

## Editor's Introduction: Japanese Interpretations of the American Revolution

### I

IT WAS in 1809 that the news of American independence reached Edo. Japanese knowledge about the outside world had gradually increased with the growth of "rangaku" [Dutch learning] during the 18th century.<sup>1</sup> But the Japanese were still ignorant of American independence at the beginning of the 19th century, because all Dutch books on world geography, then available in Japan, had been published before the American Revolution.<sup>2</sup>

In 1808, Japanese officials in Nagasaki discovered that American vessels chartered by the Dutch East India Company had entered the port. Puzzled by the news of the visit of "American" ships, the Shogunate government requested its commissioner at Nagasaki to obtain from the

The author contributed a short essay with the same title "Japanese Interpretations of the American Revolution" to *The American Revolution: Its Meaning to Asians and Americans*, ed. by Cedric B. Cowing (Honolulu, The East-West Center, 1977), pp. 111-28. This editor's introduction is partly based on that essay. But it is expanded to triple length and entirely rewritten on the basis of new research.

<sup>1</sup> In translating Japanese historical terms into English, the author relied mainly on *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan* (9 vols., Tokyo, Kodansha, 1983). This encyclopedia has an entry for most of the Japanese historical figures and the political and intellectual movements mentioned in this editor's introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Shosuke Sato, *Nihon yōgaku-shi no kenkyū* [Studies in the History of Western Learning in Japan] (Tokyo, Chuo Koronsha, 1979), pp. 147, 192-93. For a detailed bibliographical guide to the geographical literature published in Japan during the age of national seclusion, see Kaikoku Hyakunen Kinen Bunka Jigyō-kai, ed., *Sakoku jidai Nihonjin no kaigai chishiki-sekai chiri seiyōshi ni kansuru bunken kaidai* [Japanese Knowledge of the Outside World during the Age of National Seclusion: A Bibliographical Guide] (Tokyo, Kangensha, 1963).

Dutch detailed information about the current Western political situation and particularly about the status of America. In January 1809, the commissioner sent to Edo a report prepared by his assistant who had interviewed the head of the Dutch Commercial House in Nagasaki. "In 1775 or 1776," the report stated, "the people of North America revolted against England, because the English . . . had treated the colonists cruelly, exploiting their labor and levying heavy taxes on them. They continued to struggle through 1780 or 1781, drove out the English and secured their independence." Then it gave a vague explanation of the American political system, suggesting its federal structure. "The Americans established a government in each province and adopted a governor for each government. Among these governors, one, Jefferson by name, is now most highly regarded." Then it mentioned Washington as the foremost national hero in America. "During the war for independence, a very capable general, Washington by name, fought bravely against English forces, and led the Americans to the final victory. Several years before his death, the Americans established a new city and named it Washington in honor of his great service to the nation."<sup>3</sup>

It was natural that the Dutch in Nagasaki conveyed to the Japanese a pro-American view of the American Revolution. The Dutch, because of their rivalry with the British, tended to be pro-American. This was especially true when they relied on American ships to continue their trade.<sup>4</sup> But it is interesting to note that the Japanese developed a pro-American view of the American Revolution by their dependence on Dutch sources for information on the outside world. Although the Shogunate government had shown some interest in acquiring knowledge about the outside world by appointing translation officers in 1811, complacency still continued to dominate the council of the Shogunate. Kazan WATANABE<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Sato, *Nihon yōgaku-shi no kenkyū*, pp. 176–97; Madoka Kanai, "Shoki ni okeru Amerika bunka no shōgeki" [Early Impact of American Culture upon Japan], in Makoto Saito, et al., eds., *Nihon to Amerika: Hikaku bunka ron*, Vol. 1 (*Ishitsu bunka no shōgeki to hadō*) (Tokyo, Nan'undo, 1973), pp. 67–68. The Shogunate officials were given some information on the French Revolution by the Dutch as early as 1794. It was customary for Dutch ships that entered Nagasaki to submit a report on world affairs to the Shogunate authorities. For some reason, however, the Dutch failed to provide the Japanese with the news of American independence (Sato, *Nihon yōgaku-shi no kenkyū*, pp. 146–48). See also Kiyoshi Inoue, "Nihonjin no Furansu kakumei-kan" [Japanese Views on the French Revolution] in Takeo Kuwabara, ed., *Furansu kakumei no kenkyū* (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1959), pp. 592–93.

<sup>4</sup> Kanai, "Shoki ni okeru Amerika bunka no shōgeki," *loc. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>5</sup> In accordance with the policy of our association, Japanese personal names are writ-

was one of the few intellectuals deeply troubled by this mood. He was a first-rate artist who produced masterpieces in Japanese painting. But he was also a scholar with a background of Dutch learning. With the help of his friends more advanced in Dutch learning, Watanabe familiarized himself with several Dutch books on world geography. In 1839, he wrote a manuscript on trends in the Western world, mixing his admonition against complacency with factual information on Western affairs. He hoped his manuscript would be read by high officials in the Shogunate. He committed suicide two years later, however, when he heard the rumor that his activities might involve his domanial master in difficulties with the Shogunate.<sup>6</sup>

In that manuscript on the Western World, Watanabe described in an admiring tone the American struggle for independence and the American republican system: "The American people revolted against the oppressive British rule, and when they achieved independence, decided not to adopt any prince for their country. Instead, they made it a rule to elect a wise man the chief magistrate . . . and conduct their government through conferences." He also noted that America had made a phenomenal development since its independence. Why had such a development been possible? He attributed its cause to the scientific mind, which he regarded as the main strength of the Western civilization. The scientific mind, he reasoned, had brought forth technological advances and better institutions in the West. Apparently, he regarded the American adoption of republican government as a manifestation of the scientific mind.<sup>7</sup>

The mood of complacency was broken decidedly in 1853 by the arrival of Commodore Perry's "Black Ships" in Edo Bay.<sup>8</sup> Not only was

---

ten in this introductory essay in the given name-family name sequence. When Japanese romanize their names, most of them write their names in the Western way: given name first. Our association follows this custom. It is now common, however, among the Western specialists in Japanese studies to write Japanese names in the Japanese way, that is, in the family name-given name sequence. This custom is spreading among Japanese academic journals. In order to avoid confusion, family names, whenever they appear in full names, are printed in capital and small capitals in the text of this essay.

<sup>6</sup> Shosuke Sato, "Watanabe Kazan to Takano Choei" [Kazan Watanabe and Choei Takano], in *Watanabe Kazan . . . Hashimoto Sanai* (Nihon shisō taikēi, Vol. 55) (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1971), pp. 607-18, 626-44.

<sup>7</sup> *Watanabe Kazan . . . Hashimoto Sanai*, pp. 21-22, 632-33.

<sup>8</sup> For Japanese intellectual responses to America since the arrival of Perry's fleet to the end of the 19th century, see Shunsuke Kamei, "The Sacred Land of Liberty: Images of America in Nineteenth Century Japan," in Akira Iriye, ed., *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), pp. 73-99. See also Kamei's

the Shogunate government unable to maintain its cherished policy of national seclusion, but also the stability of the Shogunate regime was increasingly put in question until its final demise in 1867.

The best book on world geography available in Japanese at the time of Perry's arrival was Shogo MITSUKURI's *Konyo zushiki* [An Overview of the Geography of the World] and its supplement, published respectively in 1845 and 1846. Mitsukuri, who was a student of Gempo MITSUKURI, a famous scholar in Dutch learning, got married to one of his teacher's daughters, wrote these and other works, and died in his twenties.<sup>9</sup> *Konyo zushiki* contained basic information on the United States, not only about its geography but also its history and government. Reflecting limitations in his understanding as well as his sources, his description of American history and government was inaccurate in details. Nevertheless, his book provided the reader with a good outline of American history and a grasp of the American political system as a union of republican states. Its description of the American Revolution was sympathetic to America. Its supplement contained a biography of George Washington.<sup>10</sup>

In addition to Dutch publications, Japanese intellectuals could also utilize Chinese publications for information about the United States. The

---

introductory essay to the first volume of *Nihon to Amerika: Hikaku bunka ron*, ed. by M.Saito, *et al.*, and Madoka Kanai's previously cited article, "Shoki ni okeru Amerika bunka no shōgeki" in the same volume, pp. 61–95. Kamei's English essay was later expanded and published in book form in Japanese as *Jiyū no seichi* [The Sacred Land of Liberty] (Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1978). The author owes much to Kamei's works. For Japanese responses to the Western World in general in the 19th century, see Saburo Ienaga, *Gairai bunka sesshu ron* [Japanese Absorption of Foreign Cultures] (Tokyo, Godo Shuppan, 1946, 1974).

<sup>9</sup> The Mitsukuri family was one of the most distinguished scholarly families in 19th century Japan. Shogo Mitsukuri's only son was Rinsho Mitsukuri, a Meirokusha intellectual. Another Meirokusha member, Shuhei Mitsukuri, was married to Gempo's other daughter, and Shuhei's son, Gempachi Mitsukuri, became an eminent scholar in European history. Rinsho Mitsukuri and Gempachi Mitsukuri will be mentioned later in this introductory essay. Dairoku Kikuchi, another son of Shuhei Mitsukuri, became a distinguished mathematician and an academic statesman, serving as President of Tokyo Imperial University and Minister of Education.

<sup>10</sup> *Konyo zushiki* (5 vols., Edo [Tokyo], 1845), Volume 4, Part 2, deals with North America. *Konyo zushiki ho* [Supplementary Volumes to *Konyo zushiki*], Volume 2, contains supplementary information on the United States, and Volume 4 contains a biographical sketch of George Washington. I appreciate the kindness of Professor Michiari Uete (Seikei University) who allowed me to see his Xerox copy of these books. For a brief introduction to these books, see *Sakoku jidai nihonjin no kaigai chishiki*, pp. 176–78.

author of the early Chinese books was an American. Elijah C. Bridgman, an American missionary active in China, wrote in Chinese an introductory book on the United States in 1839. This book was reedited as a part of Wei Yuan's World Geography and History Series published in China in 1842. In 1854, the year in which Japan gave up its policy of national seclusion to conclude the first treaty with the United States, three different Japanese translations of the American volume in the series were published. Later, Bridgman revised his work, and its Japanese edition was published in 1864.<sup>11</sup>

Since Bridgman was an American missionary, his books offered a patriotic interpretation of the American Revolution. Thus, the addition of information from Chinese sources, which was American in its origin, confirmed and strengthened the Japanese image of the American Revolution sympathetic to America. Japanese considered it a war against British tyranny and that Americans had defeated a formidable enemy. Koan (Taiga) FUJIMORI, a respected Confucian scholar, expressed his admiration for American independence in the preface to one of the three Japanese editions of Bridgman's volume in 1854: "On the eve of American independence, Americans felt that they could no longer bear British tyranny. They called a congress of the notables and elected Washington their leader. Then they informed other nations of British abuses in America and fought strenuously to drive out the British oppressors and win independence from them. When I learned about their struggle, I was impressed by their cause and pleased with their victory."<sup>12</sup> It is interesting that Fujimori, a reformist-minded Confucian intellectual, did not entertain any antipathy to the nation which had sent its fleet to force Japan to open its closed door. The American triumph in the Revolutionary War and the subsequent rise of the United States as a power seemed to be a good example for the Japanese who felt that

<sup>11</sup> Atsushi Shirai, Yoshikazu Tanaka, and George Harada, "Amerika dokuritsu sengen no hōyaku ni suite (2)," [Japanese Translations of the American Declaration of Independence: A Critical Examination], *Mita gakkai zasshi*, Vol. 77, no. 4 (1984). pp. 89–94. Nichiran Gakkai, ed., *Nihon yōgakushi jiten* [A Dictionary of the History of Western Learning in Japan] (Tokyo, Yushodo, 1984), p. 631. For bibliographical information on these Japanese editions, see *Sakoku jidai nihonjin no kaigai chishiki*, pp. 135–39, 143–49, 162.

