

## INOUE ENRYŌ RESEARCH AT TOYO UNIVERSITY

Editorial by Rainer SCHULZER

### Introduction

Toyo University was founded by INOUE Enryō 井上円了 (1858–1919) in 1887 as the Philosophy Academy 哲学館. On the occasion of its 125th anniversary, in 2012, the International Association for Inoue Enryō Research was established. The university wants to stimulate research about its founder in both Japan and abroad. The founding of the research association, even more so an international one, reflects the belief that INOUE Enryō is worthy of academic inquiry, not only as the founder of Toyo University, but also as a historical person in general. Notwithstanding, the research about INOUE Enryō will continue to be linked to Toyo University in many ways. The administration, publishing, and the annual meetings of the Association will likely be located at Toyo University. Moreover, any future research will rely on preceding work and edited materials produced at Toyo University and its Inoue Enryō Memorial Academic Center (founded in 1990). This second issue of *International Inoue Enryō Research* provides

<sup>0</sup> The author is a member of the board of directors and of the editorial board of the International Association for Inoue Enryō Research.

an opportunity to reflect on the premises of INOUE Enryō research pursued at Toyo University.

Today, Toyo University is a non-profit cooperation based on the Private School Law of 1949. Its regulations issued in 1952 define its purpose as "conducting education and research based on the founding spirit [建学の精神] of founder Dr. Inoue Enryō" (1.1.3).<sup>1</sup> It is evident that this very spirit also has to be applied in the research about INOUE Enryō himself. The present editorial sets out to clarify what it means to research in this "founding spirit of INOUE Enryō." Since its centenary, Toyo University has emphasized the *Educational Principles of Inoue Enryo* (1987),<sup>2</sup> rather than his ideas about scholarship. I examine a hitherto neglected founding document of the Philosophy Academy in order to demonstrate that the philosophical idea of research and scholarship was present at Toyo University since its establishment.<sup>3</sup> The result of the investigation will be related to Enryō's two life-long principles, "Protection of Country and Love of Truth" 護国愛理. Because the phrase appears in none of Enryō's school policies, its relation to the founding spirit of the Philosophy Academy is a matter of debate. However, Enryō has been explicit that all his educational activities are based on his primary values covering theory (i.e., Love of Truth) and practice (i.e., Protection of Country) (11:486), therefore, reference to them is indispensable for interpreting the Academy's founding documents. For a detailed survey of the historical development of Toyo University's public identity, particularly in relation to Protection of Country and Love of Truth, compare the research by MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫.<sup>4</sup>

Because the author of the editorial himself is associated with Toyo University, the epistemological status of the following investigation has a circular or self-reflexive aspect. This investigation wants to exemplify the kind of research whose spirit it attempts to explicate. This verification of the university's identity further affords reflections about future research directions, which will be suggested in the latter half of the editorial.

1 『東洋大学規定集』 [Collection of Toyo University regulations] (学校法人東洋大学, 1996), 1.

2 TAKAGI Hiroo 高木宏夫, MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. 『井上円了の教育理念』 (Toyo University, 2013). Since 1987, there have been sixteen editions with different subtitles. Translation by MIYAUCHI Atsuo 宮内敦夫. *The Educational Principles of Enryo Inoue* (Toyo University, 2012).

3 The founding documents of Toyo University are reproduced in 『東洋大学百年史』 [100 years history of Toyo University], 7 vols. (1988–1995), *Shiryō* I, bk. 1: 83–93. English translations, with further bibliographical information, appear in this issue.

4 MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. 「東洋大学における《建学の精神》継承の問題点」 [Problems of succeeding the "Founding Spirit" at Tōyō University], in TAKAGI Hiroo 高木宏夫, ed. 『井上円了の思想と行動』 [Thought and conduct of Inoue Enryō] (Toyo University, 1987) (*Sōritsu 100 Shūnen Kinen Ronbun Shū*, vol. 6), 193–238.

## 1. All Learning is Based on Philosophy

To explicate its founding spirit, Toyo University mostly refers to the "Founding Ideas of the Philosophy Academy" 「哲學館開設ノ旨趣」, which was written in 1887. The concept of philosophy expressed in this document is the Aristotelian notion of philosophy as a theory of science. In a political metaphor similar to the European notion of metaphysics as the "queen of the sciences," Enryō calls philosophy the "central government of science."<sup>5</sup> By investigating the principles through which scientific fields are established, philosophy provides a systematic groundwork for specialized research. The system of science, introduced by philosophy, thus became the organizational structure of the modern research university. This could justify a certain emphasis on research about the theory of science in theoretical philosophy at Toyo University. Or, it might be expected that the faculty and department structure of Toyo University is in accordance with the logic of research specialization in a particularly thoughtful way. However, the idea of philosophy as the science of science says little about the conduct of research in areas other than philosophy and, further, it says even less about the university's educational ideals.

Since 1957 Toyo University began to use the phrase, 「諸学の基礎は哲学にあり」, for communicating its spirit in public relations.<sup>6</sup> The composite *shogaku* 諸学 occurs in the "Founding Ideas of the Philosophy Academy" in the sense of "various sciences and scholarly fields." The sentence can therefore be translated as, "The various academic fields are all based on philosophy." However, the established English translation renders the sentence as, "The basis of all learning lies in philosophy."<sup>7</sup> This literal translation is legitimate for two reasons. First, although consistent with Enryō's writings, the sentence is not a word for word quotation.<sup>8</sup> Hence its meaning cannot be established according to a specific context. Second, the single word *gaku* 学, as well as the composite *gakumon* 学問, which Enryō uses, have deep reverberations with the

<sup>5</sup> Cf. RAINER Schulzer. "Crossroads of World Philosophy: Theoretical and Practical Philosophy in Inoue Enryō," *International Inoue Enryō Research* 1 (2013): 49–55. Thomas AQUINAS was already calling Aristotelian theology the "queen of the sciences" in the middle ages. In 1755, Moses MENDELSSOHN commemorated metaphysics as "Königin der Wissenschaften" (*Philosophische Gespräche*, in vol. 1 of *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. by I. ELBOGEN, J. GUTTMANN, E. MITTWOCH, A. Altmann (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, since 1929), 13). This is probably what was taken up by Immanuel KANT in the preface to his *Critique of Pure Reason* (A viii).

