72-3378

BROWN, Edward Marcus, 1921-
DR. INZAO NITOBE IN THE UNITED STATES, 1911-1912: A RHETORICAL CRITICISM OF A JAPANESE PROFESSOR'S LECTURES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1971
Speech

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/3091

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

DR. INAZO NITOBE IN THE UNITED STATES, 1911-1912; A RHETORICAL CRITICISM OF A JAPANESE PROFESSOR'S LECTURES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

EDWARD MARCUS BROWN

Norman, Oklahoma

1971

DR. INAZO NITOBE IN THE UNITED STATES, 1911-1912:

A RHETORICAL CRITICISM OF A JAPANESE PROFESSOR'S LECTURES

APPROVED BY

William A. Parnell

H. Wayland Cummings

Paul A. Bagwell

J. P. Pritchard

Leslie Brooks Hall

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No doctoral dissertation is ever the work of a single person. I welcome this opportunity to participate in the very proper habit of acknowledging some of the debt I owe to some whose special help has contributed so much to completion of this dissertation:

To Dr. William R. Carmack, my advisor and personal friend, who not only has guided and counseled and inspired, but whose repeated expressions of confidence in me has kept hope and motivation alive;

To Edna, my beloved wife and companion, without whom this or any other project would have far less meaning, whose patience and encouragement and assistance are apparently without end;

To my children, Marcus, Aleta, Byron and Hiram, who by cooperating with their father in a task they did not choose to undertake, in their own special way, have given support and encouragement;

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard W. Brown, who through their own personal dedication to learning created in me a yearning to learn and a desire to do every job well, and who not only shared themselves unstintingly during my childhood, but have given of themselves most freely in support of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study
Justification
Special Features of the Study
Materials Available
Projected Divisions of the Study

II. NATIONAL HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES 20

Japan, 1910
The United States, 1910
Japanese-American Relations
Summary

III. SPONSOR AND SPEAKER 44

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Nitobe's Personal Background
Summary

IV. NORMS REINFORCING JAPANESE BEHAVIOR 66

Rhetoric and Culture
Describing Culture
Attempts to Delineate Japanese National Personality
Attempts to Identify Japanese Ways of Thinking
Japanese Language and National Norms
Implications for the Whorf Hypothesis
Summary

V. RHETORICAL QUALITIES OF NITOBE'S SPEECHES 91

General Rhetorical Observations
Organization
Supporting Materials
Matters of Style
Impact of the Lectures
Summary

Chapter

VI. CULTURE RELATED DATA IN NITOBE'S SPEECHES 118

General Observations about Cultural Revelations
Syntactic Features
Social Norms Reflected in Nitobe's Speeches
Summary

VII. CONCLUSIONS 139

Summary of this Dissertation
Areas for Future Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY 151

APPENDIX 161

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1910 the President of Columbia University approached one of the richest men in the United States with a proposal to advance world peace. Nicholas Murray Butler persuaded Andrew Carnegie to set aside a substantial portion of his great fortune as endowment for the Carnegie Endowment for International peace.[1] As Acting Director of the Division of Intercourse and Education, Butler and his committee quickly arranged two exchange professorships; one between German and American scholars, the other between Japanese and American scholars.[2] Butler and his co-workers, anxious to implement this phase of their work, acted on authority of an Executive Committee decision dated June 23, 1911, and had the first Japanese lecturer in California by September 16, 1911.[3]

Dr. Inazo Nitobe was formally scheduled to deliver a series of eight lectures at six different universities in the United States.[4] Before the academic year had ended he had spoken 166 times to an estimated 40,000 listeners.[5] In what was to be characteristic of the year he spoke

---

[1]Nicholas Murray Butler, Across the Busy Years, Recollections and Reflections (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), II, 90.

[2]Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Year Book, 1911 (Washington, D.C.: Press of Byron S. Adams, 1912), pp. 62-66.

[3]Ibid., pp. 63-64.

[4]Ibid., p. 64.

[5]Inazo Nitobe, The Japanese Nation (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), p. ix.

at three schools in California (Leland Stanford Jr. University, the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, and Pacific College) before even beginning the formally scheduled lectures.[6]

Purpose of the Study

This study proposes to develop a rhetorical criticism of some of Dr. Nitobe's speeches. The speaking event consisted of a series of speeches, delivered in English, by the Japanese statesman/educator, before audiences assembled at six American universities, during the 1911-1912 academic year. Incidental to that primary purpose are two related goals. Stated in question form they would be: (1) Is there need for special critical methodology to complete a satisfactory rhetorical analysis of instances of cross-cultural communication? (2) Is it possible that instances of rhetorical criticism of cross-cultural communication might provide relevant data for those who study the Whorf hypothesis?

Justification

A rhetorical criticism of this instance of cross-cultural speaking has many justifications. Among them are; the national and international stature of the speaker; the significance of the men and institutions who arranged the lectures; current demand for better understanding of the critical components of cross-cultural communication, and in particular the urgent need for effective communication between the United States and Japan.

The speaker who is the central figure of this study was an

---

[6]Year Book, 1912, p. 70.

important public figure in Japan. A prominent Japanese educator who taught at four Japanese institutions of higher learning, he served as president of three. He represented his government as agricultural advisor to Formosa. During seven years in the Secretariat of the League of Nations he was reputed to be one of its most popular public speakers. At three of the Conferences of the Institute on Pacific Affairs Nitobe was a member of the Japanese delegation, serving twice as delegation chairman. Twice he lectured extensively in the United States. Widely respected in Japan, in the United States, and in Europe, much of his respect grew from his reputation as a speaker.[7]

The series of speeches delivered in the United States in 1911-1912 represented the initial step in a grand effort to promote goodwill between Japan and the United States. The effort persisted only four years, and thirty-six years later the two nations fought a war. Still this series of speeches deserves study as evidence of the faith men had in the power of public speaking to improve international relations.

This series of speeches exists because of the cooperation of some great public figures and some great institutions in the United States in 1911. Nicholas Murray Butler, long time President of Columbia University and confidant of United States Presidents and financiers, initiated both the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and this series of lectures. Hence this speaking occasion involved Andrew Carnegie who had just begun to put his money to work for others. But it involved other public figures

---

[7]H. Vere Redman, "Lectures About Japan by Late Inazo Nitobe," review of Lectures on Japan, by Inazo Nitobe, in The Japan Advertiser, October 28, 1936.

as well. Dr. David Starr Jordan, internationally known scientist and President of Stanford visited Nitobe just before his trip to America. It appears that they completed arrangements at that time for Nitobe to speak at Stanford. The Presidents of Johns Hopkins, Brown, Virginia, Illinois and Minnesota universities agreed to cooperate in the lectures. So the study could be justified on the basis of the important men and institutions associated with it.

Events since World War II have also made urgent a better understanding of the processes of cross-cultural communication. Increased flow of trans-national communication has made vastly differing cultures more keenly aware of each other. Increased awareness has multiplied efforts at communication, so that most nations currently make far greater efforts to communicate with other nations of the world than before World War II. However, those increased efforts have resulted in a distressing number of communication failures. Our government, in particular, has engaged in appraisals of such projects as Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, Point IV, United States Offices of Information and Education, Peace Corps, and others, seeking to understand the many unexpected reactions to our efforts at communication.

Not only have governmental units given increasing attention to cross-cultural exchanges, but several areas of scholarship have discovered new implications for their disciplines when they attempted to project their theories to cross-cultural situations.[8] Among them scholars in speech and

---

[8]The following works are some of those indicating the extent to which such academic areas as Economics, Psychology, Sociology, Law, Anthropology and Political Science have become interested in cross-

communication are urging that considerable research be done in the area of cross-cultural communication.[9]

A study of Japanese-American relations may also explain their baffling recurrent collapse. Twice between 1850 and 1910 the United States enjoyed great popularity with the Japanese. Both times the goodwill was lost. After World War II the Japanese, in their unique pragmatic manner, not only accepted their American conquerors, but virtually worshipped General Douglas MacArthur. What has been gained for America three times, only to be lost twice, stands in jeopardy of being lost again.

To illustrate further the importance of this point, following her initiative in opening Japan to the West in 1853, the United States enjoyed a "most favored nation" status with the Japanese.[10] Between 1853 and

---

cultural studies, Roger Fisher, ed., International Conflict and Behavioral Science (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964). Francis L. K. Hsu, ed., Aspects of Culture and Personality (New York: Abelard-Schuman, Inc., 1954). Daniel Lerner and Wilbur Schramm, Communication and Challenge in the Developing Countries (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967). Bert Kaplan, Studying Personality Cross-Culturally (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson and Company, 1961). Floyd W. Matson and Ashley Montague, The Human Dialogue (New York: The Free Press, 1967). This last work devotes a section to "Culture as Communication: The Perspectives of Anthropology." Gardner Lindzey, Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961).

[9]Samuel L. Becker, "Directions for Intercultural Communication Research," Central States Speech Journal, XX (Spring, 1969), 3-13. Lauren E. Ekroth, "The Study of Face-to-Face Communication Between Cultures: Present Status and Directions," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967. Huber Ellingsworth, "Anthropology and Rhetoric: Toward a Culture Related Methodology of Speech Criticism," Southern Speech Journal, XXVIII (Summer, 1963), 307-312, also "National Rhetorics and Intercultural Communications," Today's Speech, XVII (February, 1969), 35-39.

[10]Nitobe, pp. 278-288.

1890 Japan chose among western standards to modernize her nation. She sought such things as industrialization, mechanized agriculture, educational reform, governmental reform, and a new military system. To cement friendship between Japan and the United States were such circumstances as: America "persuaded" Japan to come out of isolation; an American representative, Townsend Harris, gave friendly assistance in making treaties with other western nations; the first Japanese embassy abroad was to the United States. Despite all this when the Japanese decided on a model in education, it was French. Their governmental pattern and their military system were copied from Germany. While other factors were certainly important in those choices, in part the United States failed to communicate.

Japanese-American relations reached their highest point of goodwill when President Theodore Roosevelt offered his offices to settle the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. Yet in a matter of months the Japanese public was disillusioned,[11] and in 1917, when Viscount Ishii visited the United States to negotiate a treaty between his nation and the United States, the two nations, though allies in World War I, negotiated in anything but a spirit of mutual trust.[12]

An important instance of failure in communication turned on America's venture in imperialism. Americans looked on their actions in Cuba, Hawaii and the Philippines as atypical. Japan read them as typical

---

[11]Edwin O. Reischauer, The United States and Japan (Cambridge: Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 20.

[12]Hugh Borton, Japan's Modern Century (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955), pp. 283-284. Ray Watson Curry, Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921 (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968).

and imperialistic. Accordingly Japan interpreted America's "Open Door" policy in China as imperialistic double-talk.

World War II did not dash all hopes of Japanese-American cooperation, it merely set the stage for higher level cooperation. Japan became America's occupational showpiece, a demonstration of the superiority of American ways in the context of the cold war. Among other things Japan agreed to grant America military outposts.

Yet serious misunderstanding between the two nations is a growing possibility. Continued American occupation of Okinawa and military bases in Japan presents a constant irritant to Japanese pride, and a ready-made cause to be exploited by clever and vocal anti-American elements in Japan. Also Japan's phenomenal economic growth since the war places her in position to compete successfully with much American industry. High unemployment and inflation in the United States casts Japan in the role of spoiler of the American economy.

An urgent need exists to study communication between Japan and the United States, but not every context would be a suitable one for study. It may be that study of an experience in a defused atmosphere, such as the Nitobe lectures, offers a better opportunity for objectivity than more recent situations.

Special Features of the Study

This study thrusts one into what appear to be three special rhetorical situations--special at least in that they have received little attention in traditional rhetorical criticism. Being cross-cultural in nature, the study: (1) is not the typical examination of a speaker-audience from a common culture; (2) does not have available a ready-made

and often-tried methodology; (3) does appear to relate itself to the Whorfian hypothesis. Another special circumstance concerns the nature of the materials available for the study.

Speaker and Audience from Different Cultures

The bulk of rhetorical criticism examines a representative of one culture speaking to members of his own culture. However this study looks at an instance of a representative of the Japanese culture seeking to influence members of the American culture. Hence the task becomes that of evaluating cross-cultural or cross-national public speaking.

Rhetoric does not inherently consist of exchanges between members of a common culture. Still most critical studies are confined to that perspective. The student of rhetorical theory engages in a study of Greek culture, and that entails representatives of Roman, French, English and American cultures (to name only a few) studying theory that originated in Greece. It also means students from cultures that have borrowed heavily from the Greeks investigating something of their common heritage. Furthermore, several studies examine a rhetorical event in some nation other than that of the person doing the study, as Americans study Hitler before German audiences, but the cross-cultural aspect of such studies turns not on differences in culture between speaker and audience, but between critic and the central figures of his study.

To the extent that sub-cultures exist within every major culture speakers frequently confront audiences whose orientation to life is markedly different from their own. So such men as Stokely Carmichael face numerous challenges involving cross-cultural problems while speaking to audiences in the United States. Students of public speaking have given

careful attention to Carmichael's rhetorical problems.[13] Still this kind of study would not be completely analogous to the kind of cross-cultural examination proposed in this study. One would expect Carmichael to find more in common with an American audience than would a spokesman from Japan.

I have found only one study of an American representative addressing audiences outside the United States. John Condon sought to determine whether John F. Kennedy adjusted to the value system of Mexican audiences.[14] Edward T. Hall and William F. White have a brief reference to then Vice President Richard Nixon and his communication difficulties experienced in South America,[15] but there is no complete rhetorical study of the event. This study joins what must be no more than a select few that examine speeches delivered by a speaker from one culture to audiences of another culture.

No Tested Methodology

Perhaps because of little attention to the cross-cultural speaking event, no special methodology for a critical analysis has been devised. Whether a special methodology is required or not is a question yet to be answered, but currently no method specifically designed for criticism of cross-cultural public speaking exists.

---

[13]Pat Jefferson, "The Rhetoric of the 'Magnificent Barbarian,' Stokley Carmichael," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Indiana University, 1967.

[14]John C. Condon, Jr., "Value Analysis of Cross-Cultural Communication: A Methodology and Application for Selected United States-Mexican Communications, 1962-1963." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964.

[15]Edward T. Hall and William Foote White, "Intercultural Communication: A Guide to Men of Action," in Communication and Culture, ed. by Alfred G. Smith (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1966), p. 571.

Some recent studies, though not critical in nature, have examined instances of cross-cultural public speaking. Mitsuko Saito and Wayne Oxford both studied the introduction of public speaking into Japan. Saito's study traced the introduction of speech education into Japan between 1872 and 1890. Among other things she reviewed the work of Yukichi Fukuzawa who introduced the western practice of public speaking into Japan and who coined the Japanese word "enzetsu" which means "public speaking."[16] Oxford provided additional details of Fukuzawa's work, plus an annotated translation of thirty of Fukuzawa's speeches.[17] Though these two studies provide excellent background for a study of a Japanese representative speaking out of his own culture, they are not in themselves analysis of such international transactions.

Condon's study of Kennedy's speeches to Mexico, limited primarily to "value analysis," made no attempt to evaluate many dimensions of those rhetorical acts. If his methodology should become the guide for all criticism of cross-cultural speaking, criticism would be quite limited in scope.

Some writers argue for development of special methodological treatment of instances of cross-cultural communication. As early as 1963 Huber Ellingsworth proposed that rhetoricians develop a "culture-related methodology for speech criticism" through use of the techniques of

---

[16]Mitsuko Saito, "Speech Education in Japan in the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1957.

[17]Wayne H. Oxford, "A Critical Edition of Selected Speeches of Fukuzawa Yukichi Dealing with the Modernization of Japan, Translated from the Japanese with an Introduction and Notes," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1967.

anthropologists who studied culture at a distance. Ellingsworth, who saw the rhetorical critic facing the same problems as the anthropologist studying culture at a distance, urged that he avail himself of the same analytical devices in use among anthropologists.[18]

Ellingsworth was familiar with Ruth Benedict's study of the Japanese cultural image during World War II, and the related follow-up work on other nationalities after World War II. He cited Benedict's published results in Chrysanthemum and Sword,[19] and the manual edited by two of her co-workers reflecting the methods followed in her study of the Japanese.[20]

Ellingsworth more recently suggested the East-West Center in Hawaii as the ideal location to conduct study in cross-cultural communication. He argued that an increase in the number of cross-cultural studies would provide data from which scholars might develop a standard critical methodology.[21] Robert Oliver too has made several pleas for students of rhetoric to adjust to the features unique to cross-cultural communication.[22]

---

[18]"Anthropology and Rhetoric: Toward a Culture Related Methodology of Speech Criticism," Southern Speech Journal, XXVIII (Summer, 1963), 307-312.

[19](Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946).

[20]Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux, eds., Studying Culture at a Distance (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963).

[21]"National Rhetorics and Intercultural Communications," Today's Speech, XVII (February, 1969), 35-39.

[22]Robert Oliver, Culture and Communication (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1962); "Culture and Communication: A Major Challenge in International Relations," Vital Speeches, XXXIX (September 15, 1963), pp. 721-124; "Syngman Rhee: A Case Study in Transnational Oratory," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII (April, 1962), 40.

While not asking specifically for development of a critical method, other writers have urged more examinations of cross-cultural

Wayne Brockriede, in the context of his opposition to the development of national rhetorics, stated in 1966 that "our discipline needs the description of current situations."[23] Lauren E. Ekroth, after examining three types of "face-to-face communication between cultures," recommended both more studies of actual speech communications and more study of intercultural interaction where it normally occurs.[24] Samuel L. Becker has urged American scholars to re-examine their own culture-oriented theories of communication in an effort to discover uniqueness in the acts of communication in other cultures.[25]

In the absence of a specific methodology three sources were used to develop guidelines for this study: existing intra-cultural rhetorical studies; the nature of the available data about Nitobe's speeches; and cross-cultural studies done by other academic disciplines. Rhetorical criticism appears to have three general functions: the historical, the recreative, and the judicial.[26] With certain modifications the traditional

---

[23]"Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (April, 1966), 40.

[24]"The Study of Face-to-Face Communication Between Cultures: Present Status and Directions," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967.

[25]"Directions for Intercultural Communication Research," Central States Speech Journal, XX (Spring, 1969), 3-13.

[26]Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 5. Marie Hochmuth (Nichols), "The Criticism of Rhetoric," in A History and Criticism of Public Address, ed. by Marie Hochmuth (New York: Longmans, Green Company, 1955), III, p. 5. Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 9.

historical-literary-rhetorical critical method assisted in the realization of those functions in this study. In practice that method has frequently assumed Aristotelian categories as critical standards. Brockriede acknowledged that modern rhetoric occurs in a cultural context considerably different from that of Aristotle, and argued for a theory of rhetoric broad enough to comprehend the multiplicity of cultures currently engaged in rhetoric.[27] Black's objection to contemporary rhetorical criticism was that its slavish devotion to Aristotelian categories precluded some relevant judgments. In the belief that sole reliance on Aristotelian categories might obscure some important cultural aspects of Nitobe's speeches I chose to devote one portion of this study to an examination of speech contexts without conscious dependence on Aristotelian categories, and another portion to cultural emphases. There was no intent to reject Aristotelian categories out of hand, but merely to follow a method that withheld their use as long as possible.

Linguistic Relativity

A final special feature to be considered in this study is the possible relevance of data within a rhetorical criticism of cross-cultural communication to the Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity. The theory suggests an influence of the mother tongue beyond behavior in one's native culture, saying the way one categorizes his world in the mother tongue will continue to affect his categorizing processes even when he uses another language.[28]

---

[27]Brockriede, pp. 33-37.

[28]Benjamin Lee Whorf, Language, Thought and Reality, John B. Carroll, ed., (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956).

If the theory is true, there should be evidence to confirm it in the English speeches of a Japanese. Americans writing about Japan have called attention to many apparent differences between the ways of thinking of the two cultures.[29] Obvious differences exist between the two languages.[30] Differences in social orientation between the two countries are immediately obvious, Japan being a hierarchical system, and America a relatively open society. Japanese language has an elaborate system of polite and honorific expressions that assist in externalizing observances of the demands of the strict hierarchy. Americans traditionally bridle at language suggesting deference. While these are but superficial initial observations, they at least suggest sufficient differences between the two cultures to indicate that a careful study of either Americans seeking to communicate in Japanese, or Japanese seeking to communicate in English ought to provide data relevant to Whorf's theory. If Japanese as a mother tongue does condition the structuring processes of native Japanese, whatever other language they may seek to use, it would seem that a Japanese delivering formal speeches before American audiences ought to betray some evidence of that influence. Within the context of this study an effort will be made to discover such evidence.

---

[29]Charles A. Moore, ed., The Japanese Mind (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967), pp. 288-307. Robert S. Schwantes, Japanese and Americans: A Century of Cultural Relations (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), pp. 1039. William Caudill, "Japanese American Personality and Acculturation," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLV (February, 1952), 9.

[30]Samuel E. Martin, "Speech Levels in Japan and Korea," Language in Culture and Society, ed. by Dell Hymes (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964), pp. 407-415.

Limitations

Important limitations pertain to this phase of the study. If Nitobe's speeches contain evidence that would seem to confirm the Whorf hypothesis, it must be considered as sufficient only to alert others that the rhetorical criticism of cross-cultural communication appears to yield evidence relevant to the Whorf hypothesis. Under no circumstances should it be understood that this study seeks to prove or disprove the Whorf hypothesis. It only seeks to help determine whether instances of cross-national public speaking might yield data that could be useful to other scholars primarily studying the significance of relevant data in such settings.

However, failure to discover such data in this study would not disprove the Whorf hypothesis. Such failure could well be due to faulty analysis. Failure might be due to careful editing of the speech texts, or to Nitobe's considerable skill with the English language. A high level of competence in the second language could obscure the mental operations normal in the case of one speaking a language other than his mother tongue.

Materials Available

Criticism, like politics, turns out to be the art of the possible. The critic must first take stock of what is available for evaluation, decide if anything of the available materials are useful for his purposes, and finally devise a plan for arriving at a judgment.

In the case of Nitobe's lectures it has been necessary to work without some materials the critic would like to have. For instance, no reproduction of Nitobe's voice has been located, and without hearing the

voice only limited comments can be made on such factors of delivery as accent, dialect, vocalized mannerisms of politeness, etc. Furthermore, though newspaper copy exists, the coverage consists largely of quotations from Nitobe's texts without meaningful comment on manner of presentation, audience response, and ultimate impact of the lectures. Comments in campus newspapers at Brown University, Johns Hopkins University and the University of Virginia reflect high enthusiasm for Nitobe, his presence, his lecture materials, and his speaking performances. Other campus newspapers, notably the Universities of Illinois and Minnesota, appear cold and indifferent, as if determined not to make a value judgment on any phase of the lectures.

The Charlottesville, Virginia, Daily Progress reflected a sense of honor at having such a notable personality in the community. It praised Nitobe personally, all his speeches individually, and his generous giving of himself to their community. Given the return of a graduate of Johns Hopkins, as one would expect, Baltimore papers gave extensive coverage. By contrast, the New York Times carried a story on Nitobe's first lecture at Columbia, consisting mostly of quotations from his text, and was completely silent on the succeeding seven lectures.

Official reports of the Carnegie Endowment lack comments revealing qualities that a critic seeks for purposes of recreating a speaking event. The absence of comment on the part of some individuals was truly surprising. For instance, Nicholas Murray Butler was a key figure in creating the Carnegie Endowment and in arranging for the exchange professorship. His name appeared on correspondence to the Japanese Ambassador relative to the professorship, and he personally introduced Nitobe at Columbia. Yet

in his two-volume personal memoirs,[31] and in three volumes of speeches and essays dealing with international issues,[32] there was no single, even incidental reference to Nitobe or these lectures. Woodrow Wilson was a fellow participant with Nitobe in a seminar on international affairs at Johns Hopkins. In 1917 Nitobe published in Japan a little monograph on Wilson as a student.[33] In all of Wilson's published papers I found only two references to his Japanese classmate.[34] One listed (misspelled) his name as a member of the seminar, 1884-1885,[35] and the other was a footnote added by the editor.[36] During Wilson's presidency the country faced a number of perplexing problems related to the Japanese--in California, in Geneva, and in Washington, D.C. Apparently Wilson never thought of his former classmate in connection with any of those crises.

This limited treatment of the Nitobe lectures suggests that the big busy centers and busy people in America were not deeply impressed by this professorship. It constituted report data for organizations engaged in the pursuit of world peace, but Presidents and presidential candidates, presidents of universities and editors of high-circulation newspapers in big metropolitan areas had little time or space for these lectures. Put in perspective, these lectures did not rank with the Chinese revolution in

---

[31]Butler, Across the Busy Years.

[32]Butler, A World in Ferment (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918); The International Mind (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913); The Path to Peace (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930).

[33]Arthur S. Link, ed., The Papers of Woodrow Wilson (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967), II, p. 553.

[34]Ibid., II, p. 553; III, p. 362. [35]Ibid., III, p. 362.

[36]Ibid., II, p. 553.

progress in 1911,[37] or an advertisement for a travelogue by Don C. Seitz called Surface Japan,[38] or Sun Yat Sen's departure from London for China.[39]

Summary of Available Materials

On the positive side materials available to the critic consist of considerable information about the man who spoke, a rather detailed account of how the lectures came to be, published texts for both the main lectures and some additional lectures given during the course of Nitobe's year in the United States. All six of the campus newspapers have commentary, in addition to some comment in the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, the Baltimore News, the Baltimore American and the Charlottesville, Virginia, Daily Progress. Thus basically one has considerable information about the speaker, the occasions, and the content of the message. More limited information exists on message factors beyond the printed and edited texts. Available comment, while favorable, does not help the critic to understand delivery, and is limited in details of audience response.

Projected Divisions of the Study

Chapters II and III of the study develop general historical background for Nitobe's speeches. The chapters contain a review of relevant historical materials on both Japan and America as of 1910, Japanese-American relations from 1853 to 1920, information about the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and its sponsorship and promotion of the exchange professorship, and biographical data on Nitobe.

---

[37] The New York Times, Magazine Section, November 19, 1911.

[38] Ibid., Section X, p. 9. [39] Ibid., p. 4.

In part Chapter IV serves a historical function, but it also satisfies other goals of the study. The chapter contains an analysis of Japanese culture, especially social norms and sanctions. From a historical point of view this material should enable the critic to better understand Nitobe and the kind of challenge American audiences posed for him. Also it should provide a basis for predictions about the behavior of Nitobe while delivering speeches in English. Such predictions will help in making the Whorf hypothesis part of the study.

Chapters V and VI of the study contain analyses of Nitobe's speeches. Chapter V is an examination of his rhetorical techniques, and chapter VI a consideration of culture related discoveries. Chapter VII will summarize the dissertation and suggest additional studies related to it.

CHAPTER II

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Dr. Nitobe's speaking tour began in September 1911, in California, and ended on the East coast of the United States in May 1912. Critical comment on such a speaking event calls for investigation of relevant historical/cultural materials. This chapter contains a section devoted to significant events, personalities and moods in both Japan and the United States as of the date of the lectures, and historical data relevant to Japanese-American relations as of that date. Chapter III contains an account of the development of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the role it played relative to the exchange lectureship, and biographical data on Nitobe. Chapter IV is a separate consideration of cultural factors that would help one understand the contexts, both of origin and delivery of the speeches and a brief examination of some implications of the Whorf hypothesis.

Japan, 1910

If in 1910 the average American had been forced into conversation about Japan his topics would likely have been exhausted with Emperor Meiji, rice, tea, silk, kimonos, the California situation, and "Madame Butterfly." Even serious students of international affairs might have been hard pressed to go beyond the Russo-Japanese War, the Portsmouth Treaty, the Taft-Katsura Agreement, the Root-Takahira Agreement, the visit of the American battle fleet to Tokyo in 1908, the annexation of Korea, and the

alternating premierships of Katsura and Saionji from 1901 to 1813. But even a hasty resume of conditions in Nitobe's homeland in 1910 should have included more.

The Japan of 1910 might be compared to a vigorous adolescent suddenly in possession of wonderful energies, but lacking the experience, judgment and coordination to make best use of them. Japan had made herself an avid student of the West, had engaged in deep introspection, set national goals, and following Spartan discipline had made remarkable strides toward realizing them. She had revised her government, her military machine and her educational system. She had won two wars, incorporated new territory, and had begun to build an industrial base.

The government consisted of a curious blend of German, British, American and Japanese elements. The Meiji Constitution, granted in 1890 in the name of the Emperor, established a two-house Diet, only one of which was elective. A cabinet was to be appointed by the Throne in consultation with the Privy Council. In reality it was usually selected by an extra-legal body, the Genro, or Council of Elder Statesmen. Political parties were struggling into existence, but were torn by inner strife, a tendency to follow personalities rather than political issues, and the frustration of having little actual voice in government. In theory, government was a means to actualize Imperial will, but by 1912 the Emperor "participated less and less as an individual in governmental affairs."[1] Instead the Privy Council and the Genro acted in the name of the Emperor. The military

---

[1]Hugh Borton, Japan's Modern Century (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955), p. 251.

members of the cabinet enjoyed special privilege on two counts: they could appeal directly to the Emperor without the foreknowledge of fellow cabinet members, and it was mandatory that they be chosen from an elite group of high ranking officers on active duty with the Army or Navy. The House of Representatives was essentially a debating society with no effective power over policy or purse. The very existence of these many units of government, most of them created in 1890, prompted fierce struggles to define power and roles. That intra-government conflict had reached new heights of intensity by 1910.

The Japanese educational system, woefully inadequate by Western standards in 1853, increased compulsory education requirements from four to six years in 1907,[2] and by 1920 most Japanese children went on into some form of more advanced training, such as middle school, secondary school or vocational training.[3] Intense competition for the limited opportunities to attend a university had by 1920 produced a class of intelligentsia.[4]

Economically the nation was at a critical and precarious juncture. Industrial growth after 1890 had been phenomenal, but continuing unfavorable balance of trade, a rapidly increasing population, a shortage of natural resources both for manufacturing and food was pushing the country into deepening financial crisis. Japan's industrialization was dominated

---

[2]Civil Information and Education Section, Education in the New Japan (Tokyo: General Headquarters, Supreme Commander Allied Powers, 1948) I, p. 29. In mimeograph.

[3]Kenneth Scott Latourette, A Short History of the Far East (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), pp. 556-557.

[4]Edwin O. Reischauer, Japan, Past and Present (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 151.

by a few great families known as the Zaibatsu. The national economy had successfully geared itself to absorb the productive capacities of Formosa, southern Sakhalin, and Korea. Her industrial machine was annually producing over 200,000 tons of pig iron, 250,000 tons of steel, and 22 million tons of coal, but none of these amounts were enough for domestic consumption. By 1909 her ship builders were launching 50,000 tons yearly, and in 1913 over fifty per cent of all her foreign trade was transported in Japanese built ships. Electrical engineering, sugar refining, and textile production showed impressive production figures. Yet from 1909 to 1913 foreign trade reflected an annual balance of payments deficit of 48 billion yen. Government economic policies had favored the Zaibatsu and industrialization at the expense of the farmers. Not only was population rapidly outstripping food production, but farmers were restless. To make matters worse all attempts to bring order to Japan's financial house were doomed to failure by a military clique committed to expansion programs, regardless of the costs to the nation.[5] Perhaps Borton was right to say that had it not been for the economic boom occasioned by World War I Japan would have experienced a "financial collapse."[6]

Diplomatically Japan had gained international stature by winning wars over China and Russia, by assisting efficiently in the Boxer affair in China, and by concluding an alliance with Great Britain. The Japan from which Nitobe came was a world power just waiting to be recognized in her new role. She was still learning the unique requirement of that new role, but western learning blended with her own unique qualities surely

---

[5]Borton, pp. 268-275.

[6]Ibid., p. 268.

had earned for her a position among international powers when Nitobe left her shores in 1911.

