

**“The young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi and our times: From the frontline of research
on Jinsei Chirigaku (The geography of human life)”**

Saito Shoji

Translations of the above two essays written by Shoji Saito, professor at Soka University,
on Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, which were published as part of his book *Nihonteki
Shizenkan no Henkakatei* (A process of changes in Japanese views on nature), Tokyo
Denki University Press, 1989.

The young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi and our times

From the frontline of research on *Jinsei chirigaku*

I. Why now is the time to reflect on the ideas of Makiguchi

I'd like to begin this section with an issue of immediate concern. At present, i.e. as of September 1982, two of four candidates for the leadership of the governing party in Japan have indicated that "a national crisis of unprecedented gravity demands austerity from all our people" and are alluding to the probable use of coercive policies, on the assumption that the next government will be forcing these policies onto the great majority of the people. This has been reported on a number of occasions, and as a result the mass of people are showing no particular reaction. When I first encountered these reports myself, I was astounded that people did not feel more anger. As I recall, the sovereignty of this nation was supposed to lie with us, its people.

Recession - only to be expected, trade friction - only to be expected, administrative reforms - only to be expected, more taxes - only to be expected, control of textbooks - only to be expected, military expansion - only to be expected... As an agenda of power politics that assumes everything is "only to be expected" is advanced day by day toward completion, one day we may wake up to find that we, the great mass of people at the bottom of the pile, are locked into an identical situation as that of the 1930s in terms of our society and culture.

One aspect of our society and culture symptomatic of the 1980s is the admiration all Japanese have for "power" and the way in which they have allowed themselves to become captives of "power." Even granted that as a result of the social phenomena we witness every day - the most ordinary politicians suddenly elevated to prime minister, the most vulgar of people suddenly television performers who lead public opinion, to name just two examples - every one of us labors under the illusion that we too can have power if only we want it, because in this we must see that a gestalt is produced sufficient to create the pattern for this illusion, there is probably no need to single this phenomenon out for special criticism. However, the significance of this admiration of power and desire for "power" and the voluntary curbs placed on the self I speak of here incorporates a warning about the current irregular state of affairs in Japan in which the psychology of the people at the level of everyday existence is permeated throughout with this "love of power." Thanks to innovations in advanced science and technology that surpass those of the west,

the vast majority of Japanese people now want to be controlled, want to be ordered around, and are seeking affirmation of themselves in this way, however it must be said that it is precisely these attitudes in thought that constitute an expression of the “will for power”.

Why then is the country so full of people who attracted by the idea of power? One conclusion we inevitably arrive at is the well-worn theory that the leaders of the absolutist Meiji regime only accepted those aspects of modern European culture that suited their purpose, and used these without experiencing any conflict of ideas with the pre-modern elements within themselves. No matter how much anyone tries to deny it, those great achievements of our Meiji forbears still surround us with a formidable barrier that prevents us from crawling out of the depths of our misfortune. Another reason, which should at the same time be understood from a broad perspective including cases in the West, is that because the ideologies and systems of modern public education were formulated and put into practice purely to satisfy the political, economic and military demands of the modern nation state that sprung up in rapid succession during the nineteenth century, the humanity and individual happiness of children in compulsory education were relegated to a secondary position, the priority being immediate benefit to the state, and that for a long time, nobody noticed that this strategy was very much putting the cart before the horse (i.e. inverting the end and the means, the subject and the object).

Children entering this absurd system of public education forced on them by the state in the end will spend their lives dependent on rules and regulations devised by others (i.e. totally different rules to the basic principles of life they discover themselves). This education is by rights hardly deserving of the title, however the state disregards this fact, accords teachers a semblance of authority, and forces them to drag children toward whatever the goals of the state happen to be. Unfortunately, for far too long before the modern period teachers tended to be monks who had come down in the world, the top servants of aristocratic families, or hangers-on of wealthy merchants, in other words people not fitting properly into any particular occupational group, so from the moment they gained any authority in the eyes of the world, teachers had no hesitation in taking on the role the scapegoats charged with implementing the injustices of the state. In education in Japan in the modern period, even more so than in Europe, the power of the state loomed sternly behind the teacher, on top of which sat the authority of the teacher standing before the children. This existence of a small number of people giving the orders and a large majority subordinate to them continues even today as a flaunting of