<sup>6</sup> MIURA 三浦. 「東洋大学における《建学の精神》継承の問題点」 (see note 4), 224.

<sup>7</sup> Toyo University. "Philosophy." Accessed July 4, 2014. <http://www.toyo.ac.jp/site/english-about/philosophy.html>.

<sup>8</sup> TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男. "On the Philosophy of Inoue Enryō," *International Inoue Enryō Research* 1 (2013): 3–24.

Confucian heritage. Regarding this intellectual background, the translation of *shogaku* as "all learning" is more than appropriate as it shifts the focus to the educational function of philosophy. In fact, the Philosophy Academy started out not as a research institution but as a school with educational purposes. The "Founding Ideas of the Philosophy Academy" begins with the statement that philosophy, as the highest form of scholarship, is also the best type of learning for the cultivation of the human intellect. Although this is not the place, this point would be worthy of analysis. The idea of learning as a means to personal cultivation is at the very heart of the Chinese tradition. It also parallels the humanist notion of *Bildung*, which was influential in the foundation of the Berlin University. Toyo University rightly emphasizes the educational function of philosophy as its very founding idea. But our object here is to clarify what *research* in a philosophical spirit means and not what it means for education. Whilst we cannot yet answer this question, we can make a provisional summary. Toyo University is founded on philosophical ideas in a singular way. Its founding document not only contains the philosophical paradigm of specialized research, but also the educational idea that the practice of philosophical reasoning contributes to the growth of the individual.

## 2. Two Founding Documents

Apart from the "Founding Ideas of the Philosophy Academy" 「哲學館開設ノ旨趣」 (hereafter *Founding Ideas One*), a second document exists with the slightly different title, "The Academy's Founding Ideas" 「開館旨趣」 (hereafter *Founding Ideas Two*). The first document was published twice in different Buddhist journals in Tokyo before the formal opening of the Academy. The second document is the transcript of Enryō's speech at the opening ceremony on September 16, 1887. It was published in January of the following year and featured the inaugural issue of the *Philosophy Academy Lecture Records* 『哲學館講義錄』. The relationship of the two documents is not clear. As has been pointed out, Toyo University mostly refers to *Founding Ideas One* in order to affirm its identity. Nonetheless, and as will be argued, Enryō's policy statement at the opening ceremony can be considered of equal importance.

First of all it should be noted that the titles of the two documents do not differ in meaning. The titles of both documents indicate that they inform about the very object of the Academy's foundation. Because of this, the later version, rather than the earlier one, must be considered as the final and hence authoritative version. On the other hand, according to its introductory note, *Founding Ideas Two* is merely a transcript of

Enryō's opening speech. As can be expected in the case of spoken language, it is not entirely precise and shows some redundancies. *Founding Ideas One* is the more dignified document due to its concise style and proclamatory tone. The fact that Enryō published it twice before the opening shows it was intended to promote the school and attract students. Enryō could have published it again in the school's first publication, the *Philosophy Academy Lecture Records*. This series of printed lectures for the use of one of Japan's earliest distant learning programs is one of Enryō's major achievements and surely contributed considerably to the fame of his school. But Enryō did not use *Founding Ideas One* for circulation in- and outside of his school after its foundation. In fact, it was never reprinted by the Philosophy Academy during Enryō's time as principal. The inaugural issue of the *Philosophy Academy Lecture Records* instead contains—as its very first text—the transcript of Enryō's opening speech. Enryō obviously decided to communicate his ideas and intentions about the Philosophy Academy through this text. The title and the introductory note make unmistakably clear that the transcript of Enryō's speech is to be taken as the statement of the Academy's purpose. This gives *Founding Ideas Two* equal authority to *Founding Ideas One* as the source of Toyo University's founding spirit.

### 3. The Philosophical Idea of Research

Even if the authority of *Founding Ideas Two* as a founding document of Toyo University is not accepted, its importance as a historical source is beyond doubt. For a start, it is more than four times the length of *Founding Ideas One*, hence it considerably enriches our understanding of Enryō's ideas and intentions for establishing the Philosophy Academy. It deserves closer examination than is possible here. This editorial will focus the analysis on the question of what research in a philosophical spirit could have meant for Enryō.

The main goal of Enryō's opening speech is to argue that the establishment of the Philosophy Academy is of benefit to society. Enryō's belief—that a school for philosophy will contribute to civilization in Japan—is equally clear from *Founding Ideas One*. This guiding purpose of the Academy is, of course, identical with the Protection of Country. But in this historical and textual context, Protection of Country 護國, which could also be translated as "maintaining" or even "embracing" the country, is not made specific in regard to its aspects of social welfare, government support, royalism, or military defense. Before the enactment of the Meiji Constitution in 1889 and the promulgation of the Education Rescript in 1890, the Protection of Country in the first instance

simply means the minimum duty of a citizen to contribute to the "nation state" 国家 (3:330). In general, institutions are established in order to fulfill functions in their given social environment. This was also the case with the Philosophy Academy. In other words, by setting up an educational institution, Enryō wanted to make Japan a better place.