The United States, 1910

A most appropriate descriptive term for the United States as of 1910 was progressivism. If Japan could be compared to an adolescent half anxious to test his strength, the United States was just beginning to realize the folly of some youthful activity. Morison and Commager cite five major problems that American reformers faced during this time: (1) a confusion of ethics occasioned by evolution from an individualistic, agrarian to a highly industrialized society; (2) big business control and exploitation of natural resources and labor; (3) grossly unequal distribution of wealth; (4) the rise of the city with its demand for a new type of social engineering; (5) the breakdown of political honesty.[7]

Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Robert LaFollette and Woodrow Wilson dominated the political scene. Three of these men had had special relationships with the Japanese. Wilson, a former classmate of Nitobe at Johns Hopkins, was serving as Governor of New Jersey and preparing to bid for the presidential nomination of the Democratic party. Taft, Roosevelt's hand-picked successor to the Presidency, who as Secretary of War had negotiated the Taft-Katsura Agreement in Japan in 1905, was in a struggle for his political life. Robert LaFollette, long-time champion of progressivism in Wisconsin and the United States Senate, was leading the fight against Taft and maneuvering for the presidential nomination of the Republican party. Theodore Roosevelt, while not yet publicly committed

---

[7]Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Settle Commager, The Growth of the American Republic (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), II, 367.

to candidacy in 1911, was deeply disturbed over developments in the Taft administration and anxious to support an administration that would pursue the progressive thrusts of his two earlier administrations. Like Taft, Roosevelt had also shown an unusual sensitivity to Japanese during his terms in office.[8] While three of these four political leaders had in common a personal experience with Japanese, their political lives were bound up in their reactions to progressivism.

Not only major political leaders, but religious and social leaders advanced the progressive cause. Among them would be Walter Rauschenbusch and his eloquent Christianity and the Social Crisis which "established him as the major prophet of the social gospel movement."[9] Another would be Lincoln Steffens with his exposes of American cities and government, The Shame of the Cities, 1904, and The Struggle for Self Government, 1906. Still another would be William E. Du Bois, the Negro who worked with a group of distinguished white educators, clergymen, editors and social workers in 1909 to organize the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The need for such an organization as the NAACP illustrates the kind of social conditions that gave rise to the overall progressive

---

[8]Still another political figure of the time, viewed by some as the kingmaker at the Democratic Convention in 1912, was William Jennings Bryan. Bryan had helped a young Japanese student through the University of Nebraska. While on tour of the world in 1905 Bryan not only addressed Japanese audiences, but traveled to Kagoshima to visit the parents of that young student. Robert S. Schwantes, Japanese and Americans: A Century of Cultural Relations (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), p. 11. Also William Jennings Bryan, Speeches of William Jennings Bryan, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1919), II, pp. 205-211.

[9]Arthur S. Link, American Epoch: A History of the United States Since the 1890's (3rd ed.: New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 37.

movement. In 1910 there were "only 141 Negro high schools, with a total of 8,251 pupils, in all the states from Maryland to Texas." Between 1900 and 1914 "more than 1,100 Negroes" fell victim to mob action.[10] A further need would be reflected in the publications of Thomas Dixon, The Leopard's Spots, 1902, and The Clansman, 1905, both of which were calculated to "arouse the basest racial prejudices of white readers," and which "sold by the hundreds of thousands."[11]

Industry in the United States in 1910 had witnessed an end to consolidation[12] only to see the emergence of the financial empires like those of Morgan and Rockefeller. By 1913 a House subcommittee reported that the House of Morgan "had 341 directorships in 112 banks, railroads, industries, and other corporations with aggregate resources of capitalization of more than $20,000,000,000."[13]

At the same time organized labor struggled for a meaningful existence. Membership in the American Federation of Labor began to grow slowly in 1911 after "hammer blows" of an organized employer campaign had driven membership down.[14] The United Mine Workers engaged in bitter and only partially successful strikes in 1912 and 1913. International Workmen of the World were leading some successful strikes, but only through heavy recourse to violence.[15]

It could be said that Nitobe came to a nation that was suffering the early pangs of a developing social conscience. Hard battle lines were drawn between opposing camps, but the progressives were making

---

[10] Ibid., p. 30. [11] Ibid., p. 31. [12] Ibid., p. 50.

[13] Ibid., p. 52. [14] Ibid., p. 58. [15] Ibid., p. 63.

commendable headway. Roosevelt, LaFollette and Wilson advanced the progressive cause at the national political level. Muckrakers stirred the public conscience. When Andrew Carnegie declared that it was a shame to die wealthy and proceeded to put his fortune to work for society, others followed his lead. The Rockefellers began to establish foundations to promote the public good, and however belatedly, it did appear that the progressive theme had struck home. It was Andrew Carnegie's gift of $10,000,000 that funded the Endowment for International Peace, and that organization brought to reality the exchange lectureship that arranged Nitobe's 1911-1912 visit to the United States. Given the fact that Nitobe visited the United States at that period in her history when the progressive movement was realizing some fruits of victory, it seems appropriate that his coming was, in part, a result of the impact of progressive ideology on Andrew Carnegie.

Japanese-American Relations

America's Role in Opening Japan to the West

The modern period of Japan's history owes its character largely to the fact that on July 8, 1853, an American naval officer, with the full approval of his government and in violation of known Japanese policy, anchored a squadron of ships in Tokyo Bay.[16] By negotiating the Treaty of Kanagawa in 1854 Matthew C. Perry and the American Government succeeded in bringing to an end Japan's self-imposed 200 year period of isolation. Later America's first Consul General to Japan not only negotiated commer-

---

[16] Reischauer, The United States and Japan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 9.

cial treaties for his own country, but cooperated with and in the interest of the Japanese as other governments pressed demands for similar treaties.[17]

In the wake of those developments came the restoration of Imperial Government in Japan, and in time a vigorous policy of westernization. The new era was appropriately named Meiji, meaning "Enlightened Rule," and the nation that had remained virtually unchanged for 200 years set out in 1868 "to regain in one mad dash the ground lost to the West."[18]

The opening of Japan was but part of a larger movement by the West to gain commercial advantage in the whole of the Orient. China had first felt the insistent probes of Western economic pressures, and on the whole had not fared well. She had been forced by Great Britain to allow opium trade which she did not want, to cede territory she did not wish to cede, and to grant extra-territoriality which violated her sovereignty.[19] Measured against thoseexperiences, Japan, with the help of American Consul General Townsend Harris, fared somewhat better.[20]

American Contributions to Japan's Modernization

Reischauer indicates that the United States, because she had gained the "preponderant role in the opening of Japan took from the beginning a leading part" in the westernization of the country.[21] One

---

[17]Latourette, pp. 390-393. Also Borton, pp. 27-44. Also Chitoshi Yanaga, Japan Since Perry (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949), pp. 20-27.

[18]Reischauer, United States and Japan, p. 10.

[19]Young Hum Kim, East Asia's Turbulent Century (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), pp. 6-12. Also Latourette, pp. 369-376.

[20]Yanaga, p. 25.

[21]Reischauer, United States, p. 11.

could develop an impressive list of ways in which the Japanese sought assistance from the United States. The first mission which the new government sent abroad was not to Europe, but to the United States.[22] The advisors who helped Emperor Meiji draft his famous "Charter Oath" of five articles in 1868[23] had before them Yukichi Fukuzawa's work, "Conditions in the West," which contained a full description of the American government, including copies of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence.[24]

In such areas as economics, law, psychology, sociology, medicine, physics, geology, and botany, Japanese either translated American works into their own language, or sent promising young students to America, or secured the services of American teachers. While they also freely sought learning from England, France, and Germany, it is noteworthy that the United States, a relatively young nation, was sought out by Japanese eager to catch up in the world.[25]

In the field of education, in particular, the United States played

---

[22]Ibid., p. 10. Borton, p. 51. Yanaga, p. 27.

[23]The "Charter Oath" was a basic document issued early in the Meiji Period which served as guide both for the young advisors who surrounded the new Emperor and interested segments of the population. It read:

1. An assembly widely convoked shall be established, and thus great stress shall be laid upon public discussion.
2. The welfare of the whole nation shall be promoted by the everlasting efforts of both the governing and the governed classes.
3. All subjects, civil and military officers, as well as other people, shall do their best and never grow weary in accomplishing their legitimate purposes.
4. All absurd usages shall be abandoned; justice and righteousness shall regulate all actions.
5. Knowledge shall be sought for all over the world and thus shall be strengthened the foundation of the Imperial polity.

[24]Schwantes, p. 86.

[25]Yanaga, pp. 70-85.

what in retrospect seems an unprecedented role. As a member of the Iwakura Mission that visited the United States in 1871, Fujimaro Tanaka gave special attention to educational systems. With Arinori Mori, Japanese Ambassador to the United States "he worked out plans to adopt those features of American education" that appeared advantageous for Japan.[26] Upon becoming Vice Minister of Education in 1873, Tanaka "embarked upon a vigorous program of transplanting American educational practices to Japan."[27] Dr. David Murray of Rutgers College was asked to assume the post of educational advisor to the Minister of Education. Murray arrived in Japan in 1873 and spent six years helping to organize an educational system that would meet the immediate needs of the nation and harmonize "with Japanese national characteristics."[28] The teacher training program throughout the country bore "a very marked American influence."[29]

In the early years of the Meiji period United States agricultural methods were duplicated.[30] Of particular interest in this study was the attempt made by the Japanese government, in cooperation with American advisors, to develop argiculture on the island of Hokkaido. Among other things a special school was established at Sapporo. Three of the more famous teachers at that school were the American, William S. Clark, and two Japanese who experienced his influence, Nitobe and Shosuke Sato.[31] Sato, with Nitobe, attended Johns Hopkins, became President of the Hokkaido school, and became the second exchange professor to visit the United States.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 101. [27] Ibid. [28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid. [30] Schwantes, p. 48. [31] Ibid., pp. 53-57.

Between 1865 and 1885 Japan sent at least 293 students to the United States. These leaders-to-be studied in seventeen eastern colleges and universities. Later 162 of them occupied positions of responsibility and influence in government, academic life, and business.[32] One of them, Nitobe, entered Allegheny College, Pennsylvania in 1884, and soon transferred to Johns Hopkins.[33]

Some of Japan's technical advances were a direct result of her ties with America. In 1887 the magneto telephone was introduced from the United States. Beginning in 1890 Westinghouse sold large numbers of motors, turbines, transformers, and electric locomotives in Japan. Also in 1890 public telephone service began in Tokyo and Yokohama with switchboards secured in the United States. In 1898 telegraph equipment was secured from Western Electric.[34]

American documents were before the Emperor's advisors when they drafted the Charter Oath. There were other instances of American influence on Japanese political documents. When the Diet, the Japanese popular assembly was created, it resembled somewhat the two-house American legislature. Of even greater interest is Schwantes' account of a conference between former President U.S. Grant, Emperor Meiji and his advisor, at which time Grant urged the Japanese to deliberate at length before granting significant power to legislative branches.[35] It would appear that they took the former President literally. Schwantes also reports that the

---

[32]Ibid., p. 210.

[33]Sukeo Kitasawa, The Life of Dr. Nitobe (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1953), p. 90.

[34]Schwantes, pp. 65,68. [35]Ibid., p. 89.

Japanese sought the approval of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes for their proposed Constitution.[36]

In the several areas of influence America not only took the lead in opening Japan to the West, but also contributed substantially to Japan's modernization. Nevertheless there were significant strains on relations between the two nations, and in the end Japan found European models far more suited to her needs than those of the United States.

Japanese-American Political Experiences

The Japan into which Perry thrust Western influence was not a passive entity, but a very dynamic organism. Perry unleashed and projected those dynamic forces into a vastly larger geographic and social context. One should view the "enlightenment" as a time of assimilation of Western culture, but assimilation into an energetic and active system, capable of change but unprepared to yield its unique identify or to deny its past.

What Latourette has said of the "chauvinists among the Japanese" contains a measure of truth for the entire nation:

> Because of their sense of being a superior race headed by a descendant of the gods, the chauvinists among the Japanese felt it the right of the nation to rule other peoples. Yet there was a consciousness of being late arrivals in the society of the dominant Occident. Slights, fancied or real, on their national dignity by Western governments and peoples were, accordingly, magnified and met with hot resentment. They would show the Occident their might and would expel the arrogant white man from the Far East.[37]

Given this high level of sensitivity it is not surprising that political conflicts developed between Japan and the United States.

Through the period 1890 to 1930 there were at least five develop-

---

[36] Ibid., p. 92.

[37] Latourette, p. 507.

ments which heightened tensions between the two countries. From 1906 onward relations moved on a deteriorating course into World War II. The onset of serious deterioration of this international friendship was just five years before Nitobe was asked to begin the exchange professorship.

The United States was involved in the peace settlements that ended both of the wars Japan fought to insure an independent Korea. In the interim between the two wars both Japan and the United States embarked on policies of imperialism. The United States soon sought to withdraw from the role, but Japan moved ahead in it. In the course of retreating from imperialism America announced the Open Door Policy in China, which if implemented would directly counter what had become Japanese designs in Manchuria. Finally the United States indulged and imbibed in some measure in the anti-Japanese campaign in California. Ultimately, in 1924, the United States passed an immigration act which excluded Japanese entry into the country. Each of these situations deserves some explanation in that they contributed to the climate of opinion from which Nitobe came, and to which he spoke.

Settlement of the Sino-Japanese War.--The peninsula of Korea, jutting out from the mainland of Asia toward the major islands of Japan, seemed to Japanese a potential "dagger pointed at the heart of Japan."[38] Official Japanese policy called for an independent Korea, and any threat to that status was interpreted as a threat to Japan. Two wars were fought to achieve that foreign policy objective.

Prior to 1895 China contended that Korea was a Chinese dependency.

---

[38]Yanaga, p. 307. Latourette, p. 417.

By 1894 their contradictory views over Korea led Japan and China into war. To the surprise of most nations of the world Japan quickly and thoroughly defeated China. Japanese terms for peace called for an independent Korea, Chinese cession of the Liaotung Penunsula (the southern tip of Manchuria just west of Korea), the island of Formosa and the Pescadores, an indemnity of 200 million taels of silver, and the opening of four Chinese cities to Japan for commercial and industrial purposes.[39]

The demands were not extreme when viewed in the context of the times, but they constituted the culmination of a series of shocking developments that frightened some Western powers. China had been expected to win the war, and the ease with which Japan defeated her revealed the impotence of China. That served to whet imperialistic appetites. Furthermore, the victory dramatized Japanese military potential, acquired in a very short period of time. Russia, Germany, and France agreed that, given too many advantages, Japan could dominate the entire Far East. Accordingly the three nations presented simultaneous notes of protest to Japan and "advised" her to return the Liaotung Peninsula to China. Known as the Triple Intervention, the move infuriated Japanese--all the more in that they felt they had no recourse but to comply.[40] In the years that followed those very nations entered into a "competitive scramble for leaseholds, concessions and spheres of influence in China."[41] In Japanese eyes it appeared as West against East, and the United States shared in some of the resentment occasioned by the Triple Intervention.

Settlement of the Russo-Japanese War.--Soon after the Triple

---

[39]Yanaga, p. 248. [40]Ibid., p. 250. [41]Latourette, p. 507.

Intervention Japanese suspected that designs on both Manchuria and Korea had prompted Russia's part in that action. Already sensitive and indignant, Japan watched with growing apprehension as Russia made moves into Manchuria and Korea. Eventually, feeling her every fear confirmed, Japan sought through a period of six months to open satisfactory negotiations with Russia. She was virtually ignored, and in 1904 Japan exploded from ten years of smouldering resentment against Russia and won a series of impressive military victories. Russia was slow to perceive the significance of the Japanese victories, and Japan was not financially able to sustain a long war. Hence in 1905 when Theodore Roosevelt sought to bring the two nations to a peace conference, it suited both to negotiate.[42]

Roosevelt's efforts to insure a conference that would protect Japanese rights, plus his many friendly gestures toward Japan over the years, won for the United States what Reischauer calls "the high-water mark of Japanese-American friendship."[43] But disillusionment came quickly. The Japanese apparently believed that this conference afforded opportunity for revenge for the Triple Intervention. Whatever the government believed they had failed to inform the general public. Their demands for peace reflected the presumption that they bargained from strength, and their people fully believed that they bargained from strength. Their demands were extensive:

> (1) Recognition of Japanese supremacy in Korea; (2) the transfer of Russian interests in South Manchuria including the leasehold and the railroad; (3) the surrender to Japan of all Russian war vessels interned in neutral ports during the war, and the limitation of

---

[42]Yanaga, pp. 273-289, 304-315. Borton, pp. 217-222, 234-236, 240-244.

[43]Reischauer, p. 20.

> Russia's naval strength in the Far East; (4) the payment of an indemnity to cover the cost of war; (5) the granting of fishing rights to Japanese subjects in the waters off the coast of Siberia, and the cession of Sakhalin.[44]

Such demands presumed something akin to total military victory, and they reflected what the Japanese public expected to gain from the war.

While Russia was willing to grant some of these demands, the Czar absolutely refused on others. In the end the Japanese delegation was outbargained. President Roosevelt, trying to find acceptable middle ground between the delegations, counseled Japan against "the folly of insisting on the impossible." The Treaty of Portsmouth provided for: (1) recognition of Korean independence; (2) transfer to Japan of Russian interests in South Manchuria; and (3) Japanese acquisition of half of Sakhalin.[45]

Expecting far more from the peace settlement, the Japanese public reacted violently and emotionally against their government. Normally sedate newspapers were extremely critical. Some that were normally critical suggested assassination of the cabinet members and the Elder Statesmen. Riots broke out, and the office of a pro-government newspaper was attacked and destroyed. Casualties were so heavy martial law had to be declared. There was no alternative but resignation for the cabinet. Ultimately some of this intense resentment shifted to Roosevelt and the United States, for he had called the conference and it had been held on American soil.[46]

Imperialism and the Open Door Policy.--In the years between these

---

[44]Yanaga, p. 311. [45]Borton, p. 243. [46]Ibid., p. 244. Yanaga, p. 313.

two wars, other developments, contradictory in nature, added to Japanese disillusionment with America. One of them related to America's move into imperialism, and the other, the Open Door Policy, which committed the United States to repudiation of continuing imperialism.

With the exception of Hawaiian annexation, Japan did not object to American territorial acquisitions in the Pacific. She quickly concurred with United States annexation of the Philippines, though that meant United States holdings in close proximity to Japanese-owned Formosa. Apparently Japan saw imperialism as a way of life, and chose to resist only when her self-interest appeared threatened.

In this context the Open Door Policy, announced by Secretary of State John Hay in 1899, constituted a threat to Japan's self interest. The policy appeared to condone and confirm acquisitions in China by European powers, while it denied Japan any opportunity to acquire what she felt was her rightful due as far back as 1895 at the close of war with China. The ultimate implications of the Open Door Policy became more apparent to both nations after World War I, but its very declaration in 1899 contributed to tension between Japan and the United States.

Japanese Immigration.--The final irritant to Japanese-American relations, and the one which contributed most directly to the climate in which Nitobe spoke, was the immigration issue. The first conflict over this issue developed in Hawaii. Japan resisted United States annexation of Hawaii, but it was because of the immigration issue. Sugar plantation owners in Hawaii began in 1884 to recruit Japanese laborers. By 1900 the total population of Hawaii was 154,000, and the Japanese there numbered 61,111. By 1897, Hawaiians, alarmed that Japanese now constituted nearly

half their population, refused admission and sent home over a thousand would-be immigrants.[47] The Japanese government protested and sent a cruiser to demand indemnification. The United States, having viewed itself in the role of protector of Hawaii since the early 1840's,[48] moved to annex the territory. Under the circumstances this constituted an affront to Japan, but the matter was resolved when American pressure induced the Hawaiian government to pay $75,000 indemnity. Chief arguments for annexation in Congressional debates centered on "the danger to the United States of Japanese infiltration of the Islands."[49]

The first Orientals to come in large numbers to the mainland United States were Chinese. The discovery of gold in California and construction of the Central Pacific Railroad created and sustained demand for cheap labor. By 1880 almost 150,000 Chinese had been brought into California, and alarmed citizens viewed them as a menace. In 1882 Congress authorized a ten year exclusion of Chinese, after which the policy became permanent.[50]

Despite the ban on Chinese entry into the country, the demand for cheap labor continued and Japanese immigration increased. Annexation of Hawaii afforded residents of that territory unimpeded entry into the United States, and there was a sudden rise in Japanese entries into California. Where there had been an average of 1500 a year for ten years, in 1900 some 12,365 Japanese came to mainland United States.[51]

---

[47]Ichihashi Yamato, Japanese in the United States (Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1932), pp. 17, 27. Also Latourette, pp. 529-530.

[48]Morison and Commager, p. 316. [49]Borton, p. 223.

[50]Morison and Commager, pp. 185-186. [51]Yamato, p. 55.

Californians, just preparing themselves to insure permanent exclusion of the Chinese, began at once to petition Congress for exclusion of the Japanese. The agitation in California prompted the Japanese government to announce in July, 1900, "that no further passports would be issued to contract laborers seeking to enter the United States." Thereafter less than 10,000 Japanese entered the United States yearly, and after the Gentleman's Agreement in 1907 the figure dropped to 1,500.[52]

Spearheaded primarily by organized labor, the anti-Japanese campaign in California continued. In February, 1905, a particularly vicious series of newspaper articles appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle.[53] In October, 1906, the San Francisco Board of Education voted to exclude the ninety-three Japanese from the city's schools. Theodore Roosevelt, infuriated over the action, threatened a lawsuit. In calmer moments however, he realized that California was but extending the legally sanctioned "separate but equal" doctrine used in the South to keep Negro children in separate schools.[54] Ultimately the President bargained for recision of the school board action in exchange for executive agreements that would limit Japanese immigration. He then negotiated the Gentleman's Agreement whereby Japan volunteered "not to grant passports to either skilled or unskilled Japanese laborers" seeking entry into the United States.[55]

In 1908, Homer Lea, a person noted in Nitobe's speeches, observed

---

[52]Carey McWilliams, Prejudice: Japanese-Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944), p. 17.

[53]Yamato, p. 55.

[54]McWilliams, pp. 28-30.

[55]Borton, p. 305.

that all political parties in California were united in their opposition to further Japanese immigration. "He divided public opinion in California into four groupings: 8 per cent pro-Japanese; 22 per cent indifferent; 30 per cent hostile, and 40 per cent belligerently hostile."[56] In 1909 bills were introduced into the California legislature to segregate Japanese in the public schools, to prevent them from owning land, to segregate them in certain residential sections, and to prevent them from serving as directors of corporations.[57] Not all such legislation passed, but its introduction reflected a prevailing mood. In 1911 Japan and the United States were scheduled to negotiate a treaty. There was considerable insistence from California that an exclusion clause be written into the treaty, but a continuation of the Gentleman's Agreement was effected.[58]

The details of the anti-Japanese campaign in California make a lengthy chapter within themselves. They relate to this study in the following manner: The Japanese nation was not unaware of this campaign and its racial implications. Though the Japanese government volunteered to cooperate with the American government, incidents provoked in California created problems for both governments. They certainly served as grist for anti-American and chauvinistic elements in Japan. They became the basis for widespread distrust among significant segments of the two populations. It destroyed some of the goodwill that might have sustained mutual confidence and trust between the two nations.

Within months after Nitobe had spoken at one college and two

---

[56]McWilliams, p. 44.

[57]Ibid., p. 36.

[58]Yamato, pp. 255-258.

universities in California the two houses of the California legislature passed, by votes of 35 to 2 and 72 to 3, the Webb-Haney Bill which forbade "aliens ineligible to citizenship" from owning land in California. The act was specifically aimed at Japanese, and sought, as freely admitted by its sponsors, to drive the Japanese from the state.[59]

On balance, in 1911, there was still a reservoir of goodwill between Japan and America, but a decided shift of opinion had occurred after 1905. Japan felt that America had participated in discrimination against her during negotiations to conclude wars with China and Russia, and through declaration of the Open Door Policy. The anti-Japanese agitation in California tended to confirm suspicions Japanese may have entertained about any other American intentions. Japanese-American relations were clearly deteriorating.

Summary

The speeches that are central to this study originated with a man whose own nation had in his lifetime come to occupy a unique position. Japan had abandoned isolation to unreservedly embrace the world. By 1910 her attempts at selective assimilation of the best from her own past with what she found in the world community had made her a world power. She had modernized her military and to the surprise of the world convincingly defeated both China and Russia. She had geared her economy to assimilate Formosa, Korea and Sakhalin. She had modernized her government and her educational system. Perhaps only Japan understood the fragile base on which some of those achievements rested. The war with China yielded

---

[59]McWilliams, p. 45.

victories which were then snatched from her helpless grasp by the Triple Intervention. Had the war with Russia continued longer the Japanese economy would have collapsed and quick victories would have been turned into defeat. As it was this condition weakened her bargaining power at the Portsmouth Conference. Her phenomenal economic successes were threatened by shortages of critical materials and an annually worsening deficit balance of payments. Japan had become a world power, but the insecurities that plagued her position made it psychologically important that some long established nation confirm her in the new role. Like the new rich, Japan expectantly and anxiously waited recognition of her new status.

The speeches were delivered in the United States at a time when the Progressive Movement, focused primarily on domestic affairs, was dominant. American interests were so predominantly domestic that excursions into international affairs were distinctly naive and inconsistent. An example would be the venture into imperialism, followed by a wave of citizen indignation. That was followed by the Open Door Policy, conceived abroad, announced by the American Secretary of State, beyond enforcement other than by moral sanctions, and offensive to the Japanese.

Relations between Japan and the United States had built to a plateau of goodwill between 1853 and 1905. From a high point during the Portsmouth Conference, relations steadily deteriorated into World War II. America shared in blame for what was considered ill treatment after both the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars. She reaped resentment for annexation of Hawaii, and anti-Japanese campaigns in California provided

continuing grist to aggravate any possible misunderstanding between the two nations. Some influential elements in Japan were frankly committed to imperialistic expansion, and this set the stage for continuing misunderstanding over developments in Manchuria.

CHAPTER III

SPONSOR AND SPEAKER

A Japanese man delivered 166 speeches in the United States between September 1911 and May 1912. No such undertaking would occur by accident. Within the broad stream of currents flowing between Japan and the United States there had to be in one if not in both nations groups of citizens willing to focus their energies in such a way as to make that series of speeches a reality. There also had to be a man with the ability and disposition to undertake those speeches. This chapter contains background material on the movement and the man who combined forces to make these lectures possible. The first part of the chapter explains the creation of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, its particular involvement in these lectures, as well as some Japanese agencies that cooperated with the Endowment. The latter part of the chapter gives biographical data on the speaker.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Founding the Endowment

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace became an official organization December 14, 1910, when Andrew Carnegie announced that he had provided $10,000,000 to fund such an organization.[1] The events that

---

[1]Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Year Book for 1911 (Washington, D.C.: Press of Byron S. Adams, 1912), p. 1.

led to that magnanimous gesture are less clear. Carnegie intimates that his immediate inspiration was a newspaper account of a speech by President William Howard Taft. Carnegie had for several years been active in peace movements, and particularly excited about arbitration as a means of resolving international dispute.[2] He interpreted Taft's remarks in New York City on March 22, 1910, as endorsement of an agreement between the United States and Great Britain, and he felt that agreement would inspire other nations to renounce war for arbitration.[3] Just what steps led from that initial inspiration to the designation of twenty-eight men to administer the $10,000,000 trust Carnegie did not say.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia, friend and confidant of Presidents and Cabinet members, and an active leader in peace movements, claims that he persuaded Carnegie to fund the Endowment.[4] Both men had held high offices in the American Branch of the Association of International Conciliation, as had ten others among the twenty-eight charter trustees of the Carnegie Endowment.[5] James Brown Scott, first Secretary of the Endowment, reports that Butler had been in conference with Carnegie about an organization of this type since 1908. Scott further states that no one was surprised at the formation of the

---

[2]Ibid., pp. 1-2, 5-6.

[3]Ibid., p. 5.

[4]Nicholas Murray Butler, Across the Busy Years, Recollections and Reflections (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), II, p. 90.

[5]Year Book for 1911, p. 9, and Butler "The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace," in International Conciliation, Document No. 75, (February, 1914), p. 2.

organization, but that all were astounded at the $10,000,000 grant.[6]

Even a cursory check of the list of twenty-eight trustees indicates that Carnegie chose capable, dedicated men, with the kind of contacts in the world that could get significant movements going quickly. In addition to Butler there were two other university presidents, two who had formerly served as Secretary of State, a former Secretary of War, a financial advisor to J. Pierpont Morgan, prominent lawyers, college professors, and members of Congress.[7]

Organization of the Endowment

Within a matter of months the Executive Committee for the Endowment had drawn up by-laws, general guidelines for their tasks, and had organized themselves into three divisions, each with broadly defined responsibilities.[8] A Division of Economics and History was charged with responsibility "to promote a thorough and scientific investigation and study of the causes of war and of the practical methods to prevent and avoid it."[9] A Division of International Law was assigned three duties:

> (1) To aid in the development of international law, and a general agreement on the rules thereof, and the acceptance of the same among nations.
>
> (2) To establish a more perfect sense of international rights and duties and a more perfect sense of international justice among the inhabitants of civilized countries.
>
> (3) To promote a general acceptance of peaceable methods in the settlement of international disputes.[10]

---

[6] Year Book for 1911, p. 178.

[7] Ibid., p. 8.

[8] Ibid., pp. 11-28.

[9] Ibid., p. 21.

[10] Ibid., p. 22.

A Division of Intercourse and Education, under the direction of Nicholas Murray Butler, was charged with three duties:

> (1) To diffuse information, and to educate public opinion, regarding the causes, nature and effects of war, and means for its prevention and avoidance.
>
> (2) To cultivate friendly feelings between the inhabitants of different countries, and to increase the knowledge and understanding of each other by the civilized nations.
>
> (3) To maintain, promote, and assist such establishments, organizations, societies, and agencies as shallbe deemed necessary in the accomplishment of the purposes of the Corporation (the Endowment), or any of them.[11]

Educational Exchange with Japan

Butler secured approval of the Executive Committee on eight recommendations designed to carry on the work of his division. Of particular interest in this study is the recommendation which called for establishing a more complete system of educational exchanges between Latin America and the United States and between Japan and the United States.[12]

Butler's report for 1911 stated that the Executive Committee acted on June 13, 1911, authorizing among eight "specified undertakings" the following:

> To formulate a plan for the exchange of professors or other representatives between Japan and the United States, in order to spread in each country a wider and more accurate knowledge of the civilization and ideals of the other.[13]

As Butler stated elsewhere, he viewed it as the role of the Endowment "to work for the intellectual and moral education of the public opinion

---

[11] Ibid., p. 21. [12] Ibid., p. 23. [13] Ibid., p. 43.

of the world,"[14] and the "task of dealing directly with public opinion" as peculiarly that of the Division of Intercourse and Education.[15] It should not be surprising then that four of the early projects Butler initiated related to exchange lectureships. When he became aware of the efforts by the Japan Society of New York to promote an exchange of public figures between Japan and the United States, he cooperated with them by bringing into existence an exchange professorship.[16] Butler secured consent of the Japanese Ambassador, the Japanese Government, and the Carnegie Endowment to make the exchange professorship a continuing project. The Executive Committee of the Endowment authorized "the exchange of professors between Japan and the United States" at the meeting held June 13, 1911.[17] Ten days later they approved Butler's detailed plan which in turn was approved by the Japanese Ambassador and his government. "Late in June" Nitobe received a formal invitation to be the first exchange lecturer.[18]

The invitation came at an opportune time in Japan. In 1909 a group of Japanese businessmen had conducted a tour through the United States to impress on Americans the fact that "Japan had no thirst for war." These same Tokyo businessmen, organized as the Advisory Council of the Japan Society of New York saw Nitobe's selection "as a sort of corollary to the movement which they themselves had undertaken two years before." While the Endowment served as "an organization to which the

---

[14]Butler, "Carnegie Endowment," p. 4. [15]Ibid., p. 5.

