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1. Sociology in Society and the Japanistic Sociology
For the Japanese sociologists today, the "Japanistic sociology" in the 1920s and '30s\textsuperscript{1} would be something embarrassing they want to rather forget and hide in the past. In 1977 HAYASE Toshio (1903-1984) wrote as follows:

In the Shōwa period (1926- ) there arose a destructive crisis of the monopoly capitalism. And the movement for fascism began to develop in its full-scale in Japan. The unification for nationalism and also for the Tennō (Japanese emperor) system was forced to everybody. And in the regime that prepared the war, even the liberals were oppressed. The left wing intellectuals fell in conversion one after another. The tide of reactionarism became so strong that also the sociologists adjusted themselves to the situation of that time, advocating what could be called "sociology of national polity (kokutai-shakaigaku)", in order to make sociology itself survive in Japan\textsuperscript{2}.

There would be no Japanese sociologists today who praise the Japanistic sociology, or the kokutai-shakaigaku (国体社会学) in Hayase’s term. However, through the critical assessment of the Japanistic sociology, we could maybe open a new transnational sociological communication, especially with the Asian colleagues.

On the other hand, this critical assessment would also confirm the basic character of sociology in general. Sociology is always sociology of society. In a sense sociologists place themselves out of a society to observe it. But sociology is also sociology in society at the same time. Sociologists are never separated from a society that either permits their existence, or expels them.

According to Otthein Rammstedt, "two thirds of all German sociology professors

emigrated" from Nazi Germany. The émigré sociologists (M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno, H. Gerth, A. Schutz, K. Mannheim, etc.) were negatively connected with Nazi Germany, but also positively connected with the other societies that accepted them (USA, UK, etc). Sociologists, too, are never free from what Karl Mannheim himself called the "ontological connectedness (Seinsverbundenheit)" with societies. The "freely floating (freischwebend)" intellectuals also need a society that enables them, first of all, to live and survive, and then to float freely.

And it is noteworthy that in contrast to the German émigré sociologists we can hardly find Japanese ones in the USA, etc. I think this difference strongly correlates with the rise of the Japanistic sociology and its character. Because the Japanese sociologists had almost no chance for emigration, they had to survive within the "Empire of Japan" including Korea, Taiwan, and Manchuria, advocating, more or less, the Japanistic sociology.

2. A Philological Remark on the Terms "Modernization and "Kindai-Ka"

In this presentation I am giving such an expression as "another way of modernization" to the Japanistic sociology. But this could be quite misleading in a sense, because in my study the Japanese word for modernization, namely "kindai-ka" (近代化), never appears in the texts of the Japanistic sociology.

Neither does it appear in SHINMEI Masamichi’s Dictionary of Sociology (in Japanese) (1944), while you can find there such terms as "theory of social change (shakai-hendō-ron)" as title for a section (pp.209-263), or "modern national society" (pp.347-9), "modern city" (pp.362-3), "modern family" (pp.373-5), and "modern state" (pp.395-7) as items. Although the Japanese word "kindai-ka" as general vocabulary emerged in the 1930s at the latest, it was not at all familiar to the Japanese sociologists.

---

3 O. Rammstedt, Deutsche Soziologie 1933-1945: Die Normalität der Anpassung. Suhrkamp, 1986. S.14. Rammstedt mentioned a change from "deutsche Soziologie (sociology in Germany) to "Deutsche Soziologie" in the 1930's (ibid. pp.70-76). The latter was conceptualized as something special that was possible only by the German (sociologists). It was also paraphrased as "Deutsche Volkssociologie" which now broke with the ideas that were so "atomistic and individualistic" as to sacrifice "the entire for the sake of the individuals" (ibid. p.73). The same thing was also insisted by the Japanistic sociology.

4 As one of the reasons for this, the US Immigration Act of 1924, which prohibited the further immigration of the Japanese, could be mentioned.

5 The Nihon Kokugo Daijiten (Grand Japanese Dictionary) of Shogakukan (2nd ed. 1972) registers SHIMAZAKI Tōson’s usage of "kindai-ka" in the 1st part (chapter 6, section 4) of his historical novel Yoake-Mae (Before the Dawn) of 1932. Concerning the reformation of the Bunkyū period (1862), Shimazaki wrote as follows: "Without being left to the future, the modernization of the things in the feudal age had already began".
as academic term before 1945.

