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ABSTRACT

Ever since the Meiji Restoration, Japanese political leaders, under a strong impact from the West, had urged the complete abolition of feudalism. By the turn of the century, they had consolidated their political power by means of putting the Emperor system on a firm footing, and had introduced and considerably developed a modern capitalist economy.

Opposed to these radical changes were the socialist and right-wing movements, but for different reasons. The socialists, whose theories were based entirely on European ideas, opposed the authoritarianism of the Meiji government, and in international politics supported pacifism. The rightwing movements criticised the government for its pursuit of extreme Europeanisation, and for its bourgeois and liberal ethos. They also encouraged Japanese territorial expansion into Asian countries. Because the socialist movements were suppressed by the government, the rightwing ones gradually came to hold the initiative among Japanese social movements.

Kita Ikki was a radical opponent of the authoritarian form of government, but was also a vigorous advocate of Japanese imperialism as a means of overcoming Western imperialism. These two positions, usually held by two antagonistic sectors of Japanese society, were logically linked in Kita's thought on the basis of his belief in social evolution and the class struggle. He criticised the theory of the national polity for its misrepresentation of Japanese history.
and social change. For him, the Meiji Restoration had accomplished a legal revolution, which led to the establishment of a kōmin kokka (public state), in which both the Emperor and the people owed their rights and duties to the state. He believed that an economic revolution alone would suffice to bring about social democracy in Japan, a revolution which could be carried out peacefully by means of the ballot. Total class war was unnecessary. But contrary to pacifist socialists, Kita encouraged the international class struggle as the only means of abolishing the "age of imperialism." Evolution in the international world had not yet reached a point whereby a World Federation could peacefully settle conflicts among nations. By 1919, however, Kita had become an advocate of a coup d'état in order to overthrow the corrupt government, and, by means of the Emperor's prerogatives, to hasten economic change at home as well as pursue a revolutionary policy abroad.

The central theme in this study is the logical link between Kita's critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war. Because of the latter, as well as his support of a coup d'état, Kita has been labelled the "ideological father of Japanese fascism." Post-war Japanese scholars have concentrated on these "negative" aspects of his thought, and neglected the "positive" ones, namely, his critique of the national polity. Some criticise him for alleged conversion from a socialist to a fascist. This study avoids the fascist label and argues against the notion of changes in his fundamental ideas. Kita's actual writings, especially the recently
published ones, reveal that throughout his life he adhered to the basic ideas of social evolution and class struggle. Both remained the foundation of his critique of the national polity as well as his advocacy of war. Kita was never an orthodox socialist, even in his early years, nor a fascist of any kind, even in his later years. His support of a coup d'état was a tactical change made in the light of his critique of the national polity and advocacy of war, and was meant to speed up developments at home and abroad.

In the light of post-war democratic development in Japan, Kita's critique of the national polity should be evaluated "positively." The general failure to do so has been due to his advocacy of war and a coup d'état. But if the two strands of thought are logically dependent on the same premises, one cannot have one without the other. The only way to accept Kita's critique of the national polity and at the same time criticise his advocacy of war, is by recognising that Japan is no longer in the position of a semi-colonised country, and that even though colonised countries may justifiably revolt, they are not thereby entitled to become colonisers themselves. If this is recognised, the recent ideological alliance between Kita and the new left cannot be regarded as harbouring a danger of a fascist revival.
I. INTRODUCTION

Challengers of post-war Japanese democracy have exposed a number of its weaknesses.¹ They have stuck to the fact that it was introduced from outside on the basis of an almost complete denial of pre-war values. Advocates of post-war democracy, however, have tended to neglect careful study of Japan's path to modernisation and of indigenous thought.² Employing European critical tools, they urge criticism of the uneven development of Japanese modernisation. Maruyama Masao, for example, directs most of his criticism to what is called the "pathological phenomenon" in pre-war Japanese politics.³ Marxists, unable to liberate themselves from "debilitating political anxieties and associations,"⁴ concentrate on providing an ideological critique of Japanese fascism.

Neither challengers nor supporters of post-war Japanese democracy have been able to present a fair and accurate picture of Kita Ikki's thought, and to relate it to present day Japanese politics. Too keen to totally accept or reject Kita's ideas, both fail to take an objective look at the "positive" as well as the "negative" aspects of his thought. The former refer to his critique of the Japanese national polity,⁵ the latter to his advocacy of a powerful state and war. Generally speaking, supporters of post-war democracy have failed to notice the "positive" aspects of his thought, while critics have tended to ignore both, merely supporting what they believe to be Kita's position.⁶ Because these critics
don’t discriminate between the various aspects of Kita’s thought, and fail to analyse it objectively, no more will be said about them. More important are the problems raised by the analyses of Kita’s thought provided by the defenders of post-war democracy.

The most persuasive of them, Maruyama Masao, described Kita as "the ideological father of Japanese fascism," and thereby set the course for the study of his thought. Maruyama relates it to three distinct ideological characteristics of Japanese fascism, namely, familism, agrarianism, and pan-Asianism. He sees only the "negative" aspects of Kita’s thought, completely failing to appreciate the significance of Kita’s critique of the Japanese national polity.

Marxists tend to regard Kita simply as a fascist. Tanaka Sōgorō’s biography of Kita Ikki was entitled, Nihon fuashizumu no genryū: Kita Ikki no shisō to shōgai (Origins of Japanese Fascism: The Thought and Career of Kita Ikki). However, Tanaka confesses, "To the writer’s surprise, Kita’s 'A Memorial on Foreign Policy' is quite a peaceful national policy, and seems to have been drafted by a Japanese diplomatic official." Tanaka obviously expected to find a strong emphasis on war in the writing of the "fascist" Kita. Yet, Tanaka failed to see the merits of Kita’s critique of the Japanese national polity. Two purposes seem to dominate Marxist analyses of Kita, namely, to provide a scientific analysis and moral criticism of Japanese fascism. Frequently, too much emphasis is placed on the moral criticism, with the result that an objective examination of Kita’s complicated and diverse thought
is left wanting. So is an accurate picture of the actual dynamism of Japanese fascism.

The two above approaches make it impossible to find anything in Kita's thought that can throw light on post-war democratic development. Both ignore the significance of Kita's critique of the national polity, and merely concentrate on attacking his advocacy of a powerful state and war. These approaches, coupled with the fact of a post-war constitution which is based on the total denial of war, seem to allow no present day significance to the study of Kita Ikki. Both approaches, however, do not take full cognizance of the actual writings of Kita himself. Kita continually asserted both his critique of the national polity as well as his advocacy of war, and saw no contradiction in doing so. Surely his critique of the national polity should have some merit for those advocates of post-war democracy who are opposed to the old national polity and to pre-war values?

There is a third school, however, which maintains that Kita was an indigenous socialist, who opposed the simple application of western socialist ideas to Japan. Kuno Osamu argues that Kita was not an orthodox international socialist, but an advocate of building socialism in one country. He says, "The process of development of Kita's ideas is the 'Urphilosophie' (gentetsugaku) of the serious thought process of most Japanese from the Russo-Japanese War to the Pacific War." Kuno's evaluation of Kita's fundamental motives in his critique of the national polity and
his advocacy of war is, on the whole, fair, and Kuno is quite aware of the present day significance of Kita's thought. But Kuno devotes much of his attention to the question why Kita changed from an indigenous socialist to an ultra-nationalist, namely, to someone who supported a coup d'état as a means of reorganising Japanese society, and advocated war to oppose western expansionism in Asia. His answer is that Kita's strong emphasis on nationalism brought about his conversion. Kuno does not, however, demonstrate the exact nature of the change that is supposed to have taken place. He cannot account for the fact that, throughout his life, Kita advocated war against the Western powers, particularly Russia and Britain. On the other hand it is true that, as a young man, Kita had supported peaceful means of reorganising Japan, and later came to advocate a coup d'état. But George Wilson quite correctly calls this, not a change in thought, but a change in tactics. Throughout his life, at the very heart of Kita's thought, were ideas of social evolution and class struggle, both of which were the basis of his critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war. Because there was no change in these basic ideas, it is difficult to prove that Kita was converted from a socialist into an ultra-nationalist. Kita himself believed that his thought was consistent, and said that in twenty years there had been no change. The approval of a coup d'état was rather the result of maintaining the close connection between his critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war.

The political thought of Kita has been generally misunderstood.
by socialists, liberals, nationalists, revolutionaries, militarists and political leaders. It was misunderstood by the young officers of the Japanese Imperial Army who were responsible for the February 26 Affair. Kita was arrested and executed for being the alleged "wire puller" behind this attempted coup d'état. Since the war, Kita has been studied by ideologues of liberalism, Marxism, and nationalism, with the result that his position in modern Japanese politics has never been correctly determined. The recent sympathy of the new left for Kita is a new phenomenon which makes a correct interpretation of his thought all the more pressing. Members of this group are among his most ardent readers today. The suicide of Mishima Yukio, a rightwing writer who had received some degree of sympathy from the new left, reinforced this trend. However, since the new left's primary concern is not an objective analysis of Kita's ideas, but the discovery of radical methods of changing Japanese society, they also tend to misunderstand him. Matsumoto Ken'ichi, the most persuasive new left student of Kita, considers his revolutionary ideas to be the most effective way of opposing the present "Great Japanese Empire." Matsumoto recognises that "neither the rightwing nor the leftwing, but the liberals, who, by continually maintaining a middle position, have been able to hold power, took the initiative in transforming the Meiji state into the Great Japanese Empire." He is also aware that "our generation has a subconscious hatred of America." The fact that many present day leftwing critics of the new Japanese "national polity"
are at the same time among the most vociferous opponents of American imperialism, makes the study of a thinker who held similar ideas in an earlier historical period all the more relevant. The study of Kita Ikki is important, not merely because certain members of the new left have become sympathetic towards him, but because his thought is largely misunderstood and would possibly be more popular were these misunderstandings dispelled.

