

1911

17990

U·M·I

MICROFILMED 1991

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road Ann Arbor, Mi 48106-1346 USA
313 761-4700 800 521-0600

Order Number 9117990

**Western knowledge and intellectual groups in Japan and
Thailand in the nineteenth century: The *Meiokusha* and *Young
Siam***

Tonsiengsom, Surangsri, Ph.D.

University of Washington, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Tonsiengsom, Surangsri. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

NOTE TO USERS

**THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT RECEIVED BY U.M.I. CONTAINED PAGES
WITH SLANTED PRINT. PAGES WERE FILMED AS RECEIVED.**

THIS REPRODUCTION IS THE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

Western Knowledge and Intellectual Groups in
Japan and Thailand in the Nineteenth Century:
The Meirokusha and Young Siam

by

Surangsri Tonsiengsom

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

1990

Approved by *Samuel B. Page*

(Chairperson of Supervisory Committee)

Richard King
Richard King

Program Authorized

to Offer Degree History

Date December 20, 1990

© Copyright 1990

Surangsri Tonsiengsom

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature Surangsi Tonaiengsom

Date December 20, 1990

University of Washington

Abstract

Western Knowledge and Intellectual Groups in
Japan and Thailand in the Nineteenth Century:

The Meirokusha and Young Siam

by Surangseri Tonsiengsom

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee: Professor Kenneth B. Pyle
Department of History

In the nineteenth century Japan and Thailand were confronted by serious challenges from the West as well as the threat of imperialism. The *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam* were intellectual groups who introduced Western ideas and institutions into their respective countries. Their family background, educational background and their attitudes toward their own societies and the West strongly effected the modernization of these two countries.

Most of the *Meirokusha* came from the lower samurai class who were educated both in traditional and Western knowledge, especially Western sciences. Some of them such as Nishi Amone, Tsuda Mamichi and Nakamura Keiu, also had a chance to study abroad. Because of socio-political changes in the late Tokugawa period they were alienated from the traditional system and started looking to the West for models.

The family background and educational background of the *Young Siam* were very different from that of the *Meirokusha*. They came from royal families and the noble class and were taught both traditional and Western knowledge. Their level of Western knowledge, especially in the sciences, was not as intensive as that of the *Meirokusha*. Their feeling toward their own society and the West was also different from that of the

Meirakusha. They were still satisfied with their own society and accepted Western ideas only in a limited way.

The differences in their level of Western knowledge and their feelings toward their own society and the West caused them to differ in their ideas about modernization. The *Meirakusha* wholeheartedly accepted Western socio-political and economic philosophies such as natural rights, freedom and individualism. Japanese society underwent a rapid change in accepting Western culture. In contrast, Thai modernization occurred slowly. The *Young Siam* used traditional values such as kingship and unity to counter balance Western influences. They accepted only Western political institutions and technology. New political ideas did not penetrate into Thai society. Thai national identities were formulated in this period.

We can compare the results of the *Meirakusha's* and the *Young Siam's* ideas in modernization of their countries, the *Meirakusha* brought new ideas and institutions into Japanese society. Japan underwent socio-political and economic transformations which laid down a strong foundation for later development. Thai socio-political reforms resulted in an absolute state. Thailand remained an agrarian society, while Japan was developing into an industrial country.

Table of Contents.

	Page
Notes and Abbreviations.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Chapter I: The Intellectual Situation in the Pre-modern Period.....	13
Japan: Tokugawa period (1600-1868).....	14
a) Politics:	14
Domestic and International Affairs	
b) Society.....	20
c) Education: Traditional education.....	22
Western Education.....	23
Sending Students Abroad.....	27
Education for the Commoner.....	28
Thailand: King Mongkut's reign (1851-1868).....	29
a) Politics.....	30
b) Society.....	35
c) Education: Traditional Education.....	37
Western Education	
Missionary and Thai Education.....	39
Chapter II: The <i>Meirokeusha</i> and the <i>Young Siam</i>	47
A) The Socio-Political Situation in the Early Meiji period and the Early Period of King Chulalongkorn's Reign	
1) Japan.....	47
a) Politics.....	47
b) Society.....	51
2) Thailand.....	53
a) Politics.....	53
b) Society.....	57
B) Compare and Contrast Characteristics of the Intellectual Groups: the <i>Meirokeusha</i> and the <i>Young Siam</i>	60
1) The Japanese Intellectual Group.....	60

a) The <i>Meirakusha</i>	
1) Family Background.....	62
2) Educational Background.....	63
3) Characteristics.....	65
b) <i>Meiraku Zasshi</i>	73
c) The <i>Meirakusha's</i> Roles in Society.....	75
2) Thai Intellectual Group.....	77
a) The <i>Young Siam</i>	77
1) Family Background.....	78
2) Educational Background.....	79
3) Characteristics.....	82
b) <i>Darunawat</i> and <i>the Court</i>	84
c) The Roles of the <i>Young Siam</i> in Society.....	90
Chapter III: Ideologies.....	94
A) Japan.....	94
1) Liberals: Fukuzawa Yukichi, Katō Hiroyuki, Tsuda Mamichi.....	97
a) View of Tradition.....	97
b) Admiration of Western Civilization: Politics, Education and Economics.....	101
2) Conservatives: Nishimura Shigeki, Sakatani Shiroshi Nakamura Kei.....	107
a) View on Western Military Technology.....	108
b) View on Western Civilization and Japanese Culture: Politics and Education.....	109
3) Liberals became Conservatives.....	115
B) Thailand.....	122
1) Conservatives: King Chulalongkorn, Prince Vajiravāṇa Prince Damrong.....	122
a) Ensuring Survival by Modernization.....	123
b) Using Traditional Values such as Kingship and Unity.....	125
c) View on Education.....	137
2) Liberals.....	139

The Group of Students and Government Officers who submitted a Petition in 1884.....	139
Thienwan.....	141
Chapter IV: Result of Ideologies.....	148
Japan.....	148
The Connection between the <i>Meirokusho</i> and the Meiji Government.....	149
Society.....	152
Education.....	157
Western Educational System and Commercial Education Education for the State	
Politics.....	165
The People's Movement The Meiji Constitution	
Economics.....	175
Transportation: Railways, Telegram Industrialization	
Thailand.....	178
The <i>Young Siam</i> and the government.....	178
Society.....	179
Abolishing Slavery and the <i>Phrai</i> System	
Education.....	181
Education for Citizens	
Politics.....	186
Establishing the Cabinet <i>Thesaphiban</i> System	
Economics.....	190
The Growth of Rice Cultivation and Exportation Domestic Industries	
Conclusion.....	198
Glossary.....	206
Bibliography.....	213

Appendix A: The Fief School.....	240
Appendix B: Number of Japanese going abroad as Students (1860-1867)....	241
Appendix C: Countries to which Students were going 1860-67.....	242
Appendix D: Data Concerning the <i>Young Siam</i> Members (Family Background).....	243
Appendix E: Cross-cultural Experiences and Position in the Government....	245
Appendix F: Data Concerning the <i>Meirokusha</i> Members (Family Background).....	247
Appendix G: Education Background Language Studies of the <i>Meirokusha</i>	248
Appendix H: Travel Abroad Before 1876.....	249
Appendix I: The <i>Meirokusha's</i> Highest Position by 1876.....	250
Appendix J: The Imperial Rescript on Education 1890.....	251
Appendix K: Thai Summary Education Statistics.....	253
Appendix L: Volume and Value of Rice Export.....	254

Notes and Abbreviations

Note on Japanese Names

All names are given in the Japanese fashion, that is with the family name first and the personal name last. Thus, Fukuzawa Yukichi should be understood to mean that "Fukuzawa" is the family name and "Yukichi" is the given name.

The Hepburn method of romanization has been used for all Japanese words.

Transcription of Thai Words

Throughout this study, the "General System of Phonetic Transcription of Thai Characters into Roman" has been employed, as set forth in the supplement of Phraya Anuman Rajadon, The Nature and Development of the Thai Language (2nd edition. Bangkok, Fine Arts Dept., 1963), pp. 32-36. Exception are in the case of personal names and titles which follow the known preferences of the individuals concerned, as with King Chulalongkorn (and not ^âChulalongkorn) who signed his letters "Chulalongkorn."

Chronology

Three chronological systems were used in the materials for this study. The earliest is the Chunlasakkret (C.S.) or Lesser Era of the Burmese (+ 638 = A.D.). This was superseded in the late 1880s by the Bangkok Era, Rattanakosinsok Era (R.S +1781 = A.D.), which in turn give way to the Buddhist Era, Phutthasakkarat (B.E.-543 =A.D.), in 1911.

Periodization

Japan

Nara period 710-794
Heian period 794-1192
Kamakura period 1192-1336
Warring States period 1338-1568
Tokugawa period 1571-1867
Meiji period 1868-1912
Taishō period 1912-1926
Shōwa period 1926-1989
Heisei period 1989-

Thailand

Sukhothai 13th - 15th century
Ayudhaya 1350-1767
Thonburi 1767-1782
Ratanakosin (Bangkok) 1782-
Early Bangkok 1782-1873

Kings of Bangkok, Chakri Dynasty.

1 Phra Phutthayotfa (Rama I)	April 6, 1782 - September 7, 1809
2 Phra Phutthaloetla (Rama II)	September 7, 1809 - July 21, 1824
3 Phra Nangkhao (Rama III)	July 21, 1824 - April 3, 1851

4 Mongkut (Rama IV)	April 3, 1851- October 1, 1868
5 Chulalongkorn (Rama V)	October 1, 1868 - October 23, 1910
6 Vajirayudh (Rama VI)	October 13, 1910 - November 26, 1925
7 Prajadhipok (Rama VII)	November 26, 1925 - March 2, 1935 (abdicated)
8 Ananda Mahidol. (Rama VIII)	March 2, 1935 - June 9, 1946
9 Bhumibol Adulyadej (Rama IX)	June 9, 1946 -

The Chakri dynasty has ruled Thailand from 1782 to the present day. Kings of this dynasty are designated in two ways: by name or by Rama and numerical order in the dynasty. Therefore King Mongkut is also known as Rama IV and the present King, Bhumibol Adulyadej, is also Rama IX. The dynastic period initiated by Chakri is usually known as the Ratanakosin era (the era of the Emerald Buddha).

Before 24 June 1939, "Siam" was the official name of the country. In this dissertation, I use "Thailand" because it is a common use among Thai studies scholars who had done researches on this period such as D. K. Wyatt, The Politics Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn.

Abbreviations used in Footnotes:

NA	National Archives Division, Fine Arts Department, Ministry of Education, Bangkok.
RS	King Chulalongkorn' reign
KS	King 's Secretary Department
MC	Document of Ministry of the Capital

ME	Document of Ministry of Education
MF	Document of Ministry of Foreign Affairs
M	Miscellaneous Document
B.E	Buddhist Era
R.S	Ratanakosin Era
C.S.	Chulasakkarat
M.Z	Meiroku Zasshi
F.Y.Z	The Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Being a compassionate and kind-hearted adviser, Professor Kenneth B. Pyle had given the Asian students a sense of warmth, security and an appreciation of studying in this country. I wish to express my deepest gratitude for his wise guidance, willing assistance and constant encouragement which made the completion of this study possible. In addition, special thanks to Professor Laurie Sears, Professor Kent Guy and Professor Charles F. Keyes who kindly read this dissertation and whose insight and helpful suggestions were invaluable. Thanks to Professor Matsumoto Sannosuke, Professor Mishitochi Takabatake and Professor Akio Igarashi who kindly helped and discussed this work during my staying in Japan. Thanks to my colleagues in Thailand who assisted me with materials and suggestions and carried my working load during these years. Thanks to my friends, Theresa Mudock, and Karen Stanly who patiently proof read this work and always gave moral support.

Without financial support from Chulalongkorn University and the Japan Foundation, this study would not have been possible. I am grateful for their continued generosity.

FOR
My parent, brothers and sisters

Introduction

The processes of modernization and Westernization have long been of interest to scholars, the Japanese and Thai situations especially so. This is due to the fact that both Japan and Thailand remained free from the imperialistic forays of the Western powers, unlike Burma, Malaya, Indochina, and to an extent, China. This unique sovereignty in the face of imperialism made both Japan and Thailand symbols of independence. By the end of the nineteenth century some Chinese were looking at the Japanese and Siamese example. Hsueh Fu-ch'eng cited Siam as a model for China and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao enthusiastically cheered a Siam that "was roused to action and proudly still stands."¹

Both Japan and Thailand confronted the Western challenge and the threat of imperialism by modernizing their countries along Western lines. Survival dictated their actions. At times they wholeheartedly adopted Western ideas and institutions but at other times they attempted to preserve native culture and identity. Japan initially adopted Western culture in its entirety from bustles to beefsteak but later became much more discriminating choosing to preserve traditional Japanese values such as the imperial system and Confucian morality while importing Western technological and economic know-how. In this manner Japan remained free from colonialism, became an industrialized nation, and joined the clique of imperialists. Thailand was much more cautious in its approach to the West.

¹ Benjamin A. Baston, The End of the Absolute Monarchy in Siam (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 13 quoting eds. S. Teng and J. K. Fairbank China's Response to the West: A Documentary Survey 1839-1923 (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp.155, 141.

Though Western knowledge was fostered, the preservation of indigenous culture was paramount. Traditional values such as kingship and unity were emphasized rather than the adoption of Western know-how. In this manner Thailand became an absolutist state and remained a predominantly agricultural nation with a strongly entrenched bureaucracy, a factor in the revolution of 1932.

What is modernization?

Dr. Cyril Black defines "modernization" as "the process by which societies have been and are being transformed under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution."² According to him there are four key characteristics in approaching modernization studies, first the capacities relevant to modernization developed by societies during the premodern era, second the advancement of knowledge in scientific and technological revolutions from earlier eras, third the capacity of society to take advantage of the possibilities offered by advancement of knowledge in political, economic and social terms, and fourth the political leaders' roles in seeking and evaluating the utility of various institutions from modern societies and following or converting them into traditional institutions.³ However another important factor, especially in developing countries, left unaddressed by Black, is the group of intellectuals who lead the country in learning about its own society and other societies.

² Michio Nagai, ed., Development in the Non-Western World: Proceedings of the Conference on Development in the Non-Western World held in Tokyo 22-31 March 1982 (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1984), p. 124.

³ *Ibid.*

Sociologists observe modernization within a theoretical framework consistent with mainstream sociological theories of society (structural FUNCTIONALISM) and historical/social change (NEO-EVOLUTIONALISM).⁴ Functionalism is a theory based on an organic analogy: society is a bounded, self-maintaining system that maintains its equilibrium in the face of a hostile environment. To ensure a society's survival, its various social processes must mesh smoothly together to meet the system's needs. Functionalists explain change in a system as a response to changes in the environment.⁵ Changes in environment could compare to intellectual challenges from the West. A society faced with those challenges needed to find a way to survive. Intellectuals are an important factor in modifying society. Their function in the realm of thought is similar to a leader's function in the realm of politics. They explain the problems of society and attempt to find solutions and disseminate these ideas throughout society. The contribution of intellectuals developed the trend towards independence in the cases of India, Philippines and Indonesia.⁶

Japan and Thailand were examples of the successful efforts of intellectuals in a period of modernization. At the time the countries faced a changing international environment and agreed, or were forced to agree, on a massive program of change based heavily on borrowing from abroad. They were successful in borrowing from the West without undermining, and largely creating, the internal conditions conducive to modernization.

⁴ Michael Mann ed., The International Encyclopedia of Sociology (New York: Continuum, 1984), p. 245.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁶ Syed Hussein Alatas, Intellectuals in Developing Societies (London: Frank Cass, © 1977), p. 10.

Chinese modernization in the nineteenth century was an example of the failure of intellectuals to achieve this. In addition to internal and external problems that China faced, the Neo-Confucianists who were promoters of Westernization had little admiration for Western culture as they understood it. To them Confucianism provided the basis of organized life, while Western culture was nothing more than a matter of military and industrial techniques. In their minds "the Confucian social order, the Confucian political system and the Confucian ethic were of enduring value, true and right for men in all ages."⁷ This ethnocentrism led to Chinese resistance to the influence of the scientific and technological revolution, a total contrast to the Japanese case.

Intellectuals were important factors guiding the path of modernization in both Japan and Thailand. These educated men, cognizant of both Western and traditional knowledge, were responsible for choosing which facets of Western thought and life to adopt and which to dismiss. This dissertation examines and compares the predominant intellectual groups of Japan and Thailand during this early stage of modernization, the *Meirotokusha* and the *Young Siam*. The differences between the two in terms of ideology, goals, attitude toward the West, and role in society dictated the path of modernization in their respective nations. The socio-political situation of the pre-modern period and the results of modernization are also thoroughly studied.

⁷ George M. Beckmann, The Modernization of China and Japan (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers © 1962), p. 147

The meaning and roles of intellectuals:

The usage of the word "intellectual" as an adjective in the sense of having to do with things of the mind is found at least from the end of the 16th century. The noun "intellectual" is a relatively new creation dating from the last century.⁸ The simplest definition of "intellectuals" is merely "men of knowledge," people who engage in thinking about ideas and non-material problems using the faculty of reason. Roberto Michels defines intellectuals as "persons possessing knowledge, or in a narrow sense, those whose judgement, based on reflection and knowledge, derives less directly and exclusively from sensory perception than in the case of the non-intellectual."⁹

Intellectuals exist in every society and have specific and important roles. Gramsci in The Prison Notebooks discusses intellectuals in a capitalist society and in the transition to socialism. He labels those intellectuals as "organic intellectuals." They were important factors in changing Italy from a feudal mode of production to the petty bourgeois mode of production.¹⁰ He argues that intellectuals are a factor in changing from one social system to another. It is not a mistake to consider intellectuals in Japan and Thailand in the nineteenth century as "organic intellectuals" who changed their nations from pre-modern societies to modern societies.

⁸ Mann, p. 172.

⁹ Roberto Michels, "Intellectual," Encyclopedia of the Social Science (New York: Macmillan Co, 1949) p, 118.

¹⁰ Roger Simon, Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982), pp. 93-95.

This idea of the role of intellectuals as transformers is also discussed in Arnold Toynbee's, A Study of History. When one civilization is forced to adapt itself to another there emerges a special class which performs the functions of a "transformer." Just as a transformer converts electrical current from one voltage to another, so this social class which he labels the intelligentsia, learns the tricks of an intrusive civilization and teaches them to the rest of the community.¹¹

The role of Japanese intellectuals has been emphasized by Japanese studies scholars. For example David Abosch's dissertation, "Katō Hiroyuki and the Introduction of German Political Thought in Modern Japan: 1868-1883," states that "the Japanese intelligentsia was a unique phenomenon with regard to the influential role it played in easing the transformation of Japan from a traditional to a modern state....."¹²

Some works stress that the intellectuals did not only introduce Western knowledge but also tried to search for their own identities. For example, Matsumoto Sennosuke states that, "scholars not only introduced new knowledge but also tried to search for the definition of nationalism."¹³ During the Bakumatsu period while socio-political and economic changes occurred, scholars who were well informed began to educate citizens about new ideas and also to reinterpret their own values and try to define a new national identity.

¹¹ Nobutake Ike "The Political Role of Japanese Intellectuals," Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan (December, 1957) Vol, 5: 106. See also Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History (London: Oxford University Press, 1954).

¹² David Abosch, "Katō Hiroyuki and the Introduction of German Political Thought in Modern Japan: 1868-1883" (Ph.D dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964), p. 25.

¹³ Sennosuke Matsumoto and Yamamuro Shinichi, Gakumon to chishiki jin (Japanese) (Intellectuals and Knowledge), (Japan: Iwanami, 1988), pp. 424- 429.

Japanese Studies grew rapidly in the United States during the 1960s and due to Japan's burgeoning economy, modernization became a topic of interest. Many works emphasized the role of intellectuals as an important factor in Westernization. Scholarship initially focused on studying the life of intellectuals and the Western ideas each introduced to Japanese society. Fukuzawa Yukichi was an early focus of scholarship for he was deemed the most important intellectual of the Meiji era. Carmen Blacker, an early leader in the topic, published The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi, in 1964.¹⁴ She studied Fukuzawa's life and his view on practical learning based on a thorough comprehension of science. This reliance on practical learning helped Japan to stand up to the threat of Western aggression and exploitation. Blacker also studied Fukuzawa's other ideas such as the spirit of independence and equality. Many books followed along this line, including Thomas R. H. Havens' work, Nishi Amone and Modern Japanese Thought¹⁵ and Ivan Parker Hall's, Mori Arinori.¹⁶ Havens studied Nishi Amone's life as a scholar who brought Western philosophies such as utilitarianism and positivism from abroad. Nishi also had the ability to relate European ideologies to certain aspects of the native tradition. He played a significant part in helping to build Japan's armed forces. This style of study was also done by Hall concerning Mori Arinori, a founder of the *Meirokusha*, who had a long experience abroad and served in many positions in the government such as ambassador and Minister of Education. Hall

¹⁴ Carmen Blacker, The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writing of Fukuzawa Yukichi (Cambridge: University Press, 1964).

¹⁵ Thomas R.H. Havens, Nishi Amone and Modern Japanese Thought (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970).

¹⁶ Ivan Parker Hall, Mori Arinori (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972).

describes Mori Arinori as a nationalist who aimed at the security and independence of Japan. He concludes that Mori Arinori was a westernizer (at first) and a nationalist.

Another trend of study which emphasizes Western philosophies and their origin and effect on society, is illustrated by Mikiso Hane's work English Liberalism and the Japanese Enlightenment, 1868-1890.¹⁷ He stresses the English Liberal concept in early Meiji by using Fukuzawa Yukichi and Mori Arinori as examples of Japanese intellectuals who brought English ideas such as self-respect, independence and laissez-faire to Japanese society. He discusses how these ideas influenced Japanese society. For example, Mill's book On Liberty, was used in Keiō University. The *Meirokusha* as an intellectual group was studied by David J. Huish, "The Nature and Role of the *Meirokusha*," in 1970¹⁸ and Jerry Kamm Fisher "The *Meirokusha*" in 1973.¹⁹ In Huish's dissertation, he argues that the reputation of the *Meirokusha* as a discussion group is erroneous. He also discusses the uneasiness felt by Fukuzawa toward the *Meirokusha*. In contrast to Huish's work, Fisher discusses the *Meirokusha's* background, their relation with the *Yōgakusha* in the Tokugawa period and their significance in the Meiji era.

Japanese scholars also focused on intellectuals such as Ōkubo Toshieki in *Meiji keimo shisō shū* (The collection of thinking of the Meiji's intellectuals)²⁰ and Kōsaka Masaaki in, Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era.²¹

¹⁷ Mikiso Hane, "English Liberalism and the Japanese Enlightenment, 1868-1890" (Ph. D dissertation, Yale University, 1957).

¹⁸ David J. Huish, "The Nature and Role of the Meirokusha" (Ph.D dissertation, Australian National University, 1970).

¹⁹ Jerry Kamm Fisher, "The Meirokusha" (Ph. D dissertation, University of Virginia, 1973).

²⁰ Ōkubo Toshieki, *Meiji keimo shisō shū* (The collection of the Meiji's intellectuals' ideas) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, *Meiji bungaku zenshū*, Vol. III, 1967).

²¹ David Abosch, tr., Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era, ed. Kosaka Masaaki (Tokyo, 1985).

Kōsaka's book deals with the general background of Japanese thought from the late Tokugawa period to the end of Meiji period. One part of this book discusses the *Meirokusha*. Ōkubo's and Kōsaka's works emphasize the importance of the *Meirokusha* in introducing new ideas to Japanese society and stress its strongly liberal ideas. Few consider traditional ideologies which assisted the growth of nationalism and the process of modernization.

The *Young Siam* has not been so popular a topic as their Japanese counterparts. In Thai studies, D. K. Wyatt was the first scholar to discuss the *Young Siam* as a political group with "members sufficiently strong by 1873 to take the lead in urging reforms of a radical nature."²² He also deeply studied the role of Prince Damrong in educational reform. Later scholars studied individual members of the *Young Siam* including Craig Reynolds in his dissertation, "The Buddhist Monkhood in Nineteenth Century Thailand,"²³ and Sulak Sivarakasa's work, *Siam in Crisis*.²⁴ Reynolds' work discusses Prince Vajirañāna as an important monk in religious reform in the nineteenth century, while Sivarakasa's work focuses on the importance of Prince Damrong in preserving Thai traditional culture. These two works emphasize the *Young Siam's* attitudes toward Thai traditional values but do not discuss their attitudes toward the West. There have been no publications dealing with the *Young Siam* as a group important in modernizing the country.

²² D. K. Wyatt, *The Political of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), p. 45.

²³ Craig Reynolds, "The Buddhist Monkhood in Nineteenth Century in Thailand," (Ph.D dissertation, Cornell University, 1973).

²⁴ Sulak Sivarakasa, *Siam in Crisis*. (Bangkok: Kamol Keemthong Foundation, 1980).

Topics concerning individual members of the *Young Siam* have been popular among Thai students. Some have written on members of the *Young Siam* such as "Prince Damrong, His Life and Work," by Wimolwan Thongprecha in 1964 and "Ministers of Public Instruction or Education under the Absolute Monarchy," by Nangnoi Tittiranond in 1976. However, none has studied the *Young Siam* as a whole.

In the 1970s Thai scholars were interested in comparing modernization in Japan and Thailand because both countries started to modernize along Western lines at the same time but the outcomes were significantly different. What were the reasons for this? Likit Dhiravegin, a pioneer in this study, attempts to answer this question in, The Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) and the Chakkri Reformation (1868-1910) A Comparative Perspective.²⁵ However, he does not discuss reasons for the different results but only offers a general discussion of the modernization process in the Meiji period and King Chulalongkorn's reign. None of the Thai works thoroughly study this topic or even concentrate on particular factors of modernization and the effect of the intellectuals as the leading group in modernizing the country.

There are two works in English which compare Japan in the Meiji period and Thailand in the reign of King Chulalongkorn: "Studies of the Thai State: the State of Thai Studies,"²⁶ by Benedict R. O' G. Anderson and Modernization without Development: Thailand as an Asian Case Study by

²⁵ Likit Dhiravegin, The Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) and the Chakkri Reformation (1868-1910) A Comparative Perspective (The Research Center, Faculty of Political Science, Thammasat University, Bangkok, 1984).

²⁶ Benedict Anderson, "Studies of the Thai State: The State of Thai Studies" in The Study of Thailand, ed. Eliezer B. Ajol (Athens, Ohio University Center for International Studies, Southeast Asia Program, 1978), pp.193-247.

Jacob Norman.²⁷ Anderson's work mentions the political similarity of the Meiji period and the reign of King Chulalongkorn, but not in detail. In contrast to Anderson's work, Jacob thoroughly compared Japanese and Thai societies in order to find the reason that caused differences in their modernization. Japan was able to modernize and develop simultaneously, while Thailand could not. Norman concluded that Japan was a feudal society in which individual, innovative potential did lead the country to development, while Thailand was a patrimonial society which sought to preserve the traditional system.

My work differs from earlier works because I study the impact of both intellectual groups in the modernization of their respective countries. Their background and their attitudes toward their own societies and toward the West at the time of crisis would influence their ideas of how to deal with the West as well as which Western philosophies or institutions they were going to import into their societies. However, I am also aware of the differences between these two countries before and during the modernization period. The differences between these two groups resulted by the 1930s in two very different nations. Intellectuals' roles in transforming society and establishing nationalism are obvious in the Japanese case. Thai modernization took more time than Japanese because Thai intellectuals relied on traditional means to counter the West. However the result of Western presence and using modernization to confront the West politically, socially and economically transformed Thai society. The Thai were from the start more cautious about undermining their identity.

²⁷ Norman Jacobs, Modernization without Development: Thailand as an Asian Case Study (New York: Praeger Publishers, © 1971).

National identities like *Chat* (nation) were created and tied to concepts of traditional Kingship. These concepts laid a foundation for the strong nationalism of the following reign of King Vajiravudh. At the same time the bureaucratic system created during the reign of King Chulalongkorn led to the Revolution of 1932 which changed Thailand from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy.

I divide my dissertation into five chapters; first, the intellectual situation in the per-modern period; second, the *Meirotkusha* and the *Young Siam*; third, ideologies; fourth, the results of the ideologies; fifth, the conclusion.

Chapter I

The Intellectual Situation in the Pre-modern Period

The Tokugawa period and the reign of King Mongkut are known as the pre-modern periods of Japan and Thailand. They both laid down the fundamental bases for modernization. In this chapter, I will discuss the socio-political situation in these two societies including the differences and the similarities between them. All of the factors which affected the socio-political situation affected those intellectuals who played a crucial role in leading society in modernization.

During the 250 years Japan was ruled by the Tokugawa government, its socio-economic situation was not static but was gradually transformed. Many scholars agree that these early transformations were significant factors for the drastic changes Japan experienced later. Socially, Japan changed from an agrarian society to a commercialized society. Castle towns and merchants were rising. Economically, samurai who used to be the most prestigious class became poorer and were financially dependent on merchants. While the socio-economic situation was changing the political system was not evolving. The Japanese government could not cope with the socio-economic changes. Samurai were strongly dissatisfied with the old system. They had a chance to learn Western knowledge through the Dutch and were impressed by Western civilization. By the end of Tokugawa period Western learning was both qualitatively and quantitatively higher than in Thailand. Many institutions offered Western learning. All these economic, social and educational transformations

prepared Japan for the drastic changes which were to occur in the late Tokugawa period and the Meiji period.

In Thailand the socio-economic condition was not transformed as radically as in Japan. By treaties which Thailand signed with many countries, Thailand participated in international trade. Intellectually, King Mongkut encouraged society to study the West. Western learning was popular among the upper class. The social structure did not change as quickly as in Japan. Citizens of Thailand were divided into commoners and slaves which did not facilitate development. The old political system was still working well. The study of both societies in detail will help us to understand why in the nineteenth century Japan was ready or ripe for change while Thailand was not.

Japan

Politics:

Domestic

In 1603 Tokugawa Ieyasu was appointed to the position of shogun (generalissimo) by the emperor. His position depended entirely on his military power; while the emperor, although without real political power, was regarded as the source of political legitimacy and the symbol of national unity. For the next 250 years (1603-1868) Tokugawa Ieyasu and his descendants ruled the country in the name of the emperor through the *bakuhau* system. The shogunate government or *bakufu* (a term meaning military government), was an extremely complex and intricate system. Actually the Tokugawa bakufu controlled only about one-quarter of the land and the other three-quarters was divided into 260-odd han (domains). Each

han had its own administration, capital, bureaucracy, army, and taxation system. It was ruled by *daimyo* (feudal lords) who were categorized into three different groups, *shimpen* (related) daimyo, *fudai* (hereditary) daimyo, and *tozama* (outer) daimyo.¹ These daimyo served three, inseparable functions to the bakufu: they governed their own domains as semi-autonomous local lords; they also served as local representatives of central rulers, enforcing within their boundaries the universal statutes on arms and class; and they assumed by special appointment, those supra-domainal tasks that the unifiers (or shogun) occasionally saw fit to assign.² In return the shogun vested them with land. The daimyo had to collect taxes and provide military service to the shogun. The Tokugawa shogun controlled daimyo by using the *sankin kōtai* system (alternate attendance system). The daimyo were forced to spend alternate years in attendance upon the shogun at his capital city of Edo, where they resided in estates allotted to them. Sometimes, they left their wives or children as hostages in Edo. Through the *sankin kōtai* system, the shogun could control a daimyo's loyalty and wealth. This system was surely one of the most important factors contributing to the rise of a monetized economy and social change in the

¹ Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Making of Modern Japan* (Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, ©1978), p. 13. In this book Professor Pyle describes these three groups as follows:

1. The *shimpen* (related) daimyo were members of Tokugawa branch families. Should the main line of the family die out, a shogun would be chosen from among these lords, who came to number 23.

2. The *fudai* (hereditary) daimyo were those who had pledged loyalty to the Tokugawa prior to the decisive battle of Sekigahara in 1600. Because their loyalty preceded this decisive battle, they were generally considered trustworthy and they helped staff the central councils of the shogunate. By the eighteenth century they numbered in the neighborhood of 140 daimyo.

3. The *tozama* (outer) daimyo were those who had taken Tokugawa layasu as their overlord only after the battle of Sekigahara. Because their pledge of loyalty was relatively recent, they were generally regarded as less trustworthy and therefore excluded from positions in the shogunate.

² Mary Elizabeth Berry, "Public Peace and Private Attachment: The Goals and Conduct of Power in Early Modern Japan," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 12 : 2 (1986) p. 256.

late Tokugawa period. The requirement of periodic attendance at the capital along with keeping their families as hostages to deter rebellion forced daimyo to spend a lot of money in traveling and upkeep of dual residences. Moreover their increased expenditures for food and luxury merchandise exceeded their income and so they needed to borrow money from merchants.

Professor Yamamura describes the increasing poverty of the samurai in his book, A Study of Samurai Income and Entrepreneurship: Quantitative Analyses of Economic and Social Aspects of the Samurai in Tokugawa and Meiji Japan, by using the bannermen³ as an example. The samurai poverty increased because their demands increased while their incomes were not adequate. To meet their increased expenditure they resorted to various forms of loans which had the effect of accelerating financial difficulties in the succeeding years.⁴ The bakufu tried to help by increasing the bannerman's stipend. However, the bakufu also faced economic problems during the Kyōhō period (1716-1736) because of low rice prices. While the samurai became poorer because of the high expenditures in maintaining the system, the merchants, on the other hand were gaining economic power through trade. It can be seen in a document dated November 1856 in which three village leaders handed a statement to a bannerman with a stipend of 700 koku:

1. Because of your promise to reduce expenditures, we have, during the past years, advanced tax rice and made loans. However, we see no sign of any efforts to achieve necessary reductions in expenditures; 2. Your

³ The Bannermen (*hatamoto*) were Tokugawa administrative and military officers. Their positions were between *fudai daimyo* and housemen (*gokenin*). A standard definition of bannerman rank was a stipend exceeding 100 koku but less than 10,000 koku.

⁴ Kozo Yamamura, A Study of Samurai Income and Entrepreneurship: Quantitative Analyses of Economic and Social Aspects of the Samurai in Tokugawa and Meiji Japan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 41-42.

brother is an immoral idler. As long as such a person is supported by your household, there is little chance of reducing expenditures. ... You have more than six servants including maids and horsemen. Some should be dismissed; 4. Your representative asked us if we could assist in negotiating a further loan. Even if a low interest loan were to be made to you, it would be of little use as long as you have a useless (*mueki na*) brother...⁵

So, even while a bannerman with a 700 koku stipend had economic troubles there is no doubt that samurai with stipends less than 700 koku were also economically pinched. The above statement reflects not only the severity of the bannerman's economic difficulties but also the deterioration of his political and moral authority. It also vividly demonstrates the economic power of the village leaders over the samurai.

Economic change was better managed in Western domains such as Chōshū and Satsuma. Chōshū had invested a century's worth of savings in profitable enterprises, thus accumulating capital that could be used in time of emergency. Satsuma also owned a highly profitable state-operated sugar monopoly. These resources contributed to high morale in the samurai class. While Western domains became stronger in terms of productive capacity and the unusually large number of samurai, the bakufu's power gradually declined because of financial problems. This gap between the fortunes of the Western domains and the bakufu accelerated after the Tempō crisis ⁶ when the bakufu failed to reform the economy. In contrast, the Satsuma

⁵ Ibid., p. 48 quoting Kimura Motoi, "*Yuragu hōkensei to seikatsu no henkō*" (Crumbling feudalism and changes in daily life), et al., eds. Morimatsu Yoshiaki *Seikatsushi* (Tokyo, Yanakawa Shuppansha, 1965), pp. 336-337.

⁶ in 1833, the unusual cold during the spring planting of 1833, and the early snowfalls in the autumn caused crop failure especially rice, wheat, barley and even bamboo shoots. The shortage of harvesting causes famine. According to Susan Hanley and Kozo Yamamura, *Economic and Demographic Change in Preindustrial Japan, 1600-1860*, in 1836 over 100,000 starved to death in the Tōhoku, and in Echizen the following year the death rate was three times the normal figure.

government introduced new crops and processing industries thereby accumulating wealth with which to acquire military power: new weapons, new ships and new Western military training. By the end of the Tokugawa period the economic disparity between the bakufu and the Southwest domains played an important role in the Meiji restoration.

In the late Tokugawa period the bakufu's power was weak both financially and politically. This weakness became more vivid when Westerners came to open Japan for trade. During the Tokugawa period Japan followed a policy of seclusion (*sakoku*). The shogunal government limited relationships with foreigners to the Dutch and Chinese who came to trade at Nagasaki. Japan had a chance to acquire Western knowledge from the Dutch. From the 1790s other countries such as Russia and Britain began to lobby for opening Japan. Russian envoys and traders began appearing on the northern island of Hokkaido seeking to open trade relations with Japan. The British (major traders in India, Borneo and Malaya), expanded their power to China and probed Japanese coastal waters. In 1808, a British frigate sailed into Nagasaki harbor demanding supplies of food and water. This series of Western challenges, as well as the British victory in the Opium War (1839-42), illustrated the strength of the West to the shogun. The shogun saw the necessity of opening the country and studying the West. Western military strength was one of the primary reasons behind the shogun's strong support for Western studies in the latter part of the period.

External threat and internal problems compelled the shogun to sign treaties with the United States in 1854 and 1858. According to these treaties, Japan was obligated to open its ports and give extraterritoriality to the West. England, France and other European countries soon followed the

practices established by these treaties. However, the policy of opening the country did not decrease the problems within Japanese society. The Western han continued to gain strength economically and politically, especially Chōshū and Satsuma, vis-a-vis the bakufu. The situation was exacerbated by a tradition of anti-Tokugawa bias. Albert M. Craig mentions this feeling as follows:

One ceremony embodying this animus was held annually on the first day of the new year. Early in the morning when the first cock crowed, the Elders and Direct Inspectors would go to the daimyo and ask, "Has the time come to begin the subjugation of the Bakufu?" The daimyo would then reply, "It is still too early; the time is not yet come." While obviously secret, this ceremony was considered one of the most important rituals of the han. Another comparable custom in a more domestic setting has also been recorded. Mothers in Chōshū would have their boys sleep with their feet to the east, a form of insult to the Bakufu, and tell them "never to forget the defeat at Sekigahara even in their dreams." In the case of Satsuma, every year on the fourteenth day of the ninth month the castle town samurai would done their armor and go to Myōenji, a temple near Kagoshima, to meditate on the battle of Sekigahara.⁷

Eventually the Chōshū and Satsuma domains joined in a secret agreement to overthrow the bakufu and restore the imperial system.

⁷ Albert M. Craig, *Chōshū in the Meiji Restoration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 20-21.

Battle of Sekigahara (*Sekigahara no Tatakai*) was the decisive battle in the rise of Tokugawa Ieyasu to the shogunate; it took place in 1600 at Sekigahara in Mino Province (now in Gifu Prefecture). Ieyasu's forces destroyed some of his most vigorous rivals such as Chōshū and Satsuma, and after the battle he trimmed the domains of others, thereby reducing sharply the possibility of an other hostile coalition that might threaten his hegemony.

Society:

Due to Confucian influence, Japanese citizens were classified in a hierarchical class system of samurai, farmers, artisans and merchants. The samurai were originally a feudal military force and received privileges such as carrying swords. Peasants (*hyakushū*) were expected to remain on the soil, to refrain from alienating cultivated land, to live frugally, and work industriously. Merchants were at the bottom of the four classes on the assumption that as a "mover of goods" they were by definition unproductive. However, during the 250 year peace of the Tokugawa period the samurai were transformed into a bureaucratic elite and became deeply dependent upon merchants' services which bridged the gap between town and country.

Urbanization was fostered by the *sankin kōtai* system. Castle towns continued to grow. Edo, the Tokugawa capital, grew from a small castle town to an urban center of more than a million residents. As cities grew and communication improved, the peasant began to find a market to dispose of surplus goods; he could specialize in his crops, producing for a growing market network. With the rising productivity in the countryside there was an increase in the average standard of living and the emergence of a class of wealthy peasants *gōnō*, who clearly benefited from the commercialization of the agrarian economy.

Economic expansion, fostered by the *sankin kōtai* system and the increased demand for goods and luxury items, brought wealth to the merchant class. Urbanization and merchant wealth culminated in the *chōnin* culture of the Genroku period (1688-1703). This popular culture concentrated on the pleasure quarters, the tea-houses, the bath-houses and

theaters of the city and is illustrated in the art of *ukiyo-e*. The merchants became well-off in society; while samurai became poorer because of high expenditures. Daimyo borrowed money from merchants, as in this example cited by Professor Pyle, "the major daimyo of central and Western Japan, needing cash principally for their alternate attendance requirements, marketed huge amounts of rice in Osaka, and they were dependent on the great merchants of the city to handle all aspects on the transaction. Those merchants began extending to the daimyo long-term loans at high rates of interest."⁸

The poverty did not only occur to the samurai but also at the bakufu level. Originally the Tokugawa government was very wealthy because it taxed income whether in the form of rice, other products, or money garnered through massive levies from gold and silver mines. However, this fortune did not last long. By the 1660s the shogunate was borrowing money because the mines dried out and tax rates had dropped from forty per cent of production to thirty or thirty-five per cent.⁹ In other words, the tax system did not capture the profits of increased agricultural productivity. Moreover, the Tokugawa household expense also increased. With all of these factors, the bakufu's dependence on merchant loans to bankroll a growing deficit increased. Professor Pyle concluded his argument by stating that although official ideology was often opposed to the growth of the merchant class, and commercial endeavors in general, in reality government (at all levels) was dependent on merchant groups for their special knowledge in conducting

⁸ Pyle, *The Making of Modern Japan*, p. 31.

