

THE
KYOTO UNIVERSITY
ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMORIAS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
AT THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, 1962

Whole No. 73

CONTENTS

Geography, Capitalism, and

World War II

KYUSHI MATSUI

Condition of the Japanese

Politeconomy

MASAKO ICHIE

Two Kinds of Fund Formation by Heine Kawakami

NAO DEGUCHI

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY
SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

TWO KINDS OF TRUTH CONCEIVED BY HAJIME KAWAKAMI

— AN ANALYSIS OF “A STORY OF POVERTY” —

By Yuzo DEGUCHI*

Contents

- I. Scientific truth and religious truth conceived by Hajime Kawakami.
- II. The way the problem is presented in “A Story of Poverty”
- III. The way the problem is answered.
- IV. The relation between economy (as a kind of social experience), thought & ethics and religion.

I. Scientific Truth and Religious Truth conceived by Hajime Kawakami

Hajime Kawakami (1879-1946) was a socialist thinker in Japan, and by his literary talent was one of the distinguished Marxist philosophers who have propagated Marxist thought in our country. In his youth, he became famous as a journalist and, since he kept a chair at the faculty of economics in Kyoto University, he developed his humanist economic thought. He wrote in 1916 “*A Story of Poverty*” for *Asahi Shimbun*, a newspaper, which gained public favour. In this work, he showed himself to be becoming a socialist economist, and after the first World War, he came nearer to Marxist philosophy. When the students of Kyoto University acted as members of Communist Party, he was compelled to resign his post in 1928. In 1932, he became a member of Japan Communist Party. He was captured in the next year and was sentenced to five years’ imprisonment. He was released from prison in 1937, after that time he lived a life of hermitage in Kyoto.

It is well known that Hajime Kawakami in his later years mentioned that there were two kinds of truth i. e., religious truth and scientific truth and, that he called himself “an unusual Marxist” with his acceptance of these two kinds of truth.

He called himself “an unusual Marxist” because Marxists are commonly convinced that no truth could be found in religion, instead everything ap-

* Professor of Economics, Kyoto University.

pears upside down when one sees through religion. Nevertheless Kawakami held an unshakable belief that these two kinds of truth were compatible. As regards this compatibility he wrote in his autobiography as follows:

“My thought is just like a carriage pulled by two horses entirely different in character from each other, and has been often criticized that it is doomed to overturn”—“But in my opinion this carriage and pair has never been overturned.”¹⁾ In fact Kawakami was even proud of being “a materialist persisting in the existence of religious truth” and “a Marxist insisting the existence of a certain truth in the core of the existing religion” though he admitted that “it was concealed under the thick layers of various false elements surrounding it.”²⁾

It is possible to deal with Kawakami either as an economist or as a social thinker. When we think of Kawakami merely as an economist or scientist, his recognition, conviction or his pride as to the existence of these two kinds of truth can not be brought on our discussion but the importance is to scrutinize how wide and deep an understanding he had in the scientific truth and to analyse what was the characteristic of his intellect that led him to such understanding. But, when we study Kawakami as a social thinker, it is not enough to appreciate him only as an economist but we have also to see what was his universal cognition regarding men, society and history and to find out what was the personality of Kawakami who conceived such cognition. We further have to observe his attitude toward various social problems and to study carefully how was he prepared to cope with the transition of society. When we analyse these, the spirit that dwelt in the innermost depths of his personality springs up to forefront clearly revealing itself. We can only then find out how his spiritual self dealt with the realities of life. It must be in such philosophical problem that Kawakami as a so-called “wisdom-seeker” is to be discussed.

In other words, a mere assertion that there are two kinds of truth, scientific and religious will never lead us to find out an answer to the question. Instead, only when the relation between the two is clarified and how these two truths are construed is made known, we may resolve the problem.

