

Nakamura Keiu:
The Evangelical Ethic in Japan

Jerry K. Fisher
Macalester College

"Can a nation be born at once?" This question was posed in 1876 by William Elliot Griffis in his introduction to *The Mikado's Empire*.¹ Ninety years later, scholars are still amazed that Japan seems to have passed through precisely that experience. In a little more than a decade, loosely knit feudal alliances were transformed into a powerful central government; class distinctions, which were so important to the maintenance of social and political harmony in Tokugawa Japan, were officially abolished; a national, compulsory educational system was established; and the economy had become both national and international.

Griffis answered his own question by relying on the evangelical dictum: "With God all things are possible."² Few modern scholars are willing to leave anything to God, and in recent years it has become popular to stress the continuity between the Tokugawa and the Meiji eras as a partial explanation of Japan's amazing feat. This new scholarship maintains that much of what seemed to be a miraculous transformation was actually the culmination of processes begun well before Commodore Perry steamed into Edo Bay. We have had studies in Tokugawa education, Tokugawa religion, Tokugawa economy, and even in Tokugawa polity that help support this view. It has also been shown conclusively that many of the new leaders of the Meiji period were lower samurai who began their climb during the feudal era.

But whether change in the first decade of the Meiji Period was miraculous or the culmination of processes begun during the Tokugawa era, it was, nonetheless, extremely rapid—much too rapid for certain elements of Japanese society. In some *han*, feudal loyalties within the peasantry were so strong that spontaneous resistance to centralized political structures attracted

tens of thousands of followers. Furthermore, once central control was established, they benefited little from the new structures, which taxed them more efficiently and compelled their able-bodied children to attend public schools and to serve in a conscript army. Nor were samurai immune to adjustment problems; many squandered their pensions and fell to the depths of poverty. There was one group, however, which was surprisingly resilient during the turmoil of the early Meiji era: the samurai intellectuals. Although there were men like Saigō Takemori, who found himself leading a revolt against the new order, there was surprisingly little alienation among samurai intellectuals, who were both the products of the Tokugawa and creatures of the Meiji. This study proposes to investigate one aspect of that phenomenon.

There were at least three possible reasons why the Tokugawa-Meiji samurai intellectual was able to adjust to the new environment with little discernible malaise. First of all, the structures of early Meiji society were such that most intellectuals could achieve their life goals through participation in society. There was room in Meiji Japan for a Fukuzawa Yukichi, a Nijima Jo, and even an intransigent conservative Confucian scholar like Motoda Eifu. The door to success was wide open for the intelligent samurai—at least during the first years of the Meiji era. It was the age in which Takahashi Korekiyo, a future prime minister, could return from the United States in 1868, where he had been an indentured servant, and proceed to amass and squander several small fortunes while moving rapidly back and forth from one job to another: as teacher, translator, stipended student, and in and out of no less than three government ministries—all before he reached the age of thirty.³ By 1874 Fukuzawa Yukichi complained that a mediocre scholar of Western learning who invested a meager one hundred yen and three years of his time to study Western languages could command a salary of fifty to seventy yen per month: a rate of profit, he claimed, that not even a usurer could match.⁴

A second explanation for why there seemed to be little alienation among Tokugawa-Meiji intellectuals is that their values had been transformed so that they could achieve their goals even in the new Meiji government. This position maintains that Fukuzawa Yukichi and many of his Meirokusha colleagues were modern, emancipated men who introduced Western thought to Japan because they had rejected their Tokugawa

heritage. The continuity between the Tokugawa and Meiji eras was the individual himself. The process of change between the eras took place in the mind of each intellectual. There is, however, a third possibility, which has not been sufficiently explored. In this essay, I shall endeavor to show that one of the reasons "a nation could be born at once" and still leave few of its intellectuals frustrated aliens in their own land was because many intellectuals with a good, late Tokugawa Confucian upbringing felt very much at home in Meiji Japan. They were not only comfortable in the new, modern Meiji world, but they contributed greatly to its establishment and to its perpetuation.

The subject of this exposition is Nakamura Keiu, one of the most prominent of the Tokugawa-Meiji intellectuals. Nakamura was born in Edo in 1832. Before he was a year old, rice riots by destitute poor had penetrated into the great cities—even into the seat of the Tokugawa government. When Keiu was six years old, Ōshio Heihachirō, a samurai Confucian scholar serving the Tokugawa *bakufu*, led an uprising of peasants and townsmen in Osaka which left much of the city in shambles. As a youth, Nakamura lived through some of the most turbulent years in Japanese history. The samurai class, of which he was a member, was heavily in debt to the merchants; the Tokugawa government, to which his family owed their allegiance, was in an advanced state of decay; and the nation itself faced the possibility of being torn apart by the Western powers.