As has been discussed already, in order to prove that the Philosophy Academy is beneficial for Japanese society, *Founding Ideas One* stresses the cultivating function of philosophy for the human intellect. *Founding Ideas Two* instead argues for the benefit of philosophy through its application. In the first half of his speech, Enryō attempts to show that philosophy is useful for other professions. Philosophy will help the lawyer with the logic of his pleas. It will improve the medical doctor's understanding of human nature. It will provide the historian with a theoretical framework for writing about society or politics. It will even be helpful for the priest to reflect on the doctrines of his religion. Through its thematic breadth philosophy can support various professions in various ways. Thereby it contributes to society at large.

It seems Enryō's argument could have ended here. However, although Enryō emphasizes the school's purpose to support other vocational studies rather than to train experts in philosophy, in the latter part of his speech, he discusses several ways in which philosophy benefits scholarship in Japan. It is here that we have to read if we want to know what research in philosophical spirit meant for Enryō. He considers five points, which can be paraphrased as follows:

1. Philosophy "synthesizes and integrates" 總合統括 the other sciences. Thereby, it provides the scholar with an understanding of the relationship and value of the academic disciplines.
2. Philosophy does not admit the authority of tradition or history. This is what guarantees its progressive character.
3. Instead of deducing things from uncertain premises, philosophy relies on induction; it infers from empirical evidence.
4. The philosophical overview of academia allows a greater "impartiality" 公平 and permits a "critical judgment" 批評.
5. Philosophy distinguishes critically between right and wrong. Thereby, it determines the usefulness of ideas.

We can see that these five points are substantial statements, even if their logical order or completeness might appear unsatisfactory. Although the Philosophy Academy did

not start out as a research institution, the philosophical spirit of science and scholarship is clearly part of its founding principles. This provides a solid foundation to, what is today, one of the ten largest research universities in Japan.

#### 4. The Love of Truth

In the interest of interpreting the above mentioned five points, we can use another early position statement of Enryō, which is relevant due to its content, wording, and historical proximity. The initial paragraphs of the *Prolegomena to a Living Discourse of Buddhism* 『仏教活論序論』, published only a couple of months before the opening of the Academy, belong to the most important pieces of text Enryō wrote. In the preface to the *Prolegomena*, he sets out the characteristics of a philosophical discussion of Buddhism with great clarity. The rejection of tradition as a source of validity is arguably the most fundamental principle (point 2). In one sense, the very idea of philosophy follows from it.

I do not love the man Shakyamuni, I do not hate the man Jesus. The only thing I love is the truth, the only thing I hate is the untruth. [...] I would never be so blind and ignorant to believe a teaching because of its origin or the biography of its founder. I will only believe it, if it is consistent with today's philosophical reasoning and I will reject it if it is not. [...] Generally, it is the duty of the scholar to love the truth. (3:327–330)

Because philosophy denies historical authority, it starts in every generation, in every philosopher, in every moment from the point of zero. The moment a given fact or norm is questioned, the problem cannot be solved by appealing to the past anymore. Philosophy represents the idea that validity has to be established in the medium of discursive reason. In this sense, Enryō makes a claim for a "fair and impartial [公平無私] judgment based on philosophy" (3:327) in his discussion of Buddhism. Philosophy only provides the method to test the authority of tradition, and does not offer specific tenets on its own. In *Founding Ideas Two*, Enryō therefore compares philosophy with the "measure of the carpenter" 大工の尺度 (ものさし). Philosophy examines the coherence of our beliefs using logical arguments. In order to maximize coherence, different fields of knowledge have to be considered. This demands a survey of other disciplines (point 1). Empirical evidence grants a superior certainty, therefore, philosophy, since Aristotle, defers to natural science (point 3). It is the overview of empirical evidence and of philosophical argument that first enables the making of critical and impartial judg-

ments (point 4). In the *Prolegomena*, Enryō therefore takes "consistency" 符合 with the "various fields of philosophy and science" 理哲諸学 (3:327) as the criterion of truth.

Thus we see that Enryō's general idea about the duty of the scholar, as stated in the *Prolegomena*, is consistent with the philosophical idea of research as outlined in *Founding Ideas Two*, and this is not surprising. However, two questions arise. Why did Enryō not refer to the Love of Truth in the policy statements of his academy? And second, although Enryō knew that "philosophy" literally means "loving wisdom" (2:27), why did he never make explicit that Love of Truth conveys the very idea of philosophy? While these questions cannot be answered with finality, we may offer possible hypotheses.

We begin with the first question. The reason why Enryō did not expose the Love of Truth as the founding principle of his Philosophy Academy might have been that he considered it not specific enough. It was the great achievement of Enryō's mentor and founder of Tokyo University KATO Hiroyuki 加藤博之 to pinpoint the idea of truth as the single guiding principle of academic research. In his lecture about the question "What Does Science Mean?" 「何ヲカ学問ト云フ」 Kato had made the same fundamental statements as Enryō, namely that academia does not admit past authority, but relies whenever possible on empirical evidence. Elsewhere, he argued that the university as such relies on the consensus that all academic disciplines "research the truth for its own sake." Kato also recognized that this idea of academic research had originated in ancient Western philosophy. In the preface to the first issue of the *Journal of the Philosophy Society*, he declared that philosophy does not take the founding fathers such as Shakyamuni or Confucius as "sanctum" 本尊. The sanctum of philosophy is the truth.<sup>9</sup> Because the philosophical idea of truth had already been institutionalized in the form of Tokyo University, Enryō possibly thought it not specific enough as a founding principle for his school. Therefore, Enryō brought forward a more defined concept of philosophy. The Love of Truth was the duty of every scholar, but philosophers maintain the highest standpoint because they survey and synthesize all academic knowledge.