Concerning the English word "modernization", the situation would be nearly the same. Although the OED registers the first appearance of this term in 1770, it was not until the rise of the modernization theory in the 1950s that this English word prevailed in social science and sociology. For example, while Edwin R. A. Seligman’s *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1933) contained no item for "modernization" (also no registration in the index), we can find it in David L. Sills’ *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* of 1968 (vol.10, pp.386-409). And as Wolfgang Knöbl pointed out, the emergence of modernization theory in the USA was with no doubt related to the Cold War in general, and especially to Harry S. Truman’s "Point Four" Program (1949) which gave a vision of "how underdeveloped regions in the world could prosper with the help of American technology and know-how to counter the attractions of communist ideology".

On the other hand, independently of this rise of the American modernization theory, the word "kindai-ka (modernization)" gradually became an academic term in Japan after 1945. And it was not sociologists, but other social scientists like ŌTSUKA Hisao (1907-1996) and MARUYAMA Masao (1914-1996), who first used this Japanese word. Following them, the Japanese sociologists also introduced this word into the sociological vocabulary. The *Dictionary of Sociology* by FUKUTAKE Tadashi et al. (in Japanese) (1958) contained the item "kindai-ka" which was, however, based on Ōtsuka’s historical study of the European modern economy.

From August 29 to September 2, 1960, nearly three months after the decision of the Japanese parliament about the US-Japan Security Treaty, the "(Preliminary) Conference on Modern Japan" of the Association for Asian Studies (AAS) was held in Hakone. It could be said that through this conference the American modernization theory of the

---

7 H. Ōtsuka, *Historical Starting Point for Modernization* (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1948. While in this book Otsuka himself defined the modernization as "the dissolution of the feudal and the establishment of the capitalistic", he admitted another usage of this term by his contemporaries, in which the modernization also meant "the historical development of the capitalistic onto the higher stage" (*ibid*. p.1).
8 In the section 5 of M. Maruyama’s *Philosophy of FUKUZAWA Yukichi* (in Japanese) (1947) we can find the expression "nihon-kindai-ka (modernization of Japan)".
9 The participants were as follows: John W. Hall (Chairman), Ronald P. Dore, Marion Levy, Robert Lifton, Edwin O. Reischauer, KAWASHIMA Takeyoshi, MARUYAMA Masao, NAKANO Takashi, OGATA Sadako, and others (M. B. Jansen ed., *Changing Japanese Attitudes toward Modernization*, Princeton UP, 1965, p.3-4).
1950s was introduced into Japan. The revised version of J. W. Hall's paper "Japan within the Concept of Modernization" was translated in the Japanese academic journal *Shiso* (No. 439, January 1961). And the No. 473 (November 1963) of this journal was published with the title, *On "Modernization"*.

However, as the quotation mark in this title suggested, the Japanese social scientists did not completely agree with the American modernization theory. They took distance from the American concept of "modernization" which they felt differed from their own of "kindai-ka" in some points.

Firstly, the Japanese social scientists questioned, whether the American concept of modernization was simply equated with (western modern) capitalism. If so, KAWASHIMA Takeyoshi (1909-1992) (sociology of law) said, "it would make us fall in the error to approve only the development in the western capitalistic style, and to neglect or deny the social development in other styles, especially by socialism and communism". Against this fully anticipated criticism, some of the American modernization theorists had proposed to measure the degree of modernization mainly on the material dimension, e.g. "literacy rates, urban population, GNP per capita, calories consumed per capita, utilization of electricity, circulation of newspapers". If the circumstances of the socialist or communist countries could be measured with these indexes, and compared with those of the capitalistic, then the concept of modernization would become, so to speak, ideology-neutral.

However, this ideology-, or value-neutrality was also, secondly, questioned by the Japanese social scientists. Maruyama and others insisted that "greater recognition be given to the value changes affecting the individual in modern society", and Kawashima said, "I believe that in the modernization of Japan such values as 'democracy' and 'human rights' have played an important role in providing the motive force in social and political development".