⁹ Conrad D. Totman, *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu 1600-1843* (Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1967), p. 78. quoting Kobetsu Jun, *Kinsei shakai (Society in the early modern period)* (Tokyo, 1952), pp.178-179.

the financial affairs of the system.¹⁰ One can conclude that in this period, government (at all levels) finally came to depend on merchants.

Due to the soaring expenditures of the bakufu and of the individual daimyo samurai stipends were cut. This had a direct effect on samurai life, especially on lower level samurai. The economic difficulties of the period were one reason for the interest on the part of Japanese intellectuals, in becoming a wealthy nation, like the nations of West.

Education

In this period education was widespread not only within the samurai class but also among commoners. The shogunal government strongly supported samurai education. In 1607, Tokugawa Ieyasu appointed Hayashi Razan (1583-1657) as his adviser. Razan's duties included advising on matters of administration, finding historical models in ancient texts and expounding them to the shogun. At the same time he was encouraged to develop Confucian studies. The Confucian model was established as the official learning for the samurai class. Ieyasu also subsidized the printing of books and funding for libraries. Han governments such as Chōshū and Satsuma also supported Confucian studies.

Confucian studies had three aims: first, the development of moral attitudes that would help stabilize the country; second, the development of intellectual capacity, technique, attitudes or knowledge; and third, the development of artistic ability and skills.¹¹ From the age of eight samurai were trained in Chinese studies. In order to achieve those three

¹⁰ Pyle, *The Making of Modern Japan*, p. 31.

¹¹ R. P. Dore, *Education in Tokugawa Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), p. 34.

aims they needed to study two kinds of learning: *Bun* ('civil studies', 'learning', culture', 'intellectual matters', 'the literary arts' are possible translations in some contexts) and *Bu*— the military arts. These two could not be separated. In civil studies (*Bun*), they learned such subjects as medicine, mathematics, astronomy and gained moral training through such Confucian classics as Classic of Filial Piety and the Greater Learning. With this dual curricula it is not surprising that samurai were both military officials and scholars in the Tokugawa period. Most of the Tokugawa writers defined *gakumon* at that time as a system of ethical training.

With the support of both bakufu and han, Confucian studies as well as the number of scholars grew especially during the time of Tokugawa Yoshimune (1716 -1745). In this reign, the world of the scholar was a large and well-developed one -including both Confucian studies and Dutch Learning.

Western Learning

Western Learning came to Japan through the Dutch who traded at the port of Nagasaki. From the early eighteenth century when the government lifted the ban on the import of nonreligious books there emerged a small group known as the "Dutch scholars" (*rangakusho*) who studied Western astronomy, medicine, botany, and other practical sciences. Realizing the importance of Western sciences, official Tokugawa scholars changed the name of foreign studies from "barbarians studies" to "Dutch studies."

The successful translation of a Dutch anatomy text in 1771 is generally taken to mark the beginning of serious "Dutch Learning." Japanese

scholars seriously started to pursue Western knowledge not only in medicine, physics, chemistry, astronomy, and mathematics, but also in geography, metallurgy, navigation and military tactics.

In the eighteenth century, there was great freedom for students of Western learning. In 1789 the first Dutch Language School in Japan, the *Shirado* was opened in Edo. Between 1789 and 1826 the school had ninety-four pupils, chiefly men interested in medicine, but also men of other professions.¹² Dutch Learning was also booming in the Western fiefs of Chōshū, and Satsuma. Later in 1843, it was studied in the central fief of Sakura.

The interest in Dutch Learning also grew at the shogunal level. Tokugawa Yoshimune was curious about astronomy, watch making, geography and other topics he encountered from the agents of the Dutch trading station in Edo. In 1720 he eased the seclusion edicts to allow Western books to circulate in Japan so that by the middle of the eighteenth century some translation work was beginning. For example, the *Rakishū Shinsho* (New Book on Astronomy), a textbook on physics and astronomy was translated between 1798 and 1803 from the Dutch version of an English work by Shizuki Tadao (1760-1806). He also translated part of Kaempfer's, History of Japan.

Perry's arrival in 1853 and the threat of Western imperialism impelled the bakufu to establish the first large-scale school of Western studies, *Yōmeigaku* (later was the *Bansho shirabe-sha*, or Office for the Inspection of Foreign Books) in 1855. This school grew rapidly and by the

¹² Donald Keene, The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720-1830 (Revised Edition) (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969), p.30 quoting Itazawa, *Rangaku no Hattatsu*, p.53.

end of the first year there were nearly two hundred students. No less than sixteen future *Meirokusha* members were associated with this school before the Meiji Restoration: thirteen as teachers, two as students, and one as both student and later as an instructor.¹³ Most of these men were hired as instructors at the *Bansho shirabe-sho* between 1857-1862.¹⁴ At this institution many friendships and associations formed. It was here that Tsuda and Nishi first became companions. Some had experience in working together. For example, in 1859 Tezuka Ritsuzo and Nishi Amane published the first English grammar in Japanese. A year later Fukuzawa Yukichi and Furukawa Masao published a Dutch statistical survey of world resources. This institution was not only a central place for Western scholars (*Yogakusha*), but also was the Bakufu's tool for learning about the West.

The major aim of studying Dutch Learning was to increase Japanese military strength. This is mentioned explicitly in an order of 1856 by the daimyo of Satsuma:

At the time when defence against the foreign barbarian is of crucial importance it is the urgent duty of all samurai both high and low to cooperate in learning of conditions in foreign lands so that we may adopt their good points to supplement our deficiencies, reinforce the military might of our nation and keep the barbarian nation under control. Hence, in whatever time you have, study translations of foreign books to gain close acquaintance with foreign customs and endeavor and mechanical devices so that they may become wings for our endeavor to spread the Imperial influence throughout the world.¹⁵

¹³ They were Katō Hiroyuki, Mitsukuri Rinshō, Mitsukuri Shūhei, Nakamura Keiu, Nishi Amane Sugi Kōji, Tsuda Mamichi, Sugita Gentan, Koyasu Takeshi, Meejima Hisoka, and Kanda Kōhei.

¹⁴ Jerry Kamm Fisher, "The Meirokusha" (Ph.D dissertation, University of Virginia, 1973), p. 35.

¹⁵ Dore, *Education in Tokugawa Japan*, p. 171 quoting *Kokumin Seishin bunka kenkujo*, ed., *Nihon kyōiku shi shiryō-sho* (NKSS), 3, p. 285.

Scholars who had acquired Western studies were ones who supported the *kaikoku* policy (opening the country). They believed that Japan needed to open the country and acquire Western knowledge in order to create a strong and independent nation. An opposing group supported the *jōi* policy (expel the barbarian). One of the leaders of the *kaikoku* policy was Sakuma Shōzan (1811-1864), a samurai-scholar who exercised considerable influence, partly through his followers and partly through his lord, who was a bakufu councillor. He studied both Western gunnery and other Dutch studies, and became convinced of the critical importance of such technology to his country's defense. He strongly believed in "Eastern ethics and Western science." For him, Confucian morals remained valid for personal behavior, but it was necessary for the government to acquire Western science, such as military technology, in order to solve both internal and external problems. Even though Shōzan was assassinated in 1864, his ideas strongly influenced scholars in the late Tokugawa and the early Meiji periods.

As we have seen, learning was a duty which the samurai needed to fulfill; especially in the study of Confucianism. They were required to be educated in both civil and military studies. However, in the late Tokugawa period while the bakufu faced social, economic and political problems, "Dutch Learning" became popular. It was strongly supported by both the bakufu and some han in the late eighteenth century. They recognized the importance of the West not only in a military sense but also in an economic and political sense. The establishing of the *Bansho shirabe-sho* (Office for the Inspection of Foreign Books) in 1855 and the sending of students abroad were good examples of how the government was attempting self-strengthening by using Western knowledge. It is not a mistake to conclude

that this movement laid a strong basis for Japanese intellectuals in the nineteenth century.

Sending students to study abroad:

The bakufu encouraged Western studies not only by establishing schools, but also by sending students to Europe and the U.S.A. In 1860, some of those who had been on a mission to the United States urged students to "Go West young men." In 1862, because of the turmoil surrounding the American Civil War, students were sent to Holland. This set a precedent for future students to go to Europe and the United States.

The pioneer group to Holland consisted of 15 students connected with the bakufu's naval school at Nagasaki, plus two officials, Nishi Amane and Tsuda Mamichi, from the *Bansho Shirabe-sho*. During the two years the group was in Europe, the fifteen from Nagasaki studied naval technology, while Nishi and Tsuda took general courses.¹⁶ This group was the first official group which went abroad. However, before that there were unofficial groups sent by the fiefs (see Appendix B). Mori Arinori, one member of the *Meirokusha*, was in the group sent by Chōshū. Many students went to France and England (see Appendix C). This is one reason why liberalism became very popular in Japan later.

Initially military technology was the main subject for which both the bakufu and the fiefs sent students. However for some students the aim was changed after studying abroad for a while. For example, Nishi

¹⁶ James T. Conte "Overseas Study in the Meiji Period: Japanese Students in America, 1867-1902" (Ph. D, Dissertation Princeton University, 1977), p. 10.

Amene and Tsuda Mamichi saw social science as intrinsically more interesting than military subjects.

Education for commoners

Commoners could pursue their education by attending *terakoya* located in a Buddhist temple (means a "house or family which makes a business of taking pupils").¹⁷ The number of *terakoya* grew very quickly around the eighteenth century.¹⁸ Later, commoners were permitted to enter fief schools with the samurai children. Okayama fief was the first to initiate this integration. In 1660 a number of farmers' children were admitted to study and act as servants and errand boys for the officials and teachers.¹⁹ Okayama was followed in this by Chōshū. However, there is no evidence that any fief admitted commoners to the main fief school in large numbers or on a footing of equality with samurai students. It was still limited to wealthy commoners. However, this signaled a change in education.

A special school for commoners was established in the reign of Tokugawa Yoshimune (1716-1745) who was particularly active in educational matters. He gave land to an unemployed samurai to enable him to start a school.²⁰ This school was intended for commoners and to train useful professional scholars.

In the *terakoya* school students were trained in the basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic, together with other useful information. Only in the fief school could wealthy commoners have a chance

¹⁷ Dore, Education in Tokugawa Japan, p. 252.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 220 quoting NKSS, 2, p. 585.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 227 quoting NKSS, 7, p. 74.

to learn basic moral Chinese education. The literacy of Japanese commoners was relatively high by the end of the Tokugawa period. From Dore's estimation somewhat more than 40 per cent of all Japanese boys and about 10 per cent of Japanese girls were getting some kind of formal education outside of the home.²¹ Merchants were perhaps the most likely to be willing to spend money on the education of daughters, since shop-keepers' wives needed to read and write in order to help in the shop.

In conclusion, by the end of the Tokugawa period, standard education in Japan was high in terms of quality and quantity. Commoners, both boys and girls, had a chance to acquire knowledge in the *terakoya* which were spread widely throughout the country. Samurai had opportunity to learn not only Confucianism, but also Western studies such as astronomy, physics, medicine and military technology. The bakufu supported Western studies by establishing language schools, Western studies institutions and sent students to study abroad. With all these supports it is not surprising that by the end of the Tokugawa period the Japanese literacy rate was high and intellectuals were well-informed in both traditional and Western knowledge. This bequeathed a significant foundation for the Meiji intellectual life and for, the *Meirokusho*.

Thailand

King Mongkut's reign was important for modernization in the reign of King Chulalongkorn as the Tokugawa period was for the Meiji. Social, economic, political and intellectual changes in this period affected

²¹ Ibid., p. 254.

the Chulalongkorn period directly. In this reign the socio-economic situation gradually changed. However, it did not prepare Thai society as well as Japan for the drastic changes to come with modernization. But we cannot deny that it laid a significant foundation for Thai society to face both internal and external problems in the following reign. In this section, I will discuss the socio-economic changes of King Mongkut's reign in order to compare this with the transformation of the Tokugawa period. Comparing developments in these two societies will help us to understand differences between them and their intellectuals, the *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam*.

1) politics

King Mongkut (1804-1868) was the fourth King in the Chakri Dynasty and was the eldest son of King Rama II and his Queen, Sisuriyendra. For twenty-seven years he remained a monk because of political reasons. Despite being the heir to the throne he was initially usurped by Prince Chatsadabodin, his half-brother (later King Rama III). During King Rama III's reign, Prince Mongkut remained a monk. While a monk, he received both an ecclesiastical and secular education. He acquired Western knowledge from missionaries such as Bishop Pallegoix, Jesse Caswell, D. B. Bradley, and S. R. House. Among them, Jesse Caswell was closest to King Mongkut. He was invited to teach English in Prince Mongkut's (at that time) monastery to the Prince himself and several priests and others connected with him. Jesse Caswell described how eagerly Prince Mongkut studied:

..The priest never misses a lesson and piles [sic.] me with many questions that I commonly have to tear myself away from him....²²

At the same time, King Mongkut's followers such as Luang Naisit (later was Chaophraya Si Suriyawong, the regent in the reign of King Chulalongkorn), and Chaophraya Phra Khlang (Treasury later Ministry of Finance)(Dit Bunnag) also recognized the power of the West and agreed that the Thai needed to open their country and adopt Western civilization. They were a witness to Western advances in China, the forced opening of Japan, and the disastrous consequences of the refusal of Burmese and Vietnamese rulers to make concessions to Western demands. Thus, just as the West was prepared to force the door open in Siam, King Mongkut and his advisers prepared Thailand to cope with this crisis and co-operated by opening the country voluntarily. In order to meet the Western challenge, they enthusiastically studied Western knowledge. For example, King Mongkut focused on Western science, particularly astronomy and physics; Prince Wongsathirat Sanit, his younger brother and head of the Department of the Royal Physicians, studied Western medicine. Another brother, later known as Phra Pin Klao, "second King," studied Western military science and English. In addition, several members of the bureaucratic nobility studied English and science. D. K. Wyatt describes the men who engaged in the studying of Western knowledge as follows:

These were men of high position, men well educated in the traditions of Thai culture, men who continually showed their loyalty to traditional customs, manners, practices, and ideas. All of them showed their devotion

²² William L. Bradley, "Prince Mongkut and Jesse Caswell," The Journal of the Siam Society Vol. LIY, Part I (January, 1966): 36.

to Thai Buddhism in the accustomed manner. All of them were heavily in the politics of the day and were, in Sir John Bowring's word, "patriots."²³

Not only was King Mongkut well-informed, but he was also the first "enlightenment man" in Thailand. Intellectually, he tried to rationalize Buddhist philosophy and declined to believe in the supernatural. He founded a new sect, *Thammayut* (adhering to the thamma), which borrowed the dress and disciplinary forms of the Mon sect.²⁴ This was noticed by Caswell as follows:

From six months intimacy with the inmates of this wat I have been led to conclude that there is strong tendency in the new school of priests to the rejection of every thing in religion which claims a supernatural origin, or that has any thing to do with other than the present state of existence. A Buddhist is ipso facto an atheist, as he does not acknowledge a Creator and Supreme Ruler. Still his religion is full of the supernatural—full of the past and of the future. Chau Fa and his followers, are strongly inclined, if I am not mistaken, to deny the existence of a heaven and a hell, and of any kind of a future state.²⁵

Craig Reynolds values King Mongkut's religious reforms, which denied superstition and mythology, as a sign of change among Thai intellectuals. He elaborates that the influence of these reforms and the presence of Westerners broadened the Thai intellectual perspective concerning their country and the world. They became more and more aware of themselves and their nation's past.²⁶ Before the end of King Mongkut's reign there were significant numbers of "modern Buddhists," to use the term that Henry Albaster applied at that time, both in Sangha and in the circle of

²³ D. K. Wyatt, *The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), p. 28-29.

²⁴ Ibid., p.27 quoting Cheophraya Thiphakorawong, *Phraratchaphongsawadan krung rattanakosin ratchakan thi 3...thi 4* (*The History of Ratanakosin period from the reign of king Rama III to Rama IV*) (Bangkok, 1963), p. 365.

²⁵ Bradley, 39.

²⁶ Craig Reynolds, "Buddhist Cosmography in Thai History, with Special Reference to Nineteenth-Century Culture Change," *Journal of Asian Studies* Vol. XXXV, No. 2 (February, 1976): 212.

nobles around the king.²⁷ It was the beginning of a new group of intellectuals who were interested in studying the West and accepted Western culture.

In opening and preparing the country, King Mongkut laid significant, fundamental bases - political, social, and economic for King Chulalongkorn to follow, much as the Tokugawa period did for the Meiji period in Japan. The King lead his followers to study Western knowledge such as language, military techniques and sciences. His movement broadened the Thai perspective on the world and awareness of itself in international affairs. Comparing Western learning in these two societies, we can see that in Japan it began earlier and spread wider. Japan studied "Dutch Learning" from the early part of the eighteenth century while Thailand only began to study about the West in the early nineteenth century. In the case of the Japanese they learned directly from the Dutch while Western missionaries were prevalent in case of Thailand. Later the Japanese government went a further step; they sent students abroad and established Western studies institutions and language schools. In Thailand Western learning was popular only among a small group of people in the upper class. Thus, it is not a mistake to say that in this period the level of Western studies in Thailand was relatively low compared to Japan. One reason which can explain this difference is that Thai society was not as progressive as Tokugawa society.

In foreign affairs, after a period of avoiding contact with the West from the reign of King Rama I (1782-1809) to Rama III (1824-1851), King Mongkut opened the country to the West. Near the end of King Rama III's

²⁷ Charles F. Keyes, "Buddhist Politics and Their Revolutionary Origin in Thailand," International Political Science Review (1989) Vol. 10 No. 2 : 125

reign the British, who controlled Burma as well as Malaya, came to make a treaty with Thailand. Out of fear of British power, the Thai government unwillingly signed the Burney Treaty in June 1826. However, the British were not satisfied with the content and tried to revise it. They were unable to do this in the reign of King Rama III. Being well-informed about the situation, King Mongkut, when he came to power, voluntarily signed the Bowring Treaty in 1855 with Britain, and a similar treaty with U.S.A in the following year. The Bowring Treaty was a model for treaties that were made between Thailand and most of the European powers and subsequently, Japan.

The main features of the "treaty system" established by the Bowring and subsequent treaties included extraterritoriality for Western subjects in Siam, fixed import and export duties, provided the right of residence in Bangkok, the end of government trading monopolies, and the most-favoured nation clause under which additional privileges granted in one treaty could automatically be claimed by all.

The consequence of the new treaties was to open Siam to a flood of influences from the West, which would in time transform the economy, society, government and the monarchy itself. The economic changes were obvious. In former times, the government monopolized trade and limited import and export duties. Thus, the treaty system revolutionized the whole economic structure. The growth of exports, especially rice encouraged the government to expand the canal system in the central part of the country in order to open new rice fields. The Thai depended on

reclamation of land for cultivation rather than using new technology in order to improve productivity.²⁸

Society:

Society in King Mongkut's reign was still a traditional one which as Akin²⁹ explains, was organized by man-power. The king theoretically owned all man-power. However, in order to control citizens he used the *sakdina* (dignity marks) system³⁰. It was devised by Ayudhaya King Trailokanat³¹ in 1466 and allocated grades to each person in society ranging from 5 for the commoner without a family to 100,000 for the *uparot* (the heir apparent). Those awarded 400 marks and above constituted the official class, the *noi* (patrons), grouped under their supervision were the *phrai* (commoners).³² The *noi* or patrons were responsible for producing the *phrai* when the state demanded the latter's labors, services or required their presence to answer charges in the court of law. In theory, this pattern of relationship was reproduced throughout the hierarchy, culminating in the most powerful patron of all, the king. In this way the social pyramid, with power flowing from the top down and resources from the bottom up, was conceived to facilitate the fulfillment of the King's command and

²⁸ James C. Ingram, Economic Change in Thailand Since 1850 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955), p. 48

²⁹ Akin Rabihradana, "The Organization of Thai Society in the early Bangkok Period, 1782-1873," Data paper: Number 74 Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, July 1969.

³⁰ Akin defined *sakdina* system as the most accurate guide to the different statuses of the whole population. The amount of *sakdina* one possessed correlated with the amount of manpower under one's control. The control of manpower brought two assets which were wealth and political power.

³¹ The ninth king in the Ayudhaya period ruled from 1448-1488.

³² There were two types of the *phrai*; *phrai luang*, *phrai som*. *Phrai luang* belonged to the king. They were required to serve the king (*Ratchakan*) by using government corvée labor for a period of six months in a year. *Phrai som* belonged completely to *noi*. They were not required to serve government corvée. The king could not redistribute *phrai som* or take them away from the *noi*.

requirements.³³ The *phrai* were the most valued factor of production in the economic system because only through their labor could the bounty of the rich and extensive land be harnessed.

The patrimonial rulers (kings) thus divided their subjects into two groups: those who contributed their labor and the fruits of their production to the state, and the administrative officials who controlled the king's resources on his behalf and mobilized them for his use. King Mongkut was the first King who expressed these patrimonial sentiments when he drew the distinction between the status of the *phrai* and the *noi*, in relation to the crown. To the first group, the commoners who were the majority of the population, he claimed to extend general kindness and concern. As their King, he would try to spread happiness in the kingdom and protect his people from being abused by others.³⁴ This feeling was bequeathed to King Chulalongkorn who felt sympathy to the lowest class of society—slaves. According to Mrs. Anna Leonowens, King Chulalongkorn (when he was an heir) was also concerned with the suffering in the slaves lives. She stated:

To this young prince, Chulalongkorn (sic), I was strongly attached. He often deplored with me the cruelty with which the slaves were treated, and, young as he was, did much to inculcate kindness toward them among his immediate attendants. He was a conscientious lad, of pensive habit and gentle temper; many of my poor clients I bequeathed to his care, particularly the Chinese lad Ti. Speaking of slavery one day, he said to me: "These are not slaves, but nobles; they know how to bear. It was we, the princes, who have yet to learn which is the more noble, the oppressor or the oppressed."³⁵

³³ Lysa Hong, Thailand in the Nineteenth Century Evolution of the Economy and Society (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, © 1984), p. 10.

³⁴ Ibid., quoting NL, CMH, RIV, C.S 1219, No. 77 (The National Library of Thailand, Chotmaihet, Fourth Reign, Chulasakkharat 1219)

³⁵ Anna Leonowens, The English Governess at the Siamese Court (London: Arthur Barker Ltd., 1954), p. 238.

We do not know where did King Chulalongkorn get this idea. However, during the reign of King Rama IV, there was an American Missionary, D. B. Bradley who discussed the Civil War in America and blamed slavery. He critiqued this system in *Nangsü Chatmaihei (Chronicles Book)* as follows:

It is inappropriate for a country to encourage slavery, because people are not animals and therefore should not be owned, sold or separated from their families. They possess the right of freedom. ... People in the Northern states of America did not use slaves because they considered Africans as human beings.³⁶

Some Thai nobles did not agree with Bradley's idea and tried to protect slavery in Thailand by saying that slavery in Thailand differed from that in other countries. Slavery in Thailand was a bondage system between master and slaves. Bondage was always preferable to starvation of beggary.³⁷ However, in the reign of King Rama IV an anti-slavery view began to form in Thailand. It is possible that King Chulalongkorn received this abolitionist tendency from reading or talking with missionaries transmitting American cultural values to Thailand.

Education:

Thai traditional education was initiated in monasteries. When a Thai boy began his studies at the local monastery, he typically was tutored by a particular monk, perhaps a family member or one with whom his family had some association. Most boys, however, lived within the

³⁶ Seichon Wannarat, "Fonkatop khong hmo Bradley to sangkhom tai," (The Influence of D. B. Bradley in Thai society" *Yorasan Aksansart (The Journal of Faculty of Arts)* Y. 14 p.17 quoting *The Bangkok Recorder* Vol. 1 No. 10 (July 22 1865) : 78.

³⁷ Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450-1680* (New Haven: Yale University Press, © 1988), pp. 120-136.

monastery compound and were known as *luksit* or *sitwat*.³⁸ They had to act as a servant for their teachers by helping them with their alms bowls on their morning round and assisting in the preparation and serving of meals. In return the monks would teach them to read and write, and perhaps to figure, and instruct them in the principles of Buddhism. The monks also were responsible to some extent for the *luksit*'s physical welfare, for their health and safety. Before King Chulalongkorn's reign there was no formal educational system. The education intended only that "the children learned what is good and what is bad and know how to do things".³⁹ In other words it aimed solely to produce good Buddhists.

Monastic education was supported by people in the villages and by monks. Parents sent their children to the temple in order to discipline them. Literacy was only a secondary priority because it was not needed unless a boy had a chance for future work in the government. Needless to say, the literacy rate in Thailand was low. There are no literacy rate statistics available for this period. The earliest statistic concerning the number of schools was compiled in 1885/86. There were only 29 schools in the country (19 in Bangkok and 10 in provinces) and 2,014 students at that time.⁴⁰ In comparison in Japan 40 to 50 percent of males were literate by the end of the Tokugawa period.⁴¹

Nobles' children had their own special education within the palaces. Boys and girls were trained in etiquette as well as reading and

³⁸ *Luksit* means students. *Sitwat* means monk's students.

³⁹ Nangnoi Tittiranond, "Ministers of public Instruction or Education under the Absolute Monarchy," (Thai) (M.A. Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1976), p.23.

⁴⁰ David K. Wyatt, The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn, p. 387.

⁴¹ Herbert Passin, Society and Education in Japan (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), p. 54.

writing, from aristocrats. There was no curriculum, no standard textbooks, nor even classes. The main subjects which they generally studied were reading and writing, studies of good manners and behavior, and Buddhist biography. The percentage of people who could read and write was low. This worried King Mongkut especially in the cases of legal proclamations :

There are very few people who can read legal excerpts. Even if they can read them, I wonder how much they can understand, especially rural citizens. They are illiterate. When they see governmental documents, they are immediately afraid, even though they do not know the message.⁴²

Missionaries and Thai education:

In 1828, both Catholic and Protestant missionaries re-entered Thailand after an absence since the end of the Ayudhaya period (1350-1767). They were English (Jacob Tomlin), German (Carl Gutzlaff). Later, in 1835 the American mission led by D. B Bradley followed the English and the German missions. They attempted to convert the Thai. Initially, King Mongkut did not oppose these missions and let them preach in Thailand, but few Thai converted to Christianity.

Nevertheless the coming of missionaries brought many significant things to Thai society, such as education, medicine, and the sciences. The missionaries were the first to establish an educational system in Thailand. For example, the American missionaries built the first school in 1852 at *Wat Arunratthavararam*, and the Catholic missionaries taught children in their cathedral in 1877 which was later known as *Assumption* School. Despite the fact that there were few mission

⁴² *Phrachumphrakatratthakan thii sii B.E 2401-2404 (Thai) (The Collection of Announcements in the Reign of King Mongkut 1858-1861) (Bangkok: Kurusapha, 1961), p. 2.*

schools,⁴³ these schools were very popular among the upper classes. They preferred to send their children to missionary schools over monasteries because at mission schools their children could learn English and other subjects. English especially was regarded as a very valuable subject, due to King Mongkut 's favor of English as a tool to study world news.

Furthermore, King Mongkut himself also invited missionaries' wives to teach his children in the royal palace. Sometimes, he hired foreign teachers from abroad, such as Mrs. Anna Leonowens and Mr. Francis George Patterson. King Mongkut revealed his feelings against religious proselytizing at this time. In his letter to Mrs. Leonowens, he mentioned his aim in hiring her as follows:

We are in good pleasure, and satisfaction of heart, that you are willing to undertake the education of our beloved royal children...you will make your best effort to transmit knowledge of the English language, science, and literature, and not towards conversion to Christianity; as the followers of Buddha are mostly aware of the powerfulness of truth and virtue, as are the followers of Christ, and they are desirous to have ability in the English language and literature, more than new religions.⁴⁴

Missionary education also illustrated to the government the importance of education. Later, when Prince Damrong arranged education in the palace, he asked assistance from Samuel. G. McFarland, the principal of a mission school. They attempted to use a Western model in the new palace school.

With the awareness of Western power, King Mongkut prepared both his children and the children of noble families through imported Western education. He hired foreign teachers to teach English in the palace.

⁴³ Suphanee Kanchanattithi, "The Role of Missionary in Thailand during the reign of King Rama III to King Rama V" (Thai) (M. A Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1964), pp. 234-6.

⁴⁴ Leonowens, p. VII.

In 1871 King Chulalongkorn followed his father's footsteps by establishing *Ratchakuman* school in the palace as a model school.

Western knowledge was widespread and popular among Thai royal families and nobles, especially military technology. For example, Chaofa krommakhun Itsaret (the second king in the reign of King Mongkut) was commissioned by King Rama III to reconstruct, "after Western models," the ancient fortifications at Paknam. Working with a corps of European engineers and artisans, he eagerly acquired the English language. Through language and being a friend of various foreigners, he improved his acquaintance with the Western sciences and arts of navigation, naval construction and armament and gunnery. He was described by Gutzloff as follows:

Chow-fa-nooi, the younger brother of the late king and the rightful heir of the crown, is a youth of about 23, possessing some abilities, which are however swallowed up in childishness. He speaks the English language; can write a little, imitate works of European artisan; and is a decided friend of European sciences and Christianity. He courts the friendship of every European; holds free conversation with him, and is anxious to learn whatever he can.⁴⁵

Second to King Mongkut, he was a man who could master English and Western culture. Moreover he also translated a gunnery textbook from English into Thai in 1841. This book was used in training the Annamese artillery. Another noble, Chaophraya Si Suriyawong, was interested in building ships and built the first steam ship in Thailand christened "Ariel."

Western ideological influence can be most clearly seen in the impact of science on the Thai's perception of the world. From the Sukothai

⁴⁵ B. J. Terwiel, *A History of Modern Thailand 1767-1942* (London: University of Queensland Press, 1983), p.142 quoting K. Gutzloff, "Journal of a Residence in Siam," *Chinese Repository* 1 (1832) :19.

period (13th -15th centuries) to the early nineteenth century, *Traiphumi of Phra Ruang* (Three-Worlds Cosmography of Phra Ruang, later called *Traiphumikhata*), which was compiled in Siamese prose from the Pali canon and commentaries, was used to explain Thai cosmography.⁴⁶ The structure of the *Traiphumikhata* cosmography began with hells and ended with the heavens, the cosmography ranks all beings from demons to deities in a hierarchy of merit which accrues according to karma- the physical, cognitive, and verbal actions of past lives. It was unquestioningly used to express Buddhist principles and to explain natural phenomena.

As Thailand entered a new era, the *Traiphumikhatha* had to compete with Western systems of thought. The traditional explanations for natural phenomena--planetary movement, weather, biological processes--were shaken by explanations offered by Western science. *Kitchanukit* (A Book Explaining Various Things) is a good example of Western influences. It was written by Chaophraya Thiphakorawong (Khum Bunnag), King Mongkut's Minister of Foreign Affairs, and published in 1867 entirely under Siamese sponsorship. The author aimed at releasing people from the magical arts. For each topic, he started with a question, provided the traditional explanation, criticized that traditional belief, and ended with an explanation using scientific and geographical analysis. For example, in the explanation of rain, he had the following comment:

Question: Why does it rain in the rainy season and not rain in the dry season?.....According to the *Traiphumikhata*, when the sun is in the South near Angel Vassavara (the angel for rain)'s palace, he is afraid of the heat and does not come out from his palace. So, there was no rain in the dry season. When the sun moves to the North, the Vassavara angel comes out

⁴⁶ Reynolds, " Buddhist Cosmography in Thai History, with Special Reference to Nineteenth-Century Culture Change," : 203.

from his palace. So, the rain falls. There are another two explanations. One is that the wind blows water from the gigantic pond in *Himmaphan* forest to the earth. The other is that the dragon plays with water and blows water in the air, and the wind blows that water to the earth. We can not prove all of these arguments. Where is Vassavarahog angel's palace? Where is the *Himmaphan* forest? If it is in the north, all of the rain must come from the North. Actually, rain comes from all directions.....Water evaporates, this vapor accumulates in the air. In summer, the heat melts ice. The earth's gravity makes this water drop, which we call rain. So, the rain is colder than other water because it came from ice.....⁴⁷

Craig Reynolds believes that *Kitchanukit* reveals a significant change in Thai intellectuals from the *Traiphumikato* cosmography to ideas of two worlds: 'the natural and the religious world, each category of phenomena having a set of "laws" which guided its working.'⁴⁸ We cannot deny the Thai perception of the world in this book was strongly influenced by Western science. So, Thai elites, such as King Mongkut and Chaophraya Thiphakorawong, perceived that "world matters and religious matters are not the same."⁴⁹

In the reign of King Mongkut Western studies, especially language, were studied in Thailand. Unfortunately, this kind of education was available only to a few people. So, it is no wonder that by the reign of King Chulalongkorn the group of people who led the country in its adoption to Western civilization came from the upper class which had this educational privilege in society.

The "intellectual situation" of the Japanese was more receptive to reform and Westernization than the Thai. During the 250 years of

⁴⁷ Thiphakorawong, Chaophraya. *Kitchanukit* (A Book Explaining Various Things or Duties, Great and Small) (Bangkok, 1965), p. 12.

⁴⁸ Reynolds, "Buddhist Cosmography..." p. 215.

⁴⁹ Thiphakorawong, *Kitchanukit*, p.173.

Tokugawa government, the Japanese socio-economic condition were tremendously transformed. Japan changed from an agrarian society to a commercialized society. The merchant class grew in wealth. Samurai and the government financially depended on merchants. The Tokugawa could not cope with these changes and were faced with both financial and ideological problems. Contrary to the bakufu, the Western domains such as Chōshū and Satsuma could solve economic problems and strengthened themselves both in economy and military power. The coming of the West in 1853 vividly illustrated bakufu weakness. Finally in 1868 under the lead of Chōshū and Satsuma the bakufu was overthrown and imperial power restored.

Even though the socio-political condition in the Tokugawa period was collapsing, the intellectual situation was very progressive. The samurai who were trained in both traditional knowledge and Western knowledge eagerly studied the West not only in a military sense but also in an economic and political sense. Sakuma Shōzan coined the most popular slogan, "Eastern values and Western Knowledge." The government in both levels, the bakufu and han, supported Western studies by establishing language schools and Western studies institutions (*Bansho shiraba shō*) and by sending students to study abroad. Many of them such as Nishi Amone, Tsuda Mamichi and Nakamura Keiu were later members of the *Meirokusha*. Moreover standard education was widely spread also among commoners. *Terakoya* schools were established through out the country. Thus, by the end of Tokugawa period despite the fact that the old political system was collapsing intellectual vigor remained strong. The Japanese were ready to accept new knowledge and use these new ideas in their society.

In Thailand the socio-economic system was not transformed as much as in Japan. Because of the "treaty system," the Thai economy changed from a self-sufficient economy to an export oriented economy. Rice became the main export product. The government expanded rice fields in order to increase productivity. There was no significant change in society. The majority of citizens were divided into two groups; commoners and slaves. Standard education did not exist in society. Children, especially boys, were sent to monasteries to study. Moral study was emphasized over the practical skill of reading and writing. Because of the presence of the West in Asia King Mongkut encouraged his followers to study the West. However, only the small group of people in the upper class could acquire Western knowledge such as astronomy, physics and military techniques through missionaries. They emphasized studying language over other subjects. Thai students did not have a chance to study directly from the West. However, Western sciences affected Thai perspectives about the world.

It is not mistake to conclude that in comparing the "intellectual situation" in both countries, Thailand was comparatively low in both quality and quantity. in the Japanese case there were many factors that helped intellectuals to have a broad and active view about the West. This is due partially to the chance some had to acquire knowledge directly from the West, while in the Thai case, Western knowledge was gained second hand from missionaries. Moreover, Western knowledge in Thailand was harder to acquire and limited to the nobility when compared to the Japanese case. Japanese and Thai intellectuals also differed in the areas of study. Japanese intellectuals were more interested in diverse subjects such as medicine, mathematics, astronomy, and military science while the

Thai were primarily interested in language with some military science. All these differences resulted in a differing *raison d'etre* for Western study. The Japanese learned about the West in order to become one with the West, while the Thai learned about the West simply in order to survive. I will discuss their similarities and differences in the following chapter.

Chapter II

The Meirokusha and the Young Siam

In order to understand the attitudes and ideas of the *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam* towards modernization, we need to examine their personal backgrounds as well as the socio-political situations of their respective countries. In this chapter, the socio-political situations which existed in both countries and which affected the characteristics of these two groups are discussed. Group members will be compared and contrasted in terms of educational background, family, and publication history. This comparison will give us a better definition of these intellectual groups.

A) The socio-political situation in the early Meiji and the early period of King Chulalongkorn's reign

1) Japan.

a) Politics

The Meiji Restoration changed the political landscape of Japan from a dual system of government which had existed from the Kamakura shogun to a newly unified nation under imperial aegis. In 1868 young samurai¹ from four western domains overthrew the bakufu, restored

¹ They were samurai from the Court, and han such as Satsuma, Chōshū, Tosa, and Hizen.
From the Court:

Senjō Sanetomi (1837-1891)

Iwakura Tomomi (1825-1883)

From Satsuma:

the emperor to power and began the transformation of traditional Japanese politics, society, and economy.

These were young (average age slightly over thirty in 1868) energetic and enthusiastic men primarily from lower class samurai families. Kido, an exception, came from a higher status samurai family. Many had received special training during the Tokugawa period either military or Western studies. Saigō, Hirose, Itagaki and others were military commanders of han units. Several had been abroad including Godai,

Ōkubo Toshimichi (1830-1878)
 Terashima Munenori (1833-1893)
 Godai Tomoatsu (1835-1885)
 Saigō Takamari (1828-1877)
 Kuroda Kiyotaka (1840-1900)
 Matsukata Masayoshi (1837-1924)

From Chōshū:

Takesugi Shinsaku (1839-1867)
 Kido Kōin (1833-1877)
 Ōmura Masujirō (1824-1869)
 Itō Hirobumi (1841-1909)
 Inoue Kaoru (1835-1915)
 Yamamoto Aritomo (1838-1922)
 Hirose Saneomi (1833-1871)

From Tosa:

Itagaki Taisuke (1837-1919)
 Gotō Shōjirō (1837-1897)
 Fukuoka Kōtei (1835-1919)
 Sakamoto Ryōma (1835-1867)

From Hizen:

Etō Shimpei (1834-1874)
 Ōkuma Shigenobu (1838-1922)
 Soejima Taneomi (1828-1905)
 Ōki Taketō (1832-1899)

Others:

Yokoi Shōnan (1809-1869, Kumamoto)
 Katsu Kaishū (1823-1899, Bakufu)
 Yuri Kimimasa (1829-1909, Fukui)
 Inoue Kawashi (1844-1895, Kumamoto)

Itō, Inoue, and Katsu. Others had close associations with Westerners in Japan: Ōkubo, Saigō and Okuma had long conversations with Satow, the English interpreter.² Some such as Yamagata, Kido, and Itō studied under Yoshida Shōin³ who emphasized loyalty to the emperor. Huber contends that this notion of loyalty to the throne strongly influenced the Meiji leaders.⁴

Dissatisfaction with traditional society, together with the idea of imperial restoration, drew these young samurai together to overthrow the bakufu. At the time they did not have a clear blueprint for the future. They aimed only to achieve one ultimate goal: to secure the state and to strengthen it against the West. This could only be accomplished by leashing western science and military technology to the defense of the Japanese spirit. Some such as Ōkubo and Itō urged greater adoption from the West including the industrial model. This is illustrated in Ōkubo's statement of 1874 dealing with the encouragement of industry:

We have come to a point where all the internal conflicts have ceased, and the people can now enjoy peace and can securely engage in their respective callings. This is the most opportune time for the government and its officials to adopt a protective policy which has as its goal the enhancement of people's livelihood...

² John Whitney Hall, Japan: From Prehistory to Modern Times (New York: Delacorte Press, ©1968), p.270.

³ Yoshida Shōin (1831-1860), samurai of the Chōshū clan and zealous promoter of the Imperial cause and the expulsion of foreigners. In Edo, he along with Sakura Shōzan, studied things foreign and wishing to see Europeans at home, they went to Nagasaki, secretly to embark on a Russian ship, but at their arrival found the ship had already left. The following year (1854), when Commander Perry's fleet returned to Shimoda, they asked to be taken to America, but were refused. The Bakufu hearing of this put them in prison. Later, he returned to Chōshū, opened a school and gathered about him a group of shishi passionately committed to the Imperial Institution and to national defense. He had a strong influence on Chōshū samurai.

⁴ Thomas Huber, The Revolutionary Origins of Modern Japan (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1981), p.209.

An example can be found in England which is a very small country. However, she is an island nation and has excellent harbors. She is also richly endowed with mineral resources....⁵

The Meiji leadership benefited from the existence of the *Meirokusha*, a group of intellectuals interested in things Western, to supply various ideas and Western models from which they then could pick and choose. The pragmatic nature of the Meiji leadership allowed them to change as necessity dictated. The fact that the intellectuals were not of the leadership cohort allowed them greater time to develop their ideas and greater maneuverability, and freed them from any stake in maintenance of the status quo. Thailand's case was to be very different for there the intellectuals and the leaders were one and the same.

