

Kyoto University Economic Review

MEMOIRS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

VOLUME XV

1940

京都大学
経済学部

2001239

図書

PUBLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF ECONOMICS IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS IN THE IMPERIAL
UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

VOLUME XV

(July 1940)

NUMBER 3

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE EAST ASIAN SYNTHESIS

By KICHIHIKO TANIGUCHI

CONTENTS :

- I The Concept of the New Order in East Asia.
- II The Basic Principles of the East Asian Synthesis.
- III The Creation of the Cultural Synthesis.
- IV The Creation of the Political Synthesis.
- V The Creation of the Economic Synthesis.

I. THE CONCEPT OF THE NEW ORDER IN EAST ASIA

Japan's ultimate aim in connection with the present China Affair consists in the establishment of the "new order" in East Asia. What is the nature of this order and what are the basic principles upon which it should be established? These are fundamental questions that must be answered, if the desired goal is to be attained. They have not hitherto been fully answered in definite terms.

At first glance these questions appear to pose purely theoretical problems which may seem to have no direct relation to the actual project of reconstruction. It may be argued that continental resources ought to be exploited and private enterprises promoted, regardless of the nature of such basic principles, and that the present situation calls for the inauguration of active reconstruction instead of discussions of theoretical and abstract ideas. However, we do not concur in this point of view. On the contrary, we are firmly convinced that it is of paramount importance to establish a clear-cut definition of the proposed order concurrently with the present stage of its development.

Many problems that arise here at home and on the continent in conjunction with the creation of the new order must, of necessity, be solved in conformity with certain clearly defined basic principles. Otherwise, the situation would inevitably become confused owing to a lack of unity among the various phases of the project. Even if such confusion could be avoided, the situation resulting from arbitrary decisions would not be conducive to a speedy realization of our ultimate goal and the China Affair would be deprived of real significance. Thus all efforts calculated to achieve the end in view, such as the pacification of the inhabitants, the restoration of order and the establishment of the new central regime, must be directly related to certain basic principles. In the absence of such guiding principles, any errors of policy would be difficult to correct and the China Affair might well fail to attain its true goal.

It is far from true to assume, however, that the formative idea of the new order is totally absent. There already exist in the national consciousness certain ideas which, like nebulae, are yet indefinite and unsystematic and still without adequate scientific basis, but which are capable of eventually developing in a concrete form. These ideas at the present stage of development can hardly be regarded as positive concepts, but they can at least be differentiated from concepts of a conflicting or negative nature. They

may be said to resemble the desires of an infant, in that an infant can identify the object it craves, although it cannot adequately express its will.

The task by which we are confronted today is twofold, first, there is the positive task of systematising these still inchoate ideas into a homogeneous scientific concept and second, the negative task of eliminating such elements as are inimical to this concept, as a means of achieving further orientation. Since we have already made, on a previous occasion, some effort to explain this negative task, we shall in the present treatise endeavor to arrange and systematise the factors which, taken together, comprise the idea of the new order in East Asia. As a preliminary to this effort, it will be necessary to enunciate certain negative conclusions as to what these ideas are not.

1. Among the intelligentsia and the leaders of public opinion in China, there are those who claim that the present Sino-Japanese conflict is nothing more than an example of Japan's imperialistic aggression. The prevalence of such a view seems natural in a country like China, which has consistently been subjected to the imperialistic designs of the Western capitalistic powers. It may be quite possible, furthermore, that in pursuing her China-policy after the manner of Western imperialistic powers, Japan may have resorted to some practices that have invited misunderstandings on this score. In so far as the present China Affair is concerned, however, it should be emphasized that Japan does not entertain territorial ambitions nor does she desire to reserve for herself special rights and interests, a statement of policy which has been made by her Government on numerous occasions. On the contrary, she is determined to accord due respect to China's sovereignty and to assist her in the maintenance of her political independence. Therefore, Japan's intentions cannot justly be regarded in the light of imperialistic aggression designed to reduce China to the status of a colonial possession. In fact, one of the principal objects of the reconstruction consists in the recovery

of independence for China, which has already been reduced to a semi-colonial status by the various powers.