<sup>12</sup> *Amerika sōki* [General Introduction to the United States], translated by Tatsu (Chikuan) Hirose (\*Edo, 1854), introduction, p. 3. An asterisk indicates that the book was printed and bound in the traditional Japanese style. See also Taichiro Mitani, "Taisho demokurashi to Amerika" [Taisho Democracy and America], in Saito, *et al.*, eds., *Nihon to Amerika*, Vol. 1, p. 121.

they had to maintain their independence amid the presence of aggressive Western powers. Shintaro NAKAOKA, one of the anti-Shogunate patriots who wanted to create a new central government for effective national defense, considered the American Revolution a successful example of the struggle for expelling oppressive foreigners.<sup>13</sup>

George Washington became a Japanese hero. For example, Shonan YOKOI, a prominent progressive intellectual active in politics in the 1860s, admired him as a political leader of eminent wisdom and virtue. "Washington established," he wrote in 1860, "several admirable principles for the nation. He made it a rule for the leader of the nation to bestow his position to the most worthy man; he also made it a basic national policy to promote world peace. . . . He not only proclaimed these principles but also observed them faithfully. Indeed, there was no gap between his words and deeds." Nagazane MOTODA, who later drafted the Imperial Rescript on Education for Emperor Meiji, considered Washington's virtues and achievements comparable to those of the legendary kings of ancient China. Such high esteem of Washington was typical. With an exaggerated notion of his role in the Revolution and in nation-building, the Japanese developed a heroic image of Washington as the founder of the American nation, a patriotic leader of great military and political genius, and a kind of philosopher king. Because of his respect for Washington's "principles," and also probably because of Townshend Harris's peaceful diplomacy, Yokoi held a favorable view of the United States. Comparing America with the European powers encroaching upon China, he considered the former peace-oriented and therefore the best power for Japan to cooperate with.<sup>14</sup>

## II

Although the Japanese continued to regard the American Revolution primarily as a heroic war for national independence, they gradually began to appreciate the intellectual aspects of the Revolution. They were able

<sup>13</sup> Michio Hirano, *Nakaoka Shintaro* (Tokyo, Hakuryūsha, 1966), pp. 205–06. See also Marius B. Jansen, *Sakamoto Ryoma and the Meiji Restoration* (Princeton, 1961), p. 251.

<sup>14</sup> Masatada Yamazaki, *Yokoi Shonen ikō* [Shonan Yokoi's Posthumously Found Writings] (Tokyo, Nisshin Shoin, 1942), pp. 508, 908–09. *Watanabe Kazan* . . . *Hashimoto Sanai*, pp. 448–49, 507. Also see Yamazaki, *Yokoi Shonan den* [A Biography of Shonan Yokoi] (3 vols., Tokyo, Nisshin Shoin, 1942), Vol. 3, pp. 259–61.

to understand a republic and a federal state in their own way. They were able to envisage republican government in Confucian terms, as Yokoi did, as a system of investing by election a wise and virtuous man with governing power.<sup>15</sup> They could comprehend a federal system since Japan had a form of federal structure under the Tokugawa Shogunate. If the Shogunate had led Japan's modernization, modern Japan would probably have developed with a federal system.<sup>16</sup> But it required some time for the Japanese to understand such key concepts of modern liberalism as liberty and human rights. When pioneering Japanese intellectuals were able to grasp these new concepts, they had to invent appropriate Japanese words for these concepts.<sup>17</sup>

It was Yukichi FUKUZAWA, the foremost champion of enlightenment in Meiji Japan, who introduced the American Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution to the Japanese public. In *Seiyō jijō* [Conditions in the Western World], a phenomenal best-seller first published in 1866, Fukuzawa outlined American history and the American political system and translated the whole text of these basic documents into intelligible Japanese.<sup>18</sup> Paraphrasing a sentence in the Declaration of Independence, Fukuzawa began his widely read series of essays *Gakumon no susume* [An Encouragement of Learning] (1872) with a message of the equality of man, "Heaven did not create a man above or below another man."<sup>19</sup>

Fukuzawa also popularized in 1869 the image of America as a land

<sup>15</sup> Michiari Uete, *Nihon kindai shisō no keisei* [The Shaping of Japanese Modern Thought] (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1974), pp. 87–88, 139.

<sup>16</sup> Kiyoshi Asai, *Meiji ishin to gunken shisō* [The Meiji Restoration and the Idea of Prefecture-County System] (Tokyo, Gannando, 1939, 1968), pp. 45–56.

<sup>17</sup> Fukuzawa gave an explanation of considerable length on such terms as liberty and right. *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* [The Complete Works of Yukichi Fukuzawa] (21 vols., Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1958–64), Vol. 1, pp. 486–87, 493–497. See Ki Kimura, "'Jiyū' wa itsu Nippon ni haitte kitaka" [When 'Liberty' Came into Japan] in Kaikoku Hyakunen Bunka Jigyo-kai, ed., *Kaikoku hyakunen Meiji bunkashi ronshū* (Tokyo, Kangensha, 1953), pp. 299–336. See also Shoichi Matsuo, *Jiyū minken shisō no kenkyū* [A Study of the Freedom and People's Rights Ideas] (Tokyo, Kashiwa Shobo, 1965), pp. 14–17.

<sup>18</sup> *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 1, pp. 311–27, 351–55. Ki Kimura speculates that Fukuzawa's translation of the Declaration of Independence may have had some influence upon anti-Shogunate activists in initiating an open rebellion against the Shogunate. Kimura, *Nichi-Bei bunka kōryūshi no kenkyū* [A Study on the History of U.S.-Japanese Cultural Relations] (Tokyo, Kashiwa Shobo, 1965), pp. 14–17.

<sup>19</sup> *An Encouragement of Learning*, translated by David Dilworth and Umeyo Hirano (Tokyo, Sophia University, 1969), p. 1. See also *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 3, p. 29.

of liberty in *Sekai kunizukushi* [The Countries in the World], a book written in a storyteller's style. He stressed that the American people lived in self-reliance and cherished their liberty. "Combining this love of liberty with patriotism, they developed a sturdy spirit of independence." When the British government began and continued to encroach upon their "natural rights," the American patriots were determined to fight against thousands of British troops. "They would not live under injustice and subjugation. They would rather die for liberty and the country." As for the American republican government, he wrote: "The American people formed their government upon a firm compact. They made a government, but no prince. Their government was a self-government of the people." Under such a government, "the wealth of the country has increased rapidly. The United States now rivals Britain in trade and industry and surpasses France in education, arts and sciences."<sup>20</sup> Fukuzawa idealized the American liberal democracy and somewhat exaggerated the rapid rise of the United States, obviously hoping to infuse Japanese youths with a spirit of independence. Later, however, he wrote on the United States in a more realistic vein.

While Fukuzawa respected modern Western civilization, he was afraid of Western imperialism. "Among the countries touched by the Westerners," he questioned in 1875, "was any able to maintain real independence?" "Western countries are extending their domains in the East," he warned again in 1881. "Now their expansion threatens East Asia like a spreading fire." Thus Westernization was a necessity for non-Western countries for their survival. Fukuzawa had to combine his care for individual liberty with his care for national power. "When every man in a nation maintains an independent life, the nation can better secure its independence," he wrote in *Bummei ron no gairyaku* [A General Treatise on Civilization], the most scholarly and thoughtful of his works, published in 1875. In this connection, he mentioned the fate of the American Indians. "Who owned America originally? . . . The American Indians lost their country to the white people. Although a civilization now thrives in America, it is not a civilization of the original Americans, but that of the white people." Just as the Indians lost their country, the Asians would lose theirs if they remain backward. His criticism of Western imperialism was rather mild, because he accepted power politics as a rule

<sup>20</sup> (6 vols.\*, Tokyo, Keio Gijuku, 1869), Vol. 5, pp. 8–14. See also *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 2, pp. 633–37.



of the game in international politics.<sup>21</sup> It was also because, as Sukehiro HIRAKAWA argues, he believed in the value of civilization and was unsympathetic to backwardness.

In a book-length essay, Hirakawa compares Fukuzawa and Benjamin Franklin. Both Fukuzawa and Franklin taught the importance of self-help and self-improvement. They both were free from religious bigotry. They both emphasized the need of promoting useful knowledge. They both propagated the spirit of capitalism. Both wrote a classic autobiography. There were certainly many interesting similarities in their ideas and personalities.<sup>22</sup>

It was Fukuzawa himself who introduced Franklin's life and "Poor Richard's" proverbs to Japanese youths in a popular textbook.<sup>23</sup> During the Meiji Era, many biographies of Franklin were written, and many editions of his autobiography and other writings were published.<sup>24</sup> Next to Washington, Franklin was the best known American in Meiji Japan. His life and writings inspired many young Japanese who hoped to make use of opportunities newly opened to the common people after the Meiji Restoration.

Other major figures of the Meiji Enlightenment, such as Hiroyuki KATO and Masanao (Keiu) NAKAMURA, introduced in their influential books the ideas of the American and French Revolutions and the concepts of constitutionalism and republicanism. Rinsho MITSUKURI wrote a detailed modern history of the West from a liberal viewpoint.<sup>25</sup> Several

<sup>21</sup> *Jiji shōgen* [Short Essays on Current Affairs] (1881) in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 5, pp. 186–87; *Bummei ron no gairyaku* (1875), in *Zenshū*, Vol. 4, pp. 202–03; *Minjō isshin* [Refreshing People's Minds] (1879), in *Zenshū*, Vol. 5, pp. 42–54.

<sup>22</sup> Hirakawa, "Shimpo ga mada kibō de atta koro" [When Progress Was Still a Robust Hope], *Shinchō*, Vol. 81, no. 2 (Feb. 1984), pp. 6–105. It was later published in book form with the same title (Tokyo, Shinchosha, 1984).

<sup>23</sup> Fukuzawa, *Dōmō oshie gusa* [Teachings for School Children] (5 vols.\*, Tokyo, Shokodo, 1872). Vol. 1. p. 30–37. See also *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 3, pp. 181–85.

<sup>24</sup> Teruko Imai, "Nihon ni okeru Furankurin no juyō—Meiji jidai" [Japanese Acceptance of Franklin—The Meiji Era], *Tsuda juku daigaku kiyō*, Vol. 14, no. 2 (1982), pp. 1–39.

<sup>25</sup> Hiroyuki Kato, *Kokutai shinron* [A New Treatise on the Forms of Government] (Tokyo, Taniyamaro, 1874) reprinted in *Meiji bunka zenshū* [Meiji Culture Collection] (28 vols. plus 3 supplementary vols. and 1 appendix vol., Tokyo, Nihon Hyoronsha, 1928–38, 1955–69), Vol. 2 (Jiyū minken), pp. 111–26. Keiu Nakamura, *Kyōwa seiji* [Republican Government] (2 vol.\*, Tokyo, Dojinsha, 1873); Rinsho Mitsukuri, *Bankoku shinshi* [A Modern History of Western Countries] (18 vols.\* in 3 series, Tokyo, Gyokusan-do, 1872–78). Mitsukuri described American history in 1st ser., vol. 6, pp. 52–73, and

books, all translations, on American history and government were published in the 1870s. One of them, *Gasshūkoku shōshi* [A Brief History of the United States], a translation of *The American Child's Pictorial History of the United States*, was published by the Ministry of Education. Its preface stated that Japanese children would profit from reading this history of the rise of the United States. The United States had quickly risen to a major power in the world, it maintained, because the American people had acquired the spirit of independence. It recommended Japanese pupils to develop a spirit of independence, which was defined as love of one's country, eagerness for learning, diligence in one's trade and profession, and a strong will to endure hardships.<sup>26</sup>

Fukuzawa, Kato, Nakamura and Mitsukuri were members of Meirokusha, or the Meiji Six Society, an association of intellectuals organized in 1874 under Arinori MORI's leadership for the purpose of promoting "Civilization and Enlightenment." The Meiji government, eager to make the general populace receptive to a series of drastic reforms it was instituting, commended the slogan of "Civilization and Enlightenment," and welcomed the Meirokusha intellectuals to popularize the spirit of the new age. The government adopted their books as school textbooks. It was not initially concerned that these textbooks taught the ideas of modern Western revolutions, including such concepts as the sovereign-

---

3rd ser., vol. 3, pp. 1-73. Mitsukuri also wrote a school textbook for citizenship education on the basis of French and American textbooks: *Taisei kanzen kummō* [Western Teachings on Ethics] (3 vols.\*, Nagoya, Nagoya Gakko, 1872).

<sup>26</sup> (Tokyo, Ministry of Education, 1874). Mombushō [Ministry of Education] also translated a book on U.S. government in 1873. *Beikoku seiji ryaku ron* [An Outline of U. S. Government]. For a list of books on U.S. history and government, published in the Meiji Era, see *Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan Meiji-ki kankō tosho mokuroku* [A Catalogue of the Books Published in the Meiji Era: The Holdings of the National Diet Library], Vol. 1 (Philosophy . . . Geography) (1971) and Vol. 2 (Politics . . . Military Affairs) (1972). See also the early catalogues of the Imperial Library (the forerunner of the National Diet Library).