In order to establish a unified nation, the Meiji leaders gradually transformed the political system of Japan: First a new name for the capital, Tokyo, and the transfer of the throne from Kyoto. Next the domains were transferred to the throne in 1869 with the former daimyo transformed into "governors." In 1871 these han were officially converted into prefectures. The creation of the Home Ministry in 1873 finished the task of centralizing prefectures, for new governors were appointed in Tokyo and local administration fell under central control. On the map and on paper a fully unified nation was created by 1873. However domestic unrest continued sporadically through the mid-1860s highlighted by the Satsuma rebellion in 1867 and ending with the Kabasan Incident of 1864.

On the international scene, Meiji leaders were keenly aware of the dangers posed by Western imperialism. The Opium war and subsequent

⁵ David John Lu, *Sources of Japanese History* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, ©1974), p. 48 quoting Ōkubo Toshiaki et al., *Kindaishi Shiryo* (*Document on Modern History*) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965), pp. 53-54.

imperialist forays remained vivid in Japan's memory. The threat of imperialism prompted the Meiji leaders to build a stronger state and to practice restraint in foreign policy (as illustrated in the decision not to invade Korea in 1873). In the early years of Meiji, Japan was relatively stable and peaceful, a situation much more conducive to modernization. In contrast, Thailand, poised between British Burma and British Malaya, was much more threatened by the possibility of colonialism.

b) Society

Society was also transformed in Meiji Japan. The four class system of samurai, artisan, farmer, and merchant, established in the Tokugawa period was abolished. Samurai privileges from sword-carrying to administrative positions were abolished. Even their military monopoly disappeared with the establishment of a conscript army in 1873. Now in theory every male regardless of social rank was eligible to be drafted into the national army to serve three years of active duty and four in reserve. The conscription completed the abolition of the samurai class:

"Neither the samurai nor the common people will have the status they were accustomed to in the past...nor will there be any distinction in the service they render to their country, for they will all be alike as subjects of the Empire."⁶

Former samurai turned to other occupations. Some went into business, others found jobs as policemen, teachers, military officers and petty officials. This abolition of hereditary status freed the energies and talents of the young Japanese for the task of building the new Japan.

⁶ Peter Duus, The Rise of Modern Japan (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, © 1976), p.81 quoting Joseph Pittau, Political Thought in Early Meiji Japan, 1868-1889 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 23.

The societal changes also benefited the other classes. The late Tokugawa period economy favored commerce through the expansion of interregional trade, the commercialization of agriculture, the low rate of taxation and the increased availability of capital in local areas. The Meiji Restoration brought the elimination of trade restrictions. Merchants were now free to trade domestically and abroad, free to accumulate more wealth. Farmers also benefited. The commercialized economy of the late Tokugawa period led to the growth of rural industry and by-employment. Rural entrepreneurs and landlords developed to take advantage of the burgeoning economy. The Meiji Restoration continued their good fortune by ending the restrictions on land alienation and ownership. Farmers could now sell and buy land. The rising fortunes of merchants and farmers was a significant factor in modernization.

In addition Japan benefited from a high literacy rate. The Meiji leaders also recognized the need for a comprehensive modern educational system along with the abolition of feudalism in 1871 and national conscription in 1873. In 1871 the Iwakura mission was sent to Europe. Understanding Western educational systems was one of their aims. Tanaka Fujimaro, (soon to become Vice-Minister of Education), wrote fifteen volumes of observations on his return home. He stated the importance of mass education. While the government convened study commissions and experts to prepare for educational development, modern schools were established in various areas. For example, in 1869, 60 modern schools were built in Kyoto; in 1879, primary schools housed in modern-style buildings opened in Osaka and Tokyo.⁷ The government also called for domains to send

⁷ Herbert Passin, Society and Education in Japan (Tokyo; Kodansha International Ltd., 1982), p. 65.

their talented youth to study in Tokyo. In October 1868 the government established the School Commission to prepare for a new educational system and to supervise existing facilities. Fukuzawa Yukichi who was already well known for his view of Western learning and his prolific writings was a member in the Commission. Along with the new educational system, in the fields the old educational system, *terakoya* was also promoted.

2) Thailand

a) Politics.

In 1868, King Mongkut passed away, when the Crown Prince (later King Chulalongkorn) was only 15 years old. In order to secure his son's enthronement, King Mongkut enlisted powerful bureaucrats to support his son in the future. Moreover, he requested Chaophraya Si Suriyawong (Chuang Bunnag), the most powerful bureaucrat at that time, to serve as a regent until the boy-king came of age. Chaophraya Si Suriyawong agreed and served the boy-king until 1873.

Powerless, King Chulalongkorn reigned rather than ruled. Power was in the hands of old bureaucratic families such as the Bunnag (Chaophraya Si Suriyawong's surname) who had control of important positions and factions in the government. King Chulalongkorn later described his situation in a letter to his son:

Only 15 years old, I was enthroned. I was powerless as the almost extinguished lamp.⁹

⁹ *Chumnum pha ratchaniphon nai ratchakan thi ha phapokinaka phao 1* (Thai) (A Collection of King Chulalongkorn's Writing, Part 1) "Phraratchathetarake phraratchathan somdet phraboromorsatirat choofa Yachirunnahit 23 May R.S 112" ("King Chulalongkorn's letter to

As regent, Chaophraya Si Suriyawong appointed his sons and followers to important positions in the government. For example, his nephew, Chaophraya Surawong succeeded him as Kalahom (Minister of Military Affairs); a son, Chaophraya Phanuwong (Thuam Bunnag) took over the Phrakhleng (Ministry of Finance). As D.K. Wyatt explains, Thai politics in the early period of King Chulalongkorn was divided into three factions, *Young Siam, Conservative Siam* and *Old Siam*.⁹ These factions correspond to the parties of the king, the regent, and the old nobles. In addition conflict arose between the King and an heir (Prince Wichaiyan)¹⁰ which became known as the Front Palace Crisis of 1875. D. K. Wyatt writes that this crisis brought the country to "the brink of civil war."¹¹ Prince Wichaiyan sought British assistance; the British refused to intervene and the King regained control. This crisis was of much more than immediate significance, for it brought into sharp focus all the dangers and the intractability of the political environment in which King Chulalongkorn had to work.

Prince Yachirunnahit, an heir, dated on 23 rd May 1893") (In commemorating the death of Phrachao boromwongther phraongchao Prapharphanpirai, 1950), p.10- 11.

⁹ D. K Wyatt, The Political of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn , p. 43- 44.

¹⁰ Prince Wichaiyan was an heir because of the ex-regent's support. King Chulalongkorn did not choose this heir by himself. So, late in 1874, some of the more radical of King Chulalongkorn's supporters in the Privy Council began to attack Prince Wichaiyan, demanding, in effect, that the King's right to choose his own heir be restored. This led to The Front Crisis which D. K. Wyatt described in his book, Thailand: A Short History: "Wichaiyan, feeling threatened and seeing the young King's strength growing, as a result of the reforms, began to call in his troops and drill them in the Front Palace grounds in the dead of night. When informed, King Chulalongkorn strengthened his own palace guard. Then, on the night of December 28-29, 1874, a fire was set near the gunpowder storehouse and gasworks in King Chulalongkorn's palace, and Wichaiyan's troops arrived at the gate, fully armed, and demanding admission in order to assist in putting out the fire. They were refused admission, the fire was quenched, and both parties stood tensely awaiting the next move."

¹¹ David K. Wyatt, Thailand: A Short History (New Haven: Yale University Press, ©1982), p. 193.

The *Young Siam* was the most progressive among these three factions and they encouraged the upper class to accept Western civilization. King Chulalongkorn, as a leader of the young group, gradually and zealously attempted to regain power by reforming the country. In 1873 he was twenty years old and insisted upon a second coronation in order to declare his maturity and his right to the throne. After that coronation he reformed the legislative system by establishing the Privy Council and the State Council. Finally, in 1888, both traditional groups (*Conservative Siam* and *Old Siam*) lost power because of Chaophraya Si Suriyawong's death. King Chulalongkorn made slow and careful reforms in the administrative system. Ministers-designate were chosen, almost all of whom were the king's brothers such as Prince Damrong Rajanubhab (minister-designate of the ministry of Public Instruction). This was the first step in the adoption of Western institutions which was completed in 1892. Even though Thailand established a cabinet, the king still held absolute power and exercised this through his own men.

Instability was not limited to the central government, but also ran rampant in the countryside. Government power was not effectively centralized. Parts of the country on the northern, eastern and southern borders were financially and politically independent. They were tied to the central government only through recognition of the king's sovereignty. Periodically they rebelled against central authority such as the "Holy Man's" uprising of 1901-1902. During the period 1874-1902, the government also fought the "Haw" and the Shan¹² who continued to invade the northern part of Thailand. This instability was heightened by the fact that Thailand was

¹² "Haw" is a group of Chinese who came to Southeast Asia by land. The Shan are of a group of Tai-speaking people living in Burma, Thailand and Southern China.

surrounded by Western colonies, such as Malaya (English), Burma (English) and Laos (French).

Colonialism had a long history in Southeast Asia. The British arrived in Burma prior to their incursion into China. In February 1885, after several wars between Burma and England, Burma was annexed to British India. Furthermore, in the East, the French colonized Laos and Cambodia. The imperial desires of England and France were not satisfied with these territories and both attempted to expand their power into Thailand. King Chulalongkorn appeased these desires by granting some areas in order to save the country as a whole. The most severe crisis occurred in 1893 between France and Thailand when France blockaded the Gulf of Siam with battleships. Thailand was forced to give the left side of the Maekhong river and to allow the French military to be stationed in Thailand for a certain time.¹³ Between 1886-1909, Thailand lost extensive territory, approximately 176,000 square miles.¹⁴ However, the government felt it was bearable in order to preserve national independence. Moreover, these areas were loosely held vassal states and border areas, often ethnically non-Thai, rather than integral parts of the kingdom. These events warned leaders of

¹³ In detail see Sodsai Khantiworapong, "Thailand and the French Indochina Question" (M. A thesis: Chulalongkorn University, 1977).

¹⁴ During this period Thailand lost the following areas to both England and France:

- 1) Penang- governed by England in 1886 and 1900.
- 2) Tanossee annexed by Burma in 1893
- 3) Kampuchea(except Phratabong Siemrat and Seesopol)-controlled by France in 1867.
- 4) Sibsongchuthai and Huapanthanghathanghog ruled by France in 1888.
- 5) The left bank of the Maekhong river annexed by France after the crisis of 1893, and French troops to Chantaburee (1893-1904) and Trad (1904-1906)
- 6) The right side of the Maekhong river opposite of Luangphrabang was occupied by France in 1904.
- 7) Phratabong, Siemrat and Seesopol were French territories in 1907.
- 8) Kelantan, Trengganu, Kedah and Perlis and nearby islands were given to England in 1909.

the need for political change and military reform in order to meet the imperialist challenge.

b) Society

There was not a great change in Thai society in the early period of King Chulalongkorn. The population remained fixed into two broad classes—the rulers and the ruled.¹⁵ The rulers were the king, the royal family and government officials. The ruled were the *phrai*, the laboring class. They were required to pay a head tax, or, as an alternative, to serve the government for three months each year. There were no “freemen” in the Western sense. The *phrai* had a direct relationship to the *nai* (government officials). The *phrai* worked for the *nai*; in return, the *nai* gave them legal protection. Therefore they were more loyal to the *nai* than to the King. This type of social structure limited the King's maneuverability in directing modernization.

Furthermore, the king was also faced with a largely illiterate population. Traditional Thai education was ineffective. Despite the fact that Thai boys traditionally studied in monasteries, the literacy rate was quite low. According to Bishop Pallegoix's memoirs, only 20 boys in 100 who had studied in monasteries could read, and only 10 in that 20 could write.¹⁶ Phraya Anuman Rajadhon partially blamed this on the poor quality of teachers. Among monks who acted as teachers, only a few were literate.¹⁷ In

¹⁵ H. G. Quaritch Wales, Ancient Siamese Government and Administration (London: Bernard Quaritch Ltd., 1934), p. 40-59.

¹⁶ Pallegoix, Laorüang Krung Sayam. (Thai) (Story of Thailand), trans. Santa T. Komolbuth, (Bangkok: Kaowna publisher, 1963), p. 2.

¹⁷ Satiakoset (Phraya Anuman Rajadhon), Chevit Chao Thai Samai Kon (Thai) (Traditional of the Thai Royal Family), p. 145, 148.

other words, there was no well developed education system- no curriculum, no evaluation, no examinations.

In conclusion, the Thai socio-political situation at this time did not encourage Thai development. Internationally, not only was the country in danger from imperialism but internally it lacked well-educated men to work for society. Thai intellectuals and leaders recognized this problem and sought a solution. Fortunately, there were already some ideas and trends about adapting society that had existed since the end of King Mongkut's reign and were bequeathed to King Chulalongkorn. We will discuss this issue later.

A comparison of Japan and Thailand shows that the social and political situation in Japan was more stable and thus easier to develop than in Thailand. Internationally, the threat from imperialism was more evident in Thailand because her boundaries were adjacent to Western colonies such as Burma (in the West), Laos and Cambodia (in the Northeast and the East) and Malaya (in the South). England and France also attempted to colonize Thailand. The government accepted the loss of some areas in order to preserve its independence. Moreover, with the "treaties system" many countries such as England, France and Japan gained extraterritoriality in Thailand. Japan was less threatened by imperialism than Thailand simply because it was an island. Only a country with strong naval power, such as Great Britain, could threaten Japan.

Internally, the Meiji restoration discarded the old system leaving an unobstructed path for a new system. The government united the country before undergoing development. In 1871 the government announced the abolition of the domains and the divisions of the country into prefectures. The Home Ministry was established in 1874 to take charge of

internal affairs. In Thailand government power was diffused between old and new elites each with a different agenda. The government developed the country while it strengthened and centralized its power. Moreover, the government did not completely control all parts of the country. The further an area was from the capital, the less power the government had over that area. These areas were politically and economically independent and merely acknowledged the sovereignty of the capital.

Socially, Japanese society was more ready to develop. Social restrictions were abolished. A man of talent could rise in society. Literacy in the country was high compared to Thailand. Professor Pyle concluded that in the early Meiji period Japan had "extraordinary intellectual mobility."⁶³ While in Thailand, society remained restricted. Commoners were not free; they were under the corvée system. Some of citizens were slaves. Literacy was very low compared to Japan. Thai education did not facilitate development.

Moreover, if we look at the intellectual groups, Japan was also luckier due to the fact that there were two separate groups concerned with national development; the government leaders and the intellectuals. Both were well-informed about the national situation and Western culture. A consensus concerning change was also shared by the young and open-minded leaders. While in Thailand political leaders and intellectuals were the same group of people. They had two jobs to accomplish at the same time. So, they did not have as much maneuverability as the Japanese intellectuals. The domestic and external dissimilarities in the situations of these two countries made the means to achieve their ultimate goal- survival-

⁶³ Pyle, The Making of Modern Japan, p. 63.

tremendously different. Japan aimed at making a new strong and wealthy nation and catching up with the West; but in Thailand the government aimed for simply ensuring national survival by centralizing power and developing the country.

B: Compare and contrast characteristics of the intellectual groups: the *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam*.

In the late nineteenth century, Japanese and Thai intellectual groups (the *Meirokusha* in Japan and the *Young Siam* in Thailand) led society to accept Western civilization. Both were established in 1873 and shared the goal of educating the people of their respective countries. However, they were different in various aspects, such as their family and educational backgrounds, their attitude toward their own societies and their aims for their respective countries. In this section, I will discuss their similarities and differences.

1) The Japanese Intellectual Group.

a) the *Meirokusha*

In 1873, a group of intellectuals came together in order to educate Japanese society in Western studies. The founder was a former Japanese Consul (*banri kashi*) to the United States, Mori Arinori. Mori became acquainted with American intellectual groups and consulted with Nishimura Shigeki, a famous Confucianist. Nishimura describes the origins of the *Meirokusha* in a work called *Qiji Roku* (Record of the Past)

In the summer of 1873 Mr. Mori, who was formerly from Satsuma, returned from America...and met with me. He said: 'In America

scholars form learned societies where they can mutually study the arts and sciences and hold lectures. The public benefit from this. In Japan scholars are isolated and without mutual communication. The public is little benefited by their learning. I should like to organize Japanese scholars into the type of scholarly society prevalent in America. The purpose of the society shall be mutual discussion and study. Of late we have witnessed the moral decline of the Japanese people and the end is not yet in sight. Here indeed is a real task for scholars! If we establish a society, its purpose should be to advance learning and to establish models of morality. I thought this good and agreed...The society was called the *Meirakusha* because it was established in 1873, the sixth year of Meiji. Up to that time Japanese scholarship had been limited to learning of Japan and China and Western learning was relatively unknown. The teaching of the *Meirakusha* was largely confined to new Western theories and many government officials and scholars came to listen and participate. Subsequently a magazine was published called the *Meiraku Zasshi*, which was the progenitor of Japanese magazines.¹⁹

From this writing, we can see that the *Meirakusha* had two aims: one to advance the level of scholarship, and two, to establish moral standards. In order to achieve these goals, they used meetings, discussions and the magazine, *Meiraku Zasshi*, as tools.

There were 4 types of members in the *Meirakusha*.

1. Staff. Initially there were 10 members in this group: Mori Arinori, Nishimura Shigeki, Fukuzawa Yukichi, Nakamura Keiu, Nishi Amane, Katō Hiroyuki, Tsuda Mamichi and Mitakuri Shōhei, Sugi Ryōji, and Kisaku Rinsyō. They attended the meetings and generally worked for the organization. In Meiji 7 (1874) five more joined: Hatakeyama Yoshinari, Sugita Gentan, Shimizu Saburo, Sakatani Shiroshi, Tsuda Sen.

2 Correspondents or reporters. They lived in other areas and sent reports or articles to the *Meirakusha* but did not attend meetings.

3 Honorary members.

¹⁹ Masaaki Kosaka, *Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era*, trans. David Abosch (Tokyo: Pan Pacific Press, Centenary Culture Council Series Vol IX, 1958), p. 61-62.

4 Special (Guest) members. They came from other areas and occasionally joined the meetings.

The total number of members ranged from twenty seven to twenty nine. Many worked for the government such as Mori Arinori (Ministry of Education, 1885-1888), Nishi Amane (worked in Ministry of Military), and Nishimura Shigeki (worked in the Ministry of Education). Generally, they came from the samurai class and were educated in both traditional and Western knowledge (*Yōgaku*).

I will concentrate on the primary group, the staff, especially those who wrote articles in *Meiraku Zasshi*. Judging from those articles, we can see that all critically discussed several subjects such as politics (popular assembly, the government), society (the distinction between husbands and wives, human social intercourse), religion and Western culture. Their opinions were different and varied partially due to their family and educational backgrounds.

1) Family Background.

All of the *Meirakusha*, except Nishimura Shigeki, were born into middle or low-rank samurai families (see Appendix F) and thus were faced with the socio-economic problems of the Bakumatsu period. Some of them had been financially dependent on merchants. Fukuzawa's situation is typical of the *Meirakusha*. He was born in Nakatsu Han, as the youngest child of a low ranking, but well- educated and informed samurai. His family had financial difficulties and was forced to borrow money from a merchant. He remained adamant that it was inherently unfair for his father, who had talent and knowledge, to suffer in life. This suffering made a strong impression on Fukuzawa's childhood and underlines his famous phrase,

*Monbatsu Seida wa oya no kataki de gazaru*²⁰ (lineage society was my father's enemy). He blamed the hierarchical social system for his father's misery and propounded a social system based on merit rather than on heredity. In this new system knowledge was to be the path out of poverty. The families of Tsuda, Katō and Nishi also suffered from economic and political problems (*Seiseinan*).²¹

The inequality inherent in the social structure and their personal socio-economic suffering made this group of samurai feel antagonistic to the traditional system. This antagonism was heightened when they went abroad to travel or study. For example Fukuzawa went to America in 1860, to Europe in 1862 and back to America in 1867. Western notions such as equality, humanity, and independence seemed very attractive to these discontented travellers. They came home with a common consensus that the new Japan should be a country where the benefit of the people was paramount, a country which did not ignore the people's welfare.

2) Educational Background.

All of the *Mairakusha* were well-educated men in both traditional and Western education. When young, they studied Confucianism as was common for samurai children. Later they had a chance to acquire Western knowledge and language from several schools in Nagasaki, Osaka and Edo. Dutch Learning (*Rangaku*) which came to Japan through Nagasaki gave them significant Western knowledge especially in the sciences. It was strongly supported by Shogun Yoshimune who was interested in Western

²⁰ Kanse Iida, *Fukuzawa Yukichi* (Japanese) (Tokyo: Chuo, 1984), p. 9.

²¹ Aso Yoshiteru, *Kinsei Nihon Tetsugakushi* (Japanese) (History of Recent Japanese Philosophy) (Tokyo; n. p, 1942), p.82

sciences and decided to encourage the study of the Dutch language. By his order in 1750, Japanese Explanation of Dutch Botany (*Oranda Honsa Waga*) was published, and in 1758 a Dutch Dictionary was completed. Dutch Learning was thus extended from the small circle of Nagasaki interpreters to the shogun's palace itself. The great wave of interest in Dutch learning started in 1774 when *Tafel Anatomia* (Dutch Anatomy) was published and openly circulated. Realizing the importance of Western sciences the Japanese name for foreign studies became *rangaku* (the *ran* being extracted from "Oranda") in place of the old *bangaku* or "barbarian learning," indicating the new dignity in which they were held. The study of Dutch medicine was in any case the object of most of the men who turned to *rangaku*. Dutch Learning was a great stepping-stone to greater knowledge of European sciences. Later on, the famous *Yōgaku* (Western School) was established by Sakura Shōzan, Ogata Koan and Mitsukuri Genpo who became aware of the importance of Western knowledge. Most of the *Meirokusha* members went to study in this school. So, when some of them such as Nakamura Keiu, Tsuda Mamichi, Nishi Amane and Mori Arinori went to study abroad or worked in foreign countries, they already had a great deal of knowledge in Western sciences. Thus, Western society, politics and economy seemed to be more interesting to them than sciences. These subjects were new and were critical to national power. For these reasons they focused their studies on these subjects and came back with fresh and enthusiastic ideas to promote Western knowledge in Japan. As Nishimura Shigeki mentioned in *Oji Roku*, Mori wanted to establish the *Meirokusha* to educate society in a fashion similar to American scholars.

It is interesting to note that almost all of the *Meirokusha* knew Dutch and English as second and third languages. These languages aided

their acquisition of Western knowledge and civilization, for they were able to learn from original Western sources. Thus they were able to directly compare ideas of Western and Japanese culture and to judge the best course for Japan. The Meiji leaders could then choose from the new models and ideas introduced into Japanese society by the *Meirokusha*

3) Characteristics.

As mentioned, this group was composed of intellectuals- both Confucian and Western- who met every month to discuss issues. Moreover, they also published *Meiroku Zasshi* from 1874 to November 1875 (a total of 43 issues). Tsuda was the most prolific author, followed by Sakatani Shiroshi. Their attitudes toward Western civilization are evident from these articles. Those attitudes can be divided into two groups: liberal²² and conservative. Both of these groups shared a common feeling of antagonism to traditional society and both wanted to create a new society. However, they differed on the nature of this new society. Some wanted to imitate Western civilization, spiritually and institutionally, while others called for the maintenance of Japanese values.

The liberal group included: Fukuzawa Yukichi, Katō Hiroyuki, Tsuda Mamichi and Nishi Amane. The conservatives: Nishimura Shigeki, Mori Arinori, Nakamura Keiu and Sakatani Shiroshi.

The liberals strongly emphasized freedom and human rights. For example, Tsuda, born in 1829 in Okayama, was the eldest son of a low samurai family from Tsuyama. In 1847 he came to Edo and became a student

²² Liberal here means one who wanted to accept Western liberalism which emphasized individualism, and constitutional regimes which legally guaranteed various rights and freedoms to their subjects. See, Michael Mann ed., *The International Encyclopedia of Sociology* (New York: Continuum, 1984), p. 206.

of Dutch learning under Itō Genboku. In 1857 he became an Instruction Assistant at the bakufu's *Bansho shirabe-sho* (Bureau for the Investigation of Western Books).²³ In 1862 he and Nishi went to Holland and studied at the University of Leyden. After Tsuda returned to Japan in 1865, he translated Vissering's lectures into Japanese under the title *Taisei Kokuhoan* (The Public Law in the West). He also wrote 16 articles for the *Meiroku Zasshi*. He continually called for "freedom" of the press, of trade and in the legal system. He emphasized human rights, as a barometer of civilization and barbarism. In his article, "On Desiring Freedom of the Press," he emphasized the importance of "freedom" in civilization:

The distinction between Civilization and Barbarianism can only be viewed in terms of whether people have or have not freedom of speech and conduct...What we beg of the court is that it broadly encourage a policy of unrestricted freedom and that it open the eyes of our countrymen still more by granting freedom of the press to all persons through the prompt promulgation of regulations whose truth, justice, and clarity are like the sun and the moon hanging in heaven.²⁴

Many of his articles criticized Japanese legislative power, laws, and government. He believed in human talent, freedom and liberty. He did not mention any traditional values, or systems which might be helpful in making Japan a civilized country.

Many other liberals in the *Meirokusha* such as Nishi Amane also called for human rights and freedom. His articles covered several subjects, such as knowledge, religion, national character, and human abilities. On

²³ *Bansho shirabe-sho* was a school founded in 1856 at Edo for the study of European sciences, the correction of translation, etc. Seven of the *Meirokusha* including Katō, Nishi, and Tsuda were members of this institute. In 1862, its name changed to *Hōsho shirabe-sho* (Place of Study of European Books).

²⁴ William Reynolds Braisted tran., *Meiroku Zasshi: Journal of the Japanese Enlightenment* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 72-73.

freedom, he argued that people should have freedom in religion, as well as in politics, and education. He believed that freedom was the most valuable factor in building a nation. In "An Essay on Brick Construction," he compared brick building to nation building. If each brick had its own nature, the building would be strong. In the same way, if people had freedom, that nation would be as strong as a brick building. The government's sole duty was to prevent social disturbances and to assist national development. He also valued knowledge and believed wisdom could help men in developing the country. "Men of extraordinary knowledge easily achieve their objective (by using this combined keenness) like an armor penetrating arrow..."²⁵

Despite the fact that Nishi believed that Buddhism and loyalty were good factors: "Faith, therefore, is the basis for all conduct and the human virtues as well as the foundation for ruling others and controlling oneself. Only after we have established the great principles of faith will we enjoy health and security of body as well as peace and strength in the country,"²⁶ he did not recommend such traditional values in the process of national development because the government's use of loyalty and faith left change at the discretion of that government.²⁷

"Freedom" for the liberals was not limited to political freedom but also included "freedom" of trade. Fukuzawa and Tsuda called for free trade. In Tsuda's article, "On Opposition to Protective Tariffs,"²⁸ he argued that protective tariffs did not help industry because Japan needed to import material from abroad. Also, in another article, he called for freedom for

²⁵ Ibid., p. 221.

²⁶ Ibid., p.154.

²⁷ Ibid., p.152.

²⁸ Ibid., p.56.

foreigners to travel in the country. This would help develop Japanese enlightenment as well as industry by enhancing contact with the West. Nishi Amane agreed with Tsuda's opinion, but he suggested that "it may quite appropriately be introduced little by little."²⁹

Even though Fukuzawa agreed with the need for free trade he still worried about negative effects such as foreign debt and foreign investment.³⁰ He warned that "...travel by foreigners within the country (*naichi ryakō*) is preparation for mixed residence (*zōkkyō*); mixed residence is a convenience for trade: and trade is the source of destruction."³¹ He suggested that these factors would not destroy the country if Japan developed higher intellectual power.³² His ideas about free trade were more complicated than either Tsuda or Nishi's because he correlated trade with the abilities of the Japanese. If ability was low, free trade would bring negative effects. He recognized the benefits of foreign trade and emphasized the fact that free trade could not actually exist until foreign countries and Japan stood on an equal footing.³³

In the field of education the liberals were not satisfied with Confucianism which emphasized moral training, righteousness, duty and responsibility between classes. This traditional educational emphasis on Confucianism was viewed by the liberals as narrow and inflexible. Nishi Amane wrote five articles called "Knowledge" in *Meiraku Zasshi* dealing

²⁹ Ibid., p.293.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 321.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., p. 320.

³³ Chuhei Sugiyama, "Fukuzawa Yukichi," in Chuhei Sugiyama and Hiroshi Mizuta, *Enlightenment and Beyond: Political Economy Comes to Japan* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, © 1988), p. 53, quoting *Fukuzawa Yukichi Zenshu* (*The Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi*: hereafter FYZ) (Tokyo, 1958-64), vol. 4, p. 435.

with education. In these articles he divided knowledge into disciplines and encouraged the study of physical principles, and mental principles.

Furthermore, he denied the all-embracing principle or reason that the followers of Chu Hsi sought in all things physical and metaphysical.³⁴ He encouraged studying science that "...possesses the ability to expand man's wisdom; the arts, to increase his capacity".³⁵

It was odd that Fukuzawa, the most famous liberal, wrote only three articles: "A Speech on the Peace Negotiation Relating to the Formosa Expedition," "Refuting Nishi's Discussion on Travel by Foreigners in the Country," and "The Equal Numbers of Men and Women." It is difficult to interpret his ideas for developing the country simply from these articles, but from his other writings Fukuzawa's ideas become evident. However, we know that he was not satisfied with the standard of public knowledge. In one article he stated that low public knowledge was dangerous for the country.³⁶ He emphasized raising the educational attainment of the public. This idea is clearly expressed in his famous books such as *Seiyō Jijō* (Condition of the West) 1866, *Gakuman no Susume* (Encouragement of Learning) and *Bunmei Ron no Gairyaku* (An Outline of Civilization) 1875. He also emphasized learning, freedom, and human rights. Fukuzawa was not only a member of the School Commission which was established in October 1868 to prepare for a new educational system and to supervise existing facilities but he was also appointed a director of the South school of the University

³⁴ According to the Sung Confucians, the Chu Hsi Confucianism believes in a dichotomy between *ri* (principles or ideal forms) and *ki* (matter) and argues that men should rid themselves of *ki* by contemplating *ri*. *Ri* were uniform principles which prevailed equally in all natural and human phenomena. Nishi did not agree with this idea. He divided *ri* into two: human (mental or intellectual) principles (*shiri*) and physical principle (*butsuru*).

³⁵ Braisted, p. 276.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

(the section specializing in Western Studies).³⁷ Through these positions, it was possible for his ideas to influence Japanese education in the early Meiji period.

While the liberals emphasized Western values, such as freedom, individualism, independence, and human rights, the conservative group called for traditional values such as loyalty, the imperial line, and faith. They tried to mix traditional values (moral and ethical) with new values (materialism and utilitarianism). Sakatani Shiroshi, Nakamura Keiu and Nishimura Shigeki were members in this group. Even though they recognized the power and the benefits of Western civilization and knew that Japan must adapt along the Western line, they still sought the preservation of Japanese traditional values. According to their ideology, Japan could not develop without these traditional values. They also believed strongly in Confucianist values, an idea which liberals totally rejected.

The preservation of Confucianist values was strongly emphasized by Sakatani Shiroshi (Rōrō), a little known member of the *Meirokusha*. The oldest member, 52, he wrote 16 *Meiroku Zasshi* articles, second only to Tsuda. He joined simply to study the West.³⁸ Sakatani was born in Bichu (in Okayama Prefecture), as the third son of a family of sake makers. When he was five years old, he moved to Osaka and studied Confucianism under the guidance of Okuno Shozan and Oshio Heihachiro. In 1839 he studied with Koga Doan, the official Confucianist scholar of the bakufu. In his work, *Hakushikado kaijijsetsu* (Comments on Western Culture), written in 1862 he compared the relationship between Japanese

³⁷ Passin, p. 67

³⁸ Yoshino Sakatani, *Sandai no Keifu* (Japanese) (*Three Generations*) (Japan: Misuzu Shobo, 1976), p. 32.

culture and Western culture to the relationship of the King to the people. Japanese culture was equivalent to the King, the most important factor in national identity, Western culture was the people, a supplement for Japanese culture.³⁹ Moreover, he revealed his view that people should have faith clearly in his article, "On Secular Ethical Teaching (*Seikyo*)." He also quoted Confucius' words that "...people without faith are not upright."⁴⁰

Nishimura Shigeki, one of the most famous members of the *Meirokusha*, was also preserving traditional values. He was born into the Sakura clan in 1828. He studied Confucian learning and later became a disciple of Sakuma Shōzan. He studied Dutch learning and English under Tetsuka Ritsuzo and served as an official in the Sakura clan until 1872. He was a famous Confucian scholar at the time the *Meirokusha* was established. He was a moralist who emphasized Confucianism and the imperial line. In his work, "On Free Trade" he mentions that "men should exhaust themselves in filially serving their parents (and in filial piety to the Japanese empire)."⁴¹

These two scholars were similar in calling for traditional values and reverence of the imperial line. However, even though Sakatani called for reverence to the emperor, he also accepted the necessity of opening ports and learning from the West. Thus we can see from his works that Sakatani was not a liberal but held views that called for a mixture of Japanese and Western cultures.

³⁹ Noriaki Komata "Sakatani Shirōshi ni miru dento to keimo - sono setten no kaimai," *Nihon shiso shi zasshi (Meirokusha no shiso)* (Japanese) ("Explanation of Sakatani Shirōshi's idea of Traditionalism and Enlightenment"), Vol 26: Henkan Sha, 1986, p.7-8.

⁴⁰ Braisted, p. 279.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 356-358.

Nishimura Shigeki was different. He rejected a free trade policy because Japan was not as prosperous as England. The Japanese were neither good at figures nor technically skilled. Moreover, Japan had had a trade imbalance and suffered from free trade since she opened the country. He cited that Japan annually suffered losses from trade amounting to 7,000,000 yen.⁴² So, it was not conducive for Japan to practice free trade. Nishimura argued that Japan should have a protective tariff similar to the U. S.

The third person in this group, Nakamura Keiu, was to some extent more liberal than Sakatani and Nishimura. He was born in 1832 into an ambitious peasant family that had purchased samurai status. He had from early on shown intellectual brilliance. At age ten he won a scholarship to the *Shōheikō* (School of Prosperous Peace), the official Confucian academy of the Tokugawa house and studied there between 1848 and 1853. In 1866 he was sent by the Tokugawa government to study in England. So, among three conservatives, only Nakamura Keiu had a chance to study abroad. He wrote seven articles for the *Meiroku Zasshi*. In these articles, he approved of certain Western ideas such as new laws or regulations, but at the same time, valued customs as preservers of stability in society. Moreover, he emphasized the importance of religion, moral training and freedom of religion so that the moral character of the people would be enhanced. In Keiu's philosophy Christianity was a root of Western civilization. His early beliefs were primarily Christian but later they reflected a synthesis of Christianity and Confucianism. For example, in his *Ten* (The Heavens)

⁴² Ibid., p. 358.

Confucius was personified as god in Christianity. In other words he attempted to combine new and old values.

Why is Keiu classified as a conservative rather than a liberal? First his philosophy retained traditional values such as moral training, customs, and the Confucian definition of a good ruler. Second his ideas were not liberal when compared to the first group. He did not discard traditional values but tried to mix them with new ones as he had when he synthesized *Ten* with god in Christianity.

b) *Meiraku Zasshi*

Though *Meiraku Zasshi* was not the first magazine in Japan, it has been generally regarded as the best of several early opinion journals that spread knowledge of the West during the first years of the Meiji period. It covered various subjects including the Japanese language, political systems, and society. One issue centered on the duty of scholars with editorials by Mori, Tsuda and Nishi.

There were 43 issues of *Meiraku Zasshi* published from Meiji 7 (1874) to Meiji 8 (1875). After November 1874, publication increased from two issues per month to three a month. Each issue sold approximately 3,205 copies.⁴³ This is impressive when one realizes that the Tokyo Ichinichi Shinbun printed only 7,000 copies.

All of the *Meirakusha* members published articles in *Meiraku Zasshi*. Tsuda was the most productive writer, contributing some twenty-nine articles on a wide variety of topics. His articles are clear evidence of his continued attachment to nineteenth century European liberalism and

⁴³ Eijiro Honjo, "Meirakusha ni tsuite," *Nihon gakushi inkyo* (Japanese) ("Concerning the Meirakusha") Vol. 26, No. 2 p. 100.

humanism. Professor Ōkubo has described Tsuda as being the farthest to the left and Nishimura Shigeki as being the farthest to the right in this group.⁴⁴ So, we can see that the *Meirakusha*, as well as the *Meiraku Zasshi*, was a mixture of Western ideologies and traditional values, each scholar emphasizing one or the other depending on the time and the situation. These varying situations will be discussed later.

The *Meirakusha* members explicitly declared that they did not have political ambitions or aims. Their goal was to educate society in Western ideas. However it was inevitable that some articles dealt with political issues such as a popularly elected assembly and human rights. Because of the democratic movement in society, the government became more conservative and attempted to control opposing ideologies. On 24 June 1875 the government promulgated strict new press and liberal ordinances that held editors accountable for the material they published. As a result of this conservative government action, on the 1st of September the *Meirakusha* members voted 9 to 4 in favor of suspending publication.⁴⁵ Though *Meiraku Zasshi* ceased publication in November 1875, the *Meirakusha* members continued to write for other publications. For example Fukuzawa wrote articles for *Jiji Shimpō*, and Nishimura created his own conservative group, *Datokukai*, which published its own journal.

⁴⁴ Ōkubo Toshiaki, ed., "kindai," *Meiji keimo shiso shu, Meiji bunka zenshu*, (Japanese) ("Modern period," Collection on the ideas of the Meiji Enlightenment) Vol. III (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969), p.439.

⁴⁵ Braisted, p. xliiip.

c) The *Meirokusha's* role in society.

The *Meirokusha* was the first Japanese group of scholars that aimed to educate the public about Western studies by publishing a magazine and through a public forum. Japanese scholars, Ōkubo Toshiaki⁴⁶ and Kōsaka Masaaki,⁴⁷ have emphasized their role and influence on society during the *bunmei kaika* period (civilization and enlightenment). Ōkubo Toshiaki calls the *Meirokusha* "the pioneer cultural society of modern Japan" and states that "as it contained the new intellectuals of the time, it was the focal point of the so-called Enlightenment Movement of the early Meiji period."⁴⁸ He is supported in this estimate by another prominent historian of ideas, Kōsaka Masaaki, who writes: "the Meirokusha was in the vanguard of the civilization and enlightenment movement."⁴⁹ According to them, the *Meirokusha* held a most important position in the period of momentous change. This idea has been reiterated by most Western scholars including G. B. Samson and Reischauer.

The importance of the *Meirokusha* is disputed by David Huish.⁵⁰ In Huish's opinion, Ōkubo's and Kōsaka's works exaggerate the importance of the *Meirokusha*. For him, the *Meirokusha* was a group of intellectuals, knowledgeable about the West, and worried about Japan's inferior position

⁴⁶ The completed reference to Ōkubo's work is found in the bibliography in his own *Meiji keimo shiso shu* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shodo: Meiji bunka zenshu, Vol III, 1967), p.461-471.

⁴⁷ Masaaki, *Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era*, p. 54.

⁴⁸ David Huish, "The Meirokusha: Some Ground for Reassessment," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 32, (Massachusetts: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1972) : 209 quoting Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Mori Arinori* (Japanese) (Tokyo: Bunkyo shoin, Nihon Kyōiku sensetsu sōsho, Vol. XVIII, 1941), p.64.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 208 quoting Kōsaka Masaaki, *Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era*, p. 54; and Kōsaka Masaaki, "The Intellectual Background of Modern Japanese Thought," *Journal of World History* 3 (1957), 612.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*,

in the face of the West.⁵¹ They gathered, then, in order to inform society, by publishing a magazine and holding discussions. However, their discussions were not real debates but only lectures because of the variety in their interests and backgrounds, as well as in their fields of study. According to Huish, it is unsuitable to call the *Meirokusha* a public-speaking group or debating society. He also warns that one should not exaggerate their influence. Furthermore, he argues that Fukuzawa was not at ease with nor fitted the *Meirokusha* mold because of his perception of being a scholar rather than his ideology.⁵² In Fukuzawa's opinion scholars should be independent. He saw a lack of independence in the *Meirokusha's* members because almost all of them were civil servants, making it difficult for them to express their ideas freely.

Even if we accept Huish's argument, we still can not deny the influence of the *Meiroku Zasshi* in society due to its relatively large circulation and the concomitant high literacy rate of the Japanese. In my opinion, the *Meirokusha* had significant effect on Japanese society during a time of development. This group acted as a bridge between a traditional world and a modern world. They presented new ideas to society in general and to government leaders, as well as reclaiming traditional values. The *Meiroku Zasshi* laid out new concepts and old values in politics, society and economics at a time that government leaders were trying to find a system for the new nation. Some articles called for new laws and practical learning, while others discussed the imperial line and moral learning. We cannot deny that the *Meirokusha* brought new ideas into Japanese society

⁵¹ *ibid.*, p.215.

⁵² *ibid.*, p.221.

and linked old values to a new society. They were intellectuals who presented ideas for government to pick up and use in modernizing the country. This influence will be discussed in Chapter IV.

2) Thai intellectual group.

a) the *Young Siam*

No document mentions explicitly the composition of the *Young Siam*. However, we know that after the second coronation, on 16 November 1873, King Chulalongkorn alone ruled the country. The regent, Chaophraya Si Suriyawong, was promoted to an honorary rank. The *Young Siam* were young elites and princes who gathered around the King and shared his attitudes and ideas. These men admired Western civilization, but at the same time also respected and wished to preserve their own culture. In other words, the *Young Siam* were still bound to their own past and identified themselves as *chaonai* (princes and elites) who would lead the country in development. Available documents do not explicitly state who they were, their aims or even their role in society.