Theoretically speaking, Japan is not yet in possession of sufficient capitalistic means, viz., financial and political means, to pursue any imperialistic designs in China. And even if she were possessed of such means, their use for imperialistic designs on the continent is not compatible with the idea of establishing the new order or seeking the basis of lasting peace in East Asia. For imperialism is in reality the traditional foreign policy of the Western capitalistic powers and any attempt to follow in their foot-steps would be inimical to the construction of the new order. Even if she achieved some measure of success in such aggression, she would not only fail to establish lasting peace, but would face the danger of provoking recurrent conflicts in the future. However the idea of the new order may be defined, it should not include any imperialistic factor either in theory or practice. In attempting to solve the various problems that arise in the process of reconstruction, precautions must be taken to avoid misapprehension on this score. In short, the question as to whether Japan's present activities in China are imperialistic or not is a matter which can only be determined by her future operations, hence an adequate conception of the idea that will guide such operations and policies is a subject that requires immediate attention.

2. It is believed in certain quarters in this country that the idea of the new order is limited to the formation of the East Asian economic bloc. It is true, as we have previously pointed out elsewhere, that the international economic trend has been toward the formation of economic blocs. It is not entirely illogical, therefore, that a certain section of our people should advocate the organization of the East Asia economic bloc in line with this world-wide tendency. Furthermore, the economic bloc is an outcome of the effort to escape from the impasse of the economic order reached in the last stage of capitalism. As early as 1931 Great Britain organized the formidable British imperial bloc as a means

of protecting her capitalistic order. An economic bloc, therefore, is a product of the old economic order and lacks elements which could contribute to the growth of the proposed order envisaged by us.

Historically speaking, bloc economy emerged as a means of combating the world-wide depression that had prevailed since 1930, by promoting easy flow of commodities among the various units comprising the bloc. There appeared temporarily such types as the so-called gold bloc, but they constituted the exception rather than the rule, for bloc economy is designed primarily to promote reciprocal trade among various units within the bloc. In other words, a bloc is concerned primarily with economic affairs; its activities being limited to the exchange of commodities. The proposed new order, on the contrary, involves not only economic problems, but political considerations and cultural relationships in the widest sense of the term. Furthermore, even in its economic aspect, exchange of commodities is merely one of many problems. The supply of capital and labor, particularly the supply of technological factors, are among its more essential economic problems. Inasmuch as the establishment of the East Asian new order is concerned with practically every phase of human life, comprising political, economic, and cultural factors, the concept of the economic bloc is hardly comprehensive enough to embrace the idea of the new order in its entirety.

3. The idea of an East Asian cooperative system is also being advocated by a certain group of our people. That the Eastern nations should unite on a free and equal footing for the promotion of their common interests, is a proposal which, under the present circumstances at least, has much in common with the popular project of Sino-Japanese cooperation. Moreover, as a theory, it is not entirely without merit. The concept of cooperation, however, is primarily based upon the principles of individualism, equality and liberalism. In this respect, it connotes capitalism and belongs to the old world order. This conclusion is justified by the fact that

the rise of the concept of cooperation at the beginning of the modern era was coincident with the rise of capitalism which emerged in England in company with individualism and liberalism. Therefore, whatever our estimate of the cooperative system may be, it is certainly not compatible with the idea of the new order. There are those who wish to substitute for cooperation the idea of an Asian union or federation, but the meaning of the terms has never been clearly defined.

Were it possible to establish the East Asian cooperative system, it would remain a flimsy organization at the mercy of any change in the present situation, a release of the pressure of Western capitalism, or a conflict of mutual interests; and the danger of another Sino-Japanese conflict would probably persist. The difficulty of reconciling conflicting interests by bringing the interested parties together into an organization on an equal footing has been demonstrated by the many failures which have arisen in connection with the attempts to reconcile capital and labor. It is apparent, therefore, that lasting peace cannot be restored in East Asia merely by organizing a horizontal association of the interested powers.

It is now evident also that the idea of the new order in East Asia does not accord with such concepts as the economic bloc or the cooperative system, much less with imperialism. It is for this very reason that we propose the East Asian Synthesis.

II. THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE EAST ASIAN SYNTHESIS

The idea of the new order in East Asia is embodied in the principles of the East Asian synthesis. What, then, is the nature of this proposed order? In answer to this question, let us compare it, first of all, with a cooperative system. A cooperative system presupposes individual persons or organizations that are brought together into association on a free and

equal basis. It is a horizontal relationship organized for the common interest or the welfare of a number of independent and equal individuals. A synthesis also implies a number of independent individuals or units. It implies, in addition, however, a superstructure which synthesizes and transcends the component units. Individuals are merged and absorbed within this totality. It is, therefore, a vertical relationship of the constituents instead of a horizontal relationship as in the case of the cooperative system.

