

## Chapter 2

### From the Beginning of the Meiji Period to the Promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education

NITTA Hitoshi<sup>1</sup>

#### A Bitter Experience During the Beginning of the Meiji Period

Shortly after the Meiji Restoration, it was thought to be an urgent matter for all Japanese people to feel unity with the state, feel unity as a nation, and have loyalty to the state in order to maintain independence while confronting Western powers. Thus, a movement to educate the people developed, one which we can call a movement to form the “consciousness of the nation” (*kokumin ishiki*). It placed primary importance on Shinto, and secondary importance upon Buddhism and Confucianism in the government’s great promulgation campaign (*taikyō senbu undō*). This happened from 1872 to 1875 during the Meiji period (1868–1912). The priests and monks who were engaged in this education movement were called *kyōdōshoku* and they educated the people according to three standards of instruction (*sanjō kyōsoku*), which were general principles for educating the people: “to revere the deities and love the state;” “to clarify heavenly principles and the righteous path of men;” and “to humbly serve the emperor and observe the will of the court.” They educated the people accordingly.

However, a dispute occurred at Daikyōin, which was established as both a “research institution of education” and “facility for preaching to the people” for both Shinto and Buddhist priests. Daikyōin was located at Zōjōji Temple in Tokyo, and the government established an altar within it, where three deities of creation (Amenominakanushi no kami, Takamimusubi no kami, and Kamimusubii no kami, who appear at the beginning of the *Records of Ancient Matters* (*Kojiki*)) and Amaterasu Ōmikami were enshrined. Then, the government compelled the Buddhist monks to worship them as well. As a result, Jōdo Shinshū (True Pure Land Sect), which did not believe in worshipping Shinto deities, opposed such an order, and initiated a movement to leave Daikyōin in order to start preaching on their own. This was called the *Daikyōin bunri undō* (movement to separate from Daikyōin). This dispute continued for more than one and a half years, but, in the end, the government accepted the True Pure Land Sect’s position. Not only was their independent teaching allowed but the Daikyōin was also terminated, and the collaborative missionary work of Shinto and Buddhism ended with it (although other Buddhist sects did not necessarily oppose the collaborative missionary work).

This incident became an important lesson to leaders in government who were involved in

---

<sup>1</sup> THE AUTHOR is professor in the Department of Contemporary Japanese Studies at Kōgakkan University. This chapter was originally published in Japanese in Nitta Hitoshi 新田均, “*Arahitogami*” “*Kokka Shintō*” to iu gensō: “*Zettaigami*” wo yobidashita no wa dare ka 「現人神」「国家神道」という幻想—「絶対神」を呼び出したのは誰か (Tokyo: Jinja Shinpōsha 神社新報社, 2014).

religion and education. At the time of this dispute, the foundation of the government had become unstable due to a disagreement on whether to launch a punitive expedition against Korea (*Seikanron*). The policy to educate the people, instead of uniting the nation and supporting the government, brought confrontation and split the world of religion, and this made the government deeply concerned. Officials learned the hard way that it would be troublesome for them to clumsily get involved in issues relating to the teaching of religion.

There is an interesting document which was drafted by Shimaji Mokurai in his position as a leader of the Honganji school of the True Pure Land Sect (Nishihonganji) and submitted by the head priest of Nishihonganji Ōtani Kōson to Chief Minister Sanjō Sanetomi. This document states that “as we adore the Emperor, it is natural to worship the imperial ancestral deity Amaterasu Ōmikami, but the three gods of creation is a doctrine created by followers of Shinto. A single person cannot believe in two religions, so as the True Pure Land Sect, we can never accept it.” What I thought was interesting is Shimaji’s words at the beginning, saying that because Amaterasu Ōmikami is the Emperor’s ancestor, he respects her. It is not that he respects the Emperor because he is a descendant of Amaterasu Ōmikami, but that he also [in addition to respecting the emperor] has to respect Amaterasu Ōmikami because she is the Emperor’s ancestor. 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.