<sup>9</sup> KATŌ Hiroyuki 加藤弘之. 「本会雑誌ノ発刊ヲ祝シ伴セテ会員諸君に質ス」 [Congratulatory note on the occasion of the publication of this society's journal, together with a suggestion to its noble members], 『哲學會雜誌』 [Journal of the philosophy society] 1 (1887): 1–3. The phrase "research of truth a such for its own sake" (in Japanese 「真理其物のために真理其物を研究する」) appears in 「学問ノ目的」 [The end of science], in vol. 3 of 『加藤弘之文書』 [Writings of Katō Hiroyuki], ed. by ŌKUBO Toshiaki 大久保利謙, 3 vols. (同朋舎, 1990), 409–412. The lecture 「何ヲカ学問ト云フ」 [What does science mean?] was published in 『學藝志林』 [Grove of endeavor in scholarship and arts] 16 (1885): 488–512.



Regarding the second question, the answer could be that Enryō's slogan of the Love of Truth did not originate from translating the word *philo-sophia*. In 1881, the year of Enryō's enrollment as a student of Tokyo University, the faculty of letters was restructured. An independent philosophy department was first established, of which Enryō became the first and only student. Ernest F. FENOLLOSA, who hitherto had been the dominating figure in the letters department, was replaced by TOYAMA Seiichi 外山誠一, who became head of the faculty.<sup>10</sup> TOYAMA was not only responsible for Enryō's curriculum, but also became Enryō's teacher in philosophy. TOYAMA is listed as second among the supporters of the new academy given in the introductory note to the first publication of *Founding Ideas One*. He also gave one of the congratulatory lectures at the opening ceremony. What exactly Enryō learned from TOYAMA has hitherto not been closely examined. However, Toyama published an article during his presidency of Tokyo Imperial University in 1898 and from this we can grasp one of his fundamental beliefs. It demonstrates the importance Toyama gave the article, titled *Evils of Blind Faith in Authority*, that it was published in both Japanese and English. It starts out with a quote from Aristotle that Toyama wanted to "be truly fixed in the mind of every body." The quote in English reads, "Plato is to be loved, still the truth is [to be] much more so," and is rendered in Japanese as 「プラトーンは愛すべきも真理は尚ほ愛すべし」.<sup>11</sup> The saying, which goes back to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (1096a), has a long history in Western thought and has had many different variations of which, "Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas," is the most famous; most significantly quoted by two icons of modern science, Roger Bacon and Isaac Newton.<sup>12</sup> There is no proof that Toyama taught this saying to Enryō at Tokyo University. But it seems likely that Toyama, who had graduated high school and university in the United States, had already learned the saying during his studies of philosophy, chemistry and biology at Michigan University. The parallel between Enryō's proclamation "not to love the man Shakyamuni, but only the truth" and "Plato is to be loved, still the truth is to be more so," does not seem coincidental.

<sup>10</sup> This is apparent from comparing the academic years 1880–1881 (1:82f) and 1881–1882 (1:180) in 『東京大学年報』 [Yearbook of Tokyo University] (6 vols., 1993–1994). See also YAMAGUCHI Seiichi 山口静一, 『フェノロサ社会論集』 [Collection of Fenollosa's article's about society] (思文閣, 2000), 25f.

<sup>11</sup> TOYAMA Seiichi [sic] 外山誠一. "Evils of Blind Faith in Authority," *The Hansei Zasshi: A Monthly Magazine* 13, no. 4–5 (1898): 144–148, 190–194. 「學教上に於ける聖權の利害」 [The advantages and disadvantages of sacred authority in learning and teaching], 『東洋哲學』 [Eastern philosophy] 5, no. 1–2 (1898): 1–4, 57–60.

<sup>12</sup> Henry GUERLAC. "Amicus Plato and Other Friends," *Journal for the History of Ideas* 39.4 (1978): 627–633.

## 5. A Priori Commitment to Truth

A disclaimer shall now be made in order to avoid any misunderstanding. In *Founding Ideas Two*, Enryō chides the scholars of the East for being prejudiced, for daydreaming, and for arbitrarily revering antiquity. This line of criticism was already common in the first generation of Japanese Enlightenment intellectuals. Needless to say that such a view should not be taken at face value. Today, fortunately, nobody would seriously argue that research or discussion never existed outside of European philosophy. The attitude to think and decide individually, instead of relying on the judgment of others, is too natural to be attributed only to Western individualism. To this end, we can name the Indian Buddhist thinker Dharmakīrti (7th century C.E.), the Chinese Confucian philosopher WANG Yángmíng 王陽明 (1472–1529) or the Japanese thinker MIURA Baien 三浦梅園 (1723–1789) as evidence for the priority of the individual search for truth over traditional authority. The degree to which the criticism of traditional East Asian scholarship not only by Katō, Toyama, and Enryō, but also FUKUZAWA Yukichi 福澤諭吉, NISHI Amane 西周, and NISHIMURA Shigeki 西村茂樹 was justified and to a certain extent necessary, others may decide, as it is of no relevance here.<sup>13</sup> Ultimately, validity is the only thing that matters. Yet, it is of some importance regarding the identity of Toyo University, if Enryō's appeal to Western philosophy, as an historical instantiation of the Academy's founding spirit, was historically justified or not.