Needless to say, a synthesis establishes a certain definite relationship among the constituent elements. This relationship, however, is not a simple horizontal association as in the case of a cooperative system, but a horizontal relationship regulated by a vertical relationship by which each constituent is merged into one and the same totality. It is essentially similar to a horizontal relationship between brothers which is, in turn, subordinate to a vertical relationship between parents and children. A cooperative system can exist without a vertical relationship, but a synthesis is impossible without it, just as the relationship between brothers cannot exist without the relationship between fathers and sons. While a cooperative system assumes merely a mutual relationship such as that between brothers a synthesis assumes the relationship between parents and children which absorbs and transcends that of brothers.

In the second place, unlike a cooperative system which is founded on the concepts of individualism, liberalism and equality, a synthesis is based upon totality, control and discrimination. The concept of totality in this connection signifies synthetic totality and differs from the so-called totalitarian order. The latter represents a collective body organized by, and at the expense of, the individuals. A synthetic totality, however, is a system which, while composed of individuals, exists as a superstructure transcending its constituent elements. In the ultimate analysis, it is a system which involves the principle of individualism and is not irrelevant to it. The term "totality," however does

not fully convey the essential meaning of the concept and the name "unitary body," or synthesis, may conveniently be substituted in so far as it represents, not a mere association of individuals, but a collective system which transcends the component elements.

Control, as against liberalism, should also be considered in the same light. Modern liberalism emerged as the antithesis of medieval despotism. Nevertheless, a liberalism which has reached an impasse is apt to seek a solution by a return to despotism. Such a tendency becomes even more prominent when the situation is dominated by a so-called totalitarianism. This, of course, implies a return to medievalism and is incompatible with the concept of the new order. Regulative control as proposed by us in connection with the new order is not a concept inimical to liberalism, but one which combines both despotism and liberalism within a synthetic whole.

Similarly, the principle of discrimination does not conflict with that of equality. The synthetic principle of discrimination is one which embraces and presupposes the concept of equality. Equality rules in so far as all individuals tend to organize themselves on an equal basis and share their responsibilities under the new synthesis. However, discrimination regulates the relationship between the synthetic whole and the component individuals in so far as the latter are called upon to share their responsibilities in accordance with their talents and endowments. The synthetic totality, therefore, is organized upon the principle of equality in its formal aspect, but is discriminatory in its essential phase. In this sense, it is an epiphenomenon that synthesizes and, at the same time, transcends medieval absolute discrimination and modern absolute equality.

Thirdly, the synthetic principle is antithetical to the analytic principle. It is superfluous to say that analyticism has certain elements in common with individualism and syntheticism with totalitarianism. The synthetic principle under discussion, however, neither rejects nor ignores

analysis, but comprises and transcends it. For synthesis without analysis is impossible and the totality prior to analysis is merely chaotic.* The synthetic system is actually the synthetic union of the confused mass and the analysed individual units.

It is generally held that synthesis is Oriental and analysis Occidental. However, our so-called Oriental syntheticism is in contrast with Occidental analyticism and antedates the latter in history. Hence the antithesis apparent here consists of a medieval syntheticism in contrast with a modern analyticism. Should the synthetic principle under discussion prove to be of same nature as Oriental syntheticism, then it may be regarded as representing the revival of an older Orientalism hardly compatible with the idea of the new order. The present stagnation of Occidental culture and civilization is a result of the deadlock in analyticism. Analysis should not terminate in mere analysis but must be followed by synthesis. It is synthesis in this sense that constitutes the basic principle of the new order in East Asia.

In the East Asian synthetic order, the constituent powers, unlike those in a cooperative system are embraced and transcended by the synthetic totality. Thus Japan, China and Manchoukuo will eventually be absorbed in the higher totality of East Asia, while individually they will remain in perfect independence. East Asia as a totality is an existence that transcends Japan, China or Manchoukuo, each of which, however, can through this milieu achieve prosperity and independence without sacrifice of or threat to their independent existence. Unlike a cooperative system, the synthetic totality combines the three functions vertically and not horizontally. The new East Asian order, therefore, is a spatial existence that comprises the geographical areas of the East Asian states.