educational authority that has prevailed since the Meiji period, despite the emergence of conspicuous variations in the 1980s like the *Gakushu shido yoryo* (“Guidelines for instruction”) and *Kyotsu ichiji shiken* (universal university entrance examination) courtesy of the officials of the Ministry of Education. The production of people graded according to their “deviation value” i.e. how they relate to the average, suits the goals of the state (these days the maintenance of a high-tech controlled society) perfectly. Alfred Adler is known as the psychologist who formulated a theory of “individual psychology” as an alternative to the teachings of his mentor Freud, who believed sex to be the main determinant in personality, concentrating instead on the conflict between feelings of superiority and inferiority. Adler divided people into submissive and imperious types, and reported that both these types are produced during the process of education. “The greatest disadvantage of an authoritative education,” he wrote, “lies in the fact that it gives the child an ideal of power, and shows him the pleasures which are connected with the possession of power.” (*Understanding Human Nature*).

Bertrand Russell, influenced by the psychology reports of Adler, adds in his book *Power* (1938), (Chapter Two, Leaders and Followers) “Authoritative education produces the slave type as well as the despotic type, since it leads to the feeling that the only possible relation between two human beings who cooperate is that in which one issues orders and the other obeys them.” Russell continues later, “I have spoken hitherto of those who command and those who obey, but there is a third type, namely, those who withdraw. There are men without the courage to refuse submission without having the imperiousness that causes the wish to command. Such men do not fit readily into the social structure, and in one way or another they seek a refuge where they can enjoy a more or less solitary freedom. At times, men with this temperament have been of great historical importance.....Something of the hermit’s temper is an essential element in many forms of excellence, since it enables men to resist the lure of popularity, to pursue important work in spite of general indifference or hostility, and arrive at opinions which are opposed to prevalent errors.”

The “third type, namely those who withdraw” refers here to those who free themselves from the relationship of command and obedience, and not those who have dropped behind through sloth or stupidity. On the contrary, these are the individuals with the formidable energy required to take the initiative and propel themselves outside the “power structure.” In short, if we are to maintain freedom of thought in the true meaning of the word, and oppose the prevalent errors, we must make the decision to throw

ourselves bodily outside of all that is “power”. Knowing this, but being unable to make that decision, symbolizes our cowardice as ordinary men.

At the very least, I would like to shed some light on the important question of what it means to stand outside of the framework of command and obedience and think for ourselves, by examining the traces of a voyage taken by an eminent person familiar to us.

These traces left by a eminent person familiar to us, it goes without saying, are the numerous sketches that Tsunesaburo Makiguchi contemplated and discarded, contemplated and discarded again as he created *Jinsei chirigaku* amid abject poverty. From this pile of rough etchings was born a monumental academic work.

II. *Jinsei chirigaku* – a product of the pedagogical paradigm

In 1900, the first year of the twentieth century, when the “young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi” embarked on *Jinsei chirigaku*, not a single preceding work existed of even any slight assistance as a model for the scientific theory of geography he had in mind. There were of course magazines like *Chishi* and a number of published works in individual sciences falling into the broad category of “natural geography” e.g. geology, topography, soil science, limnology, oceanography and meteorology, but these were a disparate collection of writings, and to the young Makiguchi at least appeared to be of little immediate use in the scientific pursuit of “the relationship between land and people” which he was formulating, having either excessive or insufficient detail. Most importantly, they were in essence mere translations i.e. transplants of Western geography displaying a distinct unwillingness to tackle the issues of life i.e. the real concerns of Japanese people. For this reason, thanks to the elevated position of the specialists involved, geography as a discipline had become increasingly theoretical in nature, resulting in a growing aversion to the “dull dry rote learning” of those dimensions of geography dealt with in elementary and middle school textbooks. Something had to be done. The question was what could be done to enable students to build up their powers of observation, to reveal the powers of reasoning within each student that would enable them not only to answer the question “what?” but ask the question “why?” The “young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi”, desperate to find the answer to this question and realizing that no existing work would provide the desired results, decided that he had no choice but to write a book himself.

In 1900, Makiguchi was still head of geography at Hokkaido Normal School. The draft of his lecture *Yama to jinsei* (“Mountains and Human Life”) given in May the previous year at a regular meeting of former classmates in the school hall, had been published in July that year in the *Hokkaido shihan gakko dosokai zasshi* (“Hokkaido Normal School Former Students’ Magazine”) No. 13. This draft of the *Yama to jinsei* lecture was used again in Chapter 9 *Sangaku oyobi keikoku* (“Mountains and valleys”) of *Jinsei chirigaku*, published in October 1903. Some slight revisions had been made, but this treatment of the old manuscript i.e. using it three years after printing, (despite the fact that the manuscript was too long and Makiguchi had no choice but to in his own words “cut it in half for publication”) itself four years after the actual lecture, demonstrates the attachment and pride he felt with regard to the manuscript. At the same time, from a bibliographical viewpoint this manuscript provides a foundation for extending the period during which Makiguchi worked on *Jinsei chirigaku* back to May 1900.