All the books on American history published in the 1870s and the 1880s were translations of one sort or another. George Payne Quackenbos's books, such as *A Primary History of the United States*, *An Elementary History of the United States*, and *An Illustrated School History of the United States* provided a number of Japanese writers in American history with originals. The catalogue of the National Diet Library lists five translations published in the 1870s and the 80s. Fukuzawa bought Quackenbos's history books in America in 1867, and began to use them as textbooks at Keio Gijuku. See: Kamei, *Jiyū no seichi*, pp. 67-70; Eiichi Ozawa, *Kindai Nihon shigaku-shi no kenkyū —Meijiki* [A Study of Modern Japanese Historiography: The Meiji Era] (Tokyo, Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1968), pp. 98-100, 141-42; *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 7, pp. 102, 156, 477.

ty of the people and the right of revolution. Alarmed by the rise of the “Jiyū Minken” [Freedom and People’s Rights] Movement, however, the government began to strengthen restrictions on freedom of speech and press in the second half of the 1870s. It also began to tighten its control over education. In 1880, it removed some works by Meirokusha intellectuals from the list of authorized textbooks.<sup>27</sup>

It may be recalled that the Meirokusha intellectuals were hardly political radicals even if they introduced the ideas of the American and French Revolutions into Japan.<sup>28</sup> Arinori MORI, working within the government, recommended Japanese to take a cautious view of republicanism and the American system of government. As early as 1871, he wrote: “While we entertain an exalted opinion of what is called a Republican form of government, we confess that it is not without its disadvantages and dangers.” He urged them “to consider the American system of government in all its aspects before adopting any of its features into their own form of government.”<sup>29</sup> His associates in Meirokusha would have agreed with his opinion. They certainly considered that the British system was a more practical model for Japan than the American system. Britain was a constitutional monarchy, and it was more natural for the Meiji government to transform itself into a constitutional monarchy. Besides, the British parliamentary government had enjoyed a long history of stability since the Glorious Revolution. Such liberals as Fukuzawa and Kato were greatly impressed by its stability. The United States, on the other hand, had just experienced the Civil War. The Civil War possibly tempered Japanese liberals’ admiration for the American political system.

<sup>27</sup> Daikichi Irokawa, *Kindai kokka no shuppatsu* [Japan’s Start as a Modern State] (Nihon rekishi, Vol. 21) (Tokyo, Chuo Koronsha, 1974), pp. 44–51, 221–23, and Shingo Shibata, *Ningen no kenri—Amerika kakumei to gendai* [The Rights of Man/Woman—The American Revolution and Our Age] (Tokyo, Otsuki Shoten, 1977), pp. 60–63.

<sup>28</sup> For a penetrating analysis of the ideas of the Meirokusha intellectuals, especially of Amane Nishi and Hiroyuki Kato, see Uete, *Nihon kindai shisō no keisei*, pp. 111–96. For a translation of articles published in *Meiroku zasshi*, the organ of the association, see *Meiroku Zasshi, The Journal of the Japanese Enlightenment*, translated by William R. Braisted (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1976).

<sup>29</sup> Mori’s introduction to *Life and Resources in America* (1871) in *Mori Arinori zenshū* [The Complete Works of Arinori Mori] (3 vols., Tokyo, Sembundo, 1972), Vol. 3, English Writings Section, p. 6. *Life and Resources* was also published as Part III of *Japanese in America* (New York, 1872). The author of this introductory essay hesitates to call *Life and Resources* the first Japanese work in American studies, because it was drafted by Charles Lanman under Mori’s direction at the Japanese Legation in Washington. See *Mori Arinori zenshū*, Vol. 3, introduction.

Since the war had been known to Japanese intellectuals before the beginning of the Meiji Era, however, the consolidation of the Emperor system during the 1870s, as Shunsuke KAMEI suggests, may have been the main reason for their turning to Europe for monarchical models.<sup>30</sup>

## III

The Meiji government remained an autocracy for two decades, but a movement demanding a liberal, constitutional regime gradually developed during this period. Although the Meirokusha intellectuals never participated in pressure group politics or anti-government politics, preferring to work within the government or devoting their energy to education and writing, the introduction of the political philosophy of the American and French Revolutions and of modern Western liberalism had a strong impact on the movement known in Japanese history as the Freedom and People's Rights Movement. Champions of this movement often mentioned the American Revolution in their writings and built up their argument on such concepts as liberty, equality and inalienable rights.<sup>31</sup>

Since 1876 was the centennial of the American Revolution, proponents of People's Rights exhorted the people to learn from the spirit of 1776. A journal of the movement published an article, "An Oppressive Government Should Be Overturned." The author of the article praised those who had petitioned the government to repeal the Press Act and the Libel

<sup>30</sup> Hiroshi Imai, *Meiji Nihon to Igrisu kakumei* [Meiji Japan and the English Revolution] (Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1974), pp. 64–74; Kamei, *Jiyū no seichi*, pp. 47–49, 75.

In *Kokutai shinron* (see note 20), Hiroyuki Kato wrote: "A republic is much more beautiful in form than a monarchy. But it does not necessarily offer better substance. If we compare Great Britain with the United States, the former has such irrational elements as a hereditary monarch and an equally hereditary aristocracy, which republican America does not possess. In reality, however, Great Britain gives better protection for the liberty of the people." He also stated that it would be wiser for a nation with a monarchical tradition to transform itself into a constitutional monarchy. The introduction of an outright republican system would have destabilizing effects. Thus he recommended a constitutional monarchy for Japan's future. *Meiji bunka zenshū*, Vol. 2, pp. 125–26. Kato would soon become more conservative, rejecting the theory of natural rights. As for Fukuzawa's admiration of the stability of British parliamentary government, see: *Minjō isshin* (1879), in *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū*, Vol. 5, pp. 42–54.

<sup>31</sup> Their representative writings are collected in *Meiji bunka zenshū*. Vol. 2 (Freedom and People's Rights), Vol. 4 (Newspapers), Vol. 5 (Magazines), Vol. 14 (Freedom and People's Rights).

Act, which the government had promulgated in the previous year. Citing the Declaration of Independence and paraphrasing its ideas, he argued for the right of resistance to an unreasonable law, particularly a law suppressing freedom of the press. "We should not expect to be able to enjoy civilization and liberty without fighting for them," he warned. "We should resist the Press and Libel Acts, as Americans resisted the Stamp Act." "Let us be Patrick Henrys," he concluded the article with a spirited phrase: "We might perish, but the unjust laws shall perish with us!"<sup>32</sup>

Emori UEKI, who later became a prominent activist and ideologue for the cause of People's Rights, drew a similar lesson from the American Revolution. "Liberty Should Be Bought by Blood" was the title of the essay he wrote anonymously. "It is said that the Americans now enjoy more liberty than any other nation. Before their independence, however, their liberty was threatened by the oppressive rule of the British King. Had they acquiesced in his rule, what would be their fate today? America might be like India or Annan! Great were the American people of 1776! They devoted their souls and bodies to the cause of liberty. They were quite willing to shed their blood. Today's American liberty is the beautiful tree grown on the American blood shed a century ago."<sup>33</sup> Another writer agreed with him: "Genuine liberty is a reward for a bloody struggle, not for a discourse on the table. . . . If we want to have genuine liberty, we should be prepared to sacrifice hundreds of our lives!"<sup>34</sup>

People's Rights activists composed several songs for their movement, which praised the patriots in the American Revolution. "Look at America!" extolled a song popular in Tosa about 1877. "For whom did she shed her blood seven years? For liberty she did without shedding tears!" In 1884, People's Rights activists in Gumma Prefecture joined impoverished farmers in an agrarian revolt. Carrying makeshift banners made of straw mats, the rebelling farmers gathered at the foot of Mt. Myogi. They sang a People's Rights song presumably written by Ueki: "Let's remember the struggle for American independence! Humble people

<sup>32</sup> "An Oppressive Government Should be Overturned," *Sômô zasshi*, No. 3 (June 9, 1876), reprinted in *Meiji bunka zenshû*, Vol. 5, pp. 419-22.

<sup>33</sup> "Jiyû wa senketsu o motte kawazaru bekarazaru ron," *Konan shimpô*, No. 11 (June 1876), reprinted in Saburo Ienaga, ed., *Aoki bunko jiyû minken shisô*, Vol. 2 (Tokyo, Aoki Shoten, 1957), pp. 14-17.

<sup>34</sup> Koji Ito, "Assei seifu tempuku subeki ron," *Hyôron shinbun* No. 62 (January 1876), reprinted in Yasushi Goto, ed., *Aoki bunko jiyû minken shisô*, Vol. 1 (Tokyo, Aoki Shoten, 1957), pp. 69-72.

started it under makeshift banners like ours. If we want to secure our liberty, we should now shed a lot of our blood.”<sup>35</sup>

Among the People's Rights activists, Patrick Henry was a popular hero. Many Japanese recited his legendary phrase: “Give me liberty, or give me death!” Because of this phrase, Henry inspired many People's Rights activists, including Taisuke ITAGAKI, the best known leader of the movement. According to a legend created by his admirers, Itagaki uttered an equally memorable phrase when he was assaulted by an assassin in 1882: “Liberty shall never die even if Itagaki be dead!”<sup>36</sup>

Of course, the American Revolution was not the only revolution that attracted People's Rights activists. They sometimes referred to the Puritan Revolution in England. They were also inspired by the French Revolution. Chomin NAKAE and Kentaro OI, leading radicals in the movement, specialized in French learning and were inspired by Jean Jacques Rousseau and by the example of the French Revolution. But the French Revolution seemed to be marred by the excesses of the Terror and the ultimate defeat of the revolution. Even to Nakae, a Francophile, the Terror was very repugnant.<sup>37</sup> The American Revolution, on the other hand, seemed to be honorable and glorious. Therefore many People's Rights publicists preferred talking of the American Revolution as a main source of inspiration. It may be a symbolic example that Kutsuzan KOYAMA's famous “Song of Liberty” allocated eight lines to the English Revolution, fourteen lines to the French Revolution, and twenty-four lines to the American Revolution.<sup>38</sup>

Reflecting the mood of the age which witnessed the ascendancy of the People's Rights movement, several books on the American Revolution were published in the early 1880s. Although these books, like those published in the previous decade, were translations of survey history books published in America, it is significant that at least two books were

<sup>35</sup> Saburo Ienaga, *Ueki Emori kenkyū* (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1960). pp. 139–41, 170–74. Irokawa, *Kindai kokka no shuppatsu*, pp. 307–08; Shibata, *Ningen no kenri*, pp. 66–68. For other representative People's Rights songs, see: *Meiji bunka zenshū*, Vol. 2, pp. 180, 196.

<sup>36</sup> Irokawa, *Kindai kokka no shuppatsu*, pp. 275–76.

<sup>37</sup> Inoue, “Nihonjin no Furansu kakumei-kan,” *loc. cit.*, pp. 604–05; Imai, *Meiji Nihon to Igirisu kakumei*, pp. 70–71. Nakae and Oi were of course familiar with the story of the American Revolution. Nakae's School for French Learning translated the Declaration of Independence; Oi once schemed a Korean revolution in which he was to play LaFayette's role in the American Revolution.