### **The Meaning of the Theory Claiming the Emperor as the Divine Descendant**

Before moving to the late 1870s and early 80s, let us examine what view of the Emperor was introduced to the people in the early years of the Meiji period. We can understand it from a book of commentaries on the three standards of instruction at that time (Miyake Moritsune, *Sanjō kyōsoku engisho shiryō shū*, vols. 1–2, Tokyo: Kinseisha, 2008). According to these texts, many phrases referring to the Emperor as Amaterasu Ōmikami’s descendant using terms such as “*shinson*,” “*shinin*,” and “*shinei*” often appeared. Among these phrases, some examples stated that as the Emperor was “*shinson*,” he was to be revered as an “*arahitogami*,” or a living deity.

On the other hand, though, it is noteworthy that there are many examples explaining that “the Japanese people are also descendants of kami.” For instance, according to a book of commentaries by the Kogi sect of Shingon Buddhism, “the people are deeply aware of their identity as divine descendants and never disrespect their ancestral deities to this day.” Similarly, a book of commentary of the five sects of True Pure Land states: “Our people are also the people of Imperial Japan and the divine descendants.” The *Sansokukyō no shōkei*, written by Kanagaki Robun in July of 1873, clearly explains it for a general audience:

The Emperor of no other country but ours is the descendant of the Sun Goddess or the enshrined deity of the Ise Grand Shrine; thus, there is no higher status than his, and he is the Emperor of the eternal imperial line who is allowed by heaven to govern Japan. Although we are inferior to the Emperor, because we were born in the land of deities (*kami*), our ancestors were also the deities who served Amaterasu Ōmikami. While comparing to paper [also pronounced *kami*] of high quality made from mulberry trees, we are lower like tissue paper, but the ordinary paper of Asakusa is still paper [deities]. Thus, those who do not worship their ancestors go against heaven, and are devils and heretics.

Considering these examples, in terms of the theory that the Emperor was “*shinson*,” the difference between the Emperor and ordinary people lies in whether he or she was the

descendant of Amaterasu Ōmikami or other deities, and there was no difference in a respect that both the Emperor and the people in general are descendants of deities. Therefore, in this discussion, “deification” due to being the descendant of deities was insufficient to make the Emperor an absolute being.

If one reads mythology in a straightforward manner, it depicts the order of heavenly deities centered on Amaterasu Ōmikami, then the descent to earth of Ninigi no mikoto, the grandson of Amaterasu, the creation of earthly deities and the organization of their descendants, so one should not be surprised at the emergence of the idea that the Emperor and the nation are no different in terms of their commonality as the divine descendants, no matter which deity is considered superior. Before the next section begins, it should be mentioned that after the mid 1890s, the theory of the people as “*shinson*” continued to be used in commentaries on the “Imperial Rescript on Education,” where the term frequently appeared.

### **The Lesson of the Pantheon Dispute (*Saijin Ronsō*)**

In 1881, when the democratic movement reached a peak, the government was concerned by internal disputes within Shinto. After the termination of the Daikyōin, an institution called the Office of Shinto Affairs (*Shinto Jimukyoku*) was established for Shinto proselytizers to conduct missionary work, and a dispute took place on whether Ōkuninushi no kami should be enshrined there. The details will be omitted here, but this dispute became so great that it ended up splitting the domain of Shinto into two: the Izumo faction, which demanded Ōkuninushi no kami be enshrined, and the Ise one, which opposed it. Because they could not solve the dispute within the domain of Shinto, the government was brought in to make a judgement, and, in the end, in February of 1881, an imperial decision brought the dispute to a close.

As a result of this dispute, many officials were concerned that if the government continued to allow the Shinto priests to freely conduct missionary work, there would be a risk of similar internal disputes in Shinto, and if that happened, it might weaken the authority of the enshrined deities of the state. This made the government decide in January of 1882 to ban senior priests from proselytizing or conducting funeral ceremonies. This divided Shinto priests into two groups: Shrine Shinto, which engaged in rituals, and Sect Shinto, which engaged in proselytization and funeral ceremonies. This incident also gave a lesson to the officials of the government that when they were directly involved in theological aspects of Shinto, they risked unintentionally undermining the authority of deities, which might then undermine the Emperor’s authority.