Now if we take this *Yama to jinsei* and compare the earlier and later manuscripts, we are surprised to find something extremely important that we as scholars of Makiguchi’s thought have carelessly missed in our investigations. That surprise is similar to the surprise of wandering through the cloud and mist on the ridge of a high mountain, when suddenly the cloud and mist is blown away and the summit of the mountain appears towering above us in a bright blue sky, much closer than we had imagined. When we take a closer look, to our surprise we see it is clear right down to the base of the mountain. The recent *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu daianana kan shoki kyoikugaku ronshu* (“Complete works of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi Vol. 7 Early essays on the subject of pedagogy”) (1982; Daisanbunmeisha) reproduces *Yama to jinsei* as it was in its first magazine publication, including the exhaustive footnotes and supplementary notes of proofreader and annotator Hideo Sato. These notes serve to illuminate the early process by which Makiguchi’s ideas were formed, something of which previously we had little more than a vague idea. First of all, let us take a look at page 2 of the foreword (pp. 329-30 in the “Complete Works”).

Yama to jinsei (Mountains and human life)

Having been asked to present this lecture, I agreed without giving it much thought, and after considering for some time what I should talk about, and coming up with no brilliant ideas, I chose the following subject and constructed a plan based to some extent on the so-called five stage format. There are time restrictions however, and I’m afraid I am not much of a speaker, so I can’t promise things will work as planned.

This is the aim of the lecture. I believe you will all incorporate what you hear today in your existing knowledge to form a harmonious whole.

My lecture is called *Yama to jinsei* (“Mountains and human life”). At first glance you might imagine a topic like this to be rather profound, but this is not actually the case. Academic disciplines are not necessarily original in character. Look back to the origins of the law of gravity and what do you find – an apple fell, that’s all. The great invention of Pestalozzi too simply involved showing what was already there. The same can be said for geography.

Here, believes that any extravagant ideas evoked in the minds of the audience will have been largely curtailed.

Well then, how shall we begin? Mountains are something you have seen with your own eyes, something familiar to you all, so I’m sure you already have some thoughts on them. At the very least let’s put our minds to the following statements.

1. Mountains produce many things.
2. Climbing mountains lifts the spirits.
3. Mountains make rain fall.
4. Mountains create water sources.

The listeners are made here to pull apart their old ideas.

What I want to talk about here are 2. and 3. What I say will be no more than ideas you already have, or parts of ideas you have, and I will simply try to arrange them in a slightly more orderly fashion. My topic then, more specifically, is “explaining what value mountains have with regard to the various interests we believe to be our objective in teaching”.

Here the six kinds of interest must be revised.

1. Interest related to experience
2. Interest related to thought
3. Aesthetic interest
4. Empathetic interest
5. Social interest

6. Religious interest

At this point, believes the concepts assimilated by the listeners are clearly sorted and they are ready to accept the ideas a whole. This is the preparation process.

From here the author moves on to the main topic. In other words, to ensure his audience has a firm grasp of what he is talking about as he presents new concepts to them, it is necessary to divide the material into several sections to explain it.

These sentences leading into the foreword have been cut from the later *Yama to jinsei* manuscript. It would be reasonable to imagine the grounds for this omission to be that in the old manuscript, having “curtailed extravagant ideas” in his former classmates at Hokkaido Normal School, the aim was to make them “understand the value” of mountains as in Herbartian teaching theory “with regard to the various interests,” and to reproduce this without modification Makiguchi thought would be annoying for the readers of *Jinsei chirigaku*. And in place of the section omitted, in the new manuscript, before embarking on the final section of Chapter 9 “*Sangaku oyobi keikoku*” (“Mountains and valleys”), i.e. “Section 8 Summary”, he adds in small script the following “disclaimer”.