Kawakami himself had naturally had his own view as to the relation between the two. To summarize it, he said that the scientific truth dealt with “external world” while the religious truth concerned itself with the “spirit of internal world” and that one should always bear it in mind that “these two kinds of truth had clearly its own specific domain to

1) Hajime Kawakami, “*Autobiography*” Vol. V. (1952) pp. 154, 157

2) *ibid.* p 157

govern.”¹⁾ The details will be presented later, but what I wish to point out here is that this conviction of Kawakami constitutes an inherent as well as a fundamental factor that can be traced back to the origin of his thoughts.²⁾ Therefore, to analyse the life of Kawakami with our eyes focused on this point will certainly be worthy as one of the basic subjects in the study of his thoughts. In this connection, I take up here one of his masterpieces entitled “*A Story of Poverty*”, a classic book in the history of economic theories in Japan, in order to examine the way he presented the problem and appreciate his efforts paid for its solution and to make a certain comment on the conclusion that he himself had reached in this book.

II. The way the problem is presented in “*A Story of Poverty*”

“*A Story of Poverty*” appeared in the Asahi Newspaper intermittently from Sept. 12 till Dec. 20, 1916. His contribution to the paper was made in 54 instalments. The story comprised 3 chapters, and the subjects treated in each chapter, the number of instalments, and days required for the printing of each chapter are as follows:

First Chapter: Subject—“How many are suffering from poverty?”

Appearing in 16 days divided into Section 1-1 to 4-2, from Sept. 12 till Oct. 3.

Second Chapter: “Why so many are suffering from poverty?”

10 days, section 5-1 to 7-4, from Oct. 4 to Oct. 20.

Last Chapter: “How can we put an end to poverty?”

28 days, Section 8-1 to 13-3, from Nov. 11 to Dec. 26.

During the above period, the story did not appear on the paper for 52 days in total, i. e., 6 days (3 from Sept. 20 to 23 and Sept. 27 and Sept. 29) for the printing of 1st Chapter; 7 days (from Oct. 6 to 12) in the printing of 2nd Chapter; and 21 days of intermission after the end of 2nd Chapter until the beginning of the last Chapter, that is, from Oct. 20 till Nov. 11. In the printing of the Chapter, there were intermissions of 2 days (from Nov. 11), 5 days (from Nov. 17 to 21), 6 days (from Nov. 23 to 28), 5 days (from Dec. 3) and 3 days (from Dec. 15 to 17), totaling 18 days. Thus the days when the story did not appear on the paper were 52 days in total.

1) For example, “On Religious Truth and Religion”, “*Diaries in prison*” II (1953), p. 241.

2) We can trace the origin in the end of 1905, when Hajime Kawakami began to face the problem of “science vs. religion”. It was then that he suddenly quit writing his book “*A Critique on Socialism*” and confined himself into “Mugaen” or “A Cottage of Self-renunciation”. The detailed account is given in his “*Autobiography*” Vol. V, in the chapter entitled “Crossing the Death Line”

The reason why such intermission took place may be either due to the subjective circumstances of the author or to the objective circumstances on the part of newspaper editors. But when an author has to postpone his contribution against his will, he will customarily write an apology to the readers. Kawakami, being an honest and ready writer, would not have ignored such custom, and it can be expected to find some lines of apology affixed to his writing after interruptions.

With such conjecture, I examined particularly his articles of the days when he contributed his writing after an interval. The affixed lines which are supposed to be his message of apologies are found in the section 5-3 of October 13 which was started after 7 days of interval and in the section 8-1, of Nov. 11, which is written in lucid style, after 21 days of long intermission. For other sections, however, I could find no apology. I will comment later as to the way he apologizes and his points of argument in the story which appeared before and after such intervals because they are presenting important clue to the comprehension of the contents of his book. Here I merely call the attention of the readers to the fact.

