

## Section 4    The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionary

### Chapter 12

Japanese history is like this. If we delete the legendary primitive age that is said as 1,000 years without letters from the political history like the age of *Takamagahara*, Japanese race have attacked and persecuted the Imperial Household for almost 1,500 years as unbroken traitors as if they had been in a body since they had entered into the period that history has been recorded. –What thought were they based on? We shall not make an established theory through in all ages reverse only from the surface of the political theory. We discovered that interpretation of history by the theory of Japanese constitution quite reverse like the Ptolemaic system by investigation of described actions in the political history and induction from ethical history that considers thoughts. Racial actions follow racial thoughts, and every racial history who has divided from one human being has common way of social evolution. So, the political and ethical history describes and explains the fact and reason of evolution of special races and the philosophy of the theory of social evolution that is common with all races forms the basis of the political and ethical history of every race as a historical philosophy that studies the trace of social evolution (I wish you finished reading the previous Section, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*).

As the ancient and medieval history of all races should be interpreted by a principle of blood superiority and a principle of loyalty and filial piety, the ancient and medieval history of Japanese race must be interpreted laying a principle of blood superiority and a principle of loyalty and filial piety a fundamental thought as a natural way of social evolution. We previously said this: the presupposition that Japanese race was a race that valued a principle of loyalty and filial piety, was the truth through all races in the world and in the ancient and medieval times. But it is clearly false to regard that Japanese had followed the Imperial Throne for 2,500 years from that fact and to form the conclusion of Japanese history. And we said this: Japanese inversely suppressed and attacked the Imperial Household because they had respected their family lines by a principle of blood superiority and they regarded loyalty and filial piety as the supreme

goodness by a principle of loyalty and filial piety<sup>1</sup>. Why we adapt the way to remove these established theories is because we intend to overthrow the reversed superstition of the Roman Pope of the theory of Japanese constitution like the Copernican system against the Ptolemaic system, but a principle of blood superiority and a principle of loyalty and filial piety that were truth through all races had got the reason that Japanese race had attacked and persecuted the Imperial Household as traitors in all historical aspects.

For a while, we said in imitation of those who criticized history by a viewpoint of today's sense that all Japanese were traitors. But this criticism by a viewpoint of today's sense is fault because it does not criticize morals in accordance with the stage of evolution and takes the side with the Imperial Household. Namely, 'traitors' seeing from the side of the Imperial Household meant very loyal retainers seeing from the side of opponents of the Imperial Household. Japanese race became accessories in the crime, that is, traitors seeing from the side of the Imperial Household to carry out their loyalty and filial piety to nobles of their masters. Furthermore, repeatedly speaking, since Japanese race had a prosperous principle of loyalty and filial piety like all other races, they became traitors to carry out their prosperous loyalty and filial piety to each patriarchal master, and to make attacking enemies of their patriarchal master at the sacrifice of their own lives moral duties. When the Imperial Household appeared before patriarchal monarchs, Japanese race were moralists who were very faithful to their masters, appeared before the Imperial Household as bold traitors, and overwhelmed it. Today's those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution abuse Takauji whenever they open their mouth. They know that *Lushun* fell to Japan only by General Nogi<sup>2</sup> either Baltic Fleet was sunk only by General Tōgō<sup>3</sup>, none the less they think as if traitors committed a crime by themselves. What a pitiful barbarous village in the Orient! Don't they know why Yoshitoki prospered in Kamakura and exiled the Three Emperors to *Oki* or *Sado* was because his 190,000 people defeated the Imperial army, captured the Emperors, kept his order, and punished them? Don't they know that why Takauji drove away the Emperor *Godaigo* from *Kyōto* was because our ancestors organized from the navy of 70 ships and 200,000 army defeated Masashige in *Minatogawa*? We require people to think them over fairly. If someone said that Japan

---

<sup>1</sup> See the introduction of the Chapter 11.

<sup>2</sup> General Nogi is Nogi Maresuke (1849-1912). He was a soldier and commanded the Third Corps and captured Lushun as a general in the Russo-Japanese War.

At that time, Russia had built fortress in Lushun. Since it was very strong, Japanese army fought against heavy odds.

He immolated himself at the funeral of the *Meiji* Emperor.

<sup>3</sup> General Tōgō is Tōgō Heihachirō (1847-1934). He took up a commander in chief of a combined fleet, fought against the Baltic Fleet of Russian Navy in Japan Sea, and won it in Russo-Japanese War.

won only by patriotism of General Nogi and Tōgō in the Russo-Japanese War, and that all other Japanese people were loyal retainers, so they were traitors or Russian spies, he or she would be a mad person. Like That, why do they irrelevantly say that only Yoshitoki and Takauji were traitors and all other Japanese people were very faithful to the Emperors and helped an unbroken line of the Imperial blood, if this country is not a barbarous village?

History is not what only a few people make freely. They are just symbols that express racial thoughts; they just represent racial actions and carve them on history. So, unless we regard Japanese history as Yoshitoki's or Takauji's history, either as description of the Imperial Household like today's historians, Japanese history as a racial history is described as the very traitors' history against the Imperial Household. Only recorded representatives or symbols were not traitors. The very 'Japanese race' hidden under them were traitors against the Imperial Household. –Having been traitors seeing from the side of the Imperial Household was the natural result in ancient and medieval times based on a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety like all other races.

We must briefly speak the primitive age that is said as 1,000 years by a legend because any race had had a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety as a sign before history got to be written.

Even the Latin races who reached democracy earliest in ancient times had not had morals other than absolute and infinite patriarchal rights and a principle of loyalty and filial piety at first after they migrated to Greece or Rome; needless to say, they had not had them before they migrated there. The Germanic races that form today's European democratic countries adapted monarchy and patriarchal system in a long time of the medieval times like the Latin races after primitive, republic, and equal age. Hence, a principle of loyalty and filial piety was the only supreme moral at that time. Like that, although the time of the period without letters was a trivial legend, if we do not regard the oldest historical records as meaningless but at least can infer lives of a few hundred years before history got to be written from those records on the whole, (since in those historical records, the primitive, republic, and equal age is not recorded by transmission of observation of other Latin races like other German races' ones )<sup>4</sup>, we can imagine that historic times of Japanese race inherited a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety and then began.

In what is called a period of a maternal family line that didn't have matrimonial relationship or in more primitive age that people had not been conscious of even a

---

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps he supposed *Germania* of Tacitus or so.

maternal family line, primitive villages had been as republic and equal groups by instinct sociality. One side those groups were peaceful, the other side they fought with others; in them, consciousness of father and child were nothing or very weak, so it was forgotten when they grew up. Hence, there was no moral of filial piety either a complicated relationship of rule and obedience except for simple belief of the root of public laws or trifling customs. And since they were republic groups based on primitive equality, there was no class moral of loyalty. –So, we have previously said that the patriarchal system has not existed from the primitive times either is the final form.