[16]Nitobe, p. v. [17]Year Book for 1911, p. 63. [18]Nitobe, p. vi.

lecturer from Japan could be properly accredited," it was Japanese businessmen including "practically all the representative business interests in Tokio" who paid Nitobe's expenses.[19] The Japan Society maintained an active interest in the project, sponsoring a special reception for the Nitobes during the Columbia University lectures,[20] and arranging for publication of the lectures.[21]

As Butler visualized this particular project it was to continue indefinitely, with a Japanese representative coming to the United States every two years, and an American representative going to Japan on the alternate years. Dr. Hamilton Mabie was designated "as exchange lecturer in Japan for 1912-1913." The general subject of his lectures was "The American Spirit, Ideals and Character." His goal was "to interpret the American as he is and as his origins and history exhibit him."[22] In the 1913-1914 academic year Shosuke Sato came to the United States and delivered a series of seven lectures at sixteen colleges and universities.[23] Dr. John Frier Hidden, President of Princeton University was supposed to visit Japan in 1914-1915, but with the development of World War I trustees of the Endowment deemed it expedient to postpone the matter.[24]

---

[19]T. Miyaoka, Growth of Internationalism in Japan (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Intercourse and Education, 1915), Publication No. 6, pp. 7-8.

[20]New York Times, December 10, 1911.

[21]Nitobe, title page.

[22]Year Book for 1912, p. 71.

[23]Year Book for 1913, p. 71.

[24]Year Book for 1915, p. 66.

After World War I the lectures were never resumed. The 1916 Year Book reports the "exchange still interrupted," and as a substitute project the Endowment allocated $6,000 for publication and distribution of three books: Japan to America, America to Japan, and The Japanese Problem in the United States.[25] Annual reports from the Director of Intercourse and Education continued to carry a heading, "Educational Exchange With Japan" until 1921. Each year a brief paragraph of explanation noted that there was interest in resuming the project, but that world conditions did not yet permit. In 1922 the heading was dropped from Butler's reports and did not appear again in the Endowment Year Book. By that time tensions between Japan and the United States over the immigration issue had made the exchange inexpedient. After 1924 even such an advocate of friendship with America as Nitobe vowed that he would not set foot on American soil until the exclusion law was rescinded.[26]

The First Exchange Professorship

The first Endowment Year Book described plans for the first exchange professorship:

> For the year 1911-1912 it is proposed that the representative of Japan shall spend five or six weeks in succession at Brown University, Providence, R. I.; Columbia University, New York; Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.; and the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.[27]

---

[25]Year Book for 1916, p. 57.

[26]Sukeo Kitasawa, The Life of Dr. Nitobe (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1953), p. 73.

[27]Year Book for 1911, p. 64.

For these six universities Nitobe prepared a basic series of eight lectures. However the Endowment officials intended that he should have opportunity "to meet in the freest possible way teachers and students and citizens of the neighborhood, as well as to meet and address on various subjects boards of trade, chambers of commerce, literary, scientific, fraternal and other organizations."[28] So in addition to the forty-eight lectures scheduled at the six universities Nitobe addressed one hundred eighteen other groups during his stay in the United States.[29]

Illustrative of these extra speaking occasions would be Nitobe's addresses at a Historical Conference at Clark University, November 18, 1911, delivered between his scheduled lectures at Brown University (October 19 to November 13) and Columbia University (November 21 to December 14).[30] His schedule at Virginia University fell across an examination week. Nitobe delivered three lectures at the University, then visited "Lexington, Richmond and other points of interest" addressing students of Washington and Lee, Virginia Military Institute and Richmond College.[31] In that same period the newspapers also reported that he spoke at the First Methodist Church in Charlottesville.[32]

This description of the nature and scope of the first exchange professorship between Japan and the United States would argue that the Endowment had through this, one of its earliest projects, made a signi-

---

[28]Ibid., p. 63.

[29]Nitobe, p. ix.

[30]New York Times, November 19, 1911, Section C, p. 1.

[31]The Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Virginia, March 9, 1912.

[32]Ibid., March 11, 1912.

ficant and positive step toward realization of the goal to "work for the intellectual and moral education of public opinion of the world."[33]

Nitobe's Personal Background

Early Experiences Led to America

Just nine years after Admiral Perry opened Japan to the West, Inazo Nitobe, third son in a noble family, was born in Morioka, Japan, which is now the capital of Iwate Prefecture and located in the northeast section of Honshu, the main island of Japan. The turmoil occasioned by Perry's intrusion was moving toward a climax. Nitobe was six years old when youthful Emperor Meiji, supported by counselors who vowed to banish all foreigners from their land, came to the throne. Gradually Emperor Meiji and his court came to realize the impossibility of isolating Japan again, so they set out to match Western strength. During the formative years of Nitobe's life his country was openly committed to a policy of learning as much as possible from the West.

Despite the fact that his family was from what appears as a non-strategic area, they were certainly attuned to the spirit of the times. An influential family in their area, his father was a high official of the local chieftan.[34] When Inazo was but fourteen and in school in Tokyo, the Emperor visited Morioka and chose to reside at the Nitobe home. He commended Grandfather Nitobe for his industry, for having completed a water system that permitted irrigation of a vast tract of farm land, and encouraged the Nitobe children to "inherit the grandfather's

---

[33]Butler, "Carnegie Endowment," p. 4. [34]Kitasawa, p. 7.

noble spirit and contribute to the agricultural development of the country." Inazo took this encouragement literally and switched his academic emphasis from law and politics to agriculture.[35]

At the newly established Sapporo Agriculture College in Hokkaido Nitobe came under the influence of the American Professor, William S. Clark. Though Clark had left the College a year before Nitobe arrived, his influence lingered on, and Nitobe was the first of his class to sign Clark's register headed "Agreement of Those Who Believe in Jesus Christ."[36] Further records show that Nitobe moved from second in scholarship his first year to first in scholarship his second year. He was always at the top of his class in English.[37] Having begun serious study of English at the age of ten, he was by this time, five years later, far more skilled with that language than most Japanese students.

Upon completion of studies at Sapporo, Nitobe returned to the home of an uncle and guardian in Tokyo, and sought admission to Tokyo Imperial University to study Economics and English Literature. Asked why he wanted to study English Literature Nitobe replied that he wished "to become a bridge across the Pacific." This statement became a subsequent guideline for his attitudes and work.[38]

Studies Abroad

These were the years when Japan was most introspective and

---

[35] Kitasawa, p. 9. [36] Ibid., p. 10. [37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., p. vii; Mitsuru Ishii, A Biography of Inazo Nitobe, summarized in English by Toshiro Shimanouchi, October, 1934, p. 9. (typewritten.) In the Nitobe Papers at Friends Library at Swarthmore College is a picture of a monument erected at Morioka, with the words "Bridge Across the Pacific."

inclined to borrow from other nations. Administrators, professors and scholars felt their own educational system was inferior, and they longed to study abroad. Nitobe also perceived the West as the fountainhead of significant learning and asked his uncle for permission to study in the United States. The uncle had anticipated such a request, and withdrew funds he had invested in government securities to enable the boy to enroll first in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania,[39] and within a month in Johns Hopkins. Among his classmates at Johns Hopkins were Woodrow Wilson, later President of the United States; Shosuke Sato, later his President at Sapporo Agriculture College and the second Japanese Exchange Professor invited by the Carnegie Endowment; and John Dewey, American philosopher.[40]

Upon completion of his studies at Johns Hopkins Nitobe received a double notification: an appointment to the faculty at Sapporo Agriculture College, and instructions to proceed to Germany to continue study. He attended three German universities before receiving the Ph.D. degree from Halle in 1890.[41] Returning to America Nitobe completed two important actions before resuming duties in Japan. He arranged for the publication of his first work in English, and he married a young American Quakeress, Miss Mary Patterson Elkinton. The international marriage was opposed both by the Elkinton family and Nitobe's guardian, but in time all were able to give their complete approval.[42]

---

[39]Kitasawa lists Alleghany College, Pennsylvania. Shimanouchi's translation of Ishii cites "Midwill College, Pensylvania."

[40]Kitasawa, p. 12. [41]Ibid., pp. 15-21. [42]Ibid., pp. 20-22.

Educator

Nitobe went directly to Sapporo and devoted himself to educational activities. Letters to friends in America indicate that he taught a full schedule at the college, helped found and direct two other schools, and maintained a full public lecture schedule. For six years he maintained such a full schedule that he finally became ill. In 1897 doctors ordered him to take a rest and recommended from two to seven years. In his characteristic way he rested; while recuperating in California he dictated the manuscript for what was to become his most famous book, Bushido, the Soul of Japan.[43]

Once his health was regained Nitobe returned to Japan and accepted a teaching assignment at Kyoto Imperial University.[44] Three years later he agreed to serve two years as President of First National College in Tokyo. He held the position eight years, resigning in 1913 to become a full-time professor in Tokyo Imperial University.[45] When Tokyo Women's Christian College was founded in 1918 Nitobe became its first President.[46] Surely Nitobe earned his reputation as "one of the most outstanding educators in Japan."[47]

Public Servant

Nitobe rendered other public service in addition to his work in education. At age 40 he was appointed to serve his government as Head of the Industrial Development Bureau for Formosa. Under his direction sugar production in Formosa became a highly profitable operation.[48]

---

[43]Ibid., pp. 34-42. [44]Ibid., pp. 47-48. [45]Ibid., pp. 49-56.

[46]Ibid., p. 62. [47]Year Book, 1911, p. 63. [48]Kitasawa, pp. 42-47.

At age 59, when Japan was offered an opportunity to appoint a delegate to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, Nitobe was chosen and served seven years with distinction.[49] He was also selected to head the Japanese delegation at the third bi-annual Conference of the Institute on Pacific Relations, an organization formed in Hawaii in 1925. The third conference turned out to be crucial, and Nitobe not only made it a success, but continued active in the Institute until his death.[50] Though Nitobe was offered a cabinet post as Minister of Education, he declined, seeming to prefer working in more unofficial positions.[51]

In 1932, when Japanese actions in Manchuria came under sharp world criticism, Nitobe faced an unhappy choice. His Quaker convictions led him to speak out personally against militarists in his own government, but when that government asked that he conduct a lecture tour in the United States explaining Japan's posture in Manchuria, he arranged to do so.[52] This must have been his most difficult assignment. He traveled throughout the United States, speaking over one hundred times between May, 1932, and March, 1933, offering explanation for his country.[53] Americans were in no mood to hear such explanations, so his primary audiences did not respond. Militarists in his own government likely thought he temporized.

---

[49]Ibid., pp. 64-67. [50]Ibid., pp. 75-76, 81-82. [51]Ibid., p. 55.

[52]Ibid., pp. 76-77. On October 10, 1967 I conversed by telephone with J. Passmore Elkinton of Philadelphia, nephew of Mrs. Nitobe. He reported that Nitobe refused to come to America as an official representative of the Japanese government, but agreed to come as a private citizen.

[53]Kitasawa, pp. 76-82.

After the lecture tour he returned to Japan briefly before traveling to Canada to participate in the fifth Conference of the Institute on Pacific Relations. He had intended to conduct another lecture tour of the United States, then go to Geneva to meet with the Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, a group he had helped establish during his days with the League. However, he became ill while resting in Canada and did not recover from an operation. He died in Victoria, Canada, October 15, 1933,[54] renowned educator, statesman, and spokesman for his nation.

Writer

Altogether Nitobe published fifteen works in Japanese, though some were pamphlet size. He released nine books in English, plus a lecture on the League of Nations. He published two works in German, and his most famous work, Bushido, was translated into many languages.[55] His major works in English appeared regularly and primarily on Japanese life and relations, almost as if he served as a national propagandist. Just after receiving his Ph.D. in 1890 he released his first English volume, Intercourse Between the United States and Japan. In 1894 he published a work reflecting his interest in the Quaker religion, The Life of William Penn. Bushido, released in 1899, made him world famous. The Story of Faust, in Japanese, in 1910, reveals his interest in bringing the literature of the world to his own people. The Japanese Nation, published in 1913, contains the lectures that are the subject of this study. Western Influences in Japan, 1931, is a compilation of essays

---

[54] Ibid., pp. 84-87.

[55] Ibid., pp. 89-93.

edited by Nitobe and released on the occasion of the third Conference of the Institute on Pacific Relations, held in Japan. Also in 1931 he published a collection of essays and speeches entitled Japan: Some Phases of her Problems and Development. Two other works, Reminiscences of Childhood in the Early Days of Modern Japan, and Lectures on Japan, were published by his wife in 1936, after his death. The last volume contains lectures representative of those Nitobe delivered in the United States in 1932, and might constitute the basis for another study of his speaking. During his years in Tokyo Nitobe began to write editorial column for the major newspapers.[56] Many of those editorials have been collected in a volume entitled, Editorial Jottings, but they are not available in English.

Public Speaker

Japanese Climate for Public Speaking.--Public speaking presumably flourishes in a particular political climate. Japan after 1860 offers an interesting study related to that assumption. Political power prior to the Meiji era, while theoretically residing in the Emperor, actually resided in military chieftans known as shoguns. The coming of Perry precipitated an internal struggle for power that eventuated in a climate in which public speaking was a viable political instrument.

Emperor Meiji came to the throne by right of birth, but the power he actually exercised, despite polite language to the contrary, was determined by a circle of advisors who replaced the Tokugawa Shogun. Practical political considerations demanded that the new power group act

---

[56] Ibid., pp. 56-58.

in the name of the Emperor. Their decision to assimilate western ideas led them to create some political institutions they probably did not understand. For instance, the Charter Oath, proclaimed with considerable fanfare by the Emperor and his advisors, promised "an assembly widely convoked" and "great stress on public discussion." It also set as a national goal the seeking of knowledge "all over the world."

Ultimate development of the Diet, a cabinet, political parties, educational reforms, and citizen participation in government came largely as a result of expectations created by that proclamation. Those developments brought into Japanese society several new and unfamiliar institutions and roles that required definition; in a sense power vacuums developed. A struggle to define and give substance to those new institutions and roles ensued, and public speaking emerged as an important social tool.

During the early Meiji years, in 1870, Yukichi Fukuzawa introduced public speaking into Japan. He coined the word enzetsu, which means "public speaking." He built Enzetsu Hall on the campus of Keio University and conducted public speaking demonstrations there.[57] However it was actual political conditions in Japan that took public speaking out of the realm of a classroom exercise and made it a vital social tool.

Nitobe was born and reared in the very period when public speaking was assuming a place of consequence in Japan. To earlier generations, perhaps even the Emperor's Council of Advisors, public speaking would

---

[57]Carmen Blacker, The Japanese Enlightenment (London: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 13, 142.

have appeared to have no relevance to social problems, but to Nitobe's generation it was a natural part of their environment.

Given this background one wonders just how much Nitobe engaged in public speaking. The more one examines his life the more it is apparent that he used it often. One is tempted to say that the one who undertakes to evaluate Nitobe's life without taking into account his speaking could overlook one of his most important contributions.

Speaking in Japan.--Nitobe's speaking in Japan lends itself to analysis in terms of kinds of audiences he addressed as well as kinds of speaking done in different periods of his life. Primarily he addressed student groups, religious groups, and adults interested in educational experiences. He made some purely political speeches, but primarily he addressed audiences seeking a broader understanding of the world beyond Japan. In early life he addressed almost exclusively student and religious groups. With experience and maturity he became almost a national institution, and his publications, especially his editorial writings, created for him audiences throughout the entire citizenry.

As a teacher Nitobe addressed students, both in and out of the classroom. As a devout Quaker he participated in their regular religious exercises, and as his fame increased he was more and more in demand at Quaker gatherings beyond his local community. As a reputed internationalist he gained access to Japanese audiences interested in understanding things in foreign nations. He actively sought audiences in those cities where he taught. In particular he sought to share his understanding of foreign literature and philosophy. He lectured about the works of

Carlyle, Goethe, William Penn, and Faust. It is said that he accepted a teaching position in Tokyo because it would give him opportunities to share through lectures his understanding of America and Europe. He is presented as drawing large crowds in his vigorous defense of Idealism at a time when Naturalism was making inroads into Japan.[58] He is credited with contributing to the downfall of the Tanaka Cabinet in 1929 with a speech of rebuke in the Diet.[59] A Japanese Prime Minister recalled having heard a Nitobe speech delivered before "an audience ranging from teen-agers to graduates of colleges and universities." All understood the speaker, and the one-day-to-be Prime Minister decided to transfer from the prestigous Peers' College to First National College where Nitobe was then President.[60]

Perhaps the most striking story of Nitobe's influence on a Japanese listener is told by Gurney Binford. A young samurai privately approached Nitobe after an hour-long speech and confessed that he had come to the meeting with plans to kill Nitobe for reported remarks he considered slanderous to the Emperor. The speech convinced the young warrior that his judgment of Nitobe had been wrong. He not only made this confession, but proffered his dagger, handle first, to Nitobe.[61]

When Nitobe returned from Europe in 1927 he had gained the full stature of an internationalist working for peace. Many circumstances in his own country were tending toward militarism, conflict, and war.

---

[58]Kitasawa, p. 3. [59]Ibid., pp. 73-74. [60]Ibid., p. 51.

[61]Gurney Binford, As I Remember It, manuscript, written in Los Angeles, March, 1941, pp. 11-12.

Kitasawa has characterized this period of Nitobe's life: "Scarcely giving himself time to rest, he was soon traveling all over the country, lecturing on world peace and internationalism."[62]

International Speaking.--Nitobe's international speaking divides itself naturally into three phases: his speaking in the United States, his speaking while he served in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, and his speaking at Conferences of the Institute on Pacific Relations. For convenience we will consider these occasions in reverse order.

The Institute on Pacific Relations originated in 1925 in Hawaii. Later Conferences were in Hawaii (1927), Kyoto, Japan (1929), Shanghai, China (1931), and Banff, Canada (1933). Nitobe attended the last three as chairman of the Japanese delegation. In each instance he addressed the Conference. As chairman of the host delegation in 1929 he bore primary responsibility for its success, and that conference in turn insured the permanency of the organization. Texts of several of his addresses have been preserved. His opening address to the Third Conference is the best of this group of speeches.

At Geneva Nitobe was frequently called upon to fulfill lecture assignments. During his seven years in the Secretariat "nine of ten times" that a speaker represented the Secretariat, it was Nitobe. If he was not specifically asked for, the officials of the Secretariat usually designated him as the speaker, because, as Secretary General Eric Drummond put it, "he is most highly qualified. He is not only a good speaker, but

---

[62]Kitasawa, p. 74.

he gives audiences a deep and lasting impression. In this respect no one in the Secretariat can excel him."[63]

Nitobe's speeches in America are of special interest in this study. These fall into three convenient groupings. He spoke in the vicinity of Johns Hopkins as a student in the late 1880's. He came to the United States at the invitation of the Carnegie Endowment in 1911-1912. He came to the United States as a private citizen, concerned over tensions between his country and the United States in 1932-1933.

Little is known of his student speeches, other than the fact that he spoke in churches and usually protested against the unilateral treaties western nations had concluded with Japan in 1872. In particular he protested conventional tariffs and extraterritoriality. He also spoke about the need for women's education in Japan. At one of those Quaker meetings he met Mary Elkinton, who not only asked to be allowed to help in the causes he championed, but eventually became his wife.

The 1911-1912 lectures will be analyzed in detail in chapters V and VI of this study. Representative lectures from the one hundred delivered in 1932-1933 are published under the title Lectures on Japan, and would afford materials for a separate study within themselves.

American attitudes toward Nitobe can be seen in press releases, introductions made when he spoke, and invitations received from so many places in America. His reputation in 1932 can be seen in the following comments: "Nitobe Arrives: . . . Statesman . . . Here to Fight Prejudice."[64] An article in New Republic noted Nitobe as "Quaker, a scholar

---

[63] Ibid., p. 66.

[64] New York Times, May 7, 1932, p. 4.

and a philosopher" who for years "faithfully served the cause of international cooperation as a high official in the League Secretariat."[65] The Christian Century said of him: "By any measuring rod, Dr. Nitobe has been one of the most important figures in international life."[66] Since Nitobe's name had become synonymous with Japanese representation, a further indication of American attitudes toward him is reflected in the calibre of the American delegation to the Fifth Conference of the Institute on Pacific Relations. Joining were American delegates Owen Lattimore, author, Henry R. Luce, publisher, Harold G. Moulton, President of Brookings Institute, and James T. Shotwell, Professor of History at Columbia University. Still another indication of American esteem for Nitobe is reflected in the fact that many institutions invited him to lecture in America when he resigned from the League.[67]

All these circumstances portray American opinion of Nitobe fifteen and twenty years after the 1911-1912 visit. No such accumulation of data is available on American expectations in 1911. However it can be said that the Carnegie Endowment considered him "one of the most outstanding educators in Japan."[68] It can further be said that newspaper reports where he spoke in 1911-1912 are without exception commendatory. Further it appears that nothing he did before 1925 created any negative attitudes toward him in America.

---

[65]Raymond Buell, "An Open Letter to Dr. Inazo Nitobe," The New Republic, May 25, 1932, p. 42.

[66]The Christian Century, June 1, 1932, p. 691.

[67]Ishii, p. 20.

[68]Year Book, 1911, p. 63.

Summary

In the early 1900's many prominent Americans became active in peace movements. One of those men, Nicholas Murray Butler, persuaded a fellow peace worker, Andrew Carnegie, to endow an organization through which efforts at world peace might be channeled. Butler himself headed one of the three divisionsof the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and began at once to promote an international educational program. Fortuitously Butler and certain Japanese citizens seeking cultural exchanges with the United States were able to cooperate, and the first of several exchange professorships was Japanese-American. The proposal was to alternate, with a Japanese in America in 1911-1912, and an American in Japan in 1912-1913. The exchange, intended as a continuing project, was interrupted by World War I and never resumed.

Dr. Inazo Nitobe, the speaker, was possessed of the native ability, educational and cultural experience, high motivations and aspirations necessary to assess and meet the demands of these particular speaking situations. His educational experiences included studies at Sapporo Agricultural College, Tokyo Imperial University, Johns Hopkins University and Halle, Germany, where he receivied the Ph.D. degree. In Japan he was active as college professor, public speaker and writer. Married to an American Quakeress, he became a Quaker himself. It is not surprising that Japanese businessmen in Tokyo, the Japan Society of New York, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace should have agreed that he should be the first exchange professor from Japan to the United States.

CHAPTER IV

NORMS REINFORCING JAPANESE BEHAVIOR

As a critical component in cross-cultural communication culture must be examined. Wide variations existing within populations make scientific identification and description of particular cultural features most difficult. When one chooses to consider only one aspect of human behavior such as communication, the task of correlating particular cultural components to it becomes even more difficult.

Culture itself has been identified by Kluckholn and Kelley as "all those historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational and nonrational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behavior of men."[1] Henle has a more succinct statement: "Culture constitutes the set of modes of procedure or the guides to living which are dominant in a group."[2] Certain terms in these statements are pivotal: "created designs for living;" "potential guides for the behavior of men;" "modes of procedure;" "guides to living which are dominant in a group." This chapter seeks to identify these "guides . . . which are dominant" within the Japanese culture. The chapter

---

[1]Clyde Kluckholn and William H. Kelley, "The Concept of Culture," in The Science of Man in the World Crises, ed. by Ralph Linton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 97.

[2]Paul Henle, Language, Thought and Culture (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958), p. 3.

divisions are: (1) why rhetoricians must become more culture conscious; (2) the kinds of problems one faces in describing whole cultures; (3) the kinds of cultural components this study seeks to identify: (4) conclusions about Japanese culture drawn from anthropological, philosophical and language studies; (5) possible implications within this study for the Whorf hypothesis.

Rhetoric and Culture

Analysis of a rhetorical situation automatically involves one in judgments of cultural items. In traditional intra-cultural situations critics may unconsciously adopt the cultural perspective that is common to the situation being studied. Richard Gregg has observed that "when a communicator addresses audiences which share his cultural patterns of thought he may disregard culture to a large extent."[3] I would put the case even stronger. To assume, as has often been done, that the speaker or the critic will automatically identify with and operate within the cultural patterns of any audience, however much they have in common, is to overlook an important variable in the rhetorical situation. As speakers have modified their approaches to subjects following audience analysis they have acted on cultural data. When speakers have faced audiences from cultural backgrounds obviously different from their own they have been more prone to acknowledge that audience analysis in that case involved cultural data.

---

[3]George A. Borden, Richard B. Gregg, and Theodore G. Grove, Speech Behavior and Human Interaction (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 221.

In reality the student of communication has always had to work with and pass judgment on cultural items, but components of communication pose one kind of problem of perspective where all parties share the same culture, and quite another where different cultures are represented. For the most part rhetorical studies have concerned themselves with the former. Only lately has the incidence of cross-cultural communication so increased that it has made urgent the identification and description of the unique aspects of various cultures.

Classical rhetoric developed in the Greek cultural context, Fourth Century B.C. Concepts that emerged from that setting have provided broad guidelines for the student of public speaking, but those guidelines have sometimes been superimposed on other cultures in a way which obscured the uniqueness of those particular contexts. As Brockriede has argued, to presuppose that a rhetorical act today would be limited exclusively to the Greek setting is to be highly irrelevant.[4] Edmund Glenn's study of speaking in the United Nations further demonstrated this point.[5] Glenn concluded that Russian, English and French viewpoints were evident in the composition and translation of messages at the United Nations. Surely this would argue for an examination of Russian, English and French culture if one sought to evaluate communication in the United Nations context. It would further argue for a study of Japanese culture where one sought to evaluate an instance of a Japanese

---

[4]Wayne Brockriede, "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (February, 1966), 40.

[5]Edmund Glenn, "Meaning and Behavior; Communication and Culture," The Journal of Communication, XIV (December, 1966), 248-272.

addressing American audiences.

Describing Culture

Few would disagree that the rhetorical critic should identify the cultural factors relevant to a given speaking situation. The troublesome matter is, how. Specifically, in the case of this study, how does one identify the relevant components of the Japanese culture? The nature of the task can be further clarified by some admissions. G. C. Allen saw the problem when he wrote of an "insistent demand of the human mind for formulae in which to imprison the vague and uncertain complexities of national character."[6] Observers have fallen into the attractive and easy practice of assigning sweepingly descriptive labels to nationalities. So the French were once described as "logical but shallow," the Germans "methodical but sentimental."[7] Americans have been termed pragmatists; Greeks, lovers of disputation; Spartans, courageous; and Cretans, liars and gluttons. In part these practices are but demonstrations of both the utility and futility of language. While it is convenient and efficient to employ the single symbol "pragmatist" to denote the highly complex and variable behavior of Americans, it is also misleading and erroneous in that it glosses over some of the highly individualistic variations between Americans. The same would be true with any culture. Language itself may reduce efforts to identify cultural traits to oversimplification or overstated claims.

---

[6]G. C. Allen, Modern Japan and its Problems (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1927), p. 11.

[7]Ibid.

Bennett and McKnight confronted this same problem as they researched their study of the Japanese scholar in America and Japan. They had to cope with the problem of identifying cultural components. They examined "numerous studies by social scientists of national character or culture" and concluded that such studies really only identified norms, not actual behavior. Having reached that judgment they were content to talk about norms rather than actual behavior.[8] Likewise this study will examine culture in terms of national norms, mores, or sanctions that tend to reinforce behavioral patterns within a culture. Within such norms considerable variation in personal behavior will occur, but the culture itself will seek to perpetuate what it considers desirable.

Of the various approaches used to study culture, three offer help in isolating these national norms: Several writers have attempted to delineate a Japanese national personality or a national character. Others have discussed the Japanese mind or the Japanese ways of thinking. Still others have discussed the unique features of the Japanese language. Representative studies from each of these three approaches will be examined in an attempt to identify broad social norms operative in Japan.

Attempts to Delineate Japanese National Personality

In discussing attempts to delineate Japanese national personality or national character, Kerlinger recognizes that "scholars . . . say it

---

[8]John W. Bennett and Robert K. McKnight, "Social Norms, National Imagery, and Interpersonal Relations," Communication and Culture, ed. by Alfred G. Smith (Chicago: Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 597.

is impossible," but he argues that not only is it possible but also urgent that the effort be made. Scholars cited by Kerlinger, having examined attempts to develop national personality, objected both to the methods used and the conclusions drawn. They questioned the ability to gather all the data needed to generalize about a national population, or to circumscribe conclusions so they would account for the wide variation of conduct within a population. Some believed it would be more profitable to study city culture as opposed to rural culture within a nation. Some thought it impossible to guard against the cultural bias of the experimenter and cited LeBarre's conclusions in 1945 that found the Japanese personality aggressive, while finding the Chinese personality friendly, warm, and cooperative.

Fully aware of these and similar failings, Kerlinger felt the major difficulty with such studies arose from efforts to force the wrong kind of conclusions. He acknowledged that this kind of work would "always be inadequate for an accurate analysis of" a "particular individual in a national structure." Hence it would be wrong to draw up Japanese national character and insist that Nitobe had to conform to that image. On the other hand Kerlinger insisted on the possibility of abstracting "common traits . . . to form a generalized personality structure which" while it might not accurately fit any one individual, would "offer convenient guideposts for better understanding of a nation and the individuals in it."[9]

---

[9]Fred N. Kerlinger, "Behavior and Personality in Japan," in Japanese Character and Culture, ed. by Bernard S. Silberman (Tucson, Arisona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962), pp. 400-401, 410-411.

Douglas G. Haring's anthropological study, done in 1953, contains a grouping of observations about Japanese conduct and personal character based on his own extensive experience in Japan as well as consideration of numerous anthropological studies of the Japanese.[10] He specifically cites Benedict,[11] Gorer[12] and LaBarre.[13] Haring's conclusions are consistent with those drawn by such students of Japan as Reischauer.[14] Haring, a resident of Japan from 1918 to 1926, visited the country again in 1952. He observed two things about the culture: (1) Japanese behavior had changed profoundly from 1926 to 1952. In 1952 there was an

---

[10]Douglas G. Haring, "Japanese National Character," in Japanese Character and Culture, ed. by Bernard S. Silberman (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962), pp. 387-399.

[11]Ruth Benedict, Chrysanthemum and Sword (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946).

[12]Geoffrey Gorer, "Themes in Japanese Culture," in Japanese Character and Culture, ed. by Bernard S. Silberman (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962), pp. 308-324.

[13]Weston LaBarre, "Some Observations on Character Structure in the Orient," in Japanese Character and Culture, ed. by Bernard S. Silberman (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962), pp. 325-359.

[14]There are no perfect works on Japanese cultural traits. Haring's work was selected after consideration of many. Some, such as Lucy Crockett, Popcorn on the Ginza (New York: William Sloan Associates, 1949) and even David and Evelyn Reisman, Conversations in Japan (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), rose little above the superficial observations of a tourist. Another type, such as the writings of Lafcadio Hearn and numerous Christian missionaries, are overly sentimental. The works of Gorer and LaBarre, though both apply methods tested by anthropologists, began with assumptions about Japanese character that have not been empirically confirmed. Reischauer, not totally free of subjectivity, nevertheless has impressive credentials as an observer of things Japanese. His father was a missionary to Japan; his wife is Japanese; he did graduate study in Japan, and served there as U. S. Ambassador. He has co-authored a set of Japanese language texts, speaks the language fluently, and has written extensively on Japan and the Far East.

obvious sense of freedom in movement, thought and speech, that stood in marked contrast to the behavior Haring had perceived during his eight year residence. Even "the complex language of social status was falling into disuse." (2) Haring, assigned to duties on an island community between Kyushu and Okinawa, discovered that its people had never exhibited the compulsive neuroses toward conformity typical of the pre-war Japanese he had observed. He also learned that the island had escaped the police-state tactics which gripped Japan from 1600 to 1945. Haring then chose to review anthropological literature to develop a list of "outstanding aspects of Japanese conduct and personal character." The list, edited somewhat, follows:

> (1) Psychologically and culturally the Japanese people are unusually homogeneous.
> (2) The Japanese conform almost eagerly to numberless exact rules of conduct and exhibit bewilderment when required to act alone or in situations not anticipated in the codes.
> (3) The major sanctions of conformity to Japanese codes of conduct are ridicule and shame.
> (4) The Japanese are extremely polite.
> (5) Japanese families and Japanese society are rigid hierarchies. Individuals must ascertain their precise status in every social situation.
> (6) Veneration of family ancestors and of the Emperor as surrogate of the national ancestors means that every individual has been reared to constant awareness of infinite blessings received from these sources.
> (7) Pleasures of the flesh are regarded as in no way sinful or evil. They are subordinate, however, to the major goals of life.
> (8) The word makoto, mistranslated in dictionaries as "sincerity," is charged with emotional significance in Japan. A makoto person uses every means, including deception and violence, to carry out his duties.[15]

Haring called this list an "inadequate summary of Japanese characteristics," but claimed that it did not differ very greatly from what the Japanese

---

[15]Haring, pp. 389-390.

said of themselves. Haring's conclusions were: (1) these traits reflect a tendency toward conformity; (2) they are in large measure a product of the Tokugawa police-state methods; (3) they were especially emphasized and reinforced just prior to World War II by militarists using their own unique police-state methods.[16]

If Haring is right, these socially reinforced patterns of behavior were part of the culture of Nitobe's time. During his lifetime Japan not only sought to learn western ways, but constantly searched for what it considered uniquely Japanese, and through reinforcement pressures of police-state machinery, operated to reinforce "habits of conformity, suspicion and tense watchfulness."