“So far I have analyzed and observed the different elements of the effects that mountains have on human beings, and have been careful not to overlook the overall effect of the combination of these elements. Therefore to bring this discussion to a conclusion, we need to shift our viewpoint slightly and summarize what we have analyzed and discussed so far. At the time, in Hokkaido, I lectured a little on the question of “mountains and human life” for the benefit of the students. As I bring this discussion to an end, I admit there will be some repetition of that lecture material, however as I did have a few things to add, I have made some slight revisions and made this revised version an abridged version. (*Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zenshu daiikan Jinsei chirigaku (I)* [“Complete Works of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi Vol. 1 The Geography of Human Life (I) pp. 124-5]

Makiguchi had “analyzed and observed the elements of the effects that mountains have on human beings”, from “Section 1 *Yama no kodo to jinsei*” (“The height of mountains and human life”) to “Section 7 *Keikoku to jinsei* (“Valleys and life”), however because the basic framework of his observations was grounded in Herbartian teaching theory, it would be reasonable to interpret these words used to conclude the final section as a desire to acknowledge what he owed to the pedagogy of Herbart.

Already, in the introductory section of *Jinsei chirigaku* - i.e. “Chapter 3 *Ikani shui o kansatsu subeki*” (“How we should observe that which is around us”), Makiguchi uses Herbartian teaching theory as a framework, summing up the question of how people interact with their surroundings as follows: “Because we deal with all different kinds of people, we employ various methods of interaction. We may observe moreover that even when interacting with the same person, as time goes by or under different circumstances, or at almost the same time, we use several or all of these methods of interaction.” Makiguchi even provides a diagram, adding “when we apply the items in the summary on the right, we should be able to categorize them as shown on the left.”

Spiritual interaction

- Sensory interaction (1)
- Interaction via use (2)
- Scientific interaction (3)
- Aesthetic interaction (4)
- Moral interaction (5)
- Empathetic interaction (6)
- Public interaction (7)
- Religious interaction (8)

Experience

Social interaction

This system of grouping spiritual and intellectual activities into categories such as “sensory interaction”, “empathetic interaction”, “experience” and “social interaction” made perfect sense to people working in education in Japan during the 1880s and 1890s, and was a system that anyone knowledgeable in this field would readily recognize and understand.

This is in all probability the reason Makiguchi consciously avoids gratuitous repetition in the new *Yama to jinsei* manuscript.

What I have gleaned from a detailed comparison of the old and new manuscripts is that in the earlier manuscript, a phrase in parentheses is inserted at almost every stage, and at the end of each section are notes on teaching theory, e.g. “I have already discussed the experience of mountains and interest in mountains in terms of reasoning. Here I realized

that mountains have considerable value in terms of improving understanding.”

“(Observing from this perspective should provoke in us empathetic or social interest. In other words, interest out of empathy as opposed to the interest from the viewpoint of reason that I mentioned earlier. This is the result of the conclusions and summary in Section 4.)”. The “young geography student” Tsunesaburo Makiguchi clearly grounded his observations of geographical phenomena in the pedagogical paradigm, at the same time possessing a command of precise techniques of inductive reasoning, and eventually “discovering rules” and “establishing principles” through his own efforts. The means by which Tsunesaburo Makiguchi achieved this, taking into account his starting point as a thinker, must be found in the pedagogical paradigm. The role of *Principles and Practice of Teaching* (1886) written by James Johonnot and translated by Nagao Ariga, the first work Makiguchi encountered on his admission to the full course of the Hokkaido Normal School, cannot be overestimated. Because the young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, who digested the pedagogy of Johonnot (which combined/resolved perfectly in the United States British ideas of empirical scientific consciousness with the developmental teaching theories of Pestalozzi, bringing the resulting set of ideas to fruition) as he progressed one step at a time toward the formation of his own ideas, was, unlike his classmates, sustained in his thinking by a grounding in the “ocean thought” of Arahama in Echigo (modern-day Niigata) and the “enlightened rationalism” of his time in Otaru, he was able to master easily the various relatively carefree pedagogical theories of the first half of the Meiji period. Furthermore, Makiguchi was able to impose upon himself a “discipline of ideas” far stronger than that of any other student in any normal school in the country. Pedagogy itself was the least advanced academic discipline in the modern period, and being inherently a hotchpotch concocted from the essences of various adjacent sciences, it was convenient in that studying pedagogy allowed Makiguchi to absorb a number of modern sciences at once.

The objective fact of conformity to the above pedagogical paradigms confirmed by comparing the old and new texts of *Yama to jinsei* is something that Makiguchi himself openly acknowledges in his explanatory notes in *Jinsei chirigaku*. Once again I confess I will resort to an extract, however I believe it is unavoidable in order to gain a correct understanding of this acknowledgement.