Like that, a principle of loyalty and filial piety following a family system has not been a moral that human beings has had from the beginning either has been final authority in our lives. That is, a principle of loyalty and filial piety appears when races experienced a certain evolution and established the patriarchal system, and it is a class moral in the stage that people consciously unite under patriarchs. First, social consciousness awakes between mothers who suckle their children on their breasts and children. A maternal family line connected by social consciousness that awoke only between mothers and children is born; it is expanded to fathers and a paternal line appears. After it gets to be expanded to brothers, their wives and children, and three and four family lines live together in a family, its population gradually increases and it divides the head and the branch family. When the branch family connects with the head family by consciousness of a family line, it forms the patriarchal system; and the society enters into the process of social evolution based on a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety. In the patriarchal system formed by a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety, people believe the immortality of the souls of ancestors based on ancestor worship of the primitive religions at that time and hold united rituals under patriarchs of the head family. The patriarch of the head family holding the chief performing a ritual has the absolute supremacy to his families and the branch families as a representative of ancestors, and then monarchy of the unity of religion and politics is formed. –We can imagine that Japanese race perhaps had experienced the primitive, republic, and equal period in other country, formed the patriarchal system of the unity of religion and politics united under *Shintonism*, reached the period that history was described by a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety, and got to written the first volume of history. Namely, the patriarch required his children filial piety since he was their father; at the same time, he required them loyalty since he was a ruler of the family. Loyalty and filial piety were not only public morals that awoke in the struggle for existence among villages (see the part that we have explained one-side socialism in the Section 3, *The theory of biological*

*evolution and social philosophy*.) but also were the most primitive private morals germinating under the patriarchal system. So, in the most primitive age like this, since patriarchs require both loyalty and filial piety, the thought that loyalty agrees with filial piety is never forged; the phrase that the monarch is the parents of people or people are babies of the monarch were not the meaningless one having followed in the emperors' footsteps historically like today. But direct loyalty and filial piety are only required to the family of the patriarchs; when the family gets to divide fifty or sixty branch families and the head family, each family has each patriarch and each patriarch was a father who each family had to respect and was a monarch who he or she had to obey. And since the blood relationship of the head family and the branch families gradually becomes weak, people have to rely on souls of remote ancestors that their all members regard as common fathers to connect with them. That is, worshiping souls of remote ancestors do not only mean being dutiful to their ancestors but also obeying what is called their orders and then being faithful to them obeying The man who was given a posthumous title of the Emperor *Jimmu* and is legendary called the ancestor of the Imperial Household said, 'the soul of my ancestor descended to earth and helped me. Many plots have disappeared and there is no threatening situation now. So, I will worship the heavenly god and will be faithful to her'<sup>5</sup>, when he conquered Japan following his family groups. Of course, this description is seen in *Nihon Shoki* which collects what is said as legends after ages and is written in classical Chinese, so we should receive this very carefully. But his word, 'I will worship the heavenly god and will be faithful to her', meant *Amaterasu Ōmikami* was the subject of loyalty and filial piety for him and the argument that the monarch and subjects constituted a family and loyalty agreed with filial piety was perfectly truth at that time that immortality of souls of ancestors was believed and the national polity was formed by the patriarchal system.

But don't misunderstand. The fact that the monarch and subjects constituted a family only showed that a conqueror of the *Jimmu* Family became the monarch and the subject in the patriarchal system, and he formed a family under *Amaterasu Ōmikami*. And, of course, conquered slaves and humble people were owned by the patriarch like his family but were not members of his family; nor were his family and having migrated innumerable family groups before and after the relationship the head family and the branch families. The fact that loyalty agreed with filial piety meant that the Emperor *Jimmu* obeyed an order of *Amaterasu Ōmikami* herself and was faithful to her like his word; loyalty agreed with filial piety in common ancestors of the branch families and the head family. It did not mean that between the branch families and the head family

---

<sup>5</sup> This remark is seen in the third volume of *Nihon Shoki*.

divided from a common ancestor, their members did not regard the Emperor *Jimmu* of the head family as the representative of *Amaterasu Ōmikami* of their own ancestor but regarded him as the final goal of loyalty, and members of the branch families who should include white-haired people than him were faithful to him along with the head family in unison.

Dr. Hodumi says that today's Japan is a patriarchal country, but he explains it by the conception of extension of individuals; this explanation is a scientific way after a microscope invented. He dishonestly says that since the present Emperor is extended from the body of *Amaterasu Ōmikami*, he is her living image, so we have been faithful to the present Emperor himself in unison, but this explanation does not only ignore the letters of classics and go against *Shintonic* believes; he cannot interpret why the relationship of loyalty and filial piety generates between people of what is called members of the branch families who have been extensions of the life of *Amaterasu Ōmikami* as the same and the Emperor who has been an extension of *Amaterasu Ōmikami*, that is, among each element of *Amaterasu* who individual of *Amaterasu* has been expanded. So-called those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution are terrible heretics seeing from *Shintonism* and traitors against classics.

Anyway, in the period of worshiping ancestors, it is believed that *Amaterasu Ōmikami*, of the Imperial Household that was powerful family in the *Kinki* region actually existed as the soul and she ordered them through the mouse of the patriarch of the head family. That is, since loyalty and filial piety were directed toward her and agreed with each other (and loyalty toward the patriarch of each family agreed with filial piety toward the patriarch), loyalty and filial piety didn't contradict at all and each patriarch and the soul of the remote patriarch connecting with them were the noblest authority as the focus that loyalty agreed with filial piety. Of course, since it was legendary before the period that history got to be written like these, we only use those legends as materials of scientific inference. But the emperors (who were given a posthumous title and were the patriarchs of family groups in one region) were regarded as spokespeople of *Amaterasu Ōmikami* of the substance of agreed loyalty and filial piety (who was the legendary patriarch of remote ancestors of each family), and members of those groups undoubtedly obeyed their orders. Although we take the strictest scientific attitude and put all emperors in the no-letter period whom *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* hand outside recorded history, we can fully infer that patriarchs and them of remote ancestors had been resources of powers as the substance of loyalty and filial piety by the primitive religion of worshiping ancestors in the process of social evolution and the patriarchal system that had been formed by awakening of social consciousness

based on retracing a family line. –The fact that ancestors of the Imperial Household faced family groups in the region as patriarchs of the substance of loyalty and filial piety or spokespeople of patriarchs of remote ancestors meant that; most family groups scattered in the greater part of other regions had each patriarch of the substance of loyalty and filial piety or each spokesman of patriarchs of remote ancestors and faced ones. As someone said, ‘distant wild people have not been under the rule of me yet’, most ancestors of people in the primitive age that is said as 1,000 years by a legend were independent out of the theory of Japanese constitution. So, in the primitive villages, each village had existed as each different family group by a religion of worshiping ancestors of a primitive religion and had been united under each different soul of patriarch; traffic among them had been blocked, and they had been independent and confronted each other for the reason that souls of patriarchs had been different.

Anyway, Japanese race also gradually evolved from the stage of the primitive age by a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety like all other races, got to become conscious of history, and needed to record history to inherit their consciousness after ages. In this way, *Kanji* got to be imported and history got to be written.

Since history got to be written, different great families developed and got traitors one after another. Soga Family who we have explained attracts our attention most because it was remarkably powerful. –And these phenomena appeared by a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety as the same.

Of course, a principle of blood superiority, and loyalty and filial piety after Confucianism and Buddhism came into became greatly different from previous one like a religion of worshiping ancestors that believed the souls of patriarchs as immortal, so loyalty did not get to mean the great filial piety toward common ancestor of the head family and the branch families; loyalty or filial piety got to mean that social consciousness that traced a family line and awoke in one’s family united one’s family as a social group under the patriarch, and made efforts for the purpose and profit of the patriarch. Social consciousness was the most vigorous toward close relatives, but gradually got thin in accordance with alienation. So, though power groups such as *Omi* or *Muraji*<sup>6</sup> were same branches divided from a common ancestor with the Imperial Household, their members had regarded loyalty toward each patriarch or the head family of the close relative as the highest moral by much more vigorous social consciousness than thin social consciousness toward the Imperial Household of the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Omi* and *Muraji* were hereditary titles that ancient baronial families had had to show their political and social positions. *Omi* was a baronial family who had been based on certain regions and *Muraji* was a baronial family who had taken charge of certain offices (for example, religious services or military affairs).

remote head family. Finally, when each patriarch of the branch family confronted with the Imperial Household of the head family—based on a viewpoint of equality that they were same family lines and same branches, they were faithful to each patriarch or the close head family by social consciousness to close relatives; in this way, they fulfilled moral duty to attack the Imperial Household (we have previously pointed based on the Imperial Rescript on Education teaches us the order of fulfillment of moral duties in accordance with the degree of loves that the theory that loyalty has agreed with filial piety<sup>7</sup>. You shall understand that this argument shall never groundless).