At the same time, the new order is a historical synthesis that implies temporal progress. To return to medieval Orientalism in repudiation of modern Occidentalism is to reverse the course of historical progress. The idea of the

new order must consist in an historical totality that synthesizes both medieval and modern thought and culture. The antithesis between medieval despotism and modern liberalism, medieval totalitarianism and modern individualism, medieval discrimination and modern equality, medieval syntheticism and modern analyticism, are historical contrasts which are represented by the antithesis between Orientalism and Occidentalism. It is for this reason that the synthetic totality is at once a geographical and a historical synthesis.

The basic principle of the synthesis of East Asia is thus a principle that regulates the mutual relationship of the East Asian powers. The system, however, can never exist in independence of the internal system of the constituent states. For example, an internal system of monopolistic capitalism tends to express itself as imperialistic aggression. In so far as the international relationships of the East Asian powers are regulated by the synthetic principle, the internal structure of each constituent state must also be reorganized upon the same principle. The creation of the new order, therefore, must be preceded by the reorganization of the internal system of each state in accordance with the same principle. While detailed discussions of this subject are out of place in the present study, it may be pointed out that these internal reforms bear essentially on the solution of class problems, while the latter, in turn, must ultimately depend upon the synthesis of all the classes within a super-class organization. Whatever the final form of such an internal synthetic system may prove to be, experiences in many countries would seem to indicate that class problems can never find satisfactory solution except in the synthetic principle. It is beyond dispute, therefore, that the creation of the new order within a state must commence with the solution of the class problem.

Lastly, the eventual rise of a synthetic order in East Asia is not merely an abstract or a theoretical problem, but a concrete and practical one as well. How else can we explain the fact of the stupendous sacrifices being made for

the creation of the new East Asia? Where else can we find an adequate theoretical basis for the inevitable sacrifices involved in the future promotion of this cause? The idea of cooperation for mutual interest is inadequate either to explain the present state of affairs, or to guide the future course of operations and becomes wholly misleading in relation to the guidance of the practical project itself. It is not for selfish ends that Japan is facing the enormous sacrifices of the present, but solely because she has devoted herself to the creation of a higher international order in East Asia. Also this idea of cooperation is wholly inadequate to justify the future sacrifices which will be required of the three states concerned. It is the basic principle of the new synthetic order in East Asia alone that must condition practical policies in the future.

III. THE CREATION OF THE CULTURAL SYNTHESIS

One of the most important aspects of the creation of the new East Asia is the task of cultural reconstruction. The word culture is used here in a broad sense, and covers religion, morals, art, philosophy, science, education and every other important phase of human life, excluding only politics and economy. The problems involved in this connection are intimately related to the principles in accordance with which the work of cultural reconstruction ought to be pursued.

Having explained previously that the idea of the new order is implicit in the concept of a synthetic system, it would appear redundant to claim now that cultural reconstruction in the new order must also be guided by the synthetic principle. Let us tentatively call the proposed order a synthetic cultural order and consider why and how such a system is to be established.

In the guise of general discussion, we have already made certain strictures on imperialistic aggression. It should be pointed out that some propositions put forward in connection

with cultural reconstruction are themselves imperialistic in nature. It is an encouraging phenomenon that, along with the decline of capitalistic culture in recent years, we now observe a tendency to exalt Japanese culture. What is popularly regarded as true Japanese culture, however, is often limited to the traditional or unique culture of Japan or to an old and narrow Japanism comprehensible only to the Japanese. While such a proposal may have certain merits of its own, it is not free from the charge of being imperialistic, inasmuch as it purports to extend the unique elements in Japanese culture throughout East Asia as the cultural goal of the new order. Essentially, traditional Japanese culture and capitalistic culture occupy antithetical positions. Therefore, the effort to transplant such Japanese culture to a new soil which lacks an original culture of its own can hardly be regarded as an act of imperialistic aggression. However, to embark on such a course in a country like China which boasts of a cultural history of five thousand years is a problem of an entirely different category.