Assume for the moment the operation of these social norms in Nitobe's Japan. Would one make any predictions about the behavior patterns of a speaker emerging from that culture? A speaker operating by such norms might be expected to demonstrate an awareness of kinship with his own nation, possibly to the point of being defensive about his own people, their behavior, and their reputation. It would not seem strange for such a speaker to be profusely polite, and extremely sensitive about minute details of conduct. At least it does not seem out of place to be alerted to the fact that Nitobe might behave in these ways.

Attempts to Identify Japanese Ways of Thinking

Among works that seek to establish the uniqueness of Japanese culture are those of Charles Moore, The Japanese Mind,[17] and Hajime

---

[16]Ibid., p. 399.

[17](Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967).

Nakamura, Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples.[18] Carefully done studies seeking descriptions of "ways of thinking" should reveal information about Japanese social norms.

Moore drew his conclusions not on his own experience alone, but studied carefully at least fourteen papers presented by Japanese scholars in four separate East-West Philosophers' Conferences held at the University of Hawaii over a period of twenty-five years. He listed two reported thought patterns of the Japanese as typical of the enigma they present to western observers, which he called "experiential" and "anti-intellectual," and he saw them as the positive and negative sides of a way of adjusting to reality. Then under ten other headings, many of them contradicting each other, Moore illustrated paradoxes in Japanese ways of thinking. For instance he characterized the Japanese as exotic because they had so little philosophical thought to call their own, but eclectic or harmonious because they adapted and assimilated from other cultures only what was practical in the Japanese context.[19]

Many Japanese writers agree with Moore's judgment that Japanese prefer "experiential" and "anti-intellectual" thought patterns. By "experiential" Moore meant that the "primary interest of the Japanese" was in experiencing, in living, in doing and in enjoying life.[20] Hideo

---

[18]Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India, China, Tibet, Japan, ed. by Philip P. Wiener (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1964).

[19]Moore, pp. 288-307.

[20]Ibid., p. 288.

Kishimoto elaborated on the same quality in his description of the Shinto worshipper "interested exclusively in his spiritual experience before the shrine."[21] To this Nakamura added: "Japanese simply accept life as it is--with all its confusions, incompatibilities, contradictions."[22] Immediate experience seems to be the key. Some Japanese writers call it "radical empiricism." Comparing the Eastern and Western mind Dr. Daisetz Suzuki reportedly explained: "The Western mind abhors paradoxes, contradictions, absurdities, obscurantism, emptiness, in short, anything that is not clear, well defined, and capable of determination."[23] And yet, Moore adds, "To the Far East, these are not to be abhored; in fact, they represent reality as it is--and truth."[24]

In sharp contrast to this positive approach to reality is the negative adjustment which Moore identified as "anti-intellectualism." He illustrated, saying: "It seems almost as if Japan differs from the rest of the major traditions of the world, all of which would accept the Socratic dictum that 'the unexamined life is unfit to live.' Japan might even counter by saying that it is the examined life that is unfit to live, because it is not life."[25] The point is clarified by completing Kishimoto's description of the Shinto worshipper--"interested exclusively in his spiritual experience before the shrine; not in intellectual explanations or arguments about matters of religion." The conceptual, analytic, and even the explanatory would be rejected because they are associated with

---

[21] Ibid., pp. 113, 289.

[22] Ibid., p. 289.

[23] Ibid., 290.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid., p. 289.

the intellectual and described as "unnatural, impractical, and a distortion," a getting away from things--"a deliberate refusal to face things as they actually are."[26]

If Moore's observations are correct, a critic should expect Nitobe's speeches to reflect a confusing proclivity for intuitive passages. One would assume that the American mind, generally described as inclined toward the logical and reasoned arguments, would find some passages in Nitobe's speeches puzzling simply because the speaker would not indulge in lengthy argument. Before evaluating this notion one other important study needs attention.

Hajime Nakamura, Professor of Indian and Buddhist Philosophy at the University of Tokyo, has examined "ways of thinking" in the major cultures of the East. As a student of Buddhism he noted its distribution and influence in India, China, Tibet, and Japan and the distinct differences in the Buddhism taught and practiced in those four cultures. He assumed Buddhism as a common stimulus originating in India and having been presented to the other three cultures. What he discovered was an indigenous Buddhism in each culture. Nakamura argued that a careful study of the processes that produced those indigenous religions would reveal something of the indigenous ways of thinking.[27]

Having made his careful analysis of each culture and its treatment of Buddhism, Nakamura listed three major characteristics of Japanese ways of thinking:[28] (1) acceptance of phenomenalism, (2) tendency to emphasize a limited social nexus, (3) non-rationalism. These could

---

[26]Ibid. [27]Nakamura, pp. 10-11. [28]Ibid., pp. 345-587.

be simply explained as follows:

(1) Japanese accept the phenomenal world as absolute.[29] The phenomena of this world are central to their life-adjustment and they tend to reject the notion of anything existing over and above the phenomenal world. In keeping with this way of thinking Japanese tend to accept man's natural dispositions, and act with tolerance toward man's behavior. Of particular interest is what Nakamura describes as "cultural multiplicity," borrowing freely from other cultures. Such an attitude would be consistent with a weak spirit of criticism.

(2) Japanese tend to emphasize a limited social nexus.[30] This tendency manifests itself in over stressing social relations, which take precedence over the individual. "Thus a human event . . . is not purely a personal event but an event having some value and emotional significance in a narrowly given sphere of social relations."[31] There is a "complete and willing dedication of the self to others in a specific human collective."[32] There is close observance of family morals, emphasis on rank and social position, a tendency toward ultra-nationalism, and an easy inclination toward Emperor worship.

(3) Japanese tend toward non-rationalism.[33] This section of Nakamura's work is the most difficult to follow. He argues, as he did in the two previous sets of conclusions, that the Japanese language contributes to the ways of thinking here identified. His favorite descriptive terms are "intuitive" and "emotional." He observes the

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 345-406.

[30] Ibid., pp. 407-530.

[31] Ibid., p. 414.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid., pp. 531-576.

Japanese to be indifferent to logical rules, unconcerned with formal consistency, and tending toward intuitivism and emotionalism.

What Nakamura has done in this final set of conclusions is consistent with what Moore found in Japanese writings, and what many Japanese writers apparently want to say about themselves. At first this analysis seemed a proper description of a difference in thought processes between Japanese and the western world. A problem arises, however, because the language used to describe these non-rational people sounded strangely like a pattern of logic--not familiar western patterns of logic, but a pattern of logic. Two considerations helped to clarify the matter.

First, Professor Miyamoto, Professor Emeritus of Buddhist Philosophy at Tokyo University, dissents from this characterization of the Japanese mind. He denied statements of a colleague, Hedeki Yukawa, to the effect that Japanese mentality "was in most cases unfit for abstract thinking and rational thinking." Miyamoto cited numerous instances of Japanese use of a Buddhist system of logic, and argued that Japanese art itself demonstrated a capacity to work with the abstract. These arguments suggest that though Japanese may not conform to western patterns of logic, they nevertheless have a kind of logic.[34] One might say of them that they feel more comfortable with their own patterns of logic than with western patterns, and that what Reischauer called their "national self consciousness and a sense of inferiority" makes them fear

---

[34]Shoson Miyamoto, "Comments by Miyamoto Shoson," in The Japanese Mind., ed. by Charles A. Moore (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967), pp. 60-65.

that they do not respond to logic since they do not feel at home with western logic.[35]

An examination of Japanese symbolic equivalents for "intuition" and "logic" offers a clue as to the Japanese willingness to describe their thought processes as non-logical. Both of these Japanese terms have within them a Chinese character that can be translated The characters for intuition carry the idea of directness and immediacy. Logic carries the idea of argument and discourse. Hence the Japanese prefer the quick reaction, immediate experience, "radical empiricism," and they dislike the very critical, analytical, reasoned, examined approach to life. On this basis it would appear that Moore's use of the Socratic dictum was correct. For the Japanese, the examined life would simply make then uneasy.

Professor Nakamura has done a remarkable job isolating and describing these three ways of thinking. He demonstrates that ways of handling thought that were indigenous to Japan exercised important influences on the development of Buddhism in Japan. If they constitute the kind of norms that would make major changes in an incoming religion they might also be the kind of norms that would influence the behavior of a Japanese national delivering speeches in another language and in another land.

Some of the norms discussed in this section have appeared in Haring, Moore and Nakamura. All three noted unusual homogeneity, veneration for family and Emperor, and a view of the family and society

---

[35]Edwin O. Reischauer, The United States and Japan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 108-112.

as rigid hierarchies. Haring and Nakamura found the Japanese did not regard pleasures of the flesh as sinful or evil. Both found them conforming to numberless exact rules of conduct, particularly with reference to rank and social position. On the basis of these observations one would not be surprised if Nitobe demonstrated unusual attachment to his countrymen--even to the point of being defensive about their welfare. One might expect an element of "this worldliness" even in the Quaker, Nitobe. One would surely expect Nitobe to behave as if anxious to observe proper ritual and recognize social rank and position.

Japanese Language and National Norms

Language is but one of the many things learned from one's cultural milieu. Probably no other single item of culture is more revealing or influential, with respect to both the individual and the total culture. Language obviously permits members of a culture to designate and encourage adherence to desired patterns of behavior. Some hold that language provides even more subtle behavioral determinants. Since languages reflect cultural differences, it is appropriate to look for features of the Japanese language that differentiate it from others.

Japanese appears to stand alone among the world families of languages. Though it has borrowed its written characters primarily from China, the two languages are very dissimilar, Japanese being agglutinative and Chinese analytic. Japanese was once thought to be related to Korean, but it is now generally agreed that no familial relationship exists between the two.

Several grammatical features about Japanese set it apart from

other languages. It lacks grammatical gender. Sex can be designated in the language, but "there is no such thing as agreement for gender." The suffix san, used after proper names, can mean Mr., Mrs., of Miss."[36] Though there are circumlocutions or affixes that indicate the plural notion, "strictly speaking Japanese words have no plural forms."[37] This factor is so pronounced in the English of some Japanese that Charles Moore proposed to edit and correct all manuscripts for The Japanese Mind, but changed his mind in favor of allowing English readers an opportunity to sample the flavor of Japanese thought.[38] Word order in a sentence is somewhat rigidly formalized: subject, object, verb.[39] Verbs always come at the very end of a sentence. The verb is "completely impersonal," so carries no personal endings, but this simplicity is small compensation for the demanding intricacy imposed by the Japanese penchant for politeness. While other words may carry affixes that add elements of politeness, the verb carries the main portion of this burden.

Other languages have devices for expressing politeness, but Japanese probably has the most complex and demanding linguistic system for politeness. To illustrate how the language reflects one's perception of his social status relative to the person he is addressing, take the concept "give." In Japanese there are three different verbs: one to use

---

[36]Mario Pei, The Story of Language (New York: J. B. Lippincott, Company, 1949), p. 380.

[37]Serge Elisseeff, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Takehiko Yoshihashi, Elementary Japanese for College Students (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), Part II, p. 4.

[38]Moore, p. 2.

[39]Elisseeff, p. 8.

if the speaker is of higher status than the party being addressed; one to use if the two are equals; and one to use if the speaker perceives himself lower in status than the one being addressed. To make the system complete there are three complementary verbs to denote the three relationships if the speaker wishes to "receive" rather than "give." Beyond this, if the speaker perceives the need for extreme politeness there are suffixes and prefixes that may be added to other words in the sentence. The goal is always to give proper emphasis to the station of the other party in the conversation. These verbalizations may be accompanied by reinforcing non-verbal behavior such as bowing and vocalized "non-words" appropriate to the particular situation. If it is eating, sucking sounds show appreciation. If it is admiration of the beautiful or unusual, prolonged cooing sounds may be emitted. Reliance on these polite mechanisms has become so pronounced in some literature that its length would be reduced by one-half if the honorifics were taken out.[40]

Martin noted that Japanese must make choices on two axes before they can utter a verb form. He calls them the axis of reference and the axis of address. In the case of the first a speaker must decide whether he will use plain, polite, or deferential language. In the case of the second he must decide on humble, neutral or exalted terminology. The first choice reflects the speaker's attitude toward the person being addressed. The second choice reflects the speaker's attitude toward the subject.[41]

---

[40]Nakamura, pp. 407-408.

[41]S. E. Martin, "Speech Levels in Japan and Korea," Language in Culture and Society, ed. by Dell Hymes (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964), pp. 408-412.

The impact of status consciousness on language reaches to the family itself. Should one refer to his own wife, the proper term is tsuma, (woman) or kannai (the one deep within the house). If one speaks of the wife of another, okusan (your wife) or okusama (your honored wife) would be proper. A wife speaks of her own husband and son as shujin (master) and segare (a son); of another's she would say dannasan, (protector) and musukosan (son, one of yourself). These comprise the simple kinship terms. Beardsley, Hall and Ward list twenty-one separate kinship terms one might use (grandfather, father, son, etc.) and list three and four alternate terms that should be used for each relationship, depending on the social context in which one finds himself.[42]

It may appear that this point has been unduly belabored, but the attention given it here cannot exceed its importance as a factor in the day-to-day adjustments of Japanese to each other. It underscores the observations made elsewhere in this study: the Japanese are extremely status conscious; they perpetuate language behavior capable of the most precise discriminations between social states; in so doing they reinforce a rigid system of heirarchy.

Another more subtle influence of language also deserves attention. Harold Vetter has illustrated the positive influence of grammatical mind sets:

> The native speaker of English would show little hesitation in accepting a word string like All mimsy were the borogroves, and the mome raths outgrabe as being an utterance in his mother

---

[42]Richard K. Beardsley, John W. Hall and Robert E. Ward, Village Japan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 246.

> tongue, albeit a strange one, and rejecting as a candidate for admission to membership a string like Label break to calmed about and.[43]

Vetter talks about "an intuitive basis" for working with language. Apparently he believes members of a language-culture develop expectations based more on grammatical structure than on vocabulary. Apparently one anticipates some uncertainty with vocabulary and can live with that level of uncertainty easier than he can with the disorienting effect of a violation of grammatical expectations.

If Vetter's observation and the inference drawn from it are true it has implications for Nitobe's position in his speeches. As indicated above the word order in Japanese sentences is subject, object, verb, with the verb always being the last word in the sentence. Word order in English sentences is usually subject, verb, object. Would a Japanese tend to scramble the word order when speaking in English? Would he be influenced to revert to traditional Japanese word order? Would he be influenced to place verbs near the end of sentences, if not at the very end of sentences? Would he be disposed to superimpose Japanese grammatical patterns on his English constructions to the extent that native speakers of English would feel disoriented at hearing him?

The contrast between discursive aspects of Japanese and English can be illustrated with some literal translation of thoughts from Japanese to English. The first item below is an attempt to translate the thoughts and identify the functions of Japanese words within the sentence. The

---

[43]Harold J. Vetter, Language Behavior and Communication (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1969), p. 27.

second item is a literal translation without comment. The third item represents a smoother English translation.

Columbus (wa--a post position designating "Columbus" as the subject of the sentence) Atlantic Ocean (wo--post position designating "Atlantic Ocean" as being in the objective case) west (ni--post position indicating prepositional idea "to" or "in the direction of") crossing over San Salvador (ni-- post position suggesting prepositional idea "to") having come (verb form which completes the thought) north (ni) North American continent being (this verb form completes a clause) south (ni) South American continent being, this fact (or this thing) he did not know (the form of this major verb in the thought group is in agreement with the subject, "Columbus").

Columbus Atlantic Ocean west in the direction of crossing over San Salvador to having come, north to North American continent being, south to South American continent being, this fact he did not know.

Columbus, crossing west over the Atlantic Ocean, having come to San Salvador, did not know that the continents of North and South America lay north and south of him.

With this kind of grammatical contrast in mind, one would predict that the influence of Japanese grammar would intrude on Nitobe's handling of the English language so that some of his sentences might represent less than first order approximations of English.

If Nitobe's native language should operate as a set of social norms, even when Nitobe was speaking in English, one would expect the following: more polite expressions than in normal English, particularly indicating attempts to define social status; some difficulty in handling

plurals and gender, and some violation of traditional word order in English sentences, particularly verbs after objects, and verbs near the end of sentences.

Implications for the Whorf Hypothesis

Several times in this study reference has been made to the Whorf hypothesis, and possible implications the findings of this study might have for that hypothesis. In the final chapter of the study this question will receive further attention, however it deserves some preliminary attention here.

In the context of stating the purpose of this study the question was asked: Is it possible that instances of rhetorical criticism of cross cultural communication might provide relevant evidence for further study of the Whorf hypothesis? Having developed the historical and cultural background deemed important to this critical analysis, one can see some relevance between the kind of materials considered here and the Whorf hypothesis. Of course the rhetorical critic will probably deal with evidence at levels of abstraction inappropriate to prove or disprove Whorf's hypothesis, but Joshua Fishman has suggested it might be well to put aside "attemptsat grossly proving or disproving the Whorfian hypothesis and instead" focus attention on "behaviors that do or do not show the Whorfian effect as well as the degree and the modifiability of this involvement when it does obtain."[44]

---

[44]Joshua A. Fishman, "A Systematization of the Whorfian Hypothesis," in Communication and Culture, ed. by Alfred G. Smith (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 516.

The kinds of materials he examines and the judgments the critic is called upon to make incline him toward assuming the Whorf hypothesis to be true. Such has proved an intriguing possibility from the inception of this study. Without careful attention to the demanding strictures that must operate before one can accept or reject such an hypothesis one is tempted to make claims that cannot yet be substantiated.

In this chapter we have sought to identify cultural norms. Admittedly the level of abstraction at which this study is operating precludes strict scientific rigor. Still the evidence considered from anthropologists,philosophers, and linguists supports the judgment that identifiable norms operate in the Japanese culture. In the face of that judgment educated guesses have been made about Nitobe's behavior during the delivery of speeches in English. It may be that those educated guesses will encourage research efforts that would not have been attempted except for our efforts.

I have assumed that the cultural norms identified here will influence, in some degree, a speaker's behavior even outside his own culture. It now remains to examine Nitobe's speeches to see if that evidence is forthcoming. If it is, then one will need to make judgments about its implications. If it is not forthcoming, judgment may need to be made about procedures used in this study.

Summary

This chapter concluded that rhetoric operates in a cultural context, and that students of rhetoric are obligated to make themselves aware of cultural factors operating within the contexts of their work.

For the student of cross-cultural communication that would mean identification of the social norms that reinforce behavior. Admitting the difficulty of such a task I sought Japanese social norms in two sources: (1) studies of anthropologists and philosophers, and (2) Japanese language.

Haring found the Japanese society to be: (1) unusually homogeneous; (2) eager to conform to numberless exact rules and codes of conduct; (3) yielding to sanctions of shame and ridicule; (4) extremely polite; (5) developed into rigid hierarchical structures in family and society; (6) venerating family ancestors and the Emperor. He concluded that these conditions reflected a tendency toward conformity, that they were a product of police-state methods, and that they were rigorously enforced in a police-state atmosphere prior to World War II.

Moore observed the Japanese to be (1) experiential, which he defined as experiencing, living and enjoying life, and (2) anti-intellectual, which he defined as disliking intellectual explanation and argument.

Nakamura described his people under three headings: Japanese (1) accept the phenomenal world as absolute; (2) tend to emphasize a limited social nexus; and (3) tend toward non-rationalism.

The Japanese language structure was adapted to perpetuate some of the norms noted above. Built into the Japanese language was an elaborate system of polite expressions and honorifics designed to clarify social status and perpetuate hierarchical structure. Not necessarily related to social norms were other language traits that differentiate Japanese from English: (1) Sentences always end with a verb. (2) Sentence word order was usually subject, object, verb. (3) Japanese grammar does not make

provision for plurals nor for gender.

On the basis of these observations it has been predicted that Nitobe's English speeches will be affected as follows: (1) Language will reflect identification, perhaps defensive in character, with his group, his family and nation. (2) Language will include polite expressions designed to clarify status. (3) Certain syntactical features will be affected by Japanese grammar: use of plurals, gender, word order, and placement of the verb within the sentence. (4) Nitobe will not develop extensive analysis or argument.

CHAPTER V

RHETORICAL QUALITIES OF NITOBE'S SPEECHES

Apart from whatever cultural significance Nitobe's appearances may have had, he did deliver formal speeches that possess certain rhetorical qualities. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the speeches in terms of the rhetorical techniques they reflect and audience responses to those combined techniques. The speeches will be considered under the following headings: (1) general rhetorical observations; (2) organizational qualities; (3) supporting materials; (4) matters of style, and (5) impact of the lectures.

General Rhetorical Observations

An enterprise of the proportions of this professorship was not without purpose. Yet to identify purpose one has to examine several items of evidence. Presumably the official representing the Carnegie Endowment in exchanges with the Japanese Ambassador would understand the overall purpose of the professorship. Butler expressed that purpose:

> With a view to spreading in Japan and the United States a wider knowledge of the institutions, the public opinion and the culture of each, and to promote relations of confidence and goodwill between the two peoples.[1]

The Japanese businessmen who financed Nitobe's trip and who saw it as a "sort of corollary to the movement which they . . . had undertaken two years before" sought "to impress upon the people of the United States . . .

---

[1]Personal letter from Nicholas Murray Butler to the Japanese Ambassador to the United States, December 15, 1911.

that Japan had no thirst for war and no ambition for territorial expansion but that the outlet for the production of her industries and the field of useful employment for her surplus population were all that Japan sought in foreign countries."[2] Nitobe himself stated his understanding of the purpose of the professorship in the preface to his volume of speeches:

> The object of the scheme--as I take it--is the interchange of right views and sentiments between the two peoples, rather than a mutual giving and taking of strictly academic knowledge. The appointees, whether men of science or men of affairs or of literary reputation, are expected to be convoys of warm human feeling rather than of cold scientific truth.[3]

The Baltimore News stated its understanding of the exchange of lectures:

> To help build up a public opinion that will resist all attempts to arouse unnecessary antagonism between the two countries, and to give each nation a better knowledge of the other.[4]

Nitobe's personal purposes in the lectures were to contribute to the "trans-Pacific bridge," his own figure for continuing cooperation and goodwill between Japan and the United States.[5] A study of the themes of the speeches reveals that Nitobe did not state purposes within the speeches, but developed a heavy emphasis on improved Japanese-American relations which would permit the combined energies of the two nations to concentrate on realization of a peaceful world community in which Japan could readily identify her place.

---

[2]T. Miyaoka, Growth of Internationalism in Japan (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Intercourse and Education, 1915), Publication No. 6, p. 8.

[3]Inazo Nitobe, The Japanese Nation (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons 1912), p. vi.

[4]Baltimore News, July 10, 1911.

[5]Nitobe, p. xii.

The texts of Nitobe's published speeches lack some of the personal qualities normal in an oral context. Though there are compensations for these deficiencies, the absence of these personal qualities is obvious. Little in the texts reflects adaptation to audiences. References to people, places and events of the moment are absent. To illustrate, the "East and West" speech has the following opening line:

> As facilities of intercommunication, and therefore points of contact, have of late rapidly increased, and as the East and West can now see and hear each other at close range on matters of business interests, instead of merely exchanging courtesies at a polite distance, occasions have likewise more frequently arisen for misunderstanding and doubt.[6]

The first sentence of the lecture on "Morals and Moral Ideals" further illustrates what is characteristic of these lectures; a long involved sentence, with unusual vocabulary, and little evidence of audience adaptation:

> Under various names--characterology, sophiology, ethology, race psychology--the study of alien character has been cultivated to discover some traits peculiar to different races, and this has given rise to the so-called Volkergedanken theory, which takes for granted without demonstration that every race must be possessed of some mental and moral features not shared by others.[7]

The two quotations above stand in sharp contrast to the opening lines of a very different speech by Nitobe at Stanford University:

> I consider it a great kindness on your part to invite me to this institution, whose fame as a contributor to knowledge has reached all quarters of the globe. I am conscious of the rare honour you have conferred upon me by so doing.[8]

The contrast is so sharp one finds it hard to believe that Nitobe actually opened the eight lectures of his formal speeches just as the printed texts appear. There is an explanation for the difference. Nitobe himself

---

[6]Ibid., p. 1. [7]Ibid., p. 150. [8]Ibid., p. 316.

acknowledged that the last item was not like the others:

> The first address which I delivered in this country was in response to the invitation of Leland Stanford Jr. University, but as it contains a number of local allusions, I have placed it last as an appendix.[9]

Of course those very local allusions of which Nitobe wrote almost apologetically provided the sense of an intimate personal relationship between speaker and audience that was missing from the other texts. The local allusions provided evidence of speaker awareness of and adjustment to the living components in the speaking situation. Bryant and Wallace have called it "vivid-realization-of-idea at the moment of utterance."[10] It calls for something more than mere recitation of a prepared message, and Nitobe appears to have had that quality in the speech given at Stanford. This would argue that he was capable of making adjustments that do not appear in the eight texts that are the major focus of this analysis. Nitobe further admitted that the printed texts were not "exactly like" what his listeners heard, but claimed "that the general trend of thought and messages" remained the same.[11]

Regardless of the reason for the difference between the Stanford speech and the texts of the eight lectures the formal nature of the latter affected such rhetorical components as organization, style and handling of supporting materials.

---

[9] Ibid., p. ix.

[10] Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking, (4th ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969), p. 233.

[11] Nitobe, p. ix.

Nitobe's supporting materials reveal extensive preparation. Within the eight lectures he drew on the history of Greece, Egypt, India, China, Rome, Germany, France, Britain, and the United States. He demonstrated himself to be familiar not only with the religions of the Far East, Buddhism and Shinto, but that of the Moslems, Saracens, Jews and Christians. At least thirty-five specific references were made to great men in literature or history. Just to mention some of the more familiar, he quoted such Englishmen as Shakespeare, Cromwell, Kipling, Swift, Byron, Pope and Browning. He cited Kant and Hegel, Augustus and Napoleon. He quoted Americans Bryant, Clay and Mark Twain. These were not instances of pretentious parading of names, but references indicating that he knew the men and their thought. Such references had the effect of making Nitobe appear a widely read individual. Checking a number of his sources confirmed that Nitobe had properly understood and represented the men whom he quoted.

This very list of sources would suggest that Nitobe spent little time with a particular reference. It would be further confirmed by noting that he cited over one hundred authority figures in the eight speeches. Numerous paragraphs are full of data with no attempt at elaboration or amplification or reinforcement.

An overview look at Nitobe's speeches permits certain rhetorical observations of a general nature. A consensus of the various stated purposes revealed a primary goal of drawing Japan and the United States closer together. The formal lectures lack certain personal qualities common to the oral context which affected organization, style and handling of supporting materials. Nitobe derived supporting materials from a wide range of sources, but introduced so many personalities there was little

opportunity to develop their contributions to the fullest.

Organization

Organizational features of Nitobe's formal lectures lay buried in the texts. Introductions were virtually non-existent. Conclusions consisted of useful ideas that lacked forceful development. Thesis sentences were obscured or lacking altogether. Only two of the four lectures had clearly identifiable main points, and only those two had consistently and carefully developed transition sentences. I chose to outline the texts of several speeches to get a more complete view of the organizational structure. Two of the outlines have been included as appendices C and D. Once major points were isolated in an outline an orderly coordination and subordination of ideas became apparent. Outlining revealed no potential strength in six of the eight introductions, but it did display a total unity in the speeches, logical progression of thoughts within each speech, and ideas suitable for forceful conclusions.

The order of development in these eight speeches was dependent on subject matter. In the "East and West" speech and the speeches on religion, morals, and economic conditions, Nitobe followed a topical order. In his speeches on Japanese History and America and Japan he followed a chronological order. His speech on geography appropriately followed the spatial order, modified somewhat by topical order, and the speech on race and national characteristics made use of a combined chronological and topical order.

Almost without exception Nitobe sought to establish common ground with his audiences and organized his thoughts to take advantage of that tactic. In the speech on economic conditions he accomplished that through

two appeals. He began with Biblical materials familiar to all Americans, "Man doth not live by bread alone,"[12] and proceeded to identify his people historically with this non-materialistic attitude toward life.[13] He followed that with a discussion of Japanese traditional veneration for agriculture and hard work.[14] When he acknowledged the impact of materialistic philosophy on his country it was against a background of resistance to it,[15] and a background that identified values and traditions of his people with American values and traditions: Biblical injunctions against materialism and veneration for the rural life. In the "East and West" speech Nitobe began with references to recent developments in which both Japan and the United States had faced the consequences of imperialism.[16] Early in the speech on geography he contrasted Japanese land area with the total area of the United States, then compared Japan to individual states in the United States.[17] In one speech he established common ground with the young American nation by identifying Japan as the youngest among Asiatic nations.[18] In the lecture on morals he first philosophized about the difficulty of grasping the moral phase of any national life. Then he helped Americans to appreciate Japanese moral viewpoints by developing two perspectives: Americans looking askance at Japanese bathing habits, and Japanese finding cause for alarm in what Americans considered innocent--ladies with bare shoulders in ball-rooms.[19]

---

[12] Ibid., p. 204

[13] Ibid., p. 206.

[14] Ibid., pp. 209-215.

[15] Ibid., p. 210.

[16] Ibid., pp. 1-3.

[17] Ibid., p. 23.

[18] Ibid., p. 83.

[19] Ibid., pp. 150-153.

Supporting Materials

Nitobe's speeches include a variety of types of supporting materials drawn from an unusually wide range of sources. Each of the eight speeches has several types of supporting material, and within the eight there are instances of definition, comparison and contrast, narrative, quotations, statistics, authority, description and rhetorical questions. There are two instances of repetition, one a series of statements in antithesis to each other, and the other repetition of parallel structure.