Namely, in this period, since social consciousness awoke in a very narrow extent, one family was the unit of the struggle for existence. For example, Soga Family overthrew the honored great families such as Mononobe or Nakatomi Family in the struggle of this unit and began to compete with another great family of the Imperial Household. Social consciousness does not expand at a stroke. It gradually awakes in accordance with evolution of history and through a family line, and gets to drive out people of other family lines (see the part in the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy* that we have explained that the unit of the struggle for existence expands from a narrow one).

So, only close relatives of the emperors were faithful to the emperors of the patriarchs; members of other families such as *Omi* or *Muraji* that were the units of the struggle only obeyed a principle of loyalty and filial piety under each patriarch. Since the patriarchs had regarded that they had been the same family lines with the emperors and had been equal to them and their social consciousness had been weak, when they held different interests with the emperors, they acted under them as unrelated branch families; when they were unrelated to the emperors, they got unrelated onlookers. And when they conflicted with the emperors, they became traitors following their members. Not only one person was a traitor. Why different great families got traitors one after another was not because patriarchs could do by themselves but because their family groups united by the closest family line were faithful to them by a principle of loyalty and filial piety. The fact that the Imperial Household was oppressed by Soga Family for a long time unless that member of the Imperial Household<sup>8</sup> took a sword for himself and rose up meant many patriarchs were onlookers following family groups based on a principle of loyalty and filial piety.

Since things were like this, that exemplary hero, the Emperor *Tenji* transcended the patriarchal system and intended to construct an ideal state based on the sovereignty of

---

<sup>7</sup> See the Chapter 10 and the note 27, in the Section 4, Chapter 10.

<sup>8</sup> It means the Emperor *Tenji*.



the state that formed the supreme organ by the Emperor alone. But this ideal state cannot be realized until in the distant future. It could not be dreamed in the ancient society that had not enough evolved either social consciousness had just awaken through a family line like many idealists intended to construct ideal states at a rising nation, though socialism could not realize until the system of the capitalist fully developed. A nation-state that the Emperor *Tenji* regarded as an ideal could not be realized cutting off historical process of the patriarchal country halfway; it needs that all members of the nation widely awake social consciousness after long evolution like the patriarch country succeeds to. –Now, if so, you can clearly understand this attempt was just utopia of the Emperor *Tenji* and it became extinct along with his death; the Imperial Household itself existed as the patriarchs with the stream of the patriarchal country and that despotism of *Fujiwara* Family appeared. In the period of Despotism of *Fujiwara* Family was that the unit of the struggle have been formed by a family based on close relatives, their members have united under the patriarchs by a principle of loyalty and filial piety, have stood on the Imperial Household for a long time of a few hundred years, and have made their patriarchs act as traitors.

The so-called principle of blood superiority and loyalty and filial piety that what we call those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution had produced traitors who had attacked and oppressed the Imperial Household from the beginning of Japanese history when ancestors of the Imperial Household had been the patriarchs.

After that, history entered into the Medieval Ages when Heike Family, Genji Family, Houjou Family, Ashikaga Family, and Tokugawa Family ruled. –These unbroken traitors formed the patriarchal country based on a principle of blood superiority and loyalty and filial piety, and as a natural result, attacked and oppressed the Imperial Household based on loyalty of their subjects under them. However, it goes without saying that the ancient age when the society had been formed only by a family line is quite different from the Medieval Ages in the same stream of the patriarch country. So, you shall be able to understand the fact by above-mentioned explanations that only members of a family called *Genji* or *Heike* got traitors by the patriarchal system and a principle of loyalty and filial piety, but we must explain the fact that many ancestors not being their family lines assisted traitors by special reasons in accordance with social evolution. At first, we shall explain a principle of blood superiority.

Those who consider scientific ethics such as the origin of morals or formation of consciousness somewhat in detail shall easily understand this explanation. Needless to say, the substance of morals is based on sociality being as instinct. But to unite actions

with morals, at first, it is necessary to be made sociality in accordance with the times and regions by external compulsions. Morals mean sociality formed in this way; when we simply refer to morals, they are only ideological like a conception of atom in physics. Morals do not appear in actions until they are formed by societies that are different regions or the times. Customs in today's barbarous villages where force even trivial matters by extremely strict punishments are certainly formed its sociality by external compulsions. Religions of worshiping ancestors or polytheism regarded from the sun, the moon, and stars to dogs, horses, trees, or stones as gods; innumerable gods were found everywhere and forced people to obey morals as supervisors from the outside.

But as societies evolve, this outside compelling power gradually gets to be moved inside and the compelling power gets to be based on consciousness; even if cruel punishments are not inflicted, or innumerable gods do not supervise, people get to regard a compelling power of consciousness as a categorical imperative. In this way, societies enter into the period of autonomous morals. Heteronomous and autonomous morals show the process of evolution that human beings pursue when they grow up from children to adults throughout their lives. Like that, as societies grow up and develop throughout their big lives, they evolve from the period of heteronomous morals to the period of autonomous morals.

Even the order of morals of Japanese race should not be omitted from this truth. The 1,000 years that is said as by a legend until the Emperor *Ōjin* or *Nintoku* that foreign civilization was imported—even if we accept the years as the legend as we have previously mentioned—were the same with today's villages in the South Sea where have had fifty or sixty thousand years history but their people have still been barbarous acts. As a result in the primitive age, there are innumerable outside compelling powers such as not only innumerable souls of ancestors but also innumerable outside compelling powers such as gods of the sun, the moon, the wind, the thunder, snakes, birds, fish, or stones and societies were the period of heteronomous morals that societies were maintained.

But when autonomous morals such as Confucianism or Buddhism of much evolved societies were imported in Japan, those who had united under patriarchs by a heteronomous principle of blood superiority were taught them as a clear autonomous consciousness. People got to regard unity based on a family line as the supreme goodness of morals, do not get to regard souls of ancestors or punishments of outside compelling powers but get to regard their own consciousness as a categorical imperative, and get to do everything under a principle of blood superiority of their own accord.

But consciousness just means the substance of moral judgments and a framework

how people judge moral actions is perfectly made by social circumstances after a birth (see the part that the reason how consciousness is formed in the Section 2, *Ethical ideal of socialism*). And since morals begin to be made by existing societies before they make societies evolve, at first, they have no choice to make societies maintain as they are and they are charged with this the first duty. So, it goes without saying that societies had not enough evolved in comparison with today although they were alike autonomous morals by consciousness, they could not transcend existing morals, doubt existing ones, either present more evolved moral ideals. –Especially, in the medieval period of Japanese race who was blockaded by the Ocean, it was no chance to compare other morals that the degree of social evolution and the direction were different with its own morals like today, to gain more evolved moral ideals, either to criticize existing morals.

So, the formation of consciousness was perfectly projected and imitated and morals remained the stage that received existing moral customs and ethical admonitions. In the medieval period that people obeyed morals based on imitation without doubt, it was natural that the worth of a family line that any race worshiped at least once was received as if those who were thirsty demanded water. By reproduction of same family lines by increase of population, conflict of societies, and development of social consciousness by disturbances—that is, tracing family lines or beyond family lines—a view of equality of human beings was gradually expanded, none the less the conception of descendants of certain person was regarded as very noble and that they should obey the men absolutely; they have passively made the contents of moral judgments.

This worship of a family line is not limited only Japanese race. In the ancient and medieval period that social consciousness had developed tracing a family line, this conception had dominated even today's European races as social consciousness for a long time. For example, the *sacred* German Emperor who brags the trivial matter that he is a man of the Hohenzollern House even today and goes to stool tries to resist against social democracy. And this worship of a family line was especially strong in the medieval Japan where could not evolve rapidly by a blockade of the Ocean; any traitor could attract worship of people by the dignity of his own family line and could act as a traitor.