Now, Kawakami presents his theme as follows:

He confirms how extensively the poverty exists in England and U. S. A. and citing Takuboku's famous sonnet,¹⁾ expresses his belief that poverty is the "most serious social disease in 20th century". Then making long quotations from "*Theory of Moral Sentiments*" of Adam Smith as well as from the "*Tales of Zen-Buddhism*" of Eiso Mamiya, he says that, because these words seem to be contradictory to his own belief, he must examine it.²⁾ Kawakami mentions in this connection that the poverty meant by Mamiya is "voluntary poverty" or "noble poverty", while the poverty in economic sense as discussed in his book is the "poverty imposed upon the people against their will."³⁾

Now, is such distinction consistently maintained through all the chapters of "*A Story of Poverty*"? Yes, it is in a sense. However if it is viewed from another aspect, the line of demarcation between the two gets blurred. The details will be given later, but here, I just wish to point out that such ambiguity has been caused by the unconscious intervention of ethical and

1) Takuboku Ishikawa (1885-1912) is a famous poet in modern Japan. The sonnet that Kawakami cites here runs as follows,

Working hard day and night,
I can't be well off.
I draw a long breath,
Gazing at my hands in grief.

2) "*A Story of Poverty*" (Iwanami Bunko Edition) 35-37 pages.

3) *ibid.* p. 39.

religious judgement in economic affairs.

Another point I wish to check here is if it is right when Kawakami assumed that there was something in common between the thoughts of Adam Smith and that implied by Mamiya, a Zen-buddhist. The meaning of the fable, taken from Mamiya's book,¹⁾ may be summarized thus: Once upon a time, a beggar and his son lived under the girder of Gojo Bridge of Kyoto. One day they saw an unusual scene. A samurai (or feudal warrior) met with a merchant on the Gojo Bridge. As the merchant came walking right toward him, he could not help talking to the merchant. Then, the samurai sat down on the bridge and with his head bowing deep, apologized to the merchant for the overdue repayment of his debts. The arrogant merchant won't take heed of what the warrior wanted to say. He showed an obviously contemptible attitude to the samurai. Watching this scene so disgraceful to the samurai status, the beggar's son said to himself: "How happy am I now that the beggar status can be entirely free from such a disgrace! We can enjoy a carefree life." Hearing these words of his son, the father instructed the son, saying "Don't forget that it is to me that you owe your happy life."

Now the paragraph taken from "*The Theory of moral Sentiments*" runs as follows. "In ease of body and peace of mind, all the different ranks of life are nearly upon a level, and the beggar, who suns himself by the side of the highway, possesses that security which kings are fighting for."²⁾ The gist of the paragraph is roughly as follows:

While utility is one of the principal sources of beauty, its appearance arouses people's desire by stirring up one's imagination and thus inspires diligence. It is this deception that nature constantly stimulates men to keep them in the state of diligence. Thanks to such deception, people work hard for economic, political and scholastic achievements. The rich who tries hard to satisfy "their vain and insatiable desires" after all comes to share their wealth with the poor. "They are led by an invisible hand to make nearly the same distribution of the necessaries of life which would have been made had the earth been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants; and thus, without intending it, without knowing it, advance the interest of the society, and afford means to the multiplication of the species."³⁾ Thus Smith revealed his optimistic view of the civil society of his time.

What does this juxtaposition of Occidental and Oriental thoughts, made

1) "Zen-Kai-ichi-ran"

2) *ibid.* p. 38, Adam Smith, "*The Theory of Moral Sentiments*" Book IV, Chap. I. (Japanese Reprint 1958, p. 212)

3) Adam Smith, *ibidem.*

by Kawakami mean? In the first place, I must point out that, while introducing Occidental thoughts and Western social science into Japan, he had never forgotten to think of the facts and ideas of his country and the Orient. It is very instructive to note such attitude of Kawakami, because Japanese economists to-day are not sufficiently conscious of it.

However, what is of no less importance is that such juxtaposition of Occidental and Oriental thoughts should be made with proper care and only with scrupulous consideration given thereto according to its objective.