In the East Asian synthesis based upon the concept of cooperation, cultural reconstruction will proceed along the line of unifying the cultures of the East Asian states. Actually this would probably mean a union of the Japanese and the Chinese cultures. It is highly doubtful, however, whether two different cultures can be assimilated on an equal basis. One culture may be able to absorb and assimilate another culture, but it seems impossible, in spite of the proposals of the adherents of the cooperative idea, to establish a new culture by uniting two different cultures on a free and equal basis. Each racial group in the world has a culture of its own. However, as the science of cultural evolution teaches, the question as to which culture will eventually predominate over the others and become a world culture is another matter and belongs properly to the historical study of cultural patterns. While it is true that Japan retains her original culture, it is also true that her culture is being assimilated to that capitalistic culture which has already

established itself as a species of world culture. Nevertheless, the nature of the new cooperative culture, or the union of the Chinese and Japanese cultures, and the progressive evolution of such a culture are problems that remain to be solved.

Now the synthesis of culture, relating to the whole idea of synthesis, is an inevitable outcome of the growth of a national or a world culture. It is not only possible in theory but proved in history that a new and entirely different culture emerges from the combination of two different cultures. The Renaissance brought about a synthesis of ancient and medieval culture which in turn gave rise to modern culture. Similarly, a synthesis of medieval and modern asiatic cultures is about to create a new culture in "the new order." The idea of synthesis is essential in interpreting the various phenomena in terms of progress, particularly in considering the historical evolution of culture. Inasmuch as the creation of the new order is a turning point in world history and the beginning of a new historical epoch, the new culture to be created must be a culture of epoch-making significance in the evolution of world society. It must not be a mere amalgam of Japanese and Chinese cultures, but a synthesis which represents a new departure in cultural evolution.

What, then, are the arguments that support the inevitable rise of a new synthetic culture? Why is it that this culture must be a new type of synthetic culture? The first answer to these questions is found in the stagnation of modern capitalistic culture. The days of the capitalistic culture, which has so long prospered upon the capitalistic economic soil as the dominant phase of world culture, are already numbered, due to the growing sterility of capitalistic economy. This is proved by the fact that, despite its essentially peaceful nature, its religions and its arts glorify war and its philosophy and its science encourage it, when war becomes inevitable, on account of the interplay of capitalistic economic necessities. That the discoveries of the natural

sciences should be devoted to the rape of humanity is an eloquent proof that capitalistic culture is doomed. The new world culture which is expected to rise out of this impasse must be a new historical and synthetic creation. While there are undoubtedly some who would propose the revival of medieval culture, their suggestion is of little significance inasmuch as it would imply cultural retrogression. The new world culture can develop only out of a synthetic coordination of medieval and modern cultures. The new culture that must arise of the synthetic union of medieval feudal culture and modern capitalistic culture is the new historical synthesis whose appearance we anticipate in the new Eastern Asia where it will evolve into a future world culture.

This new culture also represents a synthesis of Western and Eastern cultures which has great racial and geographical significances. This follows from the generalization that medieval culture is Oriental and modern culture Occidental. The synthesis of these cultures means more than a mere combination of the two. The creation of a new synthetic system of culture, therefore, does not end with a synthesis of Japanese and Chinese cultures alone, for this has already been accomplished to a certain extent through the historical contacts of the two peoples, resulting in the formation of a characteristic Oriental culture. The new cultural synthesis to which we look forward is a constructive synthesis of Oriental and Occidental cultures. It is this new synthetic culture which must inevitably replace Western culture, a culture which is beginning to reach an impasse as a result of having developed into a world culture.

China is a cultured nation having a history of some five thousand years. However, it is erroneous to maintain, as some Chinese thinkers do, that Japanese culture is entirely of Chinese origin. In spite of the profound influence exerted by Chinese culture, the indigenous Japanese culture has continued to thrive to this day. It should be admitted, however, that the influence of Japanese culture is entirely

insignificant when compared with the influence exerted by Chinese culture on Japan. In view of this fact, what is known as Oriental culture is represented largely by Chinese culture.

To the extent, then, that the construction of a new cultural order involves a revival of medieval oriental culture, the leadership would naturally rest in the hands of the Chinese. However, cultural synthesis in the new order means not a return to medievalism but the synthetic coordination of medieval Oriental culture and modern Occidental culture. Consequently those who have assimilated Western culture most extensively would be in a dominant position. In view of the fact that Japan has long devoted herself to the assimilation of capitalistic culture somewhat to the neglect of her own, she now occupies a more favourable position for leadership in the proposed enterprise than the other Eastern communities.