That Fujiwara Family who is called as a descendant of *Ama no Koyane no Mikoto*<sup>9</sup> did not only drive out other classes based on an honor of a family line but also overthrew an ideal of *Taika* Revolution inside the Court gathering worship of people. Descendants

---

<sup>9</sup> It is said that *Ama no Koyane no Mikoto* is one of gods in *Takamagahara* in Japanese myth. According to myth, when Amaterasu Ōmikami hid herself in Ama no Iwa Yado (the Cave in the Heaven), *Ama no Koyane no Mikoto* read out a *Shinto* prayer and prayed for her to go out. It is regarded as an ancestor of Fujiwara Family and worshiped in *Kasuga* Great Shrine in *Nara* city.

of innumerable Imperial princes who are legendary said that had proceeded the provinces for generations from the period of the Empero *Sujin* settled the provinces having the pride of a family line that they were same branches of the emperors and formed the sign of the future aristocratic country where they was prosperous being feudal lords and ruined<sup>10</sup>.

The Heike Family that was always proud that they were descendants of the Emperor *Kammu* and the Genji Family that considered the fact that they were descendants of the Emperor *Seiwa* as an honor could fully act as traitors because they were respected by ancestors' consciousness that a family line was the noblest. Historically recorded facts clearly prove this. That first local clan awaking political powers and rising—that is, Taira no Masakado<sup>11</sup> who was the sign of the future aristocratic country based his right to seize political powers upon the pride of a family line that he was a grandson of the Emperor *Kammu*<sup>12</sup> and intended to rule consciousness that worship a family line. Though it is not evident whether the same family line Kiyomori dared to have everything his own way by this belief afterward or not, everybody would know that plunder of Genji Family was done concentrating consciousness of worship of a family line based on the pride of a family line that they were descendants of Yoshiie<sup>13</sup> who was a descendant of the Emperor *Seiwa*. You shall understand it from the fact that the Court often promulgated the Imperial orders that forbidden *samurais* in the whole country to join neither the Genji nor Heike Family, having been eager to worship a family line.

Even local clans or *Kokushis* in the provinces where members of the Genji or Heike Family only passed a night got subjects of the Genji or Heike Family. And it goes without saying that not only the Battle of the Genji and Heike divided the whole country in two for a while but also many people were put in a happy situation that they were not restricted and were independent, and followed them in accordance with their own freedom. Some people were not related to the Genji either the Heike Family, none the less they said that they followed the noble family just because Tametomo<sup>14</sup> had

---

<sup>10</sup> Strictly speaking, feudal lords who were really descendants of Imperial princes were very few.

<sup>11</sup> He was a general of the Heike Family in the middle of Heian era (?-940). He had influence in *Kantō* region but conflicted with his relatives such as his uncle Taira no Kunika. At last, he assassinated Kunika and invaded neighbor regions. In 939, he built a palace in Sarushima (in today's Chiba Prefecture), set up different bureaucrats, and called himself 'Shinnou (the New Emperor)'. But he was finally overthrown by Taira no Sadamori, Kunika's son and Fujiwara no Hidesato.

<sup>12</sup> Actually, he was not a grandson but a great-great-grandson of the Emperor *Kammu*.

<sup>13</sup> Minamoto no Yoshiie was a general of Genji Family in the last years of Heian era (1039-1106). He was sent to *Mutsu* area (today's the *Touhoku* region) with his father Yoriyoshi, defeated Abe no Adatou who rebelled there (1029?-1062), and repressed the rebellion. With this as a turning point, he constructed his basis in Eastern countries. After that, he got to be regarded as a hero in the Genji Family.

<sup>14</sup> Minamoto no Tametomo was a general of the Genji Family in the last years of Heian era (1139-1170). He was famous as a soldier celebrated for his valor and had influence in *Kyūshū* region. In the Battle in the first year of *Hougen* (1156), he followed the Emperor *Sutoku* but was defeated and exiled to *Izu Ōshima* (it is in today's Tokyo)

influence in *Kyūshū* region for some time or regarded a surrender to the Heike Family as an honor of their families and said that they belonged to the noble family; these are proofs that they got their subjects by trivial matters. Since their loyalty based on these was strong, they became fearless traitors when the Imperial Household appeared in front of the Genji or Heike Family.

Since a family line of the Houjou Family was very low, its members governed well to compensate the weak point; they were humbly and put up with a low official rank. Nevertheless, the word of the Nun General<sup>15</sup> who raised a bamboo blind, was fretful, and cried made 100,000 soldiers shed tears and swear to fight at the risk of their lives; even lineal ascendants were resignedly united under the order of the Houjou Family, and finally, they behaved as traitors such as to exile the three Emperors.

And why Ashikaga Takauji overthrew Houjou Takatoki easily was because he was a descendant of the Genji Family that was far superior to Houjou's family line, so once Takauji rebelled against the Emperor *Godaigo*, people were faithful to the noble descendant of the Genji Family. People followed toward Takauji so eagerly that a rumor that a descendant of Yoshiie would surely conquer the whole country<sup>16</sup> spread.

And Yoshimitsu said this, when he hoped the position of *Daijō Daijin* but he could not get it. 'If so, I will become the king, make Shiba, Hosokawa, Hatakeyama, Rokkaku, and Yamana Family Five Family's social standings of regency and *kanpaku*, made Toki, Akamatsu, Niki, Kyōgoku, Yamanouchi, Isshiki, and Takeda Family Seven Family's social standings of regency and *kanpaku*, and appoint other *Daimyos* other official ranks. And I will make families using the family names such as Tachibana or Kiyohara in conformity with Sugawara or Ōe Family and make those who are famous among subjects of *Daimyos* Samurai class. And I will appoint the Chief<sup>17</sup> in *Kamakura* Government Ujimitsu<sup>18</sup> the Shogun. If I correct military arts and set up learning, I can become the virtuous king'<sup>19</sup>. When he started confiscating feudal estates from various

---

region).

<sup>15</sup> It points Houjou Masako. For Masako, see the note 46 in the Section 4, Chapter 11.

<sup>16</sup> This rumor was resulted from a will of Yoshiie himself that a man of the seventh generation from him would conquer the whole country.

A man of the seventh generation from him was Ashikaga Ietoki, the grandfather of Takauji, but he was unable to bear pressure and committed suicide entrusting realization of the will to his grandson.

This episode was made clear by Takauji and Tadayoshi, his younger brother afterward and Imagawa Ryūshun, a general in the Muromachi era (1326-1414), records it in *Nan Taiheiki (Criticism to Taiheiki)*.

<sup>17</sup> In Japanese original text, this part is '*Kanrei* (the superintendent)' but this is false because Ujimitsu was the chief in *Kamakura*.

<sup>18</sup> He was Ashikaga Ujimitsu who was the Chief in Kamakura Government (1359-1398).

Under the reign of Muromachi Shogunate, the Kamakura Government was put and charged the rule the East Japan. Since the Kamakura Government had had a resource of revenue and was powerful, it often conflicted with the Shogunate. For example, Ujimitsu intended to take the place of Yoshimistu.

<sup>19</sup> According to *Ashikaga Chiseiki (The history of the reign of Ashikaga Family)*, it is said that Ashikaga Yoshimitsu said this to noblemen of the Court who were opposed to his appointment to *Daijō Daijin*.

noblemen, he did it relying on the honor of a family line that he was a descendant of the Emperor *Seiwa*, so he did not behave unreasonably. –We said that Japanese race persecuted the Imperial Household because they worshiped their own family lines based on a principle of blood superiority. The presupposition that people were based on a principle of blood superiority is the truth through the ancient and medieval times in all races. But it is clearly fault to conclude from this that people had helped an unbroken line of the Imperial Household in Japanese history. That is why we said like this.

On the one hand, a principle of blood superiority was worship of a family line for a lower class, on the other hand, for a noble class who was worshiped; it became the basis when they practiced a cruel equalitarianism because they belonged to the same family line and the same branch with the Emperors. For example, Masakado who belonged to the Heike Family intended to be independent by reason that he was a descendant of the Emperor *Kammu*, or Yoshimitsu who belonged to the Genji Family intended to plunder properties saying that he was a descendant of the Emperor *Seiwa* and his behavior was not unreasonable; it is simply that these actions were based on a view of equality gradually developed by tracing a family line (you shall understand that it shall not be an inference rashly ignoring history that we have previously pointed out that the theory that monarchs and retainers have constituted one family shall be a bold equalitarianism conversely and shall become a suicidal logic).