As Nakamura rapidly ascended the ranks as a student and then teacher at the Shōheikō, the official Tokugawa Confucian school, he was not unmindful of the world about him. He began to study the Dutch language when he was sixteen—six years before Perry's visit to Japan. By 1855 he was trying to learn English and was beginning to have grave doubts about the wisdom of the Tokugawa policy. A recently discovered document tells us much about Nakamura's thinking in the late 1850's. In that essay, entitled "Treatise on Western Learning," Nakamura stated that it was necessary for the Japanese to pursue Western studies. He also maintained that it was absolutely essential that Western studies be approached in the correct manner. He explained this by saying:

In order to understand this new field of knowledge, we must dwell within its midst. We must become fully acquainted with some aspect of it in order to grasp its

essence. The sage does not forget this point. Look at it this way, presume everything in the land is dried out. However, within this drought-wrought land there is water. There is water in the sea, there is water in the river—we could carry it from there. But if we dig a well in the dried earth, water can also be obtained—it will spring forth to nourish the land. Western “skills” are not just clever tricks or stunts that can be simply mastered. Their ultimate source lies in the same intellectual stream as our own.⁸

Nakamura was approaching the problem of understanding the West with tools he had developed as a Confucian scholar: grasp the essence, do not become entangled with nonessential elements. When, in 1866, he had an opportunity to go to England to observe the West at first hand, he took it.

Victorian England presented Nakamura with a thoroughly understandable model. He began to realize that Christianity was at the center of Western culture and that if one did not understand how it affected the morals and practices of the people, then one could never understand the *products* of Western civilization. Nakamura was away from Japan just fifteen months, but he brought home an *omigage*, a souvenir which he felt captured the driving spirit behind the West's position of strength in the world: Samuel Smiles's most successful publication, *Self Help*. Interlacing moral dicta with biographical examples, Smiles bombarded his readers with Victorian evangelical values. Smiles endeavored to answer the question: “Why is England the greatest nation in the world?” And in publications such as *Self Help*, he showed that England was great because so many of its people were superior; its people were superior because they were good Christians. In Smiles's mind, Christianity was the source of England's power, and its “essential characteristics” were “the virtues of constancy, energy, perseverance, industry, patience, accuracy, cheerfulness, hope, self-denial, self-culture, self-respect, power of good example, [and] nobility of character.”⁹

This was precisely the medicine that Japan needed for her sickness, thought Nakamura, because the Japanese people were, at that time, the antithesis of Smiles's ideal. In an article published in February 1875 entitled “Thesis on Changing the Character of the Japanese People,” Nakamura's view of the way-

wardness of his countrymen can be clearly seen. He wrote: "[The Japanese] still indulge in wine and women as they always have. . . . They do not know the way of heaven—they have no morals. They pay no attention to their work nor do they realize the necessity to work diligently. . . . They do not like to study nor endure difficulties. They have no perseverance."⁷

Self Help made its first Japanese appearance in March 1871 under the title *Saikoku risshi hen*, which can be translated "How the West Succeeds." The popularity of the book was phenomenal, and Japanese scholars have since called it "The Bible of the Meiji era." Since that first Japanese translation, *Self Help* has been in print almost continuously.⁸ The book did quite well in the West, too, 250,000 copies having been sold by the turn of the century.⁹ In 1872 Nakamura published another Meiji-era classic, a translation of John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*.

A close examination of both Nakamura's and Smiles's ideas elicits interesting comparisons. A basic tenet of Confucian ethics is that men, not institutions, determine the course of history. In his writings, Nakamura constantly pressed this point. There was little wonder that he was immediately attracted to Smiles. So central to Smiles was this concept that he began his famous *Self Help* with the following quotations:

The worth of a State, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it.—J. S. Mill

We put too much faith in systems, and look too little to men.—B. Disraeli¹⁰

Compare these statements with those made in Meiji 8 (1875) by Nakamura Keiu:

Government is like a cup which holds water: the people are like the water in the cup . . . if we change the shape of the container, the water which fills it has no change in character whatsoever. More important than changing the government is to change the character of the people. If day by day we can get rid of their soiled old ways and their character becomes fresh and new, we have hope.¹¹

In the waning years of the Tokugawa *bakufu*, Nakamura Keiu had advocated digging a well to tap the ultimate source of all knowledge. By 1875 he felt that the government had

located that source, but only if its nourishing waters were used would the Japanese people be saved.