1. The natural environment that surrounds us on all sides has a constant physical and spiritual effect on our daily lives. If we therefore observe closely all these elements and their relationship to our lives, we will find the basis we need to understand the

situation in different regions and countries as described in *Chishi*. And if we accept this as what ought to be the popular view of geography, then we can largely interpret the geography of different regions and countries, what should be called the various types of geographical discourse, by applying these fundamental ideas. Being a bit on the slow side, what I have come up with despite myself as a result of some effort is no more than what I have endeavored to find out about this basis for understanding. My learning is only of limited extent, and I am still unable to find an example from which others may learn from. All I have done is follow some rules of pedagogy that have occurred to me to gradually arrange material into the content of what I say to you, and now more than ever I am concerned that I have failed to produce what I had hoped. My conclusions are no doubt riddled with defects in the same manner as my materials. I hope to receive some guidance on this from those more knowledgeable than myself in this area.

2. Because the objects of our observations are part of the society we live in now, any attempt to obtain a correct understanding of them leads us inevitably to current affairs. So while I have remained aware of the objective of this work, I have sometimes had no choice but to stray somewhat from my main topic, and I ask the forgiveness and understanding of my readers for this.

Thus Makiguchi does not shrink from stating unequivocally that he has merely attempted to arrange the jumble of materials he finds in front of him into some coherent form while “adhering to the laws of pedagogy.” This is because in his attempts to construct a fundamental theory of geography, Makiguchi is in the position of “not having the ability to forge parameters for this structure” and Makiguchi himself has no hesitation in confessing that he is unable to find an alternative to basing his ideas on the structure of pedagogical theory.

If Makiguchi had submitted unquestioningly to the “authority” of existing works on geography and thought, “if great teachers of such exalted reputation cannot do it, how could someone like me?” or “there must be considerable difficulty involved if such great men do not do it, so there’s no way I could,” then what would have happened? He would have decided that the foolhardy endeavor that was the writing of *Jinsei chirigaku* was pure madness and discarded the idea before even attempting it. That however, is not what happened.

III. “Anti-authority” ideas – relativist value theory

Suddenly we find ourselves close to the end of our discussion.

There can be no doubt now that the “young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi” employed the pedagogical paradigm to construct a unique system of geographical theory. So far I have discussed the various influences leading to the writing of *Jinsei chirigaku*, but merely comparing Makiguchi’s work with existing work in geography relegates the ideas of Makiguchi himself to the status of a mere shell, and makes it impossible to grasp the true nature of those ideas. The study of Makiguchi’s thought has once again entered a new dimension and a new phase.

We must not reach the hasty conclusion however that Makiguchi succeeded in developing a unique and creative geography system by himself simply by “adhering to the laws of pedagogy”. Aspects of his system without a doubt belong in the realm of true inspiration. In these, Makiguchi displayed a genius all his own.

Having recognized this we must remember that *Jinsei chirigaku* was as we might expect a work conceived, contemplated and researched outside the realm of “power” (the command/obedience relationship). Returning to the words of Russell, in terms of being created during a period and at a place when a person was one of the “third type namely those who withdraw,” determined to enjoy “a solitary freedom” and indulging in “something of the hermit’s temper”, Makiguchi’s *Jinsei chirigaku* certainly fits the bill.

In April 1901, Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, then also a house master at Hokkaido Normal School, was forced to accept responsibility for the famous strike incident, and left Hokkaido for Tokyo, having been made as it were to “fall on his sword.” Despite saying that he was going to write a book on geography, at first there seemed little hope of achieving this. In short, he had little choice but to continue the life of an unemployed wanderer. It is around this time also that Makiguchi comes into contact with the socialist activists drawn to the *Heimin Shimbun* (“Commoner’s News”) as a meeting place. This was a life light years from his existence as a normal school teacher, during which he had gone with the flow as part of the power structure of the state.

And it is precisely because he wrote during this period as one of “those who withdraw”, that as Russell says, he was able to “resist the lure of popularity”, “pursue important work in spite of general indifference or hostility” and “arrive at opinions” which were “opposed to prevalent errors.” Without diminishing Makiguchi’s other works, the fundamental reason for his producing such a masterpiece in *Jinsei chirigaku* was that at the time, like it or not he was beyond the magnetic pull of “power.”

I would like here to draw the reader's attention to a very significant point concerning the writing of *Jinsei chirigaku*. This is that in *Jinsei chirigaku*, Makiguchi deliberately avoids the terminology used specifically by those in power. I have conducted extensive semiotic searches of *Jinsei chirigaku*, however to describe all my findings would consume far too much space, so I shall confine this discussion to a single example.