We shall explain a principle of loyalty and filial piety. The moral of loyalty was different from filial piety which respected the soul of patriarchs of remote ancestors connecting between present and ancient patriarchs; loyalty itself fully developed as an autonomous moral and people attacked and persecuted the Imperial Household under traitors to fulfill a moral duty of filial piety.

All morals exist for existence and evolution of societies. Moral judgments are made in accordance with the purpose of existence and evolution of societies. And formations of societies are different in accordance with difference of economic relationship. So, contents of morals are also different in accordance with difference of social system. Everybody knows this fact today; barbarians who are put the circumstance where they cannot be satisfied with their economic requests do not regard eating human flesh as evil, either regard killing or deserting infants as immoral. They have different morals with us according to difference of economic situations. Brazilian barbarians regard that they have the right to beat old people to death by a clubs as big as a human head when they migrate and in Eskimos' villages, they regard that their old people propose for

themselves in a conference in their villages and decide their own suicides when they are starving as a moral duty; these are different morals from ordinary ones in social systems having an economic shortage.

But in China and so on where economic requests were fully satisfied with, morals were quite different from these regions; in that place, respecting and supporting old people had been regarded as the highest goodness since ancient times. In today's civilized countries, has killing children been regarded as a horrible crime, hasn't it? Of course, these are extremely different instances, but from these you shall be able to infer that morals that aim at maintaining existence of societies shall be extremely different in accordance with difference of social economic circumstances.

If we do not superficially understand that the fact that this social system and moral formation are different in accordance with economic situations is based on lands or gold, but is based on physical materials to maintain lives, we shall be able to understand that it shall be natural that the big organism of the society shall change its own system and morals connecting with the system in accordance with difference of economic situations to maintain its life because a society is an organism and it adopts the formation to adjust the circumstance for the purpose of existence and evolution (see the Section 3, , *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*). So, evolution of morals means evolution of societies and evolution of societies means evolution of economic situations. This is why we can wholly understand ethical history which considers evolution of morals and political history which considers changes of societies by studying economic situations in accordance with an epoch.

In the slavery where human beings were owned by others under others' ownership, there was a moral obeying to deal as one's possessions; that is, their own bodies were not theirs and this moral approved the right to owners who owned slaves to present, to sell, or to kill their slaves. This was loyalty of the most primitive slavish moral and families under the ownership of their patriarchs and descendants of conquered slaves were required obeying to deal as one's possessions by an outside compelling power at first because the moral which we have explained were made socially.

While, the times evolved from the period of heteronomous morals based on this outside compelling power to the period of autonomous morals based on inside compelling power, they regarded being dealt their own bodies as one's possessions by their masters as a supreme direction of consciousness for themselves, that is, as their moral duty and a moral called 'loyalty' that meant sacrificing their own lives for profits of their masters.

In the period of heteronomous morals based on slavery that was the most primitive

loyalty, fulfillment of morals had to be required by chains and whips in Europe, and outside compelling power of extremely cruel punishment also in Japan. But Japan was different from European countries where had maintained slavery by chains and whips until quite recently. Why things were done was because European countries always had equal and independent foreigners as slaves by battles with foreign countries or capture of black people and they needed chains and whips to oppress spirits of independence. Records write that slaves at the time that the Emperor *Jimmu* migrated and Korean slaves and slaves of *Emishi* afterwards had had rebellious spirits based on spirits of independence when they were conquered or taken prisoners and in next generation; but their descendants heteronomously (or of their own accord) got to approve absolute obedience to dealing their own bodies as one's possessions since their consciousness was made socially (and for how formation of consciousness is done freely and quickly by social circumstances, see the Section 2, *Ethical ideal of socialism*).

What this slavish moral that obeyed to be dealt as one's possessions went to extremes was following their masters to the graves. Why Plato included slaves and women of human beings in the possessions on his argument about socialistic public properties was because he regarded them as one's possessions without personality; like that, why past people buried not only gold, silver, jewels, or stones but also masters' close subjects, wives, and mistresses in the ground as following their masters to the graves was because they were masters' possessions. And because of following their masters to the graves that was the most extreme fulfillment of loyalty, it is said that tearful voices didn't cease day and night; in the primitive age until a reign of the Emperor *Suinin*<sup>20</sup>, slavery was entirely heteronomous as a natural result of primitive morals also in Japan.

This slavery that regarded human beings as one's possessions lasted until after far ages also in Japan. As long as there were these economic situations and social systems based on them, they could not drive only following their masters to the graves that was disposal of possessions out of societies. Why the Emperor *Suinin* adapted burial mound figurines instead of following to the graves<sup>21</sup> was because the society greatly evolved and social consciousness got keen by Confucianism of the evolved society. But pure

---

<sup>20</sup> In the Japanese original text, this part is 'the Emperor *Sujin*' but this is clearly fault.

According to *Nihon Shoki*, it is said that the Emperor *Suinin* stopped the custom of burying subjects and so on as following their masters to the graves.

*Nihon Shoki* writes this: in November 2, Yamatohiko no Mikoto buried in Tsuki Zaka. At this time, his close subjects were collected and were buried his grave while they were alive. But they didn't die after a few days but cried day and night. At last they died and hanged in the air the stench of something rotting. Dogs and birds gathered there and ate them. The Emperor heard these tearful voices and grieved. So, he said his subjects, 'although subjects were favored during their masters' lifetime, burying them forcibly is cruel. Even if it is a custom from old times, why can we follow a bad custom? Hereafter, I order stoppage of following to the grave'.

<sup>21</sup> According to *Nihon Shoki*, the Emperor asked a good idea about a funeral instead of following to the graves to his subjects. Then, one of his subjects *Nomi no Sukune* ordered craftsmen to make human beings, horses, or any other things by clay and advised him to put those burial mound figurines around graves instead of human beings.



slavery had lasted in the name of humble people and they were sold and bought based on notification to the government office. Children of slaves were the same as calves of cattle belonged to farmers and it was punished by larceny when their true parents sold their own children. Having intended to be complete to forbid following to the graves by a heavy punishment that put three kinds of relations<sup>22</sup> to death after the *Taika* Revolution, you would be able to infer how it was widely practiced.

In this way, slavery that regarded human beings as one's possessions had lasted in the medieval age; in Japanese pirates of the middle ages, there were slave traders and slave trading vessels, and slaves sold and bought. Like in Rome, people usually used slaves regularly, none the less once slaves were sick, they left them on the corner of huts or on the roadside; or like a tale of Obasute Yama (the Mountain to go to leave one's old mother)<sup>23</sup>, they deserted old and useless slaves in mountains or forests. The moral of filial piety was a slavish moral that deprived human beings of their personality and made them obey disposal by owners as one's possessions. Hence, it was natural that disposal of one's possessions like following to the graves had continued under all sorts of forms in the name of filial piety while slavery had lasted. When the times entered into the period of autonomous morals, slaves gradually got to have personality; when masters died in battle, their followers followed them by the side of dead bodies. For example, in the period of Tokugawa, the Shogunate enacted the law to forbid following to the graves by a severe punishment<sup>24</sup> and made Daimyos obey this, none the less when they died, a few subjects always followed their masters to the graves to follow the other world with them. There is a proverb, 'chaste women don't serve two husbands and faithful subjects don't serve two masters'; it seems to teach women and subjects to approve based on autonomous morals that they are husbands' or masters' possessions and seems to lighten the duty to follow to the graves a little

Exactly, *Bushido* (like Chivalry) in Japanese medieval history was very beautiful because samurais raised it an autonomous moral. But it meant inheritance of a slavish moral that approved to present or to kill them whom should have personality as masters' possessions, that is, the object of the right under the ownership of masters. This was not only in Japan; it was one of stages of evolution that any race invariably had to pass through as a process of social evolution and moral development. For example, since European countries in the medieval history were the same aristocratic

---

<sup>22</sup> This meant fathers, mothers, brothers, wives, and children.

