1. Foreword

This paper elucidates INOUE Enryo’s thoughts on peace and war. His work is often considered as supporting imperialism and militarism, and, in fact, he asserted the necessity of mobilizing the entire nation for war in Fragment of a Philosophy of War 『戦争哲學一環』 in 1894, and demonstrated a warlike attitude in "My Thoughts on Countering Russia" 『対露余論』 in 1904. However, when reading these texts carefully, we can note a change in his stance in the decade between them. In "My Thoughts on Countering Russia," he seems to long for peace, despite his warlike attitude. In Life is a Battle-field 『人生是れ戦場』, written in 1914 during his later years, he displays a remarkable attitude towards peace, and even declares in the work that this is a new era of peace.\(^1\)

From this perspective, I will argue that Enryo’s later works represent a shift from a philosophy of war to one of peace. Of course, this emphasis on peace does not imply that all the problems in his texts are resolved. For example, advocating peace is often accompanied by the affirmation of colonialism. I will therefore also examine the
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problems of imperialism and colonialism in Enryō's later works. By using these arguments, I will clarify the possibilities and limitations of Enryō's later practical philosophy.

2. A Philosophy of War

In exultation at victory in the First Sino-Japanese War, Inoue Enryō published Fragment of a Philosophy of War.² This book reflected the public opinion that war brought prosperity to Japan and explained the necessity for war and the need to be prepared for it. He started his book as follows:

Even though there is no doubt that war is a phenomenon of social changes and that war is based on everlasting and unchangeable law, man regards it as unusual [常道] [...], but I think war is not unusual but normal [常道]. (pp. 1–2)

Whereas most people regarded war as an emergency measure, Enryō considered war as normal. He assumed war to be inevitable and preparation for war to be necessary. Therefore, he considered war as an ordinary part of life. To explain this, he drew attention to five reasons. The first reason is based on the law of the cosmos. Two matters that have different properties from each other must clash with each other. This law also applies to human societies. Different nations must clash with each other and war ensues (pp. 3–7). The second reason is based on the law of changes. Nothing can hold onto itself, but changes into another thing. Therefore, peace cannot hold its state, and changes into the state of war (pp. 7–11). The third reason is based on the argument of Thomas Robert Malthus. Since there is not enough food and living space for human beings, war occurs in order to secure them (pp. 14–16). The fourth reason is based on human desire. While human desire is infinite, money and goods are limited. Therefore, humans contend for them; they wage war (pp. 16–17). The fifth reason is based on agnosticim. Man cannot know the sole truth, man has mutually different truths. Man rejects conflicting truths, and decides what truth is by war (pp. 17–18).

After demonstrating its inevitability, Enryō analyzed various elements of war. In this argument, he explained why Japan defeated China. According to him, Japan gained victory through two peculiarities, namely, the existence of the Imperial Household and the "Great Way of Unity between Loyalty and Filial Piety" 忠孝一致の大道 (p. 72). He regarded the Imperial Household as "an unbroken line and lasting as long as heaven
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and earth shall endure" (p. 71). In addition, he thought "We Japanese subjects share common ancestors with the Imperial Household, who are descended from the gods" (p. 73). According to him, the Empire of Japan is one family, because Japanese have the one lineage. As result of that, "Loyalty to the Emperor is consistent with Filial Piety to the father" (pp. 74–75). That is the Great Way of Unity between Loyalty and Filial Piety.

Enryō considered the Japanese situation after the First Sino-Japanese War as follows: "our nation is confronted with a chance for Japan to assume hegemony over the Orient" (p. 76). For supremacy in the Orient, he urged universal militaristic education. He wrote, "Based on the Great Way of Unity between Loyalty and Filial Piety, we must impart children with a purely militaristic education [純然たる軍国の教育], not only at school but also in the family, and strengthen the body and soul of the Japanese people" (pp. 76–77). Militaristic education would be the norm and all citizens incorporated into a militaristic system from the emperor down. Thus, he constructed a theory that supported totalitarianism in order to mobilize the entire nation for war.

Let us summarize the above arguments. Enryō thought war is inevitable and not an unusual state. The particularity of Japan lies in the Imperial Household and the Great Way of Unity between Loyalty and Filial Piety. Since the Empire of Japan is one large household, there is no conflict between family and nation. It can be said that Enryō's patriotic sentiment is very patriarchal. His concept of the Empire of Japan is that of a patriarchal society led by the emperor. All Japanese subjects are mobilized by the emperor, and prepare for war through the standard militaristic education.

3. Inoue Enryō and the Russo-Japanese War

An essay "My Thoughts on Countering Russia" was written by Inoue Enryō as part of a growing conviction that Japan needed to wage war on Russia. In the first half of his essay, he tried to justify the war against Russia based on the Mahāsatyanir-granthasūtra 『大薩遮尼乾子経』 (Dai sashhani kenshi kyō). According to him, it is permitted to wage war against an enemy of Buddhism to save a country and friends. Russia in those days was a Christian country and did not permit freedom of religion. Therefore, he regarded Russia as an enemy of Buddhism (25:597). In this way, war against Russia was justified.
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Enryō likened Russian policy to the barbarity of the crusades, which indicated a warlike attitude. However, he only justified war, he did not advocate it. He wrote "In the present world situation, I believe starting a war is permissible; however, at the same time, there are many ways other than war" (25:600). Public opinion inclined toward a war, which he accepted, but he suggested another way. He warned that the use of force could not bring peace to eastern Asia. He mentioned the episode when he visited India with KAWAGUCHI Ekai 河口慧海 (25:600–601). He met a Tibetan in Darjeeling and asked him whether diplomatic relations between Tibet and Japan could be established. The Tibetan answered, "In Tibet, after the First Sino-Japanese War, Japan is well known as a terrible nation which forcefully deprives a country of its territory by military force. Tibet is afraid of a Japanese invasion if diplomatic relations were to be established." Therefore, Enryō thought, "we cannot gain the peace in eastern Asia, even though we win a war temporarily" (25:601).