When you think about it, Makiguchi spent his childhood and his early adult life in Hokkaido, the school from which he graduated was in Sapporo, the administrative center of Hokkaido, and he “served” (not a term I favor, but as it was widely used at that time I will employ it, if ironically) for around ten years on the staff of his old school, so we would presume that the word *kaitaku* (development, reclamation, exploitation, i.e. a word often associated with Hokkaido) would appear frequently in *Jinsei chirigaku*. When we actually examine the original text however, we notice that Makiguchi has made a conscious effort not to use the term, and only employs it in a fairly off-hand manner (or for paradoxical effect) when it is unavoidable.

In terms of frequency, *kaitaku* only appears four times in an enormous book of one thousand *kiku* size pages (i.e. 22 x 15 cm pages) (strictly speaking six times in four places). This is certainly not nearly as frequently as might be expected. Makiguchi's stubborn determination to exclude the term is blatantly obvious. The terms *kaimei* and *kaimeijin* (“enlightenment” and “enlightened person”) on the other hand are sprinkled liberally throughout *Jinsei chirigaku*, a kind of leitmotiv for the work, appearing over one hundred times in those one thousand pages in a number of “variations on the main theme.” We must not forget that “enlightenment” formed the foundation of Makiguchi's geography, and was the alpha and omega of his pedagogy. *Kaimei* (enlightenment; education) and *kaitaku* (development, reclamation, exploitation) are very similar words in terms of Japanese expression, both in appearance and in sound, however their meaning is as different as “civilization” and “barbarity”. While the latter term i.e. *kaitaku* (these days “*kaihatsu*”) has no separate existence from the power of the state or large corporations, the former, i.e. *kaimei*, only exists in close association with the spirit of the individual. There are three or four other reasons why Makiguchi had little option but to treat *kaimei* with reverence and reject *kaitaku*, however we can justifiably say that the main reason was his understanding of the political and social realities of *kaitaku*, as advanced in the main by the state, for what they were – a saga of injustice, barbarity and inhumanity. Any reader of *Jinsei chirigaku* who fails to note the textual fact that the author has consciously avoided the term *kaitaku* – a term with which anyone with a connection to Hokkaido should be more than familiar, would fail from the beginning to

understand any of the concepts that the author is promoting, or experience any change in themselves. The significance of an item of vocabulary that only appears six times in four places is considerable, so I would like now to list each of those uses.

...This is something we must not overlook, like the significance of the landing of the American admiral at Uraga on the Miura Peninsula, like the emergence of a giant of religious reform (Nichiren) from the southern part of the Boso Peninsula, and like the way in which the development of Hokkaido began at Oshima. We may see then that the leaders and main instigators of the reforms of the Meiji Restoration, i.e. the people from the fertile lands of the Satsuma and Choshu clans, did indeed have some bearing on the character of the peninsula.

(Chapter 7 Peninsulas and promontories, Section 2 Peninsulas and Civilizations)

This could well be the reason why most of Japan's highest mountains are famous peaks, inspiring priests to take to them and pilgrims to travel around their sacred sites. In Hokkaido, there are examples of mountain worship among the local people, and perhaps it is simply that the land has only recently been opened up and they have yet to be discovered, but there are still unfortunately no temples on the tops of mountains. The land has however been developed by a mountain people. Can the mountaintops have possibly been left without such adornment for this long? I very much doubt it. And in actual fact even in our playground of Hokkaido, every year on April 8 by the lunar calendar the elderly men and women of Horoto leaning on their walking sticks and forgetting how bent their old backs are, take their grandchildren to the rocky Moipayama (*Inkarashipe* in the Ainu language) and climb the mountain while paying their respects to the thirty-three statues of the Goddess of Mercy en route. In view of this, no young person living in a country of mountains could do less.

(Chapter 9 Mountains and valleys, Section 8 Summary)

Because forests are the most influential factor in the distribution of rivers, if we know how many rivers there are in a particular area, this will correspond roughly to the forested area in the region. Most of the small rivers and streams of our local areas find their source in areas of lush forest, and the rivers that flow between these trees dry up completely when the trees are felled as part of development of the land, so you can see how these areas are left with nothing but the remains of riverbeds.