In any case the creation of a new synthetic cultural order is a most difficult and tedious task that will require years of concentrated effort. It must be preceded by the construction of an adequate political and economic foundation upon which the new culture can be established. Inasmuch as the nature of the foundation determines to a large extent the character of the culture that can be built upon it, the construction of a synthetic political and economic order is a pre-requisite for the creation of a synthetic cultural system.

IV. THE CREATION OF THE POLITICAL SYNTHESIS

It is apparent from the foregoing discussions that the new political order in East Asia must also be established upon the synthetic principle. Our interest in this aspect of the reconstruction programme is concerned with the points at which the synthetic principle differs from other principles.

The political order under an imperialistic regime is of

a very definite nature inasmuch as the territory is taken possession of as a colony and is administered by a governor-general. It is clear that the creation of the new political order will not proceed along these lines, since it does not involve any aspect of colonization work. The establishment of such a political relationship has not only been denied by the Japanese government in successive declarations, but it is impossible in theory as well as in practice. In seeking solutions to the problems that arises in the course of reconstruction, great caution must be exercised to avoid any policy or practice that may invite suspicion on this score. In practical politics, it may be difficult to draw a line between colonial operations and other political tactics, but theoretically it is clear that imperialism has no place in the proposed project.

Secondly, an international bloc is an economic organization that seems to have no immediate relationship with any political order, but in the process of the foundation of a bloc political element do play a very important role. In such a bloc as the British Imperial bloc or the Soviet Russian bloc, it is to be noted that in most cases this form of international alignment is established by bringing colonies, dominions, and dependencies together under the leadership of the home government. Especially in the initial stage of its formation, political factors play such an important role that in their absence, no other factors, however competent in themselves, are effective in creating such blocs. If there should emerge a new political relationship consisting of a colonial domain, it must eventually give rise to an international bloc. Stated differently, the appearance of a bloc suggests the existence of the colonial relationship. It is a result destined to feature the last stage of the capitalistic order. Therefore, any political order that precedes the formation of a bloc must be regarded as deviating from the political concept of the new order.

Thirdly, the political principle of the cooperative system consists in a federation of states on a free and equal basis. Unlike the League of Nations, which unites the

member states only in certain limited political activities, the federation can be considered as an organ which combines the constituent powers with respect to a much wider field of activity. However, even in an organization of this nature, each member state maintains its independence on the basis of self-interest and participates in the organization only so far as its common interests are involved. Hence it is essentially similar to an alliance or an entente, in which capitalistic powers join and withdraw according to the dictates of self-interest. In so far as the East Asian states share their interests in common, a state federation of this nature may be able to maintain the peace in East Asia. But it may become powerless, should the constituent powers begin to find their interests in conflict.

In contrast to a federation of this nature, the synthetic political order under discussion will unite the various states in East Asia into a synthetic super-structure, while allowing each state to maintain its political independence. This structure would not, of course, be regarded as a state in the traditional sense of the word. It is neither a federation nor a union of states. While it has no concrete state structure of its own, the political activities of each constituent power are directed toward the evolution of this political totality. It has essentially a spiritual and abstract existence. Yet this fact does not tend to reduce its power of exercising political influence upon the East Asian powers. On the contrary, the constituent powers regulate their mutual political relationships as well as their internal political affairs in conformity with the fundamental policy of the synthetic totality.

What, then, are the arguments that support the eventual evolution of such a synthetic political order? In this analysis also, we are led to conclude the inevitability of the synthesis of historical political orders. Modern democracy, which is an antithesis of medieval autocracy, is now on the eve of decay in reality, for the nominal democracies are steadily turning into autocracies. Democracy rests upon an economic

structure established, in turn, upon individualism, equality and liberalism and since this economic structure is already on the wane, steadily giving place to a new economic order, it is only natural that democracy should now be brought to face an impasse in consonance with its basic economic structure.

The new political order that replaces democracy, however, should not be a species of medieval autocracy. It is true that today there is a strong tendency for democracy to turn toward autocracy, but the new political structure which gains the ascendancy should be a synthetic structure that combines autocracy and democracy rather than a revival of medieval autocracy. It is this historical progress of the synthetic political order that constitutes the political concept of the new world, and this order can alone represent the ideal political totality in East Asia, which is bound, in time, to grow into a new world order.