<sup>23</sup> Old tales such as *Yamato Monogatari* or *Konjaku Monogatari* record a legend of the Mountain to go to leave one's old mother.

A man lived in Sarashina (present Nagano Prefecture) left his aunt to the mountain and ran away. But when he saw on the bright moon, he regretted that he did. On the next morning, he went home taking her.

<sup>24</sup> In 1663, after the Fourth Shogun Ietsuna (1641-1681) was adult, the Shogunate forbade following to the grave.

countries with Japan, Chivalry that regarded loyalty as the primary object like Japan was produced.

But here what we should pay attention to is the fact that societies gradually evolve. Though patriarchal monarchs in the medieval aristocratic countries had had lands and people as the object of ownership for their own purposes and profits, they had gradually evolved than monarchs of the patriarchal system in ancient age; people who had been regarded as one's possessions had been recognized their personality to some extent than slaves who had existed under ancient patriarchs. Namely, human beings themselves got not to be treated as one's possessions under noble-people's ownership directly and since lands which fed human beings belonged to noble-people, they got to think that people who were fed by lands from economic subordinate relationship toward lands were subordinate things of noble-people of land owners. So to speak, it was indirect relationship. Because of this, the general public were inherited, presented, or killed along with lands as serf as if they were noble-people's possessions. Especially, although samurais were presented others by their masters, they could not refuse it by their own will; when their masters freely intended to execute them, they could not be independent either do self-defense. These were entirely resulted from slavish obedience caused by economic subordinate relationship toward lands.

And like today's scientific ethics divides evolution of morals with three ages of instinctive morals, imitative morals, and criticized morals, any race until the medieval age could not criticize existing morals either hold up moral ideals beyond them because they were on the way of the process of evolution of morals; this was the age of imitative morals. So, societies had evolved and entered into the age that morals had had autonomous forms, none the less they had no choice but to imitate and receive a moral teaching of slavish obedience having existed from the ancient times in an aspect of the contents. Seeing from this point, *Bushido* (like Chivalry) in the medieval history got to regard slavish obedience toward each master as the supreme virtue. –Since there was an economic subordinate relationship that generated from the fact that noble class occupied lands and the medieval times was the stage of the age of imitative morals, *Bushido* (like Chivalry) which had a solemn, splendid, and autonomous form was very noble in an aspect of moral forms, nevertheless its contents of moral judgments was filled with slavish obedience. And Chivalry in European medieval history was the same with it because it was the result of the medieval history and class states.

This is why we said that we could understand political and ethical history by considering economic situations according to the times. Those who are independent on the economic basis have the independent right politically and morally; those who are

subordinate on the economic basis have the obligation to obey them politically and morally. So, in the ancient times when the emperors owned all lands by their strong powers (but their control was actually limited in the *Kinki* region and afterward it was divided by different great families.), all people were those who obeyed politically and morally under the emperors.

But when the times entered into the aristocratic countries after the Battle between the Genji and Heike Family, noble class who plundered lands and were independent economically by strong powers in the same way refused political duties and moral duties obeying slavishly as those who were ruled to the emperors based on the standpoint that they got political and moral freedom and independence. And their traitors' followers or serf were subordinate to them based on political duties that they followed with their masters and moral duties obeying slavishly under them from the economic subordinate relationship toward those noble class.

Hence, when noblemen who they were subordinate to insisted on political and moral freedom or independence in the shape of what is called traitors, Japanese race in the medieval age under the noblemen fulfilled loyalty from the economic subordinate relationship; because of this, they became supporters of them, and attacked and persecuted the Imperial Household. In the period that we should name 'babyhood of *Bushido*'<sup>25</sup>, Yoritomo admonished samurais, 'masters and subjects should value a debt of gratitude'; we can see that this admonition required that masters should give lands or rice of stipend from his or her<sup>26</sup> economic favors and their subjects who received lands or rice of stipend should be subordinate to them. Why developed *Bushido* after that theorized, 'subjects should devote your lives to your masters for rewards. Think that your lives are not yours', was because they and their families were maintained by masters' economic favors. It meant the approval of political and moral obedience based on economic subordinate relationship that lives of subjects being maintained by masters' favors should be devoted to their masters for rewarding to masters' profits. And it goes without saying that the *Bushido* made 1,000 years of the aristocratic countries in the medieval age when this loyalty was regarded as a supreme direction of consciousness and was practiced by noble autonomous forms the age of traitors against the Imperial Household consistently.

That is, they persecuted the Imperial Household by consciousness of *Bushido*. —That is why we said that Japanese race attacked the Imperial Household because they regarded loyalty and filial piety as the supreme virtue by a principle of loyalty and filial

---

<sup>25</sup> It points the Kamakura era (1192-1333).

<sup>26</sup> In Kamakura era, there were examples that women inherited the position of the master of samurai.

piety, or said that the presupposition that people valued a principle of loyalty and filial piety is the truth through all races in the ancient and medieval age but it is clearly fault to conclude that in Japanese history, people have obeyed the Imperial Household for 2,500 years from the fact.

Today's those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution get angry to *samurais* who appeared along with *Bushido* and grieve why the Imperial Household declined was because samurais rose into power. But they are struck their brains by a hammer of an unbroken line and shout *banzai* to His Majesty the Emperor along with *Bushido*. What a barbarous village! (We can say that Mr. Inoue Tetsujiro<sup>27</sup> of a doctor of literature and a dean of the department of literature in Tokyo Imperial University is a tribal chief in these barbarians. See his all works).

The above-mentioned argument toward a principle of superiority of blood, and loyalty and filial piety makes us consider a few exceptions of so-called loyal retainers to the Imperial Household furthermore.

First, counting what is called loyal retainers from the beginning of history in imitation of those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution, we can count that there are the Four Generals and Takeuchi no Sukune<sup>28</sup>; but it is out of the question for us because these men were in the primitive age. Those who fret that Dōkyō's behaviors caused by the Empress's favor was high treason and unreasonable would praise that Wake no Kiyomaro was a great loyal retainer<sup>29</sup>. But this is also out of the question for us because this episode is what is taken up as a subject matter of illustrated story books. We are enough to pay attention that the Great Family lurked behind him and made his behavior bold, though we don't dare to say them disloyal; the Great Family was the Fujiwara Family. Until the Family declined, no one could be counted as a loyal retainer.

Those who only have inferior intelligence which is absurd count Ariwara no Narihira one of loyal retainers by his poems but he was an equalitarian who had an affair with the Empress<sup>30</sup> and were worshiped by poets making violets subject matters. The Heike Family overwhelmed the Fujiwara Family but we cannot regard them as loyal retainers; Yoshinaka overthrew the Heike Family but he was not a loyal retainer, either.

---

<sup>27</sup> He was a leading philosopher in 19th-20th century Japan (1855-1944) He invited a German philosopher Raphael Koeber (1848-1923) to Japan and promoted introduction of European thoughts but leaned nationalism at a later date.

<sup>28</sup> It is said that Takeuchi no Sukune was an influential subject served from the reign of the Emperor *Keikou* to the Emperor *Nintoku* in the *Yamato* Court.

For the Four Generals, see the note 11 in the Section 4, Chapter 11.

<sup>29</sup> For Dōkyō and Wake no Kiyomaro, see the note 29 in the Section 4, Chapter 11.

<sup>30</sup> She was Fujiwara no Akirakeiko (829-900).