(Chapter 11 Rivers, Section 10 Rivers and enlightened individuals)

Plants do not only differ in distribution according to the climate of an area, but even within areas subject to the same climatic conditions plant varieties will differ depending on the soil. This is something obvious to anyone who casts an eye outdoors for even a short time. The terms sandy plain, grassland, bush, forest and developed area as generally used indicate the distribution of plant life based on such factors as soil and topography.

1) *Sunahara* (flat sandy areas)

Places where the soil and sand that form the surface of the earth's crust are exposed are either completely devoid of plant life, or plant life is only found in very small quantities. Narrow strips of flat land near the sea, lakes and rivers belong to this category, and are generally disregarded as areas unable to be put to any use.

5 *Kaitakuchi* (developed land) An area in which human labor has altered the state of the natural environment, using it for the cultivation of a variety of crops. Includes rice paddies, vegetable plots, grazing land, houses, roads etc.

The above categories and order also indicate the concentration of useful plants. In other words developed land refers to so-called fertile land suitable for the growing of useful plants, most of which were once areas thickly covered in forest and suitable for dense growth. Forests become desolate in the following stages, and plant life scarce before finally disappearing as the region is transformed into desert.

(Chapter 20 Plants, Section 8 Distribution of plants in relation to soil and natural features)

The young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi had witnessed and heard of several actions of extreme cruelty and inhumanity in the development of Hokkaido, and did not overlook the injustices perpetrated and the corruption that was rife under the Satsuma-Choshu government. At the time, (in fact the same can be said of the period after World War II) Japanese intellectuals were studiously ignoring (the more brazen and ignorant of the opinion leaders losing all inhibitions and glorifying the government's actions) the way in which the great powerless majority of people were suffering in the name of *kaitaku*, while a handful of the strong and wealthy in power lined their pockets; in other words the fact that the land of Hokkaido was being systematically destroyed by "colonization policy" and "imperialist ideology". Our Makiguchi's penetrating powers of observation however enabled him to see the truth, leaving him consequently with no inclination to use a term like *kaitaku* employed with such abandon by the government and its tame academics.

(These penetrating powers of observation however did not mean that Makiguchi neglected to fairly assess the positive aspects of *kaitaku* such as modernization and rationalization, and at no time did he adopt the narrow-minded stance that all he had to do to be effective was to criticize and oppose anything and everything. Rather he always insisted on a holistic and relative approach.) Take a look at those four examples of *kaitaku* that scrape into *Jinsei chirigaku*. No matter what kind of slant you try to put on any of them, never does Makiguchi give even the slightest hint of affirmation or unreserved support for the act of *kaitaku*. This is one of the remarkable aspects of *Jinsei chirigaku*.

While on the topic of the remarkable nature of *Jinsei chirigaku*, we must not overlook the fact that Makiguchi harbored pacifist ideas of the most radical variety. Around the summer of 1903, when Makiguchi was working on the manuscript for *Jinsei chirigaku*, pressure was mounting to take a tough line against Russia, and the whole of Japan was in suspense, waiting for war to break out. Seven professors from Tokyo Imperial University: Masaakira Tomii, Hirono Tomizu, Toru Terao, Sakue Takahashi, Shingo Nakamura, Noburu Kanai and Kiheiji Onozuka sent a message of support for war to Prime Minister Katsura, urging him to “take this opportunity to fly the flag of justice and face up to what must be done with the means at our disposal” in what became known as the *Shichi hakase kengen* or “Seven professors’ proposal”, and engaged in activities that aimed to muster public opinion behind war, including writing in newspapers and magazines and going on speaking tours to publicize their views, in what became a well-known event in Japanese history. Through all of this warmongering, our young Tsunesaburo Makiguchi continued to sing to his own “anti-war”, “peace” and “international harmony” tune in direct opposition to the majority opinion, in a kind of *basso continuo* throughout *Jinsei chirigaku*. On page four of the opening volume he suddenly declares, “We feel we are offering ourselves to the world and making the world our home. However in actual fact, we who have encountered the enlightenment of the 20th century have made little headway in these things even if we are aiming toward them, and they are things we should be aiming for. Stupidly we impose our own limits and remain trapped in vain within the confines of our old walls, and are in danger of being swamped by our own petty and narrow-minded conflicts.” (Chapter 1 An overview of the relationship between the earth and human beings), and has no hesitation in daring to label the nationalists *chikan* or idiots (this word *chikan* incidentally is now only used to describe a perpetrator of sex crimes, but in the young Makiguchi’s time it was used for idiot or fool). He then proceeds to clearly target those pressing for war, insisting that the

economic effects of war on private enterprise deserve more attention than nationalist politics.