<sup>38</sup> *Meiji bunka zenshū*, Vol. 2, p. 196.

entitled as histories of “Amerika kakumei,” an exact translation of the “American Revolution.”<sup>39</sup> Although the term “kakumei” had existed in Japan, it was an old-fashioned term derived from the usage in ancient China. It meant a change of the ruling dynasty by the will of Heaven. At the beginning of the Meiji Era, Japanese did not apply this term to modern Western revolutions. The American Revolution was a “war,” and the English and French Revolutions were “revulsions,” “overturns” or “rebellions.” The French Revolution began to be called “Furansu kakumei” since 1876.<sup>40</sup> The American Revolution, too, was referred to as kakumei in the 1880s. In 1883, Ryoichi KURIHARA published *Kakumei shinron* [A New Study on Revolution] and discussed the modern Western revolutions and defined the meaning of the term on the basis of an American book.<sup>41</sup> Histories of a revolution or revolutions were a vogue in the 1880s.<sup>42</sup> It would be worthy to mention that a translation of Alexis de Tocqueville’s *De la Démocratie en Amérique* was published in 1881. It was entitled *Jiyū genron* [A Basic Treatise on Liberty], reflecting the interest of the translator.<sup>43</sup>

Confronted with a rising demand for constitutional government, the Meiji government on the one hand promised in 1881 to open a National Diet ten years later and on the other hand applied repressive measures against anti-government activities. It is interesting, in this connection, to recall a passage in *Bei-Ō kairan jikki* [A Record of the Observation

<sup>39</sup> Namio Sakamoto, *Beikoku kakumei-shi* [A History of the American Revolution] (Tokyo, c1880); Shozo Honda, *Beikoku kakumeishi* [A History of the American Revolution] (Tokyo, Uchida Rokakuho, 1883), Yoshinori Hisamatsu, *Taisei kakumeishi kan* [A History of Revolutions in the West] (3 vols. plus 3 supplementary vols., Tokyo, Gangando, 1882–85) dealt with the fall of the Roman Republic, the English Revolution, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution. The title of Vol. 3 was “American Independence and Nation-Building.” Misao and Chojiro Watanabe, *Bankoku kakumei-shi* [A History of Revolutions in the World] (Tokyo, Minseisha, 1889) discussed briefly twelve revolutions, beginning with the American Revolution. These books were translations of some sort. With regard to the American Revolution and American history in general, G.P. Quackenbos’s books were still popular sources from which Japanese writers freely edited and translated.

<sup>40</sup> Inoue, “Nihonjin no Furansu kakumei kan,” *loc. cit.*, pp. 597–603.

<sup>41</sup> (Tokyo, Matsui Chubei, 1883). The original book which Kurihara selectively translated was an American book entitled *A Study of Government* (Boston, 1871). Its author’s name was written as Emman in Japanese.

<sup>42</sup> Ozawa, *Kindai Nihon shigaku-shi no kenkyū*, pp. 106–04.

<sup>43</sup> *Jiyū genron*, translated by Tatsushige Koizuka (3 vols., Tokyo, Yurindo, 1882–83). This was a translation from an English edition. Part of *Democracy in America* was translated in 1873.

Tour in America and Europe], an official diary of the Iwakura Mission of 1871–73, compiled by Kunitake KUME and published in 1878. After a brief description of the American Revolution, Kume observed that the Americans were too democratic to accept a monarchy even at the time of independence. He then dwelt on weaknesses as well as strengths of democracy. Democracy was all right for the Americans, he observed, because they all firmly favored democracy and were well accustomed to the democratic way. “If this democratic way flows into other countries,” he cautioned however, “it tends to pit the people against their prince. Once the established order is shaken under its impact, it will be difficult to restore social and political stability. France was the first victim of this evil effect, Spain, its second victim.” To prevent such a danger, he added, “European countries have adopted constitutional governments.” Thus Kume warned of potential danger which the spread of democratic ferment might bring forth, and presented the adoption of constitutional government as a preventive measure against such a danger.<sup>44</sup>

While the government was preparing a constitution, many individual citizens and associations were drafting their own constitutional plans. Among them, Ueki’s plan drafted in 1881 is worth mentioning. It declared that “the supreme power of government resides in the people.” It specifically recognized the rights of resistance and revolution. It provided a government based on the American style of separation of powers, a unicameral legislature, and the extension of suffrage to all tax-paying men and women. His plan was unique also in envisaging Japan as a federal union. His draft constitution stipulated that “the federal government shall not interfere with internal affairs of any state belonging to the Federal Union of Japan.” Obviously he was influenced by the United States Constitution. But his preference for a federal system was derived from his experience as a political activist. His plan was an extreme case, making each province a free and independent state with the right to possess its own army and militia. But other People’s Rights activists, too, favored strengthening provincial autonomy.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup> The Iwanami bunko edition of *Bei-Ô kairan jikki* was published by Iwanami Shoten (Tokyo) in five volumes in 1977. Quotations are from the Iwanami edition, Vol. 1, pp. 52–53.

<sup>45</sup> Saburo Ienaga, Shozo Matsunaga, and Eiichi Emura, eds., *Meiji zenki no kempō kōsō* [Constitutional Plans in Early Meiji] (enlarged edition. Tokyo, Fukumura Shuppan, 1984), pp. 27–30, 238–250. For other liberal constitutional plans, see: pp. 108–116,



In 1889, the Meiji government finally promulgated the Imperial Constitution. Hirobumi ITO, the author of the Constitution of 1889, may have read the *Federalist* papers.<sup>46</sup> But it was the conservative Prussian Constitution that he chose as the most suitable model for monarchical Japan. It was more than half a century later that Japan replaced the Constitution of 1889 with a new constitution influenced by American constitutional thought. The Japanese Constitution of 1947, a product of the American occupation, borrowed verbatim several phrases from the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

Although the Meiji Constitution was a conservative one, its promulgation tamed political discontent. The decline of the Freedom and People's Rights Movement ended the age during which many Japanese found in the American Revolution an inspiring example directly relevant to their political experience.

#### IV

Since the Japanese ruling elite looked to European countries for institutional models, the Japanese institutions for higher education were modeled after German universities. Scholars in the emerging Japanese academic community also looked to European scholarship. For Japanese professors teaching Western history, Western history meant primarily European history. The United States and the whole Western Hemisphere were largely left outside the realm of history. The American Revolution was a minor event in their lectures and writings, and it was usually called simply a War for American Independence.<sup>47</sup> Once the institutional foun-

---

224–26, 258–60. Roichi Naito's plan contained a provision for a limited veto power of the Emperor quite similar to that of the U.S. President (pp. 224–26).

<sup>46</sup> Kentaro Kaneko, *Kempō seitei to Ō-Bei jin no hyōron* [The Promulgation of the Constitution and Westerners' Comments on It] (Tokyo, Nihon Hyoronsha, 1937), pp. 71–73. For the growth of constitutionalism from the mid-19th century to 1891, see Takeshi Osatake, *Nihon kensei-shi* [A History of Japanese Constitutionalism] (Tokyo, Nihon hyoronsha, 1930).

<sup>47</sup> For a representative advanced textbook on Western history, see Gempachi Mitsukuri, *Seiyō-shi kōwa* [Lectures on Western History] (Tokyo, Kaiseikan, 1910). It referred to the American Revolution as a War for American Independence. "One of the causes for American independence was anti-monarchism, an idea fashionable in the Western World at that time," the author commented, "the monarchical government of France committed a blunder by aiding American independence without paying due attention to this aspect of American independence." This was the only passage in which he mentioned the revolutionary nature of the movement for independence (pp. 595–608). The

dations of modern Japan had been established, interest in the United States tended to decline among the Japanese intellectuals.

But this does not mean that Japanese interest in America became negligible. James Bryce's *The American Commonwealth* was translated in the 1890s, and several books on American history were written around the turn of the century.<sup>48</sup> Worth noting among them is Unosuke WAKAMIYA's *Beikoku-shi* [A History of the United States], which appeared in 1909. Wakamiya presented in this book a very detailed, accurate and readable survey history of the United States that extended over six hundred pages. Although this book lacked footnotes and a list of references, its quality indicates that the author was very well-informed about American history. His evaluation of events is often remarkably well-balanced even in the context of present-day scholarship. His comment on the American Revolution is a good example. "A revolution may be justified when a people have suffered long enough under an unbearable tyranny. Great Britain did not impose such a tyranny upon its American colonies. The taxes Britain intended to levy in the colonies . . . were not heavy; Britain carried almost single-handedly the financial burden of imperial defense; Britain never intervened in the domestic politics of its colonies with armed forces before its action in Boston [in 1774]." In

---

custom of referring to the American Revolution merely as the independence of the United States or the war for American independence continued through the Taisho Era and the prewar Showa Era. For representative survey books on Western history, see: Hideo Segawa's *Seiyō tsūshi* [A Survey History of the Western World] (3 vols., Tokyo, Fuzanbo, 1915) published in the Taisho Era, and Shin Orui's famous *Seiyō-shi kōwa* [Lectures on Western History] (Tokyo, Fuzanbo, 1934) published in the prewar Showa Era. They both called the American Revolution "American independence" or "the War for American Independence." Only some of those who wrote books on American history, such as Wakamiya and Takagi, used the term "Beikoku kakumei," the exact translation of the American Revolution. After the Second World War, Japanese historians began to call the American Revolution a revolution. But many of them preferred calling it "Amerika dokuritsu kakumei" [the American Revolution for Independence]. Both terms, Amerika dokuritsu kakumei and Amerika kakumei, are now used in University textbooks. On the other hand, most high school textbooks of World History still avoid these terms. They call the American Revolution "Amerika no dokuritsu" [The Independence of the United States]. But the one which has the largest share of the market of high school World History textbooks calls the American Revolution "Amerika dokuritsu kakumei." Although "Beikoku" and "Amerika" are synonymous in this context, "Beikoku kakumei" and "Beikoku (no) dokuritsu" have been out of use in the postwar era. "Amerika kakumei" and "Amerika dokuritsu" have commonly been used.

<sup>48</sup> *Heimin seiji* [Government by the Common People] translated by Ichiro Hitomi (4 vols., Tokyo, Minyusha, 1889-91). "Heimin seiji" may be translated simply as democracy.

his view, "Britain respected the liberty of its colonists more than any other country." Doubtlessly he had read some works of the "Imperial School." Then how can the American Revolution be justified? "We can regard it as a justifiable revolution only when we take it into account that the colonists possessed the same inalienable birthrights of Englishmen as their brethren in the mother country. They inherited the same political principles as had driven the English people to revolutions in the 17th century."

Wakamiya observed that some historians considered the American Revolution conservative in nature. He conceded that they were not entirely wrong, since the purpose of the American revolt was the defense of English liberty. But he stressed that the American Revolution was not a mere conservative revolution, but a revolution with positive or creative aspects. "If we recall," he argued, "that the revolution led to the founding of a new political system and thus contributed to the progress of democracy, we shall easily be able to recognize that it also had a positive character. Had the self-reliant American people acquiesced in the laws they regarded as unjust, it would have meant a great setback for the cause of democracy."<sup>49</sup> Thus Wakamiya's view of history as progress in "heimin seiji" [democracy] anticipated that of the Taisho democrats. Strangely his excellent survey history was entirely forgotten by later Japanese specialists in American history. As both Japan and the United States emerged as major Pacific powers around the turn of the century, U.S.-Japanese relations became increasingly important for Japan. Yuichi MASAOKA stressed the need to promote American studies in his encyclopedic work on the United States in 1913. A man knowledgeable about America and acquainted with many influential Americans, Masaoka had helped Japanese diplomats and businessmen in America. Because of his background, he was keenly aware of lack of understanding of the United States in Japan. "Many Japanese tend to dislike America and the American people," he deplored, "without having any substantial knowledge about America and its people." "They even hate," he lamented, "those Japanese who have lived in America."<sup>50</sup>

But the intellectual climate was soon to change. During the Taisho

<sup>49</sup> Wakamiya's *Beikoku-shi* was published by Jitsugyo no Nihonsha (Tokyo). Quotations are from pp. 133-34. The author is still searching for Wakamiya's biographical data.

<sup>50</sup> Masaoka's book, *Beikoku oyobi Beikokujin* [the United States and Its People] was published by Jitsugyo no Nihonsha (Tokyo). Quotations are from pp. 1-2.

Era, Japan witnessed the rise of a new democratic spirit. Several factors, such as the spread of education, the progress of urbanization, and the growth of political parties, contributed to the rise of this spirit. President Wilson's international leadership and America's rise as the most powerful nation at the end of the First World War also stimulated a democratic spirit in Japan. There was a widespread feeling that democracy would be the source of the new postwar age. In this intellectual climate, scholarly interest in America began to develop.