Some may say that Taira no Tomoyasu<sup>31</sup> and an army 20,000 strong who protected the retired Emperor *Goshirakawa* from bandits like Yoshinaka were loyal retainers. But what do they think that the army 20,000 strong was formed by vagabonds of half-samurai-and-thief haunted inside and outside *Kyōtō* and evil monks? Yoritomo who is said that he defeated Yoshinaka and was entrusted the function of the sovereignty would be an idealistic loyalist for Mr. Aruga Nagao. But it is sure that an army 17,500 strong and monk soldiers who protected the Three Emperors against 190,000 traitors who were deeply moved by a word of his widow and marched toward the capital were not loyalists. Because monk soldiers often threatened the emperors to fall into the hell and only followed them based on their own interests; Shigetada<sup>32</sup> was a disrespect man who knocked the Gate of the Imperial Palace and abused, 'I'm mad at myself that I am deceived by the very cowardly emperor<sup>33</sup>'. So, until the Houjou Family was overthrown, there was no loyalist.

But there were loyalists in the Nitta and Kusunoki Family. It is sure that the Nitta Family acted freely based on their economic independence at first and records prove it; but inferring uncouth and unaffected character of Nitta Yoshisada, we don't believe that he acted for his own powers to the end. Either we cannot perfectly agree a view that the conflict between the North and South Court was the conflict between the Nitta and Ashikaga Family. The North and South Court took the shape like in the War of *Ōnin*<sup>34</sup>, the whole country was divided in two halves under the flag of Yamana and Hosokawa. Or it was the prelude of the upcoming Civil Wars under the pretext of the code of Nitta and Ashikaga because in the aristocratic countries of the medieval history, though some rulers unified the whole country by an alliance, other rulers did by oppression, all noblemen did not lose the character as rulers. We can enough imagine that with Yoshisada behaved freely and independently as a nobleman at first, he inherited principle of blood superiority, loyalty, and filial piety in the age of imitative morals

---

<sup>31</sup> Taira no Tomoyasu was a nobleman and a samurai served the retired emperors. He negotiated with Yoshinaka as an envoy of the retired Emperor.

<sup>32</sup> He was Yamada Jirō Shigetada who was a samurai in the Kamakura era. He served the Emperor *Gotoba* and distinguished himself in the Rebellion of Jōkyū.

Accurately, *Jōkyūki* (the Record of the Rebellion of Jōkyū) writes this: the army of the Court fought bravely against the army of the Shogunate but defeated. The survivors hurried the Imperial Palace to do a final decisive battle. Miura Taneyoshi appealed, 'we were defeated. Please open the gate' but the Emperor *Gotoba* only answered, 'if you barricade yourself in the Imperial Palace, Kamakura samurais will surround here and will attack me. It is regrettable'. Shigetada said this that Taneyoshi was unfortunate.

<sup>33</sup> Today's *Jōkyūki* doesn't write an abuse of Shigetada but some old books by a printing type write that Yamada Jirō loudly abused, 'I must be killed reluctantly since I was deceived by the very cowardly emperor.'

<sup>34</sup> In 1467, Muromachi Shogunate divided two factions because of a successor of Shogun; one side was a group of Ashikaga Yoshihisa, a son of 8th Shogun Yoshimasa, and the other side was a group of Ashikaga Yoshimi. A powerful subject Hosokawa Katsumoto took a side of Yoshimi and other powerful Daimyo Yamana Mochitoyo (Sōzen) took a side of Yoshihisa. Because of this, two factions clashed with in *Kyōto*.

This war lasted for 11 years.

because of his simple character without doubt, discovered the Emperor who had the highest family line, and fulfilled loyalty that was regarded as the supreme virtue; otherwise, we cannot understand that the Emperor *Godaigo* took the immoral measure that he betrayed Yoshisada and made peace with Takauji<sup>35</sup>, none the less he only cried and left, and when he died by a stray arrow, he put the Imperial Rescript into a bag made by a Japanese brocade and hanged it on his neck.

But you mustn't misunderstand. It can be applied to only Yoshisada; his followers were faithful to him from economic subordinate relationship. It was irrelevant for them whether the Imperial Household was the enemy against Yoshisada or his side. Masashige and Masatsura<sup>36</sup> were the most excellent exceptions. So, we should not think like those who advocate the theory of Japanese constitution that at first Masashige obeyed an order of a traitor Takatoki and conquered Watanabe Magoemonnojou in *Settsu*, Yasuda Souji in *Kii*, and Ochi Shirou in *Yamato* who were in the van to overthrow Houjou Family<sup>37</sup>, so he had an ambition. But we don't think that we compare the fact that he agreed the Emperor's summon not waiting the third summon with the historical fact of Zhuge Liang (Kongming)<sup>38</sup> and should praise him specially. Still less, why can we commit a rash act that we compare his death like falling flowers to a death of Gonsuke by hanging himself by a loincloth<sup>39</sup>? We can enough imagine that he worshiped a family line of the Imperial Household by a principle of

---

<sup>35</sup> After Kusunoki Masashige was defeated in *Minatogawa*, the government army could not hold out against an attack of Ashikaga's army. The government army retreated in *Kyōto* and deployed a war of attrition to recover from the discouraging situation. Then, the Emperor *Godaigo* took shelter in *Hieizan*. A war of attrition lasted a few months but couldn't turn the tables.

So, the Emperor *Godaigo* intended to make peace with Takauji. Yoshisada requested him not to make peace with Takauji but he ignored Yoshisada and made peace with Takauji. Yoshisada grieved at it but went to Hokuriku region and intended to recover his balance. But when he fought with the army of Shiba Takatsune, he died by a stray arrow.

<sup>36</sup> He was a son of Masashige (1326-1348).

<sup>37</sup> Watanabe, Yasuda, and Ochi were powerful families had influence in Kinki region and rebelled in the last days of Kamakura Shogunate. One record writes that Kusunoki Masashige obeyed an order of Kamakura Shogunate and defeated them.

<sup>38</sup> He was an ancient Chinese prime minister in Shu (181-234). He served under Liu Bei who was the founder of Shu and Liu Chan who was a son of Liu Bei.

*San Guo Zhi (History of the Three Powers)* writes this: when Liu Bei was scouting talents, he heard that Zhuge Liang was an excellent person. So, He intended to recruit Zhuge Liang as his subject and visited him. But when he visited Zhuge Liang on the first and the second, Zhuge Liang was away from home. On the third he could meet Zhuge Liang and Zhuge Liang agreed at his invitation.

<sup>39</sup> Gonsuke means a male servant. Why a male servant was called as 'Gonsuke' was because many male servants' names were 'Gonsuke' in the Edo era.

Perhaps Kita wrote this sentence taking criticism of Fukuzawa Yukichi into consideration. Fukuzawa argued this in the seven section of *Gakumon no Susume (A recommendation of Learning)*: it was not rare that when Gonsuke went an errand for his master, he lost one *Ryō*, was bewildered, and was obsessed that he could not make an excuse to his master, hanged his loincloth over a branch of roadside trees, and hanged himself.... It is the same examples that loyalists killed 10,000 enemies and died in battle with the example that Gonsuke hanged himself because of losing one because both deaths aren't of use to civilization.... We mustn't call these acts as 'martyrdom'. Though he didn't directly mention about Masashige, he argued, 'many of them were those who followed a master in the battle between Two Court' in the first half and hinted Masashige. When *Gakumon no Susume (A recommendation of Learning)* was published, this argument was understood that he identified Masashige with Gonsuke and he was offended violently.

blood superiority, loyalty, and filial piety and died for loyalty of the supreme virtue as a result of the age of imitating morals at the time when he died in *Minatogawa*. This was what we cannot interpret as economic independence of noble class; in the age of imitating morals, people had fulfilled conventional morals without doubts except for those who had distinguished philosophical brains or those who transcended old morals and acted freely like Kou no Moronao<sup>40</sup>.