The recent publication of previously unstudied writings of Kita Ikki makes it possible to demonstrate more conclusively than would otherwise be possible that Kita's critique of the national polity is intimately related to his advocacy of war. 17
II. CRITIQUE OF THE NATIONAL POLITY

Kita Ikki's theoretical critique of the Japanese national polity was developed during the years 1901 - 1906, although it was continually expressed in a variety of ways after that. It is to be found in his *Nihon kaizō hōan teikō* (General Outline of Measures for the Reconstruction of Japan), written in 1919,\(^\text{18}\) as well as indirectly in several pamphlets and letters of blackmail written in subsequent years.\(^\text{19}\) The critique was expressed theoretically in his early years, and more on the practical level in later years.

A full appreciation of Kita's ideas requires an understanding of how he viewed the great domestic and foreign crises the nation was experiencing during his lifetime. The period between the Meiji Restoration and the turn of the century was characterised first and foremost by a transition from feudalism to capitalism, under a strong impact from the Western powers. The dominant political ideology during this transition period was *son'no jō* (revere the Emperor, expel the barbarians). While the injunction to revere the Emperor had greatly contributed to the integration of the Meiji state, the one to expel the barbarians was subsequently overshadowed by the movement towards extreme Europeanisation. Capitalism and a modern political system based on European models were introduced. Because there was more emphasis on national power than on the "people's rights," the Meiji Restoration did not accomplish a complete bourgeois revolution. The Meiji state possessed two
characteristics which are frequently regarded as antagonistic, namely, an authoritarian form of government and a capitalist economy.

Opposed to the authoritarian form of government was the jiyū minken undo (Freedom and Civil Rights Movement), which drew its inspiration from European Liberalism. But the fate of the movement demonstrated the weakness of European Liberalism as a guide for the modernisation of Japan, with the result that the forces of authoritarianism received an extra boost. Shortly afterwards, the first socialist and rightwing movements began to develop, both being opposed to liberalism as well as absolutism. While the rightwing movements were inspired by traditional Japanese thought, the socialists were entirely dependent on European socialist ideas.

Pertinent to this study is that in the beginning Kita was neither a socialist nor a supporter of the rightwing movements. He saw in the Meiji state serious internal contradictions, which had been brought about by the dual nature of the Meiji Restoration. Partially responsible for the serious problems he discovered in Japanese society was the Kokutairon (The Theory of the National Polity). Neither socialists nor members of the rightwing had attempted to criticise the theory of the national polity. That Kita did so is most significant.

In June 1903 Kita wrote an essay, "Kokumin tai kōshitsu no rekishiteki kansatsu: iwayuru kokutairon no daha" ("Historical Observation of the People versus the Imperial House: The Breakdown
of the so-called Theory of the National Polity"), in which he unequivocally criticised the theory of the national polity. He wrote, "it is the extremely illusory and unreal national polity, that infringes on the freedom of learning, restricts the freedom of thought, and has spoiled and poisoned the people's education throughout."²² In a careful examination of the history of the Imperial House, Kita tried to show that advocates of the theory of the national polity based it on fallacious interpretations of history. Rejecting the belief in the divinity of the Emperor, Kita said that "our ancestors were all rebels."²³ He tried to portray the real history of the relationship between Emperors and political leaders. Although, because of pressure from the Home Ministry, he did not complete the essay, what he did write demonstrated his strong criticism of the theory of the national polity.

Three years later, in 1906, Kita published his Kokutairon oyobi junsei shekaishugi (The Theory of the National Polity and Pure Socialism) at his own expense, because no publisher would accept such a "dangerous" book for publication.²⁴ Kita attempted in this book to develop his theory of social democracy, which was based on the findings of all branches of knowledge, namely, economics, ethics, sociology, history, jurisprudence, political science, biology, and philosophy. The book's five chapters were on the economic justice of socialism, the ethical ideal of socialism, the social sciences and biological evolution, the counter-revolutionary nature of the so-called theory of the national polity, and the
enlightenment movement of socialism. In each chapter, Kita critici­
cised the main advocates of the ideas and theories with which he was
dealing.

As Kita himself notes, the fourth chapter on the theory of the
national polity constituted the most important part of the book.
The central question was "whether or not socialism is incompatible
with the national polity." Kita argued that his brand of
socialism, which he called "pure socialism," would bring about
social democracy in Japan. By "pure socialism" Kita meant justice
in accordance with all branches of knowledge, namely, economics,
ethics, sociology, history, jurisprudence, political science,
biology, and philosophy. This reluctance to fragment human exis­
tence into autonomous and competing walks of life explains why Kita
insisted that "pure socialism" could not be actualised unless
accompanied by nationalism (kokkashugi). He saw that man has a
social as opposed to an individual character, and that the attain­
ment of human excellence is dependent on living in a certain
quality of society, namely, one which is not only just in all areas
of life, but in which everyone recognises the interdependence of life.
Nationalism is therefore a prerequisite to the realisation of "pure
socialism." Whatever injustices there happen to be in any particular
historical period, have to be overcome as a result of social evolu­
tion, rather than total class war, which could so fragment society
as to make a wholesome life impossible of attainment.

The theory of the national polity, which advocates the
attainment of past greatness, disregards social evolution. It does not encourage social betterment and is largely responsible for the depravity which has prevailed in the realms of economics, ethics, sociology, history, philosophy, and jurisprudence. Kita delivered a three-pronged attack on the theory of the national polity.

Firstly, he rejected the historical myths on which people like Hozumi Yatsuka and Aruga Nagao based the theory of the national polity. Hozumi and Aruga believed that the Japanese people were the sons of Amaterasu Omikami (The Heaven-Shining-Great-Deity), and that under the national polity of Bansei Ikkei (The Imperial Throne, transmitted in an unbroken line), sovereignty belonged to the Emperor, the divine authority of the Japanese people. Kita strongly criticised their misinterpretations of Japanese history, and their inclusion of one thousand years of unwritten history before the compilation of the Kojiki (The Record of Ancient Things) and the Nihon shoki (The Chronicles of Japan) in 712 and 720 A.D. respectively. Kita suggested the exclusion from the history of Japanese politics the unwritten history.

Secondly, Kita argued that the relationship between the Emperor and the people had undergone profound changes since the beginning of recorded history. He concluded that there were two broad types of national polity. The one before the Meiji Restoration, in which the rights and duties of the Emperor and the people were opposed to one another, he called kaikyū kokka (class state). In it legitimate political authority was entirely a matter of morality, because
there existed no legal relationship between the Emperor and the people. The national polity after the Meiji Restoration, in which both the Emperor and the people were legally dependent on the state for their rights and duties, he called kōmin kokka (public state). Sovereignty, under the Meiji Constitution, he said belonged neither to the Emperor nor the people, but to the state. 30

Thirdly, Kita criticised the advocates of the theory of the national polity for not distinguishing the system of government from the national polity. Rejecting the notion that only one system of government was compatible with a particular national polity, Kita argued that three systems of government were compatible with kōmin kokka. Firstly, there was the system in which one privileged member of the state constituted the supreme organ, for example, the Russian government after the liberation of the peasants, and the Japanese government from 1868 - 1890. The second system was one in which the majority of the people, who have been declared equal to one another, and one member of the state, together constitute the supreme organ, for example, the Japanese government after 1890 and the British government. Thirdly, there was the system in which the majority, declared equal to one another, constitute the supreme organ, for example, the French and United States governments. 31 Under the second system, Kita regarded the Emperor as an organ of the state. Unlike Minobe Tatsukichi, who also regarded the Emperor as an organ of the state, the supreme organ, Kita did not want the Emperor alone to constitute the supreme organ.
Believing that the Emperor and the Diet together constituted the supreme organ, he criticised Minobe for developing his theory without taking proper consideration of the articles in the Meiji Constitution.

Kita was uncompromisingly opposed to Hozumi's and Aruga's theory of the national polity, as well as Minobe's theory which made the Emperor the supreme organ of the State. In relation to the national polity of kōmin kokka, he regarded both as counter-revolutionary.

When his Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi was banned five days after its publication, Kita gave up all attempts to overtly criticise the theory of the national polity. In November 1906, he wrote an essay, "Jisatsu to ansatsu" ("Suicide and Assassination"), which is most difficult to interpret, because of his use of irony to express himself. The argument seems to be that because the Meiji leaders set legal limits on the Emperor's sovereignty, they had to tolerate "rebels" in the world of ideas. And these rebels had introduced into this world thinkers like Friedrich Nietzsche, Leo Nikolayevich Tolstoi, Maxim Gorky, Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev, Peter Kropotkin, and Mikahil Alexandrovich Bakunin. If the government were to restore the "lost sovereignty" of its official ideology, it would have to prevent the introduction of thinkers like these. However, for the moment it was satisfied to force the rebels to "commit suicide," because of their agonising inability to tolerate its pressure on them. Kita wrote ironically, "I pray that no ray
of hope will be cast on them. Alas! Who can guarantee that the agonising suicide will not be changed into a revolutionary assassination?" The essay seems to lend support to totalitarianism under the Emperor Meiji. But Kita was not trying to justify the Emperor system as a whole. Rather, he was saying that Japan, without an economic revolution to make the legal equality of the people under the Meiji Constitution a reality, would fall into the hands of revolutionary assassins, who would attempt the total destruction of the Meiji state.

Concerning the practical implementation of his "pure socialism," Kita argued that the legal revolution of the Meiji Restoration, which had granted the people theoretical equality, required an economic revolution to make this equality a reality. This economic revolution was to consist of the nationalisation of land and capital, and the means to it was to be universal suffrage. He wrote, "The ballot is the bullet of the economic Restoration, and the possession of universal suffrage is the occupation of an ammunition wagon ... As a result of a class struggle carried out by means of the ballot, the economic Restoration will appropriate for the state the capital and land of the wealthy aristocrats, and break up their de facto monopolisation of political power."