Now, what can we find from the comparison of the said quotations from Adam Smith and the Zen priest? There is a common approach to life between the two, in that both are backed by the religious state of mind. The discourse of Zen-Buddhist emphasizes that the status of calm resignation which will be finally attained through self-enlightenment will not be perturbed by a social environment like poverty, while in case of Smith, his belief is noticeable that "nature" realizes a scheduled harmony overruling all human prudence and discretions and so-called natural religion lies behind his expressions.

However, this common characteristic between the two may lose its community when they are taken up as expressions of *thought* or *ethics*.

Not a few point out that when natural religion is expressed as thought, it turns out to be Deism which supports Smith's image of society. I choose "deception of nature" to denote this thought by parodying the expression used by Smith in the above citation. Ever since Mandeville the contradiction between the subjective motive of one's social behaviour and his objective role played by such behavior for social harmony has been continuously pointed out, and one side of the dialectic structure of modern civil society is here discussed. Smith was presumably conscious of the dialectic structure of modern civil society. But could we find such consciousness in the discourse of the Zen priest? Certainly not. Mamiya has no understanding of modern society and the way he combines economy and religion is through a medium of feudal ethics. It is through such ethics that a beggar, when he faces an incident in which feudal ethics is overruled, may forget his dissatisfaction of daily life and immerse himself in religious ecstasy. It must be noted here that the gate to religious ecstasy is opened through a denial of feudal ethics, and therefore that the ethics is serving as medium in a passive form between religion and economy.

Next, one must pay attention to the fact that whether or not one has a modern social consciousness has bearing upon whether or not he has modern historical consciousness. Many of our readers must have already noticed that what I called "deception of nature" has much to do with what

Hegel called "cunning of Reason". Needless to say that what Smith called "natural process" of history means a "natural progress" to be achieved by rational proceeding of affairs but he admits that in "actual process" such progress, influenced by human ignorance and injustice, had been retarded and sometimes even reversed. Smith thus distinguished natural process from actual process, but what is noteworthy here is that he believed that the one was, in a long run, not very different from the other. Here we see an example of direct unity of "reality" (human conduct) and "what should be" (providence) in Smith's naturalistic thought and thus it is to be regretted that, in spite of his paradoxical expression of "deception", he failed to thoroughly comprehend the dialectic interpretation of history as it is seen in Hegel's "cunning of Reason".¹⁾ However we can clearly observe that Smith had modern historical consciousness.

How about in the case of Zen discourse? Even apart from its expression taking the form of fable, we can not even sense the existence of modern historical consciousness neither in the beggar nor in the author.

In spite of the religious feeling common to them, there is a marked difference between the two in their historical consciousness.

When Kawakami made citation of these two, it is obvious that he was predominated by the afore-said identity of religious feeling of the two but was not fully cognizant of their difference, because Kawakami mentioned nothing about their social or historical consciousness.

While discussing about social thoughts and social science, he overlooked the said difference that should be taken into consideration whenever one deals with religious problem. This entails a serious question as to the conclusion of his "*A Story of Poverty*".

III. The way the problem is answered

"*A Story of Poverty*", in its 1st chapter, tries empirically to confirm the fact of poverty, then in the 2nd chapter, Kawakami inquires into the causes of poverty and attributes it to production (Oct. 20)²⁾. Up to here the story unfolds itself smoothly except one relatively long interruption. However, as it is pointed out above, when the story moved forward into the last chapter, the author took a long pause of 3 weeks, and on Nov. 11, when he picked up his pen anew, Kawakami wrote the following remarks to start with.

1) G. Lukács point out the relation between Smith's social thought and Hegel's dialectic thought, cf; G. Lukács, "*Der junge Hegel*"

2) *A Story of Poverty*, (Iwanami Bunko Edition) pp, 86-91. The suffixed date is the day when the article appeared in the newspaper *Asahi*.