11 M. B. Jansen ed., *Changing Japanese Attitudes toward Modernization* (see note. 9), p.25. The materialistic view of modernization was most clearly presented by Marion Levy at the Hakone conference. He said, "In seeking to define modernization (...) I would rest the definition on two types of measures, both technological in nature. One has to do with the extent to which tools are utilized to multiply or otherwise increase the effects of the application of energy to materials. The other has to do with the ratio of energy supplied from inanimate sources to that supplied from animate sources" (ibid. p.24-5).
12 *ibid.* pp.27-8. The term "democracy" in this remark of Kawashima should be contextualized in the political situation in Japan of 1960, namely the massive protest movement against the US-Japan Security Treaty in Japan. Noteworthy would be the follow-
In 1947 FUKUTAKE Tadashi (1917-1989), one of the leaders of sociology in Japan after 1945, published an article for the reconstruction of sociology in Japan\textsuperscript{13}. For Fukutake, too, the *value changes* as well as the *values* (democracy, etc.) that Maruyama and Kawashima tried to integrate into the concept of modernization were essential for the reconstruction of sociology in Japan. This reconstruction must be the farewell to the sociology until 1945, namely to the Japanistic sociology. Fukutake said, "With the defeat of Japan, the absolutism of the Tennō system that had strongly constrained the social science in Japan dissolved at last. (...) Our country is now on the way of bloodless revolution"\textsuperscript{14}. The reconstruction of sociology in Japan must be consistent with the "democratic reconstruction of Japan"\textsuperscript{15}. Furthermore, Fukutake combined this reconstruction with socialism:

> We are assured that for the reconstruction of the Japanese society there is no other way than that to the *social(istic) democracy* (社會主義的民主主義). (...) In contrast to the society only based on the laissez-faire, the socialist society is highly planned, which is the inevitable consequence of the contradiction of the capitalistic society. The despotism or the dictatorship would be the wrong type of control to cope with this contradiction. As K. Mannheim insisted in his *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* (1940), the problem for us is not "freedom or control", but "good or bad control". The task of sociology is to give scientific foundations for making a good planned control\textsuperscript{16}.

For Fukutake, it was not that the modernization could also mean socialism, but that it should be accomplished in the form of socialism.

Not only the Japanistic sociology in the 1930s, but also this statement of Fukutake in the late 1940s would be embarrassing for the Japanese sociologists today. The ideas such as "Planning for Freedom" (K. Mannheim) have already diminished in the tide of

\textsuperscript{13} T. Fukutake, "For the Reconstruction of Sociology in Japan" (1947), in his *The Tasks of the Contemporary Sociology* (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1948, pp.227-260.
\textsuperscript{14} ibid. p.237, p.243.
\textsuperscript{15} ibid. p.243.
\textsuperscript{16} ibid. p.244-5.
neo-liberalism. But Fukutake was clearly against the "dogmatic" (公式主義的) or totalitarian Marxism. He stressed the "various possibilities of socialist society" which we need not identify only with the so-called "real socialism" or the socialism that really existed.

From the philological review of the Japanese word for modernization "kindai-ka" we can conclude as follows: 1) This word was introduced and established in social science and sociology in Japan only after 1945, 2) the Japanese social scientists believed that the modernization should involve a series of value orientations, and "democracy (or democratization)" was one of the most important, and 3) they never excluded socialism (or communism) from the concept of modernization.

3. From the "Moonlight" Sociology to the Japanistic Sociology

Now I briefly sketch the history of sociology in Japan until 1945.

In 1956 DAIDÔ Yasujirô (1904-1987) characterized the sociology in Japan with a witty expression, namely "moonlight sociology" (月光社会学) 18. The moonlight is nothing generated by the moon itself. It is the sunlight that is only transmitted by the moon. Likewise, the sociology in Japan was (and maybe still, is) originally the sociology made in the West that was (and maybe, is) only translated into Japanese.

Sociology in Japan started with introducing Herbert Spencer, first by Ernest F. Fenollosa in 1878, and then, since 1881, by TOYAMA Masakazu (1848-1900). Later in the early 1900s, Auguste Comte was introduced by TAKEBE Tondo (1871-1945) who combined Comte's sociology with the Confucian philosophy.

In 1924 the Japanese Sociological Society (JSS) of today was established, and the monthly (!) publication of its Journal of Sociology also started in the same year. Until September 1930, this journal held 77 issues in total, and from No.1 (May 1924) until No.60 (April 1929) each issue contained a frontispiece which was a picture of sociologists or sociological matters (see, Table). The biggest group of them was German as well as American (15 for each), followed by Japanese (10), French (7), British (5), Austrian (4), Russian (2), Italian (2), and Czech (1). The rate of the Japanese is only 16 % to 84 % of the Western. The expression "moonlight sociology" seems correct.