“This confrontation with the world’s powers is said to be about autonomy and independence, but this is only in political terms. In terms of economics we bear a portion of the burden of improving the lives of all by spreading ourselves to every corner of this enormous market and cooperating with each other, and are no more than an outlet for the items produced as our part of this burden. That some economists have used the term “trade group” as a substitute for “country” demonstrates this fact. We talk about civilized nations and uncivilized nations, but this is no more than the difference between selling high quality manufactured goods and low quality inferior manufactured goods, the difference between being an itinerant salesman and owning a shop. And so the position of our great Japanese empire in this enormous market is one of a long narrow mountainous land a mere 27,000 *tsubo* in area lying between 21 and 51 north and 120 and 150 degrees east, full of rundown shops, where people sit idly in front of the brazier happily smoking and waiting for customers; no more than a silk shop or a tea shop-come-general store with a cherry blossom symbol on the curtain at the entrance, staffed by 40 million employees.” (Chapter 13 Ocean Section 1 The role of oceans in our current situation). Now how’s that for a far-sighted view?

Makiguchi clearly placed himself outside the magnetic field created by the power of the state. By doing so he developed the ability to perceive the truth where others could not, and develop views “opposed to the prevalent errors”. In *Kyodoka kenkyu*, published in 1912, considering he was employed by the Ministry of Education to compile a geography textbook, the way in which Makiguchi still succeeds in openly venting his “anti-central authority” views is quite impressive. *Chiri kyoju* (“Geography instruction”) however (published 1916) is rife with double meanings over which he has obviously agonized, as an elementary school principal and thus unavoidably part of the command/obedience structure. Indeed, in *Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei* (“A System of Value-creating Pedagogy”) Volume 1 (1930) and Volume 2 (1931), written during the period in which his sense of alienation was rapidly deepening, even in his position as an elementary school principal, he had already begun to voice free opinions outside the realm of “power.” In Volume 3 (1932) and Volume 4 (1934) he vents without inhibition his by now totally “anti-authority” views. This was a result of the growing breadth and depth of his spiritual universe as a follower of the Nichiren Shoshu sect. Caution is required in any attempt to rank Makiguchi’s works, but these developments are the reason any fair assessment will conclude that *Jinsei chirigaku* and the four volumes of *Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei* may be counted as his masterpieces.

Furthermore if *Jinsei chirigaku* had not been completed, is it not highly dubious that the process by which Makiguchi formed his main ideas would have continued to be active through his second, third and particularly his fourth work – *Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei*? It was only when the free spirit tested his wings outside the web of power (in some periods it would be strictly more accurate to say on its fringes) that life was breathed into the skeleton of the pedagogical paradigm.

My research has turned up a number of geniuses who employed the pedagogical paradigm to excellent effect in other fields. Alexander Graham Bell, who discovered the telephone through his enthusiastic efforts in education for the deaf. D.H. Lawrence, who created great works of literature with piercing insight into the faults of twentieth century industrial society, based only on the pedagogical knowledge he obtained in training for teaching at Nottingham University. Both these men were free spirits, who withdrew from the realm of power. It would be a grave error however to assume that within the pedagogical paradigm lies some amazing innate potential. If this were the case, surely there would be none of that class of inferior school principals – yes-men of the administration -ranting about “the destruction of education” or reviving the compulsory singing of the national anthem and flying of the Japanese flag, issues that confront us so directly today, and no undignified scrambling by elderly professors for honorary posts and medals. In the final analysis, we must conclude that when used by those stubborn but gentle types able to step outside the bounds of “power” to promote their own brand of free thinking, the paradigm of pedagogy, which in truth is no more than a kind of Jack-of-all-trades jumble of disciplines, can be used to surprising effect.

This is also an issue with which we must all contend. When we escape to a place where the logic (or occasionally the sentiment) of “power” that manages and commands us at every level from the society of our nation as a whole to our everyday lives, and urges us to affirm its authority, cannot reach us, the persistent rays of “absolutism” and “authority” cease to shine on the world and we see clearly that in fact all things are very much relative and play only an unobtrusive transitory role. We should notice furthermore that it is the “reverse thinking” of “escape from the system” that elevates ideas previously on the outside or the fringes to the highest position, that has true revolutionary impact. Our *Jinsei chirigaku*, which remains clear-headed and optimistic throughout, is a great work in that it perceives all of creation in terms of “relative thinking”.