The first speech, "East and West" began with a claim that imperialism was a cause of misunderstanding and doubt between East and West. The claim was supported by a group of examples which in effect developed an operational definition of imperialism:

> Imperialism, the overpowering trend of the last century, which, causing the stronger nations to overleap their respective territorial bounds, has brought them face to face with one another in unexpected quarters distant from home. The Dutch and the English, for instance, encountered each other in an unwonted relation on the South African veldt. The Japanese and Russians renewed acquaintance under strained circumstances on the plains of Manchuria--somewhat after the manner of America and Spain in Cuba and the Philippines, or more recently, the Italians and Turks in Tripoli.[20]

The second lecture also began with a definition, the component parts of which served as the major divisions of that speech:

> Geographically defined, Japan is a series of long and narrow volcanic islands in the Pacific Ocean, lying off the north-eastern coast of the Asiatic continent in the shape of a longitudinal curve.[21]

A favorite and effective supporting device for Nitobe was that of comparison and contrast, and he usually chose to blend the two together as

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[21] Ibid., p. 21.

he did in the case of establishing the relative size of Japan:

> We can compare favourably with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland or with Italy. In relation to the United States, however, the comparison will not redound to our glory, for our whole area is only equal in expanse to the State of Montana, is smaller than California or Texas, and is about three times the size of the State of New York or Virginia or Pennsylvania.[22]

When he called Japan "insular by nature" he developed comparisons with England.[23] When he argued that Japanese mountainous terrain had contributed to freedom from invasion and civil liberty he alluded to Switzerland.[24] A comparison with Egypt and the Nile illustrated the extent to which a volcanic character had influenced Japan: "If Egypt is the gift of the Nile, Japan is the legacy of primeval fire."[25]

Though Nitobe usually developed brief illustrative devices, there are some full narrative passages. In the speech on Japanese history he developed a particularly effective story about two warriors who though opponents, developed first a genuine respect and then affection for each other. When they met in battle a third time each knew he would die.[26] A humorous story of a huge catfish under the earth's crust whose movement caused earthquakes underscored the fact that his people had to live in constant awareness of earthquakes.[27] There were myths about the origin of the Japanese islands,[28] as well as the Japanese race,[29] but Nitobe neither overused the narrative nor used it at an inappropriate time. In fact there were passages in the speeches where he came very close to developing

---

[22] Ibid., p. 23. [23] Ibid., p. 25. [24] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[25] Ibid., p. 31. [26] Ibid., pp. 65-66. [27] Ibid., p. 33.

[28] Ibid., p. 51. [29] Ibid., pp. 85-86.

narratives, but stopped short:

> A large number of our population are born and bred within sight of the sea, and, thus destined by nature to wield its craft, breathe its winds, and fight its billows, are inured from infancy to a sea-faring life.[30]

Thus he maintained interest by half promising a narrative but did not expend the time required for the details of a story.

The speeches are replete with quotations from American, British and Japanese literature. He identified over one hundred American and European authorities on whom he relied for support of his ideas, and there were numerous quotations interspersed into his texts with no author identified. In his first speech he cited nine authority figures but quoted nothing from them. He cited nine individuals from whom he also took brief but direct quotations. He used eight short quotations that were in no way identified, apparently in the belief that the particular phrasing or the familiarity of the material justified its use.

In his first speech he sought to play down the popular notion of great differences between East and West. Some quotations used in connection with that point will illustrate his techniques. Nitobe acknowledged Kipling as source for the idea that the human family could be classified "into those who wear trousers and those who wear something else."[31] He further noted the difficulty associated with classifying mankind according to compass directions by quoting Alexander Pope:

> Ask where's the North? At York, 'tis on the Tweed;
> In Scotland, at the Orcades; and there
> At Greenland, Zembla, or the Lord knows where.[32]

---

[30] Ibid., p. 23. [31] Ibid., p. 7. [32] Ibid.

He suggested an improvement on the rhetoric of the psalmist, saying "As near as the east is to the west,"[33] rather than "As far as the east is from the west." He concluded the point with a quotation from Henry Clay: "I know no South, no North, no East, no West, to which I owe any allegiance."[34]

Some of the subject matter of Nitobe's speeches required the handling of statistics, particularly geography and economics. In each instance he chose to link statistics with some other illustrative device. Thus his statement of per capita income evolved out of consideration of the entire wealth of Japan yielding a hypothetical ten per cent return, that figure divided by the national population, and that figure divided by twelve to produce a monthly figure.[35] He made the numerical count of earthquakes meaningful at a personal level by noting that between 1885 and 1909 some 37,642 earthquakes had struck the islands of Japan. Put in perspective that would mean "about four shocks per day."[36]

Where appropriate Nitobe used description as supporting material. To make his point about the varied climate of Japan he described twelve different flowering plants, native and well known in his country, one for each month of the year.[37] In a somewhat brief but nevertheless descriptive passage he identified the East at one point in history:

> If there was then any East that could be named in juxtaposition to the West, it expressed chaos against order, a crowd of kings who reigned without governing, a nondescript mass of beings who simply existed without living.[38]

---

[33] Ibid., p. 8. [34] Ibid. [35] Ibid., p. 208.

[36] Ibid., p. 31. [37] Ibid., pp. 39-42. [38] Ibid., p. 6.

In a rather tedious section he described Japanese physical characteristics. His handling of such details as height, shape and length of limbs, pigmentation, shape of head and nasal index was mechanical and devoid of any special handling to heighten interest.[39]

Nitobe availed himself of all types of supporting materials, and using them in ways appropriate to his subjects, in most instances showed himself a good judge in handling supporting materials to insure clarity. Some of the appropriateness of his adjustments can be seen in adaptations to American values.

Adaptations to American Values

Use of illustrations from Biblical contexts would suggest sensitivity to American values, and Nitobe used such material in five of his eight lectures. Of twenty-one Biblical references, seven appeared in his lecture on Japanese religion, and the remaining fourteen appeared in four other lectures.

An impressive gracefulness characterized Nitobe's use of these Biblical passages. They were not instances of thundering pronouncements of judgment from on high, but a gracious sharing of common thought forms with an audience. His first lecture concluded with a plea that the United States and Japan should come to a better knowledge of each other, that thoughts of war might be banished, and that together they might influence other nations to become part of a "federation of the world." His closing sentence was: "And to this great consummation, devoutly to be wished for,

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 92-99.

it is a privilege to contribute a widow's mite."[40]

In another lecture he made reference to early inhabitants of Japan who failed to "multiply and replenish the entire land, much less subdue it."[41] Commenting on the Japanese tendency to borrow and imitate, Nitobe suggested a parallel between Emperor Meiji's "injunction to seek knowledge all over the world" and the Biblical command to "Prove all things and hold to that which is good."[42]

In still another place he acknowledged Japanese kinship with mankind and the Apostle Paul in "a struggle between the dual natures of good and evil, between 'the good which I would and which I do not, and the evil which I would not and which I practice.'"[43]

One of his most effective uses of Biblical materials was in the conclusion of his lecture on religious beliefs. The plea was for a universal brotherhood born of the strength of all religions. His peroration began with the statement:

> On this height in the fulness of time may be brought into common brotherhood, the philosophers of the North and the seers of the South, the thinkers of the West, and the wise men of the East,--and God shall be glorified by all his children.

Then Nitobe appended a Biblical reference:

> The hour is coming when neither on the mountain of Samaria nor in the city of Jerusalem--not alone in the Orient, neither in the Occident,--but in spirit and in truth, wherever men come together in brotherly love, shall they worship the same Father.[44]

Such handling of Biblical material is but illustrative of some insightful subject-matter adjustments Nitobe made for the benefit of American audiences.

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 19-20. [41] Ibid., p. 87. [42] Ibid., p. 104.

[43] Ibid., p. 123. [44] Ibid., p. 149.

Nitobe found other ways to identify with Americans. In a passage in his "East and West" speech he spoke of misrepresentations of his country. He argued that an honorable nation would develop the moral stamina to bear "unkind comments and hard treatment . . . if not like martyrs, at least like gentlemen." But there would be times, he continued, when vigorous response to mistreatment would be the only alternative. To clinch his point with Americans, Nitobe said:

> You understand this spirit. It is not a warlike or aggressive spirit. Is it not the spirit of '76, as you call it? When the Thirteen Colonies, the "three millions of people armed in the holy cause of liberty," rose up, like one man, "invincible by any force," who called them an aggressive people? There is a wide margin between an unconquerable spirit and a spirit of conquest. . . . No people will understand the distinction better than the American.[45]

Nitobe understood American sentiment toward the Revolution.

There was a touch of irony in some of Nitobe's adjustments to America. While acknowledging westernizing influences on the structure of Japanese government, Nitobe admitted to little real progress toward party government. Then he added: "But here we feel no regret--in the face of recent examples this country has shown us."[46] Given the Taft, Roosevelt, LaFollette frictions within the Republican party, and given Taft's difficulties with Congressional leadership in his own party, Nitobe must be credited with an awareness of the inner workings of American politics, and a certain gentleness in his allusions to them. A sensitivity to the contemporary American cultural and political scene is shown in his use of the term popularized by Roosevelt, "muckraking."[47]

Concluding his speech on Japan's history, Nitobe composed a

---

[45]Ibid., pp. 18-19. [46]Ibid., p. 79. [47]Ibid., p. 163.

beautiful reference to the assistance America had rendered his country. Saying that environment was as vital to the life of a nation as to the life of a plant, he asked a question:

> Which nation has retarded and which accelerated our growth? Which offers, or will offer, a favourable, and which a fatal condition? We shall speak . . . of the part played by America in our national development--how her Stars heralded to the world the rising of our Sun.[48]

Such a development showed an understanding of American values and tastefulness in appealing to them.

In Nitobe's final speech, devoted entirely to relations between the United States and Japan one would expect several special adjustments to American values. The first division of the speech culminated with outright praise for the high level of goodwill between the two nations achieved when Roosevelt arranged the Portsmouth Conference to conclude the Russo-Japanese War. In the second division of the speech Nitobe recounted with a sense of genuine distress the obvious deterioration of relations between the two nations after 1905.

A source of strength in this speech was the astounding quantity of documentation. No point that could possibly have sparked disagreement was left unsupported. Rather than make the speech heavy or mechanical it enhanced Nitobe's credibility and made his individual points more impressive. Such a mass of relevant documentation would inspire in proof-oriented Americans awe at the thought of the research done to accumulate such an array of data. Actually Nitobe's thesis, published by Johns

---

[48]Ibid., p. 82.

Hopkins in 1891, contained his careful research done twenty years prior to the speech.[49] In this instance Nitobe adapted to the American love for thoroughly done argumentation.

Another important factor in this speech was Nitobe's apparent "tongue-in-cheek" manner at several critical junctures. He seemed so well informed of the details he recounted that he was above personal involvement. His language suggested that one chuckle with him, or that he would chuckle with his listeners about an event common to the history of the two nations. In mock consternation he cited dire astrological predictions, which in retrospect were ridiculous. At one point he reviewed some press copy that appeared in London and the United States prior to Perry's mission to Japan. He characterized the copy with a comment:

> Looking through a number of newspapers and periodicals of the time, I am struck with the absence of public sympathy concerning an enterprise of which the United States can so nobly and so justly boast.[50]

Not only was it laughable that the general American public had forseen nothing of consequence in Perry's expedition prior to his sailing, but Nitobe handled the incident in a way to appeal to America's willingness to poke fun at her own foolishness.

Still another strength of this speech lay in Nitobe's obvious fairness in comments about the shortcomings of officials in his own country. It seemed to say that he recognized the humanity and frailty of

---

[49]Inazo Nitobe, The Intercourse Between the United States and Japan (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1891), pp. 110-191.

[50]Nitobe, Japanese Nation, p. 281.

citizens in both countries. It was almost as if he believed that goodwill between the two nations was in spite of rather than because of citizen attitudes and official actions. One might also say that this kind of objectivity was a gesture of politeness on Nitobe's part. In American eyes it would stand as an example of willingness to admit one's own shortcomings.

Not everything in this speech had the "tongue-in-cheek" quality. Nitobe's declaration that "there is no infernal magic or underhand discrimination in our trade in Manchuria" sounded clearly quarrelsome in tone.[51] Nitobe resented, and rightfully so, suggestions that his people were liars, imitators, immoral, and warlike, and his language carried a note of petulance or defensiveness. In the context of the anti-Japanese hate literature of the times Nitobe was really quite restrained. Many of his statements did reflect an ability to see both sides, or a sympathy for those who had misjudged his nation. Not all statements were that way, and he did not hesitate to side with his own people. At times it would have been better had he ignored some of the issues. Even so, his language reflected courage and forthrightness and convictions. Such qualities would win the respect of Americans.

On the whole Nitobe's speeches include numerous instances of fortunate adjustments to American values. Among them were his tasteful uses of the Bible, references to proud moments in American history, awareness of contemporary political events, ability to adpot a light joking stance, and willingness to meet criticism head-on. At times he

---

[51] Ibid., p. 296.

displayed an almost petty attitude in reference to those criticisms, but he also managed to display courage and conviction, and even suggest the role of underdog. Whether he knew it or not, his speeches contained appeals that were well phrased for American audiences.

Matters of Style

Style in Nitobe's speeches was both praiseworthy and objectionable. A primary stylistic trait had to do with vocabulary. A sample of one speech yielded such words as "impingement," "megalomania," "dilettante ethnologists," "autochthonous," and "zoilists." Throughout Nitobe's "East and West" speech there were numerous unusual and foreign words, phrases and names such as "civitas Dei," "civitas terrena," "argumentum ad crumenum" and "populus vult decipi." Only in the case of the last phrase did Nitobe provide a translation. Texts of the eight lectures contained forty-four words or phrases that were Latin, German, French, Semite or Chinese. Thirty-two of those instances had no explanation. Forty-three Japanese terms were used, but all were explained. At least twenty-eight words in English would not appear in an average vocabulary. (igneous, moiety, hylozoism, horologue, etc.) In one place in particular the key word was the most obscure in the sentence: "The race feels deep down in its consciousness that sublunary existence is not the whole of life."[52] Nitobe obviously assumed audiences familiar with European languages and technical English, though not familiar with Japanese.

Related to this vocabulary pattern were references to such scholars

---

[52] Ibid., p. 118.

as Blumenbach and Cuvier--without identification. They were German and French physiologists, but the average American reader or listener would not have immediately associated them with a particular scholastic specialization. There were names from Greek mythology (a race of Myrmidons) and Persian history (Bactrian). The average American university audience likely did not have ready referents for those terms. Unless there was compensation of some kind, this stylistic feature alone could have caused a listener to lose a sense of oneness with Nitobe.

On the other hand there were instances of stylistic excellence in Nitobe's speeches. Twice he used a repetitive device to emphasize a point. The first time he was pleading for a positive outlook on relations between East and West:

> It is not by mutual fault-finding or by exaggerating each other's peculiarities that we can arrive at understanding or appreciation. Not by antipathy, but by sympathy; not by hostility but by hospitality; not by enmity but by amity, does one race come to know the heart of another.[53]

In this instance he also used antithesis, some alliteration, and words with opposite meaning but similar total sound.

The other example of repetition is probably too long, but it indicates Nitobe was master of the thoughts with which he worked, the resources at his disposal, and even the English language:

> It is said that the genius of the East is spiritual, mystical, psychical, and that of the West is materialistic, actual, physical; it is said that the forte as well as the fault of the East is religion and sentiment, and that of the West, science and reason; it is said that the East delights in generalisation and universal concepts, and the West in particulars and special knowledge; that the one leans to philosophy and ideas, and the other to practice and

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

> facts; that Oriental logic is deductive and negative, and Occidental logic is inductive and positive. It is also said that in political and social life, solidarity and socialism characterise the East, and individualism and liberty, the West; it is said again that the Asiatic mind is impersonal and rejects the world, whereas the European mind is personal and accepts the world. The strength of Europe lies in the mastery of man over nature, and the weakness of Asia in the mastery of nature over man. In the land of the morning, man looks for beauty first and writes his flighty thoughts in numbers; in the land of the evening, man's first thought is for utility, and he jots down his observations in numerals. He who watches the setting sun, pursues whither it marches, and his watch-word is Progress and his religion is the cult of the future. He who greets the effulgent dawn is therewith content and cares not for its further course, but rather turns in wonderment to the source whence it came, hence his religion is the cult of the past. The matin disposes man to contemplation, the vesper hour to reflection. In the East man lives for the sake of life; in the West man lives for the means of living.[54]

The passage combines repetition with parallel structure.

Nitobe's ability to borrow a Biblical phrase and tailor it to his needs in a sentence shows consciousness of stylistic demands.[55] The Baltimore Sun reported a sentence from Nitobe's first speech at Johns Hopkins that showed stylistic excellence. Apparently in the context of his plea for Japanese-American friendship he said: "The dragon seeks the friendship of the eagle."[56] On the same theme he closed the speech on Japanese history: "We shall speak in a future lecture of the part played by America in our national development--how her Stars heralded to the world the rising of our Sun."[57] Though the subject was less pleasant the handling of language was as skillful where he borrowed Sherman's statement about war to explain a trend in Japanese history: "'War is hell;'--but in

---

[54]Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[55]Ibid., pp. 20 and 149.

[56]Baltimore Sun, January 12, 1912.

[57]Nitobe, Japanese Nation, p. 82.

medieval warfare the sense of honor often robbed it of its horrors, its stigmata, and its subterfuges."[58]

On the whole there were serious stylistic weaknesses in Nitobe's speeches, primarily due to overuse of foreign words and technical English words, but there were instances where his phrasing and blending of his thoughts with familiar quotations provided beautiful language.

Impact of the Lectures

Despite the weakness of some rhetorical techniques Nitobe employed, his lectures produced impressive favorable reactions. This section first considers the immediate responses of his primary audiences, and then examines delayed and removed audience responses.

Primary Audience Response

The first series of lectures was scheduled in Manning Hall on the campus of Brown University. While sources do not indicate the size of either hall, the Daily Brown Herald, campus newspaper, reported that the size of the audience for the first lecture required moving to larger Sayles Hall.[59] Four days later interest remained such that Nitobe was asked to begin informal conferences with students in the English seminar rooms,[60] and neighborhood schools sought his lectures. On October 31, 1911, he addressed students of English High School in Providence. On November 1,

---

[58]Ibid., p. 67.

[59]The Daily Brown Herald, October 20, 1911.

[60]Ibid., October 24, 1911.

he spoke at Rhode Island Agriculture College in Kingston.[61] After Nitobe's last lecture on the Brown campus the Herald reported: "Dr. Nitobe concluded his course of lectures yesterday afternoon . . . before the largest and most enthusiastic audience that has greeted him thus far."[62]

The pattern appears to have been similar at the five other schools. If attendance provided an indication of impact, Nitobe had extensive and increasing impact through the course of lectures at each of the six universities.

The second series of lectures was delivered at Columbia University. Comment in the Columbia Spectator was disappointingly limited and somewhat reserved. However a story about a reception hosted by the Teas Association at Columbia carried a line about "the visiting Japanese professor whose lectures have been found very interesting, both to students and friends of the university."[63] Other stories described lectures "which were listened to with interest by large audiences."[64]

Perhaps Nitobe's warmest response in New York City was to a lecture delivered before the Japan Society of New York. The New York Times reported that "several times during his speech Dr. Nitobe had to wait until the applause of his audience had subsided before he could proceed."[65]

A personal highlight of the lectures must have been Nitobe's

---

[61] Ibid., October 31, 1911. [62] Ibid., November 14, 1911.

[63] Columbia Spectator, November 28, 1911.

[64] Ibid.

[65] The New York Times, December 10, 1911.

return to his alma mater, Johns Hopkins University. Three Baltimore newspapers gave extensive coverage to those speeches.[66] The lectures began in McCoy Hall, but from the first speech some who sought entrance had to be turned away. Subsequently the university arranged for the use of the Concert Hall of the Academy of Music, a larger auditorium for the last four lectures. The Baltimore News summed up public reaction saying, "Dr. Nitobe's lectures have attracted wide attention and the attendance has been large."[67]

The fourth series of lectures was at the University of Virginia. There Nitobe was presented to the student body in a brief introductory lecture at the monthly College Hour. His thirty minute talk "left the audience . . . wanting more."[68] It appears that he captivated the students with that first speech. Nitobe's schedule at Virginia conflicted with a special week of examinations, and it was feared that students would not give up their precious study time to a visiting professor. But from the first night he faced a large audience, and "with his delightfully interesting and concise treatment," he won "frequent and enthusiastic applause by his witty sallies and humorous comparisons."[69] When Nitobe left Virginia for Chicago the University of Virginia campus newspaper editorialized: "Dr. Nitobe came . . . immediately before the intermediate

---

[66]Baltimore Sun, September 18, 1911, January 5, 12, 22, 24, 25, 26, 1912. Baltimore American, July 11, 1911, January 3, 12, 25, 26, 1912. Baltimore News, July 10, 1911, January 3, 23, February 5, 1912.

[67]Baltimore News, February 5, 1912.

[68]The Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Virginia, March 8, 1912.

[69]Ibid., March 9, 1912.

examinations and few lecturers could have drawn a student audience at that time. Yet the Exchange Professor has interested them from the time when he met them at the March College Hour."[70]

While reports did not indicate the total basis for his popularity, Virginia audiences were quite responsive to Nitobe. In some instances it may have been the novelty of having a visitor from a foreign country, but at Virginia, as at Brown and Johns Hopkins, Nitobe's personal performances contributed to growing audiences. In the case of Virginia in particular his initial lecture was credited with winning a following that continued to grow as the lectures progressed.

Delayed and Removed Audience Response

Evidence concerning impact beyond the immediate audiences is less complimentary. Hamilton Wright Mabie, the second exchange professor who visited Japan in 1912-1913, said that Nitobe's lectures "had deeply interested large audiences."[71] For the most part the reports of Butler did little more than repeat official language of the project authorization. For instance the Carnegie Endowment Year Book for 1911 contained the proposal and some of the goals of the professorship:

> At each institution at which he is in residence the representative of Japan is to have opportunity, in addition to whatever formal and academic lectures may be arranged, to meet in the freest possible way teachers and students and citizens of the neighborhood, as well as to meet and address on various subjects boards of trade, chambers

---

[70] College Topics, The University of Virginia, March 30, 1912.

[71] Hamilton Wright Mabie, Educational Exchange with Japan: A Report to the Trustees of the Endowment on Observations Made in Japan in 1912-1913 (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1914), p. 2.

of commerce, literary, scientific, fraternal and other organizations.[72]

In the 1912 Year Book Butler's report sounded much like a playback of the original proposal:

> In addition to Nitobe's formal lectures, numerous conferences were held with small groups of professors and students and addresses were made before many clubs, educational institutions, boards of trade, chambers of commerce and historical, scientific and geographic societies.[73]

In 1913 Butler prepared a paper on the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace for publication in the Independent. Later it was republished in International Conciliation. He included a brief reference to Nitobe:

> Dr. Nitobe spent six weeks at each of six universities, giving more or less formal courses of lectures; and from these universities as centers he went out to meet boards of trade and chambers of commerce, as well as literary, scientific and social organizations of various kinds.[74]

None of Butler's reports really added useful information about Nitobe's speaking.

Concerning total impact of Nitobe's lectures it must be admitted that national politics and the pressure of international affairs in Europe took precedence in American thinking. Nitobe envisioned the professorship as an opportunity to contribute to his dream of building a bridge across the Pacific.[75] Yet, in a campaign for the Presidency, Woodrow Wilson, a former classmate at Johns Hopkins, gave no notice to these lectures; in

---

[72]The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Year Book for 1911 (Washington, D.C.: Press of Byron S. Adams, 1912), p. 64.

[73]Ibid., Year Book for 1912, p. 71.

[74]Nicholas Murray Butler, "The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace," International Conciliation, (February, 1914), p. 7.

[75]Nitobe, Japanese Nation, p. viii.

the course of his campaign to regain the Presidency, Theodore Roosevelt, frequent and energetic champion of Japanese causes, came to Columbia University while Nitobe's lectures were in progress and apparently was not aware of their existence; Nicholas Murray Butler, the man who did most to initiate both the Endowment and this exchange professorship, failed to mention it in his personal memoirs; and the New York Times carried almost a full column on his first Columbia lecture, but failed to mention any of the other seven. Thus one is forced to conclude that the impact of the lectures beyond immediate audiences was not great.

No American official working with the tangled relations between the United States and Japan is known to have singled out these lectures as reference points for improved relations between the two countries. In truth relations between Japan and the United States continued unchecked on a deteriorating course. Apparently the lectures did nothing to change American preoccupation with problems in Europe. When war came in Europe the Endowment officials decided it was not opportune to continue the professorship. It was never opportune to resume it, though Japanese seemed anxious that it be resumed. This attitude speaks volumes about American assignment of value to Nitobe's speeches. For the most part Americans were too absorbed in other interests to hear or remember the visiting professor of 1911-1912.

Summary

Rhetorically speaking these speeches reflect the fact that public speaking as a social tool was new to the Japanese. This chapter has reviewed Nitobe's use of the rhetorical techniques of organization,

supporting materials and style, and the impact of his use of those techniques achieved. On the whole his adjustments were remarkable. The speech texts reflect obvious deficiencies in organization and style and some questionable practices in handling supporting materials. Introductions were especially weak, conclusions were only partially developed and thesis sentences and main points in most speeches were obscured. Style was hampered by too much use of foreign words and technical vocabulary. On the other hand there were offsetting virtues for each weakness. When I outlined the speeches subdivisions, main points and subordinated sub-points were readily identifiable. Though numerous bits of supporting material were sometimes bunched compactly together with limited explanation or application, a variety of materials were used with an understanding of their meaning and with direct relevance to the point being developed. Overall they created the image of a widely read scholar sharing information with his audiences. He used all types of supporting material, adapting it to the demands of the subject matter. He used some special forms of repetition. He frequently adapted to American values. On balance the nature of his supporting material plus some appropriate adaptations to American values offset the negative effects of foreign words and technical vocabulary. Primary audiences responded enthusiastically to Nitobe, though more remote audiences seemed unaffected by the speeches.

CHAPTER VI

CULTURE RELATED DATA IN NITOBE'S SPEECHES

A major contention of this study has been that culture adds a major dimension to analyses of cross-cultural speaking. The previous chapter demonstrated that traditional rhetorical categories provide a basis for discussion of the cross-cultural event. Yet there remain important judgments a critic can make regarding Nitobe's speeches. This chapter contains additional judgments based on cultural criteria. Based on data introduced in chapter IV this chapter will develop the following divisions: (1) general observations about cultural revelations in speeches; (2) culture and syntactic features; (3) social norms revealed in Nitobe's speeches. Under the third division the chapter will consider general defensiveness, defensiveness in humor, polite expressions, analysis and argument and themes in the speeches. Implications for the Whorf hypothesis will be considered under the divisions on syntactics and social norms.

General Observations About Cultural Revelations

This study was not undertaken in the belief that it would prove Nitobe's speeches of such historical consequence that they delayed war between the United States and Japan. It was hoped, however, that a careful examination of his speeches would, among other things, reveal traits that would correlate with Japanese culture.

While Nitobe's speeches certainly reflected his culture, they were not the source of discovery about Japanese culture. A good portion

of this study was devoted to an examination of Japanese culture in an effort to become sensitive to the cultural variables that may have been of consequence to Nitobe as he spoke. An unhesitating recommendation to anyone contemplating a cross-cultural study would be that they study the relevant culture. However, if this study is any indication, one should not expect speeches to serve as the original source of cultural data. Instead they serve to confirm and enrich understanding of cultural patterns.

Another hope entertained in the beginning of this study was to find within the English speeches of Nitobe items that would correlate with Japanese cultural norms. An assumption of the study was that the character of language could be correlated to culture. It was assumed that language behavior tended to remain essentially the same though the language user be outside his native culture, using a language other than his native language. Thus it should have been possible to predict some patterns of behavior in Nitobe's English speeches on the basis of norms operating in both the Japanese culture and language.

The norms considered in chapter IV included both broad social norms and language behavior. Based on those considerations I made certain predictions about what one should find in Nitobe's English speeches. Examination of the speeches supported the prediction that some broad social norms may operate on a speaker facing a culture other than his own. They did not appear inherently linked to language structure, but their operation was revealed primarily through the content of language of the ideas developed by the speaker. In no instance was there evidence in the speeches to support the prediction that Japanese language habits would influence Nitobe in his handling of the English language. The

remainder of this chapter examines in more detail these predictions.[1]

Syntactic Features

Regrading the prediction about Japanese syntactic features making their way into Nitobe's English speeches, evidence was not found to support it. The speeches yield no instances of his mishandling plurals or gender in English, nor of violation of the traditional English word order--subject, verb, object.

To check Nitobe's sentences for placement of the verb within the sentence I made comparisons with an American speaker. The decision to make such a comparison posed selection of a suitable American speaker. Several alternatives were considered. An American educator/statesman addressing Japanese audiences in Japanese would have provided some interesting comparisons, but apart from the fact that few Americans have learned to speak Japanese, such a comparison would not have provided a standard for judging Nitobe's English sentences. What was needed was English speeches by a speaker with a personal background, audience

---

[1]Japanese social norms identified in chapter IV were: (1) Japan is a rigidly hierarchical society, exalting group over individual, with language patterns that reinforce social status positions. (2) Japanese yield themselves to numberless exact rules of conduct and perceive ridicule and shame as major sanctions of conformity. (3) Japanese tend to accept the phenomenal world as absolute. (4) Japanese prefer "immediate experience" or "radical empiricism" to argument and analysis.

Based on those norms the following predictions were made about Nitobe's speeches: (1) Language would reflect identification (maybe defensiveness) with his group (family and nation). (2) Language would include many polite expressions designed to clarify the speaker's perception of his status. (3) Certain syntactic features in Nitobe's English speeches would reflect influence of Japanese grammar: particularly use of plurals, gender, and word order. (4) Nitobe would avoid extensive analysis and argument where Americans would expect them.

challenge and speech subject matter similar to that of Nitobe. Since Nitobe's speeches have been called "formal" and "informal" on the basis of obvious audience adjustment or lack of it, it seemed proper to seek an American who had made speeches of that same quality.

Nicholas Murray Butler compared to Nitobe in many ways. Like Nitobe he was a college president with influence far beyond his academic role. He worked arduously for world peace, and delivered many addresses for that cause, traveling frequently to Europe. His published speeches include some with many local references and some with none.[2] One of each type was chosen for comparison with Nitobe's speeches.

Nitobe's Stanford speech was of the informal type. Beside the first 300 words of it I placed the first 300 words of a speech by Butler entitled "Building the International Mind." Butler's speech was delivered in Denver, December 12, 1927, and has numerous references to locality: places in Colorado; people in Colorado politics; events in Colorado history.[3]

The text of Nitobe's "East and West" speech was one of his more formal ones. Beside the first 300 words of it I placed the first 300 words of an address by Butler, "The Path to Peace," delivered December 4, 1927.[4] Butler's address contained no local allusions, but from the first sentence plunged directly into the subject.[5]

---

[2]Nicholas Murray Butler, The Path to Peace (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930).

[3]Ibid., pp. 91-114.

[4]Ibid., pp. 79-90.

[5]These 300 word segments are included as appendices G and H.

On the basis of these comparisons, Nitobe's speeches showed no influence of Japanese syntax so far as placement of the verb within the English sentences. Because Japanese grammar always placed the verb last in the sentence, I predicted that Nitobe's speeches would reflect a tendency to place English verbs late in English sentences. They did not. As Appendix I records, Butler actually placed verbs nearer the end of his sentences than did Nitobe.

The data in Appendix I, admittedly drawn from a limited and possibly atypical sample, only gives a basis for saying that Nitobe's grammatical patterns did not vary appreciably from those of this American educator. Should one wish to generalize about Nitobe in comparison to a wider segment of the American population, a far more comprehensive comparison would need to be developed.

Syntactics and the Whorf Hypothesis

Throughout this study are references to the possibility that cross-cultural public speaking might yield instances relevant to the Whorf hypothesis. While at no point has it been claimed that this study would produce evidence in support of the Whorf hypothesis, it was assumed that there would be instances of behavior showing what Fishman called "the Whorfian effect."[6] However there was no indication in the speech texts that Nitobe's attempts to express himself in English were influenced by Japanese syntax. The most significant Japanese language related

---

[6]Joshua A. Fishman, "A Systematization of the Whorfian Hypothesis," in Communication and Culture, ed. by Alfred G. Smith (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 516.

discovery of this study was the elaborate polite verb system. Operation of the Whorf effect here would have caused Nitobe difficulty in finding an English verb to express an appropriate degree of politeness. Failing in that one would have expected Nitobe to use other words to achieve the desired degree of politeness. The speeches do not contain such evidence.

Social Norms Reflected in Nitobe's Speeches

While Nitobe's speeches showed no indication of the influence of Japanese syntax, there was conflicting evidence about Nitobe's thought processes being in harmony with the social norms identified in chapter IV. He showed a conscious identification with his people and was quite defensive of them. Even his humor appeared related to a defensive posture. Limited examples of politeness were observed. Though the speeches reflect a tendency to provide fleeting glimpses of information instead of involved arguments, Nitobe did develop some telling argumentation. The themes of his speeches reflect status consciousness on the part of the entire Japanese nation. There was more evidence of a Whorf effect at this level than at the level of syntax.