“Autumnal tints are now in all their glory and it is the best season for reading. But the writer feels recently very languid to write. This story has been suspended for already 2-3 weeks, and though I have managed to start writing again, I feel as if I am a dull horse driven by whipping to climb a steep slope”.¹⁾

I have no knowledge about his health condition in the latter part of October 1916. Probably his health might have been broken due to overwork. But it could also be quite possible that his thinking was stifled then and he fell into a state of anguish as to how to develop his story. Now, Kawakami frequently compared scientific career or even general human affairs to a journey.²⁾ Prior to his said account, when he resumed his pen after taking an interval of a week, he apologized his suspension to the readers and added “I will quietly walk through over the slope.” Here he must have compared his descriptive difficulty to a slope, but I suspect that his expression “steep slope” as used in the above citation meant a difficulty in the development of his reasoning. Since the highlight of this story was the last chapter, where he discussed how to eradicate poverty, the author must have taken up the pen with much enthusiasm but presumably he could not hit upon good ideas when he resumed writing after a long pause, the pen ran slow and the text unusually shows a sign of stagnation of his thought.

Discussing the basic countermeasures against poverty, he pointed out 3 policies, (1) abolition of luxury (2) social welfare policy, and (3) nationalism or socialism. In elaborating upon these measures, he discussed first the item (3), then (2) and discussed (1) last.

I will not referring here to the details of his explanation. But what I would like to stress is that Kawakami, due to the lack of his understanding of modern society and history—on which I touched upon before—was led to his conclusion.

In the end of the 2nd chapter, Kawakami presents his theory on

1) *Ibid.* p. 68.

2) *Ibid.* p. 68. Kawakami often compared himself to a wayfarer. For instance, read these wakas (waka is 31-syllable Japanese poem).

Hardly have I recovered,
From fatigue of a long journey,
I will set out to-day,
On a new travel.

(This poem was written on the day of Kawakami's joining Japan Communist Party.)

I have reached the mountain-top at last,
I look back and find,
Hills and rivers lie far beyond.
How many of them have I passed over!

machinery, in which he states that the productive power of machinery is "remaining oppressed to display its full strength" in the present social system and that the "reason why the goods necessary for the eradication of poverty could not be abundantly produced is that the productive powers of the society are used to the production of luxuries", and he concludes that "this is the principal cause inherent to the current economic structure of society where so many people in the civilized countries are still suffering from poverty".¹⁾

Obviously he was trying to locate the cause of poverty in the sphere of production, and he was right in that he found the origin of poverty in the relation between productive powers and productive relations. We can perceive here his access to the Marxian theory. But question was how far and deep he understood the same. In other words, he was clearly aware of the modernity of productive powers, but as to productive relations, his comprehension was not necessarily sufficient. It seems to me that he failed to clearly understand the modern nature of capital, because, when Kawakami used such expressions that "the structure of present society is perfectly convenient for the rich", "but wretched are those who do not have money",²⁾ he obviously identified wealth as money in general and not as money capital, as a form of modern capital.

Due to the lack of correct understanding of the inherent nature of modern capitalism which comes from his lack of historical consciousness—he could not find the cause of poverty in the historical perspective of the development in productive relations. Therefore though he tried to find the cause of poverty in the socio-economic structure, he could not correctly grasp the ownership of productive means, and consequently he ended up with finding the primary cause of poverty in that the advanced productive powers remain unutilized and productive means were used not for the production of necessities but for luxuries and as the result the poor suffered from scanty supply of necessities of life.

No one can deny that partiality in the production of consumer goods certainly constitutes one of the factors of causing poverty but it is not specific to modern capitalism. What makes the production of modern capitalism distinctive is to be found in the production of productive goods, and Kawakami should have found out a structural cause of poverty in this field. But he was not able to sufficiently analyse the system in this sector and he, as an economist, must have been discontent with his critique of modern capitalism. Thus with his dissatisfaction at heart he had to find his con-

1) *Ibid.* p. 79, pp. 87-8.