However, there was hope! The Confucian and the evangelical ethics both emphatically stated that man could be saved. While the preacher waxed eloquent about sin and repentance, Smiles, the Victorian social practitioner, found the road to salvation to be the same as Nakamura did: all men must be taught how to live as men *should* live; education, especially moral education, was the means toward this end.

In order to teach others, one must be upright himself. For Nakamura, this was no obstacle, for evangelical prohibitions and commandments seem to have appealed to him even as a young man. The following are a list of dicta Keiu drew up for himself when he was twenty-two years old, well before he had come into contact with Western ideas:

1. Don't forget the virtues of loyalty and filial piety.
2. Don't forget the importance of correct bearing in all of your actions.
3. Don't use untrue words—neither lie nor exaggerate.
4. Cut away sexual desire—this is especially important for young people.
5. Study everything and don't be lazy.
6. Don't start reading a Dutch book and not finish it.
7. In all things criticize yourself but don't criticize others.
8. Cut off bad thoughts.
9. Be of sincere mind—don't be superficial or indulge in hypocrisy.
10. Always keep your blessings in mind, be grateful to your mother and father, don't forget the toils of the farmers, don't be lazy about anything you do.¹²

Nakamura Keiu's biographers tell us that the above credo is indicative of the way he thought and acted throughout his life.¹³ But his intellectual endeavors did not stop with Smiles's type of teachings and actions. In fact, Nakamura's thought did not even begin with evangelical strictures: it began with Neo-Confucian ethics and metaphysics. At the Shōheikō, Nakamura came under the influence of Sato Issai, one of the leading scholars of the Ōyōmei school of Neo-Confucianism in nineteenth-century Japan.¹⁴ The Ōyōmei school followed the teachings of the Chinese sage Wang Yang Ming (1472–1524), a monist who viewed

the universe as a collection of essences each metaphysically complete in itself. Thus, for Ōyōmei, men existed as individuals, full, complete unto themselves. Feudal hierarchies had no logical place in Ōyōmei thought, nor was society held together by family ties or the class ethics of the samurai. It is true that Nakamura mentioned the importance of loyalty and filial piety in his credo, but in the context of the entire statement, they were certainly not central to the ethics enunciated. Loyalty appeared to be more important as a personal discipline than as a system of behavior. Filial piety was defined by Nakamura not in terms of duty but in terms of thanksgiving; one was grateful to one's parents just as one was thankful to the farmers who worked hard to produce the food that one ate. In later writings, Nakamura's gratitude to his parents could be described best by the concept "love."¹⁶

The personal ethics articulated by Nakamura focused on the cardinal sin of evangelical Christianity: indolence. He assumed that man knew what he must do (and must not do); the only problem involved was putting his knowledge into action. But how did man know what to do? Nakamura spoke to this question in a work entitled "A Treatise on the Oneness of Morals and Happiness."¹⁶ In this essay, Nakamura took a traditional Confucian concept, *tendō* (the way of heaven), approached it as an Ōyōmei scholar, and equated it with a Christian concept of the Laws of God (*rosu obu goddo*). The metaphysics is taken from Wang Yang Ming. *Ten* (heaven) was not something that was external to man; it was not above, below, or around him; it dwelt within him. To follow the Way of Heaven was thus a natural act on the part of man: it was to obey the commandment written upon his heart. Ōyōmei monism did not isolate each individual. Each individual was complete but was of the same essence as other individuals; thus a major thrust of this philosophy was universality.¹⁷

Had Samuel Smiles been able to understand Nakamura's theology, it is unlikely that he would have agreed that they were talking about the same thing. But Nakamura knew precisely how Victorian ethics supported his Confucian world view. The ethics of both Smiles and Nakamura assume a static and constant ethical standard. The laws of God were indelibly written on man's conscience. If Smiles had been true to his Calvinist heritage, he might have questioned whether or not only the saved were capable of knowing God's will; but Nakamura, the

Confucian scholar, had no doubts about this matter: *all men* had a natural capacity to follow the Way of Heaven, and Nakamura's Way of Heaven was the same for all men! The concept of original sin was alien to him, but Nakamura felt that Smiles's teachings were applicable to all men and were particularly well suited to Japan's needs. Thus, Confucian universalism allowed Nakamura to learn from the West while holding fast to the teachings of the East.