The new political ideal consisting in a synthesis of autocracy and democracy should at once become the regulative force that adjusts the international relationship of the East Asian powers as well as their internal political structure. In accordance with this principle, such democratic ideas in our political system as parliamentarism and majority rule must undergo drastic changes, although in reality these political proceedings have already lost much of their democratic significance in recent years. The continental powers will also be required to submit to extensive reforms, in view of the fact that many democratic tendencies have appeared of late particularly in China since the revolution.

What the internal political structure should be under the synthetic political order is not yet certain. It is certain, however, that even under this principle, the internal political order in each state must vary from that of its neighbours in accordance with the stage of evolution it has reached and in line with its national and historical peculiarities. Thus, since Japan has its own historical and national characteristics and has reached a certain stage of historical progress, her political structure must vary from the political

structures of the continental states. However, the study of such problems must be left to the specialists in each field.

V. THE CREATION OF THE ECONOMIC SYNTHESIS

It has been shown that the principles of imperialism, economic blocs and economic cooperation cannot adequately represent the ideal of the new order. It follows that only the synthetic principle can constitute the basis of economic reconstruction in East Asia.

In order to regulate the economic relationship of the East Asian powers in accordance with the synthetic principle, it is necessary first of all to adjust the internal economic order of each state in accordance with this principle. For it is impossible to regulate the mutual economic relationship without reference to the existing internal order. It is for this reason that the construction of the new order must begin with the internal economic reconstruction of the states concerned. It goes without saying, however, that even under the same synthetic principle each state must pursue its reconstruction in accordance with its peculiarities and the stage of historical evolution at which it finds itself. In this connection, let us now consider the principles upon which Japan should undertake her own reconstruction.

The deadlock reached in the capitalistic economic order is one of the considerations which explains the inevitable emergence of syntheticism as a principle of internal economic reconstruction. By adopting modern capitalistic principles, Japan has made remarkable progress in industrial productivity since the beginning of the Meiji Era. In the last stage of capitalistic progress, however, economic laws operate in such a manner that they no longer increase productivity. In endeavouring to promote the economic reconstruction of East Asia, Japan was faced by the need of further enhancing her own productivity. In the face of this necessity it has now become apparent that she can no longer rely upon her

old capitalistic economic system. Under such circumstances Japan was obliged to adopt stringent control of wartime economic operations and regulate her economic affairs in the name of national policies. So far no theory by which this development could be systematized has been established. Whatever that theory may be, however, it is apparent that internal economic reconstruction in Japan must secure the enhanced productivity which is essential for the construction of the new order.

The question may now be raised as to why internal reconstruction should be pursued in accordance with the synthetic principle. Those who support liberal economic theories may still claim today that the expansion of productivity can be achieved by liberalistic economic activities. To prove the futility of this theory, it is sufficient to turn attention to the realities as observed in Western capitalistic states, where the productivity is being greatly hampered by class exploitation under capitalistic economy. Capitalistic monopoly, which is apt to grow externally in the form of imperialistic aggression, frequently develops internally into a species of class imperialism, thereby leading to the exploitation of certain classes by others and eventually giving rise to the restriction of productivity. That this course of events leads to class struggles and general internal unrest has been demonstrated in many Western capitalistic states. It is undeniable that Japan was also exposed to this danger in the not distant past.

To counteract this tendency, there was a period in our history when the policy of reconciling capital and labor was adopted. This policy is based upon the theory of cooperation as has already been pointed out and seeks to secure the reconciliation of conflicting interests by uniting capital and labor on an equal footing. Fundamentally, therefore, it is based upon the principles of individualism, liberalism and equality. It is difficult to solve the capital-labor relationship or any other conflict of interests merely by organizing a horizontal association of the parties concerned on a free and

equal basis. Experience in our country has indicated that the greater the effort made for the reconciliation of capital and labor, the wider became the cleavage between the two classes. This is proof of the fact that the solution of the class problem by means of cooperative ideas is impossible and that the basis of internal economic reconstruction must be something more than the cooperative principle based upon individualism and liberalism.