Defensiveness

A surprising number of passages in the eight lectures appeared defensive in character. In the initial lecture Nitobe introduced imperialism and racism, indicating that his people had suffered from both.[7] He cited specifically: Americans casting suspicion on Japanese public figures when they were really guilty of questionable behavior themselves;[8]

---

[7]Nitobe, Japanese Nation, pp. 1-3. [8]Ibid., p. 9.

Kaiser Wilhelm's famous cartoon depicting "yellow peril;"[9] Richard Hobson's noisy prophesies about war between Japan and the United States.[10] It does seem significant that a man in the role of ambassador for his nation, even though it was an unofficial role, should choose in his first speech to adopt this defensive posture five times. In the lecture on "Morals" Nitobe assumed this defensive role six times on such subjects as kissing in public,[11] modest dress for women,[12] the woman's place in the home,[13] marriage customs,[14] the character of Japanese women,[15] and the trustworthiness of Japanese bank tellers.[16] Only one lecture was completely free of this trait, and in the eight lectures twenty-two instances of this defensive quality occurred.

These passages were all the more striking because Nitobe showed himself so skillful in other places with a "tongue-in-cheek" development. These particular passages sounded testy and snappish, as if someone had only recently offended him on a matter pertaining to his people.

Defensiveness in Humor

Seldom does a person from one culture so capture the nuances of a second language that he can successfully develop humor in a second culture. For the most part the texts of Nitobe's speeches reflect the image of a serious scholar sharing serious information, which is consistent with the authority status given a teacher in Japan. His infrequent

---

[9] Ibid., p. 14. [10] Ibid., pp. 16-17. [11] Ibid., p. 151.
[12] Ibid., p. 152. [13] Ibid., p. 162. [14] Ibid., p. 163.
[15] Ibid., p. 165. [16] Ibid., pp. 168-173.

attempts at humor are also consistent with the generalization that one does not without thought attempt to develop humor in a second language. Still there were some places where even the printed texts left no doubt that Nitobe intended humor.

Reference has been made to a "tongue-in-cheek" attitude in the first half of his final speech. His subject matter was contemporary newspaper comment on the preparation for and execution of Perry's mission. He concluded the section with the wry observation: "I am struck with the absence of public sympathy concerning an enterprise of which the United States can so nobly and justly boast."[17]

In the speech entitled "Race and National Characteristics," Nitobe developed a lengthy description of his people. Following a rather detailed list of general physical traits (height, limb proportion and length, shape of head, skin color, hair, nasal index, etc.)[18] he developed another lengthy section on the beauty standards for Japanese women.[19] Then in a passage which combined Japanese politeness and humor he made references to the men. Speaking of himself and members of his own group, the Japanese sense of propriety forbade that he devote much space to such a subject, or that he be complimentary. He began, putting the qualitative judgment in the mouth of someone outside his group, with the observation that foreigners often remarked "that there are far more beautiful women in Japan than handsome men." The mild humor was heightened by adding another phrase: "the latter being a rare article." Continuing in the derogatory tone he quoted a young Frenchman "who concluded an account of his tour in

---

[17] Ibid., p. 281. [18] Ibid., pp. 92-95. [19] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

Japan with this sweeping assertion--"Le Japonnais n'est pas intelligent.'" This was one of the foreign phrases Nitobe failed to translate: "The Japanese is not intelligent." Nitobe continued this mild abuse of himself and Japanese men: "I know it is a flagrant breach of good form for me to say, 'We are more clever than we look.'" Then he added: "Suppose for modesty's sake I reverse the proposition and say, 'We look uglier than we deserve.'"[20]

In the same speech Nitobe discussed Japanese language habits. Since their language did not require certain sounds, they developed no skill with those sounds and sometimes had difficulty pronouncing some foreign words. Nitobe identified the missing sounds as "l, v, the English th, and the German ch." "In the case of l," Japanese forced "r to do its work." In the case of v they substituted b. Those without experience in English were most likely to make these substitutions, and they created some amusing situations. Nitobe did not see these as serious problems in a classroom, but agreed that the solemnity of a church service would be dangerously threatened when hallowed was pronounced harrowed, or benison (blessing or benediction) was pronounced venison. He illustrated the errors that were sometimes "carried into writing when v-a-l-e was spelled b-a-r-e; l-i-f-e, r-i-f-e; l-a-w, r-a-w; and l-o-v-e, r-o-b-e!"[21]

These instances exhaust what I would term attempts at humor in Nitobe's speeches. With all these efforts together one can look for a common trait or theme. They all developed at the expense of the speaker of at the expense of some practice of his people. There is then the

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 98-99.

[21] Ibid., p. 102.

definite possibility that this common pattern is but an extension of a defensive posture combined with politeness. In this manner he gave others opportunity to correct his distortion of himself and his group.

Polite Expressions

There was less support for the prediction about polite expressions designating the speaker's perception of status. In some places it seemed that Nitobe did purposely phrase language to defer politely to his American hosts. The closing line of his third lecture was such a case: "Her Stars heralded to the world the rising of our Sun."[22] The concluding paragraph of the lecture on "Race and National Characteristics" contained another, where he spoke of "our peasants and your labourers."[23] These were subtle distinctions, if in fact they could be called distinctions at all. It appeared that he gave "Stars" a place of prominence over "Sun" in the first instance, and perhaps deliberately described his own people as "peasants" while using a more dignified term, "labourers" for Americans.

To make even these questionable claims about politeness required some imagination. The speeches simply did not contain a multiplicity of obvious polite expressions. Hence there was no support for the argument that people reared in a culture where language is replete with status designating polite forms will replicate those patterns of politeness in another culture with another language.

It would be interesting to know whether Nitobe's voice and non-verbal behavior communicated a predisposition to politeness. There was no

---

[22] Ibid., p. 82.

[23] Ibid., p. 115.

evidence available to check that aspect of his speaking. On the basis of the language of his printed texts there was no evidence to support the prediction that Nitobe's language would include many polite expressions designed to clarify his perception of status.

In connection with the subject of politeness it seems appropriate to refer to circumstances in Nitobe's final speech. There was a deft touch with a suggestion of joking in the first division of that speech. The second division had an altogether different tone--more defensive--almost accusing. Though it was obvious that the tone of the speech had changed in the final portion of the speech, the total perspective still suggests that Nitobe was practicing politeness in the way he handled the first half of that final speech. Some of the public statements of Americans about relations with Japan had been both irresponsible and stupid. Nitobe chose to respond to those statements with charity.

The Japanese have a greeting ritual which may be relevant to the development of this final speech, as well as the whole lectureship. The ritual calls for a seemingly interminable number of bows and humble posturings. It is proper if not obligatory for both parties to identify with social positions somewhat lower than their real status. In the course of this bowing and pronouncements of numerous polite terms each party will respond with behavior to elevate the other to his rightful position. The party who fails to respond and help the other assume his rightful position is a crude uncultured barbarian.

Perhaps Nitobe saw his nation as having played the proper humble role all too often, only to be the recipient of no assistance from the second party. Perhaps his nation had taken a low social position, only to

be pushed even lower by foreign "barbarians." This would have given a special impetus to his retorts to accusations against his nation. In the final section of the final speech he may have been expressing a sense of exasperation at the barbarian behavior of Japan's critics. But even so, he did so only after having been polite in the first division of the same speech.

Analysis and Argument

It was predicted that Nitobe would avoid extensive analysis and argument. The prediction was not supported. Nitobe chose to engage in considerable analytical detail on some issues, analyzing economic conditions in his country, the Shinto religion, and tensions that had developed in the United States-Japanese relations. For the most part he stated generalizations, and then offered specific instances to support his generalizations. The order, logical progress, and analytical detail characteristic of his speeches can be seen more clearly in outlines than in the texts. Appendices C and D consist of the outlines of the "East and West" speech and the speech on religion.

Nitobe's final speech contained his best uses of argument. In that speech he made his most concentrated effort to dispose of misrepresentations of his country. In the first portion of the speech, using the common ground technique, Nitobe sought to develop a receptive attitude in his American audiences. Listeners should have been chuckling with him over the foibles of human nature demonstrated to be common to both nations. He showed himself to be tolerant of American errors in judgment and sought to develop a climate in which he could expect the same tolerance on the part of Americans toward his people. At that point, having

developed a favorable psychological atmosphere, Nitobe presented point by point refutation for commonly repeated charges against Japanese. In the context of his arguments he appealed to the good relations of the past, [24] discredited those who had led crusades against Japanese,[25] quoted the Commissioner of Labor for the state of California who "regretted the decreasing supply of Japanese labour,"[26] cited statistics comparing Japanese entry into the United States with other nationalities,[27] represented positively Japanese financial interests in Manchuria,[28] and quoted the Bible[29] and former Japanese Premier Katsura[30] to discount the possibility that Japan wanted war.

Full appreciation of Nitobe's approach to analysis and argument and logic cannot be gained merely by looking at outlines of his speeches and argumentative passages of a single speech. Over against some clearly argumentative passages are other passages where he introduced accumulated bits of information but did not bother to develop them in a careful analytical manner. One is reminded of observations by Moore and Nakamura about the unexamined life, the experiential outlook, the phenomenalistic approach to life and the tendency toward the nonrational. Consistent with these ideas would be Nitobe's use of one hundred twenty authority figures in the eight speeches with almost no effort to introduce credentials or

---

[24] Ibid., p. 289.

[25] Ibid., p. 290. Nitobe mentioned "a certain Tveitmoe" as having a criminal record in his native Norway, and as being in prison in the United States subsequent to his attacks on Japanese.

[26] Ibid., p. 291. [27] Ibid., pp. 292-293. [28] Ibid., pp. 294-296.

[29] Ibid., p. 297. [30] Ibid., pp. 298-299.

otherwise enhance their images. At least thirty-five short quotations were blended into the texts with no attempt to identify the author or the context from which the quotation came. Apparently he felt that the audience experience with those particular quotations would be sufficient without analysis or explanation. A paragraph from the "East and West" speech illustrates many of these qualities:

> Take the early history of art, and it seems that Greece and India and China were in pretty close contact. Compare ancient Hindoo sculpture with Greek, and it is amazing to observe how closely allied they are, with the Bactrian as a link between them. Place by their side the old Chinese images, until lately almost unknown and only recently unearthed, and we feel that the lands of Plato and Confucius were not irreconcilably opposed in culture. The victories of Alexander, somehow, do not strike me as the descent of an army of civilisation into a region of a very inferior grade of culture. The Jews served for a long time as cosmopolitan mediators between Europe and Asia through their commercial agencies; then, later, the Arabs, not yet turned hostile to Christianity, became the intermediaries of Occidental and Oriental science and art. But as the Saracens and afterwards the Ottomans--or shall we say Moslems?--interposed an almost insuperable barrier between Europe and Asia, the world was practically rent in twain. Then each began to pursue its own course, irrespective of the other's movements, so that when Europe awoke from its sleep of the Dark Ages, Asia still continued to slumber; but by the time they met again after the lapse of centuries they could hardly recognize each other's features. Rejuvenated Europe, fresh and strong, armed with science and trained in liberty--how could it own a friend of "Auld Lang Syne" in decrepit Asia, worn with age and torn with discord! Sluggard Asia had lost all consciousness of unity of any kind. You cannot call it Buddhaland, because unlike Christ in Europe, Buddha has rivals claiming dominion with him; nor was there any unity of race, literature, or language. If there was then any East that could be named in juxtaposition to the West, it expressed chaos as against order, a crowd of Kings who reigned without governing, a nondescript mass of beings who simply existed without living. Who would not then prefer "fifty years of Europe to a cycle of Cathay?"[31]

This view of Nitobe's approach to analysis and argument is probably colored by two factors: my western orientation may have forced me to

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

seek a familiar organization pattern in Nitobe's materials. My dissatisfaction with Nitobe's handling of some materials may have been satisfied by appealing to the Moore and Nakamura characterization of Japanese as experiential and nonrational. Whatever the cause I have observed Nitobe as using logic, analysis and argumentation, but also exhibiting disinclination for argument and analysis. At times his conduct was consistent with Japanese social norms, and at times it violated Japanese social norms.

Themes Developed

The themes developed in Nitobe's speeches clearly related to Japanese culture. In part this resulted from the fact that he was expected to reveal his home to America through his lectures. His titles reflected that aspect of the culture relatedness of his speeches. The titles, in the order that the speeches were delivered, were as follows:

> The East and the West.
> The Land or Geographical Features in Relation to the Inhabitants.
> The Past in its Significance to the Present.
> Race and National Characteristics.
> Religious Beliefs.
> Morals and Moral Ideas.
> Economic Conditions.
> The Relations Between the United States and Japan.

Mere titles do not reveal themes. However the title Nitobe gave his volume of speeches, The Japanese Nation: Its Land, Its People and Its Life, suggested that his goal was to reveal his nation. In keeping with that goal, Nitobe's first lecture operated at a high level of abstraction and placed Japan in the traditional East-West context. Lectures II through VII explained things unique to Japan. Lecture VIII concentrated specifically on Japanese-American relations.

Units developed within the speeches revealed themes obviously

important to Nitobe. Some appeared not merely one time in one lecture, but several times in several lectures. For instance, six of the eight lectures (I, II, III, IV, VII, VIII) closed with a plea for goodwill between Japan and the United States. The other two lectures (V, VI) closed with appeals directed to a wider community. Perhaps their subjects, religion and morals, made it inappropriate to talk of two-nation cooperation when there was the possibility of international cooperation. Bridging the subjects on bi-lateral goodwill and international cooperation, an over-riding theme sought to unite Japan with a wider segment of the world community.

Nitobe made a practical adjustment to his American audiences. Six of the eight lectures closed on the theme Americans could do most about, namely fusing a friendship between the two nations. Had that goal been realized it could have contributed to a wider international community, a "federation of the world."[32]

Nitobe's major theme of uniting Japan with a wider segment of the world community was related to some interpretations of Japanese culture. Ruth Benedict[33] and Edwin Reischauer[34] argued that Japanese entry into World War II was in some measure an attempt to establish a clearly definable international status. Their thought was that the Japanese compulsion for clearly defined and clearly stated status in social

---

[32]Ibid., p. 20.

[33]Ruth Benedict, Chrysanthemum and Sword (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946), p. 21.

[34]Edwin O. Reischauer, The United States and Japan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 163.

relationships projected into the international scene. So when the nation came out of isolation in 1858 and sought to find its place in the world, one of their most compelling longings was for a delineation of status at the international level commensurate with what they experienced at the domestic level.

A second theme emerged again and again, regardless of the lecture title. It concerned Nitobe's feelings for what he apparently considered slights against his nation. These have been cited several times before, but they appeared so often they became a significant theme among themes in the lectures.

Kenneth Scott Latourette wrote of "chauvinists among the Japanese" and their "hot resentment" over "slights, fancied or real" to their national dignity.[35] Reischauer wrote of a Japanese "national self-consciousness" which contained "a large degree of embarrassment and the fear of interiority."[36] He further described the attitude as "comparatively ingrained and compulsive."[37]

Whether these judgments are too severe or not, Nitobe did devote an inordinate proportion of eight lectures to defending his nation against attacks. The passages I have labeled defensive did not exhaust the material that centered on defending the nation. There were other passages where the tone of Nitobe's text seemed light, almost joking, but the subject matter concerned what he considered a misunderstanding of his people. Even attempts at humor turned on self or national deprecation,

---

[35]A Short History of the Far East (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 507.

[36]Reischauer, p. 108.

[37]Ibid., p. 107.

which could have been a form of defensiveness itself.

Though there were a number of subjects related to presumed slights, they could be classified under two headings: imperialism and racism. Items in the first category constituted threats to Japan in international affairs. Nitobe warned that imperialism was a kind of greed that could consume all nations, but it was clear that his primary concern was for his own nation.[38] He saw imperialism as a threat to peace and security in the Pacific, hence to Japan. He believed that other Asian nations blamed Japan for western encroachment in Asia,[39] and he saw the question of extraterritoriality, once imposed by the West on both Japan and China, as a manifestation of imperialism.[40] He interpreted western suspicion of Japanese trade interests in Manchuria as a by-product of imperialism.

Most of the slights to which Nitobe addressed himself related to racism. Many of these have been noted earlier in the study, but they were brought together to emphasize their relation to a theme. At least five separate times he noted aspersions cast on the ethical standards of Japanese public officials or business men.[41] Typical of still another kind of racism were items like Kaiser Wilhelm's "yellow peril" cartoon,[42] Hobson's blatant racist remarks and prophesies,[43] Hart's remark that Japanese constituted a "socialistic . . . ant hill of human beings,"[44] and

---

[38]Nitobe, pp. 1-3. [39]Ibid., p. 45. [40]Ibid., p. 286.

[41]Ibid., pp. 9, 168-173, 220, 224, 229.

[42]Ibid., p. 14. [43]Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[44]Ibid., p. 218.

California agitation and discrimination against Japanese.[45] A special kind of racism was revealed in charges of imitativeness, mimicry and lack of originality.[46] Finally there evidently had been racist inspired remarks about the Japanese family, including the modesty and morality of Japanese women,[47] the propriety of marriage arrangements,[48] and public display of affection.[49]

Despite the attention given these defensive sections in Nitobe's speeches, the total impact of his themes was positive. His major theme was, "Help Japan find her place in the Sun!" Perhaps he was stating it in the conclusion to lecture III: American "Stars heralded to the world the rising of" Japan's "Sun."[50] That major theme was supported by other related themes: Help America and Japan to be friends; Let America and Japan cooperate toward world harmony; Let all these conditions help Japan discover the role which is rightfully hers among the family of nations.

Social Norms and the Whorf Hypothesis

Apart from purely language considerations it was predicted that the thought patterns in Nitobe's speeches would reflect habitual responses to certain Japanese social norms. Varying degrees of support were found for that prediction. Twenty-two separate instances in eight speeches of defensiveness regarding Japan, Japanese people and Japanese customs would argue that Japanese homogeneity and group loyalty affected Nitobe's

---

[45] Ibid., p. 290. [46] Ibid., p. 81. [47] Ibid., pp. 152-154.
[48] Ibid., pp. 162-166. [49] Ibid., pp. 151-152. [50] Ibid., p. 82.

adjustments as he faced American audiences. Even his limited attempts at humor appeared related to a defensive posture. The themes of his speeches reflected a desire by Japan to find her place among the nations of the world, which could have been related to Japanese habitual adjustments to hierarchy and status. Some of Nitobe's lapses into petty defensiveness were seen as possible exasperation over failure on the part of Americans to help elevate his people to their rightful status among nations of the world. Contrary to prediction, Nitobe did engage in analysis and argumentation, but there were many passages in his speeches where he obviously chose not to engage in extensive analysis and argument. Rather he followed a pattern more traditionally Japanese in providing mere glimpses of men and their thoughts. All of this argues that the speeches reflect evidence of Japanese social norms in operation though there was no indication that Japanese language patterns transferred to Nitobe's English. Therefore social norms appear to exercise more obvious influence in the cross-cultural communication than do language patterns.

Summary

While Nitobe's speeches did not serve as original sources of truth about culture, they did serve to confirm and enrich understanding of cultural patterns. If this pattern is typical the rhetorical critic should acquaint himself with culture before examining speeches. Predictions about the possible effect of Japanese syntax on Nitobe's handling of the English language were not confirmed. Even the elaborate Japanese system of polite language appeared not to have influenced Nitobe's use of English. On the other hand at the idea level there was considerable reflection of

of the operation of Japanese social norms. Defensiveness was the attitude most often reflected in Nitobe's adjustments. His handling of themes reflected a desire for an international climate affording Japan a clearly defined role. This would be but a projection of the Japanese notion of hierarchy and status. Related to that theme was another, often repeated, seeking lasting friendship between Japan and the United States. Important in Nitobe's eyes was a related theme: do not make unfounded and unfair attacks on the Japanese people. Some of Nitobe's apparent bursts of anger appeared related to Japanese orientation to politeness and face-saving. Though Nitobe used logic, analysis and argumentation, contrary to expectation, he also handled authorities, quotations and some other supporting materials in a way that suggested a preference for what Moore and Nakamura called experiential and intuitive development of ideas.

This chapter found no incidence of the Whorfian effect in Nitobe's language patterns, but there was considerable evidence of the effect of social norms in his handling of ideas.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of this Dissertation

The Speaking Event

This dissertation is a rhetorical criticism of a cross-cultural public speaking event. During the 1911-1912 academic year a Japanese educator/statesman, Dr. Inazo Nitobe, came to the United States through joint efforts of Japanese businessmen, the Japan Society of New York, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This marked the beginning of an exchange professorship sponsored by the Endowment until World War I diverted energies elsewhere. Nitobe's schedule took him to six eastern universities with eight prepared lectures. During the academic year he addressed numerous other audiences, ultimately 166 with over 40,000 listeners, at other universities, high schools, learned societies, religious groups, commercial groups, clubs, and community groups.

The expectation of the Endowment was that this continuing exchange professorship would promote goodwill between the United States and Japan. Nitobe shared that desire, having made a life goal that of becoming a link between East and West.

Nitobe's immediate audiences received the lectures with enthusiasm. Audiences grew in size through the course of the eight lectures at each university. In some instances a larger hall had to be secured to accomodate

the crowds. At Brown, Johns Hopkins and Virginia Universities students displayed unusual enthusiasm for Nitobe and his lectures.

Impact beyond the immediate audiences was slight. The general American public likely was not aware of the lectures. Important public figures gave little or no notice, and no American policy makers used these speeches as a basis for promoting better relations with Japan. In fact relations between Japan and the United States worsened steadily after the speeches. Though the speeches did not contribute to worsening relations, neither did they bring about improved relations.

Special Features

Analysis of this cross-cultural speaking event involved some features not common to rhetorical criticism. Some of those conditions had to do with availability of materials. Analysis of the speeches was accomplished mainly through reliance on edited texts. Data was not available on delivery patterns and vocal qualities. Newspaper comment, while helpful in the total analysis, contained only limited references to delivery, mastery of the English language, and vocal quality. Comments on audience response centered entirely on audience size and general level of interest, with no comment on other overt responses, immediate or delayed.

Other special features turned on the suitability of traditional critical methodology for such a study as this. While it provided general guidelines, and while analysis frequently used traditional rhetorical terms, I judged it best to develop the study free of traditional methodology as long as possible. My goal was to allow the data of the speeches to emerge in its own right rather than allow restrictive rhetorical categories to be superimposed on the data.

Traditionally, historical perspective has been important in rhetorical criticism. In this study six separate subdivisions of history demanded research and development. These included the historical scene in Japan as of 1910, the historical scene in the United States as of 1910, Japanese-American relations as of 1910, the agency that sponsored the exchange professorship, biographical data on the speaker, and cultural perspectives on Japan.

Conclusions about those subdivisions of history were as follows: (1) Japan, having renounced isolation and feudalism, had in sixty years deliberately revamped much of her social, economic and governmental structure to match what she observed in the West. Having demonstrated to her own satisfaction that she deserved a place among the nations of the world, she anxiously awaited confirmation of that self image. (2) The United States, blundering amateurishly into world affairs it hardly understood, was primarily occupied with reactions to the progressive movement. Concerned with internal problems that denied many citizens' rights and opportunities, the progressive movement fought human selfishness, greed, and entrenched social, economic and political power as it sought to develop an ethic for a society rapidly industrializing and urbanizing. (3) Relations between Japan and the United States were on a deteriorating course and would continue so into World War II. (4) Sentiment nourished in numerous peace movements in the United States culminated in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Funded with a $10,000,000 endowment and blessed with able and experienced administrators a division of the Endowment moved within a year of its creation to sponsor several exchange professorships. (5) Dr. Inazo Nitobe, a product of Japan's Meiji Era, a

citizen of the world, educator and statesman among his own people, a man who made much of his contribution to society through public speaking, was the first exchange professor sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment. (6) The culture from which Nitobe came was characterized by a rigid hierarchical structure acknowledged and perpetuated by elaborate polite rituals that defined social status. The society exalted group loyalty above individuality. Where major social sanctions were shame and ridicule, the populace conformed almost eagerly to numberless exact rules of conduct and exhibited bewilderment when required to act alone or in situations not anticipated in the codes. The Japanese language reflected evidence of these cultural norms. In addition the language had some unique traits that set it apart from English.

On the basis of these observations, and in keeping with the Whorf hypothesis, I predicted that Nitobe's speeches would reflect: (1) group consciousness and group loyalty; (2) repeated efforts to clarify social status through polite terminology; and (3) syntactic constructions at variance with English.

The nature of the data within these speeches led to discussions of organization, style, and supporting material. Other traditional rhetorical concepts were not used as analytical headings, for to have done so would have been to fasten rhetorical devices on the data rather than to allow the data to lead the critic. Also such an approach would have encouraged the critic to conclude that his task was complete when he had exhausted the list of rhetorical categories. In the case of this study I judged it particularly important to bring the cultural data into the analytical process, and it contributed more to understanding these speeches

than would have been accomplished by a mechanical check-off of each of the rhetorical canons.

The decision to seek data related to the Whorf hypothesis, made prior to the examination of these speeches, not only necessitated an examination of Japanese social norms and Japanese language traits, but made the entire analysis culture oriented. Though the dissertation found no support for the Whorf hypothesis, efforts to gain the cultural perspective necessary to consider the Whorf hypothesis contributed materially to satisfying the historical, recreative and judicial functions of criticism. On the basis of this experience I would argue that every cross-cultural study would benefit from a deliberate attempt to associate the study with a specific culture-related theory of communication.

Judgments of the Speeches

With but one exception the speeches were basically impersonal and formal. The speech Nitobe delivered at Stanford University had personal references and an informal quality. While the Stanford speech proved that Nitobe understood the demands of a local situation and could adjust to them, still the manuscripts of the eight lecture series lacked local and personal references. These formal and impersonal qualities affected the organization and style of Nitobe's texts. Introductions were virtually non-existent. Main points were obscure and difficult to identify. However when the speeches were outlined a logical and orderly progression and subordination of ideas became apparent. In general transitions were lacking and conclusions seemed only partially developed. His vocabulary, with many technical English words and numerous foreign words appeared to be above the

experience level of his audiences.

The impersonal and formal qualities did not obscure other features about Nitobe's speeches. The content was challenging, appropriate to his themes, rich in illustrative materials, and frequently well adapted to his audiences. Nitobe drew supporting materials from the history and literature of the world. He used narration, quotations, allusions, and comparisons. His illustrative materials were appropriately adapted to his purposes, and were used in ways consistent with their nature. The speeches contained passages particularly well adapted to American values. There were Biblical references, references to American history and literature, and appeals to American values of fair play, sympathy for the underdog, honest admission of fault, and courage in the face of adversity.

The speeches developed three major themes that reflected Japanese cultural norms. There were pleas for renewed friendship between Japan and the United States, a world federation of nations, and a definition of Japan's place among the nations of the world. A minor theme, also related to Japanese cultural norms concerned numerous defenses against attacks and presumed attacks on Japan and the Japanese.

Nitobe's English language did not reflect evidence of influence of Japanese language patterns. Sections of a formal and informal speech by Nitobe, compared with sections of similar speeches by Nicholas Murray Butler, showed no significant differences in word order or placement of verb within sentences. There was no indication that Japanese syntax was superimposed on his English sentences. The texts indicate that he handled English plurals and gender with no difficulty, though those distinctions are not made in Japanese. Though Japanese had an elaborate

system of polite expressions that influenced every verb and noun and some modifiers, there was no evidence that Nitobe sought to incorporate that polite terminology or a substitute for it in his English. In short, none of the language related instances that might have been considered instances of the Whorfian effect appeared.

Some explanations should be considered in relation to these circumstances. Nitobe was unusually skilled in the English language. The speech texts were edited by Nitobe, and possibly by his publisher. Since no voice reproduction was available it was impossible to determine if vocal behavior contained evidence of Japanese cultural norms in operation as Nitobe spoke.

Areas for Future Study

Suggestions for Cross-Cultural Studies

Critical methodology for cross-cultural studies has not been developed. This dissertation appears to be a pilot study as a rhetorical criticism of cross-cultural public speaking. On the basis of this study I offer the following suggestions about critical methodology: (1) Allow the nature of the speaking situation and the materials available for study to dictate methodological decisions. (2) Avoid a tendency to adopt prescriptive lists of rhetorical categories. (3) Seek ideas, suggestions and guidelines in studies of intra-cultural communication. (4) Consider the work other academic disciplines are doing in cross-cultural research. (5) Consider some of the practical evaluations and adjustments agencies of government are making in their campaigns to reach other cultures. (6) As additional cross-cultural studies are completed,

periodically examine them to determine if a common approach is emerging.

The critic must expose himself both to the culture of the speaker and the audiences. Something similar to this has been done in studies of intra-cultural communication when critics have examined general historical background for the speech, the specific setting in which the speech occurred, the speaker's personal background, and the audience. Still the cross-cultural study thrusts all these dimensions into a wider context. Insistence that the critic examine culture, in the broad connotations of that term, will insure that he accept the specific obligation to acquaint himself with the variables that pertain to that wider and more complicated context inherent in cross-cultural communication.

On the basis of this study several conclusions seem warranted. The critic will not discover new truths about culture in speeches, but he will discover confirmation of cultural traits in speeches. Without a careful study of culture before analysis of the speeches such correlations would be missed. The critic will not find confirmation of culture in areas of language structure, but in the area of ideas. This notion needs to be tested in different contexts for confirmation, specifically in a situation where the speaker is not highly skilled in a second language, or where the critic has access to voice reproductions.

The critic would do well to associate his study with some theory of cross-cultural communication. In this dissertation the Whorf hypothesis added valuable dimensions to analysis. Other studies might wish to use Whorf, or transformational grammar, or systems theory, or theories of bilingualism. A theory carefully chosen and realistically related to a particular study can add perspective that might otherwise be overlooked.

Other Suggestions for Study

Rhetoricians should do many cross-cultural studies. While governments operating in the context of the cold war have searched frantically for successful communication formulae, rhetoricians have barely begun to analyze cross-cultural communication. Perhaps this study, with the tentative judgments that had to be made, will encourage others to follow the advice of scholars in communication like Becker, Brockriede, Ekroth, Ellingsworth and Oliver, and examine critically contemporary efforts in cross-cultural communication.

Someone should begin joint efforts with anthropologists systematizing cultural data that will help in cross-cultural studies. The major cultures of the world need to be studied for their distinguishing characteristics, or someone needs to discover that there are no distinguishing characteristics. If they exist, the levels at which they are significant need to be established. Someone needs to study the subcultures within major cultures. Wide variations within cultures and subcultures need to be noted, described and catalogged. Each such collection of data must be identified by date, for cultures change with time. The volume of work entailed in these suggestions is enormous, but if judgments about efforts at cross-cultural communication are to become something more than intuitive guesses or tentative suggestions such work must be done.

A group of scholars would do well to concentrate on developing several studies related to a particular nationality. This study has involved Japan and the United States, and numerous similar possibilities exist. There could be studies of Japanese speakers in China, in Korea, in Formosa, in Brazil, in Hawaii, and in Europe. One could study Japanese

speakers in the United States who possess far less skill with the English language than did Nitobe, and one could speculate that different results might be found relative to the language-related predictions of this study.

Four additional studies could be done on Nitobe alone. One could study his speeches made during his 1932 tour of the United States. One could assemble and study manuscripts on speeches he made during his service in the Secretariat of the League of Nations. Documents pertinent to this period are being cataloged in the United Nations. One could study the speeches Nitobe made while attending three Conferences of the Institute on Pacific Affairs. A group of scholars is currently assembling sources and composing monographs on Nitobe at Tokyo Women's Christian College, and through them one might secure Japanese speech texts, translate them and develop another study on Nitobe.