2) *Ibid.* pp. 96-7.

tentment somewhere else. Where then? He directed his efforts to find it in the critique of subjective conditions of the classical economics as well as in the explanation of his 1st policy mentioned above, where he tried to find out the means of eradicating poverty in the alteration of subjective state of mind.

As stated above, Kawakami after confessing his view that identifies capital with money, proceeded to criticize the classical economic theory centering around *homo-economicus* with poignant words saying that the starting point of the classical economics was very plaintive.¹⁾

Here he proved himself having no sufficient grasp of the paradox of Mandeville nor of "deception of nature" of Adam Smith. All that we can see is his outright judgement from religious or moral point of view.

With such an idealistic conclusion drawn by himself, Kawakami set his direction for the eradication of poverty, and yet his scholarly attainments in economics did not allow him to push ahead his argument along his set direction. Thus he realized it incumbent upon him to discuss first on his objective countermeasures, such as social policy (policy No. 2) and Socialism (policy No. 3). However, now that Kawakami had indicated his direction toward solution to the problem,²⁾ he was probably neither interested in getting too deep into these objective countermeasures. It may also be readily understood that, even if he did get into the discussion of such objective measures, his explanation must have had its limitation anyway, due to the lack of proper understanding on modern capitalism.

He did not touch upon social welfare policy in detail, and, while regarding socialism or "nationalism", he introduced the so-called Marxian "formula" of materialistic interpretation of history, but he did not show much willingness to analyse the formula, and instead he substituted it for the ethics of Confucianism by claiming that there was "a philosophy in the Orient similar to that conceived by Marx"³⁾ and eventually he stated that the reformation of individual is more important than the improvement of economic system, or, if possible, he wanted to see to it that both would be

1) *Ibid.* p. 99

After translating the later part of "morale" of "*Fable of the Bees*", Kawakami says "this piece of poor poem became later a seed from which grew the fundamental thought of the orthodox economic school. This is a very poor start but the inherent character of economics is, frankly speaking, something like this."

2) Kawakami later confessed, "one of my objectives was to appeal to the rich to control their self-interests as far as possible." *Ibid.* pp. 138-9.

3) "I am not intending to do here a complicated task of making comment on Marx's points of argument. However, fortunately, since there is an ancient thought handed down to us in the Orient similar to his economic interpretation of society, I can proceed with my citing the words of ancient wisemen that are familiar to our ears." He then cited two sentences each from the *Analects of Confucius* and the *Discourses of Mencius*. *Ibid.* p. 127.

materialized, so saying, he defended his own standing.

By concluding like above, he thought he had answered the most thorny question of his story.

At the beginning of the article of Nov. 13, touching briefly upon ripening of autumn, he wrote "I know from the beginning that I was tackling a job beyond my ability but I have at last treaded through the hilly path up to this point taking many pauses. It was as if a lean horse carrying a heavy load on his back was climbing up a slope. Now I have crossed the mountain pass. From now on, I would take a short cut to hurry down the hill."¹⁾ We can read between the lines the relief he must have had, surmounting the crux that challenged his thought and his animated feeling looking forward to making successful elaboration of his standing thus concluded.

The subsequent 10 articles are devoted for the presentation of his demand to the rich for restraining the luxuries and introducing ethical rules concerning the conformity of economy with moral, and in the end he cited the famous paragraph of the opening chapter of "*Ta Hsueh*" an Old Chinese Classics.²⁾ Thus the "*A Story of Poverty*" which started with the presentation of positive evidence of the existence of poverty ended with an economic ethics inspired by Oriental thought in ancient times.

The solution to which he thought he finally found his way was not necessarily a satisfactory answer for Kawakami, an economist, in view of the fact that, three years later when Kawakami once again presented this story to the public, he obliterated the last chapter.³⁾ And it is readily understood for us too when we analyse the contents of the said chapter, why he did so. However, what I am trying to do in this paper is not to discuss on his solution in detail within the domain of economics but to question how Kawakami grasped and was conscious of the relation between scientific

1) Ibid, p. 133.