The first expression of a concrete plan appeared in 1901, in his essay, "Jindo no taiqi" ("The Great Moral Obligation of Humanism"). He outlined the need to extend the power of the state in order to strengthen the foundations of Japanese civilisation, as
well as the need to amalgamate the upper and lower classes, and to unite the monarchy with the subjects. Five concrete measures were proposed: the Emperor should grant an audience to the people, the class system should be abolished, learning should be distributed equally, universal suffrage should be adopted, and the gains of the capitalists should be restricted through the organisation of labour unions and other forms of mutual aid among labourers.  

In his Nihon kaizō hōen taikō, Kita proposed more detailed and far-reaching reforms, for example, the abolition of the Peerage System, the introduction of universal franchise, the establishment of a National Reorganisation Cabinet and Diet, and the renunciation of the Imperial Estate. He dealt with the rights and duties of labourers, and the privileges and freedom of the people. The limitation of the private property and private land systems, and the limitation and nationalisation of large capital, was also touched on. All Kita's plans were extremely rational and practical, and most were implemented under the post-war Constitution.  

The method of their implementation advocated in Nihon kaizō hōen taikō did, however, involve a major departure from his earlier peaceful ones. By 1919, Kita had come to support a coup d'état, suspension of the constitution, and martial law. He wrote, "In order for the emperor and the entire Japanese people to establish a secure base for the national reorganization, the emperor will, by a show of his imperial prerogative, suspend the Constitution for a period of three years, dissolve both houses of the Diet, and place
the entire nation under martial law.²⁴²

Although this tactical change cannot be fully understood apart from Kita's ideas on foreign policy, there are certain weaknesses in his critique of the national polity which facilitated his acceptance of the supreme power of the Emperor as the sole possible means of carrying out the economic revolution. Firstly, he never considered the possibility of popular sovereignty, but insisted that the Emperor and Diet would be the supreme organs of the sovereign state. Secondly, having never really attempted to show in detail how the co-equal Emperor and Diet were meant to work in practice, he had tended to neglect the importance of representative government. Finally, because Kita never doubted that the Meiji Restoration had legally established a social democracy, he never saw the need for a total revolution.

The strengths and weaknesses of Kita's critique of the national polity can be traced to certain basic ideas in his thought, namely, the theory of social evolution and the theory of class struggle. The former was the basis of his rejection of the myth of the national polity as unhistorical, the latter the basis of his emphasis on the need for an economic revolution to break down the actual feudalistic classes that existed in spite of the legal revolution accomplished at the Restoration.

The Darwinian theory of social evolution was introduced into Japan in 1877, and, because of its comprehensiveness and optimism, came to occupy a dominant position in the Japanese philosophical
Many leading thinkers adopted it as a central part of their thought, for example, Nakae Chōmin, the radical liberal leader of the Freedom and Civil Rights Movement. For Kita, the importance of the theory lay in its combination of science and philosophy. It could not contradict his theory of pure socialism, "because the whole basis of science and philosophy is the theory of biological evolution, the fundamental principle of which is the struggle for survival." Although Kita made it the very basis of his thought, he was not uncritical of it. He wrote, "Although today's theory of biological evolution has been considerably developed since Darwin, it is still confused as a whole." Its major weakness was its overemphasis of individualism and neglect of nationalism. Dealing only with the small unit of the individual, it ignored the larger unit of society. The individualism of Oka Asajirō, the main advocate of social evolution in Japan, was the object of vigorous criticism from Kita. The idea that social improvement could come only after the individual elevation of each member of society was anathema to Kita. On the contrary, he believed that the improvement of individuals would be the result of social improvement. The national polity and system of government were undergoing a process of evolution, and should be studied historically as social phenomena.

The second basic tenet of Kita's thought was a modified theory of class struggle. In his introduction to Nihon kaizō hōan taikō he wrote, "I do not necessarily rule out social progress by means
of a class struggle." Kita owed much to Marx, but was critical of him. The greatness of Marx, he said, was "only in the field of economics, in which he gave an historical explanation of capital in early modern machine industries, and in the field of history, in which he discovered that the evolution of society depends on the class struggle." He went on to say, "Although we respect the greatness of Marx, and of Darwin, who advanced the theory of biological evolution, we moderns, who are more evolved than they, do not accept their words as articles of faith, but recognise that competition between states is as much of a fact as is the class struggle within states." Kita's subsequent support of a coup d'état as a means of implementing social democracy highlights the difference between his and Marx's ideas of the class struggle. While Marx supported a revolution from below, to be accomplished by the entire proletariat, Kita supported a revolution from above, to be carried out by the state. While Marx aimed at the simultaneous revolution of the whole of society, Kita believed that different aspects of the revolution, which need not necessarily be accomplished all at once, could follow one another. Since the Meiji Restoration was a legal revolution, it was only necessary to work for an economic revolution. The question of tactics was not unrelated to the basic idea of the class struggle, an idea to which Kita adhered throughout his life. It is important to remember that he was openly sympathetic to the early socialists, whose struggle was carried out in the face of severe government suppression.
Kita's ideas of social evolution and class struggle differed from those of contemporary Darwinists and Marxists in a way directly related to another central characteristic of his thought, namely, his emphasis on the special role of the state. Because the state was to play an active part in promoting the economic revolution and class struggle, its activity was essential to social evolution. If the state's involvement was essential to the abolition of classes, the class struggle should proceed in a way that does not conflict with the establishment of a powerful state. Kita admired Plato and Mencius because of this belief that the power of the state should not merely be used to abolish injustice, but should be made sufficient to accomplish this task. He was most critical of socialists, who ignored the existence of the state and merely emphasised the class struggle, as well as of followers of Oka Asajirō, who believed in evolution through the improvement of individuals without any aid from the state.

Kita Ikki's critique of the Japanese national polity was consistent and comprehensive. His analysis of Hozumi's theory was regarded by Kuno Osamu as a model critique of a ruler's ideology, and it reminded him of Marx's method of criticism in *German Ideology*. It is most unfortunate that the merits of this critique have not been noticed by advocates of post-war democracy.
III. THE ADVOCACY OF WAR

The most striking characteristic of Kita Ikki's ideas on foreign policy is a strong advocacy of war, something which is seldom unnoticed. He said quite unequivocally in his Nihon keizō hoan taikō, "peace without war is not the way of Heaven," and went on to explain,

"The right of starting a war. A state shall justly start a war, not merely if it does so for the sake of its own self-defence, but if it does so to protect other nations and peoples who have been oppressed by unjust power. (For example, to promote Indian independence and the protection of China).

"A state . . . shall justly start a war against those who unfairly monopolise large territories, and ignore Heaven's way of peoples' coexistence. (For example, a state may justly start a war against the possessors of Australia and Far Eastern Siberia, in order to obtain these territories)."

The war which Kita advocated was of a specific kind, namely, one waged by the poor nations against the rich nations, and he did so in order to promote the class struggle and social evolution in international society. A war waged by Japan for the protection of the Asian peoples from Western imperialism was morally justifiable. Although he may be criticised for disregarding the sovereignty of the colonised peoples, he was not an advocate of "Greater Asianism." He wanted Japan to possess colonies in order to oppose Western imperialism more effectively, not in order to bring to the Asian peoples the benefits of the Emperor's magnanimous rule.

Kita's ideas on international politics were remarkably
consistent throughout his life. Between 1903 and 1935, when he wrote his last essay, "Nichibei gōdō taishidan no teigi" ("Discourse on a Joint Japanese-American Consortium for China"), he wrote several essays, books, letters, pamphlets, and memorials on the subject of foreign policy and international relations. One would expect his ideas to have changed with changes in the international situation. However, although his practical proposals for Japanese foreign policy underwent considerable modification over the years, his fundamental ideas remained unaltered.

The central theme, his advocacy of war, will be examined in relation to his understanding of the contemporary international situation, his concrete programme for solving the crises in which Japan and other Asian nations found themselves, and the basic tenets of his thought which led him to criticise the Japanese national polity. No one has yet made an exhaustive attempt to examine his advocacy of war in this light.

As far as Japan was concerned, the most salient characteristic of the international situation at the turn of the century was the desire of the Western capitalist countries to conquer the Asian peoples, in order to expand their own economies. The British ability to secure raw materials and markets was largely due to their policy of maintaining the indigenous social and political structures of the conquered peoples, for example, in India. But the more backward Western capitalist countries, such as Germany, France, Russia, and even the United States, joined in the scramble for Asia, and
had been concentrating their efforts on China. For the time being their methods departed from gunfire to commerce and industry.

China's own failure to modernise led to her semi-colonisation.

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, Japan had felt herself threatened by these same powers. Even her drive for modernisation had not enabled her to obtain equal status with them. Japanese capitalism was still undeveloped, and unequal treaties were still in force. E. H. Norman wrote,

"Japanese capitalism had passed through its formative stage, deprived from the first of tariff autonomy and hence forced to labor simultaneously on two fronts. Internally its task was to hasten industrialization and the development of a home market, and internationally, to win recognition as a Great Power — a consummation which would automatically bring treaty revision, better trading privileges, even alliance with some of the Great Powers."

Japan, however, invaded Korea in 1894 even before she obtained the revision of the unequal treaties, a move which illustrates how badly the Meiji leaders wanted to create a powerful state that could stand up to the Western powers. Colonies were required to provide markets for the Japanese economy, and to enable the Japanese to demonstrate to the powers her ability to administer her own colonies. The Triple Intervention following the Sino-Japanese war merely contributed to the growing national consciousness of the Japanese people. Norman maintained that the "war of 1894-95 . . . marked a definite turning-point in Japanese foreign policy along the path of expansion, and enormously strengthened the position of the advocates of such a policy."

Thus began Japan's emulation of the
Western capitalist countries' exploitation of Asia. Before this, the Japanese government had taken the initiative in the drive towards modernisation. Now, a growing national consciousness encouraged expansion into Asia.