Recognizing the need for American studies, Tokyo Imperial University (University of Tokyo) decided in 1918 to make use of Alonzo Barton Hepburn's donation for initiating an American studies program in the Faculty of Law. Lecturing for the new program, Inazo NITOBE, a leading liberal intellectual, who had aspired in his youth to become "a bridge across the Pacific," declared that the growing importance of U.S.-Japanese relations and the spread of democratic thought had made American studies "a very important task for the Japanese." Nitobe's lectures were published in book form as *Beikoku kenkoku shiyō* [The Founding of the United States] in 1919. The author intended to give the reader basic knowledge about the origins of the United States and a chance to draw some lessons from the history of Colonial America and American independence for Japanese overseas development and colonial policy. The book explained the origins of the thirteen colonies in some detail, but touched on the American Revolution only briefly. As a whole, it was not a significant work. Nitobe was a good writer and a great educator, but his study of American history was limited. Since he was appointed to the post of Under-Secretary General of the League of Nations in 1920, he found little time to do any more scholarly work in American studies.<sup>51</sup> The task was taken up by Yasaka TAKAGI, a young scholar who was designated to assume the new chair of American constitution, history and diplomacy at Tokyo Imperial University in 1924.

In 1931, Takagi published *Beikoku seiji-shi josetsu* [An Early American Political History], an intellectual and institutional history of Colonial and Revolutionary America. After fifty-four years, this book still remains the best introduction to American history from the founding of

<sup>51</sup> Mitani, "Taisho demokurashi to Amerika," *loc. cit.*, pp. 121–60; Makoto Saito, "American Studies in Pre-War Japan," *Amerika kenkyū*, No. 4 (1970), pp. 1–24. The quotation from Nitobe is from his *Zenshū* [The Complete Works of Inazo Nitobe] (16 vols., Tokyo, Kyobunkan, 1969–70), Vol. 3, p. 25. Nitobe's *Amerika kenkoku shiyō* was published by Yuhikaku and included in Vol.3 of his *Zenshū*.

the colonies to the ratification of the United States Constitution. Takagi incorporated in this book the viewpoints of the two major schools in the historiography of the American Revolution: the "Imperial School" and the "Progressive School." While discussing in detail the problem of imperial structure, Takagi paid attention to radical-conservative conflicts among the Patriots and the social aspects of the Revolution. He maintained that "the American Revolution was not only the movement of the colonies for independence from the mother country, but also a great change of the social system within the colonies." However, his interpretation was not a mere synthesis of the Imperial and Progressive Schools; it was characteristically his own.<sup>52</sup>

Throughout his academic career, it was his scholarly interest to trace the origin and development of democracy in America and to learn from the American experience. He attributed the ideological origin of American democracy to the broadly defined Puritan tradition and found in the frontier the most important environmental factor shaping the democratic character of American society. He always emphasized Puritanism and the frontier as the two keys to understanding American democracy. This view underlay *Beikoku seiji-shi josetsu*, although the Puritan tradition was much more emphasized than the frontier experience in this exposition of early American history. Believing in the importance of ideas in shaping the course of history, Takagi did not fully subscribe to the Progressive historians' economic interpretation. In spite of his high regard for Charles A. Beard, for example, he gave Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution only a relative value as a corrective to uncritical hero worship. While paying due respect to the antifederalists, Takagi evaluated highly the statesmanship of the Constitution-makers and regarded its ratification as the culmination of the constructive aspect of the Revolution.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Yasaka Takagi, *Beikoku seiji-shi josetsu* (Tokyo, Yuhikaku, 1931). The quotation is from p. 229.

<sup>53</sup> Most of his works are collected in *Takagi Yasaka chosakushū* [The Works of Yasaka Takagi] (5 vols., Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1970-71). Marius B. Jansen outlines Takagi's life and work in the introduction to the fifth volume which contains his writings in English. See also Makoto Saito, "Takagi sensei no Amerika kenkyū" [Dr. Takagi's American Studies] in M. Saito, ed., *Gendai Amerika no naisei to gaikō* (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1959), pp. 369-81. See also M. Saito, *et al.*, eds., *Amerika seishin o motomete* [In Search of the American Spirit: The Life of Yasaka Takagi] (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1985). For Takagi's comments on Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution, see *Beikoku seiji-shi josetsu*, pp. 406-09.

Inspired by Takagi's pioneering work, Moritane FUJIWARA began to study in the 1930s, American constitutional development from its colonial origins to the ratification of the United States Constitution. After some years of research in the United States, Fujiwara published in 1940 an immense, well-documented *Amerika kenkokushi ron* [A Study on the Creation of the United States].<sup>54</sup> This work still offers a very rich mine of useful information for students of the political and constitutional history of Colonial and Revolutionary America. Within a broad context of the British Empire, he described the transplantation and transformation of English ideas and institutions in North America, the development of Anglo-American conflicts which led to the Revolution, and the shaping of the American constitutional system during the Revolutionary Period. His interest in Anglo-American political and constitutional history attested to his innate liberalism.

Meanwhile, Japanese aggression in China continued, and U.S.-Japanese relations were greatly strained. Takagi tried in vain to use his influence to prevent the outbreak of the catastrophic war. Amid rampant anti-Americanism of the war years, he continued to lecture on American democracy to his students. When he published the lecture notes after the war, it is said, he found in them practically nothing to revise. He used his prestige and leadership to develop American studies in postwar Japan. The publication of the multi-volume *Genten Amerika-shi* [A Documentary History of the American People], a project he planned, organized, and supervised, was the most remarkable fruit of his leadership. Its editorial policy reflected his viewpoint and his lifelong aspiration to contribute to the growth of democracy in Japan through American studies.<sup>55</sup>

v

Before World War II, no professor in the history department of any university specialized in American history. Takagi's chair belonged to the Law Faculty of Tokyo Imperial University. A few history students, however, such as Kenichi NAKAYA, Hiroshi SHIMIZU and Akira IMAZU, chose to major in American history in the 1930s and early 40s. Their

<sup>54</sup> (Tokyo, Yuhikaku, 1940).

<sup>55</sup> Amerika Gakkai [The Japanese Association for American Studies], ed. (5 vols. plus a supplementary volume, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1950-58). The supplementary volume was replaced by Volumes 6 and 7 (1981-82).

productive years came after the war. Following Takagi, these historians maintained that the American Revolution was not merely a war for independence but a revolution marking the advent of American democracy. But they focused, more than he had done, on class conflicts in Revolutionary America and on social changes resulting from the Revolution.

Their emphasis on class conflicts and social changes was related to the major current in postwar Japanese scholarship in Western history. Although Marxists were a minority among Japanese historians, Marxian class categories and a Marxian framework of class conflict had strong influence upon postwar historical scholarship in Japan. Since both Marxist and non-Marxist historians believed that Japan had fallen under the militarist authoritarian regime because Japan had not experienced a genuine "bourgeois revolution," the bourgeois revolution became a major focus in the study of Western history in postwar Japan. American history specialists hoped to impress their colleagues specializing in European and Japanese history with the significance of the American Revolution as a bourgeois revolution.

"If we look at the American Revolution as a social or bourgeois revolution as well as independence from the mother country," Kenichi NAKAYA argued, "we can find characteristics comparable to those of the French Revolution." "Although the change was less conspicuous than in the case of the French Revolution," Hiroshi SHIMIZU observed, "American social structure underwent a great change during the American Revolution."<sup>56</sup> Their interpretation became something like an orthodoxy in the postwar Japanese historiography of the American Revolution. Textbooks of Western or World History for university and high school students usually reflected their interpretation. Among the American works on the American Revolution, these Japanese historians naturally found those by Progressive historians, such as Beard, J. Franklin Jameson, Louis M. Hacker, and Merrill Jensen, most congenial to their viewpoint. Absorbing the perspectives of the Progressive historiography on the American Revolution, these Japanese historians developed a schematic interpretation of the Revolution. They regarded independence as a victory of the radicals, who, representing farmers, artisans, and small

<sup>56</sup> Kenichi Nakaya, *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei* [The American Revolution] (Tokyo, Kobundo, 1955), pp. 6–8, 45–54. Hiroshi Shimizu, "Shimin kakumei to shitenō Amerika kakumei" [The American Revolution as a Bourgeois Revolution], *Rekishi hyōron*, No. 16 (1948), pp. 1–8. See also his *Amerika gasshūkoku no hatten* [The Growth of the United States] (Tokyo, Shibundo, 1960).

merchants, aimed to achieve not only independence but also political and social democratization at home. Later, they maintained, the conservatives, representing wealthy merchants and large landowners, gained the ascendancy and achieved a kind of counter-revolution in putting the new United States Constitution into effect.

A representative work which presented this line of interpretation was Akira IMAZU's *Amerika kakumei-shi josetsu* [Studies on the American Revolution], a collection of articles on the internal aspects of the Revolution.<sup>57</sup> It is easy to find Merrill Jensen's influence in this book, for its author used such Jensenian terms as "internal revolution," "internal conflict," and "democratic movement." Imazu argued that political and social changes in the Revolutionary Period were not mere by-products of independence but fruits of a democratic movement which had long been carried on by the class of less privileged people. He also maintained that the movement for independence itself was closely interlaced with class conflicts within the various colonies.

Another Japanese historian influenced by Jensen's works was Tadami TAKENORI. During the 1960s, he wrote extensively on the socio-economic aspects of the Revolution. Then he published in 1972 *Amerika kakumei no kachi taikei* [The Value System of the American Revolution], a study on the bills of rights in the revolutionary state constitutions.<sup>58</sup> This book reflected Jensen's thesis, constructing its argument on the dualism of conservative-radical conflict and relating the ideological conflict to socio-economic conflict.

## VI

After World War II, a number of economic historians began to study the development of American capitalism and discussed the American Revolution in that context. Most of them adopted the thesis developed by Hisao OTSUKA, the dean of Japanese scholars of Western economic history.<sup>59</sup> Although Otsuka's discussion of the origins of modern

<sup>57</sup> (Kyoto, Horitsu Bunkasha, 1960). For his thesis, see particularly pp. 271-87. Other works on the American Revolution by Imazu are *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei* [The American Revolution] (Tokyo, Shibundo, 1967) and *Amerika dokuritsu no hikari to kage* [Light and Shadows of American Independence] (Tokyo, Shimizu Shoin, 1976).

<sup>58</sup> (Tokyo, Aki Shobo, 1972). He also wrote *Minshū to Amerika kakumei* [The Common People in the American Revolution] (Tokyo, Aki Shobo, 1976).

<sup>59</sup> His thesis was stated in such works as *Kindai Ōshū keizaishi josetsu* [A Study of Modern European Economic History] (2nd ed., Tokyo, Nihon Hyoronsha, 1946); *Kin-*



capitalism was based on his research in European, mainly English, economic history, his thesis had a great impact on Japanese students of American economic history.

For both Takagi and Otsuka, the primary concern was modernization and democratization of Japan. They sought for this purpose to learn from the history of advanced Western countries. Being Christians, they found the ideal type of the modern man in hardworking, self-reliant Puritans. Takagi emphasized their innate democratic spirit; Otsuka, their genuine capitalist spirit. Non-Christian scholars could agree with them, because they, too, felt that Japan needed to develop such a sturdy personality to shed the remnants of feudalism. Japanese historians specializing in English, American and French history regarded the modern history of these advanced Western countries as a yardstick to measure Japan's backwardness.

Most of the Japanese economic historians specializing in American economic history agreed that industrial capitalism in America as well as in England originated in the growth of a market economy in rural communities of yeoman farmers. Like Otsuka, they found the prototype of the industrial capitalists in hardworking Protestant yeoman farmers, not in merchants engaged in overseas trade. Because of this democratic origin of capitalism, they implied that these countries could develop both capitalism and democracy. They regarded farmers and other small producers as the real promoters of a "bourgeois revolution." They argued, however, that merchants and planters took away most of the fruits of the American Revolution from the protoindustrial capitalists and delayed the development of industrial capitalism.<sup>60</sup> This economic interpretation largely fit and reinforced the orthodox view of the American Revolution mentioned above.

---

*dai shihonshugi no keifu* [The Lineage of Modern Capitalism] and *Kindai no rekishiteki kiten* [The Historical Starting Point of Modernization] (Tokyo, Gakusei Shobo, 1948). His works are collected in *Otsuka Hisao chosakushū* [The Works of Hisao Otsuka] (10 vols., Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1969). A new edition of his *Chosakushū* has just begun to be published.

<sup>60</sup> Besides Suzuki's publications which are discussed in this essay, the following books are major works of the "Otsuka School" in American economic history. Katsumi Nakamura, *Amerika Shihonshugi no seiritsu* [Emergence of American Capitalism] (Tokyo, Nihon Hyoronsha, 1966) and his *Amerika shihonshugi ron* [Studies in American Capitalism] (Tokyo, Miraisha, 1971); Toshiro Kusui, *Amerika shihonshugi to sangyō kakumei* [American Capitalism and Industrial Revolution] (Tokyo, Kobundo, 1970); Keiji Miyano, *Amerika kokumin keizai no keisei* [A Study of the Shaping of American National Economy] (Tokyo, Ochanomizu Shobo, 1971).