However, although in this way we can see that only Masashige was a loyalist of the Emperor, it goes without saying that other 300 followers toward him were faithful to and died for him not for the Emperor. The lifetime of Masatsura was a story like flowers. Seeing from his elegant, calm, and brave character and from moral teachings in a strict home in his childhood, we can say that he did not fight with the North Court for his political ambition or economic powers but for the South Court most devotedly. But his followers who entered their names in Nyoirinji Temple<sup>41</sup> didn't intend to die for the Emperor against his attitude. Especially, those who were not his family but fought desperately until last were that; in the Battle in *Abeno*<sup>42</sup> on November 26th of the coldest season, he helped 500 enemies who fell into the river from the Watanabe Bridge<sup>43</sup> and were drowned and gave armors for horses. They were deeply moved by his caliber as a general and got his followers<sup>44</sup>. –Even loyal souls in *Minatogawa* or *Shijōnawate* were like this. We want to listen to who were really faithful to the Imperial Household among ancestors of today's 45 million people except for these a few—the very a few exceptions.

The fact is like this. Both those who defended the Imperial Household from its side and those who attacked the Imperial Household did those not to be loyalists toward the Imperial Household either to be traitors. Those were results of loyalty in near side that they were very faithful to each master. It was Tokugawa Nariaki<sup>45</sup> who expressed this

---

<sup>40</sup> He was a general in the Nambokuchou era (?-1351). He served under Ashikaga Takauji as a vice-minister in Muromachi Shogunate.

He distinguished himself in war many times but after he got to confront with Ashikaga Tadayoshi, a younger brother and was killed by conspirators of Uesugi Yoshinori.

In *Taiheiki*, he was described that he often acted rudely and made light of the Court.

<sup>41</sup> Nyoirinji Temple is a temple of the *Jodo* Sect of Buddhism in *Yoshino* which was built at the Emperor *Godaigo*'s behest.

It is said that before Masatsura took the field of *Shijōnawate*, he stopped at Nyoirinji Temple and wrote a poem on its wall (and he died in *Shijōnawate*).

<sup>42</sup> In the Battle in *Abeno* (a district of today's *Osaka* Prefecture), Masatsura fought with defeated the army of the North Court.

This date is based on the old calendar, so it is equal to the end of December.

<sup>43</sup> *Watanabe* is a name of a place the mouth of *Yodogawa* River in *Osaka*. In Nambokuchou era, this place often got a battlefield.

<sup>44</sup> This episode was written in the 25th volume of *Taiheiki*.

<sup>45</sup> He was a Daimyō in *Mito* Han and the father of the last *Shogun* Tokugawa Yoshinobu (1800-1860). He carried

point most clearly, who was one of noble class when the theory of Reverence for the Emperor got to be advocated. He said: if you people intend to repay *Amaterasu Ōmikami* for her favor and intend to be faithful to the Court or the Emperor at once ignoring your direct masters or fathers by mistake, you cannot escape a crime of treason conversely<sup>46</sup>.

It was natural that he required his subjects like this as noble class. And monarchs of class states until Meiji Restoration from the ancient times and the medieval times had consistently been masters or fathers before they subjects' noses like these. Without they left these 'masters or fathers before they subjects' noses' out, there was not true loyalty or filial piety. The moral of filial piety is not produced between those who don't have a blood relation or a special relation being equal to it. Like that, the moral of loyalty is not produced between people exist as one's possessions under others' ownership or there is an economic subordinate relation, either.

So, seeing the most praiseworthy and ideal loyalists such as *Akō Roushi*<sup>47</sup>, why they were loyal was because they were put under an economic subordinate relation to noble class of masters or fathers before they subjects' noses who Nariaki said. Once in *Akō Castle*, they stormed that they engaged the army of the Shogunate and died in the castle<sup>48</sup>; but it would be a crime of treason conversely for them, like Nariaki said, to ignore masters or fathers before their noses and to be loyalists toward the Shogunate or the Court. So, why 300 people in *Minatogawa* followed to the grave for Masashige of the master or the father before their noses, and 800 people and a few thousand people afterwards followed to the grave for Takatoki of the master or the father before their nose were because they were put an economic subordinate relation to noble class of masters or fathers before their noses. It was inconceivable for those who followed to their masters' graves whom swore to be faithful to their masters to ignore masters or fathers before their noses and to commit a crime of treason that they got loyalists

---

out various political reforms and assisted politics of the Shogunate. But he confronted with Ii Naosuke over the inheritor of the *Shogun* and was punished to place under house arrest.

He was famous that he respected the Imperial Household based on Neo-Confucianism and was a strong exclusionist.

<sup>46</sup> In 1834, when he returned to his country for the first time, he showed his subjects the point of reforms. At the beginning of his remark, he mentioned this.

In this connection, he referred to not only *Amaterasu Ōmikami* but also *Tōshōgū* (Tokugawa Ieyasu).

<sup>47</sup> They were 47 samurais in *Akō Han* (a region in the Southern west of today's *Hyōgo Prefecture*).

In 1701, their master Asano Naganori attacked Kira Yoshinaka with his sword in the passageway of Edo Castle (it is said that he attacked Yoshinaka because he was made trouble by Yoshinaka but the truth is not clear). The Fifth Shogun Tsunayoshi got enraged because the affair happened when the Imperial envoys came to the Edo Castle, and he ordered him ritual suicide on the same day and confiscated his feudal estate.

Asano's subjects requested the Shogunate to punish Yoshinaka because he was also wrong but the Shogunate didn't punish him. So, Asano's subjects planned to assassinate Yoshinaka to pay his mortification, and they attacked the Yoshinaka's mansion, and did it in 1702.

<sup>48</sup> It meant that they intended to rebel the Shogunate.



toward the Shogunate or the Court. –Loyalty and filial piety to masters or fathers before their noses was the key in the age of class states.

At that time the Imperial Household migrated into Japan, the Emperor and *Amaterasu Ōmikami* were the objects of loyalty and filial piety as masters or fathers before they subjects' noses in limited family groups and regions. However, after the society evolved, the population increased, branch families that were from the same family line got great families, and got powerful in the Court, or got many powerful families and got to expand other regions, innumerable masters or fathers before they subjects' noses formed noble class. They were aware that they were the same family lines with the Imperial Household, made a view of equality toward the Emperors; they led those who were subordinate to them by loyalty and filial piety and became traitors. Many of these masters or fathers before they subjects' noses decided their own attitudes from economic independence by plunder of lands for their absolute freedom. Because of a principle of blood superiority, loyalty, and filial piety in the age of imitating morals, they belonged to Genji, Heike, Houhou, or Ashikaga Family, or the Imperial Household; others didn't belong to anybody and were independent, or belonged to independent feudal lords, Toyotomi, Tokugawa, or their subjects and formed class states in the medieval times of aristocratic countries. So, the general public who obeyed those noble class had no choice but to obey masters or fathers before their noses like satellites rounded the planets. And they got consistent traitors against the Imperial Household that did not have a few lands and weak court nobles.

So, we declare this: those who regarded the Imperial Household as masters or fathers before their noses and were faithful to it were only court nobles who were subordinate to it economically, that is, ancestors of today's the nobility), and all of Japanese race were subordinate to noble class and got traitors against the Imperial Household. And Japanese race were traitors against the Imperial Household in almost all Japanese history because a sign appearing nobles had existed since the first that history had gotten to be written. –This is the heliocentric system against the geocentric system of the Roman Pope. Let us repeat a declaration again: Japanese race persecuted the Imperial Household because they worshiped their own family lines by a principle of blood superiority, and attacked the Imperial Household because they regarded loyalty and filial piety as the supreme virtue by a principle of loyalty and filial piety. The presupposition that people valued a principle of blood superiority was the truth in all races through the ancient and medieval times but it is entirely fault to conclude that people had helped an unbroken line of the Imperial Household in Japanese history. The presupposition that people valued a principle of loyalty and filial piety was the truth in

all races through the ancient and medieval times but it is clearly fault to conclude that people had followed an unbroken line of the Imperial Household in Japanese history for 2,500 years. We must wake up from the quickly the geocentric system of the Roman Pope immediately.

Anyway, the problem of a hammer which we commented that it strikes brains of Japanese people from the side and makes their intelligence inferior: if you say that all of Japanese race were traitors against the Imperial Household, why the family line of the Emperor can be an unbroken line?