We will not say that it was a misunderstanding. In the triad of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, philosophy was founded as a culture of discussion. Being aware that learning is never complete, Socrates avoided the attitude of the teacher. He approached his partners in conversation, not in order to convince them, but instead because he hoped to learn from them. It is only because Socrates proved to be superior in discussion that his declaration, to know that he does not know, appeared ironic. He nevertheless stayed firm in his attitude not to teach, in order to give an example of somebody who ceaselessly searches for wisdom. We owe this picture of Socrates to his grateful student Plato, who exposed the Socratic dialogue as the existential and methodological starting point of philosophy, by bequeathing his complete philosophy in the literary form of dialogue. In the academy, which Plato founded, his best disciple, Aristotle, rose up as

<sup>13</sup> FUKUZAWA Yukichi 福澤諭吉. 『文明論之概略』 [Outline of a theory of civilization] (Keiō Gijyū Daigaku, 2002–2003) (*Fukuzawa Yukichi Chosaku Shū*, vols. 4), 10–21. NISHI Amane 西周. 「学問ハ淵源ヲ深クスルニ在ルノ論」 [Science means to deepen the grounds], 『學藝志林』 [Grove of endeavor in scholarship and arts] 1.2 (1877). Regarding NISHIMURA Shigeki 西村茂樹 see FUNAYAMA Shinichi 船山信一. 「日本の近代哲学の發展形式」 [The developmental patterns of modern Japanese philosophy], in NISHITANI Keiji 西谷啓治. 『現代日本の哲学』 [Contemporary Japanese philosophy] (雄渾社, 1967), 64.

Plato's most striking critic. As Aristotle explained, it was his duty as a philosopher to prefer the truth, even if it collided with the opinions of his teacher (NE 1096a). The archetype of the modern scholar, Aristotle, testifies that the search for truth itself had become a tradition. There is no field of inquiry or topic specific to Western philosophy. If anything is particular about ancient European philosophy it is individualism in thinking.

NISHI Amane and KATŌ Hiroyuki transplanted the philosophical idea of truth to Japan. As with many other words, which came into use during the Meiji period for translating Western concepts, the term *shinri* 真理 established by Nishi had until then been rather uncommon. Yet, needless to say, many words for truth existed in East Asian thought before then. In one lecture, Enryō gives a list of 47 terms all supposed to be synonymous in expressing the highest notion of Buddhist truth (5:38f). Truth claims are involved whenever humans communicate. Every religion, system, school, or tradition claims the truth in its own words. It seems a paradox to say that the novelty of the philosophical concept of truth laid in the fact it had no content. What is expressed by the Love of Truth, is the commitment to an idea which is yet to be filled with meaning. We can speak of an *a priori* concept of truth, not in the narrow Kantian sense, but in its basic meaning of a temporal order between a methodological reflection and an act of cognition. To be a philosopher does not predispose the individual to any specific content. Because philosophy *a priori* rules out nothing, it is kept open to discover the new *a posteriori*. The same indetermination of truth *a priori* is intended by a famous passage from Wilhelm von HUMBOLDT:

Thus it can easily be seen, that in the internal organization of the higher academic institutions, everything relies on preserving the principle to regard science [Wissenschaft] as something not yet found and never to be completely found, and, as such, to search for it unceasingly.<sup>14</sup>

This explains why Enryō, from the beginning, saw no contradiction between his idea of founding a Philosophy Academy and his intention to revive Buddhist and Chinese studies. None of the Japanese Enlightenment intellectuals simply wanted to discard the East Asian heritage. The *paradigm of philosophy* does not mean priority of Western thought. The *Analects* 『論語』 might still turn out to be the most dignified ethical text

<sup>14</sup> Wilhelm von HUMBOLDT. "Über die innere und äussere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin" (1809/10), pp. 229–241 in *Gründungstexte* (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 2010), 231.

ever compiled. Buddhist epistemology and theory of causality in Sanskrit literature could be more sophisticated than everything ever thought in the West. And it can still be argued, as Enryō did, that speculation about the all-sublating, all-suffusing Absolute is the ultimate philosophical truth. But the case must be made. Commitment to argument and to proof is the only entrance requirement to academia. Philosophy was rightly received not as a set of tenets but as an approach. What makes the establishment of the Philosophy Academy a fascinating historical instance, is, first, that an idea we still consider valid was grasped, this is what we call enlightenment in history, and second, that an institution was founded on that idea, this is what we call progress in civilization.

## 6. The Authority of Founding Figures

Toyama's article about the *Evils of Blind Faith in Authority* is remarkable because he did not confine his warning to the realm of scholarship. Even in the Japanese version, whose less confrontational title reads "Advantages and Disadvantages of Sacred Authority in Learning and Teaching," Toyama cited quasi-religious reverence for the emperor Caesar and Napoleon as cause of calamity for the country. It is not difficult to see that Toyama's stance applied to the Meiji state entailed contentious political consequences. Toyama, however, became Minister of Culture in the short-lived third cabinet of Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 in 1898. Five years later the Philosophy Academy Incident occurred. The philosophical argument that opposition to political authority can be legitimate under certain circumstances clashed with the constitutional system that insisted upon imperial sanctity. The Incident, which represented a collision of Enryō's principles of Love of Truth and Protection of Country, would not have occurred if Toyama still had been responsible in the Ministry of Culture at the time.