The first book which articulated the view outlined above was Keisuke SUZUKI's *Amerika keizaishi kenkyū josetsu* [Studies in Early American Economic History].<sup>61</sup> Although this book was published in 1949, its two major chapters had been printed as articles during World War II. With the publication of this book, Suzuki became the pioneer in the study of American economic history.

Although Suzuki was much influenced by Otsuka whose intellectual debts were primarily to Max Weber, Suzuki considered himself a Marxist. As a Marxist, he could not embrace American capitalism in the monopolistic stage, especially when its state apparatus embarked on the Cold War against the socialist bloc. He never visited the United States because of his antipathy to postwar America.<sup>62</sup> If the present-day United States was a center of the capitalist reaction, his critics questioned, why was it necessary and appropriate to stress the democratic origins of American industrial capitalism? Keiji OHARA, a scholar critical of the Suzuki thesis, argued that American industrial capitalism developed, not struggling against, but making use of, premodern, undemocratic elements in the American society throughout its history.<sup>63</sup>

A young intellectual whose college life had once been interrupted by the authorities because of his student activism, Suzuki could not but contrast militarist Japan with liberal America in the early 1940s. He felt, it may be imagined, envy and respect for the United States which retained liberalism and sided with the anti-Fascist forces in the World War. This explains the reason why he began to study American economic history and found Otsuka's thesis persuasive in those years. Even when he became disenchanted by Cold-War America, he held to his thesis on the democratic origin of American industrial capitalism. It may be

<sup>61</sup> (Tokyo, Nihon Hyoronsha, 1949). The two major chapters of this book, which were originally published in 1941 and 1944, were later reprinted in a collection of his essays in American economic history, *Amerika keizai-shi no kihon mondai* [Basic Issues in American Economic History] (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1980).

<sup>62</sup> "Zadankai—Amerika keizai-shi kenkyū no kaiko to tembō" [A Round-Table Discussion: Studies in American Economic History—Retrospect and Prospect], *Shakai kagaku kenkyū*, Vol. 24, no. 3 (1973), p. 160. *Suzuki Keisuke sensei ni kiku* [Professor Keisuke Suzuki's Reminiscences on His Academic Life] (American Studies in Japan: Oral History Series, Vol. 2, Center for American Studies, University of Tokyo, 1981), p. 36.

<sup>63</sup> Keiji Ohara, "Otsuka shigaku ni okeru Amerika shihon shugi" [American Capitalism in the Otsuka School], *Keizai kenkyū*, Vol. 12, no. 2 (1961), pp. 167–71. See also several scholars' comments that appeared in *Shigaku zasshi*, Vol. 76, no. 5 (1967), pp. 354–56; Vol. 78, no. 5 (1969), pp. 360–64; Vol. 80, no. 5 (1971), pp. 362–63; Vol. 82, no. 5 (1973), p. 365.

assumed that this was because he kept part of his respect for the liberal tradition in America. His view of American capitalism in the monopolistic stage was very ambivalent. Although Suzuki did not elaborate, he wrote that the early history of American capitalism had an influence upon American capitalism in the monopolistic stage.<sup>64</sup>

## VII

Meanwhile, the interpretation which emphasized consensus in American history became a vogue in America in the 1950s. This new trend led many American historians to reexamine the concept of the American Revolution as a social or internal revolution by detailed state by state studies. Japanese students of the American Revolution tried to do the same with less documentary sources.<sup>65</sup> Makoto SAITO, however, made use of consensus historians'—and Tocqueville's—insight to provide a historical explanation for what he considered as outstanding American problems. Why does America lack understanding of the need for change in many parts of the world? Why is pressure for conformity so strong in America? Looking at the American scene of the 1950s, Saito posed these questions for himself. To answer these questions, he developed an interpretation of American history which stressed the lack of pre-modern ages, the absence of fundamental conflicts in its value systems, the existence of the spacious continent separated from Europe by the Atlantic, and the necessity of a national ideology to maintain the integrity of a nation of immigrants, as basic factors which shaped the character of American political culture.<sup>66</sup> His analysis of a psycho-ideological aspect of American

<sup>64</sup> See the concluding essay in his *Amerika keizai-shi no kihon mondai*, p. 325.

<sup>65</sup> See, for example, Torao Tomita, "Vagina kaikaku no ichi kōsatsu" [A Study of Reform in Virginia], *Bunka*, Vol. 21, no. 1 (1957), pp. 36–64, and Kozo Ikemoto, "Amerika kakumei to nambu" [The South During the American Revolution], *Seiyō shigaku*, No. 48 (1961), pp. 42–46. Several other articles dealt with Massachusetts, New York, and North Carolina.

<sup>66</sup> "Minshushugi no fūdoka" [Acclimation of Democracy in America], *Iwanami kōza: Gendai shisō*, Vol. 4 (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1957), pp. 31–50; "Amerika dokuritsu kakumei" [The American Revolution], *Kōza gendai rinri*, Vol. 10 (Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo, 1958), pp. 103–18. See also several essays collected in his *Amerika gaikō no ronri to genjitsu* [The Logic and Reality of American Diplomacy] (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1962). For his interpretative survey of American political history, see *Amerika seiji gaikō-shi* (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1975). Its English version was published in 1979 by the same publisher: *A Political and Diplomatic History of the United States: An Interpretive View*.

political culture deriving from these unique factors in the American national experience offered a fresh perspective to those who felt unsatisfied with the Marxist analysis of contemporary America and with the orthodox interpretation of American history as progress in democracy, which did not illuminate American problems of the 1950s so well.

Saito's discussion of the American Revolution was a part of his effort to explain American problems of the 1950s. "It is often said," he commented, "that the American Revolution was not only separation from Britain but a revolution which brought forth internal changes. But it must be noted that, in the American perception, revolutionary change in America was externalized as separation from the Old World," and was not a departure from the American past. Since pre-Revolutionary America lacked feudalism and an *ancien régime*, American revolutionaries needed no major social revolution. They tried to preserve liberal pre-Revolutionary America from the intensified intrusion of the British power. There was among them a sense of continuity with the American past in contrast with a sense of parting from the despotic Old World. For them, the American Revolution was the completion of the piecemeal process of separating from the Old World, which had been initiated and carried out by individual immigrants. Transition from monarchy to republicanism was intertwined with independence from Britain. Although it was a great change in principle, the transition was considered as a departure not from the American past but from contemporary Britain. By cutting political connections with her, Americans could easily establish the legitimacy of republicanism as the national political system and ideology. Thus they tended to regard different ideologies as alien and watched their intrusion with suspicion. From Saito's viewpoint, significant legacies of the American Revolution were the absence of a social revolution, the substitution of parting from Europe for internal social transformation, and the legitimization of American republicanism as the permanent national system and ideology.<sup>67</sup> Louis Hartz's influence was discernible.

Like American "consensus historians," Saito tended to homogenize American history. Seen from the vantage point of the 1980s, he appears to have homogenized American history excessively. The 1950s, however, was the decade in which such homogenizing seemed to make sense. To be sure, the America of the 1950s was not without its share of problems,

<sup>67</sup> This is a summary of his thesis in "Amerika dokuritsu kakumei" and "Minshushugi no fūdoka." The quotation is from the former, p. 104.

but the very fact that the country had been blessed with an exceptionally happy national past seemed to be the main cause of American troubles.<sup>68</sup>

Saito's works have been marked by fine rhetoric as well as historical insight. At the core of his views of American history, there is a rhetoric that may be called the time/place thesis. In Europe, he argues, change was a "time" phenomenon; in America, it was a "place" phenomenon. In the former, it was a movement in a time sequence; in the latter, a movement in a place sequence. The Europeans had to accomplish the elimination of feudalism and absolutism in revolutions, that is, movements in a time sequence. The Americans accomplished it in emigration from Europe, movements in a place sequence. As Frederick Jackson Turner suggested, Saito maintains, changes within America, too, were often accomplished by movements in a place sequence rather than in a time sequence.<sup>69</sup>

Three years ago, Saito discussed the Declaration of Independence in his presidential address to a convention of the Japanese Association for American Studies. He had written several short essays on the same subject.<sup>70</sup> Strangely enough, very little had been written on the Declaration of Independence during the 1950s and 1960s. This was a result of Japanese historians' absorption in socio-economic aspects of the Revolution. This absorption may be attributed to the influence of Marxian emphasis on basic socio-economic forces and to the influence of the Progressive School.

The editors of this journal wished to have Saito's full fledged article on the subject for this journal. Since he was unable to contribute a newly written article, the editors have had to be content with publishing an English translation of his address. They hope that the readers may get a glimpse of the rhetorical charm of his essays from this short piece.

Like Hartz and Saito, Hitoshi ABE's *Minshushugi to kōkyō no gainen*

<sup>68</sup> Such was the view offered by Daniel Boorstin in *The Genius of American Politics* (New York, 1952) and by Louis Hartz in *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York, 1955). Saito was influenced by both of them and also by Richard Hofstadter.

<sup>69</sup> This thesis, which had underlain his previous writings, was most rhetorically stated in *Amerika-shi no bummyaku* [The Context of American History] (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1981), pp. 18-20.

<sup>70</sup> "Dokuritsu sengen kenkyūshi sobyō" [Studies on the Declaration of Independence: A Historiographical Sketch] in Hitoshi Abe, *et al.* eds., *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei* (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1982), pp. 233-60. "1776 nen jiten ni okeru dokuritsu sengen [The Meaning of the Declaration of Independence in 1776] in his *Amerika-shi no bummyaku*, pp. 94-117.

[Democracy and the Concept of "Public"] adopted a contrasting view of Europe and America.<sup>71</sup> The essence of the concept of "public" in modern Western Europe, he said, is differentiation of private from public matters. This differentiation developed to resist government power in the Age of Absolutism. The United States, on the other hand, lacked an age of absolutism. Besides, the early experience of town meetings which did not differentiate public and private matters was idealized as the cradle of democracy. As a result, the American people have developed the typically American notion that the public interest is an aggregation of private interests. In Europe, the national political elite, as the representatives of the nation, were entrusted with the task of translating the public interest into a practical policy. This was possible, in Abe's view, because of the aristocratic tradition and the custom of deference derived from that tradition. America lacked an aristocratic tradition and hence a custom of deference. Thus American democracy had a propensity toward direct democracy. America, however, possessed one tradition that was able to serve as a counterforce against this propensity. That counterforce was constitutionalism. Having outlined his argument, Abe analyzed the constitution making process in revolutionary Massachusetts as a tension-ridden process in which direct democracy and constitutionalism converged. He also discussed the United States Constitution as an adaptation of constitutionalism to American democracy. Abe's thesis is stimulating, but his view contains several exaggerations and oversimplifications. Like Hartz and Saito, Abe exaggerated the contrast between Europe and the United States. Like them, he also exaggerated the continuity from Colonial to post-revolutionary America.

## VIII

The 1960s marked the rise of New Left historiography in America. New Left viewpoints appeared in Japan in the second half of the decade.

<sup>71</sup> (Tokyo, Keiso Shobo, 1966), see particularly pp. 38, 47–50, 218–21, 314–22. He used the same framework contrasting America and Europe in his more recent work relating to the American Revolution. "Amerika teki kosei no jikaku—Jyon Adamusu no seiji shisō josetsu "[The Awareness of Americanness], in Abe, *et al.*, eds., *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei* (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1982), pp. 3–32. Taking his cue from Edward Handler's *America and Europe in the Political Thought of John Adams* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), Abe discusses Adams's thought in the framework contrasting America and Europe. Adams tended, Abe says, to discuss politics in universal terms, and when he did so, he universalized American phenomena. His logic in *Discourse on Davila*, in Abe's view, was quite American.

The Japanese intellectual Left had been critical of the United States ever since the American occupation policy had shifted to favoring conservative elements in Japan. But their attacks had been directed mainly at American monopolistic capitalism and imperialism. They did not make a wholesale attack on the American past. For them, the American Revolution and the Civil War had been great events in the progress of history.<sup>72</sup> But new radical historians now mounted a wholesale indictment of the American past. Agitated by the black militancy in America and by the war in Vietnam, they combined their radicalism with a racial viewpoint.