### **The Ideas in the Constitution and the Imperial Rescript on Education**

Inoue Kowashi, who was deeply interested in religious policies from early in the period, clearly articulated the lesson from experience that occurred in the first half of the Meiji Period. At the time of drafting “the Imperial Rescript on Education,” he stated in an opinion submitted to Prime Minister Yamagata Aritomo in June of 1890 that: “Words to worship and respect deities should be avoided in the Imperial Rescript on Education because such words will soon become seeds for religious disputes,” and “[t]here should be no such words that please one sect and anger another.”

These words show that the primary concern of Inoue Kowashi, a central figure in drafting the Meiji Constitution as well as the Imperial Rescript on Education, was exploring a placement of the Emperor that would satisfy most of the people. In his “Dai nihon teikoku kenpō happu no chokugo,” he included the following in the conclusion on the February 11, 1889:

Looking back, my ancestors and ancestral deity established this country for eternity with the support of their subjects. This is thanks to my ancestors' great virtue and their subjects' loyalty and braveness; thus, the magnificent history of the country with the love for the country and the public has been preserved.

Here, Inoue showed a historical consciousness that saw the wonderful history of the nation—what it might be more appropriate today to call a “story”—as the result of a collaboration between the imperial ancestors' virtue and their subjects' loyalty, which formed the essential framework of the nation. Moreover, he suggested the fundamental structure of the state aimed to make it prosper through maintaining the collaboration based on the mutual respect of the imperial ancestors and those of their subjects. In short, Inoue's main point was to sustain the narrative of “the history of collaboration between the Emperor and the people” by showing reverence toward each other's ancestors.

Inoue, whose framework formed the greatest common factor in the nation's reverence for the Emperor, must have thought that what was built upon this framework as the political system was “the Meiji Constitution,” and the people, who should make the Constitution function, were shown the necessary virtues in the “Imperial Rescript on Education.” Because of that, he drafted at the beginning of “Imperial Rescript on Education:”

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education.

Inoue recognized the same framework of “the Meiji Constitution” as the “fundamental character of Our Empire” and situated it as the origin of education.

### **The Basis of the Relationship between the Emperor and His Subjects**

What should be noted here is the fact that Inoue found the basis and result of the fundamental framework of the state in “the magnificence of the national history.” I think he found his answer to the question of a lesson he had learned from the experience of making policies since the first year of the Meiji period. In other words, Inoue, through establishing the foundation of the reign of the emperor on the basis of physical (historical) things, attempted to avoid causing dispute on metaphysical matters such as religion or philosophy that would involve the emperor or government in such disputes.

Looking at it this way, one could say “that's not right, because phrases such as “our ancestors and our beliefs” and “our imperial ancestors and our beliefs” clearly show that Japanese mythology has been made the foundation, and there would be no way that Inoue considered other religious groups.” The possible counter argument is based on the interpretation of the word “my ancestral deity” as “Amaterasu Ōmikami.” It is true that Murakami Shigeyoshi said in the past that these words are based on myths and “a specific religious perspective” is expressed, and due to this, “State Shinto” arose out of the Imperial Constitution and the Rescript on Education as a system of thought.

Today, the expression “kōso Amaterasu Ōmikami” is commonly used; thus, from the

viewpoint of present-day common knowledge, the “ancestral deity” of the Imperial Rescript on Education signifies Amaterasu Ōmikami. However, in the case of the terminology used in general during the Meiji Period, it was the term “tenso” that was common to signify “Amaterasu Ōmikami.”

For those readers who are not convinced by the usage of terminology, there is another example. Soon after the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education, the Ministry of Education decided to create a book of commentaries, and requested a professor at Tokyo University and the philosopher Inoue Tetsujirō to prepare it. Upon receiving this request, Inoue drafted it and explained in the draft that the term “*kōso*” used at the beginning of the Imperial Rescript on Education means “Amaterasu Ōmikami,” and “*kōsō*” means “Emperor Jinmu.” In other words, Inoue Tetsujirō tried to explain the meaning of “*kōso kōsō*” based on the theory of the Emperor as “shinson.”