A philosophical examination as to why mankind tends to attach dogmatic authority to leaders dead or alive would require lengthy anthropological reflections. The fact itself seems undeniable when we look at examples in contemporary politics, like MAO Zédōng 毛澤東 (1893–1976) or Kemal Atatürk (*atatürk*, lit. "Father of the Turks") (1881–1938), and in religion, like, Jesus, Mohammed, and Buddha. The elevation of the founder lends stability to the institution. This also applies to academic institutions. Toyo University proudly commemorates its founder with a three meter metal sculpture, a museum, and a memorial lecture hall on its main campus. INOUE Enryō is doubtless an important asset in Toyo University's public relations. The internationalization of INOUE Enryō research provides an occasion to clarify the university's relation to its

founder. Credibility is a most important good for an institution that is founded on the critical spirit of philosophy in a singular way. As in the case with moral persons, credibility is earned by applying professed principles first of all to oneself.

INOUE Enryō research at Toyo University started out from the legitimate interest of an institution in its own history.<sup>15</sup> Enryō was appreciated as the historical person who established the institution on certain principles. After this, many more aspects of Enryō came into the picture: Enryō the philosopher, the Buddhist reformer, the enlightenment educator, the propagator of the Education Rescript, the Doctor Specter, the psychologist, the founder of the Temple Garden of Philosophy, and the world traveler. However, it is not only Enryō's multifaceted character that makes him worthy of academic inquiry. Enryō is indispensable for a comprehensive understanding of the intellectual landscape of modern Japan because he was a key figure in the reception of Western philosophy, the maturing of Japanese humanities, the emergence of modern Buddhism, and the permeation of the imperial ideology. The establishment of the International Association for Inoue Enryo Research reflects the belief that Enryō is of sufficient general interest to be researched in every respect. Yet, until today more than 90% of the research about Enryō was conducted and published at Toyo University. It is, therefore, also time to establish that there exists a gap between the Enryō as perceived at Toyo University and the Enryō as perceived outside of Toyo University in Japan and abroad. Already in 1959 IENAGA Saburo 家永三郎 criticized Enryō for "belligerism" 好戦主義. Judith SNODGRASS diagnosed "strategic occidentalism." Passages translated by Brian D. VICTORIA suggest Buddhist militarism and racism. JEE Hyanghuh 許智香 recently portrayed Enryō as an ideologue of imperialism.<sup>16</sup> The critical tenor especially in Western scholarship is not unrelated to the widespread post-modern approach in the whole field. The lack of appreciation of enlightenment ideas, combined with a critical awareness of nationalism, leads to an overall negative evaluation. One does not necessarily have to share the premise of post-modern and post-colonial scholarship in order to admit that there are political issues in Enryō's thought that have to be addressed. They shall now be put into perspective.

<sup>15</sup> MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. "History of Enryo Inoue Research," *Journal of International Philosophy* 1 (2012): 245–250.

<sup>16</sup> IENAGA Saburo 家永三郎. 『近代日本思想史講座 I : 歴史的概観』 [A course on the history of modern Japanese thought I: Historical survey] (筑摩書房, 1959), 83–84, 97–98. Judith SNODGRASS. "The Deployment of Western Philosophy in Meiji Buddhist Revival," *The Eastern Buddhist* 30.2 (1997): 173–198. Brian D. VICTORIA. *Zen at War*, 2nd ed. (Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield [1996] 2006), 29–30, 52–53. JEE Hyanghuh 許智香. 「井上円了と朝鮮巡講、その歴史的位について」 [Inoue Enryō and [his] Korean lecture tours: about their historical status], *Journal of Japanese Intellectual History* 『日本思想史学』 45 (2013): 146–161.

## 7. Political Issues in Inoue Enryō Research

The legal and ideological framework, which was implemented with the enactment of the Constitution of the Great Japanese Empire in 1889, and the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890, was in effect until the end of World War Two. During this period of 55 years, Japan developed from a country struggling to preserve its independence, to an imperialist power and eventually to a totalitarian aggressor. The continuity of the political system, combined with unprecedented transformations of Japan and the world, makes historical evaluation of the Meiji period particularly difficult. The 100th anniversary of the outbreak of World War One in 2014 gave opportunity to reflect on the significance of Japan's little participation in the war that was a watershed in European history. Neither the peculiarity of Japanese modernity, nor Enryō's moral and political thought can be sufficiently understood only by the nationalism category. Below, I distinguish therefore three problematic aspects of Enryō's writings and activities. About point one and three, critical awareness has already been expressed in past research at Toyo University. Regarding point two, there is still work to be done.

(1) Enryō's ideas about Japanese morals and the "national polity" 国体 coincide with the ideology of Japanese ultra-nationalism as summed up in the *Fundamental Meaning of the National Polity* 『國體の本義』 (1937). That has been made explicit already by the first director of the Inoue Enryō Memorial Academic Center TAKAGI Hiroo 高木宏夫.<sup>17</sup> SUEKI Takehiro 末木剛博 provides a general criticism of this thought as potentially chauvinistic, uncritical, and totalitarian in his commentary to the respective works contained in volume seven of *Inoue Enryō Selected Writings*. IYENAGA Saburo further suggested that Enryō's systematic treatment of national virtues based on the Education Rescript pioneered the academic discourse on national education in modern Japan.<sup>18</sup> However, not only as theoretician but also as an educator with an immense audience, Enryō must have played a considerable role in spreading the ideas that were turned into instruments of totalitarianism during the 1930s. MIURA Setsuo has done research on how Enryō's principles Love of Truth and Protection of Country were interpreted in an ultra-nationalist spirit at Toyo University since 1933.<sup>19</sup> The sad climax of this development is the

<sup>17</sup> TAKAGI Hiroo 高木宏夫. 「井上円了の宗教思想」 [Inoue Enryō's religious thought], in TAKAGI 高木, ed. 『井上円了の思想と行動』 (see note 4), 117.