Late Tokugawa scholars like Nakamura could not only accommodate Western thought but were able to fuse it with Confucian universalism so as to forge a powerful philosophical foundation for Japan's rapid development into a modern world power. Sakatani Rōro's advocacy in 1874 of Japan's adoption of an Esperanto-like universal language in order to facilitate modernization and world unity is a vivid example of this dynamic at work.¹⁸ At the age of fifty-one, this well known Confucian scholar, who had never studied a Western language, joined the Meirokusha, an intellectual society formed in 1874, which strongly advocated Western thought and institutions. Though Sakatani described himself as a "toothless old man" in the society's publication, his thought and that of his fellow member Nakamura Keiu represented the essential pedagogy of the society: it was necessary to create intelligent, moral men *and women* if Japan were to become a prosperous country.¹⁹ The application of this principle was universal—it was true at any time for any person in any place. But the ethics that supported it was intensely individualistic. All men and women must help *themselves* to become energetic, industrious, and perseverant. As *Self Help* taught, "the wise and active conquer difficulties by daring to attempt them: sloth and folly shiver and shrink at the sight of toil and danger, and *make* the impossibility they fear."²⁰

Though all men under heaven were capable of leading moral lives, all did not follow the laws of God, according to teachers like Nakamura and Smiles. In Nakamura's "Treatise on the Oneness of Morals and Happiness" a clear distinction was made between those who follow the laws of God and those who do not. This treatise teaches that if one were to walk the Path of Heaven, he would have abounding inner happiness (*nai fuku*), while if he should stray, he would live in the depths of despair.²¹ The treatise ends with a quotation from the Bible: "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree

bringeth forth evil fruit."²² Smiles warns, "Is there one whom difficulties dishearten—who bends to the storm? He will do little." But he adds, "Is there one who *will* conquer? That kind of man never fails."²³

Individualistic ethics can easily be extremely elitist. And though the Ōyōmei monistic tendencies in Nakamura might appear to be more equalitarian than Smiles's Calvinism, the net result was the support of an intellectual and moral aristocracy. The Meirokusha constantly lamented the fact that they lived in a society where there were so few intelligent, moral men and so many who were unintelligent and morally degenerate. In his "Treatise on Changing the Character of the Japanese People," Nakamura bitterly denounced the immorality of most of his countrymen. He noted that since the Meiji Restoration in 1868, the form of government within which the people existed had greatly improved, but the Japanese character had remained unchanged. Then he unleashed his tirade: "They are still illiterate and culturally blind . . . ; they still indulge in wine and women . . . ; they still hate to read things . . . ; they don't know the way of heaven—they have no morals; they don't pay attention to their work; they are an unintelligent, narrow-minded people."²⁴

Fukuzawa Yukichi, a Meirokusha colleague of Nakamura's who has been hailed as a crusader for the common people of Japan, consistently referred to those he championed as stupid people (*gu min*). He stated, in his famous work *The Encouragement of Learning*, that it was because of their stupidity and lack of perseverance that the poor had become impoverished. Fukuzawa felt that they had no one to blame but themselves for their despicable state and even went so far as to warn that the only method to rule stupid people was by brute force.²⁵ Fukuzawa was by no means advocating a heavy-handed government for Japan—what he and Nakamura wanted was a nation of well-educated, moral people who would become capable of ruling themselves. However, early Meiji Confucian modernizers felt that the Japanese people had a long way to go before they could stand on their own feet. In the past, individual growth had been stunted by a feudal system that placed arbitrary class and hereditary distinctions above individual ability and virtue, but these restrictions, Nakamura and his Meirokusha colleagues thought, had been eliminated by the Meiji government. Liberty and equality were things that had to be won by each individual

through his own merit. Unfortunately, few Japanese were able to meet the test.

