period.

After the examination in Part III, I concluded that the Emperor Sovereignty Theory did not argue that shrine visits should be forced upon the people, and that no direct connection was made between the Emperor Sovereignty Theory and "Shrine Shinto." To be clear, Imperial Household Shinto and Shrine Shinto had nothing to do with the theory of Emperor Sovereignty. The reason for this is that Hozumi's theory of emperor sovereignty relied on the "ancestral worship" theory with the family at its core, while Uesugi's theory of emperor sovereignty relied on the Emperor Only God theory, so there was no logical necessity to use Japanese deities [神々 Kamigami] and shrines as the basis for emperor sovereignty in either argument.

After the examination in Part IV, I concluded that the origin of "State Shinto" (State Shinto in A Broad Sense) as a term referring to the entirety of prewar political and religious relations was Katō Genchi's theory, and moreover, it was put forth as a theory of criticism of the status quo (presentation of an ideal) rather than as an explanation of the current situation. In addition, I pointed out that W. P. Woodard's theory of "Kokutai Cult" was extremely important in the sense that he made a distinction between "Shinto" including "State Shinto" and "Kokutai Cult," which the Shinto Directive aimed to dismantle, and in the sense that he defined "Kokutai Cult" as a limited phenomenon from the late 1920s (or the 1930s) to the early 1940s. If I were to restate this point at this time, I would say that W. P. Woodard's argument should be regarded as the starting point of the postwar criticism of "State Shinto" theory.

Having finished writing the above conclusions, I then listed the following four issues to be addressed in the future. The first was that, in response to Ashizu Uzuhiko's assertion that the "shrine non-religious" theory was placed in a "state of no-wind" (i.e., not criticized at all) through the Meiji and Taisyō periods to the beginning of the Syōwa period, it was necessary to examine the formation process of such a strong social consciousness back to the Edo period. However,

my subsequent research did not move in the direction of going back in time, but rather, became descended in time to examine how the "shrine non-religious" theory came to be subjected to criticism.

The second issue was to show that if "State Shinto" was inappropriate as a term to encompass the entirety of political and religious relations in modern Japan, then I would indicate what term was appropriate to use? For then, I assumed that the term would fall into the category of "public religions system," which was common in Europe at the time, and I would examine whether this assumption was appropriate or not in several cases. These cases included a reconfirmation of the various principles of religious administration established during the period when the Imperial Constitution was enacted, the actual operation of the principles after that time, an investigation of the system and its operation in European countries of the same period and a comparison with the results, and an investigation of the intentions and actual realities of the suppression of religion allegedly carried out by the government during the Syōwa era.

The third issue was to find out who, in the prewar period, was advocating the interpretation of the Imperial Constitution as Miyazawa Toshiyoshi's statement that it compelled the people to worship at shrines and to believe in the faith. To be more specific, I wanted to find out who started making this claim, when and why, and how and to what extent this claim came to influence government policy. In this regard, I would state only conclusion, it was Katō Gentchi in the case of religious scholars, and Miyazawa Toshiyoshi himself, in the case of constitutional scholars, who initiated the claim.

The fourth and final issue was to complete the history of the "State Shinto" theories. This task was fulfilled in "'Kokka Shinto' Ron no Keihu (Jou) [The Genealogy of the 'State Shinto' Theory] (1)" (*Kōgakukan Ronsō*, Vol.32, No.1, February 1999) and "'Kokka Shinto' Ron no Keihu (Ge) [The Genealogy of the 'State Shinto' Theory] (2)" (*Kōgakukan Ronsō*, Vol.32, No.2, April 1999). And They were revised in "'Kokka Shinto' Kenkyū Shi no Seiri [Organizing Research on 'State Shinto']" (*Journal of Shinto History*, Vol.53, No.1, June 2005) and "Saikin no Dōkō wo humaeta 'Kokka Shinto' Kenkyū no Saiseiri [Reorganizing Research on 'State Shinto' in Light of Recent Developments]" (*Religion Law*, No.32, October 2013), which were published later.

Final Chapter

When I attempted to address the above four issues, what I found most difficult was that they were too broad and deep for me to tackle them my only. I therefore decided to seek the wisdom of researchers who, at the time, were active in the forefront of research on political and religious relations in modern Japan. This is the reason why the symposium was planned, "Kindai Nihon no Seikyō-kankei no Wakugumi wo megutte - Tokuni 「Kokka Shinto」 wo Cyūshin to shite - [On the Framework of Political and Religious Relations in Modern Japan; With Special Reference to 'State Shinto'] " (October 25, 1997), organized by the Shinto Research Institute of the Kogakkan University.