Tomohisa SHIMIZU popularized a typical New Left interpretation of American history with biting eloquence. In *Amerika teikoku* [The American Empire] published in 1968, he argued that American history must be seen as the history of an empire, not as a history of democracy. He defined an empire as a system of expansion and of exploitation and subjugation of underdeveloped non-Western peoples. From the beginning of its history, he maintained, America had been exploiting the blacks and other minorities; America had taken lands from the American Indians, and America had extended its economic sphere overseas to build a global empire. It had been possible for America, he continued, to maintain its so-called American democracy only by these actions. Exploitation and subjugation of underdeveloped peoples at home and abroad had been an integral part of American history. American aggression in Vietnam, he asserted, was an inevitable consequence of the whole American past. But this American Empire was now on the verge of collapse, he concluded, as it was challenged by revolutionary movements of militant minorities at home and of the Vietnamese and other peoples in the Third World.<sup>73</sup>

From this perspective, the significance of the American Revolution

<sup>72</sup> Typical Marxist interpretations of American history were presented by Kenichi Kikuchi and Sozo Honda. Both of them wrote mostly on slavery and the Civil War. For Honda's view of the American Revolution, see his "Amerika kakumei no mondaiten" [Issues in Interpretations of the American Revolution], *Keizai kenkyū*, Vol. 12, no. 4 (1961), pp. 316ff. Although Shingo Shibata is not a specialist in American history, his brief discussion of the American Revolution in his *Ningen no kenri* offers an example of Japanese Marxist interpretations of the American Revolution. See pp. 17-45.

<sup>73</sup> Tomohisa Shimizu, *Amerika teikoku* (Tokyo, Aki Shobo, 1968). Also see his polemical essay, "Amerika o kontei kara kangae naosu" [A Fundamental Reconsideration of America], *Chūō kōron*, issue for January 1969, pp. 54-73. For a more scholarly presentation of radical interpretations, see T. Shimizu, Akira Takahashi and Torao Tomita, *Amerika-shi kenkyū nyūmon* [An Introduction to American History] (Tokyo, Yamakawa Shuppan, 1974, rev. ed., 1983).

lay mainly in the birth of the American Empire. Torao TOMITA, who developed a similar view in his discussion of early American history, characterized the Revolution as a “War for the American Empire.” It was a struggle of the colonists against the mother country for control of an empire in America. The Americans of European descent, Tomita argued, inherited from the British a system of exploiting the blacks and dispossessing the Indians of their lands and pursued it more vigorously after independence. He admitted the Revolution was a national liberation for the colonists; but it was intertwined with the repression of the blacks and Indians. It was a bourgeois revolution; but the bourgeois democracy it created rested on a system of racial repression.<sup>74</sup>

Their interpretations of American history had considerable appeal for the intellectual Left in Japan, especially at the time of the Vietnam War and violent racial conflicts. Some intellectuals on the Left felt dissatisfied with their interpretations, however, because they largely substituted racial analysis for class analysis (this tendency was particularly conspicuous in Shimizu’s writing), and also because they neglected a stream of radicalism in the American tradition.<sup>75</sup> Both Shimizu and Tomita were probably willing to accept such criticism, for they tended to overstate their thesis in their zeal in shattering the traditional views of American history.

However, their works also had long-term significance. First, their debunking of the American past heralded the day when Japanese could no longer regard the advanced Western countries as their models.<sup>76</sup> During the 1970s, Japan overtook these countries in several aspects of in-

<sup>74</sup> “Hokubei shokuminchi” [The North American Colonies], in *Iwanami kōza: Sekai rekishi*, Vol. 16 (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1970). pp. 234–292, and his chapter on the American Revolution in T. Shimizu, *et al.*, *Amerika-shi kenkyū nyūmon*, pp. 67–88. The quotation is from the latter, p. 83. Also see his “Amerika dokuritsu kakumei no zentei” [Pre-conditions of the American Revolution], *Shien*, Vol. 25, no. 1 (1964), pp. 36–60, and “Reimeiki no Amerika” [America in the Early National Period], *Rekishi kyōiku*, Vol. 12, no. 11 (1964). pp. 43–50.

<sup>75</sup> See, for instance, Takeji Muramoto’s comment on Shimizu’s *Amerika teikoku* in *Shigaku zasshi*, Vol. 78, no. 5 (1969), pp. 365–66, and Sozo Honda’s comment on Shimizu’s *Amerika Indian* (Tokyo, Chuo Koronsha, 1969) in his *Amerika shakai to koku-jin* [The American Society and the Black Americans] (Tokyo, Otsuki Shoten, 1972). pp. 187–96.

<sup>76</sup> Shimizu and Tomita identified themselves with the Third World and the “Third World” elements in the United States. It was fashionable among the Japanese intellectuals to romanticize the Third World during the Vietnam War. The Third World fever, however, has been cooled down in the last ten years. Reflecting on the current intellectual climate in Japan, Masanao Kano wrote in 1984: “We once thought we had the ‘shin-



dustrialization, and symptoms of social decadence became quite visible in these countries. Furthermore, the value of industrial development, a great achievement of modern civilization, began to be questioned in that decade. Secondly, Shimizu's de-emphasis on Marxian class categories indicated that even radical intellectuals began to feel that these traditional categories became increasingly irrelevant in the contemporary world, regarding both developed and developing countries. Thirdly, Shimizu and Tomita led other Japanese historians in recognizing race as a basic factor in American history. Since Japanese immigrants had been discriminated against in America, Japanese historians had been well aware of the importance of race in American history. But they had not emphasized it, because they had intended to learn the positive aspects of American democracy or to use American history to measure Japan's backwardness. Japanese historians now emphasize it as one of the basic factors in American history and pay far more attention than before the 1970s to the life and role of the black Americans, the Native Americans and other minorities. It may be added that scholarly interest in the historical experience of Japanese-Americans has been increasing.<sup>77</sup>

Meanwhile, the Japanese Marxist-oriented Left continued to affirm the significance of the American Revolution in the history of mankind. Shingo SHIBATA wrote in 1976: "It may be said that struggle for human rights that have been carried on during the past two hundred years in the various countries in the world are struggles for putting into effect the ideal of human rights declared in the American Revolution." Reflecting on the Vietnam War, Shibata noted that the Vietnamese Declaration of Independence of 1945 referred specifically to the American Declaration of Independence and followed the American document in its style and structure. It is an irony of history, Shibata implied, that the Vietnamese struggle for liberation, which he regarded as the latest revolution in the lineage descended from the American Revolution, triumphed over the United States.<sup>78</sup>

---

ing' American-type democracy or 'infallible' Soviet-type socialism as a sure guide to a bright future. The ascendancy of the Third World also seemed to indicate a path to a better world. It was as if we had been able to choose one from the several bright 'futures' contending for the destiny of history. . . . Such old days have long been gone." See Kano's review essay, "Rekishi ishiki no genzai" [Historical Consciousness Today], *Rekishigaku kenkyū*, No. 532 (Sept. 1984), p. 7.

<sup>77</sup> The next issue of this journal will feature articles on "Japanese immigrants and Japanese-Americans."

<sup>78</sup> Shibata, *Ningen no kenri*, pp. 12, 46-47, 88-89. The quotation is from p. 12.

## IX

Since the early 1970s, Japanese studies on the American Revolution have become more diversified in research interest, more substantial in documentation, and more sophisticated in interpretations.

The diplomacy of the American Revolution had long been neglected by Japanese scholars. This editor, Tadashi ARUGA, began to take an interest in the diplomatic aspect of the Revolution. In the paper submitted to the American Studies Specialist Conference for the Asia-Pacific Region held at Fujinomiya in 1975, he discussed such questions as how the American patriot leadership interpreted the international implications of the Revolution, how they conceived the interest of their new nation, and how they mapped out their diplomatic strategy.<sup>79</sup> In several other papers he published subsequently Aruga elaborated the points he had raised in his Fujinomiya paper. His article which appears in this journal was edited from several articles he had previously published.

During the past ten years, Takeshi IGARASHI has published several articles on the American Revolution mostly relating to the political process and intellectual development leading to the creation of the federal republic. These articles were collected in 1984 in a volume entitled *Amerika no kenkoku* [The Founding of the United States].<sup>80</sup> A lengthy article published in 1976 occupies the main part of this book: "The Political Leadership of the Pennsylvania Republicans."<sup>81</sup> In this almost book-length article, Igarashi considered that Pennsylvania Republicans, particularly James Wilson, played a crucial role in the making of the Federal Constitution, which created a new federal political sphere independent of the sphere of state government. In his opinion, Wilson was able to play this role, partly because of the strategic position of his state in manipulating the balance of power among the thirteen states, and partly because of his political experience within his state. Pennsylvania Republicans, Igarashi explained, had accommodated their constitutional thought with democratic principles to win popular support for their movement to revise the state constitution. Representing Pennsylvania in the Federal Convention, Wilson and other Pennsylvania Republicans strove

<sup>79</sup> "The American Revolution and the Origin of American Foreign Policy," *American Studies International*, Vol. 15, no. 2 (Winter 1976). pp. 35-42.

<sup>80</sup> (Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1984).

<sup>81</sup> "Pensiruvania kyōwa-ha no seiji shidō" [The Political Leadership of Pennsylvania Republicans], *Kokka gakkai zasshi*, Vol. 89, nos. 3-4, 5-6, 7-8 (1976), pp. 146-204, 277-352, 419-500.

to infuse democratic principles into the Federal Constitution, so that the democratic citizens of their state could smoothly be integrated into a new federal system. They felt that the federal government should derive its authority from the people, provide for their participation in it, and contain a system of checks and balances to prevent the rise of arbitrary power over the people. Although Wilson did not succeed fully in writing his ideas into the Federal Constitution, he played a crucial role in creating a system in which the two governments, federal and state, could co-exist, both deriving their respective power from the people.

Igarashi wrote in English an abridged version of this article. This shorter version, newly revised, appears in this journal. His book contains two more articles of considerable interest. One analyzes how James Madison developed his idea of pluralism, the other applies the concept of "civic humanism" to Thomas Jefferson.<sup>82</sup>

Aruga wrote two articles on the making of state and federal constitutions.<sup>83</sup> In the article relating to the consolidation of the federal union, he pointed out that the Continental Congress enjoyed great authority when provincial revolutionary regimes still lacked their own legitimacy and looked to the directives of Congress for the legitimization of their de facto power. The authority of Congress declined, he noted, as revolutionary regimes on the state level established their respective legitimacy by adopting state constitutions, deriving their power directly from the people. This change, he suggested, would explain the difference between the draft articles of confederation of 1776 and the adopted Articles of 1777. As for Madison's role in consolidating the federal union, Aruga de-emphasized the importance of his role in the Federal Convention and of his celebrated Tenth Federalist. He argued that Madison's main contribution to the cause of federal union lay in his success in incorporating the first ten amendments into the Constitution and in in-

<sup>82</sup> These two chapters were originally published as articles: "Amerika teki seiji kan no seiritsu: Jeimuzu Madison no rempo kyōwakoku kan" [The Emergence of an American View of Politics], in Abe, *et al.*, *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei*, pp. 97-134, and "Tomasu Jefuason to kaunti kaikaku—Kyōwakoku kōsō no zasetsu" [Thomas Jefferson and the Problem of Reform in the County System: A Failure of his Idea of Republic], in *Hōgakukyōkai hyakushūnen kinen ronbunshū*, Vol. 1 (Tokyo, Yuhikaku, 1983), pp. 417-68.

<sup>83</sup> "Amerika gasshūkoku kempō taisei no keisei" [The Founding of the Political System Based on the United States Constitution of 1787], *Hitotsubashi hōgaku kenkyū*, Vol. 12 (1982), pp. 3-82, and "Amerika kakumeiki hōkempō no seiji shisō" [The Political Ideas of the State Constitutions in the Revolutionary Period], *ibid.*, Vol. 13 (1983), pp. 1-58.

tegrating anti-Federalist elements into national politics as the leader of the Republican Party.

Aruga also wrote a short essay on Thomas Paine in 1984, which developed from a section of an article published in 1965.<sup>84</sup> In this essay, as he had done in 1965, he considered it significant and not merely accidental that the first pamphlet, which bitterly denounced the monarchical and aristocratic elements in the British government and openly advocated American independence, was written not by an indigenous American leader but by a publicist who had come from England just on the eve of the Revolution. He regarded that fact as one of the paradoxes in the American Revolution. In connection with *Common Sense*, he noted a remarkably high degree of literacy in Revolutionary America and the relative speediness of intercolonial communication and transportation, both of which were vital factors for the success of the American Revolution, the survival of the continental union, and the stability of the post-revolutionary liberal democratic regime.