However, Inoue Kowashi presented a different opinion, pointing out that “in the context of building the country, *kōso* refers to Emperor Jinmu while *kōsō* refer to successive emperors in praise of them, which should not be misunderstood” and demanded a correction (Inada Shōji, *Kyōiku chokugo seivitsu katei no kenkyū*, Tokyo: Kōdansha, p. 345). Whereas Tetsujirō interpreted “*kōso*” as Amaterasu and “*kōsō*” as Emperor Jinmu based on the theory of the Emperor as the divine descendant, Kowashi asserted that in the case of explaining the establishment of Japan, “*kōso* should refer to Emperor Jinmu while *kōsō* should refer to the successive emperors based on the theory of “*tokugi*,” or virtue and duty.

Inoue Kowashi also stated the following:

After the splendid achievement of Emperor Jinmu and the successive emperors of the past few thousand years, the greatness of the nation’s virtue and duty is that they are loyal to their Emperor and dutiful toward their parents; this has become so great it is now the unique basis of the education of our country. Therefore, education should be pursued according to the history and customs of the country. This is the way of education for the people (underlining added. Ibid., p. 349).

These sentences show that Inoue Kowashi placed the basis of both the Meiji Constitution and Imperial Rescript on Education upon not “mythology” nor “age of kami” but “history” and “virtue and duty” after Emperor Jinmu’s establishment of the country.

With this fact in mind, when one reads *Dainihon teikoku kenpō gige: Kōshitsu tenpin gige* by Itō Hirofumi, which is a book of commentary of both texts drafted by Inoue Kowashi, one should notice that the three terms “tenso,” “shinso,” and “sosō (an abbreviated form of “*kōso kōsō*”)” were used as words signifying ancestors of the Emperor, and that distinctions were made among them: “tenso” meant “Amaterasu Ōmikami,” “shinso” meant “Emperor Jinmu,” and “sosō” referred to the successive emperors after Jinmu.

However, just because Inoue established the basis of the relationship between the emperor and his subjects in “history,” it is not necessarily the case that his view had nothing to do with “mythology.” Inoue’s specific assertion on the reign of the emperor is famous, because he said that it was not the private reign of the premodern era, or *ushihaku*, but a public reign of the modern era, or *shirasu*. Itō Hirofumi’s *Kenpō gige*, originally drafted by Inoue, explains it in the following way:

Shirasu means nothing but the righteousness of the emperor’s reign. Certainly, the

successive emperors valued the work assigned by the heaven as a mission, and that the emperor's virtue was to reign over the people, which is not private work to serve his family. This is the foundation of the Meiji Constitution (Iwanami Bunko, p.23).

Inoue was inspired by the words in “the mythology of the transfer of the land by Ōkuninushi no kami,” which he mentioned in his lectures and recorded in his personal writings. Also, in the official commentary of the Meiji Constitution, *Kenpōgige*, the four ancient passages were cited as proof of the emperor's reign as “shirasu:” “the oracle that is as eternal as heaven and earth,” “Yamato Takeru's words,” “Emperor Monmu's edict at the time of his enthronement,” and the “imperial rescripts of the successive emperors.”

Thus, Inoue regarded both mythology and history as the base of his view when he spoke about the characteristics of the emperor's reign. However, he did not use the mythology as the foundation when he spoke about the emperor's reign itself.

As for “the Imperial Rescript on Education,” Inoue asserted that those who were in charge of it should carefully consider not only its content but also the way of being publicized and enforced. As he placed an importance upon an issue of freedom of thought, Inoue suggested that “the Imperial Rescript on Education should be publicized not as an imperial edict that is legally binding, but as the Emperor's literary work for the public. This view was supported by the government, and “the Imperial Rescript on Education” was publicized not as the Emperor's official document along with an attached paper showing the ministers who signed onto it, but as the Emperor's social writings without mention of the ministers and without having any legal obligations. However, the Imperial Rescript on Education eventually gained absolute authority as the Emperor's direct words free from the intervention of ministers.