For peace in the true sense, Enryō indicated the following steps:

1) Found the College of Confucianism and the College of Buddhism.
2) Establish the Center of Orientalism in Tokyo, and open branches in Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet, etc.
3) Hold a conference on Buddhism in Japan, gather religious leaders who live in Buddhist countries, and have good relations with Buddhism in foreign countries.

Buddhism was the main religion in these countries, and Confucianism is the common intellectual basis in China, Korea, and Japan. By taking the principal cultural position among these countries, Japan could win the hearts of these people and maintain the peace in eastern Asia. Through these activities, interactions between these various peoples would be deepened, and Japan could command much respect.

The point to which we must pay particular attention is the following statement by Enryō: "war is an unusual thing [変事], not a normal thing" (24:600). In this quotation, we can observe that Enryō had significantly changed his position concerning war. In Fragment of a Philosophy of War, war is normal. In "My Thoughts on Countering Russia," however, war is not normal but an unusual thing, and he seems to long for peace, despite his warlike attitude.

Some problems, however, are still not solved. Enryō planned that Japan would assume hegemony in eastern Asia by soft power. In the above-mentioned activities, Japan always stands in the top position. He conceived that Japan would always take a center position; in other words, a position of cultural colonialism.
4. A Philosophy of Peace

*Life is a Battlefield* was written in 1914 to interpret the Boshin Rescript 「戊申詔書」, which was promulgated in 1908. In this book, INOUE Enryō stressed that "civilization" is in contradiction with war. He pointed out four contradictions between civilization and war. First, the development of civilization brings development of transportation and strengthens economic relationships. Growth in transportation facilitates the international division of labor and the international expansion of capital across different countries. These economic relationships prevent war, because a war breaks economic relationships and brings about economic collapse (pp. 93–97). Second, development of transportation brings interaction between foreign peoples and makes mutual understanding possible. If we understand each other, then we will not want to wage war (pp. 97–100). Third, the advance of knowledge brings fairness into the world and leaves no room for vulgar propaganda. As result of that, public opinion should not lean toward a war (pp. 100–103). Fourth, moral progress makes the world better. It leads the world to eliminate discrimination and the motives for war (pp. 104–106). Of course, since there are differences of language and history, he noted that war would not disappear from the world immediately. However, he thought that the frequency and scale of war would reduce.

Although Enryō shifted from a philosophy of war to one of peace, problems still remain. Concerning Korea, he wrote:

A person who is involved with education in Korea said, 'I want to assimilate Korea into Japan, but when I teach them Korean history, they feel that Korea is an independent nation. It is a major barrier to assimilation.' (p. 109)

In this passage, Enryō did not add any comment on the issue of Japan's assimilating Korea. If he had had a negative opinion on assimilation, he would have criticized it. However, he did not criticize it. It is assumed that he agreed with assimilation. This shows that Enryō was still colonialist in his attitudes.

However, there is a more serious problem. Enryō divided war in peacetime from war in wartime. War in peacetime meant "Our Japanese subjects must fight with all overseas countries in agriculture, business, industry, science, or art" (pp. 153–154). Japanese people must compete in various international fields as Japanese subjects. Moreover, he wrote, "In the new era of peace, all subjects are united and struggle for
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the Empire of Japan" (p. 172). He asserted that all citizens should be mobilized for war in peacetime and form a unity as one. If an era of peace were to change into an era of war, what might happen? All citizens would be mobilized for war in wartime as one. Enryō's logic of a philosophy of peace is easily transformed into a totalitarian logic. The militaristic and totalitarian tendency has not changed.

Nevertheless, there is a possibility that goes beyond this flaw in his reasoning; that is the concept of "sincerity" 仮 (makoto). Enryō thought the morals of Japan differed from those of China, the U.S.A., and so on. These morals, however, have one source. All morals arise from one singular sincerity (p. 260) and this sincerity leads to God. He wrote,

The source of our inborn conscience is sincerity from heaven [天の誠]. When this sincerity arises in our mind, it becomes human conscience and honesty. Based on them, humanity is realized [...] God is the substance of sincerity. We call sincerity of heaven God. (p. 263)

Because God is superior to humans and acts of humans, sincerity as God is a universal law and can be changed neither by human nor by political situation. It is a transcendental law and the source of all humanity. This concept has the possibility to overcome nationalistic discourse as the Great Way of Unity between Loyalty and Filial Piety, because sincerity has a universality beyond the nation state.

5. Conclusion

I have discussed INOUE Enryō's philosophy of peace and war. In Fragment of a Philosophy of War, he thought war is inevitable and not an unusual state. In preparation for war, he presented a militaristic and totalitarian system. In "My Thoughts on Countering Russia", Enryō showed a warlike attitude. However he sought another way rather than war. He conceived ideas for peace in eastern Asia. Nevertheless his logic is colonialistic. In Life is a Battlefield, he changed his standpoint from a philosophy of war to one of peace. However, his logic was still militaristic and totalitarian and the problem of colonialism could not be solved. Nevertheless, it contains the possibility of new ethics based on universal sincerity. It is superior to nationalistic discourses. We need to discuss the concept of sincerity in more detail, in order to clarify the possibilities of Enryō's later ethics.