Nishimura Shigeki, another Confucian scholar of the time, wrote numerous essays in the *Meiroku Magazine*, calling the Japanese people only half enlightened (*han kai ka*). He ranked them well below the English. In fact, he even pleaded that because of the decadance of the Japanese, which he attributed to their sloth and illiteracy, it was necessary for Japan to impose high tariffs upon goods from nations where the populace was more intelligent and industrious or the effect upon Japanese economy would be disastrous.²⁶

Samuel Smiles would have agreed with Nishimura's high opinion of the English. In *Self Help*, he stated: "The spirit of self-help, as exhibited in the energetic action of individuals, has in all times been a marked feature in the English character, and furnishes the true measure of our power as a nation."²⁷ England's corporate virtue, according to Smiles, was both established and maintained by a moral aristocracy who guided their countrymen by the example of their own superior conduct. Tokugawa-Meiji Confucianists had no difficulty understanding Smiles's quotation on "The True Gentlemen" (*Shinsei no kanshi*) when he read Nakamura's translation of *Self Help*:

That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country—that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the heart of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and sceptre of a nation;—this aristocracy is not an aristocracy of blood, not an aristocracy of fashion, not an aristocracy of talent only; it is an aristocracy of Character. That is the true heraldry of man.²⁸

Nakamura and Smiles agreed that strong nations could be built only by good works. Good works were done by men, not institutions. It was the responsibility of the intelligent and the virtuous to educate their countrymen, and if the people were properly receptive to their enlightened teaching, the whole nation would prosper. Just as an individual was known by his works, so was a nation. A virtuous nation, one whose people displayed the attributes of industry, patience, and perseverance,

would bear good fruit. This was precisely what Nakamura meant when, in 1859, he counseled the Tokugawa leaders to dig a well in order to nourish their drought-ridden land. The Way of Heaven was the ultimate source of all virtue, wisdom, and power; and thus, reasoned Nakamura, the West's strength could only be due to one factor: its people were following the Way of Heaven. Smiles simply described the attributes of virtue and maintained that their energetic application would make men and nations prosperous. Nakamura, the Neo-Confucian scholar, indicated their source. In either case, the results were the same: virtue produced strength, and strength was a product of virtue. Furthermore, this dictum was as valid for nations as it was for individuals.

Neo-Confucian scholars such as Nakamura found their pre-Meiji education most useful in an era of rapid social and industrial development. More important, they helped lay the philosophical foundations for a powerful nation. William Elliot Griffis wondered if a nation could be born at once. His friend Nakamura Keiu helped make Japan into the kind of nation that Griffis greatly admired. As early as 1876, Griffis wrote of his wish that "the Sun-land lead the nations of Asia that are now appearing in the theatre of universal history," and he was a steadfast champion of Japan until his death fifty-two years later.²⁹ Nakamura Keiu did not live to see Japan's defeat of China in 1895, and it is doubtful if the victory of the Japanese nation-state over the land from which he received so much intellectual nourishment would have pleased him as it did his colleague Fukuzawa Yukichi. Fukuzawa hailed the victory as the result of perfect cooperation between the government and the people—a people and a government that were superior in wisdom and virtue to those of any nation in Asia.³⁰ But though Nakamura did not seem to share Fukuzawa's chauvinism, he still contributed significantly to Japan's emergence as a powerful nation-state. The evangelical ethic that he preached bore the same fruits in Japan as it did in the Anglo-Saxon nations. If strength was a product of virtue, then by the turn of the century Japan had indeed become the most virtuous nation in Asia.