Kita Ikki was fully aware of the seriousness of Japan's position, surrounded as she was by Russia in the north, the United States in the east, Germany in Kiaochow, Britain in Shanghai, and France in Annam. He supported the Russo-Japanese war, because, as he said, "Unhappily I was born in the age of imperialism. The first characteristic of imperialism is territorial expansion. War shall not cease." He argued that "gunfire and commerce and industry are only means in the struggle for power." To substantiate his definition of the times, he cited the imperialistic activities of the United States in Cuba and the Philippines, Britain in South Africa and China, Germany in China, and France in Indo-China. He made an analysis of the foreign policy of each one of these countries.

Russia he called the "most aggressive country," and the Slavonic people the "enemy of civilisation." This was because "the imperialism of the Slavonic people has invaded forty million brothers, and five hundred million Chinese and Koreans." He added, "Internally, Russia has been tyrannical and authoritarian, and externally, she has broken international morality, and violated declarations and treaties."

Even after the Russian Revolution, Kita never changed his mind
about Russia. On the contrary, in his open letter to Adolf Joffe, he said that Russia had become even more aggressive since the Revolution, because although she abandoned the international obligations contracted by the Tsars, she continued to pursue a policy of imperialism. As Kita said, "the number of international debts has nothing to do with socialism." Nor could Kita ignore Russian activities in Japan carried out in the name of the communist revolution. He wrote, "It is quite apparent that the orders, plans, and funds... of the communists who have attempted to create disturbances in China, to instigate revolution in Korea, and what is more, to cause the overthrow of the Imperial national polity and state system in mainland Japan, all came from Soviet Russia." Being an indigenous "pure socialist," Kita was opposed to the direct importation of the communist ideology into Japan.

Kita was convinced that Russia would attempt to invade Japan. In 1932, when there was a possibility of a Japanese-American war, Kita wrote, "Right after the opening of a Japanese-American war, the Russians are certain to attack Japan with all their strength, from inside and out... This is the main policy of Soviet Russia... By encouraging a war between Japan and America, and therefore a second world war, she hopes to attain her great aim of creating disorder in Asia and the world at large... She claims this is for the sake of world revolution." Kita's strategy for dealing with the Russian menace was the product of careful consideration. Japan should break off diplomatic
relations with Russia. Then, in an essay, "Nihonkoku no shōrai to to nichiro kaisen" ("The Future of Japan and the Opening of the Russo-Japanese War"), he presented two alternatives to the Japanese people, namely, "the outbreak of war against Russia or the downfall of the Japanese Empire." He went on: "Once we fall into the hands of the Russians, four hundred million yellow people in China and Korea will be subjected to conditions of slavery forever." Kita was convinced that "because justice and morality were incomprehensible to them, nothing but gunfire could deal with the barbarous Russians who invade others." He even said, "Who are we to deny the Russian right to aggression? Let us just insist on our right to the sword, when she uses her right to invade others." So Kita justified Japanese imperialism. He regarded Russia as the landlord holding unexploited land, and Japan as a member of the international proletariat possessing very little land. He said, "The opening of the Russo-Japanese war is not due to the aggression of a hungry 'landlord,' nor to the Emperor's and politicians' desire for fame and fortune ... The war is an expression of the people's demand for justice, a demand which has spread into Manchuria and Korea, and is made in the name of justice for these states against the barbarous dreams of the world conqueror." Kita's justification of war against Russia was the basis of his support for the Japanese occupation of Far Eastern Siberia.

Regarding Great Britain as one of the most aggressive countries in the world, Kita was no less critical of her activities in Asia.
The immorality and injustice of British imperialism in Asia and Africa was singled out for special attack. He noted, "Britain who prides herself for her freedom, has conquered the Boers who were fighting for freedom." However, Kita's very strong anti-British disposition was mainly the result of his experiences in the Chinese Revolution. "If it were not for Britain," he said, "China would not have been delayed these fifty years since the Meiji Restoration." Before China could gain any real independence, Britain would have to be expelled.

This proposal was frustrated by internationally minded republicans like Sun Yat-sen, whom most Chinese revolutionaries had supported, and by the Japanese government, who didn't want to jeopardise the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Believing that China should adopt Tōyōteki kyōwasei (Eastern Republicism), Kita rejected British parliamentarism as well as the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. He was convinced that "the preservation of the integrity of China and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance could never co-exist." Only when both countries were threatened by Russia did the alliance have any significance, a contingency which ceased to exist since the defeat of Russia in the war of 1904-5. Japan should terminate the alliance and expel Britain from southern China. Besides, the British economic partition of China was in direct opposition to Japan's principle of protecting the whole of Asia from Western imperialism.

Kita's dislike of Britain also stemmed from his suspicion that "Britain, who had urged the waging of a Franco-German war to promote
the security of the British Isles, would try to bring about a war
between Japan and the United States, in order to protect her terri-
itories and vested interests in the Pacific and China."\(^{83}\) He
regarded it as "quite a normal policy for Britain, the country
which possesses India, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Canada, ... to
eagerly look forward to the opening of a Japanese-American war."\(^{84}\)

On a practical level, Kita advocated the expansion of Japanese
military preparedness, particularly Japanese naval power, to promote
the liberation of India and to secure Chinese independence. Japan
should also aim to take over the British colonies of Hong Kong,
Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand.

Although Kita was critical of American, German, and French
imperialism, particularly in Asia, his views on these countries were
more flexible. In an age of imperialism, it was natural for all
nations to seek colonies. Kita's anti-Americanism, however, was
partly due to his antagonism towards Sun Yat-sen, who had tried to
introduce American republican ideals into China. Kita was opposed
to this, because the history and development of China and the United
States were poles apart.\(^{85}\)

To improve Japanese-American relations, Kita suggested to the
Okuma cabinet that a joint Japanese-American economic alliance to
aid China be established. He assumed that "United States investment
in China would facilitate concluding a permanent alliance between
Japan and the United States, for the protection of China."\(^{86}\) This
alliance would also serve to reduce the anti-Japanese sentiment in
China, because it involved a friendly country, the United States. Kita's main purpose in writing his "Neichibei gōdō taishi dan no teigi," was to avoid a war between Japan and the United States, something which was a distinct possibility as long as the China problem remained unsolved. Such a war was to be shunned, because it would benefit Britain. Kita concluded, "A close look at the present world situation and its development, should make it clear that there is no alternative for the Great Japanese Empire but to ally itself with America in the Pacific."  

Kita was more sympathetic towards Germany, which, he said, through learning and patriotism, had been transformed from a badly ruined country into a wealthy and powerful one. Germany was different from Russia, which had become powerful through devouring small and weak countries, and from Britain, which had gained its wealth through massacring uncivilised peoples. But "because of her unsound foreign policy, Germany, like Japan, was in a predicament, and like Japan, was trying to be rescued." Japan and Germany should therefore cooperate in China, but only when Germany desisted from her imperialistic activities in Asia, "with the promise that she would take over those African territories of which Britain was in possession."  

Kita had a great admiration for the French people, who had brought about the French Revolution, the original source of European modernisation. He learnt much from the French Revolution, which he frequently compared with the Meiji Restoration. Of
Japanese-French relations he said, "The French Republic shall determine the rise and fall of the present Japanese Empire." He saw that France, unless allied with other great powers, was threatened on all sides in Europe, just like Japan in Asia. Kita regarded a "Franco-Japanese alliance as a substitute for the League of Nations, which does more harm than good, to guarantee peace throughout the world." The main purpose of this alliance was to avoid a possible Japanese-American war.

Sino-Japanese relations were the subject of Kita's most diligent consideration. His sympathy for China was due to her position in the great confrontation between Asia and Western imperialism. His major preoccupation was to find ways of avoiding conflicts between Japanese and Chinese nationalism, his conclusions the result of his experience in the Chinese Revolution of 1911 and thereafter.

Kita never doubted that the Chinese Revolution was inspired by Japanese thought, something of which Japan should be proud. Aware that English thought had helped spark off the French Revolution, he regarded Japan as the England of the East. He wanted Japan to support the Chinese revolutionaries in their attempt to overthrow feudalism and create a modern nation state. The Japanese response to the Chinese Revolution, however, was quite ambivalent. Different people in China and Japan seemed to want different things. In his *Shina kakumei gaishi* (Private History of the Chinese Revolution), he tried to make the Japanese policy makers understand the real nature of the Chinese Revolution. The anti-Japanese movement in China
was due to failures in Japanese policy, and could continue in spite of the original Japanese inspiration of the Revolution. In his "Shina no rankyoku ni taisuru tomen no shisaku" ("A Tentative Short Term Policy towards the Disorder in China"), he examined the policies of the Ōkuma, Terauchi, and Hara cabinets, and found them lacking any concrete plan to deal with the Chinese Revolution. Moreover, the activities of Japanese rōnin in Shanghai and Hong Kong had made foreigners suspicious of Japanese motives in China. Kita wanted them strictly supervised.

Without a fundamental revolution in Japanese foreign policy towards China, there could be no friendship between the two countries. He denounced the Japanese economic invasion and partition of China, a policy which equalled British imperialistic activities there. To ensure Sino-Japanese friendship, Japan should go to war against Britain and Russia. As a means of expelling the British presence in the east, Japan should undertake territorial expansion into Hong Kong, Singapore, French Indo-China, Australia, and New Zealand. A Sino-Japanese alliance should be supplemented by a Japanese-American economic alliance in aid of China, according to which American investment would not be introduced into China without Japanese armed supervision.