Other Japanese who have addressed Americans might be studied. Baron Kentaro Kaneko, graduate of Harvard, classmate of Theodore Roosevelt, came to America as a public relations man for Japan during the Russo-Japanese War. His speeches and newspaper articles won sympathy for his nation. Shosuke Sato, classmate of Nitobe at Sapporo Agricultural School and Johns Hopkins, President of Hokkaido Agricultural College when Nitobe taught there, became the second exchange professor from Japan under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Endowment. Yukio Ozaki, famous liberal in Japanese politics, spoke frequently and with great impact in the Japanese Diet. In November, 1911, Nitobe spoke at a special Conference on Japan and Japanese American Relations at Clark University. Three other Japanese lecturers at that same Conference have been identified as: K. Asakawa, Ph.D. and Assistant Professor of Japanese Civilization at Yale; Toyokichi

Iynaga, Ph.D., Professional Lecturer in Political Science, University of Chicago; and Masuji Miyagawa, contributor to magazines and newspapers. The Clark University Conference might provide substance for a study of Japanese speech making. Tsunejiro Miyaoka, Special Correspondent for the Carnegie Endowment in Japan, delivered at least two addresses before the American Bar Association assembled in Cleveland, Ohio, in August, 1918. Delivered at a Mission Seminar in Abilene, Texas, in June, 1970, and recorded on tape is a series of lectures on Japanese Culture delivered by Judge Koichi Inomata, currently Professor of International Law at International Christian University. These are but some of the men who could be studied if one wanted to build a backlog of information about communicating with Japan. Surely it would be possible to secure similar lists among Chinese, Russians, or Latin Americans.

One might wish to study some of the few Americans who have addressed Japanese in the Japanese language. Former Ambassador Edwin Reischauer, one of our most popular Ambassadors to Japan, spoke fluent Japanese and did not hesitate to speak bluntly to Japanese audiences.

With numerous Japanese students in the universities of this country, with growing populations of Japanese in California, Chicago, New York City, and other localities, it would be possible for someone to conduct carefully controlled experiments testing some of the assertions made in this dissertation about possible correlations between language traits and culture. I have suggested that someone give a group of Japanese subjects a message in Japanese and ask that it be translated into English. Written or oral translations could be studied for obvious evidence of Japanese cultural traits.

As the number of cross-cultural studies increases, someone should be prepared to compare them with traditional intra-cultural studies to determine what each can contribute to the other.

This potential list of further studies that could be done in the area of cross-cultural communication underscores the fact that this study has been done with limited access to precedent, information, and guidelines. The times in which we live have put a premium on communication with people of other cultures. Students of communication cannot afford to neglect the task of analysis of such efforts. Hopefully this study will encourage many others to engage their energies and experience in that kind of analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aikawa, Takaaki and Lynn Leavenworth. The Mind of Japan: A Christian Perspective. Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1967.

Allen, G. C. Modern Japan and its Problems. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1927.

Beardsley, Richard K, John W. Hall and Robert E. Ward. Village Japan. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Benedict, Ruth. Chrysanthemum and Sword. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946.

Bennett, John S. and Herbert Passin. In Search of Identity: The Japanese Scholar in America and Japan. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Best, Ernest E. Christian Faith and Cultural Crisis: The Japanese Case. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Blacker, Carmen. The Japanese Enlightenment. London: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Blakeslee, George H. Japan and Japanese-American Relations. New York: G. E. Stechert and Company, 1912.

Borden, George A., Richard B. Gregg and Theodore G. Grove. Speech Behavior and Human Interaction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Borton, Hugh. Japan's Modern Century. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955.

Bryan, William Jennings. Speeches of William Jennings Bryan. Vol. II. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1919.

Bryant, Donald C. and Karl R. Wallace. Fundamentals of Public Speaking. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. Across the Busy Years, Recollections and Reflections. Vols. I and II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.

_____. A World in Ferment. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

_____. The International Mind. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

_____. The Path to Peace. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.

Carroll, John B. Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Cleveland, Harlan, Gerald J. Mangone and John Clarke Adams. The Overseas American. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969.

Curry, Ray Watson. Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968.

Dance, Frank E. X. (ed.). Human Communication Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

DeBary, William T., et al. (eds.). Sources of the Japanese Tradition. Vol. II. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

DeCecco, John P. (ed.). The Psychology of Language, Thought and Instruction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Elisseeff, Serge, Edwin O. Reischauer and Takehiko Yoshihashi. Elementary Japanese for College Students. Part I and II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Fisher, Roger. (ed.). International Conflict and Behavioral Science. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Gilbert, Dorothy Lloyd. Inazo and Mary P. E. Nitobe. Swarthmore, Pennsylvania: J. Passmore Elkinton (Produced for private distribution). February, 1955.

Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publishers, Inc., 1959.

Hasegawa, Nyozekan. The Japanese Character: A Culture Profile. John Bester, translator. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1965.

Henle, Paul. Language, Thought and Culture. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Herskovits, Melville J. Cultural Anthropology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Hoijer, Harry. (ed.). Language in Culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Hsu, Francis L. K. (ed.). Aspects of Culture and Personality. New York: Abelard-Schuman, Inc., 1954.

Kaplan, Bert. Studying Personality Cross-Culturally. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.

Kim, Young Hum. East Asia's Turbulent Century. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Kitasawa, Sukeo. The Life of Dr. Nitobe. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1953.

Kroeber, A. L. Anthropology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1948.

Lanman, Charles. The Japanese in America. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1872.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A Short History of the Far East. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.

Lerner, Daniel and Wilbur Schramm. Communication and Challenge in the Developing Countries. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967.

Lindzey, Gardner. Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Link, Arthur S. American Epoch: A History of the United States Since the 1890's. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

_____. (ed.). The Papers of Woodrow Wilson. Vols. II and III. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Linton, Ralph. The Tree of Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

McMurry, Ruth Emily and Muna Lee. The Cultural Approach: Another Way in International Relations. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

McWilliams, Carey. Prejudice: Japanese-Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance . Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944.

Masaoka, Naoichi. (ed.). Japan to America. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

Matson, Floyd W. and Ashley Montague. The Human Dialogue. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Matsushita, Masatoshi. Japan in the League of Nations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

Mead, Margaret and Rhoda Metraux (eds.). Studying Culture at a Distance. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Moore, Charles A. (ed.). The Japanese Mind. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967.

Morison, Samuel Eliot and Henry Steele Comager. The Growth of the American Republic. Vol. II. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Nakamura, Hajime. Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India, China, Tibet, Japan. Philip P. Wiener, editor. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1964.

Nida, Eugene. Customs and Culture: Anthropology for Christian Missions. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954.

Norman, E. Herbert. Japan's Emergence as a Modern State. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1950.

Northrop, F. S. C. and Helen H. Livingston. Cross-Cultural Understanding. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1964.

Nitobe, Inazo. Bushido: The Soul of Japan. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company Publishers, 1969.

_____. Lectures on Japan. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1936.

_____. The Intercourse Between the United States and Japan. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1891.

_____. The Japanese Nation. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

_____. (ed.). Western Influences in Modern Japan. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Oliver, Robert T. Culture and Communication. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1962.

Pei, Mario. The Story of Language. New York: J. B. Lippincott, Company, 1949.

Reischauer, Edwin O. Japan, Past and Present. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

_____. The United States and Japan. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Riesman, David and Evelyn Thompson Riesman. Conversations in Japan: Modernization, Politics and Culture. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1967.

Sansom, Sir George Bailey. The Western World and Japan: A Study in the Interaction of European and Asiatic Cultures. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

Schwantes, Robert S. Japanese and Americans: A Century of Cultural Relations. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

Silberman, Bernard S. Japanese Character and Culture. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962.

Smith, Robert J. and Richard K. Beardsley. (eds.). Japanese Culture: Its Development and Characteristics. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962.

Thonssen, Lester and A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

Treat, Payson Jackson. Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Japan, 1853-1895. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1932.

Vetter, Harold J. Language Behavior and Communication. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. Language, Thought and Reality. John B. Carroll, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.

Yamato, Ichihashi. Japanese in the United States. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1932.

Yanaga, Chitoshi. Japan Since Perry. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949.

Essays and Articles in Collections

Bennett, John W. and Robert K. McKnight. "Social Norms, National Imagery, and Interpersonal Relations," Communication and Culture. Alfred G. Smith, editor. Chicago: Rinehart and Winston, 1966. 595-608.

Fishman, Joshua A. "A Systematization of the Whorfian Hypothesis," Communication and Culture. Alfred G. Smith, editor. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1966. 505-518.

Gorer, Geoffrey. "Themes in Japanese Culture," Japanese Character and Culture. Bernard S. Silberman, editor. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962. 308-324.

Hall, Edward T. and William Foote White. "Intercultural Communication: A Guide to Men of Action," Communication and Culture. Alfred G. Smith, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966. 567-575.

Haring, Douglas G. "Japanese National Character," Japanese Character and Culture. Bernard S. Silberman, editor. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962. 387-399.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Behavior and Personality in Japan," Japanese Character and Culture. Bernard S. Silberman, editor. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962. 400-411.

Kluckholn, Clyde and William H. Kelley. "The Concept of Culture," The Science of Man in the World Crisis. Ralph Linton, editor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

LaBarre, Weston. "Some Observations on Character Structure in the Orient," Japanese Character and Culture. Bernard S. Silberman, editor. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1962. 325-359.

Martin, Samuel E. "Speech Levels in Japan and Korea," Language in Culture and Society. Dell Hymes, editor. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964. 407-415.

Mead, Margaret. "A Case History in Cross-National Communications," The Communication of Ideas. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1948.

_____. "Some Cultural Approaches to Communication," The Communication of Ideas. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1948.

(Nichols), Marie Hochmuth. "The Criticism of Rhetoric," A History and Criticism of Public Address. Vol. III. Marie Hochmuth, editor. New York: Longmans, Green Company, 1955.

Special Publications

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Year Book for 1911. Washington, D.C.: Press of Byron S. Adams, 1912. Also Year Books for years 1912 to 1922.

Civil Information and Education Section, Supreme Commander Allied Powers. Education in the New Japan. Vols. I and II. Tokyo: General Headquarters, Supreme Commander Allied Powers, 1948. (Mimeograph).

Eliot, Charles W. Some Roads Toward Peace: A Report to the Trustees of the Endowment on Observations Made in China and Japan in 1912. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1913.

"For the Convenience of the Press," Brochure. The Japan Times, n.d. A Reprint.

Mabie, Hamilton Wright. Educational Exchange with Japan: A Report to the Trustees of the Endowment on Observations Made in Japan in 1912-1913. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1914.

Miyaoka, Tsunejiro. Growth of Internationalism in Japan. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1915.

Special Collection

The Nitobe Papers in Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

Periodicals

Becker, Samuel L. "Directions for Intercultural Communication Research," Central States Speech Journal, XX (Spring, 1969), 3-13.

Brockriede, Wayne. "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (April, 1966), 31-40.

Buell, Raymond. "An Open Letter to Dr. Inazo Nitobe," The New Republic, May 25, 1932.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. "The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace," International Conciliation, Document No. 75 (February, 1914).

Caudill, William. "Japanese American Personality and Acculturation," Genetic Psychology Monographs; XLV (February, 1952).

Ellingsworth, Huber. "Anthropology and Rhetoric: Toward a Culture Related Methodology of Speech Criticism," South Speech Journal, XXVIII (Summer, 1963). 307-312.

_____. "National Rhetorics and Intercultural Communications," Today's Speech, XVII (February, 1969), 35-39.

Glenn, Edmund. "Meaning and Behavior: Communication and Culture," The Journal of Communication, XIV (December, 1966), 248-272.

Goldschmidt, Walter. "Language and Culture: A Reply," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLI (October, 1955), 280-283.

Green, Elizabeth. "Dr. Inazo Nitobe, His Career," Pacific Affairs, (November-December, 1933), 545-550.

Oliver, Robert T. "Culture and Communication," Vital Speeches, XXXIX (September 15, 1963), 721-724.

_____. "The Confucian Rhetorical Tradition in Korea During the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910)," The Quarterly Journal of Speech XLV (December, 1959), 363-373.

_____. "The Rhetoric of Power in Diplomatic Conferences," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XL (October, 1954), 288-292.

_____. "The Rhetorical Implications of Taoism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVII (February, 1961), 27-35.

_____. "The Rhetorical Tradition in China," Today's Speech, XVII (February, 1966), 3-8.

_____. "Speech in International Affairs," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 171-176.

Takagi, Y. "The Recollections of Dr. Nitobe," The New Age, December, 1949.

Unpublished Materials

Binford, Gurney. "As I Remember It," March, 1941. (Typewritten)

Butler, Nicholas Murray. Personal letter to Japanese Ambassador to the United States, December 15, 1911.

Condon, John C. Jr. "Value Analysis of Cross-Cultural Communication: A Methodology and Application for Selected United States-Mexican Communications, 1962-1963." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1964.

Davenport, Eugene V. "Notable People I have Known," Part of unpublished autobiography.

Ekroth, Lauren E. "The Study of Face-to-Face Communication Between Cultures: Present Status and Directions," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Minnesota, 1967.

Greene, Evarts B. Personal letter to Nitobe, December 19, 1911.

Ishii, Mitsuru. A Biography of Inazo Nitobe. Toshiro Shimanouchi, translator and summarizer. October, 1934. (typewritten)

Jefferson, Pat. "The Rhetoric of the 'Magnificent Barbarian,' Stokley Carmichael," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Indiana, 1967.

Nitobe, Inazo. Nineteen personal letters to Dr. H. B. Adams, Professor at Johns Hopkins University, dated between May 21, 1886 and April 20, 1899.

_____. Personal letter to Anna Brown, September 17, 1891.

_____. Note to Henry Brown, n.d.

_____. Personal letters to Anna Hartshorne, December 2, 1894, February 24, 1895, May 23, 1897.

_____. Personal letter to Lucy B. Roberts, October 19, 1899.

Oxford, Wayne H. "A Critical Edition of Selected Speeches of Fukuzawa Yukichi Dealing with the Modernization of Japan. Translated from the Japanese with an Introduction and Notes," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of California at Los Angeles, 1967.

Saito, Mitsuko. "Speech Education in Japan in the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1957.

Newspapers

Baltimore American, July 11, 1911, January 3, 12, 25, 26, 1912.

Baltimore News, July 10, 1911, January 3, 23, February 5, 1912.

Baltimore Sun, September 18, 1911, January 5, 12, 22, 24, 25, 26, 1912. March 5, 1932.

College Topics, The University of Virginia. March 2, 23, 30, 1912.

Columbia Spectator, Columbia University, New York City. November 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, December 4, 5, 1911.

Kitasawa, Sukeo. "Memories of Dr. Nitobe Return at Azalea Time," Nippon Times, May 1, 1948.

The Daily Brown Herald, Brown University. October 19, 20, 24, 27, 31, November 3, 7, 14, 1911.

Redman, H. Vere, "Lectures About Japan by Late Inazo Nitobe," review of Lectures on Japan by Inazo Nitobe. The Japan Advertiser, October 28, 1936.

The Daily Illini, University of Illinois. March 31, April 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 27, 1912.

The Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Virginia. March 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 23, 28, 29, 1912.

The Minnesota Daily, The University of Minnesota. May 3, 7, 8, 10, 15, 22, 1912.

The New York Times, November 9, 1911. November 19, 1911, December 10, 1911. May 7, 1932. October 16, 1933. July 28, 1932.

Tsurumi, Yusuke, "Dr. Nitobe," Japan Times and Mail, October 28, 1933.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

THE EAST AND THE WEST

As facilities of intercommunication, and therefore points of contact, have of late rapidly increased, and as the East and the West can now see and hear each other at close range on matters of business interests, instead of merely exchanging courtesies at a polite distance, occasions have likewise more frequently arisen for misunderstanding and for doubt. The reasons for this seem manifest, and among them is Imperialism, the overpowering trend of the last century, which, causing the stronger nations to overleap their respective territorial bounds, has brought them face to face with one another in unexpected quarters distant from home. The Dutch and the English, for instance, encountered each other in an unwonted relation on the South African veldt. The Japanese and the Russians renewed acquaintance under strained circumstances on the plains of Manchuria--somewhat after the manner of America and Spain in Cuba and the Philippines, or, more recently, the Italians and the Turks in Tripoli. Though I do not desire a rupture of friendship between the United States and her friends, she may yet face some of them in unamiable converse on the pampas of South America.

Upon the frontiers of empires has been witnessed the impingement of one people upon another during the last two decades. When one calls at a neighbour's front door, one is usually received with courtesy; on the other hand, one may possibly be considered an intruder in the backyard, no matter how innocent. Just as the marginal utility of commodities fixes their value, as economists teach us, so it is in the margins of civilisations that the power of expansive nationalities seems to be tried and determined. America has extended her borders to the Philippines, and Japan the edge of her dominions to Formosa. Here they almost meet. American trade, increasing in China, is brought into competition with Japanese, and as in these outskirts of commercial territory, inhabited by alien races, each nation tries to demonstrate and assert its own superiority, the timid are afraid that we may come to know each other in ways not always agreeable.

With the growth of Imperialism the stronger nations look upon each other with suspicion and jealousy, and, unlike the more innocent intercourse of former days, when men delighted in the exchange of the ideas and arts of peace, modern Imperialism, impelled by feverish megalomania and zest for commercial supremacy, has come to regard all competitors, not only as rivals, but as potential enemies, whose existence jeopardises their own and whose fate must therefore be decided at the point of the sword. Nor is Imperialism alone to blame; for it is nowadays quite the proper thing for dilettante ethnologists and amateur sociologists to put forward their incomplete theories and insufficient data only to make the imagined abyss

between the East and the West appear more hopeless. How little Blumenbach and Cuvier fancied that their classification of the human race by the colour of the skin would be taken so seriously as to become a cause of animosity among the nations of the earth! Under these circumstances it is the duty of every lover of humanity and of peace to be an interpreter, a go-between in the supposed clash of national interests and racial sentiments.

Am I greatly mistaken in believing that, as far as the race question is concerned, we are now at a comparatively early stage of generalisation, having but just begun to perceive aggregate differences? Will not the next stage be a fuller recognition of spiritual affinity, of psychological unity--a realisation that "mankind is one in spirit" and the whole world kin?

I doubt whether in the earlier centuries of the Christian ear Europe was intelligently aware of its own unity, as against the multitudinous principalities and powers of Asia, any more than these are at present conscious of their mutual ties.

The political unity forced upon Europe by the Carlovingians proved a premature coup, but religious unity survived the imperial fiasco, and brought about social unity within the boundaries of Europe. Then followed the Crusades to renew and reinforce the feeling of oneness among the warring nations. The term Christendom was then invented,--its first appearance in the English language being in 1389; but it long remained a vague, sentimental denomination. With the Reformation and the Renaissance the glamour of the Civitas Dei receded more and more into the privacy of each pious soul, while the civitas terrena, largely freed of the evil import imposed upon it by St. Augustine, was upheld by necessity, learning, and custom.

The term Christendom, which had been steadily losing its prestige as a communion of saints, God's kingdom on earth, assumed the new sense of the community of culture and the comity of nations. Its religious significance grew fainter and fainter, until it was at last displaced by the secular term, West, first used by Monsieur Comte. The selection of this term involved the thesis confirming the unity and uniformity of European civilisation, and the antithesis as to its diversity from and superiority to Oriental civilisation.

Discrimination of differences between the East and the West certainly marks an advance in the differentiation of ideas upon the age when the nations of Europe were blind to their collective interests and indicates at the same time a step toward a larger synthesis, whereby Europe becomes conscious of a common bond. But the ancients seem to have made little distinction between Europe and Asia. Probably differences were not then so glaring, trade passing unencumbered to and fro, learning and peaceful arts being freely exchanged. In the borderland between Asia and Europe mingle Aryans, Semites, and Turanians. The marvelous civilisation of Babylon was not autochthonous, nor was that of ancient Crete. Indeed, how much of Greek art and thought is strictly Occidental, I should like to know. Or, how much of the arts and philosophy of Persia and India are

strictly Oriental, I fain would ask. Until the Middle Ages the world was more homogeneous than now--at least in feeling and ideas.

Take the early history of art, and it seems that Greece and India and China were in pretty close contact. Compare ancient Hindoo sculpture with Greek, and it is amazing to observe how closely allied they are, with the Bactrian as a link between them. Place by their side the old Chinese images, until lately almost unknown and only recently unearthed, and we feel that the lands of Plato and Confucius were not irreconcilably opposed in culture. The victories of Alexander, somehow, do not strike me as the descent of an army of civilisation into a region of a very inferior grade of culture. The Jews served for a long time as cosmopolitan mediators between Europe and Asia through their commercial agencies; then, later, the Arabs, not yet turned hostile to Christianity, became the intermediaries of Occidental and Oriental science and art. But as the Saracens and afterwards the Ottomans--or shall we say Moslems?--interposed an almost insuperable barrier between Europe and Asia, the world was practically rent in twain. Then each began to pursue its own course, irrespective of the other's movements, so that when Europe awoke from its sleep of the Dark Ages, Asia still continued to slumber; but by the time they met again after the lapse of centuries they could hardly recognise each other's features. Rejuvenated Europe, fresh and strong, armed with science and trained in liberty--how could it own a friend of "Auld Lang Syne" in decrepit Asia, worn with age and torn with discord! Sluggard Asia had lost all consciousness of unity of any kind. You cannot call it Buddhaland, because unlike Christ in Europe, Buddha has rivals claiming dominion with him; nor was there any unity of race, literature, or language. If there was then any East that could be named in juxtaposition to the West, it expressed chaos as against order, a crowd of Kings who reigned without governing, a nondescript mass of beings who simply existed without living. Who would not then prefer "fifty years of Europe to a cycle of Cathay"?

But the question in my mind is whether this difference between the East and the West is strictly scientific or of lasting value? It is said that Leibnitz divided the human family into those who could read Latin and those who could not; and Mr. Kipling mildly hints the classification of the same family into those who wear trousers and those who wear something else--to which I may suggest adding those who wear nothing. The division of mankind into East and West is more convenient but no more scientific than that of Leibnitz or kipling; for with Alexander Pope, we may

> "Ask where's the North? At York, 'tis on the Tweed;
> In Scotland, at the Orcades; and there
> At Greenland, Zembla, or the Lord knows where."

The meridian that divides the globe into East and West is the line which passes through the place where the observer stands and through the two poles. Hence there are as many meridians as there are observers and what is East to one may be West to the other. The Arabs were called by the Hebrews the children of the East, and by the Babylonians the dwellers of the West; and they denominated themselves by either of these names. As

there is no absolute meridian, East and West are merely relative terms. If the meridian at Greenwich was selected by the convention of 1884 in Washington as the basis of calculation for the world, that meridian itself was only conventional, in more senses than one, for the little English village has no other claim than its observatory to be the centre of the world. The line which there divides East from West also serves to unite them. Hence we may improve upon the rhetoric of the psalmist and say, "As near as the east is to the west;" and hence, too, it is not only when two strong men, "coming from the ends of the earth, stand face to face," but when the weakest man, fixing his eyes upon the polar star, stretches out his arms, that the two hemispheres are united, and that "there is neither East nor West, border nor breed, nor birth." Without being untrue to the land of one's birth or of one's adoption, one may say with Henry Clay, "I know no South, no North, no East, no West, to which I owe any allegiance."

No small pains are taken to discover points of difference between East and West, and of these there are many, especially of the superficial sort; but the very fact that attempts are made to discover differences, takes points of resemblance for granted. When I listen to the analysis of Japanese character and institutions by a hypercritical foreigner--and vice versa for that matter--I am reminded of an anatomist who dissects a woman's corpse and eruditely arrays all the points wherein she differs from man, and would lead us to the inevitable conclusion that man and woman are so irreconcilably opposed in every single respect that the two can never be one. If he were so minded, a nursery psychologist could easily bring out evidence tending to show that a parent and a child are of such different mental constitution that their natural relations are unreasonable and must end in disaster. A mere description without an explanation is likely to lead to a wrong inference. Not much better are the method and attitude of zoilists who write on Japan. Every oddity in manners, every idiosyncrasy in thought is magnified into a distinguishing characteristic of the East or the West, as the case may be; either way, most often for the Pharisaical purpose of self-exaltation. The very faults that are common to both, are deemed particularly blameworthy when committed by the other race. The atmosphere of the Pacific seems to possess the obnoxious power of throwing above the horizon on either side not only an inverted but a perverted mirage. For instance, a clever author of a recent book dwells in some detail on the immorality of the Japanese, which he proves by statistics--appalling figures indeed--but which will stand comparison with similar statistics of the city of New York or of Chicago, if he had only given these. The same gentleman casts a suspicion upon our public men--of course in contrast to the purity and invulnerability of American politicians, who never violate one commandment of the Decalogue--the more so as the ten commandments made no mention of graft!

It is not by mutual fault-finding or by exaggerating each other's peculiarities that we can arrive at understanding or appreciation. Not by antipathy but sympathy;not by hostility but by hospitality; not by enmity but by amity, does one race come to know the heart of another. I have already intimated that the line of division is also the line of union, and

"What God hath joined, let no man put asunder."

There is something grand and graceful in the old belief or beliefs as to the locality of paradise. In the early Christian Church, on the occasion of his baptism, a new convert was made first to face the West in adjuring the devil and his work, because the West was, according to Cyril, the region of darkness; and then he turned toward the East in receiving ablution, because in that quarter of the heavens was shown God's peculiar favour. In strange contrast to this, did the Buddhists place the abode of the blest in the West, whither the sun itself makes its daily pilgrimage.

Not in the Occident and not in the Orient, but in the union of both, will be revealed many of the secrets of Divine dispensation as yet hidden from our sight. A few days before I left Japan, Seiho, the greatest painter of Modern Japan, said to me: "Though I do not profess any familiarity with European masters, I have great hopes in that region of art where the East and West come together--not the neutral land that lies barren between the two, but where Western art fades into Eastern, or where the Eastern lapses into the Western, or where the two domains overlap, as it were." As I listened to him, I thought to myself that this remark of his may be applied to other activities and walks of human life as well as to art. May we not say that some of the greatest discoveries of biology have been made in the borderland where the animal and vegetable kingdoms meet? Some of the most fertile principles have been found in the newly cultivated field which joins chemistry with physics; and as for psycho-physics, delving as it does in a realm not yet named, between the territories of mind and of matter, it has struck rich veins of precious knowledge. We may expect the greatest fertility in the virgin soil where apparently contrary natures meet and wed.

It is said that the genius of the East is spiritual, mystical, psychocal, and that of the West is materialistic, actual, physical; it is said that the forte as well as the fault of the East is religion and sentiment, and that of the West, science and reason; it is said that the East delights in generalisation and universal concepts, and the West in particulars and special knowledge; that the one leans to philosophy and ideas, and the other to practice and facts; that Oriental logic is deductive and negative, and Occidental logic inductive and positive. It is also said that in political and social life, solidarity and socialism characterise the East, and individualism and libert, the West; it is said that the Asiatic mind is impersonal and rejects the world, whereas the European mind is person and accepts the world. The strength of Europe lies in the mastery of man over nature, and the weakness of Asia in the mastery of nature over man. In the land of the morning, man looks for beauty first and writes his flighty thoughts in numbers; in the land of the evening, man's first thought is for utility, and he jots down his observations in numerals. He who watches the setting sun, pursues whither it marches, and his watchword is Progress and his religion is the cult of the future. He who greets the effulgent dawn is therewith content and cares not for its further course, but rather turns in wonderment to the cource whence it came, hence his religion is the cult of the past. The matin disposes man

to contemplation, the vesper hour to reflection. In the East man lives for the sake of life; in the West man lives for the means of living.

On the whole there is food for thought in this contrast of race peculiarities; but such general characterisation is of little practical use in diplomacy or in commerce, for the individuals with whom we deal do not always conform to a type, and the wider the scope allowed to individual activity, the greater is the divergence from the type. This is distinctly so in Japan, where the thought and the influence of the East and of the West find their meeting ground. It is well known that the sea which surrounds my country is the richest in varieties of fish, because the various currents of the ocean which wash our shores and the rivers which flow into its waters meet and mingle and offer favourable conditions to various forms of animal life. It is along the line which unites the East and the West that we should look for a higher and a richer successor to our present civilisation.

But instructive and interesting as is fishing on the high seas of speculation, there is a more pressing and utilitarian demand for the study of the regions where Europe and Asia come in direct contact. Or--to put the case more concisely--there is, at present, urgent and practical need for America to understand Japan. As long as our planet is round, a segmental or hemispheric progress, however deep, can only remain fragmentary and falls short of perfect culture. Only in a mutual understanding between the opposite points of the compass, can man read the final destiny of the race, whereas without comprehending the antipodal soul, he can never discover his own shortcomings or his peculiar gifts. Very truly says Bailey:

> "'Tis light translateth night; 'tis inspiration expounds
> experience; 'tis the West explains the East;"

and it is only tautological to add that 'tis the East explains the West.

Of late years, most unfortunately and most unexpectedly have darksome clouds been lowering across the Pacific Ocean, sometimes reaching gigantic proportions and assuming threatening appearances--so much so that some Americans have imagined they saw among the clouds a dragon spitting fire, as in the cartoon drawn by no less distinguished a personage than Kaiser Wilhelm. There is a custom in our country whereby literary men who have composed a stanza ask their artist friends to make suitable pictures to bring out the meaning the better, and, conversely, artists ask poets to write some lines to elucidate their pictures. When I first had the honour of beholding this celebrated drawing of the Kaiser, there came to my mind an ancient Japanese ode:

> "Clouds on the distant hills
> Of far Cathay--
> Smoke which from our own hearthstones
> Rose to-day!"

May we not say that the clouds which hang over the Pacific, if

there really are any, are but the accumulation of fancies which have emanated from beclouded brains amongst us and amongst you? They are largely the creations of Yellow Journalism, for which, as it enjoys no legal patent right, the public pays in fright and anxiety. Then some unscrupulous individuals make a regular trade of spreading thrilling news of the imminent danger of war. Naturally, to satisfy a general craving for excitement, writers of fiction wield their busy pen, and already on the bookstands are arrayed a number of their products bearing popular titles. There is no lack of authors who pander to depraved or bloodthirsty lovers of the fantastic. There are, too, not a few military and naval men who honestly believe that they can maintain their profession in high repute, or their trust in high efficiency, by constantly keeping possible warfare before the eyes of the public. Then, again, there are important business concerns to which a war scare is a source of large orders and of profit. Not seldom does it happen that an order for building a Dreadnaught is preceded by loud talk about complications with a foreign country. When we learn that an order for a single gunboat means business to the amount of six million dollars and employment for five thousand men for two and a half years, it is not surprising that a Japanese bogy should periodically appear. Of all forms and methods of argumentation, none is more convincing, though text-books on rhetoric refuse with lofty scorn to take note of it, than argumentun ad crumenam or ad hominem; and the deeper the pocket, the more keenly is the force of such logic appreciated. I have heard that a scare-crow in a melon patch does some good by frightening away innocent birds, but that it offers at the same time a convenient cover for a thief! "We seek and offer ourselves to be gulled," says Montaigne. The ancient Romans had an adage, "The populace like to be deceived" (Populus vult decipi) --and the populace have not changed much since then, despite all the changes they have witnessed. The gullibility of the human mind seems recently to have assumed most appalling dimensions; and when it does so, it is easily taken advantage of. It is then that false prophets and soothsayers ply their craft; and many, too many, have already made their appearance. Some of their voices were heard but lately in high places. It is deeply to be regretted that cheap prophecies are going to prove very dear to believing peoples.

Doleful prophets there have been in all ages and in all places;--for instance, in 1895, a young navy officer uttered at Annapolis a prophecy that in the year of our Lord 1896 or 1897 a great cataclysm would involve the whole of Europe, and that Russia would make irresistible march westward, while England would dwindle into a third-rate power. The time that was allotted for the fulfilment of this prophecy has long passed, and poor mortals with limited vision still fail to discern the signs of its realisation. Captain Hobson started out as a war prophet at the early age of twenty-five, and he still continues to exercise the same gift of foresight, only with this difference--that now the field of his prediction is the East instead of the West, and insteading of counting the period of its fulfilment in years he calculates it in months. In February, 1911, he declared that a rupture would take place between the United States and Japan within ten months--a period of time which, after further consideration, he stretched to twenty months and which, I hope, he will be further

inspired to prolong to eternity.