However, already in 1924 there existed a criticism about this "moonlightness" of the sociology in Japan. WAKAMIYA (Y)unosuke (1872-1938), who was rather journalist than sociologist, and later in the 1930s strongly advocated the Japanism with MINODA Muneki (1894-1946), said, in his article of 1924, as follows:

\[\text{ibid. p.244.}\]

\[\text{Y. Daidô, "Reflection on Sociology in Japan" in T. Fukutake ed. The Tasks of Sociology in Japan (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1956, pp.524-7.}\]
In these 25 years (...) the Japanese sociologists have never thematized the Japanese society. (...) The Japanese people and the Western people have different passes for the development. (...) The structure of the Western society is different from that of the Japanese society. (...) The cause of the social problems in the West is different from that in Japan. (...) Can these problems be solved automatically if we only review and discuss the Western sociologists’ theories?¹⁹

This article of Wakamiya has been mentioned repeatedly as origin of the Japanistic sociology. But it was just a starting point.

In the late 1920s there emerged a boom of "formal sociology" (G. Simmel, A. F. Vierkant, L. von Wiese, etc.) among the Japanese sociologists²⁰. The sociological mean-

---

²⁰ For example, IMORI Rikuhei (1907-1982), Study of Formal Sociology (in Japanese),
ing of this rise of the formal sociology in Japan was that it created individualistic point of view which had been neglected in the theory of social organism, for example, by T. Takebe. The formal sociology started its considerations of human social relations and interactions from the very existence of individuals. Though this individualism is no more than methodological, it could also foster the individualism as norm.

On the other hand, soon after the boom of formal sociology, there also arose a movement for the "cultural sociology" in Japan. Those who advocated the latter criticized the former as follows: What the formal sociology makes up from the consideration of the social relations and interactions, is formal, abstract, therefore, universal. But it fails to grasp the historicity of the social phenomena as well as the cultural diversity in concrete.

The book of SEKI Eikichi (1900-1939), *Introduction to Cultural Sociology* (in Japanese) (1929), was not only a product of this movement, but also a bridge to the Japanistic sociology. His remark on Max Weber’s sociology of religion is noteworthy here:

[Weber’s] 'sociology of religion' planned a study of the world religions, especially of the Asian ones, which are different from the economical ethics of the Western capitalistic culture. The reason for this study could be (...) that the scholar was driven, by the deterioration and deadlock of the spirit of the modern Western capitalism, to study other cultures than the Western, even though he was not aware of it.

Seki not only pointed out the diversity of religions or cultures, but also implied here the superiority of the Asian religions or cultures to the modern western capitalism. He understood Max Weber’s sociology of religion exactly on the line of Oswald Spengler’s *The Decline of the West* (1918, 1923), following his idea that the culture should die in the form of civilization. Later in an article of 1935, Seki wrote as follow:

The great transformation of the world history is now making it the historical destiny that the Japanese people should become the leader of the world history in place of the European. If this could come true, then the Japanese sociology should become the

---

(Tokyo, 1927), and SHINMEI Masamichi, *Theory of Formal Sociology* (in Japanese), (Tokyo, 1928), which already contained the criticism of the formal sociology.

21 In this sense ENDÔ Ryûkichi (1874-1946), YONEDA Shôtarô (1873-1945), and TAKADA Yasuma (1883-1972) should be considered as precursors of formal sociology in Japan.


general and universal sociology\textsuperscript{24}.

Seki’s vision was that the Japanese people and the Japanese sociology should become from the particular to the universal.

However, in the Japanistic sociology we can also confirm a completely reverse orientation. KAWAI Hiromichi (1907-1991) insisted, in his \textit{Principle of the Japanese Sociology} (1943), that the Japanese sociology should bring the "Japanistic awareness (日本的自覚) as historical being with particularity and uniqueness" to the Japanese people\textsuperscript{25}. He wrote as follows:

Having participated in the World War, Japan ranked among the Five Great Powers. However, at the same time Japan was brought more and more into the internationalism (世界主義) without encouraging nationalism. (…) The capitalism that had kept growing under the protection by the state since 1868 began to surpass the state in the Taishō period (1912- ), and it sometimes regarded the state as an obstacle for it. (…) In such a national crisis and disorder, we unfortunately encountered the earthquake disaster (1923). But immediately after this disaster, the Japanese Emperor (Tennō) mercifully issued the Edict for the Encouragement of National Spirit (国民精神作興詔書) that taught us to be good subjects with loyalty to the state of Japan\textsuperscript{26}.