The *Young Siam* under the leadership of one of the King's brothers, Prince Phrom Woranurak, published the first Thai newspaper called *Darunawat*⁵³ which roughly translates "teachings for a young generation." It was published from July 1874 to June 1875. Articles in this newspaper were written by members of the *Young Siam*. Unfortunately, except for Prince Phrom Woranurak and Phraye Phatsakorawong, the other members are unknown, because of the editorial policy not to use by-lines.

⁵³ Kachorn Sukhabanit, *Kao raek khong nangsiyuphim nai prathet Thai* (Thai) (Journalism in Thailand) (Bangkok: 1965), p. 43.

However, from the introduction of *Darunawat*, we know that they were the King's brothers and other government officials.⁵⁴ *Darunawat* ceased publication in June 1875, due to financial losses and a lack of working staff.

After the cessation of *Darunawat*, there was the publication of a new newspaper, *Nangsü Court Khao Ratchakan* (Book of the court news). It was published from September 1875 to September 1876 by eleven of the King's brothers. In the introduction to the *Court*, as in the *Darunawat's* introduction, the editor clearly declared that this newspaper was published due to the unity of the King's brothers.⁵⁵ From these introductions, one may conclude that the *Darunawat's* staff and the *Court's* staff were one and the same. Further evidence of this is provided by the presence of Prince Phrom Woranurak as *Darunawat's* editor and as a writer for the *Court* and by the fact that news and articles in both newspapers share a conservative outlook. We can therefore safely conclude that *Young Siam* produced both publications. Thus, for the sake of this dissertation the *Young Siam* consisted of King Chulalongkorn, eleven of the King's brothers,⁵⁶ and Chaophraya Phatsakorawong.

1) Family Background.

If we accept the argument that those who published *Darunawat* and the *Court* were the *Young Siam*, we can see that most of them, except Phraya Phatsakorawong were brothers of the King. All were

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 60.

⁵⁶ They were Prince Panurangsee, Krommamern Naret, Phraongchao Kasemsan (Prince Phrom Woranurak), Phraongchao Tongthem, Phraongchao Manuenerkmanop (Prince Yajirañāna), Phraongchao Thongkongkonhai, Phraongchao Kasemseesuphayok, Prince Damrong (Phraongchao Disvorakuman), Phraongchao Khatnangyukol, Phraongchao Savatdiprawat, and Prince Dewawongse

sons of King Mongkut though their mothers differed from the Queen (King Chulalongkorn's mother), being various concubines such as Chaochommandra Chum, (Prince Damrong's mother) and Phae (Prince Vajirafāna's mother). Therefore, they shared the same privileged background as members of the nobility. For example Prince Damrong was the 57th son of King Mongkut and the only son of Chaochommandra Chum. As a child his mother always brought him to see the King. Later, he went to see the King everyday and sometimes followed the King to rural areas. Through this intimacy, Prince Damrong had a chance to learn both general knowledge and state affairs. Phraya Phatsakorawong (Porn Bunnag) was born in the Bunnag family which held political power from the reign of King Rama III through the early part of King Rama V's reign (King Chulalongkorn). He was a nephew of the regent, Chaophraya Si Suriyawong. He was born in Chumphorn (a city in the South) while his father Chaophrayaborommaha Phrayoonrawong was Chaophraya Phra Khlang (The Minister of Finance). He received the traditional education of the nobility and then, at 15, was sent to England for further study.

2) Educational Background.

All of these men were exposed to both traditional knowledge and Western knowledge. Common subjects in traditional learning included: Thai alphabet and the Pali language. For example, Prince Damrong began to learn his letters when he was 4 years old with Khun Sang and Khun Paen, secretaries in the palace and daughters of Phraya Aphaiphaphat and Chaophrayaborommaha Phichaiyat respectively. Prince Damrong's education was typical for royal children. Boys and girls studied together until they were seven years old. After that boys went on to study Pali while girls studied manners and housework. When he was 8 years old Prince Damrong

studied Pali and Khmer languages, the former was considered an important language in order to enhance Thai. In addition to the general education, some received special tutelage depending on their future role. For example, King Chulalongkorn (the heir) was taught martial arts, whereas Prince Vajirañāṇa (the forty seventh son) was taught the Khmer script, astrology and verse forms. Their educational schedules were directed and strongly influenced by their father. Proper education for each child was assigned so that King Chulalongkorn learned to govern the country while Prince Vajirañāṇa learned to be a scholar in order to aid his brother's rule.

During his monkhood, King Mongkut was well-informed about Western influences and international affairs. He believed strongly in using Thailand's unique culture to confront Western challenges. Due to his interest in archeology, he travelled around the country and discovered the first Thai inscription at Sukothai. It described the glory of the Sukothai period and the invention of the Thai alphabets. At this time, Thai history started from the Ayudhaya period, 1350. There was no connection between the Sukothai period and the Ayudhaya period. Because of King Mongkut's inspiration Thai leaders such as King Chulalongkorn, Prince Vajirañāṇa and Prince Damrong paid more attention to the length and uniqueness of Thai history. Moreover, through education King Mongkut also taught his children self-realization; they learned not only languages such as Thai and Pali but also literatures and traditional cultures so they could be proud of their own culture and identify with it. As adolescents they studied English and had a chance to communicate with Westerners or to study abroad. This dual

education taught them how to adapt Thai culture to suit the changing values thrust upon them from abroad.⁵⁷

By the command of King Mongkut, his children learned English. In 1861, he hired an English tutor, Mrs. Anna Leonowens to teach the future King Chulalongkorn. King Chulalongkorn followed his father's example and hired Mr. Patterson to teach the royal family's children when he came back from India in 1872. Prince Damrong, Prince Devawongse, and Prince Vajirafāṅṅa were Mr. Patterson's students. Prince Damrong was a favorite student. He learned from Mr. Patterson not only the English language, but British culture as well. He always went out with Mr. Patterson for lunch, or met Mr. Patterson's friends.⁵⁸ Mr. Patterson instructed the Thai Prince in reading, writing and speaking English and French and mathematics. In his autobiography, Prince Vajirafāṅṅa mentioned that he started to learn English when he was twelve years old. Since Mr. Patterson could not speak Thai, Prince Vajirafāṅṅa needed to learn English history and geography by using English and English textbooks. He wrote in his memoirs as follows:

At the decision of King Rama IV, an English school was built near *Piman Chaisee* gate (one of the Palace's gates). Mr. George Patterson was a teacher; he was looked after by Chaophraya Phatsakorawong, who at that time held the position of *Nei Rachanattayanuhan*...At that time I was twelve years old. Mr. Patterson could not speak Thai, so he used an English method of instruction. I learned a foreign map before knowing the Thai map. I learned how to speak, read and understand English without translation...This knowledge has helped me very much as I have grown older and found use for it. I learned foreign culture from a textbook which was better than later textbooks. This method of study was good for people who

⁵⁷ Sulak Sivarakasa, "The Life and Work of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab (1862-1943) as an Historical Testimony of Endogenous Thai Intellectual Creativity," *Siam in Crisis* (Bangkok: Komol Keemthong Foundation; 1980), p.107.

⁵⁸ Sucharit Tevonsuk, *Phra phawad rae ngan khong somdet phrachaoboromwongther kromphraya Damrong Rajanubhab* (Thai) (*Prince Damrong's biography and works*) Vol I-III (Bangkok: Suksephanpenit, 1965), p. 146.

did not have a chance to study abroad, I should have had that chance. Ruang Sawat Wattenaviset was lucky to get that chance....⁵⁹

All of the *Young Siam* except Chaophraya Phatsakorawong studied English through tutors and missionaries. When Chaophraya Phatsakorawong was 15 years old, he was sent by his family to study in England. There he studied English for three years. Unfortunately, in 1866, his studies were cut short because he was needed as a translator for Chaophraya Surawongwaivat (Vora Bunnag), an ambassador to Europe. Eventually, he was responsible for all dealings with foreigners because no one else spoke English.

Most of these princes also had experience in administration. For example, when King Chulalongkorn was young, he accompanied King Mongkut to rural areas. Prince Damrong showed an interest in political affairs and traveled around with his father and sometimes met foreign guests. From his intimacy with his father and brother, Prince Damrong was well-informed and later served his brother by establishing a political and educational system. Moreover, he wrote many books and articles dealing with Thai history and archeology.

3) Characteristics.

Initially, all members in the *Young Siam* were similar because they had the same family and educational background. Articles in *Darunawat* and the *Court* show a single conservative tone throughout. They emphasize kingship, unity, and Western knowledge such as language and science. Initially nothing was mentioned about politics or society. This

⁵⁹ Prince Yajirāñāna, *Phra Prawat (Thai) (Biography)* (Mahamongkut: In commemorating his fifty years of his death, 1971), p. 14.

trend changed when some of the *Young Siam* went abroad. Men such as Prince Naretvorarit (or Naret) who had been an ambassador in Europe and America brought home new political ideas.

In 1884, eleven princes and officials, all of whom had studied or traveled abroad (mainly in England), submitted a petition to King Chulalongkorn in which they asked the government to be changed from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy.⁶⁰ Prince Naretvorarit was one of the signers.⁶¹ They stated that if Thailand did not change its political system, it would be dangerous for Thai independence. Furthermore, they suggested that this change would bring benefits to the country and to the citizens as well. King Chulalongkorn reacted calmly to this evidence. He neither accused them of treason, nor accepted the recommendations in the petitions. He acknowledged that many of the criticisms in the petitions were valid and he agreed "that we need in this country a reform of the whole system of the government", but "we need not reform right now, because we do not have sufficient men to work in that system. Moreover, the Thai are not ready, they are not yet informed about the system. They still wholeheartedly believe in a King who has absolute power."⁶² According to his answer we can see that the King was conservative yet pragmatic. This

⁶⁰ *NA, R5, KS, M. no. (1-8) Prabatsomdet prachulachomkao praboromrachobai nai kan kaekai kanpogkhongphandin "Chaonai lae kharatchakan krabbangkhotuul khamhen chatkanpianpianang rabiab ratchakanphaendin, 8 January, R.5 103"* (Thai) (Royal family and official government's petition concerning changes in the political system 8 January, 1884)

⁶¹ They were Phraboromwongther kromphra Naresuenrit, Phraboromwongther krommameun Pithayarapthitada, Somdet kromphra Sawatdiwatvisit, Phraongchao Prisedang, Mr. Nogkeew Khotchesanee (Phrayamahayota), Mr. Sunt Sethrepi (Phraya Aphaiiphit), Mr. Bust Penkul, Khun Pathi phanpichit, Ruang Yesetsaree, Mr. Preun, Mr. Seart. See Chai-a-nan Samuthawanit *Ekkasan kanmuang kanpogkhong khong Thai 1872- 1934* (Thai) (*Document of Thai Politics and Government*) (Bangkok: Social Sciences Organization in Thailand, 1975), p. 59.

⁶² *NA, R5, KS, M. no 1-8 Prabatsomdet phrachulachomkao phraboromrachobai nai kankae kai kanpogkhong phandin "phraratchadamrat ratchakan thi ha ruiang ptiang phrapenee kanpogkhong ratchakanphaendin."* ("King Chulalongkorn's speeches concerning political reforms").

petition did have some influence on the Thai political system later. The members of the *Young Siam* were more conservative than the *Meirakusha*. They were not alienated from the old system.

The reason that the *Young Siam* were neither alienated from the old system nor wanted to change it radically can be explained as follows; first traditional Thai society was still functioning well. As there were few changes in the socio-economic system, the old political system could continue to cope with these minor changes. In Japan, the old political system had collapsed. Both intellectuals and leaders tried to build a new and stronger political system. Second, the members of the *Young Siam* were from the upper class of society who had privileges and were part of the government. They never experienced socio-economic problems as did their counterparts in the *Meirakusha*. Third, none of them except Chaophraya Phatsakorawong ever went abroad. They were experienced only in Thai society, while *Meirakusha* members such as Fukuzawa Yukichi, Nishi Amane, and Tsuda Mamichi went abroad. The Western knowledge obtained by the *Young Siam* was not as broad as that obtained by the *Meirakusha*. Dissatisfaction with the old system and broad Western knowledge alienated the *Meirakusha* from the old system and inspired them to seek drastic change. The *Young Siam* did not have these feelings. They were willing to adapt Western politics, culture and economics gradually in order to achieve their ultimate goal-independence.

b) *Darunawat* and the *Court*

Darunawat was a weekly newspaper, published every Tuesday, aimed at collecting Thai news and foreign news. The publisher,

Prince Phrom Woranurak,⁶³ called for articles from others who wanted to contribute to the people's knowledge. In the first issue, the editor states *Darunawat's* aim:

This newspaper will be a teacher for the young generation. This teacher will teach various subjects and will raise the level of the younger generation's knowledge. Knowledge will help them to find jobs and live in society. When knowledge has been spread throughout the country, the country will be prosperous and glorious.⁶⁴

In accordance with this aim, they desired to produce young clever officials to work in the government. These good and well-educated officials would help Thailand become a modern and wealthy nation.

In *Darunawat*, there were two types of news: domestic and international. We can classify domestic news into four types: royal affairs, Thai literature (poems and proverbs), historical articles, and local events. The articles give details about the King's affairs, such as his speeches, his reformations, and his achievements—establishment of the Privy Council and State Council, and the King's birthday ceremony. The King's speech at the opening of the Privy Council reveals his liberality in welcoming opposing ideas. This was the first time in Thai history that a King acceded to an open forum for ideas. A secondary goal of *Darunawat* may have been to create and expand the King's legitimacy and power.

The author used metaphoric stories to support the King's legitimacy. One story concerned a lion and an elephant. The lion owned a beautifully decorated cave. One day an old elephant entered that cave provoking a fight between the two in which the elephant dies. The author

⁶³ Prince Phrom Woranurak was the twenty-sixth son of King Mongkut and a brother of King Chulalongkorn. Later, he became director-general of the appeal court.

⁶⁴ *Darunawat* Vol. I, p. 2. C.S 1236 (1874)

compared the King to the lion who had the right to occupy the cave (a country) and the regent to the elephant.

Thai proverbs and poems were published as lessons to teach the Thai in a time of crisis. There were many proverbs and stories that emphasized the importance and benefit of unity. Unity was the theme of a story about the lion and a throng of elephants. The lion wanted to eat the elephants and by separating them could attack and consume each individually. The author concluded the story by quoting Buddhist teaching that *unity causes happiness*.⁶⁵ In addition to stories, there were excerpts from famous works of literature. Occasionally, there were historical articles which discussed events far back into the Ayudhaya period. This helped to emphasize the Thai origins. Local events were also reported.

In foreign news, there were facts, reports and articles concerned with the Western world. There was a list of countries' names, their capitals, locations, and politics. In some issues, there were reports on events which happened in the West, such as a Chicago fire, a flood in London, and the Sino-Japanese war. There were 2-3 series of articles concerning George Stevenson's biography and his invention because the government was interested in Western technology. It is interesting to note that the foreign news in *Darunawat* was comprised of facts, socio-political events and sciences; news reports rather than opinion or criticism. Scientific material tended to be outdated. For example, the article about George Stevenson came out some fifty-four years after Stevenson's achievement. However, for the Thai at that time, steam engines were new and interesting. There were no articles dealing with Western ideology or the roots of Western civilization.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 80.

The reasons for out-dated scientific and political news and news without criticism can be explained in accordance with the level of Western scientific knowledge among the *Young Siam* and their aims in publishing this newspaper. First, their knowledge of Western sciences was not as high as the *Meirotkusha*'s. They learned only language and general knowledge such as history and geography through private tutors. So, there was a question of how much they knew about Western sciences and Western ideologies such as individualism and liberalism. Second, most of them were princes and were brought up in traditional society. In 1873 which was the year of *Darunawat*'s publication, the ex-regent was still in power. So the *Young Siam* aimed to use *Darunawat* to preserve the kingship and to fight the entrenched power of the regent as well as to educate the young generation. They strongly cultivated the idea of kingship and traditional values in society. Unlike the *Meirotkusha*, the *Young Siam* produced Western news as a by-product and not as an end in itself. Furthermore, Western ideologies such as liberalism and the spirit of independence were not compatible with absolute monarchy.

In 1875, publication of the *Darunawat* ended due to the lack of writers and financial losses. In total there were only fifty-two volumes which cost eight bahts. The *Court* was first published on 26 September 1875. The editor was another of the King's brothers, Prince Panurangsee. The board of editors consisted of six princes. They took turns writing news once a week: Krommamern Naret on Sunday, Phraongchao Kasemsan on Monday, Phraongchao Tongthem on Tuesday, Phraongchao Thewan on Wednesday, Phraongchao Manusnarkmanop (Prince Vajirāñāna) on Thursday, Phraongchao Savatdiprawat on Friday, Prince Panurangsee (editor) on Saturday. Prince Damrong (Phraongchao Disvorakuman) joined this group later, in April, 1876.

The *Court* or the *Court Khao Ratchakan* was a four-page newspaper published every day. In the beginning it was distributed to the King and royal families. Later, it extended to others and the publication was reduced to twice a month. However, this newspaper did not last long and as the result of lack of working space the *Court* ceased publication in September 1876.

According to *Tamnan Court Khao Ratchakan* (The Legend of the Court's News), Prince Damrong explained that the *Court* was the work of young men in royal families. They worked earnestly and industriously and were looking forward to good results. They were to receive rewards from their work. Later all of them got high ranks in the government; four became Somdet Kromphraya, three became Krommaphra and one rose to Krommamern.⁶⁶ Moreover, this newspaper not only revealed their ideas about kingship, but also their knowledge of English. They used English words, such as speech, copy right and evening dress

Later, only two men who worked in *Darunawat* and the *Court* had a chance to work abroad. These were Prince Prisdang, who was appointed as the Thai ambassador in London and to Paris in 1883, and Krommamern Naret who was also assigned as the Thai ambassador in London and then to America in 1899. Most remained in Thailand and worked in the government. Only a few of them, such as Prince Damrong and Phraongchao Manusnarkmanop (later Prince Vajirāñāna), wrote books or articles which we can use to interpret their ideas.

Most of the news in the *Court* concerned the government's affairs—especially the King's activities. For example, the Court chronicle, the King's presentation to foreigners, journeys to visit citizens in rural

⁶⁶ Somdet kromphraya, kromphraya, krommaphra, krommamern, krommalung were a hierarchy of *krom* titles which the King used to confer on senior members of the royal family.

areas, and performances in the country's ceremonies such as *Kathin*⁶⁷ and *Thuyynam Phiphatsataya* (State's Oath). Writing the *Court's* articles was an exercise for young members of royal families whose ages ranged from 14-21 years old. These articles emphasized the importance of kingship in Thai society. They dealt with royal affairs during 1875-1876, such as the following:

*page 4 Kan Thuyynam Phiphatsataya (State's Oath)
 Tuesday at Wat Phraeeratanasatsadaram (Wat Phra Kaw)
 the 14th day
 of waning moon
 the 10th month
 of Lunar year

Monday, the thirteenth day of waning in the tenth month of the Lunar year, Pee kun⁶⁸ around ten a.m, the King assigned Phrachaonongyather⁶⁹ phraongchao Chitchareon to act on his behalf in offering food to thirty-eight monks at Sutthaisawan palace.⁷⁰ Then, Phrachaonongyather phraongchao Chitchareon went to phraubosot⁷¹ at Wat Phraeeratanasatsadaram. In phraubosot, there were images of Buddha and swords as well as Phra Isuan, Phra Narai, Phra Prom, and Phra Phigkanesuan.

At 11 a.m., the King came through the front door of Phrathenang Sommutithewarat and got on Phrathenang ratchayan⁷² which was decorated with gold and jewels. He went to Wat Phraeeratanasatsadaram by Pimanchaisee gate. He entered phraubosot, and lit candles. Phrachaoboromwongther Krommaphra Pavaretyachiyalongkorn offered the precepts. The king received the precepts and saluted the image of Buddha, and images of King Rama I, King Rama II and lit the remains four candles for

⁶⁷ *Kathin* is an annual festival, following the rainy season, during which new robes are presented to the monks.

⁶⁸ Pee kun means pig's year.

⁶⁹ Phrachaonongyather means king's brothers.

⁷⁰ one of the royal palaces.

⁷¹ main hall in the temple, ordination hall.

⁷² name of a vehicle.

Phrachaovorawongther Krommamern Charoenphopoolasawat so that he could salute at Hoo Paramanusora.⁷³

This passage tells us the detail of the *Thuyynam Phiphatsataya* (State's Oath) ceremony which was an important ceremony in showing the loyalty of the government officers to the King. Most of the news in the *Court* reported the King's activities in order to emphasize the importance of kingship in Thai society.

c) The roles of the *Young Siam* in society

The *Young Siam* had two roles in society: as intellectuals and as government officials. As intellectuals they published and disseminated information. However, we must examine the kind of knowledge they sought to impart. We can see that they promoted traditional ideologies such as unity and good citizenship by using proverbs and stories. They also disseminated scientific knowledge albeit outdated. Moreover, they reported news and information from the West without criticism.

No article in either the *Darunawat* or the *Court* encouraged society to accept Western civilization. On the contrary, authors placed a strong emphasis on traditional values. This can be explained by examining the extent of Western learning among Thai scholars and their attitudes toward such studies. Scholarly knowledge of the West was broader in Japan. The Thais started to discover the West in the early nineteenth century and they studied it in order to survive. The government did not support Western learning as the Japanese government did. Moreover, none of the *Young Siam*,

⁷³ *Nangsi Court Khao Ratchakan Chaonai 11 Phraong Songchui kanthang* (Thai) (The Court which was written by eleven princes) Vol I, II (In commemorating of Phrachaoboromwongther chaofa Phanurangseesawangwong kromphraya Phanupanthuwongvoradet's birthday in 1923) (Bangkok: Rongpim Thai, 1923), p. 6.

except Chaophraya Phatsakorawong, had gone to study abroad. Even King Chulalongkorn himself did not take his first trip to Europe was until 1897. Thus, the *Young Siam* learned Western civilization indirectly through missionaries or Westerners who lived in Thailand. Also, their family and educational backgrounds played a part. They were brought up under King Mongkut's supervision and King Mongkut strongly believed in using indigenous Thai values to counter the West.

In my opinion, judging from their works and ideas, the *Young Siam* saw themselves as government officials first, and intellectuals second. First, most of them came from royal and noble families, so felt more attached to government affairs. Second, they were brought up in government circles, so were aware that government work lay in their future. Judging from their works and ideas, we can conclude that they considered themselves governmental officials who attempted to rescue their country from crisis. Perhaps we should call them *bureaucratic intellectuals*. Since they were bureaucrats it is no wonder that their ideas strongly influenced the government. For as Max Weber notes, "Bureaucracy is the means of carrying 'community action' over into rationally ordered 'social action.'⁷⁴ He elaborates further that "...all the sure instinct of the bureaucracy for the conditions of maintaining its power in its own state (and through it, in opposition to other states) are inseparably fused with the canonization of the abstract and 'objective' idea of 'reason of state.'⁷⁵ The Thai case reflects Weber's words. Thai intellectuals did not bring many new ideas into society as compared to the *Meirakusha*. One reason for this may be

⁷⁴ Gerth, H.H and C. Wright Mills, tr. and ed., From Max Weber: Essay in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press; ©1946), p.228.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

accounted for by the fact that there were fewer Thai intellectuals and they also were part of the government apparatus. Thus, they wanted to modernize the country and preserve their own power at the same time. In other words the greater the attachment of the intellectuals, the more power they held and the greater the stake in preserving this power. This is an important reason for the differences between the intellectual ideologies in these two countries. I will discuss their ideas in the next chapter.

In conclusion, Japan and Thailand in the middle of nineteenth century were socially, economically and politically different. Japan was overdue for reform. The old Japanese political power could not cope with socio-economic changes. All classes in society, especially the samurai, were discontented with the old system. The intellectuals were also well informed about Western ideologies and sciences. They were seeking Western knowledge not only to improve their military, but also for socio-political ideas. Faced with these problems and the presence of the West the old political system collapsed. The new government, the Meiji leaders, were young, energetic and wanted to build a strong, new nation to rival the West. The intellectuals shared this goal. They were ready to accept new ideologies and institutions in order to achieve this goal. Thus, Western culture was flowing into Japanese society. In Thailand the situation was totally different. Neither the society nor the economy was transformed as much as in the Japanese case. The old political system was still working well. At the time that the danger from Western imperialism was most evident the king encouraged intellectuals and bureaucrats to study the West and prepared his children to deal with this problem by inculcating them with traditional values. They also studied Western languages and general knowledge through tutors at the same time. Only a small group of people in the upper class

could acquire Western knowledge. The level of Western learning among Thai intellectuals was relatively low compared to Japan. They studied and accepted Western knowledge in order to make the West accept Thailand as a civilized country. All of these factors caused Japan and Thailand to react differently to Western cultures. Japanese society was ready to change and wholeheartedly accepted and wanted to be like the West. In Thailand the leaders and the intellectuals learned from and accepted parts of the West in order to survive. They were not ready to change nor did they want to change as did the Japanese.

Chapter III

Ideologies

Since intellectuals are important factors in guiding a society to develop in one way or another, it is necessary to study their philosophy. In this chapter, I will discuss the views of the *Meirokusha* and of the *Young Siam* toward the West. As their country was facing crisis, what did they think about the West? Their opinion will be categorized into three groups; first, their feelings toward the West as well as their own society, second, their ultimate goals for their country, and third the means to achieve these goals. I will discuss these three aspects in both conservative and liberal groups in both countries respectively; and the Japanese retreat from liberalism in the 1880s.

A) Japan

From the late Tokugawa to the early Meiji period, Western learning was widespread in society. One could acquire it no matter what class he or she belonged to. Western Learning schools were established by both western han and the bakufu. During the Bakumatsu period (1853-1868) Western knowledge such as chemistry, geography, mathematics, physics, metallurgy and military tactics were studied. By the time of Perry's coming, the Japanese had a considerable store of knowledge of the West and of its technology. There were two groups of scholars concerned about Western knowledge who had different opinions; one group preferred *kaikoku* policy (open the country), and the other *ji* policy (expel the

barbarian). Among the *kaikoku* group, the most famous was Sakuma Shōzen (1811–1864), who coined a slogan in dealing with the West, *tōyō dōtaku, seiyō geijutsu* (Eastern ethics and Western science). He had background in both Confucianism and Western Learning. He recognized the importance of Western technology in his letter:

In the present world, the traditional knowledge of Japanese and Chinese is not sufficient. It will not do (without a study of) the way of governing and managing the five continents. Considering general world conditions after the three great discoveries—namely, Columbus's discovery of the new world, assisted by scientific investigation; Copernicus's discovery of the true principles of the motion of the Earth; and Newton's discovery of the true principle of gravitation the foundations of all the sciences have been firmly established and have become dogmas. Owing to these discoveries, conditions in Europe and the United States of America have gradually shown a remarkable improvement. The steam-ship, magnetism, and telegraphs have all been invented. It is as if the art of creation had been captured by man. A truly amazing situation has come about.¹

At the same time he also valued traditional values, such as Confucianism for personal behavior by saying:

The distinctions of noble and base, superior and inferior, are laws of etiquette based on the natural way of heaven and earth...Above all in our imperial land, there is a profound reason for strictly upholding the distinctions of noble and base, superior and inferior.²

Due to his admiration of Western sciences, his opinion was strongly opposed by the other school. *Shi* (expel the barbarian) samurai passionately believed that opening the country would bring political and cultural disaster.

Nevertheless, Shōzen's philosophy remained strong among the Japanese scholars in that period and the early Meiji period as well.

¹ Masao Maruyama, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, trans. Mikiso Hane (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 396 quoting letter to Yanagawa Seigan, March 6, 1858.

² *Ibid.*, quoting memorial to the bakufu, September, 1862

However, after the Meiji Restoration, the Japanese realized how powerful the West was and recognized that they must go further in their reforms. They tried to become a strong and powerful nation. Fukuzawa Yukichi, the first scholar who suggested that Sakuma Shōzan's ideology, "Eastern ethics and Western science" was not enough revealed his interest in Western society when he went to America in 1860;

Our hosts in San Francisco were very considerate in showing us examples of modern industry. There was as yet no railway laid to the city, nor was there any electric light in use. But the telegraph system and also Galvani's electroplating were already in use. Then we were taken to a sugar refinery and had the principle of the operation explained to us quite minutely. I am sure that our hosts thought they were showing us something entirely new, naturally looking for our surprise at each new device of modern engineering. But on the contrary, there was really nothing new, at least to me. I knew the principle of the telegraphy even if I had not seen the actual machine before;... I had been studying nothing else but such scientific principles ever since I had entered Ogata's school.... As for scientific inventions and industrial machinery, there was no great novelty in them for me. It was rather in matters of life and social custom and ways of thinking that I found myself at a loss in America.³

His experiences in America (1860, 1867) and Europe (1862) made him realize that the West was not only important in sciences but also social, economic and political ideas. When he came back to Japan he saw that the Meiji leaders were also receptive towards reform. Thus, he changed his style of writing and strongly called for individual qualities of independence, initiative, and self-reliance. He led an extraordinary movement of Japanese scholars in the period we know as the *bunmei kaiko* period (civilization and enlightenment). Japanese intellectuals eagerly studied the West and freely expressed their ideas. Those ideas concentrated on one goal, to become as

³Etichi Kiyooka, tr., The Autobiography of Yukichi Fukuzawa (New York: Columbia University Press, ©1960), p. 115-116.

civilized a nation as the West. While this goal was eminent in the scholarly circles, the former *fukoku kyōhei* (enrich the country, strengthen the military) advocates still existed, though they were overshadowed by the new movement.

The means for achieving this parity with the West was a problem which the Japanese scholars earnestly worked on. They came up with several solutions which varied from liberal to conservative.

1) Liberals: Fukuzawa Yukichi, Katō Hiroyuki, Tsuda Mamichi

a) View of tradition

Because of the inequality in society and socio-economic problems which they were facing, members in this group were antagonistic towards the old society and traditional values. They thought that the old system should be changed. Fukuzawa Yukichi, Katō Hiroyuki and Tsuda Mamichi shared this feeling. They admired Western values and institutions and thought these could help Japan counter Western challenges. They called for freedom, equality, and independence for they believed that these could make Japan as civilized as the West.

I will first address the liberals' view of their own society and the values they opposed. Fukuzawa Yukichi, the most important figure in this group, strongly opposed inequality in society. He revealed this opinion in his work *Bunmeiron no gairyaku* (An Outline of a Theory of Civilization) in 1875. He stated that, inequality, the "imbalance of power," caused the differences between Japanese Civilization and Western Civilization. He insisted that this imbalance was an obstruction in Japanese society and should be abolished. He maintained that it existed in every level:

Imbalance of power pervades the entire network of Japanese society...
You will find this imbalance in all relationships between man and woman, between parents and children, between brothers, and between young and old. Turn from the family circle to society, and relations there will be no different. Teacher and student, lord and retainer, rich and poor, noble and base born, newcomers and old-timers, main family and branch families- between all of these there exists an imbalance of power...⁴

Katō Hiroyuki also had similar ideas, but was more concerned about politics than society. He vigorously attacked the imperial system which had existed in Japan for more than a thousand years. His political philosophy developed from the Bakumatsu period. In his belief, the prosperity and strength of the West were closely related to their form of government. He produced many books concerning politics, such as *Tanarigusa* (Neighboring Vegetation) in 1861, *Rikken seitai ryoku* (Outline of Constitutional System) in 1868, *Shinsei tai-i* (The Outline of Practical Politics) in 1870, and *Kokutai shinron* (New Thesis on the National Polity) in 1874. From *Tanarigusa* through *Shinsei tai-i*, Katō developed his ideas about constitutional government. In his famous work, *Kokutai shinron*, he strongly criticized the "Way of the subject" thesis of *kokugakusha* (scholars of the national studies) who argued for unquestioning submission to the emperor.

Kokugaku (National Learning School) ⁵ was established by Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801). This school emphasized studying Japanese ethics and spirits and tried to purify Japanese customs and institutions. It opposed Chinese Learning i.e., Confucianism. Instead the National Learning

⁴ Fukuzawa Yukichi, *An Outline of a Theory Civilization*, tran. David A. Dilworth and G.Cameron Hurst (Tokyo: Sophia University, © 1973), p. 136.

⁵ Masao Maruyama defines National Learning as the set of intellectual systems developed by Tode Mosui (1629-1706), the monk Keichū (1640-1701) and Kamo Mabuchi (1697-1769), in particular the system developed by Kamo Mabuchi and perfected by Motoori Norinaga. Maruyama, *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, p. 143.

School emphasized the Ancient Way. According to ancient Japanese literature, the *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki*, Japan was created by God, and the emperor descended from the Sun Goddess. So, the Japanese should unquestioningly obey their emperor. Norinaga's works are consistently devoted to elucidating the Ancient Way. He states in his work, *Kuzubana* (Arrow-root blossoms) (1780):

The august Imperial Land in the august original land where Amaterasu took birth, the august land that is ruled by her descendants; and for this reason the fact that it excels all the myriad other countries is too obvious to deserve mention.⁶

Norinaga also explained the meaning of the Way in terms of its practical application to the life of the individual, what Katō called the "Way of the subject." It strongly emphasized submission to superior forces of power. The highest forces were the gods followed by their descendant, the emperor. Norinaga demanded unquestioning obedience to the throne. He mentions in the *Tama-kushige* (*The jeweled comb box*) (1786):

The people of the present day must have no intention other than that of performing such actions as are needful of being performed at the present time, by faithfully observing the commands of the emperor of the present day and avoiding any action at variance with this which proceeds out of their own private thinking. This, in short, has been the purport of the true way since the Age of the Gods.⁷

Katō strongly opposed this idea. He viewed this submission as a symbol of slavery:

⁶ David Magarey Earl, *Emperor and Nation in Japan Political Thinkers of the Tokugawa Period* (Seattle; University of Washington Press, © 1964), p. 70 quoting Tokushige Asakichi, *Ishin Seishin Shi Kenkyu* (Kyoto: Ritsumeikan Shuppanbu, 1934), p. 786.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 71 quoting *Tama-kushige* (Together with *Nihon Tama-kushige* [Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1934]), p. 36.

Why subordinate one's will to the Imperial Mind? Clearly, this is a foolish position and moreover, it manifests a base and servile mentality. In Europe such a style of thinking would be called slavish. We Japanese are of the same human species as our emperors. We are each of us provided with an individual mind and possessed of free spirit. There can be no reason for abandoning these and acting only in accord with the Imperial Will.⁸

In the same book, he also mentions that:

The Emperor is a man and the people, too, are men...
The Emperor and the people are similar members of the human race.
Therefore, while the Emperor may exercise authority, he never has the right to treat the people as cattle...⁹

Katō emphasized that human beings are equal and from birth are endowed with rights. His position was clearly based on the theory of natural rights which he derived from Western studies especially Western philosophy, morality, politics, and laws.

While Fukuzawa and Katō attacked the inequality in society, Tsuda Mamichi criticized the Japanese legal system. He strenuously attacked the death penalty. For him punishment was a means of rehabilitation which capital punishment negated. He argued his points clearly as follows:

Punishment is for the purpose of correcting the misdeeds of men. What then is this correction? I would say that it is the proper objective of penal law to bring the criminal to repent, to regret his crime, and to return to the good path after he has recognized his sin and that he should fear his sin...¹⁰

⁸ David Abosch, "Katō Hiroyuki: The Introduction of German Political Thought in Modern Japan: 1868-1883" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964), pp. 378-379. quoting from M.B. Z: *Jiyuminken-hen*, "kokutai shinron," p. 123-124.

⁹ Ibid., p. 124.

¹⁰ Braisted, p. 198.

He strongly criticized the death penalty and torture as being uncivilized. Furthermore torture did not serve the purpose of truth or justice.

Oh, how dreadful is the injury of torture! Therefore, when a person is suspected by legal officers (and torture is used), there is a tendency for them invariably to admit the false charges even though they are innocent. After all, such persons cannot endure the pain of torture. Ordinary people would rather die falsely charged than suffer torture.¹¹

So, in Tsuda's view, torture could do no good in the judgement process, plus it was a sign of barbarity. He stated that, "Japan needs to abolish torture in order to ride side by side with various countries of Europe and America."¹² He added that if Japan did not abolish torture neither could it conclude equal treaties with the West.

Moreover, he criticized the weak points in the Japanese legal system. Since Japanese laws were not signed by the emperor or even the ministers (*kaicho*), they were not acceptable by Western standards. In order to revise the unequal treaties and become civilized, Japan needed to change her legal system.

b) Admiration of Western Civilization: politics, education and economics.

As mentioned above the liberals strongly opposed traditional society, politics and the legal system. However, they wholeheartedly wanted Japan to be a civilized nation. How then was this to be accomplished?

¹¹ Ibid., p.95

¹² Ibid., p. 96.

Their answer was to adopt the Western spirit as well as Western institutions. Human rights, freedom, equality, and independence were ideas which they strongly emphasized. Fukuzawa always believed that with these ideas Japan could become an independent and modern nation. He believed that freedom and independence could defend Japan from foreign countries:

To defend our country against foreign countries it is essential to fill the country with the spirit of freedom and independence, and to let everyone, regardless of the difference in rank and wealth, think of his country as his own interest and do his duty to his own nation.¹³

He also encouraged learning about the West as a way to encounter the West. He believed in raising the quality of citizens and focused on public education. He did not hold with traditional education which promoted rote memorization and traditional values. He urged instead that people study practical learning. In his famous work, *Gakumon no susume* (An Encouragement of Learning), 1872-76, he notes:

The object of one's primary efforts should be practical learning that is close to ordinary human needs. For example, a person should learn the 47-letters kana syllabary, method of letter writing and of accounting, the practice of the abacus, the way to handle weight and measures and the like...¹⁴

Practical learning could be used in real life and could be cultivated for the student's and the nation's benefit. Education could make Japan as wealthy and strong as the West. We can see the influence of his ideas on education in the early Meiji period such as on the Meiji education

¹³ Chuhei Sugiyama, "Fukuzawa Yukichi," in Enlightenment and Beyond: Political Economy Comes to Japan, ed. Chuhei Sugiyama and Hiroshi Mizuta (Tokyo: university of Tokyo Press, 1988), p.42 quoting F.Y.Z. Vol.3 p.44 (1873)

¹⁴ Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, tran. David D. Dilworth and Yumeyo Hirano (Tokyo: Sophia University Press, ©1969), p. 2.

code in 1872 and educational system in the early Meiji period. I will discuss these in detail in the next chapter.

Katō was less interested in society and economics. Rather he earnestly argued for freedom and human rights in the political arena: he attempted to define the role of the state and people and believed in the public's right to political participation. He used the American system as an example of how people's rights were protected by the State:

The amendment then declares: "the state shall not pass laws that intentionally injure the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States."... when male citizens of the United States who have reached twenty-one years of age are deprived of or limited in the right to voice opinion (excepting persons attached to revolutionary parties or guilty of other major offenses), then the representatives of each state will be reduced in proportion to the number of males over twenty-one years of age whose rights the state has obstructed. ¹⁵

At the very minimum people should have the right to be informed of government affairs. Katō strongly called for a popular assembly in *Mairaku Zasshi*. Furthermore, he supported freedom of religion:

After all, liberty of religious belief and practice can never depend upon sanction by government as it is inextricably linked with the free right of men to determine innately what is right and wrong (freedom to distinguish between right and wrong according to one's heaven-endowed conscience).¹⁶

In Katō's view the government had two functions in society: the protective function which included recognition of the right to life, liberty and property, and the guidance function which established the higher right of the government to intervene, to restrict, and even to suppress wherever

¹⁵ Braisted, pp.76-77.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.69.

and whenever necessary. For example the government must have the right to forbid or to punish clear cases of injury to public order or opposition to public morals. He gave as examples of such injury: "polygamy among the Mormons, killing of their own daughters by the Chinese, and voluntary suicide by women in India."¹⁷ In his idea there should be the law providing the government a special right to forbid any act injurious to national security even though such act may be allowed by religion.

In the early period, Tsuda paid more attention to the legal system than either politics or society. In the late Tokugawa period the bakufu sent him and Nishi Amane to Holland to study with Simon Vissering (1818-1888), a leading professor of economics at Leiden. After he graduated from Leiden, Vissering practiced law and assisted Professor Thorbecke, the future prime minister of Holland. He was strongly opposed to the German historical school and was a positivist in epistemology and a utilitarian in ethics. As an economics professor at Leiden, he advocated the teaching of Adam Smith and classic liberalism.¹⁸ His ideas strongly influenced Tsuda and Nishi Amane. Tsuda was especially influenced by Constitutional law. After he came back to Japan he wrote *Taisei kakuhōron* (On European national law) in 1868. It was the first European law book in Japan. Humanity and equality were emphasized. Moreover, in his articles in *Meiraku Zasshi*, Tsuda consistently called for a revised legal system and the abolishment of torture.

The liberals did not call for freedom and independence in only social and political arenas but also in the arena of economics. Fukuzawa and

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 164.

¹⁸ Thomas R. H. Havens, *Nishi Amane and Modern Japanese Thought* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970), p 53.