During the past twenty years, the study of the political thought of the Revolutionary Period developed greatly in the United States. Works by Bernard Bailyn, Gordon S. Wood, and J.G.A. Pocock, in particular, have given considerable intellectual stimulation to Japanese historians.<sup>85</sup>

While Igarashi and Aruga studied the political aspect of nation-building, Keiji TAJIMA, an economic historian, studied the significance of Alexander Hamilton's economic program in nation-building. Last year he published a solid monograph, *Hamiruton taisei kenkyū josetsu* [A Study of the Hamiltonian System].<sup>86</sup> Like many other Japanese scholars, he modestly entitled his monograph a *josetsu* [introduction]. But this book is a product of the research he had continued for three decades.

Since Keisuke SUZUKI discussed Alexander Hamilton as the champion of industrial capitalism in his first book in 1949, Hamilton's economic program, often called the "Hamiltonian System" in Japan, has been

<sup>84</sup> Their influence can be detected in Aruga's and Igarashi's works. Their influence can also be seen in younger scholars' works. For examples, see: Takeshi Sasaki, "‘Eikoku kakumei 1776 nen’" [1776 Considered as an English Revolution], in Abe, *et al.*, *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei*, pp. 167–94; Kotaro Kanai, "Masachusetts kyōwakoku no keisei" [The Creation of the Massachusetts Commonwealth], in *ibid.*, pp. 195–232.

<sup>85</sup> "Tomasu Pein to Amerika kakumei" [Thomas Paine and the American Revolution], *Hitotsubashi ronsō*, Vol. 91, no. 6 (June 1984), pp. 1–18; See also his "Amerika teki sinjo no keisei" [The Emergence of The American Creed], *Shakaikagaku jōnaru*, No. 5 (1964), pp. 169–96.

<sup>86</sup> (Tokyo, Keiso Shobo, 1984).

a focus of attention among the Japanese economic historians. If American industrial capitalism developed from a democratic social basis, why should it have such an undemocratic political leader as Hamilton as its political champion? Was he really a champion of industrial capital or that of commercial capital? Such questions have been repeatedly discussed among them.

Keiji TAJIMA, in his article published in this journal, offers his view on the meaning of Hamilton's policy toward manufactures, placing it in the context of his whole economic program. Tajima conducted extensive research on the drafting process of Hamilton's famous Report on Manufactures. In the course of his research he discovered missing parts of Tench Coxe's drafts in the Coxe Papers. However, he does not give excessive importance to Hamilton's famous report nor to his policy toward manufactures. He considers that the core of his program was his policy on public credit. Because of his appropriate handling of public credit, Tajima argues, Hamilton succeeded in laying the national foundation for economic development. Although he liked to promote industrial development, its promotion was his secondary concern. He was willing to pursue only an industrial policy consistent with his public credit policy. His efforts to promote industrial development did not succeed because the commercial interests, which provided his program with political support, lost interest in manufactures when they became more optimistic in the prospect of foreign trade.

More fundamentally, Tajima argues, Hamilton's industrial policy failed because his program for industrialization ignored the widespread existence of small scale producers and tried to introduce industrial enterprises of considerable scale at once. In his view, however, this failure did not seriously affect the success of his economic program as a whole, because his program succeeded in its most important part, that is, public credit. There are similarities between Tajima's and John R. Nelson's interpretations of Hamilton's industrial policy.<sup>87</sup> However, Tajima has developed his views on his own research and in the context of the Hamilton scholarship in Japan. Having kept company with Hamilton for years, Tajima's evaluation of his program is far more sympathetic than Nelson's.

<sup>87</sup> John R. Nelson, Jr., "Alexander Hamilton and American Manufacturing: A Reexamination," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 65 (March 1979), pp. 971-95.

## X

Compared with Japanese works on other aspects of the Revolution, those on its social aspects are extremely meager. Most of the Japanese historians, particularly those of the younger generation, interested in social history, prefer more recent periods in American history as the subject of their research. Fascinated by ethnic-racial aspects of American history, most of them found their research themes in more recent periods in which ethnic-racial aspects were more pronounced. Only those who began their academic careers when the study of "bourgeois revolutions" was still popular, have retained interest in the social aspects of the American Revolution. Even they have tended to drift away from the study of the American Revolution. Torao TOMITA has spent much of his time in the last fifteen years studying the history of the American Indians;<sup>88</sup> Kozo IKEMOTO has been studying the Atlantic slave trade and the emergence of a slavery-based society in Virginia in the early 18th century.<sup>89</sup> Limited access to pertinent sources in Japan have so far discouraged them from producing major works in the social history of the Revolution. For example, Japanese historians found several essays in John Shy's *A People Numerous and Armed* very stimulating and developed an interest in socio-military aspects of the American Revolution. Because of shortage of available sources, however, they have produced only short essays on the role of the militia.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>88</sup> Tomita, *Amerika Indian no rekishi* [A History of the American Indians] (Tokyo, Yuzankaku, 1982).

<sup>89</sup> Ikemoto wrote a number of essays on the Atlantic slave trade. One of them, "Doreisei puranteishon to dorei boeki" [The Slave Plantation and Slave Trade], was published in Sakae Tsunoyama and Minoru Kawakita, eds., *Kōgyōka e no shidō* (*Kōza seiyō keizai-shi*, I) (Tokyo, Dobunkan, 1979), pp. 208–27. More recently he has been working on the shaping of a slave society in Virginia. "Niguro jinshu doreisei shakai no keisei" [The Shaping of a Society Based on Negro Slavery], Ryukoku University *Keizai keiei ronshū*, Vol. 20, no. 4 (1981), pp. 21–33, Vol. 21, no. 2 (1981), pp. 37–51; "Doreisei puranteishon shakai no tenkai" [The Development of Slave Plantation Society in 18th Century Virginia], *ibid.*, Vol. 21, no. 4 (1982), pp. 1–16; "18 seiki Vajinia no niguro jin dorei" [Black Slaves in 18th Century Virginia], *ibid.*, Vol. 22, no. 2 (1982), pp. 120–37, Vol. 22, no. 4 (1983), pp. 96–107.

<sup>90</sup> Ikemoto and Tomita discussed socio-military aspects of the Revolution in brief essays. Ikemoto, "Amerika dokuritsu kakumei to sono gunji teki sokumen" [The Military Aspects of the American Revolution], in Kansai Amerika-shi Kenkyukai, ed., *Amerika no rekishi* (Kyoto, Yanagihara Shoten, 1982), pp. 47–65; Tomita's comments on Shy's works in *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei kenkyū no saikin no dōkō* (Tokyo, Rikkyo University Center for American Studies, 1976), ed. by himself. Makoto Saito discussed the American idea of defense in the Revolutionary and Early National Periods. See his *Amerika-shi no bummyaku*, pp. 118–40. This is the only Japanese study on the subject.

There is also the problem of a framework. They feel that American works in social history, commendable as they are in their interest in the life of the common people, often tend to be microscopic in perspective and devoid of concern with a socio-economic structure. Of course, some American social historians offer an attractive framework. For example, Kenneth Lockridge's hypothetical framework is very suggestive.<sup>91</sup> But it may seem too socio-psychological for Japanese social historians trained in a socio-economic approach. Looking at American history from the outside, they are groping for an international or transnational framework in which early American social history can be placed.

In this connection, a panel discussion held at Ritsumeikan University in 1981 is worth mentioning. It represented Japanese historians' quest for an international/transnational framework suitable to colonial American history. A summary of the presentations and discussion by the panelists is printed at the end of this issue of the journal.

Shoichi OSHIMO, a specialist in New England religious history, who is conversant with recent literature in the social history of the Colonial Period, discussed the characteristics of the colonial society, using Louis Hartz's concept of "fragmented societies."<sup>92</sup> The main point of his argument was that "fragments" transplanted to the colonies were too varied to be categorized as the "bourgeois" fragment as Hartz claimed. Such a feudal institution as the proprietary system was not only transplanted but also perpetuated until it was abolished by the Revolution. Ikemoto, another participant, discussed the relationship between slavery and political stability in Virginia. It may be said that he has been trying to develop a broad framework that connects Britain, the colonies and Africa with a focus upon slavery. Tomita, a discussant on the panel, has been groping for a similar framework, although native Americans will occupy a much more important place in his framework. Minoru KAWAKITA, another member of the panel and a specialist in English socio-economic history, discussed why the American colonies were able to revolt successfully against Great Britain in a center-periphery perspective. He is known as the scholar who introduced Immanuel Wallerstein's work to the Japanese academia.<sup>93</sup> Ikemoto and Tomita believe that Wallerstein's

<sup>91</sup>Lockridge, "Social Change and the Meaning of the American Revolution," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 6 (1972-73), pp. 403-39.

<sup>92</sup> Hartz developed this idea of "fragmented societies" in *The Founding of New Societies* (New York, 1964). Oshimo's recent work is "Amerika kakumei to kyōkai" [The American Revolution and the Church], in Abe, *et al.*, *Amerika dokuritsu kakumei*, pp. 63-95.

<sup>93</sup> Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, I (New York, 1974), and II (1980). The Japanese edition was published by Iwanami Shoten (Tokyo) in 1981.

framework is useful to them in their search of a suitable framework to place early American social history in an international setting. In this connection, they evaluate highly a recent book by Michio SHIBATA, a European history specialist, which presents a framework relating microscopic folk history with macroscopic international history.<sup>94</sup>

Such a framework will certainly be useful. When Japanese historians attempt to evaluate the historical meaning of the American Revolution in a global or international perspective, however, a framework of social history will be of limited use. It is undeniable that the global impact of the American Revolution was primarily ideological. The Revolution spread in the world two important ideas: national liberation and liberal democracy. National liberation has since been accomplished by most of the nations. But liberal democracy has not spread much beyond Western Europe, North America, and a few countries in the Asian-Pacific region. Its future is clouded by social maladies even in the United States and other old centers of liberalism. Whatever its future will be, it may be said, liberal democracy is a noble experiment in the history of mankind. If the Japanese people are committed to liberal democracy, Japanese historians should include in their historical assessment of the American Revolution due recognition to the American quest for liberal democracy during the Revolutionary Period. The social conditions in present-day liberal democracies are quite different from that of Revolutionary America. But there is still something fascinating and relevant to the liberals of the 1980s in studying the American quest for free government in Revolutionary America. In spite of the emphasis on socio-economic aspects in his own studies, Ikemoto recognizes the importance of the political and ideological aspects of the Revolution.<sup>95</sup>

Thus the conclusion of Akira IMAZU's book written in the bicentennial of the American Revolution seems to be an appropriate, if somewhat conventional, summation of its historical significance. The American Revolution, he said, established liberal constitutional government at state and federal levels, which was based on the principle of people's sovereignty. The Revolution prepared the way for further progress in political

<sup>94</sup> See Tomita's review essay and Ikemoto's comments in *Amerika kenkyū shiryō sentā nenpō* [The Bulletin of the Center for American Studies of the University of Tokyo], No. 6 (1983), pp. 37, 60. Tomita emphasizes the utility of Michio Shibata's framework, which combines a Wallerstein-type global perspective with social and folk history. See Shibata, *Kindai sekai to minshū undō* [The Modern World and Popular Movements] (Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1983).

<sup>95</sup> *Amerika kenkyū shiryō sentā nenpō*, No. 6, p. 61.



democracy. Although slavery was not eliminated, the Revolution generated an anti-slavery impulse and created free states in the North and the free Northwest territory. The American Revolution, he maintained, was a great epoch in the development of American democracy. It was also a great epoch in the history of mankind, he further observed, since its ideals and achievements have exerted a strong impact, not only upon other Western nations, but also upon non-Western peoples.<sup>96</sup>

TADASHI ARUGA  
Editor

<sup>96</sup> *America dokuritsu no hikari to kage* [The Light and Shade of American Independence (Tokyo, Shimizu Shoin, 1976), pp. 197–212. This book adopts a biographical approach in depicting the American Revolution. It contains biographical studies of several prominent Americans including loyalist Hutchinson as well as radical Samuel Adams.