And Kawai criticized the "individualistic sociology" of J. G. Tarde, F. H. Giddings, and G. Simmel, and also the Japanese sociologists who had opposed to T. Takebe’s theory of social organism combined with the Confucian philosophy. For Kawai the task of the Japanistic sociology was to bring the Japanese people from the universal back to the particular.

This idea of H. Kawai should not be regarded as something eccentric or exceptional in the sociology in Japan of the 1940s. From October 26 to 28, 1940, the Japanese Sociological Society (JSS) held a special conference for the "2600th Anniversary of the Empire of Japan" (紀元二千六百年) at the Tokyo Imperial University (University of Tokyo, today). In the session of "Japanese Society & Culture", YUMURA Eiichi made a presentation titled "The Logos Type of the Japanism"\textsuperscript{27}. According to him, one could

\textsuperscript{25} H. Kawai, \textit{Principle of the Japanese Sociology} (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1943, p.143. At this time Kawai was a professor of Nihon University, but after 1945 he left the academic world, and became a politician.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{ibid.} p.142.
\textsuperscript{27} E. Yumura, "The Logos Type of the Japanism" in: \textit{Annual Report of Sociology} (in Japanese), No. 8 (1941), pp.329-330.
hardly identify what the "Japanese spirit" really was, and there were "various opinions" about it. But there existed, Yumura argued, the "complete agreement about the nobility and holiness of national polity (kokutai)". Concerning the question, what should be the Japanism and the Japanistic sociology, there were quite different views like those of E. Seki and H. Kawai. However, it could be said that the idea of Japanism itself were shared by all Japanese sociologists at that time.

And also to be remembered is the following. Soon after this special conference, namely from December 17 to 18, 1940, the 15th annual meeting of the JSS was held (not in Japan, but) in Taipei. And 3 years later, from October 9 to 10, 1943, the 18th annual meeting was held in Seoul. In Taipei 30 Japanese and 2 Korean sociologists made presentations. But no Taiwanese (or Chinese) sociologists. In Seoul 21 Japanese and 1 Korean sociologists, and also no Taiwanese (or Chinese). H. Kawai wrote, in his above mentioned book of 1943, as follows:

Because the emancipation and the independence of Asia from Europe is only possible by the leadership of Japan, the Japanese must more eagerly behave as teachers.

Gurminder K. Bhambra stressed the necessity of the "rethinking modernity" from the postcolonial point of view. If the Japanese sociologists really want to understand the modernity or the modernization of Japan, they cannot overlook the colonial moment of the Japanese sociology itself.

* Japanese names mentioned here, in alphabetical order (Family name comes first in capitals):

ARIGA Nagao (有賀長雄)  |  NAKANO Takashi (中野卓)
DAIDÔ Yasujiro (大道安次郎)  |  OGATA Sadako (緒方貞子)
ENDÔ Kyukichi (遠藤隆吉)  |  ÔKOUCHI Kazuo (大河内一男)
FUKUTAKE Tadashi (福武直)  |  ÔTSUKA Hisao (大塚久雄)
HAYASE Toshio (早瀬利雄)  |  SEKI Eikichi (関栄吉)
HOZUMI Nobushige (穂積陳重)  |  SHIMAZAKI Tôson (島崎藤村)
IMORI Rikuhei (井森陸平)  |  SHINMEI Masamichi (新明正道)
KATO Hiroyuki (加藤弘之)  |  TAKADA Yasuma (高田保馬)
KAWAI Hiromichi (河合弘道)  |  TAKEBE Tondo (建部遙吾)
KAWAMURA Nozomu (河村望)  |  TOYAMA Masakazu (外山正一)
KAWASHIMA Takeyosh (川島武宜)  |  WAKAMIYA Unosuke (若宮卯之助)
MARUYAMA Masao (丸山真男)  |  YONEDA Shôtarô (米田庄太郎)
MINODA Muneki (蓑田胸喜)  |  YUMURA Eiichi (湯村栄一)

---