Tsuda were leaders in this movement. Professor Sugiyama argues that through the influence of Francis Wayland, Fukuzawa became interested in Western capitalist society and introduced economic liberalism in the sense of government non-interventionism i.e. laissez-faire, to Japanese society. He rejected the idea of government directly running business and at the same time presupposed the "principle of competition." The government was excluded from intervening in the economy by means of prohibition, permission and protection. The duty of government in economics was merely in "public works" such as the railway, telegraph, and utilities. He stated his belief as follows:

It would be a great mistake to misunderstand this principle and believe that the government may do anything to enrich the country, running ordinary works and competing with people in trade and industry to average prices and induce the parties concerned to every exertion. If there were someone who would do anything with no consideration of gain or loss...the effect would only be disastrous...¹⁹

He recognized the problem of the Japanese economy as an agricultural country. In *Bunmeiron no Gairyaku* (1875) he mentions:

If we look at the trade between Japan and foreign countries, one sees that Western countries are the manufacturers and Japan is the grower...In economy the wealth of a nation depends far less on the plentitude of natural produce than on the skill of human arts. For example, there is India, on the one hand, where land is fertile and yet people are poor, and there is Holland, on the other hand, where there is scarcely any natural produce and yet people are rich. Therefore in trade between a manufacturing country and a growing country, the former makes use of unlimited human power and the latter the limited produce of land...This is exactly the case with trade between Japan and foreign countries. We cannot but be on the losing side.²⁰

¹⁹ Chuhei Sugiyama, "Fukuzawa..." p. 56 quoting *Minken keizairoku* Vol 2 (1880).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 51 quoting *F.Y.Z.*, vol 4, pp.193-94.

Even though he realized that in foreign trade Japan was a loser, he did not deny the benefit of foreign trade. He emphasized the significance of foreign trade and at the same time asserted that free trade could hardly apply until foreign countries and Japan stood on an equal footing.²¹ His idea was not the same as other *Meirakusho* members who called for free trade such as Nishi Amane and Nishimura Shigeki. However, Fukuzawa still believed that by using capitalism the Japanese economy would grow. With this economic growth Japan would be able to counter the West. He revealed this opinion about international relations in, *Jiji Shōgen* (Current Affairs Discuss) (1881): "fight with weapons in war and fight with trade and industry in peace."²² This idea was also mentioned earlier in *Shōgakkō o Tatsuuru no Shui* (Prospectus of the School of Commerce) (1875). Here he stated that "fighting the war of trade against foreign countries" as "the public duty of merchants now" and "in the age of fighting with trade one cannot compete with foreigners without previously learning the art of commerce."²³ In a similar vein, as in *Gakumon no Susume*, he refers to free trade and protection:

In such a country as Britain where there is a plentitude of commodities manufactured by human arts and exported, with profit, to all over the world, free trade is defended and in such a country as America where there are plenty of goods of natural growth but few manufactured commodities, protection is defended. The discussion between both continues ad infinitum.²⁴

²¹ Ibid., p. 53 quoting *FYZ*, vol 4, p. 435.

²² Ibid., p.54 quoting *FYZ*, Vol.3, p. 109.

²³ Ibid., p. 49 quoting *FYZ*, vol 20, p. 24.

²⁴ Ibid., quoting *FYZ*, Vol. 5, p.111.

Tsuda also called for economic freedom. For him it was also a means to achieve "national prestige," in the sense of Japanese modernization. In *Unshōron* (On Transportation), 1874, he mentions three things for national prestige: first, military reforms, second, widespread education, and third, improving transportation. He gave the reason as follows:

It is generally assumed that no other country is so rich as Britain, as though there were no wealth in other parts of the world. Why is it that Britain has attained such wealth? It is simply because Britain enjoys the benefit of transportation more than any other country. The convenience of transportation in Britain is due to its favorable geographical position compared with any other country, but it is also due to its people, who compete with each other in intellect and labour...²⁵

So, according to the British model, Japan needed to develop personal freedom and transportation simultaneously in order to achieve "national prestige."

To reiterate, the liberals used Western civilization to counter Western challenges. They earnestly called for replacing the old system with the Western system both philosophically and institutionally. The influence of these liberal opinions on the government and the public will be discussed in a later Chapter. Suffice it to say that Japanese society in the early Meiji period was affected by these opinions to a certain extent.

2) Conservatives: Nishimura Shigeki, Sakatani Shiroshi,
Nakamura Keiu

Meanwhile, conservative ideas co-existed in the *Meiropusha*, though during the *bunmei kaika* period they were not as popular

²⁵ Chūhei Sugiyama, "Nishi Ameno and Tsuda Mamichi," *Enlightenment and Beyond*....., p. 68 quoting Braisted, *Meiropu Zasshi*...., no 9 (1874).

as liberal ideas. However by the 1890s many liberals retreated into conservatism which gained strength and became firmly rooted in Japanese society.

During the Bakumatsu period when the West came to Japan and called for an open door policy there were two groups of Confucianists; one which did not want to open the country or learn Western knowledge and the other which were willing to open ports and learn Western knowledge, especially military. The second group was known as progressive Confucianists. These merge into the conservatives of the early Meiji period such as Nishimura Shigeki and Nakamura Keiu. They agreed with Sakuma Shōzan's philosophy: "Eastern ethics and Western science." They realized the importance of Western military technology. Many had close relations with Shōzan, for example Nakamura Keiu was a friend and Nishimura Shigeki a student.

The conservatives were different from the liberals in many areas. First, they did not strongly attack traditional values, but rather sought to preserve them in modified form. Second, they wanted to accept only certain aspects of Western civilization, primarily those in technological and military arenas.

a) View on Western military technology

Conservatives wholeheartedly accepted Western military knowledge. They urged Japan to learn Western military technology in order to survive. In *Meiraku Zasshi*, Sakatani Shiroshi thoroughly discussed the importance of the Western tool. He defined "tool" as:

All the concrete, useful things ranging from house, carts, and ships to foodstuffs, clothing, and arms are no more than tools. Loyal ministers and

brave men all act on behalf of country, family, and friends with the assistance of tools.²⁶

He elaborated further that this "tool" could turn the crowds into brave men and the unskilled into skilled men. If Japan did not develop this tool, it would suffer:

If we fail to develop tools, we shall ultimately be no more than slaves and children even though we sedulously study Western law, government and religion.²⁷

Nishimura Shigeki and Nakamura Keiu also recognized the importance of Western technology. Nishimura believed in military competence from the time he was a student with Shōzan. He believed that only Western gunnery could repel the barbarians. At that time Shōzan broadened Nishimura's opinion by suggesting that Western knowledge was also important. Due to this influence Nishimura began to study Dutch. Nakamura Keiu revealed his opinion toward the Western military in his books, *Shingaku Seisaku* (The policy of custom learning) and *Yōgaku ran* (Thesis on Western learning). He stressed that Japan should emphasize three things: first, a wealthy nation, second, a strong army with good soldiers, and third, modern weapons.²⁸ He emphasized the need to possess Western military equipment.

b) View on Western Civilization and Japanese culture; politics and education.

In addition to Western technology, the conservatives also accepted other Western ideas, such as the concept of individual rights,

²⁶ Braisted, p.491.

²⁷ Ibid., p.492.

²⁸ Takahashi Masao, *Nakamura Keiu* (Japanese) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1966), p. 21.

freedom, self-achievement and equality. However, they did not wish a wholehearted adoption of those ideas but instead tried to synthesize them into Japanese society. Keiu provides an apt example. In 1871, he translated both Smiles' book Self Help (*Saigaku Rissihen*), and Mill's book On Liberty (*Jiyu no ri*). Self Help (1859) was an early work of Samuel Smiles written when he was still young, radical and engaged in railway administration. It was a series of lectures on self-improvement for a mutual study group of young workmen in Leeds. These lectures focused on the subject of self-help for the working class and were embroidered with examples. It was widely read. By the end of the century 250,000 copies had sold and it was translated into several languages, including Japanese. Keiu did not translate this book because of the ideas of an industrial labor force and suffrage, but rather for Smiles' assertion that, "National progress is the sum of individual industry, energy, and uprightness, as national decay is of individual idleness, selfishness, and vice."²⁹ National progress was the reason for translation and he felt that people should do their duties in order to achieve this goal. This translation disseminated many new ideologies into Japanese society. Keiu felt that one's rights should be tied to one's devotion to his country. Hiroaki Matsugawa described Keiu's view as "nationalism-democracy."³⁰

Besides, Self-Help, Keiu also translated John Stuart Mill's book, On Liberty in 1872. This important document of nineteenth century liberalism defended freedom as the necessary condition for a person's

²⁹ Earl H. Kinmonth, "Nakamura Keiu and Samuel Smiles: A Victorian Confucian Victorian," *American Historical Review* 85, (June, 1980): 541.

³⁰ Hiroaki Matsugawa, "Saigaku Rissihen to Jiyu no Ri Seikai-Bakumatsu Jugaku Yikutoria cho kyushinshugi, Bunmei Kaika," "Nihon ni okeru seio seiji shiso" Nenpo Seijigaku 1975 p. 40.

development into a self-reliant, morally responsible individual capable of making a creative contribution to society. Liberty includes freedom of thought and discussion. The government should not interfere in the personal sphere, but it must legislate in such public areas as education and industry to ensure liberty for all.³¹ In this book, freedom of religion and equality of education were strongly emphasized by Keiu. He strongly called for education for women and for the deaf and blind. In 1878 he established a school for teaching women.

The conservatives did not favor adoption of the Western political system, especially the popularly elected assembly. Sakatani and Nishimura argued that this system was not suitable to Japanese society. Sakatani mentioned that the popularly elected assembly was premature for an uncivilized society. In his article, *Should We not First Determine the Political Structure before Introducing a Popularly Elected Assembly?*, he writes:

More particularly, there is general consensus that it would be premature to introduce such a assembly before we have reached the level of enlightenment. While I believe that it is indeed too early, to assume the time to be premature is to be waiting achievement of the level of enlightenment.³²

He further argued that Japan still needed to develop education. Nishimura also said that the Japanese were too backward to be ruled by reason. In other words, he agreed that the Western political system was good but was not yet suitable for Japan. It would cause disturbance in society. He discussed these points in his article, *Three Types of Political System (Conclusion)*:

³¹ *Encyclopedia Britannica* Vol, 20 p. 731.

³² Braisted, p.169.

When a regime preserves its national security through the conduct of traditional rule, the enlightenment of the people is still appropriate to such a political system. When there is an abrupt change to a different political system at such a time, national disturbances are the more likely to arise as ignorant people will not understand the reason for change and rogues will take advantage of the ignorant to plot mischief.³³

Japan would change in the future when the wisdom of the people developed.

In his opinion a country ruled by reason needed the finest and the best people. He defined the finest and the best as follows:

Should you ask what kind of people are the finest and the best, I would reply that people are the finest and the best if they are of the type who being deeply patriotic, completely shoulder their responsibilities and are neither envious nor haughty, loyally help each other and mix together with a spirit of justice.³⁴

It is interesting to note that though Nishimura accepted the idea that Japan should have a popularly elected assembly in the future his notion of a good citizen followed Confucian values such as loyalty, filial piety, responsibility, and patriotism. So, Nishimura remained tied to traditional Confucianist philosophy but was open to new values. He recommended that the government use both morality and Western style laws in governing the country. In, *Hakuoigen* (The old man's words), he discussed the quality of a ruler.

Men who do not have morality cannot govern well. Even if he possesses morality, but does not have laws or the means to govern, he cannot govern well. In the past, one could govern with morality because the people were good and honest and the world was simple. Then, only morality sufficed. But now people are corrupted, and the world has become complex. Morality is no longer enough, we need politics and laws. Laws and the way to

³³ Ibid., p. 350.

³⁴ Ibid., p.349.

govern have become important factors that one should heed besides morality...³⁵

Sakatani, unlike Nishimura who favored gradualism, completely opposed a popular assembly. He argued that this system would ruin the imperial line which had existed in Japan for several hundred years. In his opinion, Japan should retain the idea of harmonious rule between high and low, upper and lower, king and people. He strongly believed that the imperial line was the most important and the most suitable system for Japan. This system would make Japan a strong and wealthy country, as he mentions in his article, *On the Taxing Power as the Public Business of High and Low*:

The fundamental of our national structure naturally is the uninterrupted line of emperors extending through ages eternal... The purpose of the court is to encourage the strength and prosperity of the country and to enhance the imperial prestige.³⁶

A comparison of Nishimura and Sakatani shows that they both were dissatisfied with a popular assembly. Sakatani strongly stressed the imperial system, while Nishimura emphasized morality-Confucianism. We can call Sakatani a "political nationalist" who laid the foundation for the imperial system, while Nishimura could be called a "cultural nationalist." The reason for this difference lies in Sakatani's strong belief in the imperial system. He was also afraid that the promotion of a popular role in government would endanger the imperial line.³⁷ He wanted to modernize the country without putting the Imperial line in danger. Nishimura did not pay as much attention to the political system as did Sakatani. For him morality

³⁵ Sannosuke Matsumoto, *Kindai nihon no seiji to ningen* (Japanese) (Politics and People in Modern Japan) (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1970), p. 102.

³⁶ Braisted, p.196.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

was the root and the foundation for everything from one's personal life to the order of society and government.³⁸ So, suffice it to say that he was a "cultural nationalist." He was strongly concerned about morality and believed that politics and morality should not be separated.

Nakamura Keiu did not believe that Japan could be civilized simply by adopting a new political system. The most important civilizing factor was the character of people. The political system was simply a structural change which did not change the intrinsic nature of people. He used an analogy of a jar of water to explain structural change.

If we desire to change the people's character and thereby encourage elevated conduct and virtuous feelings, we will accomplish absolutely nothing if we only reform the political structure, which is only changing round containers for hexagonal or octagonal vessels without altering the character of the water within.³⁹

Keiu suggested that education was the means by which the government could change people's character. For Keiu, there were two kinds of education: "religious and moral" education; and "science and arts." He stressed moral education in order to build good citizens. Moral education was cultivated in a child during his mother's pregnancy. If a mother was strong in body during pregnancy, her offspring would invariably be strong and healthy. During this time the child "will have been filled with a stout spirit and strong morals and breathed the atmosphere of pious virtue."⁴⁰ He emphasized that mothers would be the first teachers to guide their children:

³⁸ Donald H. Shively, "Nishimura Shigeki: A Confucian View of Modernization," in Marius Jensen ed. *Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 222.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 373.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.401.

..Prenatal education is most essential in moral and religious training. Then if the kind words, good conduct, and superb example (of the mother) continuously saturates the child's eyes and ears and envelope his body, he will unconsciously and unwittingly acquire ingrown moral and religious principles before his intellect gradually begins to develop...⁴¹

Later, schools would continue this moral training: " through the vigorous practice of religious and moral education, we cultivate the area to which the influence of the arts and sciences does not extend."⁴²

Keiu revealed his definition of a "good citizen" in his later work, *Toku iku doji* (An Outline of Moral Education) published in 1891 (Meiji 23). Keiu's main idea of *Keiten keishin* (Reverence of heaven and godliness), stressed filial piety, benevolence, and loyalty to the imperial line.

To reiterate, conservatives influenced the process of Japanese modernization by laying the foundation for nationalism both political and cultural. During the *bunmei kaika* period when interest in Western cultures was booming in Japan, the conservatives still emphasized the imperial system and the good citizen who was strongly loyal to the emperor. These ideas were stressed later when the government saw the dangerous influence of Western values, such as in the People's Rights Movement. The importance of the emperor in politics and the qualities of a good citizen were strongly emphasized in the 1890s by the proclamation of The Meiji Constitution in 1890 and the Education Rescript in 1889.

3) Liberals became conservatives

The resurgence of conservatism among liberals dates from the 1880s. Famous thinkers such as Fukuzawa and Katō produced books

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., p.373.

and articles which stressed loyalty to the imperial line and samurai ethics. Fukuzawa's works, On the Imperial House (*Teishitsuran*), published in 1881, and On Honoring the Emperor (*Sannōron*), 1888, reflect this trend. Katō also called for traditional values in his book, *linken shinsetsu*, (Theory of the sovereign state) published in 1882.

This conservative tide was caused by domestic unrest, government changes as well as a shift in the careers of the liberals. Political unrest in the years from 1874 to 1882 rose among the peasant class faced with economic difficulties, among the ex-samurai unable to adjust to the new order and among the still largely politically excluded "middle class" of landowners and urban merchants. The People Rights Movement drew strength from this discontent. In addition, the government was faced with four major uprisings among samurai between 1873 and 1877. All aimed at overthrow of the government; and the government was particularly challenged by the last and largest of these, the Satsuma Rebellion of 1877.⁴³

There were also changes within the government. Many leaders such as Saigō Takamori and Itōgaki Taisuke resigned from office over the Korea issue. Moreover, during the the crisis of 1881 Ōkuma Shigenobu who called for the immediate establishment of an English-model constitutional system was purged from the government. His idea was opposed by Itō Hirobumi as follows:

Your memorial calls selecting the heads of ministries and imperial house hold officials from political parties. In the final analysis this is equivalent to transferring the imperial prerogative to the people. Such heretical views

⁴³ Thomas C. Smith, Political Change and Industrial Development in Japan: Government Enterprise, 1868-1880 (California, Stanford University Press, © 1955), p.33.

should not be held by any subject. I too, in conformity with the Imperial Rescript of 1875, someday hope to see the establishment of a national assembly. However, I desire first to place the imperial prerogatives on a firm, unshakeable foundation.⁴⁴

Itō's idea gained more support in the government and after the crisis he was sent to Europe in order to study constitutional systems. It has been shown that, from that time, the conservatives really controlled the majority in the government. Itō Hirobumi described the early 1880s as "an age of transition":

The opinions prevailing in the country were extremely heterogeneous and often diametrically opposed to one another. We had survivors from former generations who were still full of theocratic ideas and who believed that any attempt to restrict an imperial prerogative amounted to something like high treason. On the other hand, there was a large and powerful body of younger generation educated at a time when the Manchester theory was in vogue, and who in consequence were ultra-radical in their ideas of freedom. ...A work entitled History of Civilization by Buckle, which denounced every form of government as an unnecessary evil, became the great favorite of students of all the higher school, including the Imperial university...At that time we had not arrived at the stage of distinguishing clearly between political opposition on the one hand and treason to the established order on the other.⁴⁵

The next task of the Meiji leaders was finding some means to mobilize people to sacrifice for building a strong and wealthy nation. Moreover, at that time, German economic, political, and legal ideas were adopted and implemented by the representatives of the ruling oligarchy—largely because these seemed less threatening to the status quo than the individualism, egalitarianism, and belief in democracy favored by the

⁴⁴ George Akita, Foundations of Constitutional Government in Modern Japan 1868-1900 (Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 36 quoting *Iwakura jikki*, II, 209.

⁴⁵ Kenneth B. Pyle, "The Emergence of Bureaucratic Conservatism in the Meiji Period," Undercurrent: The Japan Science, Past and Present No. 1 (March, 1983): 13-14 quoting George B. Samson, The Western World and Japan (New York: Knopf, 1950), pp. 347-348.

advocates of liberalism and laissez-faire.⁴⁶ Thus, in the 1880s liberalism was fading in society, while a corresponding tide of conservative ideas was rising among leaders. In order to control unrest the government suppressed the People's Rights Movement and the liberal press.

At this time, Social Darwinism which emphasized "the survival of the fittest" also began to replace the idea of natural rights. Katō Hiroyuki became an advocate of Social Darwinism at the beginning of the 1880s.⁴⁷ Katō, published nothing between 1874-1882, but this was a period of continued success in his bureaucratic-academic career.⁴⁸ As he was getting older and climbed the bureaucratic ladder he became increasingly conservative. In 1870 he was appointed the emperor's tutor, in 1875 Genro-in, and in 1877, the rector of the *Kaisei Gakkō* which later that year emerged as Tokyo University. In 1879 he was elected to the Tokyo Academy (the original name of the Japan Academy) and in 1881 he was reappointed rector of Tokyo University, a position he held until 1893. He gave reasons for this change in his diary as follows:

When I was 47 years old, i.e., in 1882, I wrote and published a pamphlet entitled *Jinken shinsetsu* (New Theory of Human Rights). This was the first publication after my beliefs had changed. Why did my beliefs change? Having read a book by Buckle, the British evolutionary historian. I found that the so-called metaphysical philosophy is almost meaningless and that nothing can be meaningfully discussed without the principles and knowledge of natural science. After that I read Darwin's theory of evolution, and the

⁴⁶ A. W Coats, "From a Western Point of View," in *Enlightenment...*, p. 279.

⁴⁷ Ichiro Ishida "The Spirit of Meiji," *Philosophical Studies of Japan* Vol. IX, 1969 (Tokyo: Published by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science): 50

⁴⁸ Abosch, "Katō...." p. 420.

philosophy of evolution of Spencer, Haeckel and others. My views concerning the nature of the universe and life have entirely changed.⁴⁹

Concurrent with Katō's career advancement were changes in his philosophy. These changes are clearly revealed in *Jinken shinsetsu* in which he rejected his previous ideas about natural rights and strongly instead supported Social Darwinism and the power of the state. He wrote, "I began to attack natural rights in a series of lectures held at the *Seishoji* in *Atago-shita*, Tokyo. Again on March 7, 1880, I attacked natural rights in a lecture series at the Nakamura-ro in Ryogoku, Tokyo."⁵⁰

Katō not only rejected the notion of his idea about natural rights, but praised the existence of the imperial system in Japanese society:

Imagine how someone like myself has risen from the rank of the impoverished ex-samurai class...Thanks to the graciousness of His Majesty...and now ranks above prince and marquises in the order of precedence at Court. And there are many I know from the old ex-samurai class who have attained these ranks...I want to say to my grandchildren, therefore, that I would have them be the kind of people who will go much higher in the class structure than I have gone.⁵¹

Regarding Katō's conversion, Professor Matsumoto Sannosuke has suggested that the *Jinken* was the "work of a convert, a work of severe self-criticism." Katō, in his harsh judgment, "has lost his intellectual virginity and could regain some sense of personal purity only by savagely attacking his former works. Consequently, more than any outsider, Katō subjected his works to the severest criticism."⁵²

⁴⁹ Michio Nagai, "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan," *Far Eastern Quarterly* Vol. 14 (November, 1954): 61 quoting Katō Hiroyuki, *Hiroyuki jiden* (The Autography of Hiroyuki) (Tokyo: The Committee for Prof. H. Katō's 80th Birthday Celebration, 1915), p. 47.

⁵⁰ Abosch, "Katō," p. 423 quoting M.B.Z: *Jiyuminken-hen*, "Jinken shisetsu," p.371

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 448 quoting M.B.Z: *Jiyuminken-hen*, "Jinken shinsetsu," p.385

⁵² Sannosuke Matsumoto, "Katō Hiroyuki...tenko ni tsutē" in *Shiso no kagaku*, no 2 (May 1962) : 36, 39

During the 1880s Fukuzawa's views also shifted toward conservatism. Around 1875, he started to discuss *kakutai* which at the time meant only an independent government, but for Fukuzawa the emperor symbolized *kakutai*. He compared the imperial house to the eye in a human body: by the glint of the eye we know the body is alive.⁵³ His ideas about the imperial house continued to develop with time. In 1881, in his work called, On the Imperial House (*Teishitsuran*), he began calling for loyalty to Japan's imperial institution.

Fukuzawa's view of Japan's place in the international arena changed. This is reflected in his change of slogan from *bunmei kaika* to *naihan gaikyo* (internal stability, external competition). In 1882 he published a series of articles criticizing Chinese intervention in Korea. He called for the government to put an end to this. Later his interventionist stance strengthened and he encouraged Japan to join the Western powers by acquiring colonies. Fukuzawa reveals his imperialistic tendencies in *Gaikoron* (Discussion on foreign relations), where he states that "...Japan will join the route to eat, and join to eat goods in China..."⁵⁴ Albert M. Craig gave an explanation for Fukuzawa's conversion as his view of the world changed.⁵⁵ From the late 1870s, after the Satsuma rebellion, the domestic situation became stable and Japan became more deeply concerned with the international scene. From 1876 into the early 1880s Japan was increasingly involved in Korea. Imperialism was still rampant in Asia during this time.

⁵³ Albert M. Craig, "Fukuzawa Yukichi: The Philosophical Foundations of Meiji Nationalism," ed. Robert E. Ward Political Development in Modern Japan (Massachusetts, Princeton University Press, 1968), pp.116-117.

⁵⁴ Masane Kano, "Fukuzawa Yukichi (*Seiyō Bunka no suishita*)" *Nihon no Shisoka* (Japanese Intellectuals) (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun), p.101.

⁵⁵ Albert M. Craig, "Fukuzawa Yukichi: The Philosophical Foundations of Meiji Nationalism," p. 99.

Craig concluded that "in a brutal world where principles are created only by money and guns, it is necessary to rely on one's own strength. This view of the world led Fukuzawa away from general theories about civilization to a more specific concern for Japan's immediate national needs."⁵⁶ Thus, it made him realize that not only an ideal of civilization could strengthen Japan but morality and national spirit were also necessary.

Needless to say, from the 1890s Japanese conservatism and nationalism were very strong. Many scholars agree that the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 marks the end of a chapter in the history of Meiji liberalism.⁵⁷ Fukuzawa urged the people to give complete support to the government's war efforts:

Japanese subjects must not criticize the government's policy...My sole object is victory in this war. As long as we win the war and extend our national power so that we Japanese can be proud among the nations of the world, there is no need to complain about domestic matters no matter how much discontent and unreasonableness may prevail.⁵⁸

In conclusion, the Japanese intellectuals had a great deal more depth and breadth compared to the Thai intellectuals. They were well-informed and really appreciated Western ideologies. Some of the liberals acquired Western knowledge directly from the West and wanted to apply those ideas and institutions directly to Japanese society. Some of the conservatives with the exception of Nakamura Keiu were not accustomed to the West, wanted to synthesize Western culture to the Japanese society.

⁵⁶ *ibid.*, p. 129.

⁵⁷ Mikiso Hane, "Nationalism and the Decline of Liberalism in Meiji Japan," *Studies on Asia*, ed. Robert K. Sakai (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), p.77. Albert M. Craig, "Fukuzawa Yukichi: The Philosophical Foundations of Meiji Nationalism," p.135.

⁵⁸ Hane, "Nationalism.....," p.77 quoting Ienaga Saburo, *Nihon Dotoku Shisoshi* (Tokyo, 1954), p. 230.

Thai intellectuals were similar to the conservatives in Japan in that aspect. However, as time passed, Japan changed both internally and internationally. Internally Japan was more stable than in the beginning of the Meiji period. Japan was also developing her country politically, socially and economically. Internationally, Western imperialism was still evident in Asia. The liberals realized that a nation could only survive by its strength. Only Western civilization could achieve that goal. Japan needed to mobilize people for the national goal by using traditional values such as morality and loyalty. Furthermore some of the liberals were also promoted to higher ranks in the government giving them the incentive to maintain the established order. All of these reasons caused liberals such as Fukuzawa Yukichi and Katō Hiroyuki to become more conservative. Thus, the broader and deeper experiences in Western knowledge of the liberals allowed Japanese intellectuals to practically and successfully reconcile Western learning and the need for a national identity. Since the Thai intellectuals did not have a chance to learn or experience directly from the West, their feeling toward the West was a mixture of admiration and fear. They did not have the deep and broad knowledge of the West that was necessary to reconcile Western knowledge to Thai national needs.

B) Thailand.

1) Conservatives: King Chulalongkorn, Prince Vajirañāna, Prince Damrong

As mentioned in Chapter II Thai intellectuals were basically conservative rather than liberal. They faced the same dilemma as

their counterparts in Japan: how to survive the Western challenge? But their response to that challenge was different from that of the Japanese intellectuals. They accepted some Western political institutions, but still emphasized traditional values such as unity and loyalty to the king and nation in order to confront the West. Actually, they were progressive in developing Thai society and political economy, but compared to the Japanese intellectuals they were relatively conservative. In this section, I will first discuss their ideas about the West and the survival tactics they propounded. Second, I will discuss liberals. Were there any liberals in Thailand? If there were, what was their role in society? Could they influence Thai modernization?

a) Ensuring survival by modernization.

Most Thai intellectuals believed in "enlightenment from above." The government had a duty to lead the people in development. Therefore the King, as absolute ruler and as leader of the intellectuals, had tremendous effect on the process of modernization. King Mongkut initiated modernization. Being aware of Western power he voluntarily opened Thailand, learned Western knowledge and prepared his children such as King Chulalongkorn, Prince Damrong and Prince Vajirāñāna to deal with the West. King Chulalongkorn viewed the West with a mixture of inferiority and admiration. He travelled in order to study the West. His first trip, in March 1871, took him to Singapore to observe the British Administration and to Dutch Java. During his thirty-seven days on the trip, he saw many Western colonial accomplishments such as post offices, jails, hospitals, schools, the telegraph and museums. He travelled to Europe in 1897 with the primary aim to develop strong personal relationships with all the rulers of Europe from

St. Petersburg to London. During his eight months in Europe he keenly observed Western life. He gained a much more exact sense of the technological distance between Thailand and Europe and a more realistic appraisal of the amount of time required to catch up with the West. He admired Western civilization, but also feared Western power. He realized that Thailand needed to change in order to survive. He expressed this feeling of inferiority in a letter to Prince Damrong:

It is the right decision to come to Europe. I am definitely sure that there are some benefits in this trip. I did not care how they treated me because in the Western view our country is uncivilized. Actually, they treated me well, but it was temporary. We should be aware of this...⁵⁹

Because of this sense of inferiority and the precarious situation of Thailand the King earnestly wished to learn from the West. The following year, he inaugurated the King's scholarships, a program which sent ten students who went abroad between March 1898 and March 1902. He also hired foreign advisers, and abolished traditions which in Western eyes were barbaric such as crawling in the presence of the King.

...I really want my people to have happy lives. If anything causes people suffering, I will get rid of it. I have heard that many countries denounce customs such as crawling, in order to show that there is no mistreatment...There is some mistreatment in our society. I am thinking about abolishing them. However, I cannot do it all at once. It needs to be gradually done. Our country will be civilized. For example crawling is considered as the highest salutation. It should be changed to bowing ...⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Chulalongkorn, King, *Phraratchahattareaka ratchakan thii 5 phraratchathan mayang naiphantree phraongchao Disvorakuman ratchaongkarak* (King Chulalongkorn's letters to phraongchao Disvorakuman (Prince Damrong) , in commemoration the death of Momchao Ditsanuvat Disakul at Tepsirintharevat Temple, 20 January 1968.

⁶⁰ *Chotmaihet rachakan thii ha (B.C.H.kao) "ruang kodmai, prarachaniyom rae kanphongkrong (Thai) (Chronicles in the King Chulalongkorn's Reign (old account) "Law, Royal Customs, Custom and Administration" 234/5 prakot ruang thumnemmobkhan kae phraboromwongsanuwong, (234/5 The announcement of Abolishing Clwing Custom for Royal Family.)*

The King also wished to raise the status of citizens, especially that of slaves. When he was an heir, he showed an interest in his slaves and expressed his sympathy for their suffering.

It would not be a mistake to say that King Chulalongkorn had liberal social ideas. In politics, he also welcomed bureaucratic advice and his speeches in the Privy Council and State Council reflect this:

...If more than two of the members thought that something was good or bad for the country, then, they were able to suggest those ideas at the meeting. We would discuss those issues and follow the meeting's decision. If only one of the members has an idea, and nobody agrees with it, a postponement would ensue.⁶¹

Though he welcomed suggestions from his officers few dared to offer advice.

b) Using traditional values such as kingship and unity.

Despite the Kings' liberal social stance, politically he remained staunchly conservative. He accepted only Western political institutions not ideologies. It can be explained that Thai society at that time was not ready to accept any new political system. Socially, the majority of citizens were not yet educated nor freemen. They remained under the corvée system. The spirit of independence and natural rights were not known in Thai society. Internationally, Thailand was also precariously situated in the midst of Western colonies. Both England and France attempted to expand their power into Thailand. The Thai government feared that the adoption of a popular political system would only facilitate the

⁶¹ *Chotmaihet rachakan thii he (B. Ch kao,)* (Thai) (Chronicle in King Chulalongkorn's reign) 153/11 "pakat rüang prugsachatkan thumnembanmuang" (153/11 "the announcement of counseling management of customs").

parent country's expansion into Thailand. Moreover, Thailand did not have clear boundaries. The map of Thailand was first published and circulated in 1897.⁶² For all these reasons King Chulalongkorn emphasized the central role of the monarchy in ruling the country and strongly believed that Thailand was not ready for a constitutional system. He reiterated this in his answer to the students petition of 1885 which called for a constitutional monarchy. The King compared the European and Thai political systems and elaborated Thai differences:

Europeans succeed in using a parliamentary system because fundamental factors were already rooted in the society... The Thai cannot easily import a parliamentary system because we do not have similar backgrounds... Moreover, Thai Kings are different from European Kings; the former are more benevolent than the latter. European Kings monopolized power and restricted religion while people wanted changes and freedom. It led to hostility and revolution. Generally, Thai people do not care for change. Only a few people do. Sometimes, it will cost too much to change; for example, demolishing houses for building roads or canals.⁶³

King Chulalongkorn inherited this belief of the importance of the monarch from his father, King Mongkut. Thai ideas concerning kingship originated in Buddhist teachings. Most Thai people thought of Siam as an empire in the Buddhist world. The King was an emperor or *Thamikkarat* (the King who possesses good deeds). His duty was to care for citizens and guide them to nirvana. However, this idea changed when Thailand opened the country, especially in the reign of King Rama III. Western merchants and

⁶² Somkiat Wentana, *Muang Tai yukmai: sampantaphaprawangrat: apphrawatsatsemmuk*, "(Thai) ('Modern Thailand: the relation between state and historical consciousness,") ed. Sombat Chantawong and Chaiwet Sathanan, *Yu muang Tai (Live in Thailand)* p. 82 quoting *Yorasan Phanthii (The Journal of Map)* Special issue for celebrating bicentennial of Ratanakosin period; 24-25 (July 1981-1983) pp. 23, 32.

⁶³ Chulalongkorn, King, *Phraboromrachathibay rüang sammakhi* (Thai) (*The Explanation of unity*) In commemoration of the death of Mr. So Chawakiedkul at the wat Prayunwongsawat, 20 July 2517 (1974), pp. 5-16.

missionaries came to Thailand and brought in new concepts. Western ways of thinking strongly influenced Thai ideas about kingship. Thai intellectuals used more scientific concepts and methods in thinking. Buddhism was the first area effected by this influence. King Mongkut or (*Vajirāṇāna Bhikkhu*, his religious name) was a leader who used Western knowledge to reinterpret Buddhism.

During his nearly three decades as a monk, King Mongkut undertook a major reform movement within Siamese Buddhism. He believed that many beliefs and customs had become encrusted around Buddhism that obscured the true message of the Buddha. His conversations with Christian missionaries stimulated him to reflect on the nature and essence of Buddhism. He gathered round him a small coterie of monks who shared his desire for a purified *sangha* (monkhood) and established a new sect of Buddhism, *Thammayutnikai*, meaning those monks who adhered strictly to *Thamma* (Buddhist teaching) in contrast to *Mahanikai* (Big Sect). Through this sect, he interpreted Buddhism in a different way and changed Thai traditional culture. Prince Damrong discussed his motivation as follows:

Phra Chom Klao changed ancient customs and built up several (others) to be the established practices of the fourth reign... The reasons that Phra Chom Klao chose to change various customs ... were two. One, as already stated, was because he knew in his heart that his government had met the time (when) the situation in the East would be changed by the farang who came with increasing power. (He) must change the policies of the government to accord with the civilization of the farang (so that) the country would be out of danger. But there were other things which Phra Chom Klao changed at that time which were not concerned with the civilization of the farang, but which were very important in Thai custom. There was another reason (for this) and that reason originates in the desire of Phra Chom Klao to do things correctly (so they would be) permanent. It

was not enough to follow what had been done before, just for the sake of 'protecting custom.'⁶⁴

We can see from this quotation that King Mongkut established this new sect in order to improve Buddhism in Thailand. He rejected the supernatural and divided the world into two, secular and religious. In the secular world, the King is a leader of a group of people. According to *Khampee Thamasart* (Law Code from India), a *Sammulirat* (assumed, or supposed King) governed a group of people (country). The King held ultimate power and his duties included acting as a judge⁶⁵ and leading the country in development. King Mongkut revealed clearly his combination of Buddhist and Western philosophy concerning a king's role as a judge. He mentioned that it was difficult to be fair because "in people's minds there were four basic biases: love, greed, anger and madness". In order to achieve fairness King Mongkut recommended written laws,⁶⁶ a clear indication of the influence of the Western legal system. Furthermore, he also recommended that the government centralize power and administration. He mentioned:

In one family, it is necessary to have one or two persons who have power and control the others, as one house needs a leader, one city needs a mayor, and one country needs a King who holds an absolute power.....⁶⁷

In answering the question how one's country could become more progressive, King Mongkut relied on Buddhist ideas concerning kingship such

⁶⁴ Damrong Rajenubhab, Prince, *Chatmaihet mue Phrabetsomdet Phrachomklaochaoyuhue Sawanakot* (Thai) (*Documents on the Death of King Mongkut*) (Bangkok: Sophon Phiphatthanakon, 1929), pp. 58-59

⁶⁵ Chulalongkorn, King, "Nanathramvicharinee" in *Prachumpraratchanipolpasotai nai ratchakan thii sii phak thii song* (Collection of King Mongkut's works), Vol 2, p.134.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 124-125.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

as *Thatsapitratthama* (ten *thamma* of the King) and *Chakkavattivat* (Empire's routine). At the same time there was a need for good citizens who preserved *sila ha* (five precepts) and *Phramchariya sip* (Ten prosperous manners). Suffice it to say that the good king and good citizens of King Mongkut ideas were derived from Buddhist teachings. During his reign he cultivated and expanded the popularity of kingship by traveling throughout the country. He also bequeathed these ideas to his children.

Prince Vajiravāṇa was strongly impressed by King Mongkut's philosophy. He preached the importance of kingship in one unified society to citizens, and government officials as well as to the king himself. Before he became a monk he wrote an article which reported the King's activities in *The Court*. In his famous article, *Phraracha pen huanar khong manus* (a king is a leader of people) of 1906, he discussed the King's role in society:

Phraracha pen huanar khong manus
(The king is a leader of people)

I will explain the above *thamma*.⁶⁸ This is a motto for people to use for. in one country people need to have a ruler.

Naturally, people need to live together in a group and work for themselves and the family. Humans cannot live alone. They need protection and group communication. However, living in a group, they cannot avoid argument or competition among themselves about property and money. In order to avoid these kinds of disputes and inconvenience which will occur in a group, they elect one to be ruler. The ruler will act as judge to end disputes, punish bad men, and aid the group. *Praracha* (the king) is a man who rules one province or one country independently...In order to govern the country *Praracha* needs to have assistants which are called the government officials. The majority of the group who work for their own living are *rasadan* (people).

Praracha and his assistants have to protect *rasadan's* privileges. He should not think about his own benefits. In return, *rasadan*

⁶⁸ *Thamma* means the Buddhist teaching.

will give some part of their production to *Fraracha* to be divided among his assistants.⁶⁹

Prince Vajirañāna elaborated further about the relationship between

Phraracha and *rasadon*, "...these two groups should behave according to their social status and should have *thamma* as the guideline of their actions..."⁷⁰

Prince Vajirañāna emphasized the importance of *Phraracha*'s role and

suggested that the country should preserve this system:

...*Fraracha* is a leader of people and manages the group's affairs. So, every part of society will follow his lead as other organs follow the order of the head...The independent countries which have *Fraracha*, should earnestly preserve its own *Fraracha*, as one preserves one's head, in order to declare their own independence...⁷¹

Besides kingship, Prince Vajirañāna also called for unity in society. He believed that *sammakkhi* (unity) could help a country to survive and used metaphors to explain the importance and necessity of *sammakkhi* in one society. In his article called "*Sammakkhi kù kham phromphieng*" (*Sammakkhi* is unity) he wrote:

When we look at animals and things in this world, we will be surprised at how many elements are united together. Is it nature or did someone make it so?

Human and animals are composed of four elements: earth, water, fire and wind. All these elements make a body which can move, talk, see, smell and so on... As long as these elements work together, the body is alive. If they cannot that body will fall apart...

Even through humans have small bodies and little power, they can do jobs that are bigger than themselves, such as building a house, and ruling each other. Certainly, if one lives alone, one could not do such work. Not only among human beings, but also among animals, unity helps them to

⁶⁹ *Mahavakvina* (The Buddhist Discipline) V.2 p.113.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.113.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*.

do big things, therefore termites can make a big termite hill, and ants or bees can bite a human or a big animal...

My purpose in this explanation is to emphasize the necessity of *sammakki* (unity) for humans as the Buddha said, "*sappesang sangka sammakki mutthisathika*" This means that unity creates benefits and aids in the progress for a group of people.

There are two kinds of *sammakki*: physical *sammakki* and spiritual *sammakki*. Spiritual *sammakki* is the action of a group of people who are governed by one person... these two *sammakki* give power to the group. If a group has *sammakki*, they can do anything...

Living in a non-*sammakki* group, one is not happy and nothing progresses. So, if one wishes for happiness and progress, one should cooperate with others who realize the importance of *sammakki*. One should not be selfish. S/he should think about others, be tolerant, less stubborn, and be kind to each other.... *Sammakki* will contribute good and progressive things to both oneself and others.⁷²

We can see that Thai intellectuals tried to use traditional values, such as kingship and unity to strengthen the country in order to meet Western challenges. Prince Vajirañāna also used Buddhist philosophies as a tool to cultivate these morals and spread these ideas throughout society. Buddhism played a preeminent role in creating Thai nationalism which was strongly established later in the reign of King Rama VI (King Vajiravudh). However, in King Chulalongkorn's reign not only were traditional values stressed, but Western ideologies curtailed.