Kita had no illusions about the dilemmas of Japanese foreign policy in the early 1930's. In his "Tangai kokusaku ni taisuru kenpakusho" ("A Memorial on Foreign Policy"), he wrote, "There has been no fundamental principle, spirit, or point to the foreign
policy of our Empire for the past dozen years or so. The foreign
policies of successive governments have been pursued on the prin-
ciple that tomorrow should take care of itself." There was general
confusion on the question of what ought to be done. "In answering
this question," Kita noted, "many people say there is no alternative
to a Japanese-American war." He rejected this on the grounds that
"when one thinks of a Japanese-American war, one cannot help realis-
ing that a second world war will result from a war between Japan
and America." It was essential to consider American power, as
well as the fact that Britain, Russia, and China would join in on the
American side. He wrote, "Britain would either join the Americans
at the outset, or would remain neutral ... until she had obtained
large profits from sales of arms and munitions to America ... .
Russia, the very day after the outbreak of war, would attack Japan
from inside and out." Encouraged by the United States, China
would become even more anti-Japanese, so that Japan would have to
fight China and Russia on the Asian continent, as well as reckon
with British and American naval power. The conclusion of the
Franco-Japanese alliance was Kita's answer to Japan's dilemma.

To get the Japanese government to conclude such an alliance
as well as carry out the revolution in foreign policy towards China,
Kita came to believe that a change in the domestic scene was neces-
sary. Instead of accepting his advice on policy towards China, the
Ōkuma cabinet had responded with the Twenty-One Demands, a policy
which provoked a violent anti-Japanese movement. It was at this
point that Kita, who had been in China, decided to return home and work for the Japanese revolution. By June 1919, he had come to the conclusion that the only way to overcome the inertia of Japanese policy makers, was to replace them with men who better understood the nation's critical situation and could carry out the appropriate remedies. He wrote, "A few score patriotic comrades could handle this national crisis." Kita had abandoned his belief in the ballot. To cope with the dilemmas at home and abroad, a coup d'état was necessary. There was no other way to get the right people into power in time. Two months later, Kita wrote Nihon kaizō hōan taikō, in which this tactical change was explained. He wrote, "A coup d'état should be looked upon as a direct manifestation of the power of the nation; that is, of the will of society. Progressive leaders tend to emerge from popular groups, and when popular leaders like Napoleon or Lenin come to power, it (the will of society) is expressed. In the reorganisation of Japan, the coalition between popular groups and the emperor will manifest the power of the nation." This change of tactics involved no conflict with Kita's basic ideas. He had always believed that a powerful state, which pursued the class struggle at home and abroad, was the vehicle of social evolution. The only change was the abandonment of his belief that such a state was possible of achievement through the ballot. A coup d'état would put into power men who would complete the economic revolution in domestic policy, and begin the revolution in foreign policy.
Kita Ikki did not advocate a general or even an aggressive war. His analysis of contemporary imperialism led him to believe that unless Japan went onto the offensive against the two most aggressive imperialist powers, Britain and Russia, she would be swamped. He hoped that France's insecurity in Europe would lead her to form an offensive alliance with Japan against these two powers. The alliance with the United States was defensive, merely designed to secure American neutrality. This war "against those who unfairly monopolise large territories," was to be waged by Japan not merely "for the sake of its own self defence," but "to protect other nations and peoples who have been oppressed by unjust powers."

Kita's theory of international relations was the result of his blending a recognition of the inevitability of power politics in the international world, with a belief that this world was capable of transformation and should be the subject of moral criticism. Hashikawa Bunzō writes that Kita's international programme was "based on an unparalleled and cold recognition of power politics and Staatsraison," as well as "elements of transcendental prophesying and mystical world-intuition." Both are intimately related to his advocacy of war.

Kita recognised the existence of power politics in international relations, and in this respect his thought was close to that of traditional students of the subject like Hans Morgenthau. He could well have written, "International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aims of international
politics, power is always the immediate aim. Statesmen and people may ultimately seek freedom, security, prosperity, or power itself. . . . But whenever they strive to realise their goal by means of international politics, they do so by striving for power. He in fact wrote, "Foreign policy only functions properly when it plays off one barbarian against the other." A fuller understanding of his conception of power politics can be obtained by looking at it in the light of those themes in his thought which led to his critique of the national polity, namely, his theories of social evolution and class struggle.

According to the theory of social evolution, feudal society would give way to modern society after a phase of struggle. In international politics, a modern world federated society would be ushered in after a phase of state and racial struggle. The nature of this struggle, as well as its participants, will depend on the stage of evolution each race has attained domestically. Finally, struggle for survival will give way a situation which will make it possible for a Federal Congress to settle differences peacefully, so that war would no longer be necessary. For the moment, war is the sole means of settling differences. It is also the present means of promoting social evolution in international society. Kita was totally opposed to the League of Nations, which was controlled by certain powers and which, by obstructing the struggle for survival, was working against social evolution. A World Federation like the League of Nations would become feasible only after
democratic socialists held power in every state. Until then the advocacy of war was progressive.

Imperialism therefore, was a means to the realisation of socialism. Kita wrote, "If socialism is incompatible with the theory of the struggle for survival, it is truly an unscientific utopia." On another occasion he wrote, "I absolutely insist on imperialism for the sake of socialism. To me, the advocacy of imperialism is the premise for the realisation of socialism. If I did not believe in socialism, I would not insist on imperialism." Although it seems contradictory to denounce foreign imperialism but not his own imperialism, it is no more so than Marx's denunciation of bourgeois onslaughts on the working class but not vice versa.

This was the relevance of Kita's basic idea of the class struggle. He believed that in the past, the class struggle had taken the form of rebellions, assassinations, and so on, because there was no political organisation to channel it in a less violent way. However, in the more modern state, the class struggle was carried out by means of the ballot. But there were also classes in international society, and these classes consisted of dominant and oppressed nations. Kita had always regarded Marx's two major weaknesses his failure to provide an adequate theory of the state, and his neglect of the fact that peoples' loyalty to their nation is always stronger than their loyalty to their class. Since there was no political organisation in international society to channel the struggle between states in a peaceful way, the international counterpart of
rebellions and assassinations, i.e. war, would settle conflicts among states. As the state struggle proceeded, class in international society would disappear. Kita was unalterably opposed to international communism, which recognised the existence of classes in domestic but not international society. He insisted on the existence of "both the state struggle and the class struggle." When early socialists like Kōtoku Shūsui, Sakai Toshihiko, and Katayama Sen opposed the Russo-Japanese War, Kita severely criticised them. He did not see much difference between their socialism and anarchism, which completely denied the existence of the state. During the phase of state struggles, "the freedom of the state should not be restricted by any other sovereignty, but should be guaranteed absolutely." He had no sympathy for Western socialism. "The fundamental idea of European and American socialism is self-contradictory, because it regards a war of international proletarians as an aggressive or militaristic policy, while it approves of the struggle of proletarians within a country."

Interwoven with this theory of power politics was a moral vision of the world. In his "Chō kokkashugi no ronri to shinri" ("Theory and Psychology of Ultra-Nationalism"), Maruyama Masao wrote,

"We are now in a position to have a clearer and fuller picture of the world from the standpoint of Japanese ultra-nationalism. Within Japan the standard of values is relative proximity to the central entity; by extending this logic to cover the entire world, the ultra-nationalists engendered a policy of 'causing all the nations to occupy
their respective positions [vis-a-vis] Japan. Japan, 'the suzerain country', placed each other country in an order that was based on social status. Once this order was secured there would be peace throughout the world.

"In such a scheme, where everything is based on the idea of an absolute central entity, there is no room for a concept like international law, which is equally binding on all nations." 119

The difficulty, however, is that this does not apply to Kita Ikki, although Maruyama thought it did. From a very early age, Kita had rejected the dominant Japanese values. His critique of the national polity was based on the denial of an "absolute central entity." It was therefore not possible for him to extend this logic to the rest of the world. Kita's advocacy of measures like a Sino-Japanese alliance has noting to do with the Greater Asianism of ultranationalists like Ōkawa Shūmei. The latter did believe in the myth of Hakkō Ichiu (Eight Corners of the World under One Roof), and extended the logic of the national polity to international society. 120

This does not mean that there was no moral basis to Kita's thought. On the contrary, his ideas of morality were revealed in his insistence on the justice seeking nature of Japanese imperialism, and his belief that Japan's mission was to protect Asia from Western imperialism.

Kita had said that in a kōmin kokka, following the complete evolution of the class struggle, there would be justice in all walks of life, and the era of social democracy will have begun. This is the logic he extended to international society. 121 Until the state
struggle had run its full course, there would be no justice in the relations among states. He wrote, "The present situation is definitely unjust... England is the multi-millionaire standing over the whole world. Russia is the great landlord of the northern hemisphere. Japan is in the position of the international proletariat, with only a string of small islands as her boundaries. Surely Japan has the right, in the name of justice, to go to war and seize their monopoly." American economic expansion was not a justice seeking imperialism. Nor was the Russian annexation of Manchuria and Korea. Britain's economic activities in India and China had nothing to do with justice. But if Japan attacked these powers in order to bring about justice, she would not be morally culpable.