2) Since I think the foreigners do not know about "*Ta Hsueh*," I will cite the sentence here. "Those who want to see the ancient virtues universally practised, should before that, see their country well governed, and those who want to see their country well governed should, before that, put their homes in order. Those who want to put their homes in order should first of all discipline themselves. Home can be put in good order only when they discipline themselves; the country can be well governed only when the home is kept in good order; and the world enjoys the peace only after the country is well governed. From the Emperor down to the commoner, the basis of wisdom is the same. That is, everybody should discipline himself first of all. If the basis is shaken, nothing could be expected at the end." Kawakami took Prof. Koji Ishikawa, who was then his student, to Tenryuji Temple in Saga in the suburbs of Kyoto to listen to the lecture of Eiso Mamiya. At that lecture, "*Ta Hsueh*" was used as text. We suppose that Kawakami conceived his conclusion of "*A story of Poverty*" while listening to Mamiya's lectures.

3) In 1918, Kawakami published a revised edition of, "*Views on Social Problems*, where he obliterated the last chapter of "*A Story of Poverty*,".

truth of economics on the one hand and religious truth on the other.


IV. Economy (as a kind of Social Experiences), Thought & Ethics and Religion.

Kawakami had a sharp sense as to the nature of economics as an empirical science, in particular, regarding its positive nature, and yet there is a room for doubt as to whether or not his sense was always entirely right, and in some respects he did not sufficiently realize his gap existed between his scientific research and social practice.¹⁾ The same holds true in "*A Story of Poverty*", and in this story, Kawakami probably thought that *the religious truth and empiric-scientific truth were directly linked*. This can be explained by the fact that, while in a way he found objective solution for the eradication of poverty—that was, in his expression, external truth—, Kawakami, still unsatisfied with that, tried to discover a more profound truth in a subjective solution through the search into internal truth.

One would then say, "Since the economics is introduced here, he can not claim that the scientific truth and religious truth are directly linked." Yes, it is true that the economic ethics is expounded, but what we should retrospect is that, in Confucianism, religion and ethics are blended without having distinction, and in the case of Kawakami too, religion and ethics were tried to be linked with economy with no theoretical distinction between them. If one still insists that ethics was introduced in between religion and economy, such person should realize, together with me, that this very thing is indeed the methods that combine religion with economy.


The religion and economy (in general expression, social experiences) cannot be directly linked without any mediums. There are, however, two things which can serve as such mediums, one is *ethics* and the other *thought*. In other words, the problem can be tri-dimensionally explained as indicated below :

1) Readers of Kawakami's "*Diaries in Prison*" find it very impressive when he bitterly criticized therein Ryokichi Yamamoto's lack of understanding on the empirical science and lost his temper even twice. (p. 248 and p. 166) It was not only Ryokichi Yamamoto but also many others who were called thinkers and did not understand well the inherent nature of social science, and in this sense, Kawakami's cognition on this point is precious. However, as to his way of turning back the results of the rational thinking to the sensitive world, or to social practice, he cannot escape from the criticism of being too impatient. He said "I was determined to make propaganda of socialism as much as possible making the best use of the position of an university professor" at the time of publication of "*Studies on Social Problems*". ("*Memories*" p. 212) That is one example. There remain a room of criticism on that the scholar of economics combines the way of returning the results of reasoning to the sensitive world directly with the social practice. It is by no means from Weber's standing of "Freedom of evaluation" that I say so. But it is not simple in case of social science to trace the path between conclusions of empirical science and social practice.



Religion, on one hand, reaches social experiences *via* thought, as the same is found in the above-cited Smith's words where he states that Christianity is liked with economic life of European citizens in the form of Deism. However, on the other hand, religion reaches social experiences through ethics. Although Kawakami was in lack of sufficient consciousness, he used ethics as medium to combine Buddhism or Confucianism with economy, while Max Weber combined Protestantism with European bourgeoisies' daily experiences by way of Ethos. Ethics and thoughts are considered as two things on the same dimension of the medium, but so far as social experiences are concerned, ethics or in more simple words, customs that rule social life play a role stronger than thought.