NOTES

1. William Elliot Griffis, *The Mikado's Empire* (New York, 1877), p. 10.
2. *Ibid.*
3. One of the most fascinating tales of Meiji Japan is told by Takahashi in his autobiography, *Takahashi Korekiyo ni den* (Tokyo, 1936).
4. Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Gakumon no susume* (Tokyo, 1967 ed.), p. 102.
5. Nakamura Keiu, "Yōgaku son," quoted in Ōkubo Toshiaki, "Nakamura Keiu no shoki yōgaku shisō to *Saihōku risshi hen* no yakujutsu oyobi kankō: Jakkō no shiryō no skōkai to sono kentō," *Shien*, 26.2-3:155 (Jan. 1966).
6. Samuel Smiles, *The Autobiography of Samuel Smiles, LL.D.* (New York, 1905), pp. 390-91.
7. Nakamura Keiu, "Jimmin no seishitsu o kaisō suru setsu," *Meiroku zasshi*, No. 30 (Feb. 1875), *Meiji bunsho zenshū*, Vol. 5: *Zasshi hen* (Tokyo, 1955), p. 201.
8. For further information on the continuing success of *Saihōku risshi hen* and its importance during the Meiji era, see Shōwa Joshi Daigaku Kindai Bungaku Kenkyū Shitsu, *Nakamura Keiu, Kindai bungaku kenkyū sisho*, 1:434-43 (Tokyo, 1956).
9. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed. (1911), s.v. "Samuel Smiles." *Self Help* was most recently published in English in 1968.
10. Samuel Smiles, *Self Help: With Illustrations of Character, Conduct, and Perseverance* (New York, 1870), p. 21.
11. Nakamura, "Jimmin no seishitsu o kaisō suru setsu," p. 202.
12. Shōwa Joshi Daigaku Kindai Bungaku Kenkyū Shitsu, *Nakamura Keiu*, pp. 407-8.
13. Both Ishii Kendō and Takahashi Masao, who have written biographies of Nakamura, describe Nakamura as an exceptionally moral person. Hiyan Arai, the late authority on Japanese religion, once remarked that Nakamura was extremely "upright and uninteresting." For more on Nakamura's character, see Ishii Kendō, *Nipponki jimbutsu tenkei Nakamura Masanao den* (Tokyo, 1907), and Takahashi Masao, *Nakamura Keiu* (Tokyo, 1966).
14. Though Satō Issai taught Ōyōmei, a heterodox school of Neo-Confucian thought, he also was well versed in orthodox Shu Shi (Chu Hsi) teachings, which were the official and supposedly the only doctrines taught at the Shōbeikō. Many late Tokugawa Japanese Confucian scholars developed an appreciation for both schools. Nakamura was one of these scholars, as was Sakuma Shōzan, another of Satō Issai's famous students. For a discussion of Satō Issai's thought, see Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nihon Ōyōmei gakuhō no setsugaku* (Tokyo, 1938), pp. 225-59. Although Inoue includes a chapter on Nakamura in his *Nihon Shu Shi gakuhō no setsugaku* (Tokyo, 1905), he points out that Nakamura was not a strict follower of the orthodox school.
15. Nakamura's Christian ties are stressed and documented in Takahashi's *Nakamura Keiu*.
16. Nakamura Keiu, "Tokufu gōitsu no setsu," *Keiu Nakamura senshi enzetsushū*, quoted in Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nihon Shu Shi gakuhō no setsugaku*, pp. 569-82.
17. The philosophy of Wang Yang Ming is often referred to as the school of Universal Mind.
18. Sakatani Rōro, "Shitsugi issoku," *Meiroku zasshi*, No. 10, p. 107 (June 1874).

19. Sakatani's reference to himself is found in the last article of the *Meiroku zasshi*: "Sonnō jōi setsu," *Meiroku zasshi*, No. 43, p. 263 (Nov. 1875). Though Meirokusha members were strong advocates of women's education, their reasons for schooling women would be strongly criticized by most educators today. Women, they felt, must be educated so that Japan would be able to raise more enlightened men. One of the best statements of this position is Nakamura's "Treatise on How to Make Virtuous Mothers" (*Zenryō naru haha o tsukuru setsu*), *Meiroku zasshi*, No. 33, pp. 212-13 (Mar. 1875).

20. Smiles quotes this poem, which he attributes to Rowe. Smiles, *Self Help*, p. 346.

21. Nakamura, "Tokufu gōtsu no setsu," pp. 574-77.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 583. The English translation used is from the King James Bible, Matthew 7:17.

23. Smiles quotes a poem attributed to John Hunter, Smiles, *Self Help*, p. 346.

24. Nakamura, "Jimmin no seishitsu o kaizō suru setsu," p. 201.

25. Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Gakamon no rumore*, pp. 17-18.

26. Nishimura Shigeaki, "Jiyū kōeki son," *Meiroku zasshi*, No. 29, pp. 194-96 (Feb. 1875).

27. Smiles, *Self Help*, p. 25.

28. Smiles, *ibid.*, p. 417, attributes this to *The Times*. Nakamura's translation is found in Samuel Smiles, *Saishōku risshi hen*, trans. Nakamura (Tokyo, 1876), p. 691.

29. Griffin, *The Mikado's Empire*, p. 578.

30. In his autobiography, Fukuzawa spoke of his satisfaction with the progress of Japan and its people, which, he felt, was best indicated by Japan's victory over China (Fukuzawa Yukichi, *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, trans. Kioka Eiichi [Tokyo, 1960], pp. 333-35). Fukuzawa's pride in the accomplishments of his countrymen as contrasted with the weak and degenerate state of the Chinese and Koreans is also clearly illustrated in a number of essays he wrote for the *Jiyū shimpō* in 1895. These are found in volume 15 of the *Fukuzawa Yukichi senshū* (Tokyo, 1959).