The Thai response was typical of many countries faced with Western challenges, they strengthened traditional values supporting the existing order. It was different from Japan which wanted to accept new political, social and economic systems because the old one had collapsed. In Thailand the old socio-political system was still working well. Both the social structure and Buddhism facilitated the government's use of

⁷² Vajirañāna, Prince, *Anusasane thii somdet phraboromwongther krommaphra Vajirañāna daiprathankae kongsuapa naiwanthunamkaokong thii 6 May R.S 130.* (Thai) (Prince Vajirañāna speeches for soldiers trainee on 6th May 1911) (Bangkok: Sammit publisher, 1911), pp. 7-8.

traditional values to strengthen the nation. Norman Jacobs labeled Thai society as "a patrimonial society" where the administrative leaders held the ultimate power in deciding national affairs.⁷³ The Thai were also taught to respect and fear their ruler, to feel deeply grateful for "royal generosity" and to be loyal to the *sakdina* class (the upper class).⁷⁴ These values allowed the government to chose traditional values to confront the West. Moreover, Buddhism was also the most important religion in the country. Most of the Thai were Buddhists. Thus, it was not hard for the government to cultivate Buddhist values such as unity and kingship in society.

King Chulalongkorn clearly did not want any new political ideologies, especially republicanism and communism to enter his regime. Toward the end of his reign there occurred a political movement for constitutional government in China. This news was reported by the Chinese press in Thailand. In response, the King suppressed this news with the justification that, "the idea of Chinese political parties is contrary to our interests."⁷⁵

The King remained adamant in his belief in an absolute monarchy where he alone chose the direction for Thai society. His response to the petition in 1885 stated that "at this moment, the Thai need to have government reform."⁷⁶ He clarified the types of reforms in his later work

⁷³ Norman Jacobs, Modernization Without Development: Thailand as an Asian case study (New York: Praeger Publishers © 1971), p. 29.

⁷⁴ Hong Lyse, Thailand in the Nineteenth Century Evolution of the Economy and Society (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, © 1984), p. 29. quoting Jit Phumisak, *Chomma sakdina thai* (Thai) (The face of Thai feudalism) (Bangkok, reprinted 1979), pp. 58-65.

⁷⁵ NA, R5, MC, no. 8.7 " *Loiphrahattaleka rüing nangsiipimchin* (11 January-16 February.) " (Thai) (King's letter concerning a Chinese newspaper (11 January-16 February 1908)

⁷⁶ Chai-anan Samuthawanit, *Akkasan Khanmuang Khanpogkrong khong Thai 2417-2477*, (Thai) (Documents of Thai Politics and Government) (Bangkok: Social Sciences Organization in Thailand, 1975), p. 38.

Phraborom rachathibay veduai kharm sammakki (The explanation about *sammakki*). He did not agree with those who had studied abroad and wished to imitate the European political system. He noted that "it was the same as one who used a growing wheat handbook to cultivate Thai rice. It won't work...."⁷⁷ Furthermore, he believed that "at this moment, it is easier for the Thai people to use the monarchical system because this system has been practiced in Thailand for ages..."⁷⁸ However, he realized that Thailand needed political reform and recommended moderation:

I do not agree with either those who want to change everything, even religion, or those who strictly preserve traditional values and do not want to change even a little. I prefer a moderate way and agree with any change which will lead to a moderate way.⁷⁹

He stressed harmony between the King and people and believed that unity and loyalty would enable the country to survive and become a civilized nation. He continuously stressed these ideas throughout his reign:

I have always believed that the most important reason for Thai progress is the unity and the love between the King and the people. With these factors, the Thai people can be more progressive in the future...⁸⁰

In this period there was also the emergence of the idea of *Chat* (nation) and the relationship between the nation and the king. In 1869, one of King Chulalongkorn's chief ministers, Phraya Phatsakorawong wrote an

⁷⁷ Chulalongkorn, King, *Phraboromrachathibay rüang sammakki* (Thai) (The Explanation of Unity) (In commemoration of the death of Mr. So Chawakiadkul at the wat Prayunwongsawat), 20 July 2517 (1974), p 5.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p 17.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Phrarachadamrattob phraboromwongsanuwoong rae khathullalongthureeprabat fainer, 21 September R.S 128* (Thai) (King's speech for royal families and government officers, 1909) in *Phrarachadamrat nai phrabatsomdet phrachulachomkeochaoyuhaw i'2417-2453 B.E* (A Collection of King Chulalongkorn's Speeches from 1874-1910) (Bangkok: Sopolpipatthanskorn, 1915).

article in a journal *Vajirayan Viset*. In this article he compared the Buddhist theory of kingship with modern Western political principles and brought in the newly developing symbol of *Chat* to explain the Thai monarchy. His argument can be summarized as follows:

It is understood that all the land of the kingdom belongs solely to the king. The king abides by royal customs established by our ancestors who came together to form a *Chat*. This gathering people chose from one family a capable man to be the leader of the *Chat*. This man was very able and intelligent and one the people could rely on to be their protector. This chosen leader guarded both internal and external security and brought happiness to the people. This had not been brought about by the opinion of the majority; rather it had been through the leader's own authority. The people who were organized into the *Chat* were loyal to him and followed his advice.⁸¹

Thus the Thai monarchy, which placed its legitimacy in Buddhism, was inextricably linked with *Chat*. According to Phraya Phatsakorawong's argument, *Chat* was a gathering of the people that elected the king, after which the king was given power over everything as the sustainer and protector of the people under the moral law of Buddhism.

The word *Chat* was mentioned again in 1893 after the crisis between the Thai and French. In his weekly newspaper, *Thammasat-winitchai*, Luang Ratana Yati used *Chat* together with *King* and *Buddhism*. This newspaper condemned the French invasion in 1893, saying:

It is the duty of every Thai national (*khan Chat Thai*) who loves his *Chat* and *Banmuang*⁸² to make the utmost effort to the last in defence of the kingdom against the invading enemy...I believe that those men who were born into *Chat Thai* would never surrender to become slaves of another *chat*...We must be united to struggle against the royal foe in order to repay our

⁸¹ Eiji Murashima, "The Origin of Modern Official State Ideology in Thailand," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol. XIX, No. 1 (March, 1988): p 86, quoting Phraya Phatsakorawong, "Ruang Suan" (On Farming) *Vajirayan Viset* 4 (1889): 452-54.

⁸² *Banmuang* means country.

gratitude to the king; we must defend Buddhism against being trampled down by the impious; we must defend our fatherland against the invasion of the enemy, and preserve the freedom and independence of the Thai Nation (*Chat Thai*).⁸³

These works clearly reveal Thai national identity was intertwined with such ideas as kingship, Buddhism and the duties of the Thai toward the nation. However, there is no documentation which gives the exact location of the nation named Siam (Thailand). Around 1899-1900 Prince Vajirañāna defined the Siamese (Thai) as the people who spoke Thai and lived in a land which was "connected to China in the North, Tonkin in the Northeast, Vietnam in the East, and Burma in the Northwest."⁸⁴ So, the ideas of nationhood according to Western values became clearer as well as the growing of historical consciousness and identity as the "Thai." Before King Chulalongkorn's reign Thai history was thought it have begun at Ayudhaya period (1350). King Chulalongkorn encouraged further study of Thai origins. This idea was carried by King Vajiravudh and Prince Damrong. With their effort the Sukothai period was connected to the Ayudhaya period, thus, dating Thai history at 1257. Prince Damrong had continued to work on this issue and in 1927 he stressed the uniqueness of the Thai in his lecture, "*Laksana kanpogkhrang khong prathedsayam taeboran*" ("The Characteristics of the Ancient Thai Administration"). He valued three unique Thai traits: the spirit of independence, the lack of persecution and the intelligence of compromise. All these factors enabled the Thai to remain independent for almost 700 years (1257-1927).⁸⁵

⁸³ Ibid., p. 88 quoting "*Rüang farangsed kap Thai*," (France and the Thais), *Thammasat-winitchai* 2 (1893): 30-34.

⁸⁴ Somkiet Wentana, *Muang Tai yukmai: sampantaphaprawangrattakapphrawatsatsamnut*, p. 76 quoting Vajirañāna, Prince, *Phrawatsatboramkadee (Thai) (History and Archeology)* (Bangkok: Mahamakutrajavidyalaya, 1971), pp. 3-5.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 115.

King Vajiravudh (1910-1925) continued to stress Thai national identity and strongly cultivated them among the Thai.⁸⁶ In 1911, eight days after his coronation, he established a paramilitary organization, "The Wild Tiger," made up of volunteers who were members of the civilian bureaucracy. He wanted this corp to become a new significant instrument for bringing the Thai together by stimulating martial values and a new national spirit.⁸⁷ Furthermore, he used his plays for nationalistic purposes such *Phra Ruang* (assumed name of the first in the Sukothai period) and *Huachai nakrap* (The Soul of a Warrior). He was adamant that it was necessary for the Thai to be united, to love their king and religion and, above all, to be willing to give up even life itself for these three.⁸⁸

It can be said that around the end of the nineteenth century, during the reign of King Chulalongkorn, the formulation of the Thai official state ideology began. It was founded on the traditional Thai concept of a Buddhist monarchy, on a conception of *Chat* as a national political community, and on the firm belief of the significance of Thai national traditions. This incipient ideology was formulated during the 1880s and 1890s by the ruling elite as a device to integrate the Thai people into the concept of nationhood and national traditions at a time when Siam faced a dangerous threat from Western colonialism.

Thai citizens were taught the concept of nationhood through religious preaching and education. Prince Vajirāñāne was the most important man to cultivate those concepts among the Thai by preaching and writing textbooks. Through these media the Thai were taught about kingship,

⁸⁶ Walter F. Vella, Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism (Honolulu: The University of Hawaii, © 1978), p. XIY.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

being good citizens and duty toward the nation. They were taught to sacrifice for nation. For example, in textbook, *Thammachariya* (Thamma and Ethics) Vol. IV, there was a chapter about loving one's country:

..We should love our nation and our king more than ourselves. When we grown up, we will work for the benefit of our country and try to develop our country to the same level as others nations..⁸⁹

c) View on education

Prince Damrong held the same ideas as King Chulalongkorn and Prince Vajirāñāna but was more concerned with the cultivation of good qualities in the Thai people. Besides strong cultivation of traditional values, he also called for Western learning, especially language. For him, language would be a tool to learn both international affairs and Western knowledge. In his work, "The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam," he discusses how the relationship between Thailand and the West developed from the Ayudhya period (1350-1767) to the Rattanskosin period (1782-). Foreigners found it difficult to communicate with the Thai because so few Thai spoke English. For example, in the reign of King Rama II, when the English came to negotiate the treaty, it was necessary to use two interpreters to translate statements into Malay and into Siamese.⁹⁰ King Rama IV (King Mongkut) was the first man to realize the importance of language as a means to deal with the West.

Prince Damrong emphasized education as a tool to enhance the qualities of the Thai people. A nationwide educational system would create

⁸⁹ Thammasakmontee, Chaophraya, *Thammachariya* (Thamma and Ethics) Vol. IV, : 126

⁹⁰ Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince "The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam," (A paper read by H.R.H Prince Damrong Rajanubhab at the Rotarian Dinner of the United Club, on August 7th, 1925) *The Journal of the Siam Society* Vol XXX (Part 2) (October 1926): 7.

good citizens to work for the government. He was appointed Minister of Education in 1887 and despite his reassignment as Minister of the Interior, (due to the crisis between France and Thailand in 1893 , R. S 112), remained interested in national education. In 1902, he wrote a letter to Chaophraya Prasadet Surenterathibodee (the Minister of Education) and suggested a way for national survival:

Because of external challenges, we ought to create a good, efficient internal system. If we fail to do so, we will be in trouble. ...Education is a very important thing for the nation in times of crisis. We really need to establish an educational system as quickly as we can. It takes as much time to produce a good government officer as it takes to grow a plant. In my opinion, nothing is as important as education. I have already told the King that education is a tool for the survival of the country.⁹¹

Prince Damrong did not elucidate the Thai values which the government should use in order to control and mobilize the Thai people in both confronting the West and modernization. However, from his works one can conclude that he too emphasized traditional values, such as kingship and national unity. Most of his works concerned Thai history such as History of Siam: Second King of the Bangkok Dynasty (1914) and Commentary on the History of Siam: Ayudhya Period (1914), culture, and anthropology and so he has been labeled "The Father of Thai History."

Prince Damrong's ideas had a tremendous effect on Thai modernization due to his role as a close confidant to the King and as a government official twice (in 1897 and 1906) appointed to the Counselling Committee to the regent during the King's travels abroad.

In conclusion, with the influence of King Mongkut Thai

⁹¹ Sucharit Thevorasuk, *Phraprawat rae ngankhong somdet phrachao boromwongther Damrong Rajanubhab* (Thai) (Prince Damrong Rajanubhab's Biography and Works) (Bangkok: Suksaphanpanit, 1965), pp. 239-241.

intellectuals in the nineteenth century believed in using traditional values to confront the Western challenge. They used Buddhist philosophy to justify kingship and called for unity in *Chat* (nation). All these ideas laid the foundation for nationalism in the reign of King Rama VI who defined Thai nationalism as *Chat* (nation), religion (Buddhism), and kingship. While they stressed traditional values they also adapted some Western institutions into Thai society. I will discuss those institutions later.

2) The Liberals

Liberalism was a scarce commodity in nineteenth century Thai society. If the definition of a liberal is one who advocates immediate transformation to a Western system then the students and government petitioners of 1885 can be labeled so. Their experience studying and working in Europe resulted in a wish to transform the Thai political system from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy. They attacked the old system in which power was centralized in the King and his brothers, especially Prince Devawongse, Minister of Foreign Affairs. They proposed that a cabinet be formed with which the King would share power and suggested that the Thai government follow Japan's tactics and skillful diplomacy to meet the Western challenge.

Through news and studying, the petitioners learned about Japan. They were impressed by Japanese modernization and recognized it as the reason Japan survived the Western challenge.⁹² Among Japanese developments, legal reform most impressed the petitioners. In 1872 the

⁹² Chai-anan Sanuthawanit, *Akkasan Khanmuang...*, p. 41 "Chaonei rao kharachakan krabangkomthulkhambhanchotkanphiang rathiebrachakanpandin R. 5 103" ("The political reformation suggestion of bureaucrats and government officers in 1884").

Iwakura Mission was sent to Europe and America in order to inquire about the possibility of amending the treaties. After they came back the government underwent massive reforms. In 1875 a French adviser, Gustave Boissonade de Fontarabie, was hired to draft the Criminal Code which was completed in 1877. Other codes such as the commercial and Civil Code were in the process of being rewritten. With this legal reform Japan began to regain her legal autonomy. In 1878-9 the United States was persuaded to agree to tariff autonomy. In 1882 Britain proved adamant over extraterritoriality. A compromise was then worked out, involving a plan for mixed courts under Japanese and foreign judges. This news impressed the petitioners because Thailand also suffered from unequal treaties.⁹³ Later, when Thailand reformed her legal system, a Japanese adviser, Dr. Tokichi Masao was hired.⁹⁴ He worked for the Thai government for sixteen years (1897-1913) and was honored with a chaophraya title, Chaophraya Mahithon due to his significant achievement in revising the Thai Civil Code. In February 1921 he was appointed as the Japanese ambassador in Thailand and started to revise the unequal treaty. Unfortunately, six months later he died and the Thai government ordered his funeral as his title of Thai chaophraya merited.

The petitioners began their statement with the European justification for Asian expansion: "there were many uncivilized countries in this world, so the Europeans claimed that they had a duty to expand

⁹³ Thailand had signed unequal treaties with sixteen countries; England (1855), U. S. A. and France (1856), Portugal and Denmark (1858) Netherlands (1860), German (1861), Norway, Sweden, Belgium and Italy (1868), Austria, Hungary and Spain (1869), Japan (1897) and Russia (1899).

⁹⁴ Dr. Tokichi Masao was born in Osu, Ehime Prefecture. In 1889 he was graduated from Tokyo University. In 1895 he went to continue his study in Virginia University and got his Ph. D in Law from Yale University.

civilization throughout the world."⁹⁵ Thailand's survival depended on modernizing the country on the European model. They mentioned several ways to accomplish this:

1 We need to change the present Thai political system from an "absolute monarchy," which means the King is only one who makes decisions in national affairs, to a "constitutional monarchy," which means the King governs the country in consort with his government officers. However, the King still holds the ultimate decision.

2 The cabinet will take care of protecting and developing the country...⁹⁶

They heavily stressed the idea of power sharing between the King and the Cabinet as in the British system. However, they did not push it one step further, i.e. sharing power between the government and the people. The King did not punish this group or even accuse them of being rebels but slowly assimilated them into the government. For example, Krommamern Naret (a member of the *Young Siam*) was appointed Minister of Metropolis and Phrachaonongyathar phraongchao Sawadisopol was assigned to be the Minister of Justice. Others of the group also worked in government offices. They became important to the functioning of the governmental administration. Their incorporation into government service put an end to their liberalism. However the petitioner group was the antecedent of the revolutionary group of 1932 which changed the Thai political system from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy.

Another Thai liberal was the writer, Thienwan (1842-1915). He was born in the reign of King Rama III as the seventh child in a family of nine. His father, Mr. Ruangsing was a military official and was accused of

⁹⁵ Chai-anan Sanuthawanit, *Akkasan Khanmuang...*, p. 38.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.43.

murder three times. Because his father died when he was young, he was sent to stay with his uncle-in-law. He learned reading, writing and wrestling. From the ages of eight to ten he studied Thai and Khmer in the monastery school, Wat Phrachetupol. After he finished his study at the monastery school he went back to his home in Bangkunjien (a small district in Bangkok). He became a social lion and habitually traveled around the country. During King Mongkut's reign, he became a monk at the age of 20. He stayed with his uncle from his mother's side, the Patriarch (Sa) who was a favorite monk of King Mongkut. Here he had a chance to acquire traditional knowledge such as history, geography, and Buddhism and he heard many of King Mongkut's speeches about secular and ecclesiastic topics and other countries' cultures. With these experiences, he learned about his own culture and that of others. In 1868 he quit the religious life and boarded a foreign ship which traveled through Asia and the Pacific islands. At this point Thienwan's life began to resemble Fukuzawa's. However Thienwan did not write down details of his trip as Fukuzawa did when he first went to America in 1860. Because he did not document his journey we know little of where he went and what he saw. After this trip, he became a merchant⁹⁷ and opened a law office. He was keenly interested in law and foreign cultures. He learned Western knowledge from his best friends. They included both Thai and foreigners such as Krommaphra Sawatwatanavisit, Momchao Chek Nopawongse and the American legal advisor, Mr. Kirkpatrick. They also financially supported his publications. In 1883 by writing a petition without the government permission, he was imprisoned for 17 years.⁹⁸ During those

⁹⁷ It was very rare case for the Thai to become merchant. Most of the Thai loved to be government officials. Trade was in foreigner hands, especially, Chinese and European.

⁹⁸ Chai-anen Samuthewant, *Chevitraenangkong Thienwan roe R.S Kulap (Thai) (Life and work of Thienwan and R. S. Kulap)* (Bangkok: Theraen publisher, 1979), p. 38. According to Mr.

years he wrote articles which critiqued socio-political problems of the country such as slavery, corruption and gambling. He published two magazines; *Tulvipakphatchanakit* (Using Words as Indicators) (1903-1906) and *Siriphatjanapak* (Good Words) (1908). He stated that his aim in writing articles and publishing magazines was to make the Thai remember him as "a strange citizen who fought for the justice of the Thai."⁹⁹

Thienwan's works were similar to the petitioners. He criticized the political system, the relationship between the King, the government officers, and the citizens, and the ways in which the King attempted to develop the country. He called for a parliamentary system and the preeminence of the people in the political system as the "blood line for the nation."¹⁰⁰ He argued further that "if people are still suffering, no matter how much power and wealth the King and government officers have, they can not develop the country."¹⁰¹ He also continued to emphasize the importance of the people as "the apple of the King's eye"¹⁰² which "really needed special protection and care. If anything harmful occurs, one needs to protect them from danger as one protects and cares for one's beloved children and wife."¹⁰³ While Thienwan called for parliamentary system and the people's

Damri Pothien (Thienwan's grand nephew), Chai-anan stated that Thienwan was accused by some nobles who did not like him and made a show of him. They sent Mr. Chan to ask Thienwan to write a petition. Mr. Chan lied that he already got a permission from the government. In order to legally write a petition, one needs to have permission from the government. Thus, Mr. Thienwan was found guilty and was put in prison without investigation. He had been in prison until Prince Rachaburi reformed judicial system, inspected prisons and found Thienwan was accused without guilty. So, he set Thienwan free.

⁹⁹ *Siriphatjanapak* (Good Words) 7. 1 part I (15 November, 1908).

¹⁰⁰ Chai-anan Samuthawanit, *Kanmuang kanpianplaiing thangkanmuang Thai 2411-2475 B.E* (Thai) (Political changes in Thailand 1868-1932) (Bangkok: Social Sciences Organization in Thailand, undated), p. 42.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid., p 44.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

right to participate in political affairs¹⁰⁴ he still preserved the traditional paternal relationship between the king and citizens which had existed in Thai society from the Sukothai period.

Thienwan also critiqued Thai social values, such as polygamy, gambling and corruption. He suggested that these practices should be abolished. He insisted the government raise the public's political status and moral character. His works were published in the latter part of King Chulalongkorn's reign, after the government's reforms of 1892. Despite these reforms Thienwan remained unsatisfied with the government.

Some Thai scholars in informal discussions have occasionally attempted to compare Thienwan to Fukuzawa due to the fact that there were many similarities between them; first they were laymen who had a chance to go abroad and experience other countries. Second, they were dissatisfied with their own societies such as inequality among citizens and uncivilized customs. Third, they were writers who published articles calling for socio-political reforms in the government. In my opinion, the two are not comparable, despite the fact that they are similar in many aspects, there were many differences between the characters of the two. First, Thienwan was different from Fukuzawa in using Western ideologies. Fukuzawa called for using Western ideologies such as spirit of independence and freedom directly in Japanese society. While Thienwan called for a Western political system, he still believed in the preservation of traditional values. Second, the influences of Thienwan cannot be compared with those of Fukuzawa. Thienwan's opinions did not have as much influence on the process of

¹⁰⁴ Chai-anan Samuthawanit, *Chevitraenangkong Thienwan rae R.S Kulap* (Life and work of Thienwan and R.S. Kulap), p. 80 quoting *Tulvipakphotchanakit* (Using Words as Indicators) Vol. VI (6 September 1905).

modernization in Thailand as did Fukuzawa's on Japan. Third, Thienwan also attempted to use his argument as a means to join the government. This is in total contrast to Fukuzawa's definition of a scholar.

In conclusion, Thai liberals did exist in the latter part of King Chulalongkorn's reign. However their influence on the process of modernization was minimal. The petition group of 1885 had some effect on government reform in 1892. These reforms will be discussed in the next chapter. Thienwan did not exert influence on the government, rather, he was considered a strange man.¹⁰⁵ In 1903 he presented his magazine to King Chulalongkorn and applied for work in the government. There was no response from the King. However there was an anonymous critique:

...He only relied on minor sources to reach major conclusion. If we accept him as an adviser, he will prefer talking to working.¹⁰⁶

However, his effect on the public must be further studied. We can not deny that he was the first to stress the importance of the people as the foundation of democratic government.

If we compare the intellectuals in Japan and Thailand we can conclude that they are very different. The Japanese intellectuals, especially the liberals had greater depth and breadth in their perception of Western ideologies than their Thai counterparts. They were well informed in Western sciences, social sciences and humanities and eagerly called for the acceptance of ideas such as the spirit of independence, equality and freedom. Even the conservatives admired Western ideologies as they tried to synthesize those ideas into society. They were similar to the Thai

¹⁰⁵ Chai-anan Samuthawanit, *Kanmuang kanpianplaiing ...* (Thai), p 46.

¹⁰⁶ Chai-anan Samuthawanit, *Chevitraenangkong* (Thai), p. 43 quoting National Archive B. 2 k/9 *Ruangnai Thienwanawainuangsumagasin raekhokhaurubratckakan* (Document about Mr. Thienwan presented a magazine to the king and applied to work in the government).

intellectuals in this respect. As time passed the government underwent political, social and economic reforms. Internally, Japan was more stable and stronger. Internationally, Western imperialism was still evident. It forced the Japanese intellectuals to realize the importance of being a strong nation in order to survive. Furthermore, some liberals were promoted to higher ranks in the government. All of these factors made liberals such as Fukuzawa Yukichi and Katō Hiroyuki become more conservative and start to call for traditional values such as morality and loyalty to the nation. This example shows that the Japanese intellectuals practically and significantly adjusted their ideas according to the needs of the nation. Their adjustment brought great profits to Japanese modernization and development.

Thai intellectuals were different from the Japanese intellectuals, especially the liberals. They were similar to the Japanese conservatives in three aspects; first, all of them except Nakamura Keiu (Japan) and Chaophraya Phatsakorawong (Thailand) had never gone to study abroad. Second, they were not alienated from the old society. Third, they tried to graft Western learning into their societies. However, in the case of the Thai intellectuals it was different in that they did not accept many Western ideas, especially political ones. They led Thai society to accept only the Western institutions such as State Council and Privy Council and still emphasized traditional values such as kingship and unity. Moreover, they tried to do two jobs at the same time; being a part of the intelligentsia and also a part of the government. So, they needed to stabilize the nation and modernize it. In relation to Western learning, they did not have a deep and broad knowledge of the West as compared to the Japanese intellectuals. Most of them did not have a chance to learn directly from the West. They learned only language and general knowledge. Their attitudes toward the

West were a mixture of admiration and fear. They accepted the West only in order to survive, not to be as the West. All of these limitations caused the Thai intellectuals to be less skillful than the Japanese in reconciling Western learning to national needs. However liberals also existed in Thailand. They had experience from abroad and called for the adoption of a Western political system and constitutional monarchy. But, this movement came later in Thailand. Thus, their influence on the government was slight compared to that of their counterparts in Japan.

It is not a mistake to conclude that in their approach to Western-inspired reform the Japanese intellectuals and the Thai intellectuals differed in important respects. The Thai intellectuals were more pragmatic than idealistic and wanted to preserve their own national identity rather than change it, while the Japanese intellectuals were primarily idealistic- unquestioningly accepting of Western values and only later became pragmatic-preserving their own national identity. Both of these ideas and actions greatly affected modernization in both countries. I will discuss those effects in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter IV

Result of Ideologies

Chapter III discussed the *Meirokusha's* and *Young Siam's* ideas for developing their respective countries. This chapter discusses the impact of those ideologies on society, politics and economy and how they transformed Japan and Thailand from pre-modern to modern states. The discussion is divided as follows. first, the connection between the *Meirokusha* and the Meiji government; second, the social, educational, political, and economic effects of the *Meirokusha's* liberalism in Japan; third, the impact of the *Meirokusha's* conservatives; fourth, the connection between the *Young Siam* and the government; and fifth, the social, educational, and economic influences of conservatives in Thailand.

Japan

The goal of the Meiji leaders was to make Japan as strong and wealthy as the West. *fukoku kyōhei* (rich country, strong army) and *bunmei kaika* (civilization and enlightenment) were popular slogans among both Japanese intellectuals and leaders. During the first two decades of the Meiji era, Western culture both ideologically and institutionally was wholeheartedly accepted. Liberal English and French ideologies such as utilitarianism and individualism gained popularity in society. These ideas were disseminated through society and influenced the general public and government as well. Liberal ideas channelled Japanese modernization in the early part of the era.

The Connection between the *Meirokusha* and the Meiji government

Before discussing the influence of the *Meirokusha* on social, political and economic development it is necessary to clarify the connection between this group and the Meiji leaders. Even though the *Meirokusha* provided the blueprint, the Meiji leaders constructed modern Japan. In his dissertation,¹ Jerry Kamm Fisher divides the *Meirokusha* into three groups: the *Yōgaku* aristocrats², the Confucian scholars³ and the bureaucrat-intellectuals. Most of the members are classified as "bureaucrat-intellectuals." Many were originally *Yōgakusha* but had impressive careers in the Meiji government and viewed themselves primarily as scholar-bureaucrats. Nishi Amane (1829-1897), Nishimura Shigeki (1828-1902), Tsuda Mamichi (1829-1903), Kanda Kōhei (1830-1898), and Katō Hiroyuki (1836-1916) fall into this group. Some of them such as Nishi Amane, Tsuda Mamichi and Katō Hiroyuki were connected to *Bansho shirabe-sho* (Office for the Inspection of Foreign Books) in the Tokugawa period. Nishi Amane and Tsuda Mamichi were admitted to this institution in 1857, after they had broken with their domains to enter Western studies. They were chosen by the bakufu to study abroad. Upon their return to Japan they were restored to the bakufu's Institute of Western

¹ Fisher, pp. 59-63.

² This group had deep roots in Tokugawa society. They were Mitsukuri Shūhei (1825-1886), Mitsukuri Rinsho (1846-1897), and Sugito Gentan (1818-1889) whose families had long and distinguished histories as leaders in the *rangaku* and *yōgaku* field. This group were new intellectual elites who emerged during the late Tokugawa era.

³ They were Sakatani Rōrō and Nakamura Keiu who belonged to the old elite. They were Confucian scholars. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Confucian studies (*juaku*) emerged in society as *yōgaku* did in the nineteenth century.

Studies, now known as the Institute for Development (*Kaiseijo*), where they translated Vissering's lectures on law and statistics and advised on parliamentary government. After the Meiji Restoration both were attracted into government service, Nishi into the War Ministry and Tsuda initially into the Justice Ministry. Nishi assisted Yamagata Aritomo in drafting the conscription law in 1872 and other important military policies. After Tsuda resigned from the Justice Ministry due to disagreements with the impetuous minister, Etō Shimpai,⁴ he served in a number of posts. Mori Arinori and Katō Hiroyuki also served the bakufu government in the *Bansho shirabe-sho* and worked in the Meiji government. For example, Mori Arinori became minister of education and built the statist educational system.

Nishimura Shigeki was not connected with this institute; however he held positions of administrative importance during the old regime. He had a long record of honorable service in the administrations of the Sakura and Sano domains of the Hotta family. Thus, it is not mistake to say that before the Meiji Restoration the *Meirokusha* members had already served in the old regime. After the Meiji restoration, the new government sought their expertise. Nishimura Shigeki accepted the appointment from the Meiji government as chief of the Education Ministry's Compilation Bureau (*Hansho Kachō*). He held this position for thirteen years. Under his direction, the Section not only compiled textbooks, but the first large-scale dictionary and encyclopedia of modern times, and also edited books prepared by the Translation Section.⁵ Most of the *Meirokusha*, with the exception of Katō, were in their mid-forties when the *Meirokusha* was established. They held an array of posts in various government ministries.

⁴ Braisted, p. xxvii.

⁵ Shively, p. 211.

All but Nishimura were appointed as *Genrōin* (elder statesman). For example Katō Hiroyuki was appointed to the *Genrōin* in 1875 and in 1877 became rector of the *Kōsei Gakka* which later that year emerged as Tokyo University. In 1879, Katō was elected to the Tokyo Academy (the original name of the Japan Academy) and in 1881 was reappointed rector of Tokyo University. In 1875 he was replaced by Nishimura and was appointed as Lecturer (*jiko*) on Western Books to the Meiji Emperor. Several *Meirokusha* members served in Japan's first parliament. Tsuda served as the first speaker of the House, while the others were appointed to the Upper House. Some of them held provincial posts such as Kanda Kōhei, governor of Hyōgo Prefecture, the present Kobe.

Even the *Meirokusha* members who did not directly work in government influenced the government through their publications. Fukuzawa Yukichi's works such as *Seiyō Jijō* (Condition in the West) and *Gakuman no Susume* (An Encouragement of Learning) were widely read by the Meiji leaders. For example, at the time that the Meiji leaders implemented the Charter Oath, Fukuoka Kotei⁶ consulted Fukuzawa's *Seiyō Jijō* (Condition in the West) when drafting *Seitai-sho* (A Document on the Form of Government)⁷ which can be considered Japan's first modern constitution.⁸ *Saikoku risshi hen* (The Collection of Western self-discipline), Nakamura Keiu's work, was also read and debated among government officials and

⁶ Fukuoka Kotei or Fukuoka Takachika (1835-1919) Meiji period statesman, born in the domain of Tosa in Shikoku. In 1872 he became chief assistant to the minister of education and to the minister of justice; in 1875 he became a member of the *Genrōin*, and in 1881 a councilor of state and minister of education.

⁷ After announcing The Charter Oath in April, 1868, the Meiji government implemented this policy. Iwakura ordered Fukuoka and Soejima to draw up plans for the reorganization of the government. The result was the *Seitai-sho*.

⁸ Nobutaka Ike, The Beginning of Political Democracy in Japan (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1950), p. 37.

educators.⁹ Katō Hiroyuki gave a series of lectures to the Meiji Emperor by using *Saikoku risshi hen* as his text. Nishimura Shigeki, at that time head of the compilation section of the Ministry of Education, considered *Saikoku risshi hen* one of the most important works available for enlightening people. Because their interests were in various subjects they were called the Japanese encyclopedia. Not only through *Meiroku Zasshi*, but also through other magazines they published their articles. For example Fukuzawa Yukichi also published his articles in *Jiji Shimpo*. Suffice it to say that through these bureaucrat-intellectuals and the popularity of the *Meirakusha's* works among government officials the *Meirakusha's* ideas had a strong impact on the path of Japanese development in the first part of the Meiji period.

Society

In this section, I will discuss the influence of the *Meirakusha's* ideologies, such as value of learning, spirit of independence and self-achievement, on Japanese society and will emphasize especially the quantitative and qualitative changes of the middle class in the Meiji period. These changes had significant benefits for Japanese modernization especially economic modernization.

The Meiji leaders faced many problems such as the lack of financial resources and limited support. Their most exigent task was stabilizing the new government which was composed of samurai from several han primarily Satsuma, Chōshū and Tosa. In order to achieve this goal, they issued the historic document known as the *Gakko no Gaseimon*

⁹ Earl H. Kinmonth, *The Self-Made Man in Meiji Japanese Thought: from Samurai to Salary Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, © 1981), p. 32 quoting Maeda Ai, "Meiji risshi shugi no keifu," *Bungaku* 33: 4 (April, 1965): 11.

(The Charter Oath of Five Articles) in April, 1868 in the name of the emperor. The Oath was a broad statement of policy issued primarily for uniting leaders who came from different han but also for placating potential opposition. The document was originally drafted by the Minister of Finance, Yuri Kimimasa¹⁰ and was revised several times by Fukuoka Kotei and Kido Takayoshi (Kōin).¹¹ The Western political and cultural bias of Fukuoka Kotei and Kido Takayoshi is reflected in the Charter Oath. In its final form the Oath read as follows:

1 Assemblies shall be widely convoked and all measures shall be decided by open discussion.

2 The government and the governed shall be of one mind, and the national economy and finances shall be greatly strengthened.

3 Civil and military officials as well as the common people shall achieve their aims, and thus the people's minds shall not grow weary.

4 All absurd customs of olden times shall be abandoned, and all actions shall be based on international usage.

5 Knowledge shall be sought from all over the world and thereby the foundations of Imperial rule shall be strengthened.¹²

Article three and four in essence abolished the social structure of the former regime which had been based largely on hereditary succession. The four classes (samurai, artisan, farmer and merchant) were discarded. All citizens could theoretically pursue their goals freely giving the green light for a rapid rising of the middle class.

Due to the development of a commercial economy and castle towns in the Tokugawa period a middle class of merchants (*chōnin*) evolved

¹⁰ Due to the influence of Yokoi Shōnan, Yuri Kimimasa had been attracted to a republican form of the government.

¹¹ Kido Takayoshi (Kōin) was a samurai from Chōshū and later one of the leading statesmen of the Meiji government. He was more liberal than the rest of the Meiji leaders such as Ōkubo Toshimichi from Setsuma.

¹² Ike, The Beginning of Political Democracy in Japan, p. 36.

in society. These *chōnin* acted as middlemen between the productive rural areas and the high consumption towns. Through trade they accumulated wealth and economic clout. Meanwhile the commercial economy also benefited farmers (*nōmin*) who found new markets for their produce and goods such as silk, sake and tea. These two groups were a significant foundation for the middle class in the late Tokugawa period and the new middle class in the modern period. Gilbert Rozmann emphasized this importance in his work "Social change":

Given this premodern history, it is no wonder that Meiji Japan was dynamic in many of the same respects. The new impetus came from legal changes, eliminating occupational and residential restrictions and freeing all groups to pursue their interests. The *chōnin* legacy was invigorated through entrepreneurial talent from all backgrounds and was now virtually unfettered in its pursuit of profit. The *nōmin* tradition advanced in a more market-oriented economy following the land settlement.¹³

Due to economic growth and political change in the Meiji period, the middle class was rising both economically and politically. By paying sufficient taxes they obtained the right to vote. They controlled village government and the right of electing prefectural assemblies.¹⁴ This was in contrast to the Tokugawa period where local leadership roles such as the exclusive privilege of ministering to the village deity were monopolized by few families. Even, the role of headman tended to be hereditary within a single family or rotated at regular intervals among a few qualified

¹³ Gilbert Rozmann, "Social change," *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 5 ed. Marius B. Jansen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 565.

¹⁴ Kinmonth, *The Self-Made Man in Meiji Japanese Thought: from Samurai to Salary Man*, p. 160 quoting Tokutomi, "Chūto kaikyū no daraku," *Kokumin no tomo* (Friend of the People), no. 172 (November 13, 1892): 697-702.

families.¹⁵ In summary, the Meiji Restoration gave both political and economic benefits to the middle class. Economically, at the time they were still active in traditional areas such as the production and marketing of tea, silk, and sake, they were also investing in new areas such as railroads and mining.¹⁶

The middle class was strongly influenced by *Meirakusha* works such as Fukuzawa's *Gakumon no susume* (An encouragement of learning), and Nakamura Keiu's *Saikaku risshi hen* (The Collection of Western self-discipline). Both were widely read and stressed individualism and self-achievement. Nakamura's book which opens with the famous line, "Heaven helps those who help themselves" has been described as one of the "holy books" (*seisha*) of the Meiji era. The personal ethics stressed in *Saikaku risshi hen* were: hard work, diligence, frugality, perseverance, attention to detail, and so forth. Initially this book was read primarily by officials and educators.¹⁷ Later it became popular among the younger generation. One late Meiji writer believed that this work "had a greater influence over the young in the early (1870s) than any other book of the day."¹⁸ Ronald Dore describes the aspirations of a would-be salary man:

the lad from the country inspired by articles in the magazines on "How to Live in Tokyo on 6.50 Yen a Month," making his way through the university on the diet of rice, dried fish, and bean curd...sustained through it by hopes of

¹⁵Thomas C. Smith, *The Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, ©1959), p.58.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*,

¹⁷ Earl H. Kinmonth, "Nakamura Keiu and Samuel Smiles: A Victorian Confucian and a Confucian Victorian," *American Historical Review*, 85 (June, 1980): 536. quoting Ishii Tamaji, *Nakamura Masanao den* (Nakamura Masanao's Biography) (Tokyo, 1970), 10-11.

¹⁸ Earl H. Kinmonth, *The Self-Made Man*, p.10 quoting Yone Noguchi, "A True Founder of Empire," *Japan Times* (March 9, 1907) reproduced in Ishii, *Nakamura Masanao den*. See also Ukito Kazutomi, "Educationalist of the Past and Share in the Modernization of Japan," in *Fifty Years of New Japan*, ed. Okuma Shigenobu (Dulton, 1909), Vol. 2, p. 156.

glittering rewards to follow, of honor in his native village, of the gratifying glow of virtue fulfilled in which he would kneel at (his ancestors' shine) and tell them that he had made-or restored- the family fortune.¹⁹

Government service was the main opportunity for access into the middle class. Ambitious young men came to depend less on status or patronage than on the ability of their parents to provide them with an education. Education became the means for entry into the middle class. Due to the booming of the new educational system in the 1880s, schools played an increasing role in recruiting talent from young ambitious youth from around the country and from every social class. As industrial growth accelerated, further opportunities for employment in business expanded as well and a growing number of educated young men were attracted to careers in business. This new middle class was inculcated with certain ideas of individualism- individual performance, responsibility, respect, and fulfillment (defined as *risshin*)- but this individualism²⁰ was subordinated to the state and social goals.²¹

The quality of the new middle class was a significant factor for Japanese modernization. It facilitated the process of economic development and was on its way to becoming what subsequent generations would know as the *sarariman* (salary man) white-collar workers engaged in menial tasks in government or business.²² Statistics in the Meiji era show that they were a flourishing species. In 1877 there were 15,140, in

¹⁹ Duus, The Rise of Modern Japan, p.149. quoting R. P. Dore, Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 120-121.

²⁰ The *Meirokusha's* meaning of individualism was different from the Western meaning. In the Japanese sense it meant independence, hard work, diligence and devotion to country's modernization. It was the means for country's modernization more than innately right in the Western sense.

²¹ Earl H. Kinmonth, The Self-Made Man..., p. 333.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 277.