Social science as an empirical science comes into existence when social life is systematised by abstract reasonings and is brought to conceptional order. In this case, the said three dimensions and their corresponding human faculties are to be what is indicated as follows :



Intellectual faculty is satisfied with cognition of social science while personality and spirit become contented with taking possession of ethics and thought ; and soul comes to be in peace when it cherishes religion. In this case, since the social science is a product of intellectual faculty, both ethics & thoughts and religion have to face the action of intellectual faculty in stronger degree and thereby the dimension of religion approaches the science of religion or theology, while as to the dimension of ethics and thought, thought comes to take a greater role than ethics.

For instance, when Kawakami asked himself which of egoism or altruism is the foundation of economic activity, he was thinking it by putting ethics close to thought.

Now, when we study the two kinds of truth in "*A Story of Poverty*" by these illustrations, our attention is drawn to the following two points.

In the first place, Kawakami did not give a proper position to the dimension of ethics and thought. This is probably because he could not realize the existence of intermediary dimension as a specific domain since

in the Oriental culture (here the word "culture" is used as including thought and religion), perhaps, as stated above concerning Confucianism, *religion and ethics remained undistinguished* and, empirical science being not yet independent, *science and thought were always in nebulous state*, whereas in case of European thoughts, as cited from Smith' Deism, or (if atheism could be proved in Smith's thought) an atheism which is abstracted from religion of personal God is believed to act as medium between Christianity and the sense of social science of European modern citizens. On the other hand, Max Weber tried to prove that in the formation of the European modern bourgeois society, the ethos that derived from the faith of Protestantism acted as a medium between the daily life and religion. In these two cases intermediary, dimension between the social experiences and religion was definitely presented. Thank to such clear-cut recognition, the horizon of science and that of religion have been clearly distinguished in Europe which was, however, missed by Oriental thought.

Thus, because of the ambiguity remained between the scientific truth and religious truth, science and religion came to be directly linked. To the case of "*A Story of Poverty*", too, this relation between science and religion could be applicable and this attitude was kept unchanged until Kawakami's later years.

Secondly, from our examination made above, we come to notice a moral to Japanese people that relates to the practical problem on the relation between thought and ethics that are supposed to be on the dimension of personality or spirit. Since thought is primarily the product of intellectual faculty, it achieves so-called "progress" in its typical form, while ethics that is to be much influenced by emotion has a strong tendency to be stagnant and get rigid. Therefore, although both of them are on the same dimension, they sometimes lose balance. It seems therefore that in Europe until recently, in order to recover such balance, the progress of intelligence tried to be critical on ethics on each stage of development and established new ethics, while in Oriental society, the advanced thought lacked in the practical effort to criticize the traditional ethics and reform the same, or, at least made such effort insufficiently. Therefore, in the society and also in the inner life of each individual, the unbalance between thought and ethics remained uncorrected and sometimes the traditional ethics and progressive thought co-existed in a peculiar way.

There are many instances that he who is regarded as a first class social scientist is sometimes feudalistic in his family life; a thinker who claims to be a materialist is sometimes a simple idealist in his actual life. The gap between the intellectuals and the common people may remain as it is or be

further widened rather than to be narrowed, for instance, by the fact that the former writes the book such as "Iwanami Shinsho" (a pocket size series of intellectual books). The moral to be observed by Japanese should therefore be heightened by realizing the two-way permeation of thought and ethics as shown by the two opposite arrows in the preceding schema, with new intelligence inspired into ethos and by enriching thought with sensible substance so that it can well find its way into daily life.

This is the conclusion that I reached through my search into the relation of two kinds of truth expressed in Kawakami's "*A Story of Poverty*".

N. B. This article is what is elaborated on my lecture made at Kyoto University on June 3, 1962 on the occasion of Kawakami Festival.