<sup>18</sup> For a survey see MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. 「井上円了のナショナリズムに関する見方」 [Perspectives on Inoue Enryō's nationalism], *Annual Report of the Inoue Enryō Center* 『井上円了センター年報』 1 (1992): 73–92.

<sup>19</sup> MIURA 三浦. 「東洋大学における《建学の精神》継承の問題点」 (see note 4), 216–223.

"Society for Protection of Country" 護国会, founded in 1941. The regulations of the Society define its purpose as, "the school's monolithic organization based on the founding ideas Protection of Country and Love of Truth [...] in order to train men talented for patriotic martyrdom and self-sacrifice [殉国挺身ノ人材] in the aid of the Imperial Plan" (§2).<sup>20</sup> Toyo University is yet to undertake an analysis of the political positions towards war and imperialist aggression expressed in the Society's gazette.

(2) The Education Rescript teaches loyalty to the emperor as the primary civil virtue, which is certainly not in conformity with the liberal value system of post-war Japan. The Rescript itself, however, is neither overtly militaristic nor chauvinistic. Regarding the question of Enryō's attitude towards war, rather than his elaborations on the Education Rescript, the influence of Social Darwinism in his thinking has to be examined. The necessity of such research is obvious only from looking at some of his book titles. There is *Fragment of a Philosophy of War* 『戦争哲学一斑』 from 1894, *Life is a Battlefield* 『人生是れ戦場』 from 1914 (both not included in the *Inoue Enryō Selected Writings*), and *Philosophy of Struggle* 『奮闘哲学』 written in 1917. A detailed biographical investigation will be necessary regarding the events around the publication of "My Thoughts on Countering Russia" 「対露余論」 in 1904 (25:596–613). The article's publication falls into Enryō's years of crisis between the Philosophy Academy Incident in 1903 and his retirement from the Academy in January 1906. Enryō's opening statements about the racial and religious character of the impending Russian-Japanese War apparently resulted in intellectual isolation also inside the Academy.<sup>21</sup> This most likely added to the deterioration of his health and effected directly or indirectly his resignation as principal of his school. However, the late Enryō revised his affirmative attitude towards military conflict as expressed in *Fragment of a Philosophy of War*. In his late work, *Life is a Battlefield*, Enryō stressed the irreconcilability of war and civilization and called for the preservation of peace, which is very different from belligerism. More research should be done on this point, but generally, there should be a distinction between Enryō's statements as a philosopher and his statements about Buddhist doctrine. In the editor's view, this was not sufficiently considered by IYENAGA Saburo and by Brian D. VICTORIA, who translated the most problematic passages of "My Thoughts on Countering Russia" in *Zen at War* (1997).

<sup>20</sup> 「東洋大學護國會規則」 [Regulations of Toyo University Society for Protection of Country], 『東洋大學護國會々報』 [Gazette of Toyo University Society for Protection of Country] 1 (1941): 6–9.

<sup>21</sup> The most important source for this research will be Dainihon Shūkyōka Taikai 大日本宗教家大会, ed. *Congress of Japanese Religionists* (Tokyo: Kinkodo, 1904). Idem. 『宗教家大会彙報—時局に対する宗教家の態度』 [Bulletin of the congress of religionists: The attitude of the religionists towards the present situation] (Tokyo: 金港堂, 1904).

(3) The imperialism propounded by Japan and the Western Powers before World War One was mostly legitimized by two arguments: the crude social-Darwinist stance or the mission of civilization. Enryō generally supported Japanese expansion, including the colonization of Korea. For this reason, Enryō has already been criticized by PARK Kyongsik 朴慶植 as being an "ideologue of the colonial policy" in an article published at Toyo University in 1997.<sup>22</sup> However, more research is necessary regarding the reasons for his affirmation of the colonization policy. Did Enryō really profess to militarism and imperialism? Was his justification of colonialism based on the right of the strong, superiority of Japanese civilization, or the sanctity of the Japanese polity? To answer these questions, the book *Life is a Battlefield* is likely to be the most important source. Moreover, what is the significance of Enryō teaching the Education Rescript on his Korean lecture tours? And who was his audience? JEE Hyanghuh's recent paper is an important step towards clarifying this issue. However, it will be difficult to defend IJIMA Munetaka's 飯島宗享 evaluation of Enryō's attitude in international relations as "liberating" 開放的.<sup>23</sup>

The International Association for Inoue Enryō Research encourages research on these political issues. The meetings and the journal provide a platform for discussing these questions from wider East Asian and global perspectives. Toyo University is not interested in curbing discussion about the problematic aspects of the historical person INOUE Enryō. The achievement of having established the principles, which Toyo University professes today, gives Enryō an incontestable position. By affirming itself as an institution, Toyo University necessarily recognizes its own foundation as his achievement. That does not imply an uncritical reverence or desire to deviate from truth. Between 1958 and 1973, Toyo University substituted Protection of Country and instead adopted "justice" 公正 as the pair to Love of Truth.<sup>24</sup> Truth is the single guiding idea which gives continuity to academia in general and Toyo University in particular. This constitutional axis established by Enryō is not touched by a critical awareness that practical values cannot be confined to the national framework. Enryō related "universalism" 宇宙主義 only to the theoretical realm. In a perfect world, Protection of Country and Love of Truth may be in harmony and suffice to secure global peace. But today we know that human rights and universal justice are indispensable principles in international politics. The modification of Enryō's key moral values reflects well the critical

<sup>22</sup> PARK Kyongsik 朴慶植, 「井上円了の朝鮮巡講の歴史的背景」 [The historical background of Inoue Enryō's lecture tours in Korea], *The Study of Inoue Enryō* 『井上円了研究』 7 (1997): 81–107.