1909 there were 100,558. Two decades later there were 336,574.²³

Education:

Both liberal and conservative ideologies of the *Meirokusha* strongly influenced education. Most Meiji intellectuals recognized the necessity for Japan to expand and improve its educational system. Among them Fukuzawa was the most active and aggressive. His book, An Encouragement of Learning (1876), is estimated to have sold 420,000 copies in the 1870s and a total 3.4 million copies in the 17 subsequent editions during his lifetime.²⁴ He emphasized the need for public enlightenment and his ideas strongly influenced the government. In 1871 the Ministry of Education was established and in 1872 the Fundamental Code of Education (*Gakusei*, or literally "School System") was proclaimed. The Preamble of this Code explicitly echoed Fukuzawa's liberal view:

..It is only by building up his character, developing his mind, and cultivating his talents that man may make his way in the world, employ his wealth wisely, make his business prosper, and thus attain the goal of life. But man cannot build up his character, develop his mind, or cultivate his talents without education- that is the reason for the establishment of school...Language, writing, and arithmetic, to begin with, are daily necessitiesOnly by striving in the line of his natural aptitude can man prosper in his undertakings, accumulate wealth, and succeed in life.²⁵

This code illustrates Fukuzawa's influence on the government's liberal view of education. The goal of education no longer stressed Confucian morality but instead emphasized individual goals, equality among classes and self-

²³ Ibid., p. 279

²⁴ Fukuzawa Yukichi, An Encouragement of Learning, trans. with an Introduction by David A. Dilworth and Umeyo Hirano (Tokyo: Sophia University Press), 1969, p. xi.

²⁵ Passin, p. 210.

improvement. Public education was no longer limited to the samurai class; instead a nation-wide system of four years of compulsory education was imposed. Education as a vehicle for modernization is clearly attested to in the 109 articles of the Code (later increased to 213). A complete educational system was projected wherein the entire country was divided into eight university districts, with each district divided into 32 middle school districts. In this manner a total of 54,760 primary schools were to be built. However, the government fell short of their goal and by 1879 only 52 percent of the planned number of elementary schools had been constructed.²⁶ Despite this, the four year program of compulsory education was generally successful with school enrollment increasing steadily from 1873 until 1905, when attendance reached nearly universal levels for both boys and girls.²⁷

With the desire to learn from the West and revise the "unequal treaties", the Iwakura Mission was sent to United States and Western Europe in 1871. Tanaka Fujimaro (1845-1909), senior secretary of the newly established Department of Education, served as the Iwakura Mission's educational specialist. The Japanese educational system was modeled after the French and American systems. The Meiji government centralized the educational system under the control of the Ministry of Education as in the French model while the curriculum and teaching methods were influenced by the American system. Many of the government officials who worked in the Ministry, such as Mori Arinori (the *Meirakusha* member) and Tanaka Fujimaro, were acquainted with the American model. This American

²⁶ Ibid., p.73 quoting Ogata Hiroyasu, "The Progress of the Implementation of *Gokusei* and Its Breakdown," *The Waseda Bulletin of Social Sciences*, 1962, p. 39.

²⁷ Edward R. Beauchamp and Richard Rubinger, *Education in Japan: A Source Book* (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1989), p. 42.

emphasis was strengthened when Tanaka, as Vice-Minister of education in 1873, brought David Murray,²⁸ of Rutgers University, to Japan as his adviser. American influence was particularly manifest in the adoption of the coeducational common school as the basic unit of the system, in the normal school, and in the development of vocational (particularly agricultural) education.²⁹ With the influences of both Tanaka and Murray, many Western works, especially American works, were translated and used in Japanese schools. With the firm policy of educational Westernization, the government brought an estimated 5000 foreign advisers and teachers to Japan in the 1870s³⁰ and students were sent abroad to study. These two programs accounted for 32% of the government's education budget for 1873.³¹

Mori Arinori also influenced Japanese education through his writing, *Kyōikurei ni kansuru ikenshaan* (Draft of a written opinion on the Education Ordinance), 1879. He formulated an ideal structure for education: local autonomy at the elementary level; private initiative at the secondary level; and central responsibility for higher education and for overall general direction. On 15 January 1879 the government also established the *Takya Gakushi Kaiin*, or Tokyo Academy, with the dual function of a scholarly society and of inquiry on government education policy. In this latter capacity the academy was to report directly to the ministry, taking into

²⁸ Dr. David Murray was a mathematics professor at Rutgers University. He stayed in Japan from August 1873 to December 1879 and made important contributions to the development of Japanese education. His activities included inspecting schools, planning curricula and course of study, and establishing an educational museum in Tokyo. See Beauchamp, *Education in Japan: A Source Book* and Keneko Tadashi "Contributions of David Murray to the Modernization of School Administration in Japan." in *The Modernizers: Students, Foreign Employees, and Meiji Japan* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1985), pp. 301-321.

²⁹ Passin, *Society and Education in Japan*, p. 71.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p 72, quoting Hugh Boston, *Japan's Modern Century* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1955), p.176.

³¹ Beauchamp, p. 41.

special consideration public complaints regarding the educational system. The seven charter members chosen by the ministry were all former members of the *Meirakusha*: Fukuzawa (the first chairman), Katō, Tsuda, Nishi, Nakamura, Kanda, and Mitsukuri Shūhei. Mori was elected to membership on 28 May 1897. However, he did not remain long because he went to London later in the year. Mori's influence on Japanese educational system in this period was not as evident as it was later when he became minister of education. I will discuss those effects later.

The liberal influence can also be seen in higher education through the ideas and subjects which were taught at universities. Political economy was introduced to Japan through Fukuzawa's translation of Wayland's³² works and was taught in such universities as the Department of English law in *Tokyo Kaisei Gakko* (Tokyo Kaisei School). The most important institution which emphasized this idea was Keiō established by Fukuzawa in 1858. Fukuzawa believed that the nation's future depended upon the rise of a business oriented middle class,³³ and devoted himself to developing such a class through education at Keiō where courses on business and economics were emphasized. He refused to enter government service and expressed displeasure when any of his students did so. Fukuzawa's stress on business influenced not only Keiō's curriculum, but also *Shaha Kashu-jo* (Commercial Training School), which was to become Tokyo University of Commerce, (later Hitotsubashi University). These two schools were the main producers of business leaders.

³² Wayland, the president of Brown University for 28 years, was a prolific writer in several fields, and some of his textbooks in moral philosophy, intellectual philosophy and economics were translated into several languages and were widely used.

³³ Chuhei Sugiyama and Hiroshi Mizuta, Enlightenment and Beyond: Political Economy Comes to Japan, p. 14.

Shōha Kashūja (Commercial Training School) was built in 1873.

Fukuzawa was one of the three trustees of the school (with colleagues Mori Arinori and Mitsukuri Shūhei). Its objective was to teach the would-be merchant how to fight against the foreigners by fostering nationalism and using mercantilism. Fukuzawa wrote in the prospectus as follows:

...In the past when Japan closed itself to the outer world its merchants had only to be acquainted with inland trade, and it was sufficient for them to be smart enough not to miss any business chance there...Now that foreign trade has begun, things have changed drastically. So far the wealth or skill of a merchant has only been a private matter. He should now know the public side of his affairs, which is how to deal with Western merchants...The civilization of the country as a whole is such that backwardness in business and trade only is not to blame. Nothing can be improved all of a sudden...In every Western country it has been recognized that where there are merchants, there are also commercial schools. It is as though where there were samurai in the feudal ages, there were fencing schools. In fighting one another by means of the sword one cannot go to the battlefield without learning the art of battles by means of business, one can not confront foreigners without learning the art of business."³⁴

This school offered several courses in business such as finance, banking, foreign trade, accounting and administration. Foreign teachers such as Dr. W. C. Whitney, F. A Meyer and A. J Hare³⁵ were invited to teach at the school. The school followed the Belgian model of higher commercial education based on the highly successful Institution Supérieure de Commerce d' Anvers. The *Shōha Kashūja* (Hitotsubashi) and Keiō were, and still remain, major producers of Japanese business leaders.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 155-156, quoting Fukuzawa Yukichi, *FYZ*, Vol 4, pp. 123-25.

³⁵ In 1875 by Mori Arinori's invitation Dr. Whitney came from the Bryant-Stratton-Whitney College at Newark to teach commercial subjects for this school. Due to his high salary in 1878 the prefectural government discharged him. Two other American teachers of commercial subjects (F. A Meyer and A. J Hare) were employed in Dr. Whitney's place.

In conclusion, in the early Meiji period *Meirakusha* members were among the leading liberals who greatly influenced Japanese education both ideologically and institutionally. For example, liberal ideas such as the spirit of independence and natural rights were emphasized in the Fundamental Code of Education in 1872. The liberals in the *Meirakusha* also led society in establishing business and commercial schools. These laid down a significant foundations for economic development in Japan. However, their influence, particularly philosophically, was gradually fading by 1878 because of internal and external situations which strengthened conservatism. Nonetheless, we cannot deny that compulsory education, the Commercial Training School, and political economy courses were the product of liberal philosophy.

Education for the State

The period 1879-1880 may perhaps be taken as the turning point of educational ideology in Japan.³⁶ At that time, the main current of the Meiji government can be characterized as "conservative modernizers." They were intent on creating a powerful, modern state, but they had no intention of permitting unrestricted social change. In this respect they were pragmatists, not ideologists. Again, as in the case of liberal influences, *Meirakusha* members were instrumental in this new direction.

The political resistance in society illustrated by the Satsuma rebellion in 1877 and *Jiyū Minken Undō* ("People's Rights" Movement) prompted the government to change the educational system. Moreover, in the

³⁶ Pessin, p. 81

summer of 1878, the Emperor made a tour of the provinces and was alarmed by what he saw in the schools and instructed his Confucian lecturer, Motoda Eifu, to draft a statement presumably embodying his views. This statement, *Kyōgaku Taishi* (the Great Principles of Education), was issued in the awesome form of an Imperial Rescript in 1879 and became the basic document for a conservative counterattack on the liberal school system. Westernization, it held, had gone too far, education must return to Confucian principles. From this rescript, we see clearly the demise of the liberal philosophy and the rise of a conservative one. One statement read:

The essence of education, our traditional national aim, and a watchword for all men, is to make clear the ways of benevolence, justice, loyalty, and filial piety, and to master knowledge and skill and through these to pursue the Way of Men.³⁷

There were some, such as Itō, who disapproved of the rescript. He strongly rejected the basic thesis of Motoda's Rescript and argued that the moral disorder of the time was not so much the result of the school system, but rather of the unprecedented scope of the Restoration itself. Despite this criticism the Rescript marks the point of government controlled education. The Memorandum for Elementary School Teachers issued in June 1881 stipulated that the nucleus of education was to be moral training in loyalty and filial piety:

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 227, quoting *Gakusei 80-Nen-shi* (Eighty Years of the School System, 1955), pp. 715-716.

Article I

In order to guide people, make them good, give them wide knowledge, and to do this wisely, teachers must particularly stress moral education to their pupils.

Loyalty to the Imperial House, love of country, filial piety toward parents, respect for superiors, faith in friends, charity toward inferiors, and respect for oneself constitute the Great Path of human morality. The teacher must himself be a model of these morals in his daily life, and must endeavor to stimulate his pupils along the path of virtue.³⁸

Among the *Meirokusha* members, Nakamura Keiu and Nishimura Shigeaki had called for this Confucian ideology during the *bunmei kaika* period to little avail. As the government became dissatisfied with the extent of Western influences the appeal of these conservatives rose. Mori Arinori was most important in formulating what Inoue Kowashi³⁹ coined as "*kokutai no kyōiku shugi*," a philosophy of education based on the national polity.⁴⁰ He was appointed to be Minister of Education at age thirty-eight. At that time he was both the youngest and the most intellectual member of the cabinet. In his speech to the directors of the centrally administered University, Higher Normal School, and Higher Middle Schools on 28 January 1889, only two weeks before his assassination, he cited his aim for statist education clearly:

There is no need for me to go into any great detail as to the purpose of our government educational administration...The government, to begin with, established the Ministry of Education and charged it with the responsibility for administering the system for supporting various schools from the

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 84-85 quoting Mombusho, *Gakushi 80-Nen-shi* (Eighty Years of the School System) (Tokyo, 1954), p. 763.

³⁹ Inoue Kowashi (1844-1895), politician and viscount. Born to a Kumamoto samurai family, he studied in Europe during 1872 and later served in the Ministry of Justice. He assisted in diplomatic talks with China and was widely consulted on foreign policy. He helped to prepare several government proposals for a constitution and assisted in writing the Education Rescript of 1890. In 1893 he became minister of education in the second Iwakura cabinet. From Ivan Parker Hall, *Mori Arinori* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 224.

⁴⁰ Hall, p. 397.

national treasury...The goal of our educational administration is likewise purely and simply the service of the state. In the case of the Imperial University, for instance, the question may rise as to whether learning is to be pursued for its own sake or for the sake of the state. It is the state which come first and receives top priority.⁴¹

His primary educational aim was to create loyal Imperial subjects. Teachers and administrators in the centrally administered schools were exhorted to make the state their *honzon* (main image). He also introduced into the normal school *heishiki taisō*—"military drill" or, in its full literal translation, "military-style physical training." With military drill, Mori aimed to cultivate moral discipline and create good health. His idea and his achievements prepared the Japanese for being good and healthy subjects for the imperial power. Conservatism reached its peak in 1890 when the Rescript of Education (see Appendix J) was promulgated. In essence the State completely controlled an educational system which stressed to the Japanese the need to be loyal and faithful subjects of the Emperor. The government could now use education to direct its citizens on any course it chose.

Politics:

In this section I will discuss the influence of the *Meirokusha's* liberal and conservative ideas on political, military and legal systems in Japan in the early Meiji period. As cited, the liberals emphasized people's rights and a spirit of independence. Some called for a popularly elected assembly and disseminated these Western political ideas into Japanese society where they stimulated the People's Rights Movement (*Jiyū*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, quoting *Zenshu*, I, 663, SPM: 28 Jan. 1889: "*Monbushō*.' *chokkatsu gakkōchō*."

Minken Undō) and caused the establishment of political parties such as the *Jiyūtō*.

The notion of people's rights was undeniably introduced to Japan by the *Meirokusha* liberals such as Fukuzawa, and Katō. Other liberals such as Itagaki Taisuke,⁴² and Ueki Emori⁴³ elaborated on this idea. Itagaki's first move was in 1875 when he and seven others submitted a petition demanding the establishment of a popularly elected assembly. Five years later, over 80,000 persons from twenty-four prefectures signed a petition for the establishment of an assembly. These movements aimed "to encourage patriotism by establishing an Assembly and giving the people the right to participate in the government, to foster the spirit of civilization and to build its foundations by allowing people to enjoy freedom, thereby making possible the full development of their potential capacities."⁴⁴ Itagaki led the People's Movement with the famous slogan, *kummin dachi* (joint rule by lord and subject). This phrase was used to express the relation which should exist between the emperor and the people. Itagaki's movement, though vague and not clearly defined, envisaged some type of constitutional monarchy.

⁴² Itagaki Taisuke was a samurai from Tosa and used to be one of the Meiji leaders. However, after the Korean issue he resigned from the government. He was also a President of Risshisha and later head of Jiyūtō. Jiyūtō always supported local movements such as the farmer's movements in Fukushima, Chichibu, and Guma. For detail read Roger W. Bowen, *Rebellion and Democracy in Meiji Japan: A Study of Commoners in the Popular Rights Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, © 1980).

⁴³ Ueki Emori was a samurai from Tosa who advocated a natural rights doctrine in this period. His activities and ideas had the greatest impact on three rebellions; Fukushima, Kabasen and Chichibu and their leaders.

⁴⁴ Michio Nagai, "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol 14 (November, 1954): 59 quoting Hani Goro, *Meiji ishin* (The Meiji Restoration), (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1946), pp. 161 - 162. The quotation is from "The Declaration of People for the Proposal of the Establishment of a Diet."

In this atmosphere of controversy Spencerian theories of natural rights and of representative government were taken by Japanese liberals to be a strong philosophical assertion of political freedom. After Nakamura Keiu's introduction, Spencer's works became popular in the Japanese society. Itagaki regarded his book, Social Statics⁴⁵ (translated by Matsushima Kō in 1882), as the "text book of popular rights." It was ordered in the hundreds for free distribution by the *Risshisha* organization⁴⁶ and had significant influence upon the liberal movement. In the "Brewers' Conference", (1874) organized by the *Risshisha*, Spencer's theory was strongly echoed in the statement: "The government should do no more than to guarantee national order and insure liberty and the rights of the people. It should not interfere with an attempt to control private affairs."⁴⁷ Social Statics also helped the organization to recruit members. For example, a participant in the Kabason incident, an uprising developing out of a public meeting of liberals, stated in court that after reading Social Statics he had decided to join the liberal movement.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Social Statics (1850) was Spencer's earlier work. In this early work, Spencer shows himself to be a different type of thinker from the Spencer of later years. In Social Statics, Spencer rejected utilitarianism and promoted natural rights as an a priori truth that says "human happiness in the Divine will", and claimed that the people have a right to resist unlawful authority. The Japanese had two translations of Social Statics. The first version was translated by Ozaki Yukio in 1879, under the title *Kenri teiko* ("A Proposed Morality of Rights, With Reasons"). The second version was translated by Matsushima Kō in 1882, under the title *Shakai heiken ron* ("A Treatise on Social Equality").

⁴⁶ *Risshisha* (Self-Help Society) was a political association active in the Freedom and people's rights movement of the 1870s and 1880s. It was formed in Kochi Prefecture (the former Tosa domain) in April 1874 by Itagaki Taisuke and other leading figures in the movement. The association derived its name from the Japanese title of the highly popular 1870 translation of Self-help, Samuel Smiles's (1812-1904) moralistic paean to success and self-improvement.

⁴⁷ Michio Nagai, "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan," p. 60 quoting Itagaki Taisuke, *Jiyūtō shi* (History of the Liberal Party), (Tokyo: Gosharo, 1910), p. 621.

⁴⁸ *ibid.*

Spencer's book also influenced Ueki, one of the powerful writers who stimulated farmer rebellions in the early Meiji period. It is evident from his works that Ueki's primary intellectual commitment was to the natural rights doctrine espoused by Spencer. Spencer's words, "human happiness in the Divine will" and the notion that the duty of government was to fulfill this will impressed Ueki.

One of the clearest examples of Ueki's intellectual commitment to Spencer's version of natural rights doctrine is a Popular Rights anthem composed by Ueki in 1879 entitled *Minken inaka uta* (Country Song of Popular Rights) as follow:

Man is free.
 The head thinks and the heart feels;
 The body moves and runs;
 Man surpasses all other wonderful creatures.
 The heart and body are
 Comparable to the universe.
 Man's freedom does not allow a dearth of liberty;
 We are free; we have rights.
 The people of Japan must claim their rights;
 If we do not, then our companion is shame.⁴⁹

This song not only demonstrated Spencer's ideas, but also communicated the natural rights philosophy to rural citizens. Some sectors of the farm population were attracted to Ueki's liberal idea because of the economic misery engendered through the Meiji tax structure. His ideas inspired the rural rebellions such as the Fukushima rebellion of 1862 and the Iida incident of December 1864. Ueki spent nearly two months in Fukushima between early August and late September when the confrontation between

⁴⁹ Bowen, pp. 206-207.

popular rights activists and Governor Mishima was becoming ever more intense.

Thus, the idea of natural rights which was brought to Japan by the *Meirakusha* members not only stimulated movements among the samurai, but also spread widely among well-to-do farmers and peasants who were dissatisfied with government taxation and economic misery. There were two kinds of movements, *Gōnō minken undō* (the well-to-do farmers movement) and *Nōmin minken undō* (the peasantry movement). Initially they attacked the government, but later targeted the landlord and creditor. However, none of these rebellions unduly alarmed the government because of their localized nature.

One explicit reaction towards these movements and rebellions was the rise of conservatism in the government. The Home Ministry (*Naimusho*) was used as a crucial agent of government to control the public. The Home Ministry took control of the national police force in 1874. Later on a special police force, the Metropolitan Police Board (*Keishichō*), was created to control the capital city. One of the functions of this force "was to secretly search out and take preventive action against political offenses."⁵⁰ The following year police throughout the country were also directed to control "political offenses."⁵¹ By using laws the government suppressed freedom of expression. In 1875 censorship regulation was promulgated. The Press Ordinance of sixteen articles plus an appendix contained strict penalties and administrative procedures for preventing publication. Publishers of newspapers and magazines were regulated by an

⁵⁰ Richard H. Mitchell, *Censorship in Imperial Japan* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 67 quoting Ryosuke Ishii, *Japanese Legislation in the Meiji Era*, tr. and ed. William J. Chambliss, (Tokyo: Pan-Pacific, 1958), p. 250.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, quoting Ishii, p. 252.

approval system.⁵² This Ordinance created a repressive atmosphere in which journalists and writers felt uncomfortable in expressing certain opinions. It directly affected the *Meirokusha*. In the society meeting of September 1, 1875 Fukuzawa Yukichi forcefully argued that it was time to stop publication because it would be impossible to steer clear of topics prohibited by the new regulations.⁵³ The new press law and also the declining interest of the members in writing for the *Meiroku Zasshi* during its final months as compared with their enthusiastic participation during the journal's first year, led to the cessation of the magazine.

George Akita states that the People's Rights Movement which was stimulated by the *Meirokusha's* liberal ideas did not lead the government to proclaim the Meiji constitution in 1890. The idea of a constitutional monarchy, he writes, had already existed in the government prior to the People's Rights Movement.⁵⁴ The government had plans to modernize the country along Western lines in order to revise the unequal treaties and so was open to changing the political system to satisfy the West. The constitution, therefore, gratified the needs of both the government and the people. In my opinion, even though this movement may not have directly influenced the government's adoption of the constitutional system, it did accelerate the process. The popularity of the People's Rights Movement which were stimulated by the *Meirokusha's* works about natural

⁵² Ibid., p. 47.

⁵³ Braisted, xlii; David Huish, 227-228.

⁵⁴ Kido Takayoshi was the first Meiji leader who called for drafting a constitution. His enthusiasm increased as one of the dramatic results of the Iwakura Mission of 1871-1873. In 1873 he submitted a memorandum requesting the drafting of a constitution to certain highly placed officials in the government, but his proposal was not accepted. His idea was followed also by Ōkubo Toshimichi. George Akita, Foundations of Constitutional Government in Modern Japan 1868-1900 (Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 9.

right certainly caused worries among the Meiji government. Yamagata Aritomo,⁵⁵ one of the most important Meiji leaders, expressed his worries in a letter to Home Minister Itō Hirobumi on July 4, 1879:

Itagaki's scheme...is to call for the people's rights, slander the government, abuse officials with reckless and groundless attacks, and thereby arouse disgruntled *shizoku* (samurai) and spread unrest throughout the land. By prolonging this situation he hopes to unite the people and overthrow the government at an opportune moment. Therefore, every day we delay, the evil poison will spread farther and penetrate the minds of the young and produce, inevitably, incalculable harm.⁵⁶

This also worried Sasaki Takayuki,⁵⁷ a person close to the court. In March 1881, Sasaki asked Itō Hirobumi whether he favored a constitution enacted with the popular participation or one which was an "imperial gift." Itō answered that he favored an imperially granted constitution. Sasaki then responded:

If we speedily enact an imperially granted constitution we need not fear any attack. However, if we let things drift as at present, and do not decide on a national policy for a year or two, the argument for a popularly enacted

⁵⁵ Yamagata Aritomo was a Chōshū samurai and he was a crucial political leader of the Meiji (1868-1926) and Taishō (1912-26) periods. Architect of the Modern Japanese army, he also played a major role in building the political institutions of Meiji Japan. He served in a variety of official posts, including chief of the army, minister of war, minister of home affairs, minister of justice, prime minister, privy councillor, and "elder statesman" (*genrōin*). *Encyclopedia of Japan*, Vol. 6 pp. 290-291.

⁵⁶ Roger F. Hackett, *Yamagata Aritomo in the Rise of Modern Japan, 1838-1922* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1971), p.97. quoting from Osatake Takeshi, *Nihon kensei shi taiko* (An outline of Japanese Constitutional History) (Tokyo, 1938-1939), pp. 527-528. This statement was often quoted by political Japanese scholars to show that the Meiji oligarches were worried about the opposite parties. See Richard H. Mitchell, p. 61, George Akita, p. 25.

⁵⁷ George Akita described Sasaki Takayuki as one of the most fascinating personalities of his time. He opposed Itagaki and the movement for parliamentary government, but he was a believer in constitutional government. On his return to Japan after having been abroad with the Iwakura mission, he told Prime Minister Sanjo Sanetomi that the first step Japan should take was to draft a constitution. Akita quoted Tsuda Shigemaro, *Meiji Seijo to shin Takayuki* (The Meiji emperor and his subject Takayuki) (Tokyo, 1928), pp. 279-276, 286.

constitution will gain strength, and we will probably not be able to do any thing about it.⁵⁸

Roger F. Hackett concludes that, "the growth of the popular movement was considered a real and present danger by the oligarchs."⁵⁹ This fear prompted the government to promise a constitution prior to being forced by the opposition. On March 3, 1882 Itō was assigned to lead a mission of investigation to Europe in order to study Western constitutions. Through the influence of German scholars such as Rudolph Gneist,⁶⁰ Lorenz von Stein and Albert Mosse,⁶¹ Itō was strongly impressed by the German Constitution and used it as a model for the Meiji constitution. He expressed his appreciation of the German constitution in his letter to Iwakura:

Thanks to the famous German scholars Gneist and Stein, I have come to understand the essential features of the structure and operation of states. In the most crucial matter of fixing the foundations of our imperial system and of retaining the prerogatives belonging to it, I have already found sufficient substantiation.....⁶²

Itō returned to Japan and began drafting the constitution. Two German scholars, Albert Mosse and Hermann Roesler, were also invited to work with Japanese bureaucrats such as Inoue Kowashi, Ōkubo and Itō Miyoji. In the Meiji Constitution, we can clearly see the conservative ideas and the emphasis on the power of the Emperor similar to the German constitution's stress on the power of the Kaiser. Part of the first chapter states:

⁵⁸ Akita, pp. 500-501.

⁵⁹ Roger F. Hackett, *Yamagata Aritomo in the Rise of Modern Japan, 1838-1922*, p.97

⁶⁰ Rudolph Gneist was a well-known German legal authority. Itō had a chance to listen to his lectures on the general principle that constitutions should be firmly rooted in national history. He compared the history of Japan with that of Prussian, and urged Itō to adopt a Prussian-style constitution. See George M. Beckmann, *The Making of the Meiji Constitution: The Oligarchs and the Constitutional Development of Japan, 1868-1891* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1975), pp. 69-71.

⁶¹ Albert Mosse later served in Japan from 1886-1890 as an adviser on local government.

⁶² Akita, p. 61 quoting Kaneko, *Itō den*, II, 297

Chapter I: The Emperor

Article I. The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal.

Article II. The Imperial Throne shall be succeeded to by Imperial male descendants, according to the provisions of the Imperial House Law.

.....
 Article IV. The Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in Himself the rights of sovereignty, and exercises them, according to the provisions of the present Constitutions.

Article V. The Emperor exercises the legislative power with the consent of the Imperial Diet.⁶³

The Emperor did not have power only in civil affairs but also in military affairs as the Supreme Commander of the army:

Article XI. The Emperor has the supreme command of the Army and Navy.

Article XII. The Emperor determines the organization and peace standing of the Army and Navy.

Article XIII. The Emperor declares war, makes peace, and concludes treaties.⁶⁴

Even though there is no document explicitly stating the influence of the *Meirokusha* conservatives in writing the Meiji constitution, we can see that this constitution revealed all traditional values such as the imperial line and the loyalty of citizens toward the emperor and the nation which they strongly called for in the early Meiji period. We certainly know that one of the *Meirokusha* members, Nishi Amane had a strong influence on two of the

⁶³ Beckmann, p. 151

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

most important Meiji military documents, the Admonition to soldiers (*Gunjin kunkai*), 1878 and the Imperial Rescript to Soldiers (*Gunjin chakuyu*), 1882. The former contained rules for proper military conduct together with the reminder that the armed forces should cultivate certain distinctive virtues not expected of ordinary civilians. The latter was an edict from the throne enunciating the concept of absolute loyalty on the part of soldiers and sailors to the emperor as supreme commander. The loyalty to the emperor which was emphasized in the Imperial Rescript to Soldiers and Sailors was also stressed by the constitution. It is not a mistake to conclude that the conservatives' ideas also had an influence on Japanese politics even though it was not direct and evident as liberal ideologies.

Besides politics, the *Meirokusha* members also influenced the legal system. Tsuda continuously attacked the out-dated and uncivilized Japanese laws and called for their revision. After he and Nishi returned from Holland, they worked in the Institute of Development (*Kaiseido*, it used to be the Foreign Books Research Institute) and translated their notes from Vissering lectures about natural law, international law and constitutional law. Tsuda took charge of translating Vissering's lectures on constitutional law on order from the bakufu, and published *Taisei kakuhāron* (Discussion of Western Constitutional Law) under official auspices in 1868. This book was the most polished translation of the group, receiving wide acclaim as the pioneering Japanese work on Western law, and with its publication Tsuda began a successful legal career.⁶⁵

In conclusion, the *Meirokusha* members, both liberals and conservatives influenced the Japanese political, legal and military systems.

⁶⁵Thomas R. H. Havens, *Nishi Amane and Modern Japanese Thought* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 52.

Western ideologies which were brought into society stimulated the government to speed up their political reforms and promulgate the Meiji constitution. The conservative ideas, even they were overshadowed by liberal ones during the time of *bunmei kaika* were emphasized later when the government wanted to unite and mobilize citizens. These two trends of ideologies bequeathed Japan both Western institutions such as a cabinet and legislative system and traditional values such as the imperial power and the loyalty of citizens toward the emperor and the nation. While, Japan possessed a western cloak behind this constitutional facade she also preserved the power of the emperor and traditional values for the mobilization of citizens at the discretion of the government - that of ultra-nationalism in the years prior to the Second World War.

Economics:

As already mentioned, Japan in the early Meiji period aimed to be as wealthy as the West. Both intellectuals and leaders attempted to discover and emulate the roots of Western wealth. While some of the *Meirakusha* members such as Fukuzawa did not agree in using free trade, he did however called for free competition in the economy, *laissez-faire*. Fukuzawa supported the idea that the government should allow for free economic competition and facilitate economic grow by investing in public affairs such as transportation. Tsuda supported Fukuzawa idea concerning transportation, believing that it would facilitate Japan's economic growth as it did in Britains.

The *Meirakusha's* idea of improving transportation also agreed with the government's. The Parliamentary Papers (1870) concluded that "Railways are ...of the first importance for the prosperity and military

strength of the country; and it is desirable that they should be introduced into Japan without delay."⁶⁶ Thus, the government took considerable initiative in transportation especially in railways. Up to 1877 the government controlled all construction. By which date three short sections of the planned Tokyo-Kobe rail line had been completed: those between Tokyo and Yokohama (1872), Kobe and Osaka (1874), Osaka and Kyoto(1877). After 1877, private companies participated in building rail networks. Not only were railways widespread, but also other methods of communication such as telegraphy. New transportation and communication networks tremendously facilitated Japanese economic growth for they connected markets to producers.

Besides transportation, Fukuzawa also called for Japan to become a manufacturing country. While the *Meirokusha* were expressing their ideas, the government took charge in developing agriculture and industries. Due to the fact that Japan was an agricultural society the government primarily paid attention to this area. Foreign agricultural experts from England and the United States were brought to Japan.⁶⁷ These experts recommended that Japanese peasants transform themselves into good Western-style farmers, raising cabbages, potatoes, and corn. Development occurred more slowly in industry. The booming of light industry did not occur until the late 1880s. For example, in 1882 the foundation for a modern textile industry was laid with the founding of the Osaka Spinning Company by Shibusawa Eiichi. He brought the most advanced cotton-spinning machinery available in the West and in a daring move

⁶⁶ Smith, p. 42 quoting "Memorandum on the Advantage To Be Gained from the Construction of Railways" Parliamentary Paper, LXX (1870), 97.

⁶⁷ Duus, p. 138.

installed electric lighting, making possible the operation of the company plant day and night. By the late 1880s a small boom in the cotton industry was underway, and the following decade, Japanese mills not only supplied most domestic needs, but had begun to produce for the export market as well.

It cannot be denied that the *Meirakusha*'s ideas influenced on Japanese economy, even if it was not as evident as in education and politics. Their ideas coincided with the government's who wanted to develop the country. So, the government played an important role in building transportation and leading society in strategic industries such as shipyards and mining. Professor Smith concludes that almost all modern industrial enterprises founded before 1880 belonged to the government.⁶⁸ Later, due to government deficits these enterprises were sold to private firms. At this point, private investment started rising in the Japanese economy. It was a rising sign of free competition in Fukuzawa's idea. Heavy industry continued slowly to increase. New shipyards were opened in 1881 and 1883. The Shibura Engineering Works was founded in 1887. In 1892, like several others, it began to produce electrical equipment and machinery, while the same year also saw the appearance of the first Japanese-built locomotive.⁶⁹ We can conclude, then, that both the government and the private sector played their roles in developing the Japanese economy, the former as the initiator and supporter, and the latter as maintainer of the growth.

⁶⁸ Smith, p. 52.

⁶⁹ W. G. Beasley, The Modern History of Japan (Great Britain: The Shenvel Press, © 1963), p. 149.

Thailand

Thailand, in the reign of King Chulalongkorn, experienced a period of great reformation, the "Chakkri Reformation."⁷⁰ There were tremendous changes in the society, politics and economy. The government played a crucial role in initiating and stimulating all those changes. Some traditional practices were abolished, while new, "civilized", Western practices were imported and integrated into Thai society. All these changes established and transformed Thailand from a pre-modern society to a modern one.

The Young Siam and the government.

There can be no question about the influence of the *Young Siam* on the government because the *Young Siam* were the government themselves. King Chulalongkorn the leader of the group, transformed *Young Siam* thought into action. In theory a Thai king possessed all legitimate power and ruled the country through his government.⁷¹ In the early part of King Chulalongkorn's reign most of the power was held by the regent and his conservative faction. Gradually, King Chulalongkorn regained power through national reforms. After his second coronation, 1874, he started his socio-

⁷⁰ William J. Siffin called administrative modernization in Thailand which began in the latter part of the nineteenth century as "Chakkri Reformation" according to the dynasty name. He ended the period of reformation in 1910, the last year of King Chulalongkorn. See William J. Siffin, The Thai Bureaucracy Institutional Change and Development (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, ©1966).

⁷¹ Sometimes the king did not rule the country by himself because he was too young or too weak. So, real power was in the hands of bureaucratic families or a regent. It often happened in the Ayudhaya era (1350-1767), as in the reign of King Prasatthong. Because the king was too young Chaophraya Karahom (Minister of Military) controlled most of the power. In the early part of King Chulalongkorn's reign was another example. The Bunnag family (Chaophraya Si Suriyawong's family) controlled many important positions in the government such as the regent, and *Krom The* (Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

political reforms. His most significant move was a reform in 1892 which created the new bureaucratic system in Thailand by establishing twelve ministries. He used these ministries to coalesce power among his supporters. Five in twelve ministers were members of *Young Siam*,⁷² such as Prince Damrong (the Minister of Interior Affairs) and Prince Devawongse (the Minister of Foreign Affairs). Through the holding of these positions it is no wonder that the *Young Siam* had tremendous influence on modernization in Thailand.

Society:

The single greatest change in Thai society was the transformation of the class system. As already mentioned, as a heir, King Chulalongkorn was sympathetic to slaves and wanted to set them free. When he became king, he abolished the old customs which were seen as barbaric in Western eyes such as crawling in the presence of the king and chewing betel and revoked social restrictions. At that time, the majority of citizens were either slaves or *Phrai* (commoners) attached to a corvée system. There were no freemen in the Western sense. The upper class consisted of the royal families and nobility.

King Chulalongkorn gradually abolished slavery and freed the *Phrai* from the corvée system. It took 31 years (1874-1905) to abolish slavery. In 1874, after his second coronation ceremony, a decree was issued containing the following provisions:

⁷² They were Prince Damrong (Minister of Interior); Prince Naresuanrit (Minister of the Capital (*Nakornbam*)); Prince Devawongse (Ministry of Foreign Affairs); Prince Phaanurangseesawangwong (Minister of Defense); Chaophraya Phatsakorawong (Minister of Education).

1 The fixed scale of prices for slaves was changed. For those born into slavery after October 1, 1868, the price was made zero at the age of 21

2 People born into slavery after October 1, 1868, were to become free on their 21st birthday.

3 People who were born into slavery after October 1, 1868, and who were freed on their 21st birthday, could afterwards neither sell themselves nor be sold by others into slavery.

4 Children born to freemen after October 1, 1868, could be sold only with the consent of the child after he reached the age of 15.

5 No one born after October 1, 1868 who had reached 21 years, could either sell himself or be sold into slavery.⁷³

The provisions of this decree were sufficient to promise the eventual elimination of slavery. The decree wisely allowed a considerable amount of time for people to adapt to the new system. The King went a step further, when he returned from a trip to Europe by issuing another decree providing that no one born after December 16, 1897 could either sell himself or be sold by others. This decree applied to persons (e.g., children of prisoners of war) and for the regions in the North for which the 1874 decree had not applied. Finally in 1905 the King proclaimed a law abolishing slavery. It decreed that no new persons could become slaves and that debt slaves must be credited with four baht per month until their debts were paid off and they became free.

Simultaneously King Chulalongkorn set the *Phrai* free from the *covée* system. Legally by 1905 all forms of slavery had been eliminated and the *covée* system abolished in favor of paid labor.

The reasons for the abolishment of slavery and the *Phrai* were: first, the King wanted to abolish old, uncivilized traditions in Thailand in

⁷³ James C. Ingram, Economic Change in Thailand Since 1850 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955), p. 62.

order to gain Western recognition of Thailand as a civilized country and revise unequal treaties; second, it was a means for the King to centralize power under his own command and stress loyalty to the throne.

Education:

As the *Young Siam* agreed on the importance of education in creating good citizens and qualified government officials they stressed the development of Thai education. During this period there were tremendous changes in education both institutionally and ideologically. King Chulalongkorn and his two most prominent brothers, Prince Damrong and Prince Vajirānāna expanded the educational system. These two princes enthusiastically cultivated traditional ideologies such as kingship and good citizenship.

Institutionally, the new educational system was first established for the nobility and the royal family. After King Chulalongkorn came back from India, he hired an English tutor, George Patterson, to teach English to his brothers. This led to the establishment of *Suan Anon* in 1878 for teaching English to young princes and nobility.

Thailand also needed better, more efficient government officials in order to reform the nation. Prince Damrong, director of the Education Department between 1880 and 1892, played a crucial role in reforming the Thai Educational system by founding specialized schools for children of the nobility. He established a school that provided all the advantages of the traditional system as well as the higher standard of education which the government service increasingly required. This school began instruction in September 1881 with only ten pupils, most of whom

were of royal blood. By 1884 the *Suankulup* School offered both civil and military training to young men from royal and official families.

Mass education was not introduced until 1884 when Prince Damrong began planning the extension of public education along the lines of the 1875 decree which called for the founding of modern schools in the royal monasteries.⁷⁴ Monasteries were used as a basis because traditionally education had been carried on in the monasteries and the facilities to sustain formal instruction were readily available there. The first school in this program, *Wat Mahannapharam*, was opened in late 1884. Several other schools soon followed. After a year of rapid growth, the creation of monastery schools for the general public settled down to a period of slow but steady growth.⁷⁵ In the course of the seven years between 1885 and 1892 they spread over much of the country, with varying degrees of success. The number of government schools in the provinces more than doubled, from ten to twenty-four, but the increase in enrollment was only 65 percent, and the total enrollment of the monastery schools of Bangkok remained almost static, at about 1,500 pupils.⁷⁶ In 1892, Prince Damrong was replaced by Phraya Phatsakorawong and was reassigned as Minister of the Interior because of the dangerous political situation developing between French and English colonial interests.

Public Education continued to improve. In September 1898, Prince Vajirañāna (a member of the *Young Siam*), the head of *Thammayut* (adhering to the *thamma*), was given the enormous task of organizing modern education in all the provinces of Thailand. He and Prince Damrong (now

⁷⁴ Damrong, Prince and Ratchasena, *Theasaphiben*, p. 3.

⁷⁵ Wyatt, *The Politics Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn*, p. 118.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

Minister of the Interior) stated the aim of their educational program in their "Decree on the Organization of Provincial Education" which was promulgated in the government gazette in November 1898. Cast in unambiguously conservative and orthodox Buddhist terms, it proclaimed the King's intention to "support and further the progress of the entire Kingdom" and emphasized his intention to strengthen traditional institutions in the pursuance of traditional moral ends. Prince Vajirañāna was appointed to superintend this strengthening of the religious and educational activities of the provincial monasteries.

Through monasteries (as schools) and monks (as teachers), Prince Vajirañāna spread education throughout the country. Most of these monks graduated from the *Mahamakuta Royal Academy*, which was established on October 1893 to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of King Rama IV's death. Each monk received both theological and educational training. Here they learned Thai, Pali, Sanskrit, English, basic mathematics, *Thamma*⁷⁷ and *Vinaya*.⁷⁸ Graduates of this school were crucial in the expansion the educational system.

In addition to coordinating the spread of education throughout the country, Prince Vajirañāna also wrote a simple, moral textbook, *Benjasin Benjatham* (Morality and *Thamma*). This book was composed of simplified Buddhist teachings concerning the quality of good men and the relationship and obligation of men in society. School curriculums also required students to learn *Phongsawadan* (History) in order to cultivate

⁷⁷ *Thamma* or *Dhamma* means Buddhist teaching.