Kita did not believe there to be a purely moral way of dealing with imperialism, because, as he said, "imperialism disregards morality." Hence, "one should not respond to imperialism with morality." Kita had criticised Uchimura Kanzō, a Christian democrat, for opposing the Russo-Japanese War on grounds of humanism, after he had supported the Sino-Japanese War. Kita said, "The justice of one's cause should not depend on whether one's opponents are Chinese or Russian. The precepts of humanism should not change over the short period of five or six years. I will have nothing to do with such justice and humanism." The point is that Kita did not see a purely moral way of dealing with imperialism. Justice and morality could only be infallible guides to states in
the international world after the state struggle had abolished international oppressors. This was why Kita was also critical of Tolstoi's pacifism. A second moral purpose behind Kita's advocacy of war was the protection of other Asian countries from Western imperialism. He saw that Japan, India, and China were in the forefront of the east-west confrontation. India had already been colonised, China was semi-colonised, and Japan was surrounded by imperialists on all sides, Russia in the north, the United States in the east, and Britain, France, and Germany in the south. One of the first steps towards social democracy was the attainment of a kōmin kokka, something which Japan had already achieved with the Meiji Restoration. India and China, however, were finding it well nigh impossible to reach this preliminary stage in the face of Western imperialism. They therefore needed help in overcoming their major obstacle, help which Japan alone was in a position to provide. Kita wrote, "Whether China will follow Japan and develop herself, or follow France and collapse after her revolution, is entirely dependent on the choices Japan makes." Japan should save China from collapse by removing the counter-revolutionary forces that were paralysing her. Kita was not unaware of the danger to the Chinese of accepting foreign assistance. Remembering that the French Peerage had invited intervention by accepting foreign help, he warned the Japanese policy makers not to support the Chinese revolutionaries overtly.
Kita's theories of social evolution and class struggle taught him that naked power was the most important consideration in international politics. His moral integrity did not, however, allow him to remain content with this. Believing that the struggle for power was only a phase in the evolution of world society to greater justice, he found it imperative to identify progressive struggles from reactionary ones. Progressive ones, namely, those waged by the oppressed nations, would not be morally culpable. On the contrary, because they would work for the abolition of classes in international society, they were positively to be undertaken. Kita advocated war not as a Greater Asian ultra-nationalist, but as a champion of the Asian proletariat, who had come to see that discrepancies in wealth and power between nations were far greater than those within nations, and that loyalty to nation was still much stronger than loyalty to class.
IV. CONCLUSION

The basis of Kita Ikki's critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war was his belief in "pure socialism," justice in all walks of life to be achieved after a period of struggle at home and abroad, a struggle that a strong state alone could adequately pursue. Although he borrowed the foreign ideas of social evolution and class struggle, his theory included elements that only someone who had lived in an economically oppressed country in the age of imperialism could have developed. Kita, like leaders in the "Third World" today, appreciated the importance of kokka shuqi (nationalism), which advocates the theory of social evolution, like Oka Asajirō, and the class struggle, like Kōtoku Shūsui, entirely ignored. More like Plato, Kita believed in a strong state that should undertake the pursuit of justice, not by allowing a total class war, which could tear society apart and deny man's essentially social nature, but by undermining the conditions which create classes.

Kita's critique of the national polity was an objective analysis of Japanese history, which he interpreted according to the theories of social evolution and class struggle. He insisted that after the Meiji Restoration the national polity had become a kōmin kokka, and that sovereignty belonged neither to the emperor nor the people, but to the state, on which all were dependent for their rights and duties. Recognising the distinction between the system
of government and the national polity, he held that the emperor could only be one of the organs of the state.

While his theory of "pure socialism" recognised the need for a period of limited class struggle before there could be justice in all walks of life within the Japanese islands, when extended to international society, it made few provisions for the limitation of the state struggle. There was not yet a sovereign world state, which could regulate the international state struggle in a way that promoted international justice. Attempts to set up such an authority merely resulted in one or other of the powers using it to promote their own imperialism. The only limitation on the state struggle would be each country's judgement of what was required to ensure its own survival.

Kita did not, however, believe the state struggle to be entirely devoid of moral purposes. Just as the force applied by the bourgeoisie is not immorally resisted by the force of the working class, an exchange that could lead to domestic justice, the imperialism of the international proletariat, when directed against the international landlords for the sake of international justice, was not morally wrong. Kita's state struggle had nothing to do with the Greater Asianism of ultra-nationalists, even though both advocated territorial expansion.

Kita continually preserved the link between his critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war. The deterioration of Japan's position in the international struggle for survival, made
a tactical change on the domestic scene necessary for the implementation of the required radicalisation of the nation's foreign policy. A revolution in foreign policy required a stronger state than had been gradually evolving. The crisis demanded the replacement of the ballot by a coup d'etat. Continued reliance on the ballot would excessively weaken the state, to the advantage of the Western imperialists. The new means did not come into conflict with any of Kita's basic ideas. The class struggle for "pure socialism" had to be carried out from above, that is, the government level. And believing that the Meiji Restoration had accomplished a legal revolution, he could easily advocate seizure of existing institutions by more patriotic men.

It would be unfortunate if the "positive" aspects of Kita's thought, namely his critique of the national polity, were ignored because the impeccability of his logic ties them too closely to the "negative" aspects. Equally unfortunate would be to miss the "positive" aspects of these "negative" aspects. Kita has pointed out a serious contradiction in Western socialist thought, namely, between the advocacy of class war and the denial of state war. Instead of regarding nationalism and socialism as antagonistic, Kita combined them in a way likely to appeal to any champion of justice for the "Third World." Because Kita's critique of the national polity and his advocacy of war were not merely closely linked in his own thought, but by impeccable logic, his ideas cannot be separated into "positive" and "negative" aspects without
doing them great injustice.
V. EPILOGUE

Readers unacquainted with events in Japan during the 1930's may find a statement on the way Kita's ideas differed from those of contemporary fascists, whether Japanese or European, a helpful way of categorising his thought. While a generally accepted list of necessary and sufficient conditions of fascism doesn't exist, the following five tendencies are probably as close as one can get to a set of definitive characteristics.

Firstly, fascists everywhere deny the existence of classes, and advocate the vigorous suppression of those who support the class struggle.

Secondly, fascism calls for the permanent institution of an authoritarian form of government, usually under the absolute control of a single charismatic leader.

Thirdly, fascists uphold racial and national myths of a kind which exclude religious or ethnic minorities from the nation concept.

Fourthly, fascists advocate territorial expansion by means of war, in order to acquire Lebensraum and to assert the virility of the master race.

Fifthly, for fascists, violence, whether domestic or international, is not simply a means to a political end, but is positively encouraged as an end in itself, as the expression of the virtue of virility.

Essentially, fascism has been a reaction against growing
proletarian class consciousness, and has been the most radical form of counter-revolution in the twentieth century, not merely denying the existence of classes, but undertaking to smash all class conscious mass movements, usually by violent means. In Italy, fascism was a reaction against the growing strength of the Socialist Party, while German Nazism was a movement against the Social Democratic and Communist parties. In both cases, fascism had a mass base which was used to extend its power. Because there was very little class consciousness in Japan, fascists tried to create tension by fabricating threats of revolution, but were unable to mobilise more than a few elite groups. They therefore tried to spread their influence from above by gaining control of the state, rather than from below by mobilising mass support. Fascists in all three countries, however, used the threat of foreign invasion, real or imaginary, to justify the suppression of class consciousness, which, by dividing the fatherland, was supposed to make it more vulnerable to foreign conquest. They advocated foreign wars in order to play down the domestic class struggle, claiming that the only important class struggle was between nations.

While Kita Ikki never wanted total class war, he did not advocate the suppression of class consciousness or the domestic class struggle. Nor did he regard the international class struggle as a means of diverting attention from the domestic one. Both were to be pursued simultaneously, with equal vigour. The domestic equivalent of war was unnecessary, not because the international struggle
was more important, but because the Meiji Revolution had done much to abolish the conditions that created classes. All that was required was an economic revolution, which could be accomplished from above by the existing state apparatus. A coup d'état would suffice, making total class war unnecessary. Because Kita neither denied the existence of classes, nor advocated the suppression of class consciousness, nor even regarded the international class struggle as more basic than the domestic one, he can hardly be considered to have shared this most essential characteristic of fascism.

A counter-revolutionary phenomenon, fascism has sought the permanent establishment of authoritarian government over a permanently hierarchical society. Hitler and Mussolini, encouraged by their followers, were unalterably opposed to any change in their own commanding position over a rigidly stratified society, Japanese fascists to any change in the Emperor system and national polity.

Kita Ikki, however, advocated an authoritarian form of government, not merely for a limited period only, but in order to bring about social changes, like the abolition of an hierarchical society and its ideology of the national polity. His aim was to complete the socialist revolution during the three years of authoritarian government, after which the Emperor system itself would wither away. The temporary suspension of the Diet involved no departure from his life-long belief in representative government.

It is hardly strange that a reactionary movement with backward looking ideals of society and political authority should uphold
exclusive racial and national myths to demonstrate historically the
development to superiority of the "master race." Only the tradi-
tional racial tolerance of the Italian people prevented Mussolini
from emulating Hitler's "final solution" for those who didn't belong
to the German "master race." The absence of religious and ethnic
minorities in Japan did the same in that country, although this
doesn't mean that Japanese fascists didn't uphold national myths.
Myths like Bankai Issei and Hakkō Ichū were used to consolidate the
Emperor system and national polity by romantics such as Hoda
Yojirō, and philosophers of the Kyoto school such as Kōsaka
Masaaki.

Kita Ikki never had any sympathy whatsoever for this charac-
teristic of fascism. His critique of the national polity began
with the complete rejection of Japanese national myths, and he
always insisted that Koreans should have the same rights and duties
as Japanese.  

War was the means by which the "master race" was to acquire
Lebensraum (Living space) from the inferior races, although this
was usually presented in less objectionable terms, for example, as
"a struggle between a proletarian race and the plutocratic demo-
cracies." Hitler frequently put it this way, "According to
common sense, logic, and all the principles of human and of higher
justice, nay, even according to the laws of a Divine will, all
nations ought to have an equal share in the goods of this world.
It should not be the case that one nation claims so much living
Japanese fascists spoke of a Seimeisen (Living line) which required the Japanese occupation of Mongolia, Manchuria, and Korea. The concept of Greater Asianism was the result of extending this idea to China and South East Asia. Only the Japanese "master race" could emancipate the Asian people. Okawa Shūmei wrote, "It is my belief that Heaven has decided on Japan as its choice for the champion of the East." And Japanese fascists spoke of a Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere.

"The Japanese empire is a manifestation of morality and its special characteristic is the propagation of the Imperial War. It strives but for the achievement of Hakkō Ichigō, the spirit of its founding... It is necessary to foster the increased power of the empire, to cause East Asia to return to its original form of independence and co-prosperity by shaking off the yoke of Europe and America, and to let its countries and peoples develop their respective abilities in peaceful cooperation and secure livelihood."