Nor is Captain Hobson the only alarmist; for only last summer there appeared a rival prophet who pretended to give a "mathematical analysis of the astrological evidence of war with Japan," in which the author points out that "When California was admitted to the Union Uranus was in Aries and when Washington was admitted Saturn and Neptune were cavorting together in an unholy alliance--conclusive evidence that both these States show themselves to be a sometime battlefield of the nation!"

Whatever honour these prophets may enjoy here in their own country, they have none in ours. We are too light-hearted to take them seriously. It is not childish heedlessness that makes us feel light of heart. With our eyes wide open and our minds eager for national safety, we still fail to detect any ground for going to war with any country, least of all with America. Should anything so improbable occur, you may rest assured that the initiative will not be taken by Japan.

The simple fact that Japan, during the past two decades, has engaged in two great conflicts--or three, if you include her share in the suppression of the Boxer movement--may give an erroneous idea that we are a nation wantonly fond of fighting, a dangerously cantankerous character for a neighbour to have. But is there any other nation that can boast of two hundred and thirty years of continuous peace? I do not wish to brag; but I should like to know for the sake of information whether any other country has broken that record,--and yet such is the absurdity of fame, that we figure to the world as a race of Myrmidons.

I have often seen suspicion cast upon Japan because of her great armament; that she must be drilling her army and building Dreadnaughts for the ulterior purpose of territorial expansion. I personally am opposed to such armament; but even as it is, it is not for aggression. You know the Scotch proverb, "Nae one can live in peace unless his neighbours let him." Or, to put it in more high-sounding phraseology, we have to bring ourselves into selective accommodation or organic adjustment to the bellicose environment of the twentieth century. If we need an army or navy, we need it for self-defence, self-preservation. With the acquisition of Korea and Saghalien, our coast line has increased, but not our navy in the same proportion.

We do not forget some unkind comments and hard treatment from certain countries; but we are morally prepared to bear them, if not like martyrs, at least like gentlemen. Like our fabled dragon, we do not stir while maidens play with our beard or children ride upon our back. But let a rude hand touch his throat, the dragon will rise in all his native fury. You understand this spirit. It is not a warlike or aggressive spirit. Is it not the spirit of '76, as you call it? When the Thirteen Colonies, the "three millions of people armed in the holy cause of liberty," rose up, like one man, "invincible by any force," who called them an aggressive people? There is a wide margin between an unconquerable spirit and a spirit of conquest. "The vigilant, the active, and the brave" are not

on that account the warlike. The unconquerable spirit is the spirit of peace and not of war. No people will understand the distinction better than the American.

"Westward the course of Empire holds its way," has been true in one hemisphere, while eastward has been the march of human mind in the other, and now America in the foremost files of Western time and Japan as the heir of all the Asian ages, are met to complete the world's electric circle. I would not liken you to sentinels of Occidental culture and ourselves to guards of Oriental traditions, as do some. Neither of us stands on the Pacific coast to ward off the other from the treasures of his heritage. Are we not more than willing--even eager--mutually to share our ancestral gifts?

If your country and mine should come to a better knowledge each of the other--to a fuller and deeper understanding of each other's mission and aspirations--a long stride will have been taken toward the general advancement of human happiness, a great step toward the fulfilment of the prophecy, not of a sensational soothsayer, but of a great seer and thinker, who dipped into the future, far as human eye could see, and saw the time

> "When the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the
> battle-flags were furled
> In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the
> world."

And to this great consummation, devoutly to be wished for, it is a privilege to contribute a widow's mite.

APPENDIX B

PEACE OVER THE PACIFIC

(Delivered at the Leland Stanford, Jr., University, September, 1911.)

I consider it a great kindness on your part to invite me to this institution, whose fame as a contributor to knowledge has reached all quarters of the globe. I am conscious of the rare honour you have conferred upon me by so doing. I have accepted the invitation, however, not simply because I feel it an honour to do so, but because I feel myself under double obligation to this distinguished academic body. There is no institution of learning outside of our native country which has so many of my compatriots studying under such favourable circumstances as those I see around me. If in some parts of California you build your gates too narrow for our people to enter, here, at least, I see the portals wide open to welcome mankind irrespective of colour. Here, at least, the American flag flies over every race of man, to assure equal justice and equal opportunity. It is certainly a pleasure to stand in your midst and to thank you in person for the generous welcome you have extended to my fellowcountrymen. But there is still another circumstance which puts me under obligation to you. Three weeks ago, I had the privilege of having your honoured and beloved president under my own roof. I had not had the pleasure of meeting him before, and I was delighted to make the acquaintance of this man, whose scientific achievements have placed him upon a pedestal of immortal fame, and who, nevertheless, has not lost a childlike simplicity of nature, whose arms are ever extended to unite the world in the bonds of peace.

America has done much in educating Japan; but if there is any one message which you must send to us just at this juncture, it is the one which Dr. Jordan is carrying to my country; for, owing to one reason or another, there seems to be afloat in the air the most mischievous and the most unfortunate of rumours regarding a possible estrangement between the United States and Japan. I know that you, as members of the Leland Stanford Jr. University, have imbibed the spirit of peace and a general love of mankind. Why, these very walls preach peace and good-will to men, and do not make it incumbent upon a stranger to repeat what you have always heard; but in the world outside the rumours are wild and loud. Many interests are involved in keeping them alive. "Most of them," very rightly said Dr. Brown in the Lake Mohonk conference last year, "most of them belong in the category of thoughts which are fathered by a wish. Men who fear and dislike the Japanese are eager to see some nation fight them." There are not a few business concerns which profit by agitation about war; there are not a few individuals who utilise the falsest reports for their own promotion or profit; and there are not a few nations that would derive benefit from an outbreak betwixt your country and ours. I do not like to indulge in suspicion, but my suspicions are well grounded that many an individual,

many a business concern, and many a nation is bent upon stirring up strife between the two countries, solely from selfish motives. I do not charge any particular company with this crime; but many a company can get good orders for ship-building materials and armament and provisions, simply by inciting a war-scare.

While the peace-loving community is alarmed and distressed at the prospect of any rupture, the interested parties grow fat at their expense. A scarecrow in a melon-patch may frighten away innocent birds, but a thief may be hiding himself under the scarecrow itself. When I reflect that the general public is so easily swayed by the fabrications and machinations of scare-mongers, the infinite credulity of the human mind strikes me as appalling. You and I, however, who enjoy the advantages of a higher education than is allotted to the average citizen, certainly ought to know better. Sift all this empty talk of war, and what have you left? Air-bubbles cannot be sifted, nor can mere froth and foam. Not a grain of reason is left that can be given as a just occasion for war, whereas there is every reason to believe that the two nations which border the Pacific are united by bonds of friendship stronger than those that bind any other two nations. You may say, that sounds all very well, but what about racial differences? Is there not already a Rassen-Kampf (race struggle)? Furthermore, there is no legal instrument that unites the two nations in permanent peace; no alliance, no arbitration treaty. But, my friends, there are ties that bind more closely than blood. There are words that join us more strongly than treaties and documents. If you doubt this, cast your glance upon the history of American-Japanese intercourse from its very beginning, or, if you can afford more time, study it page by page, and you can draw a conclusion for yourself that the alpha and omega of this history is exhausted in the one word--Peace.

In the whole course of this history, you have always taken the active side; we have always maintained the passive. You have helped us in our debut into the society of nations; you have always chaperoned us in our youthful career; and though gratitude is outside the category of political virtues, our national memory keeps alive the good-will that America has always manifested in her dealings with us. I am not so unsophisticated as to believe that Commodore Perry's expedition was prompted by an impulse of unalloyed Christian charity. I know that its motive was the advantage to be derived from possessing a coaling station, a refuge for the American sailors and waifs, and from the extension of commerce; but I also believe that it was the desire of the United States Government to effect its purpose in the kindliest manner. From his own account, we are aware that Commodore Perry was not always peacefully disposed. More than once did he ask his Government whether he might resort to arms, should diplomacy prove unavailing. As often was he told to refrain from using force. Because Perry succeeded in what was at that time regarded as an impossible task, by luckily avoiding bloodshed, he is called the benefactor of our country. From what he himself stated about his real attitude of mind, it seems that peaceful means were imposed upon him by his Government. We have erected a monument to his memory on the spot where he first landed, and it is far from me to detract one iota from the honour due his name, but we can call

him the benefactor of our country only by a rhetorical stretching of the term. That term is more deservedly applied to the man and to the Government that stayed his hand from possible violence, and as long as the United States Government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people, the gentle feeling of fratitude ought to go out, as it does, to you as a nation. And this incident in the life of Perry ought to teach us that whatever military and naval men may say, as long as public opinion, as long as you--men, women, and children--keep up the peaceful tradition of your fathers, the waters of the Pacific will remain calm and unbroken.

— The American who came after Perry was indeed the type and in very deed the representative of Americans, of just and true Americans.

Townsend Harris, a merchant of New York, was dispatched to Japan, the first Minister representing the United States. A man of stern rectitude and gentlest powers of persuasion, he, indeed, more than any other, deserves the epithet of benefactor; because in all his dealings with us, the weaker party, he never took advantage of our ignorance, but formulated a treaty with the strictest sense of justice. He did not hesitate to sacrifice the many advantages which his country would gain by apparently honest means, if he saw that there would be undue loss for Japan. After him there were many representatives of this country, and a large majority did credit both to their people and to the cause of justice and humanity at large. Names such as Bingham, Hubbard, and Buck are still remembered, as will be that of your last Ambassador, Mr. O'Brien, with deep respect and affection. As I have said, you have been the active party in our diplomatic relations and it was fortunate, not only for us and for the other countries of the Far East, but for every friend of peace and justice, that your envoys did not represent merely their Government in Washington, but the cause of humanity as well. We are nowadays prone to forget, in our enthusiasm for nationality, that there is a cause higher and nobler than nationality. It is said that the Americans and the Japanese are the two most patriotic nations on the face of the globe; that they are most sensitive to national honour and interest; that they are most easily moved by any appeal to their patriotism; and it is no wonder that we are alike in this respect, for we are the youngest of nations. No other peoples feel as keenly as do we that we have made our respective countries what they are.

It is the bounden duty of every individual who looks upon national responsibility as though it were a personal one, to maintain the amicable relation that has existed between us. Sometimes suspicion creeps in between us, and sometimes arguments threaten to rend us apart. So-called scientists declare from the platform that races so diverse as the White and the Yellow cannot live under the same sky, apparently forgetting that there is no race known under the sun which has not enjoyed citizenship under the Stars and Stripes. It has been one of the grandest and most exalting sights that can be witnessed, to see thousands of immigrants, representing more than fifty distinct nationalities, pouring into America, and to see those streams of varied hues merging in a short time into one current of republican citizenship. To exclude a race on account of racial difference is to admit the

incapacity of American institutions to assimilate all races--as was once the boast of the country. I cannot believe that the present generation of Americans has lost the power which its forefathers possessed and exercised, under conditions more strenuous.

One of the greatest sons of California, Mr. Burbank, has intimated in his Training of the Human Plant, that, the wider the field for selection or for sports to grow and the more chances there are for the crossing of species, the greater is the probability of evolving a plant of importance; and Mr. Kidd states that as yet no scientific standard has been discovered to guage the superiority of one race over another. Every race has traits which, when contributed, make the human plant richer and higher.

Then there are economists who whisper to you that cheap labour must be excluded, who forget that labour is only one of the many factors of production. It it is true that, the cheaper the labour, the greater is the necessity for its exclusion, why not, as Bastiat would say, burn all the latest inventions in machinery?

Then, again, there are moralists who are anxious lest the good manners of their own people should be spoiled by lower, alien standards of morality. This is an old argument, which was current as far back as the Middle Ages, and while examples are not wanting to give colour to this solicitude, proofs are on record that a strong nation exercises beneficent influence not only upon those who come thither from afar, but upon neighbouring nations. And certainly America, in the prime of its national manhood, can exert a superior influence upon other peoples.

Of all the reasons which are given for the alienation of Japan from America, the one which has seemed most disturging to the American people at large is the assertion that the Japanese are incapable of assimilation. Lafcadio Hearn has given currency to the term "race antipodalism," the belief that the Japanese are psychologically so far removed that, the more you educate them even in Western knowledge, the farther they will diverge from you in thought. Hearn with all his wonderful insight into Japanese nature, or perhaps because of his enthusiasm for things Japanese, may have thought that he was serving the cause of our people by making them appear as a unique nation, and his opinion is echoed by many who fling it into our very face. Unfortunately, there are rampant Chauvinists among us, as there are everywhere else, who pride themselves upon being different from the rest of the world; who exaggerate small differences, and who insist upon diverging from the path the Western nations pursue; who identify idiopathy with native strength, and who, in so doing, exalt national foibles into national virtues, and purposely keep themselves aloof.

I myself have no patience with those whose mental vision never reaches beyond their limited horizon. They have failed to read in history that the peoples who called themselves special favourites of their Creator, who prided themselves upon what they possessed and upon what they did not possess, fell easy victims to the barbarians, Gentiles, and the heretics whom they were wont to despise. The time has long passed when a nation

could live in seclusion and isolation. The modern age does not tolerate apartness. It grinds down peculiarities and will even coerce nations to surrender their characteristics until they learn to associate with others on a common, equal basis of right and wrong, of good and bad. I confess that the two great wars in which we came out triumphant have turned the head of some of our weaker brethren. They believe that our success was due expressly to the spirit of Bushido, the remnant of that excellent teaching which formed the samurai's code of honour. I myself feel partly responsible for disseminating this idea. I do not regret that I wrote regarding it and in behalf of it, and what I have written and spoken about it I have no mind to take back; but I do not share the views of the Chauvinists that the spirit of Bushido is the peculiar monopoly of our people; neither do I share the view that it is the highest system of morality that man can conceive or construct. I know its weakness. I know all its temptations to misinterpretation and degeneration, and I should feel a regret too deep for words, if my people failed to see that the new wine requires a new wine-skin. I should be most sorry if the noble ethics of Bushido were converted by bigots into an anti-foreign instrument. I know that I am exposing myself to grave suspicion and misunderstanding on the part of my countryment, as though I were catering to the anti-Japanese effusions of some Americans by dilating upon the seamy side of what usually passes as patriotism; but patriotism itself is a word so grossly abused! Doctor Samuel Johnson said long ago that this word is the resort of the scoundrel. Especially among the Chauvinists is it freely used as a substitute for reason and argument. Crimes, robbery, and slaughter are committed under the spell of its name. What common sense and morality cannot justify is exonerated under its sanction. Greed of territory and wars ensuing therefrom are vindicated by an appeal to it. So much so, that some one has recently defined it not as love of land but as "love of more land." Two such patriotic nations as Japan and America, unless they are on their guard, can easily deceive themselves into believing that in some territory which they covet, whether mutually or separately, they may come into conflict. We were highly amused at the strict surveillance of American authorities over the Japanese in the Philippines. It is too soon to forget the agreement signed November, 1908, between the two countries, through which instrument we mutually disclaimed all aggressive designs, in consequence of which each Government respects the territorial possessions of the other on the Pacific. This should be a sufficient guarantee that Japan entertains no ambition to acquire the Philippines or Hawaii. Equally amusing sound to our ears such articles as often appear in different magazines in regard to Japanese artifice in China. Now and then appears a book from the American press by some so-called authority on Manchuria: full of suspicions but with no facts to substantiate them, yet always winding up with the hackneyed conclusion--Japan is stealing American trade in China.

Americans ought to know by this time that, however mistaken it may be in some directions, our patriotism is not love for more land. My contention is, on the contrary, that our patriotism is confined too narrowly within the home land and feeds itself upon the insular spirit, which does not see that there are regions untouched by man where, if they but work,

our people will be welcome. Just as nature abhors a vacuum, social economy abhors a dearth of labour when land and capital can be had in abundance. Look at those orchard hills and valleys where the fruits are ripe for the hand of the picker; look at those plains where the sugar beets are ready for the weeder and the thousands of acres grown with grain and vegetables, all waiting for the labour of men; certainly California needs more labour. The State has indeed been for years in the condition of "chronic labour famine." A great state of over 165,000 square miles, larger than the area of Japan itself by some 10,000 square miles, and provided with only two and one-third million of population, equal to one-twenty-second part of our own, with a density of only fifteen per square mile, must depend upon foreign labour for the proper cultivation of its soil. Mr. McKenzie's report says that Japanese labour is responsible for nearly $30,000,000 worth of produce in this State. It is depressing to think of the vast wealth lying unexplored and unexploited in this great State, so abundantly blessed by nature, simply because of lack of labour. I wish some Stanford man would take up for scientific treatment,--perhaps under direction of such an authority as Professor Miller, the subject of the economic loss sustained by California on account of Orientophobia. Some new facts may come to light, as was the case in the study of a former member of your university, Miss Mary Roberts Coolidge, whose impartial researches made clear many points pertaining to Chinese labour. I shall not be at all surprised if in the near future, when prejudice shall have exhausted its breath in vociferation, and when the Orientophobic scales shall have falled from the eyes of labour rings--California may once more open its doors for our people. I know too well the awful power of prejudice, but I also know that economic law is stronger than prejudice. What California lacks can be supplied by Japan, and what the super-abundant population of Japan, the density of which is three hundred and thirty-six per square mile, lacks--namely, field for employment--California can offer in abundance. Far from there being any conflict, there is actually harmony of interests, and a little concession on both sides will surely do away with the few obstacles that may be imposed. Amicable solution of any questions arising from these obstacles is certainly possible, if only the minds of both parties are open to it.

We have already gone a long way toward the solution of the problem, having adopted a method which is clear and summary. To put it concisely, we have taken upon ourselves the duty of restricting immigration to your shores. Without any treaty or convention, purely by a gentlemen's agreement, this has been accomplished. The result is patent to all. I have just come across the Pacific on one of our largest steamers. She was laden to her fullest capacity with silk and tea; but the steerage was almost empty, and the few Japanese passengers in it were bound to a French island of the Lesser Antilles. The rest consisted of a number of labourers from the Philippines, new American subjects who were, of course, admitted free of conditions. But to return to my Japanese immigration problem, though a practical solution has been reached for the time being, there is some doubt as to the permanency of the present arrangement, for a proviso regarding immigration at the end of Act II, of the old treaty was omitted in the new treaty made putlic last spring. Thus the whole situation depends

upon the spirit of concession on the side of Japan, upon her magnanimity, as Professor Coolidge of Harvard puts it. "The arrangement," he says, "which will give the United States the protection it demands, will rest not on the efficiency of its own laws, but on the fulfilment of obligations voluntarily assumed by a foreign state." However willing Japan may be to continue the same course of restriction, American "cannot depend indefinitely on the generosity, real or presumed, of a neighbour."

Professor Coolidge is certainly right, speaking as a jurist,--just as Professor Von Holst was right in speaking as a publicist, of the dangers threatening the United States through what its Constitution has not provided for. At the same time, if a bona fide check to emigration is scrupulously carried out in Japan, it will in a few years become, as our Minister of Foreign Affairs said during the last session of our Parliament, the established policy of the Empire; then, the question will bother neither you nor us, for then there will be no question. Good-will can put to rights the confusion which an appeal to law can only make more confused. I believe there is not a single case that cannot be settled by friendly means better than by legal procedure. I think it was Mr. Rowell who expressed his solicitude lest, in the absence of a treaty stipulation, the act of a rowdy boy who might feel like smashing a Japanese window should lead to international complications, or at least jeopardise amity between the two Powers. If the authorities in California are as genuinely disposed as are the Japanese to settle such difficulties amicably, the police and the Court of Justice ought to be able to do so in five minutes. It is also feared that a demagogue may arise in Japan and make of a trifling incident an issue of international magnitude. I am sorry to own that there are demagogues in my country as in yours, and fire-spitting journalists, too, and hair-splitting jurists as well; but a foreign policy, such as the policy of restriction, once established and efficiently carried out, is hardly likely to be upset by them. If I may be allowed to express my private opinion, that policy is too vigorously and too conscientiously put into practice; so that some of our most promising students are debarred from the advantage of American education and some of the most intelligent working-men are lost to American economy. I may add this opinion of mine is shared by many American residents in Japan.

But, pardon me, I have sojourned too long on the California coast, because my mind is full of California impressions. Though I landed here only last Saturday, such strange sights and sounds as I did not perceive twenty-eight years ago, when I first passed through San Francisco on my way to Baltimore, overwhelmed my senses. There was then no talk of war; no word of ill-will was heard, no sound of masons building a fort, no din of trumpet or of drum; all was peace along the Pacific. I can scarcely believe my own eyes and ears, so stupendously changed is the tone of American life. I wonder if this is progress. For myself, I cannot believe so. I live in a land famed for its soldiers and sailors; but I cannot free my mind from the thought that armament and militarism and what they bring in their train, will ultimately spell the ruin of the nations that play with them.

So, as a son of Japan, and as a well-wisher of America, it is my sincere hope that all these rumours of war may prove but a transient dream, a horrible nightmare that passes with the coming of the dawn. May we earnestly pray, and diligently work toward the end, that, wherever else war-clouds may darken this earth, lasting peace shall reign over the Pacific.

APPENDIX C

Outline of the first main point in Nitobe's "East and West" speech.

I. Increased communication contacts between East and West have created much misunderstanding and doubt.

A. Imperialism is one reason for the misunderstanding and doubt.
1. It is the overpowering trend of the last century.
2. It has caused strong nations to overleap their territorial bounds.
3. It has brought these strong nations face to face in unexpected quarters.
a. Dutch and English encountered each other in South Africa.
b. Japanese and Russians met in Manchuria.
c. America and Spain were in conflict over Cuba and the Philippines.
d. Italians and Turks met in Tripoli.
e. The United States may meet friends in South America.
4. The last two decades have witnessed the impingement of one people upon another upon the frontiers of empires.
a. Just as the marginal utility of commodities fixes their value, so the power of expansive nations seems to be tried in the margins of civilization.
(1) America has extended her borders to the Philippines.
(2) Japanese domains stretch to Formosa.
(3) Here the two almost meet.
(4) American trade competes with Japan in China.
5. With the growth of Imperialism the stronger nations look upon each other with suspicion and jealousy.
a. This is unlike the more innocent intercourse of former days.
b. Modern Imperialism is impelled by a feverish megalomania and zest for commercial supremacy.
c. It has come to regard all competitors as:
(1) Competitors.
(2) Potential enemies.
d. The mere existence of these rivals jeopardizes the existence of Imperialists.
e. The fate of such rivals, it appears, must be decided at the point of the sword.

B. Racism also contributes to East-West misunderstanding and doubt.
1. Dilettante ethnologists and amateur sociologists put forward incomplete (race) theories based on insufficient data.

2. Such are used to make the imagined abyss between East and West appear hopeless.
3. Blumenbach and Cuvier did not expect their classification of the human race to be so used.
4. In early stages of study of race we perceive more differences than bases for kinship among men.
   a. Europe was slow to recognize its unity.
      (1) In earliest days there was a tendency to concentrate on differences.
      (2) The Carlovingian attempt at political unity for Europe was premature.
      (3) Religious unity ultimately brought social unity to Europe.
      (4) The Crusades gave opportunity to renew and reinforce a feeling of oneness among warring nations.
      (5) The term Christendom assumed a sense of community of culture and the comity of nations.
      (6) Gradually the term lost religious significance but still signified unity.
   b. Noting differences between East and West denotes movement through a stage toward unity (like Europe did).
5. Ancients made little distinction between Europe and Asia.
   a. Probably differences then were not so glaring.
6. Until the Middle Ages the world was more homogeneous than now in feeling and ideas.
   a. The early history of art indicates that Greece, India and China were in rather close contact.
      (1) Ancient Hindu and Greek sculpture were amazingly closely allied.
      (2) Recently unearthed old Chinese images suggest that the lands of Plato and Confucius were not irreconcilably opposed on culture.
      (3) Alexander's victories were not in lands without culture.
      (4) Jews served as mediators between Europe and Asia through their commercial agencies.
      (5) Later Arabs, not yet hostile to Christianity, became intermediaries of Occidential and Oriental science and art.
   b. Later the Saracens and then the Ottomans (or Moslems) interposed an almost insuperable barrier between Europe and Asia.
      (1) Then Europe and Asia went their separate ways.
      (2) After the Dark Ages the two met but could hardly recognize each other.
7. At that point in history the terms East and West became meaningful.

Transition: Is such a distinction between East and West strictly scientific or of lasting value?

APPENDIX D

Outline of the first main point in Nitobe's speech on Religion.

Nitobe began with a two-part definition of religion involving faith and one's response to faith: (1) Faith is what a man believes concerning existence beyond this life, future and past. (2) Response involves what a man does as corollaries of his faith, especially his worship.

I. By this definition Japanese are by nature a highly religious people.

   A. Religion is akin to their sense of beauty.
      1. Extended horizontally it generates art.
      2. Projected upward it paints and carves religion.
   B. Japanese are imbued with a religious sentiment.
      1. They are both sentimental and artistic.
      2. Among their higher sentiments is their religious taste.
      3. They are not governed by this sentiment.
         a. So their religious zeal would not be like that shown by Jews, Spaniards, Hindus or Arabs.
         b. Japanese are too matter-of-fact to become zealots.
         c. Yet when faced with persecution they see martyrdom as heroic.
         d. It would be considered an honorable exit from this life.
   C. Japanese religion is incapable of concise statement.
      1. They would be critical of attempts to reduce religion to articles of faith.
      2. The very nature of religion involves mystery and vagueness.
      3. So the Japanese conception of religion is clear in spots but vague generally.

APPENDIX E

The first 300 words of Nitobe's formal speech, "East and West."

As facilities of intercommunication, and therefore points of contact, have of late rapidly increased, and as the East and the West can now see and hear each other at close range on matters of business interests, instead of merely exchanging courtesies at a polite distance, occasions have likewise more frequently arisen for misunderstanding and for doubt. The reasons for this seem manifest, and among them is Imperialism, the overpowering trend of the last century, which, causing the stronger nations to overleap their respective territorial bounds, has brought them face to face with one another in unexpected quarters distant from home. The Dutch and the English, for instance, encountered each other in an unwonted relation on the South African veldt. The Japanese and the Russians renewed acquaintance under strained circumstances on the plains of Manchuria--somewhat after the manner of America and Spain in Cuba and the Philippines, or, more recently, the Italians and the Turks in Tripoli. Though I do not desire a rupture of friendship between the United States and her friends, she may yet face some of then in unamiable converse on the pampas of South America.

Upon the frontiers of empires has been witnessed the impingement of one people upon another during the last two decades. When one calls at a neighbour's front door, one is usually received with courtesy; on the other hand, one may possibly be considered an intruder in the backyard, no matter how innocent. Just as the marginal utility of commodities fixes their value, as economists teach us, so it is in the margins of civilisations that the power of expansive nationalities seems to be tried and determined. America has extended her borders to the Philippines, and Japan the edge of her dominions to Formosa. Here they almost meet. American trade, increasing in . . .

APPENDIX F

The first 300 words of Nitobe's informal speech, "Peace Over the Pacific."

I consider it a great kindness on your part to invite me to this institution, whose [illegible]e as a contributor to knowledge has reached all quarters of the globe. I am conscious of the rare honour you have conferred upon me by so doing. I have accepted the invitation, however, not simply because I feel it an honour to do so, but because I feel myself under double obligation to this distinguished academic body. There is no institution of learning outside of our native country which has so many of my compatriots studying under such favourable circumstances as those I see around me. If in some parts of California you build your gates too narrow for our people to enter, here, at least, I see the portals wide open to welcome mankind irrespective of colour. Here, at least, the American flag flies over every race of man, to assure equal justice and equal opportunity. It is certainly a pleasure to stand in your midst and to thank you in person for the generous welcome you have extended to my fellow countrymen. But there is still another circumstance which puts me under obligation to you. Three weeks ago, I had the privilege of having your honoured and beloved president under my own roof. I had not had the pleasure of meeting him before, and I was delighted to make the acquaintance of this man, whose scientific achievements have placed him upon a pedestal of immortal fame, and who, nevertheless, has not lost a childlike simplicity of nature, whose arms are ever extended to unite the world in the bonds of peace.

America has done much in educating Japan: but if there is any one message which you must send to us just at this juncture, it is the one which Dr. . . .

APPENDIX G

The first 300 words of Butler's formal speech, "The Path to Peace."

The one problem which in importance surpasses every other, whether national or internationa, is how the civilized peoples may hereafter live and work together without resort to international war and without its constant threat. Despite the awful lessons of the years 1914-18 there still are those in high place who plainly have learned nothing. They still use the old jargon of a generation ago and still repeat the now meaningless phrases about national security, commerce protection, and armaments as a means of preventing war. The time for all this sort of thing has gone by. Should another great war come--which may God forbid--civilisation would be hopelessly wrecked, and perhaps destroyed. In that case, some thousands of years hence our successors on this planet might be digging in the sands and forests to discover traces of our existence and evidence of our interests and occupations as we now dig in Yucatan, in Egypt, and in Mesopotamia.

Should such another great war come, the costly battleship and the submarine would be as much out of date as the bow and arrow or the shield and spear. Poisonous gases would be spread over whole populations and huge bombs from the air to wipe out in an hour the industry and achievement of generations. In such a war there would be no non-combatants. Every man, woman and child would be in instant danger. Every factory and farm would participate directly in the contest until the hour of its destruction came.

The picture is much too horrible to contemplate and yet it is a true picture.

How is all this to be avoided? Which way lies the Path to Peace? To answer this question justly one must understand and weigh the great social, economic and political forces which are and have been at work . . .

APPENDIX H

The first 300 words of Butler's informal speech, "Building the International Mind."

This greeting and this splendid and kindly welcome touch me very deeply, and tempt me to a personal word. It is many, many--more than I like to count--since I first came to Colorado to climb its peaks, to explore its high places, to cross its passes, to see its great mining camps, to tramp over its magnificent territory, and to make friends that I value more than I have words to express. Those days seem long ago. They were the days when a very different generation represented Colorado and guided its public life. Those were the days--and even earlier--when Senator Hill and Mr. Stapelton were managing the old Republican; when the sagacious and large-minded Senator Teller was playing a great part in the life of the nation; when Senator Wolcott, of magnificent mien and oratory, was captivating great audiences in all parts of the United States; when Georgetown and Ouray were busy mining camps, when Aaron Cove and William H. Smiley were making the schools of Denver the best on the continent; and when there was gathered here a host of engineers, lawyers, physicians, men of affairs and captains of industry who were laying the foundations of this city and building this commonwealth.

I cannot face this audience without thinking of those days and those names and those faces. And there come to my lips the lines which Eugene Field wrote a generation ago:

> For in these wondrous twenty years has come a mighty change,
> An' most uv them old pioneers have passed acrost the range,
> Way out into the silver land beyond the peaks uv snow,--
> The land uv rest an' sunshine, where all good miners go.

Tonight as I look upon you I have in my mind those names, and I think of those men with gratitude for their friendship and with affection for their memory.

But we are here to discuss not yesterday but tomorrow. We are here to give a few moments of our time to a consideration of that problem which takes precedence . . .

APPENDIX I

A comparison of sentence length and verb placement within sentences in the first 300 words of two speeches by Nitobe and two speeches by Nicholas Murray Butler.

	Nitobe Informal Speech	Butler Informal Speech	Nitobe Formal Speech	Butler Formal Speech
Sentence length (# words)				
Mean	14.3	17.6	17.6	18.75
Median	17	25.2	22	26
Mode	11(4)	19(4)	6(2) 16(2)	7(3)
Longest	27	56	38	45
Shortest	7	5	6	7
# sentences (thought groups)	21	17	17	16
Verb placement in sentence				
# times 2nd word	9	4	4	1
# times 3rd word	4	6	2	4
# times 4th word	3	2	2	1
# times 5th word	2	1	1	1
# times 6th word			4	3
# times 7th word	1	1		
# times 8th word	2	1	2	1
# times 9th word		2		1
# times 10th word			2	
# times 11th word or later				4