<sup>23</sup> IJIMA Munetaka 飯島宗享, 「井上円了の「教育」理念序説」 [Prolegomena to the 'Education' ideal of Inoue Enryō], in TAKAGI Hiroo 高木宏夫, ed. 『井上円了の思想と行動』 (see note 4), 5–30.

<sup>24</sup> MIURA 三浦, 「東洋大学における《建学の精神》継承の問題点」 (see note 4), 224–225.



and progressive spirit of philosophy alive at Toyo Universty. To put it in Japanese terms, Enryō is a "founder of learning" 学祖 and not a "founder of doctrine" 教祖.

The Four Sages Buddha, Confucius, Socrates and Kant are not the saints of Toyo University. They *represent* the variety of philosophical ideas and schools in the world. In the same way, INOUE Enryō *represents* the founding ideas of Toyo University. It is this aspect of Enryō that naturally comes to the fore in the university's public identity. It is legitimate to be *selective* regarding the information Toyo University communicates in public relations about its founder. That does not imply an inevitable bias in research.

However, there exists one criticism that would make the representation of Toyo University's founding principles through the historical figure INOUE Enryō impossible: hypocrisy. IENAGA Saburo and Judith SNODGRASS both assumed that Enryō's appeal to Western philosophy merely served the strategic purpose of promoting Japanese Buddhism. As is the case with allegations regarding motives, they are always possible and they can never be fully proved wrong. Yet, one may disagree with Enryō, one may find him inconsistent, one may find him shallow, but his commitment to philosophy seems beyond doubt. There is hardly any other more constant feature in Enryō's life than his identification with philosophy, which began as student at Tokyo University and lasted until the creation of the Temple Garden of Philosophy in his later years. Toyo University holds INOUE Enryō in honor, but gives priority to the philosophical spirit it received from him. Nobody loves Enryō, the only thing that is loved at Toyo University is the truth. There is nothing at stake here for Toyo University besides credibility.

## 8. Living Philosophy

What distinguishes the intellectual climate of the Meiji period fundamentally from present Japanese scholarship is its ahistorical outlook. The Meiji period is characterized by a vivid culture of discussion about the validity and practicality of ideas. This philosophical spirit common to Meiji intellectuals seems almost lost in contemporary Japanese humanities. The historical recycle, ever approaching the immediate past, will soon have rolled a second time over the Meiji and Taishō periods leaving behind only neat and neutral data. The all-equalizing historical treatment stifles discussion about the significance and value of philosophical ideas. This is certainly not what Enryō wanted. In the not-yet-discussed fifth point of *Founding Ideas Two*, he demands "vivid eyes" 活眼 in order to identify the "prolific use" 活用 of ideas. With his key word—"vitality" 活—Enryō stressed the ongoing and dynamic aspect of life. An "animating

discussion" 活論 in Enryō's sense means to concentrate on aspects which can be applied or "can be brought to life" 活かせる in future human existence. There is no question that Enryō would have considered research about his own life and works as "dead learning" 死学, if it simply confined itself to collecting, commenting and summarizing data. Enryō had no interest in historical research for its own sake, but intended to resuscitate the cultural heritage through the very practice of philosophizing.<sup>25</sup>

Enryō is an academic founding father of modern Japan in a very precise sense. In his writings he laid out a systematic structure for modern Japanese humanities.<sup>26</sup> He pioneered discourses like Buddhist philosophy, Buddhist psychology, psychotherapy, comparative religious studies, comparative ethics, Japanese ethics, philosophy of religion, Indian philosophy, and more. His institutional achievements are even more remarkable: he is the initiator of Japan's first Philosophy Society 哲学会 (1884), he created a Philosophy Ceremony 哲学祭 (1885), he founded the Philosophy Academy 哲学館 and set up a Philosophy Publishing House 哲学書院 (1887), he established a Society for Mystery Research 妖怪研究会 (1893) and a Society for Oriental Philosophy 東洋哲学会 (1894), he launched a Morality Church 修身教会 (1903) and created the Temple Garden of Philosophy 哲学堂公園 (from 1909). Not all of these organizations still exist today, but Toyo University and the Temple Garden of Philosophy have lasted as Enryō's foremost institutional legacy. The International Association for Inoue Enryō Research wants to fill these structures with life. The Editorial Policy of its journal not only invites historical research on INOUE Enryō, but also, particularly encourages contributions that are original in bringing to life the framework Enryō bequeathed.<sup>27</sup> By selecting Buddha, Confucius, Socrates and Kant as the Four Sages of world philosophy, Enryō set up the coordinates for comparative philosophy. The space which has been opened up through this global outlook waits to be filled.

<sup>25</sup> Since its 125th anniversary in 2012, Toyo University places a new emphasis on the practice of "philosophizing" 哲学する in education. "「哲学教育」[Philosophy education]. Accessed July 4, 2014. <http://www.toyo.ac.jp/site/global-jinzai/philosophy.html>.

<sup>26</sup> SHIBATA Takayuki. 柴田隆行. 「井上円了の《哲学》観」[Inoue Enryō's view of 'philosophy'], Annual Report of the Inoue Enryō Center 『井上円了センター年報』18 (2009): 3–21. Idem. 「著作を通して見る井上円了の学問」[Inoue Enryō's science as seen in his writings], (東洋大学井上円了記念学術センター, 2012) (*Tōyō Daigaku Shi Bukkuletto*, vols. 5).

<sup>27</sup> "Editorial Policy of »International Inoue Enryō Research«" (Amended July 2, 2014).