Kita Ikki advocated the conquest of British and Russian colonies alone, namely, Eastern Siberia, Hong Kong, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand. He consistently opposed moves that involved a loss of Chinese sovereignty to Japan, and completely rejected the extension of the Japanese national polity's value system to other Asian countries. He did believe that Japan had a mission, but this was not because she was a divine nation, but because the Meiji Restoration had enabled her to develop to a position of power and leadership. Japan's mission was to weaken the Western imperialists so that the Asian countries could be free from colonial domination. Without decolonisation, there could be
no socialist revolution in Asia.

Storm troops, espionage, assassination, intimidation, terror-bombing, mass-murder, and so on, are not simply the means by which fascists gain their ends, but tend to become ends in themselves, ways in which the master race asserts its virility, the supreme virtue. The use of violence by Nazis and Italian fascists, as well as Japanese militarists, became inseparable from the fascist movements in these countries. It has become inseparable from American activities in Vietnam.

Although Kita Ikki advocated a coup d'état, he did not believe that violence would be necessary for its success. Democratic socialism was to be realised by means of the Emperor's legal prerogatives, not by force. Only in foreign affairs did Kita believe that violence was unavoidable, for the Western imperialists would not willingly give up their control over the Asian peoples. But even here violence was very much a temporary expedient. There is nothing in Kita's writings to suggest that violence played even as great a part in his thought as it did in that of Franz Fanon.

Although the above analysis shows how far Kita Ikki was from fascism, his alleged inspiration of and implication in the February 26 Affair on the one hand, and the influence of scholars like Maruyama Masao who labelled him a fascist shortly after the war on the other, have combined to preserve the link between him and Japanese fascism. It is now common knowledge that Kita and the young officers who took part in the February 26 Affair
had little in common. But that there are serious flaws in Maruyama's arguments is not generally recognised. It is difficult to see why his three characteristics of Japanese fascism should be defining characteristics at all. Familism, agrarianism, and Pan-Asianism are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions of fascism. On the contrary, they are frequently used as characteristics of socialism in the Third World, particularly in present day Africa. Maruyama's characteristics are too general to describe specifically what Japanese fascism was, or to demonstrate when it began and ended. 139

Even so, there is little in Kita's writings to link him with these three characteristics. He hardly mentioned the family system, which played no part in his concept of the nation. Nor did he ever advocate agrarianism, but instead wanted the capitalist economy controlled by the state. While he did advocate an alliance with China against Western imperialism for the sake of the liberation of the Asian peoples from colonialism, he never spoke of Pan-Asianism or of extending the Japanese value system to other peoples. Even on his own criteria of fascism, Maruyama is in error in calling Kita the "ideological father of Japanese fascism."

If Kita was in no sense a fascist, there is no danger of a fascist revival through the ideological alliance between Kita and the present new left in Japan, the basis of which is a common criticism of the "Great Japanese Empire" and the "national polity." The new left must, however, face up to the problem of Kita's advocacy of war,
particularly of territorial expansion into other countries. The fact that the Japanese constitution prohibits territorial expansion is no way out, although the fact that Western imperialism no longer attempts direct political control over its colonies is a partial one. The only honest thing to do is recognise Kita's error in dismissing the sovereign rights of the peoples into whose lands he had advocated territorial expansion, be they Siberians, English, Australians, New Zealanders, or Chinese. Kita's intense hatred of Western imperialism made him unable to appreciate that Westerners, just like Asians, should not be made to live under any kind of imperialism. A revival of Japanese imperialism is therefore no answer to present day American imperialism.
The following abbreviation is used in the notes:


1 See Yamada Munemutsu, Kiken na shisōka: senso minshushugovi hiteisuru hitobito (Tōkyō: Kōbunsha, 1965).

2 Marxists are not necessarily advocates of post-war democracy. However, they are not opposed to the various post-war democratic reforms, such as the new Constitution, even though their critique of democracy is based on the Marxist model. See Hidaka Rokurō, ed., Kindai shugi, Cendai nihon shisō taikei, Vol. 34 (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō, 1964).


5 "National Polity" has been a vague and controversial concept in the post-war study of Japanese nationalism. According to Miyazawa Toshiyoshi, it means, "A political system in which an hereditary ruler serves at least as a symbol of national unity and as the concrete manifestation of moral righteousness." See Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, p. 376.


7 Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, p. 28.

8 Ibid., pp. 34-51.

9 Nihon fuashizumu no genryū: Kita Ikki no shisō to shōgai was published in 1949 by Hakuyosha, and was rewritten and published in 1959 by Miraisha under the title, Kita Ikki: Nihonteki fuashisuto no shōchō. Its expanded edition was published under the same title in 1972 by San'ichi Shobō.
10 Tanaka Sōgorō, Kita Ikki, p. 305.


13 Ibid., pp. 152-153.

14 George Wilson, Radical Nationalist in Japan, pp. 167-170.

15 Kita emphasised the consistency of his thought in the third publication of Nihon kaizō hōan taikō in 1926. KIC, II, 360.


17 For example, in 1903, Kita simultaneously attempted his radical critique of the national polity and his advocacy of the Russo-Japanese War. See Kita Ikki, "Kokumin tai kōshitsu no rekishiteki kansatsu: Iwayuru kokutairon no daha," Sado Shimbun (June 25-26, 1903), "Nihonkoku no shōrai to nichiro kaisen," Sado Shimbun (July 4-5, September 11-22, 1903), and "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," Sado Shimbun (October 27 to November 8, 1903). Because Kita used many pen names, such as Takudo and Musashibo Benkei, his early writings were not discovered until recently. The newly discovered writings, the results of Matsumoto Ken'ichi's research, were published under Kita's name for the first time in KIC, III, in April, 1972. See Matsumoto Ken'ichi, "Shokironbun hakken no kei," Gendai no me, Vol. II, No. 8 (August 1970), pp. 240-253.

18 The original title of Nihon kaizō hōan taikō was Kokka kaizōan genri taikō, whose 47 copies were secretly circulated among ultranationalists, such as Ōkawa Shōmei and Mitsukawa Kametarō, and which was subsequently prohibited by the Ministry of Home Affairs in January 1920. Nihon kaizō hōan taikō was first published in May, 1923 by Kaizōsha, with the omission of many important parts. Both versions were included in KIC, II, when it was published in 1959. In this thesis, I use the title, Nihon kaizō hōan taikō, because it is as famous in Japan as Hitler's Mein Kampf was in the West, but quote from the earlier complete version.

19 For example, in 1926, he brought up the case of the reprehensible documents concerning the Imperial Household, in which he attacked Matsukata Masayoshi and Makino Nobuaki, the close
advisers to the Emperor, for filling their own pockets. KIC, III, 195-205.

20 The leading liberals, such as Nakae Chōmīn and Baba Tatsui, learnt very much from the works of J. J. Rousseau, J. S. Mill, and H. Spencer.


22 "Kokumin tai kōshitsu no rekishiteki kansatsu," KIC, III, 37.

23 Ibid., p. 38.

24 Kita was 23 years old when he published Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi in May, 1906. As the book was banned five days after its publication, Kita published parts of the book separately, first Tetsuqakuron in July, and Keizairon in November the same year. But the very important part, chapter four, in which he criticised the theory of the national polity, Kokutairon, was not publicly available until the two volumes of Kita's writings were published in 1959 by Misuzu Shobō.

25 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 209.

26 Ibid., p. 211.

27 Ibid., p. 211.


29 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 217.

30 Kita's argument was based on a correct interpretation of Article V of the Meiji Constitution, "The Emperor exercises the legislative power with the consent of the Imperial Diet." He understood that if sovereignty was accorded to the will of the state, then neither the Emperor nor the Diet, which represented the people, could be sovereign. Kita believed in the reality of the state personality. He wrote, "The state is not something like a mechanism, which is created by a legal fiction, but is a personality with a real existence and its own purpose." He added, "If the state were a fictitious personality, one could corrupt it and make it cease to exist by means of legal force. But if it is
a personality of real existence, then no one can destroy it by creating an artificial law." Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC. I, 232-240.

31 Ibid., p. 236.

32 Ibid., pp. 232-236.

33 Kita, using the penname Gaijū, wrote "Jisatsu to ansatsu," Kakumei Hyōron, No. 6 (November 10, 1906). It is now available in KIC, III, 137-140. Matsumoto Ken'ichi, who discovered this essay, was also the first to recognize Kita's use of irony in it. See Matsumoto Ken'ichi, Kita Ikki ron, pp. 174-194.

34 "Jisatsu to ansatsu," KIC, III, 139-140.

35 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 377.

36 Ibid., p. 393.


38 Kokke kaizōan genri taikō, KIC, II, 224-226.

39 Ibid., pp. 228-243.

40 Ibid., pp. 244-259.

41 According to Mishima Yukio, a right wing writer, about 70% of Kita's plans were implemented by the Americans under the new Japanese Constitution. Hayashi Fusao and Mishima Yukio, Taiwa: Nihonjin ron (Tōkyō: Banchō Shobō, 1966), p. 214.


44 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 96.

46 Ibid., pp. 109-125.

47 KIC, II, 220.

48 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 431.

49 Ibid., pp. 111-112.

50 Ibid., p. 4.

51 Ibid., p. 412.

52 Kuno Osamu, "Chōkakkashugi no ichi genkei," p. 141.

53 KIC, II, 181.

54 Ibid., p. 272.

55 "Nichibei gōdō taishidan no teigi," was written and handed to the Japanese government policy makers in June, 1935. This discourse was first published in the expanded edition of Shina kakumei gaishi in August, 1937. It is now available in KIC, III, 417-424.