In reality, however, the class problem is about to be solved in Japan. It cannot yet be said to be fully solved, but the course of events seems to be turning gradually in the direction from which a solution can be expected. This solution is not based upon the idea of cooperation. On the contrary, if I do not mistaken, it is based upon the synthetic principle. On account of the accentuation of nationalism in Japan subsequent to the Manchurian Incident, the class problem tended to grow rapidly less acute, because the people began to look upon the state as a species of super-existence transcending both capital and labor. Whether or not the state is essentially a super-existence is, theoretically, a debatable question, but as an actual fact it is entirely beyond dispute. So far as Japan is concerned, the state transcends individuals and classes, although it is not independent of them. It is a higher totality that embraces and transcends all individuals and classes.

The synthetic principle of economic reconstruction consists in regarding the state as such a synthetic totality. It synthesizes all individuals as its components. At the same time, it represents a historical evolution, because of the fact that it synthesizes both capitalistic exploitation and mutual cooperation. It is, therefore, the inevitable product of historical progress. This is by no means a fantastic speculation, for the phenomenon is already apparent in outline, although the form in which it will eventually materialize yet remains to be seen. Nor is it known as yet upon what economic basis capital and labor can be recruited in order to render full service as members of the state in the

promotion of its economic welfare.

It is not absolutely necessary, however, that internal economic reform should be achieved prior to the construction of the new East Asian order. This reform is desired not for its own sake, but as a necessary step in the construction of the new order, and hence it should be carried out in conformity with current necessities. It is in this respect that the synthetic principle may be said to unite the internal with the international order.

The synthetic principle that regulates the mutual economic relations of the East Asian powers is not different from the above-discussed principle as applied to internal reconstruction. The East Asian nations which unite to form the new order, should not engage in mutual exploitation for selfish motives. On the contrary, they should cooperate in the common interest in a free and equitable manner, while recognizing a higher totality in East Asia which embraces and transcends them and while sharing responsibilities in proportion to their abilities for the common cause of economic progress.

In further elucidation of this principle, let us apply it to the concrete case of international trade. Trade under the cooperative idea represents free trade which operates as reciprocal trade. For free trade seeks exchange of goods and services by which common interests are served. While, politically, it is consummated on the principle of reciprocity, it is carried out on behalf of the common interests on a cooperative basis. Now the trade which is expected to develop among the East Asian nations is neither free trade nor reciprocal trade. On the contrary, it represents common trade activities regulated by the synthetic planning of the new totality that combines Japan, China and Manchoukuo. Needless to say, it is in no sense a so-called "controlled trade" which is regulated in accordance with the selfish and unilateral policies of a single state. It is controlled trade pursued under the collective economic planning of East Asia taken as a whole. Such a policy of international trade can

be explained on no other theory than that of the synthetic principle.

A question arises at this point as to the position of each constituent state, which applies particularly to the case of Japan within the East Asian totality. Is the acceptance of the totality as a higher synthesis that transcends the constituents, consistent with the independence of Japan? If the East Asian totality represents a state in the traditional sense, it is not incompatible with the independence of the constituent powers. But the totality is not a state and each state can participate in it without any infringement of its independence. The position of each state in the totality, as has been explained, is maintained formally on equal terms, though essentially each state is called upon to share responsibilities in accordance with its unique characteristics or the degree of progress it has achieved. It is beyond dispute, therefore, that because of her progress and her achievement, Japan is responsible for assuming leadership in the economic construction of the new order.

Finally, the synthetic principle must eventually prevail throughout the world as a result of the relation of the new order to a future world war. The ultimate aim of the new order consists in the establishment of peace in the Orient and eventually in the world and in this sense it opposes armed conflict. While this aim should be upheld under all circumstances, paradoxically, a world war becomes inevitable in the process of its realization. This would mean that the creation of the new order would necessitate a world war in the process of establishing a warless world. Regardless of whether the present European war develops into another World War or not, a second and a third World War seem inevitable, so long as the capitalistic world order persists and until it is dominated by a new world order. Until this objective is achieved, the work of reconstruction must proceed hand in hand with the preparation for another world war, irrespective of our sentiment for or against war itself. Under the pressure of such facts, no fantastic ideal of estab-

lishing a peaceful kingdom or any sentimental theory of cooperation has any practical value whatsoever. In the face of this eventuality, the East Asian states must be prepared to undergo enormous sacrifices in order to defend East Asia as a whole and to maintain the new order as a new world order. The economic reconstruction of today would be meaningless without this preparation for establishing a new world order. It is this point of view that affords our seemingly unrealistic theory of synthesis a very practical significance as a principle for guiding the future course of reconstruction.