56 Most of them were published in KIC, II-III. One important essay on Japanese foreign policy, "Shina no rantei tōmen no shisaku," written in September, 1920, was first published in Hayashi Shigeru, et al., ed., Ni/niroku jiken hiroku, Bekken (Tōkyō: Shōgakkan, 1972), pp. 167-171.

57 Referring to Kita's ideas on international politics, Kuno Osamu, for example, says that Kita understood international power politics quite well. But he does not further develop the point. See Kuno Osamu, "Kita Ikki: kakumei no jissenka," Asahi jōanaru, Vol. 5, No. 25 (June 23, 1963).


59 In 1895, Russia, Germany, and France intervened to compel Japan to give up the annexation of the Liaotung Peninsula. The Japanese Government was forced to accept the intervention, which subsequently induced the violent anti-government movement in Japan.

60 E. Herbert Norman, Japan's Emergence as a Modern State, p. 200.

61 "Nihonkoku no shōrai to nichiro kaisen," KIC, III, 81.
Ibid., p. 81.
63 Ibid., p. 78.
64 Ibid., pp. 73-84.
65 Ibid., p. 78.
66 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 86.
67 Ibid., p. 87.
68 Ibid., p. 89.
69 "Yoffe kun no oshiuru kōkaijō," KIC, II, 404. This open letter addressed to Mr. Adolf Joffe was written in May, 1923, when Mr. Joffe visited Japan for the negotiation of diplomatic relations between Russia and Japan. It was first published in the expanded edition of Shina kakumei gaishi in August, 1937, and is now available in KIC, III, 397-407.
70 "Taigai kokusaku ni kansuru kenpaku sho," KIC, III, 412. This memorial on foreign policy was written and handed to the Japanese government policy makers in April, 1932. It was first published in the expanded edition of Shina kakumei gaishi in August, 1937, and is now available in KIC, III, 409-416.
71 Ibid., p. 410.
72 "Nihonkoku no shōrai to nichiro kaisen," KIC, III, 73.
73 Ibid., p. 84.
74 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 92.
75 This part was omitted when the essay was republished in KIC, III. I am quoting directly from the Sado Newspaper. Sado Shim bun (July 4, 1904).
76 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 96.
77 "Nihonkoku no shōrai to nichiro kaisen," KIC, III, 78.
78 Kita Ikki, Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 172. This book was written in two parts, the first in December 1915, the second in April 1926. It was handed to Japanese government policy makers, for example, Ōkuma Shigenobu, and was published under the title, Shina kakumeitō oyobi kakumei no shina, in 1916. But the exact publishing date and publisher were unknown. Shina kakumei gaishi
was officially published in November, 1921, by Daitōkaku, and its expanded edition was published in August, 1937, by Utsumi Fumihirodo. It is now available in KIC, II, 1-204. In the first part, Kita was rather partial in examining the nature and history of the Chinese Revolution of 1911. Yoshino Sakuzō, a Taishō democrat, greatly admired it. See KIC, III, 554. In the second part, Kita suggested a revolution in Japanese foreign policy, along the lines of territorial expansion, a theme he expanded in his Nihon kaihō hōan taikō.

Kita differentiated Tōyōteki kyōwasei from European and American republicanism. The president in Tōyōteki kyōwasei would represent both Heaven’s and the people’s wills. This was quite contrary to European and American republicanism, in which the President, being elected by the people, represented only the people’s will. Kita’s idea of Tōyōteki kyōwasei was parallel to the idea of Tōyōteki kunshusei (Eastern Monarchism), which originated in the Meiji Restoration, and whose supreme leader, the Emperor, represented Heaven’s will as well as that of the entire Japanese people. Kita wrote, “Japan has obtained her freedom and unity under a monarchy, while China will obtain them under a republic.” See Shina kakumai gaishi, KIC, II, 152-164.

80 Ibid., p. 89.
81 Ibid., p. 90.
82 Ibid., p. 90.
83 "Nichibei gōdō taishidan no teigi," KIC, III, 418.
84 Ibid., p. 418.
85 Shina kakumai gaishi, KIC, II, 7.
86 Ibid., p. 193.
87 "Nichibei gōdō taishidan no teigi," KIC, III, 423.
88 Ibid., p. 424.
89 Shina kakumai gaishi, KIC, II, 201.
90 Ibid., p. 201.
91 Ibid., p. 3.
92 "Taigai kokusaku ni kansuru kenpakusho," KIC, III, 413.
93 Ibid., p. 414.
94 Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 14-19.
96 Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 28.
98 Rōnin were "adventurers, soldiers of fortune, and others who lived by their wits, courage, and readiness to break the law." See Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, p. 382. As soon as he arrived in China in 1911, Kita felt that the Japanese rōnin were doing the Chinese Revolution more harm than good. He wrote his impressions to Kiyofuji Kōichirō and Uchida Ryōhei, the head of the Kokuryō kai (Black Dragon Society), and urged them to supervise these rōnin. Kita’s vivid reports on the Chinese Revolution were published in KIC, III, 149-175. See also Nishio Yōtarō, "Kita Ikki no shingai kakumei ni kansuru ‘Denbunshū’ to ‘Hōkōshokanshū’ ni tsuite," Shien, No. 105-106 (August 1971), pp. 127-152.
99 Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 106.
100 Ibid., pp. 107-116.
101 Ibid., pp. 182-200.
103 Ibid., pp. 409-410.
104 Ibid., p. 411.
105 In suggesting the conclusion of a Franco-Japanese alliance, Kita primarily intended to divide and weaken British naval power, as well as deter Russian aggression in China and Korea. He was convinced that the alliance would prevent the American intention to break peace with Japan. He was certain that America, without the assistance of the British navy, would never attack Japan. "Taigai kokusaku ni kansuru kenpakusho," KIC, III, 413.
106 "Berusaiyukaigi ni taisuru saikōhanketsu," KIC, II, 213.
This essay was originally written in June, 1919, and was handed to Mitsukawa Kametarō. It was first published in Shina kakumei gaishi
in November, 1921, by Daitōkaku.


110 Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 183.

111 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 97.


113 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 97.

114 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 87.

115 Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 112.

116 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 85-98. See also Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 431-434.

117 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 90.

118 Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 90.

119 Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, pp. 20-21.


121 Kokka kaizōan genri taikō, KIC, II, 273.

122 Ibid., p. 173.

123 "Nihonkoku no shōrai to nichiro kaisen," KIC, III, 81.

124 "Totsu, hi-kaisen o yūmono," KIC, III, 89.
125. Kokutairon oyobi junsei shakaishugi, KIC, I, 431.

126. "Nihonkoku no shorai to nichiro kaisen," KIC, III, 81.

127. Shina kakumei gaishi, KIC, II, 133.

128. Ibid., pp. 131-134.


130. See Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, pp. 76-83.

131. Kita was aware that the Emperor system would lose its base of support after the completion of the socialist revolution. See Kita's rational and practical plans in Nihon kaizō hōan taikō.


135. Ibid., p. 130.


138. Kita exerted his influence on the young officers through his Nihon kaizō hōan taikō, which became their Bible. While they actually misunderstood Kita's ideas, they attempted the military coup d'état in order to implement what they believed he meant. Kita however, never expected his plans to be implemented by means of the February 26 Affair. See George Wilson, Radical Nationalist in Japan, p. 130.

139. Maruyama concedes that "it cannot be clearly stated from what point of time the fascist period began." Maruyama Masao, Thought and Behaviour, p. 80.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Andō, Yoshio. "Nihon no fuashizumu: senzen senji no jakkan no mondai" (Japanese Fascism: Some Problems in the Pre-war and Inter-war Periods). *Shisō*, No. 341 (November 1952), pp. 96-108.


Fujiwara, Hirotatsu. "'Gijii'-kakumeisha no yakuwari: seinen shōkō, minkan uyoku o chūshin to shite" (The Role of the "Pseudo" Revolutionaries: Centering on the Young Officers and the Civilian Right Wing). *Shisō*, No. 355 (January 1954), pp. 48-75.


---


"Uyoku, the Right Wing of Japan". Contemporary Japan, Vol. 27,


"Fuashizumu no ideorogi" (Ideology of Fascism). *Shiso*, No. 341 (November 1952), pp. 41-46.


"'Sado comun' ron josetsu: ētosu to shiten no junsei
- 67 -

shakaishugi" (An Introductory Study of the "Sado Commune":

"Shokinronbun hakken no keii" (Details of the Discovery of
Kita Ikki's Early Essays). Gendai no me, Vol. II, No. 8

Wakaki Kita Ikki: Koi to uta to kakumei to (Young Kita Ikki:

Matsuzawa, Hiroaki. "Meiji shakaishugi no shiso" (Meiji Socialist
Thought). Nihon no shakaishugi (Socialism in Japan). The Annuals
Political Science Association. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1968,
pp. 5-62.

Matsuzawa, Tetsunari. Tachibana Kōsaburō: Nihon fuashizumu genshi
kaikironha (Tachibana Kōsaburō: Japanese Fascism and the Return

Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power


Morris, Ivan, ed. Japan 1931-1945: Militarism, Fascism, Japanism?


Neumann, Franz. Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National

Nishio, Yōtarō. "Kita Ikki no shingaikakumei ni kansuru 'Denbunshū'
to 'Hōkokushokanshū' ni tsuite" (On the Reports of the Chinese Revo­
lution of 1911 Written by Ikki Kita). Shien, No. 105-106 (August
1971), pp. 127-152.

Normura, Kōichi. "Kokuminteki shimeikan no shoruikei to sono tokushitsu:
"Okuma Shigenobu, Uchimura Kanzō, Kita Ikki" (Several Types of
National-Mission Ideas and Their Characteristics: Okuma Shigenobu,
Uchimura Kanzō, Kita Ikki). Sekai no naka no Nihon (Japan in the
World). Kindai Nihon shisōshi koza, Vol.8. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō,

"Profile of Asian Minded Man II: Ikki Kita." The Developing
Economies, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June 1966), pp. 231-244.