⁷⁸ *Vinaya* means regulations for monks.

nationalism. Prince Damrong was the most productive historical writer at that time.⁷⁹ Later, he was called "Father of History" in Thailand.

Outside the educational system, Prince Vajirañāna spread his ideas by preaching and writing. He selected simple topics, used simple language, and daily metaphors in order to transfer his ideas to common people. For example, when he preached about the importance of unity he compared the country's unity to the human body:

The unity of elements made organs. The unity of organs also created body. Each organ has its own duty in order to sustain the body. If organs do not co-ordinate together, the body will fall apart...This can be compared to a nation. If a nation can protect itself from internal uprising and external invasion, the nation can survive, if not, the nation will fall down. The people should unite for the nation's prosperity and strength. If people do not unite, the nation will decline and finally collapse.⁸⁰

Prince Vajirañāna also legitimated the throne through religious teachings which explained the divine right of a king to rule. Good deeds (*bun*) in former lives accumulated in one and produced kings, individuals with an innate right to govern a country. He proclaimed that King Chulalongkorn merited his possession of the four kingly treasures: life, dignity, property and enlightenment, because of the benevolence, merits,

⁷⁹ Prince Damrong's works can be categorized as follows: history (134 issues), poem (92), religion (76), biography (160), legend (103), commentaries (19), articles in Journal of Siam Society (10). *Patakathar uang Somdet phrachao boromwongthet kromphraya Damrong Rajanubhab rae phrawatrugrao*, (The explanation about Prince Damrong and his life which was told by his daughter) (Bangkok: Suksaphanpanit, 1963)

⁸⁰ Vajirañāna, Prince, *Anusasane thi somdet phraboromwongthet kromphra Vajirañāna dai prothanke kongsuape nai wanthunamkaokong thii 6 may R.S 130 (Thai)* (Prince Vajirañāna's speeches for soldiers trainee on 6 th May 1911) (Bangkok: Sammit Publisher, 1911), pp. 2-4.

virtues and charisma accumulated from former lives.⁸¹ The accumulation of *gun* granted the King the right to rule. Moreover, the King also possessed other moral qualities such as talent, benevolence, and good judgement. All of these qualifications aided his rule. Good citizenship was comprised of wholehearted loyalty to the King and behavior suited to national progress.

Prince Vajirañāna also advised the King and government officials. His birthday sermons to the King in the years from 1900 to 1912 were published in *Phramongkolvisetkatha* (Preaching for propitiousness and supremeness). Much of his preaching centered around the qualifications of a good King, the King's activities and obligations, the qualifications of good citizens, and the hierarchical relationship in society. His sermons to the King emphasized moral issues such as benevolence:

The King ...supported royal families and government officers for progressing in property and position. The King abolished slaves for the sake of people. He also supported and expanded education throughout the country for people to be educated, to be good citizens and have pride in their nation.⁸²

Furthermore, the King was required to be well-versed in order to know what to do for the country in such areas as managing public property and arms preparation. Prince Vajirañāna said:

The King knows the country's situation so well, and can control it. He reforms the tax system for people's benefit....

Even for a small country...when it is independent, it should prepare military equipment, foods and every necessity. Even in a time of peace, a country should continuously think about their defense and progress.

⁸¹ Vajirañāna, Prince, *Phramongkol visetkatha* (Preaching for Propitiousness and Supremeness), p. 8.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 77.

If a country does not prepare well in times of peace it will fall in time of the war.⁸³

Prince Vajirañāṇa propagandized and stressed the importance of Kingship in Thailand and in particular King Chulalongkorn's role as preeminent leader. This stress on the role of the throne in education and propaganda created nationalism in Thai society which was necessary to combat the international and domestic challenges Thailand faced.

Politics:

Politically, the *Young Siam* aimed to stress kingship in order to confront both internal and external problems. Thus, in political reforms they accepted Western institutions such as the Privy Council, the cabinet and legal system in order to be considered a civilized nation by the West, but the king's power was still strongly emphasized. None of the Western political ideologies or systems could enter society. With these efforts Thailand possessed Western institutions and preserved their traditional values such as kingship and unity. Benedict Anderson and Somkiat Wantana stated that politically Chakri reforms did not create a nation-state but an absolutist state.⁸⁴ In other words the Thai political system still remained an absolute monarchy leavened with Western institutions.

As King Chulalongkorn recognized the need for political modernization, two Councils were created in 1875: the State Council and the Privy Council. In 1883, the regent, Chaophraya Si Suriyawong died, and in

⁸³ Ibid., p. 135.

⁸⁴ Wantana, p. 75 and Benedict Anderson, "Studies of the Thai State: The State of Thai Studies" in *The Study of Thailand*, ed. Eliezer B. Ayal (Athens, Ohio University Center for International Studies, Southeast Asia Program, 1978), pp.193-247.

August 1885 the "second King," Prince Wichaichan, died leaving all power in the King's hand. King Chulalongkorn was now free to reform government administration and to centralize his control over the bureaucracy through nepotism. In 1892 he reorganized the government. Siffin labeled this movement "the radical reorganization of 1892."⁸⁵ The basic structure of Thai government both centrally and locally was changed. Twelve ministries such as the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Defense replaced the traditional system of two great ministries (Defense and Interior), six minor ministries, plus a miscellaneous collection of agencies. The King appointed his younger brothers and his followers to important positions within the bureaucracy. The *Young Siam* were active five of twelve government ministers; Prince Damrong (Minister of Interior Affairs), Prince Devawongse (Minister of Foreign Affairs), Prince Naret (Minister of Metropolis), Prince Phaenurangseesawangwong (Minister of the Navy) and Chaophraya Phatsakorawong (Minister of Education). Prince Damrong had significant achievements in centralizing the Thai administrative system. Siffin elaborates that "with the appointment of Prince Damrong came the development of a new pattern of provincial government in Thailand, and the foundations of the new bureaucratic system as well...."⁸⁶ During his twenty-three years as Minister of Interior, Prince Damrong integrated the nation through effective provincial government. He abolished *kin muang* (appanage system)⁸⁷ and established a structure of

⁸⁵ Siffin, p. 52.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁸⁷ This system had been used from the Ayudhaya era. *kin muang* literally means "to eat the place". The phrase has also been translated idiomatically as "to govern". The king was entitled to eat the kingdom. It was his. Officials, who obtained authority and status from the king, acquired the privilege of *kin muang* within their particular jurisdictions. The official who received *kin muang* could collect taxes and govern areas which he was assigned. This was payment from the king at a time when Thailand did not use a salary system.

domestic government based upon trained, salaried officials. *Thesaphiban*, "the system of territorial (or local) government," was initiated in 1894 in which the nation was divided into *Manthan* (Prefecture), *Changwat* (province), Amphoe (a subdivision of a *changwat*), *Tambol* (township) and *Muban* (village). Central government mandates were channelled down to local levels through the appointment of *Manthan* administrators. Through this system the government centralized local power under the Ministry of Interior. The new government also increased the demand for officials so the bureaucratic system expanded very rapidly during the reign of King Chulalongkorn. Rough estimates based upon Ingram's data on noncapital expenditures from 1892 suggest that the salaried bureaucracy more than doubled in size between 1892 and 1899, and that it probably doubled again between 1900 and 1905.⁸⁸ Even though the bureaucratic system was enlarged, high positions were still occupied by young men from noble families. This was one factor which eventually led to the Thai revolution of 1932.

By the end of King Chulalongkorn's reign power was centralized in the hands of the King and his younger brothers through the merit of establish the cabinet. Through the establishment of a Ministry of Interior, Prince Damrong could politically and financially control provinces by the *Thesaphiban* system. By 1914, the last full year during which Prince Damrong was its Minister, there were more than 3,000 professional civil servants stationed throughout the provinces.⁸⁹ Tej Bunnag concluded that through the achievement of Prince Damrong "Siam was transformed from a

⁸⁸ Siffin, p. 94 quoting Ingram, Appendix B, p. 236.

⁸⁹ Tej Bunnag, *The Provincial Administration of Siam 1892-1915 The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 254.

conglomeration of states and provinces without clearly defined boundaries to a compact state with a definite frontier." ⁹⁰

The reformation which was initiated by King Chulalongkorn resulted in the loss of power by both bureaucrats in the central government who lost their slaves and their *phrai* and local leaders who lost direct control over revenue and manpower. One question should be asked: How did the government cope with those who were dissatisfied? Wisely, the government co-opted them into the new system by appointing them as salaried civil servants. Those who were not recruited into the new system provided leadership in rebellions. The most important rebellion at this time was the "Holy Man's" uprising of 1901-1902. This was a large-scale, popular rebellion involving Northeast Thailand, Southern Laos, and the adjacent portion of the Vietnamese Central Highlands. Thai experts interpret the cause of this rebellion in various terms: economic, political and religious. ⁹¹ This rebellion was a widespread but short-lived cause. It was suppressed within a few months. King Chulalongkorn showed deep insight into the causes of the rebellion when he told Prince Damrong that the rebellion was an attempt to return to the older governing tradition in the face of dislocations caused by the new reforms. Tej Bunnag also believed that the people were not satisfied with the *Thesaphiban* reforms. In 1902, Lyle, the British Vice-Consul in Nan, thought that one of the reasons why the people

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

⁹¹ They were Charles Keyes, Toem Wiphakphotchakit, and Tej Bunnag. Toem includes a chapter on the rebellion in his history of Northeast Thailand. Tej Bunnag's article, "Khabot Phu Mi Bun Pak laen R.S 121" (The 1901-1902 Holy Man's Rebellion in Northeast Thailand), gave a history of the events of the "Thai" rebellion, and an interpretation explaining the uprising in largely economic term. Charles Keyes' paper, "Millennialism, Theravada Buddhism, and Thai Society" discusses the rebellion as an example of the potential affinity of Thai Buddhist culture to millenarianism given changes in elite-group structures and political leadership. John B. Mudich, "The 1901-1902 "Holy Man's" Rebellion," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 62, 1 (1974): 47-66.

of Phrae had supported the Shans' rebellion was because they resented paying the taxes while feeling that "nothing was made for the country, the money was drained to Bangkok; the new administration has now been established for more than two years, and still nothing undertaken in the way of public works." ⁹²

Economics:

The *Young Siam* were not overly concerned with economic affairs. However, they did introduce Western economic institutions and facilitate economic growth by expanding transportation such as railways, roads and canals. King Chulalongkorn was aware of the fact that whatever progressive reforms he might accomplish would depend on the provision of adequate revenues. In the old system the king's personal finances were inextricably combined with the public treasury. In order to have an efficient system, the King established new finance offices. On 4 June 1873, he promulgated the "Royal Ordinance for the Finance Office (*ha ratsadakonphiphat*)." This Finance Office was established to centralize the collection of revenues from the various tax farms and ministries to a single office, to provide for uniform accounting procedures, and to safeguard against embezzlement and bribery. The King personally supervised the task of auditing the accounts of the various ministries assisted by three of his younger brothers (*Young Siam's* members), the princes Devawongse, Sommot and Naret, in what became known as the Royal Audit Office in 1874.⁹³ These

⁹² Bunneg, p. 255. quoting M. 117/13: Robyns to Suresak Montri, 30 September 1902.

⁹³ Wyatt, *The Politics Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn*, p. 54 quoting Damrong, "*Phraprawat Thewawong*" p. 113. Phraya Si Worawong, *Phrawat Phrachao borasomwongther kromphra sommot amorasphan* (Bangkok, 1916), p.5.

reforms had the effect of bringing about a 50 per cent increase in state revenues in two years.⁹⁴

The Thai economy underwent changes during King Chulalongkorn's reign due to the Bowring Treaty between Thailand and England in 1855. This treaty set a pattern for other countries to follow: the United States (1856), France (1856), Denmark (1858) and Portugal (1859). These treaties aided the transformation of the Thai economy from an almost self-sufficient economy to an economy which specialized in a few products such as rice and textiles.

The Bowring treaty established extraterritoriality, and included free trade measures:

2 British subjects were given the right to trade freely in all seaports, and to reside permanently in Bangkok. They were to be allowed to buy and rent property in the environs of Bangkok; namely, in the area more than four miles from city walls but less than twenty-four hours' journey from the city...

3 Measurement duties were abolished and import and export duties fixed.

a) The import duty was fixed at 3 percent for all articles,

b) Articles of export were to be taxed just once, whether the tax was called an inland tax, a transit duty, or an export duty.

.....
5 The Siamese government reserved the right to prohibit the export of salt, rice, and fish whenever these articles were deemed to be scarce.⁹⁵

Free trade caused rice exports to increase steadily. (see Appendix L) This growth in production did not reflect technological advances but rather the expansion of rice fields, especially in the Central

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ingram, p. 34.

Plain. The expansion was quite impressive. By 1905/6 the area had risen to 9.1 million *rai*⁹⁶, an increase of 3.3 million over the 1850 estimate of 5.8 million *rai*. The increase was even greater during the next forty-five years with a peak of 34.6 million in 1950.⁹⁷

Growth was primarily due to individual initiative. The government assisted and encouraged agricultural growth through infrastructure support. The building of transportation networks was primarily for political security purposes but also aided rice transportation. Railways to the North and Northeast actually facilitated the delivery of rice to Bangkok and expanded cultivation in these regions. The government-built irrigation and transportation networks were still inadequate in the Thailand of the 1890s. Private companies began to take part in construction of transportation networks. The first major private effort was the construction of a large-scale irrigation project (The Rangsit Scheme) by the Siam Canals Land and Irrigation Co. in 1889.⁹⁸ With the expansion of rice field, irrigation and communication made rice productivity increased steadily. It caused Thailand became a major rice exporter and the Thai economy was integrated into the world economy.

The government not only supported economic growth by building transportation but also helped to revive and strengthen the silk industry through technical assistance. As early as 1902, Japanese experts such as Kamentoro Toyama, Toshitsure Michima and others were brought in to survey the industry and to give instruction to home weavers as well as to teach in

⁹⁶ *Rai* is a square surface measure equal to 1600 square meters. Two point fifty-three *rai* equals one acre.

⁹⁷ Ingram, p.43.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

a school which was established in Korat.⁹⁹ Experiment and demonstration stations were set up and Japanese experts brought in modern looms on which they gave free lessons to the villagers. Meanwhile several hundred girls graduated from the silk school and new equipment was imported and distributed by the government. After several years, however, silk exports had not increased and raw-silk imports were no smaller. An investigation revealed that the silk weavers had ignored the new methods. According to Graham:

Efforts made by the authorities to combat this astonishing lethargy only had the effect of decreasing the cultivation of silk wherever they were applied, and the Government, finding itself therefore equally unable either to lead or to drive its people to better things, abandoned the whole undertaking and left the silk-growers to look after themselves. With the weavers the Japanese expert had never had even the shadow of an influence, and thus the silk situation in 1922 was exactly as in 1901, before the King set about improving it.¹⁰⁰

This unsuccessful development was due not only to the unpopularity of the instruments, but also the change in the direction of government policy to another sector of agriculture.¹⁰¹

There are no signs of indigenous, large scale industrial development in Thailand. Most private production such as textiles took place in homes and small workshops and was for domestic use. Only in the last two or three decades has an "infant industrial Thailand" emerged. This movement sponsored in large part by the government, has still barely begun, but in relative terms the progress has been considerable.

⁹⁹ Surangsi Tonsiengsom, "The Relationship between Thailand and Japan during the Reign of King Rama V to King Rama VII" (M.A. Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1977), p.150.

¹⁰⁰ Ingram, p. 118 quoting W. A. Graham, *Siam* 3rd ed. 2 vols (London, 1924), p. 89.

¹⁰¹ Tonsiengsom, p. 156.

Ingram mentions that prior to 1919 there were few industrial ventures besides rice milling and lumber milling. The Siam Electric Company began in 1867 and with European capital and management it brought electricity and tramcars to Bangkok.

During the reign of King Chulalongkorn, the government facilitated economic growth by expanding roads and railways. Even though the main goal was national security, economic growth was the by-product. The government was also involved in direct ownership and operation of manufacturing industries. So far, the bulk of the government's industrial activities were in public utilities, but planning also occurred along other lines. If all the plans approved by the government and announced to the public between 1930 and 1950 had been completed, Thailand would now have an imposing array of government-operated industries. As it is, the list from 1950 is quite modest.¹⁰²

David Feeny gave reasons for Thai economic underdevelopment in his book, The Political Economy of Productivity Thai Agricultural Development, 1880-1975. He believes that "the divergences between the goals of national security and economic development and between the social interest and the private interests of the elite"¹⁰³ were responsible for Thai underdevelopment. He gives as an example the government choosing to expand the rail network rather than concentrating on water transportation in spite of its importance.¹⁰⁴

If we look at the influence of the *Mairakusha's* and the *Young Siam's* ideologies on development in Japan and Thailand, we can see that the

¹⁰² Ingram, p. 139.

¹⁰³ David Feeny, The Political Economy of Productivity Thai agricultural Development, 1880-1975 (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, © 1982), p. 121.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 112.

influence of the *Young Siam* was stronger and more direct than the *Meirakusha's* because they were political leaders. On the other hand, if we look at the influence of Western ideologies in the modernization of the two countries the *Meirakusha* brought many Western socio-political and economics ideas to Japanese society. Those ideas had a strong impact on Japanese development and laid down a significant foundation for the later period. In Thailand the *Young Siam* brought in only Western institutions such as the cabinet, the Privy Council and the State Council. Thus, Thai development was a mixture of Western institutions and Thai values.

In Japan, modern education used both Western institutions and ideologies. Commercial and business schools were established and produced many Japanese business men. Institutions such Keiō University and Hitotsubashi University are still popular breeding grounds for Japanese business leaders. Moreover, conservative ideas in education cultivated strong nationalism among Japanese citizens which led Japan to be an aggressive country in the Second World War. Politically, due to the flowing of Western ideologies, the Japanese called for their natural rights, thus caused the government to speed up political reforms. The Meiji constitution was promulgated while traditional values were preserved. Economically, the *Meirakusha's* ideas coincided with the government. With the goal of becoming a wealthy nation, the government took charge in establishing transportation and initiating and facilitating economic growth. Foreign experts were hired to help Japan in economic development. While the government facilitated economic growth, Japanese education supplied qualified men to work both in the government and business. Suffice it to say, that the *Meirakusha's* ideas strongly influenced on Meiji modernization.

Unlike Japan, in Thailand Western ideologies were suppressed by the government although socio-political transformations were supported by the throne. Socially, there were significant changes such as the abolition of slavery and the *Phrai* system (corvée system). The idea of "oneself" was created. Public education was established and supported by the government in order to produce qualified public officials and good citizens. Politically, the government centralized its power by using the *Thesaphiban* system which divided the nation into *manthan* (prefectures) and sent a governor to each *manthan*, who reported directly to the government. While Thailand was still ruled by an absolute monarch Western institutions such as the cabinet, the Privy Council and State Council were adapted. The concept of kingship changed from an assumed god to merely a leader of the country. Ideas about *Chat* (nation) were created. Thai boundaries and the definition of being "Thai" were clearly defined. Thai national identity emerged during this period.

Though the *Young Siam* were not overly concerned about economic development Thailand did experience economic changes. The Bowring treaty caused Thailand to become an important world rice exporter. The government modernized transportation for national security which facilitated economic growth. Modernization of the textile industry began though was not completed due to changes in government policy. Thai economy was not transformed as much as the Japanese economy and did not lay down a significant foundation for industrial development as in the Japanese case.

If we compare the results of the *Meirokusha's* and the *Young Siam's* ideas in modernization in these two countries, we can see the *Meirokusha* brought new ideas and institutions into Japanese society. Japan

underwent socio-political and economic transformations which laid down a strong foundation for later development. Thai socio-political transforms caused Thailand to be an absolute state. Thailand remained an agrarian society, while Japan was developing into an industrial country.

Conclusion

Japan and Thailand were very similar in several historical respects; first, they opened themselves to the West in the 1850s. Second, the periods of reform and modernization, the Meiji period and the reign of King Chulalongkorn, started from 1868. Third, the Meiji emperor and King Chulalongkorn were enthroned at the same ages, fifteen years old. Fourth, they were the only two countries in Asia which escaped Western colonialism. Comparative studies of these two countries are thus very interesting, especially their reactions toward Western challenges in the nineteenth century. The Meiji period and the reign of King Chulalongkorn ensured the independence of the two nations from Western imperialism and also laid a strong foundation for the future. Even though the reasons behind modernization in Japan and Thailand were similar, resisting Western encroachment, the end results were quite different. The dissimilarity of approach to Westernization and its results in Japan and Thailand are reflected in the intellectual groups, the *Meirakusha* and *Young Siam*, which led their respective societies in adapting to Western culture. The contrast between these two groups demonstrates differences in many areas such as the differences in the pre-modern period, the depth of Western studies, their readiness in adapting new ideas and new institutions and the role of their leaders.

In the pre-modern period, socio-political and economic situations in both countries were significantly different. The Japanese transformations prepared the country for rapid modernization. The merchants were socially and economically rising while the samurai status declined. A similar reversal occurred on the government level. While the

bakufu became politically and economically weak, Western domains were rising financially and militarily. In 1868 these domains overthrew the bakufu and restored imperial power. Both the bakufu and many of the han governments supported traditional education and Western studies. Japanese scholars had the opportunity to learn Western knowledge, especially sciences such as astronomy, medicine, botany and other practical sciences, in addition to their traditional knowledge, Confucianism. Faced with socio-political problems, they tried to find a solution for strengthening their society. By the last years of the bakufu, a popular slogan was Sakuma Shōzan's, "Eastern ethics and Western science." It illustrated the extent to which Western sciences had already gained legitimacy.

Compared to Japan, the Thai socio-political situation was not drastically transformed. Politically, Thailand remained an absolute monarchy and was undergirded by religion. The old system worked well even on the eve of Western challenges. Socially, Thai citizens were bound to the corvée system, some of them were slaves. There was no standard education. Monasterial education was the only way commoners' children could be educated. King Mongkut urged the upper class to acquire Western knowledge such as language, astronomy, mathematics and military technique. It is not a mistake to conclude that the commitment of intellectuals in Thailand to Western learning was not nearly so advanced as in Japan. Moreover, Thai society was not ready for change as was the Japanese.

The two groups, the *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam*, provided intellectual leadership to their countries in the period of modernization. The *Meirokusha*, experienced in both traditional and Western systems, looked to the West for new models. They eagerly learned about the West and disseminated this knowledge through their magazine, *Meiroku Zasshi*. Some

of them worked in the new Meiji government, such as Nishimura Shigeki, Katō Hiroyuki and Sakatani Shiroshi; but many did not, including Fukuzawa Yukichi and Nakamura Keiu. The Meiji leaders, young, energetic samurai searching for new social, political and economic models, turned to the expertise of the *Meirokusha* intellectuals. Thus, Western concepts such as the spirit of independence, constitutional and representative government, economic theory and Social Darwinism were introduced and widely spread throughout society. But within the *Meirokusha* there were also conservatives. They advocated the preservation of some traditional values, such as an imperial system and a spirit of filial piety and loyalty to the emperor. So while Western philosophies were widely spread in society, traditional values remained. Both new ideas and old values strongly influenced the way the Japanese developed.

In contrast to the Japanese intellectuals, the *Young Siam* came from royal families and the noble class. They were different from the *Meirokusha* in these aspects: family background, educational background and their connection to the government. The *Young Siam* were not only intellectuals but also political leaders. All of them remained satisfied with the old government at the time of modernization. Since they were a privileged group, they did not want to revolutionize the system. Internally, political power was still in the regent's group and the rural areas had financial and political autonomy. Internationally, Thailand was surrounded by Western colonies. Compared to Japanese intellectuals, Thai intellectuals were political conservatives. They accepted only limited Western institutional innovation such as the Privy Council, the State Council, and Western laws and cabinet system in order to impress the West. None of the Western political philosophies such as people's rights and liberalism

entered into society. Through Buddhism they cultivated traditional values such as kingship and unity among the Thai in order to confront the West. Because the intellectuals were also political leaders their ideas were strongly impressed upon society.

Because the old system was collapsing the Japanese intellectuals and leaders as well as society at large were ripe for change. The Japanese intellectuals were free from governmental ties and so had no need to preserve their positions and nothing to gain from the status quo. They, therefore, wholeheartedly accepted the lessons of the West. Most of the new government leaders also had relatively little at stake in the former system and so were open to change. All these reasons made Japan receptive to Western political, social and economic models. In Thailand, the old system and ideologies continued to function and satisfy the social needs of the people. The Thai accepted the West and learned Western knowledge in order to survive in a world of powerful Western countries. But the intellectuals and government leaders were not eager for drastic change and so did not study the West as enthusiastically as the Japanese intellectuals.

The differences in intellectuals as well as the leaders made the results of modernization in these two countries dissimilar. In the first ten years of the Meiji period Western thoughts and institutions were flowing into Japanese society. Education reflected liberal ideas and new philosophies such as political economy. New institutions were established such as Hitotsubashi and Keiō. These schools produced the new middle class, the businessmen of society. Economically, the government also invested in heavy industries and communications in order to facilitate economic growth. Politically, a new system was also created. A cabinet was established. Japanese citizenry were given a limited right to vote. The

government was preparing a constitution. There was also the rise of the People Rights' Movements in society. Often the impetus for the movement was not political but economic. In order to control society, the government leaders became more conservative. They chose to use traditional values such as filial piety and loyalty to the emperor in order to create a disciplined national group. The Education Rescript in 1890 and the Meiji constitution of 1889 which emphasized loyalty and filial piety and the power of the emperor in politics marked the end of the period of liberalism in Japanese society. These values were cultivated through education. In this manner the Japanese could be mobilized in any direction the government wished (including military). Mark R. Peattie succinctly describes this transformation :

No task facing the young leadership in early Meiji Japan had been more essential to the creation of a new state than the transformation of Japanese society. In the long run, all other innovations attempted by the Meiji modernizers to promote national security and prosperity would depend upon the social and intellectual transformation of the people as a whole, so as to shape their loyalty and obedience to the new state, as well as to develop new attitudes and new skills among the people so as to meet the challenges and opportunities of modernity.¹

It is not a mistake to conclude that the *Meiropusha*, the liberals and the conservatives, had an influence on the Japanese development. They brought in Western ideologies and stimulated the government to proclaim the Meiji Constitution. Liberalism continued to enter Japan. Even after *Meiropusha* ceased publication, the *Meiropusha* members still wrote for other publications. For example Fukuzawa wrote for *Jiji Shimpō* and Nishimura Shigeki wrote for the *dōtoku-kai* group. Some of them continued

¹ Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie ed., The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, © 1984), p. 37.

working in the government and were appointed to high positions such as *Genro-in*. Seven were members of the Tokyo Academy group which was established by the government in 1879 as an advisory group for the Ministry of Education.

Thai politics and economics did not undergo so drastic a transformation as Japan because Thai intellectuals and the government tried to make only the changes required for national survival. Politically, the government created an absolutist-nation by importing Western institutions while still preserving traditional values. At the center the king established twelve ministers and appointed his younger brothers and his sons to these positions. Five of them were the *Young Siam's* members. Through these ministries the king could centralize administrative power. Provincial administration was under the control of the Ministry of Interior. D. K. Wyatt described the modernization in the reign of King Chulalongkorn as follows:

Chulalongkorn's reign, the Fifth Reign of the Chakri dynasty, was marked chiefly by building institutions, not least of all the strengthening of the monarchy and the creation of the modern army and state. Though in some senses, both monarchy and bureaucracy had been present in Siam for centuries, by the early twentieth century they had acquired the power and authority they had not had earlier²

The importance of kingship in Thai society was also strongly emphasized by education and religion. The concept of kingship changed from a channel for divine power to a leader of the country. Citizens were required to be loyal to him. National identities were gradually defined around kingship, Buddhism, and the nation. They were clearly emphasized in the

² David K. Wyatt, Thailand: A Short History (New Haven, Yale University Press, ©1982) , p. 223.

writings of King Vajiravudh (1910-1925). He stressed the preservation of Thai culture and described the Thai nation as founded on the basic triad of "nation-religion-monarchy" (*chat-satsana-phramahakasat*), a trinitarian mystery in which all three elements were inextricably bound together.

The influence of the *Young Siam* was pronounced in the social area and was very progressive. Thailand underwent significant changes. Many out dated and uncivilized customs were abolished. All Thai citizens became freemen. Public education was established and expanded throughout the country by Prince Damrong and Prince Vajirāñāna. The government hired foreign advisers and sent students to study abroad. These factors caused significant growth in the literacy rate and in the number of educated men working for the government.

In conclusion, if we compare the influence of the *Meirokusha* and the *Young Siam* on the modernization of these two countries, the *Young Siam's* influence was more limited than their counterparts in Japan because of their more limited Western knowledge and the weaker influence of the Thai central government. While the *Young Siam* were cautiously and gradually modernizing their country, they also tried to regain power from the old clique and escaped Western colonialism. Politically, they used traditional values such as kingship to emphasize national identity and the uniqueness of being Thai. Western institutions were adapted in order to impress the West and assist the King in ruling the country. In contrast to their impact on politics, the *Young Siam's* influence was very significant in the social area. They instituted progressive social reforms including steps to abolish slavery and institute public education. The economy also developed along with politics and social institutions. Transportation,

especially railways intended to increase national security, facilitated the economic growth.

The modernization of Japan in the early period was not limited as in the Thai case. The Meiji leaders were young, energetic and wanted to establish a new nation. This facilitated the influence of the *Meirakusha* on modernization in various areas such as politics, society and the economy. The idea of natural rights was introduced. Japanese movements were formulated not only for political reasons but also for economic reasons. Education emphasized the spirit of independence. Japanese modernization occurred too fast too soon and created confusion in the society. As a result, it subsequently led the government to be more conservative for reasons of national security: the people had to be mobilized in order to provide strong support for the government's goals. Traditional values such as imperial power and loyalty of citizens toward the emperor were called for. In the early part of the Meiji period the influence of the *Meirakusha* was spread throughout various parts of society and caused rapid changes in Japanese society. This was completely different from Thailand where the *Young Siam*'s influence was gradual and limited.

Glossary

Japanese

- bakufu* Government of the shogunal authority, to distinguish it from the Imperial Court and from the authority of the feudal lords (*daimyo*) over their domains. The word, which literally means "Tent Government," reflects the military origin of the Tokugawa regime and conveys the notion that it is a government of the military class.
- bakuhan* political system in the Tokugawa period in which composed of *bakufu* as the central government and 260 han (domain).
- Bakumatsu* latter period of the Tokugawa period (1603-1867).
- Bansho shirabe-sho* or Office for inspection of Foreign Books. It was established in 1855 for Western Studies.
- bu* arms, military studies; as distinct from *bun* (see below).
- bunmei kaika* civilization and enlightenment, one of the main slogans of the Meiji reformers to define their program
- bun* learning, education, civilian affairs, as distinct from *bu* (see above), the military.
- chōnin* merchants
- daigaku* the university; literally, the "great learning"; before the war the normal course was three years; after the war, four years, on the American model.
- daimyo* the feudal lord, or lords of provinces of assessed yield of 10,000 *koku* (see below) of rice, who ruled as vassals of the Tokugawa Shoguns.

- Edo** headquarters of the Tokugawa government, renamed Tokyo ("Eastern Capital") in 1868, when the restored Imperial Government moved there from its traditional capital of Kyoto.
- fudai*** refers specifically to these feudal lords whose ancestor had supported Tokugawa Ieyasu before the battle of Sekigahara. As a general rule, high offices under the bakufu could be filled only by members of this group, as the descendants of those who submitted after Sekigahara (called *Tozama*) were traditionally considered unreliable.
- fukoku kyōhei*** Rich Country, Strong Military; one of the main slogans of the early Meiji reformers.
- Genrō*** an extra-constitution group of elder statesmen former prime ministers and high court officials- who acted as advisers to the Throne. It was very powerful until the 1920s when all but one of the original *Genrō* had died.
- gōnō*** wealthy peasants who were well-off in the late Tokugawa period
- hyakushō*** peasants
- han*** fief, domain, province. During the Tokugawa period there were between 250 to 300 of them, each ruled by its own lord, the *daimyo*, who acted as vassal of the Shogun. They were, in effect, semi-autonomous principalities, the degree of their freedom of action depending upon their size, wealth, relation to the Shogun, and distance from effective control.
- hatamoto*** direct vassals of the Tokugawa family, lower in rank than the *fudai* lords, but holding the right of audience with the shogun.

Many bakufu officials in the lower ranks were drawn from this class.

- jiyū minken* freedom and popular rights; a movement started in the 1870s by ex-samurai outside of government who had come under the influence of Western thought.
- jōi* Expel the barbarian policy
- kaikoku* Open the country policy.
- koku* a measure of capacity, approximately five bushels. In term of rice, this unit was used to measure the productivity (and, consequently, the value to the lord) of the various han; it was also the standard unit for computing the stipends of the samurai. Traditionally assumed to represent the amount of rice required to support one man for one year, with the development of a money the *koku* underwent wide fluctuation in actual purchasing power.
- Kokugaku* National, or Japanese studies.
- nōmin* farmers.
- sankin-kōtai* the hostage and alternate attendance system by which the shogunate assured its control over the *daimyo*. *Daimyo* were required to reside in Tokyo every other year and to leave their families behind as hostages when they returned to their domains.
- shimpai* daimyo were members of Tokugawa branch families. Should the main line of the family die out, a shogun would be chosen from among these lords, who came to number 23.
- shōnin* the merchant class on of the Tokugawa period.

- terakoya* the parishioners' school, often called the "temple school," of the Tokugawa period. This was the most wide-spread type of elementary school for the common people.
- tōyō dōtoku, seiyō geijutsu* Eastern knowledge and Western technology.
- tazama* daimyo who had taken Tokugawa Iyasu as their overlord only after the battle of Sekigahara. Because their loyalty was relatively recent, they were generally regarded as less trustworthy and therefore excluded from position in the shogunate.
- Yōgaku* Western learning.

Thai

- banmuang* country
- chao* (1) Ruler, proprietor, owner; (2) Member of the hereditary ruling class in the North.
- chaofa* Child of a king by a queen
- chaophraya* The highest rank in civil government, generally conferred upon those whose were ministers (*senabadi*) of one of the six major traditional *krom* of one of the twelve ministers.
- chat* nation
- Darunawat* the *Young Siam's* publication from July 1874 to June 1875.
- Kalahom* (1) By the fifteenth century, the department (*krom*) of military affairs; (2) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the department having primary responsibility for the administration on the Southern and Western provinces; (3)

after 1894, the Ministry of War; and (4) the name by which the head of the *kram kalahom* was known.

- kathin* Rainy season ceremony.
- kram* Department of State. Before 1889-1892, most offices of State were termed *kram*, but after that date this term was reserved for the primary division of ministries; e.g. the *kram suksathikan* (Education Department) was one of the major constituents of the *krasung thammakan* (Ministry of Public instruction).
- luksit* or *sitwat* students
- manchao* The child of a prince of the rank of *phraangchao manchaoying* is used to designate daughters.
- manthan* A group of provinces (*muang* or *changwat*) headed by a commissioner, under the form administration inaugurated in the 1880s and formalized by the Ministry of Interior in the 1890s.
- muang* (1) In this study, this word generally has been used to denote the province headed by governor, the primary subdivision of the *manthan*. The term also may be applied (2) narrowly to a town or city, or (3) widely to denote the entire nation.
- noi* Patrons who awarded 400 marks and above. They were official class.
- phra* (1) Rank in the civil administrative hierarchy between *phraya* and *luang*, (2) honorific for monk; (3) general honorific term for persons or objects having religious associations, as *phra traipidak* (Holy Tripitaka).

- phrai* commoners who were majority of the Thai. They were under patrons' supervise and were bound to the corvée system.
- phraengchao* (1) Children of a King by concubine; or (2) children of a prince of the rank of *chaofa* and a princess of high royal rank.
- phraya* Rank in the civil administrative hierarchy between *chaophraya* and *phraya*. It was held by men generally at subministerial rank.
- ratthakan* Government.
- sakdina* It was devised by Ayudhaya King Trailokanat in 1456 to allocate grades to each person in society ranging from 5 for the commoner without family to 100,000 for the *uparat* (the highest-ranking prince, oftentimes the heir apparent).
- sangha* The Buddhist monkhood.
- senabodi* Minister of State, head of a ministry.
- tambon* A commune, group of villages. (Sometimes spelled *tambot*.)
- thamma* Buddhist teaching.
- Thammayut* New Buddhist sect was established by King Mongkut. He tried to rationalize Buddhist philosophy and decline to believe in the supernatural.
- Thesaphiban* The system of provincial administration formalized by the Ministry of Interior after 1894, the chief administrative unit of which was the *manthan*.
- Traiphumikhathe* or *Traiphumi of Phra Ruang* (Three-Worlds Cosmography)
It was compiled in Siamese prose from the Pali canon and commentaries, was used to explain Thai cosmography.
- uparaja* (Sometimes spelled *uparat*) Deputy or "second" king, sometimes heir-apparent.

1987

Monastery, monastic institution, including all the buildings within the monastery compound.

Bibliography

Sources About Japan.

I. Books and Articles in English:

- Abosch, David. tr. Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era. Kosaka Masaaki, ed.
Tokyo: Pan Pacific Press, 1985.
- Akita, George. Foundations of Constitutional Government in Modern Japan,
1868-1900. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,
1967.
- Aso, Makoto and Ikuo Amano. Education and Japan's Modernization. Japan:
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1972.
- Beasley, W. G. The Modern History of Japan. Great Britain: The Shenvai
Press, © 1963.
- Beeuchamp, Edward R. and Richard Rubinger. Education in Japan: A Source
Book. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989.
- Beckmann, George M. The Making of the Meiji Constitution: The Oligarches
and the Constitutional Development of Japan, 1868-1891. Westport,
Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- _____. The Modernization of China and Japan. New York: Harper &
Row, Publishers, © 1962.
- Berry, Mary Elizabeth. "Public Peace and Private Attachment: The Goals and
Conduct of Power in Early Modern Japan." Journal of Japanese Studies
12: 2 (Summer, 1986): 237-271.
- Blacker, Carmen. "Fukuzawa Yukichi on Family Relationships." Monumenta
Nipponica (1958): 40-60.
- _____. " Kyūhanjō, by Fukuzawa Yukichi." Monumenta Nipponica (1953):
304-329.

- _____. "The First Japanese Mission to England." History Today 7 (December, 1957): 840-47.
- _____. The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writing of Fukuzawa Yukichi. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.
- Braisted, William Reynolds, tr. Meiroku Zasshi: Journal of the Japanese Enlightenment. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Cassirer, Ernst. The Philosophy of the Enlightenment. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, © 1951.
- Conroy, Hilary, Sandra T. W. Davis, and Wayne Patterson, eds. Japan in Transition Thought and Action in the Meiji Era, 1868-1912. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, © 1984.
- Craig, Albert M. "Fukuzawa Yukichi: The Philosophical Foundations of Meiji Nationalism." In Political Development in Modern Japan, edited by Robert E. Ward, 99-148. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- _____. "John Hill Burton and Fukuzawa Yukichi." *Kindai Nihon kenkyū* (Research on Modern Japan) 1 (1984): 218-238.
- _____. "Science and Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan." In Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization, edited by Marius Jansen, 133-160. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Dore, Ronald Philip. Education in Tokugawa Japan. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965.
- Duus, Peter. The Rise of Modern Japan. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, ©1976.
- Earl, David Magarey. Emperor and Nation in Japan. Seattle: University of Washington, ©1964.

- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. An Encouragement of Learning. David A. Dilworth and Yumeyo Hirano, trs. Tokyo: Sophia University, © 1969.
- _____. An Outline of a Theory Civilization. David A. Dilworth and G. Cameron Hurst, trs. Tokyo: Sophia University, © 1973.
- _____. The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi. Eiichi Kiyooka tr. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1948.
- Gluck, Carol. Japan's Modern Myths Ideology in the Late Meiji Period. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, © 1985.
- Goodman, Grant Kohn. The Dutch Impact on Japan (1640-1853). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Hockett, Roger F. Yamagata Aritomo in the Rise of Modern Japan, 1838-1922. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- _____. "Nishi Amane- A Tokugawa-Meiji Bureaucrat." Journal of Asian Studies 28: 2 (February, 1959): 215-225.
- Hall, Ivan Parker. Mori Arinori. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- _____. "Mori Arinori: The Formative Years (1849-1875)." Paper on Japan 3 (1965): 52-124.
- Hall, John Withney. Japan: from Prehistory to Modern Times. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1980.
- Hane, Mikiso. "Nationalism and the Decline of Liberalism in Meiji Japan." Studies on Asia (1963): 68-80.
- _____. "The Source of English Liberal Concepts in Early Meiji Japan." Monumenta Nipponica 24 (1969): 259-72.
- Havens, Thomas R. H. Nishi Amane and Modern Japanese Thought. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970.

- _____. "Scholars and Politics in Nineteenth Century Japan: The Case of Nishi Amane." Modern Asian Studies. 2: 4 (October, 1968): 315-324.
- _____. "Comte, Mill, and the Thought of Nishi Amane in Meiji Japan." Journal of Asian Studies. 27: 2 (February, 1968): 217-228.
- Horio, Teruhisa. Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan: State Authority and Intellectual Freedom. Steven Platzter, ed. and tr. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, © 1988.
- Huber, Thomas M. The Revolutionary Origins of Modern Japan. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1981.
- Huish, David J. "The Meirokusha: Some Grounds for Reassessment." Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 32 (1972): 208-229,
- Ike, Nobutaka. The Beginnings of Political Democracy in Japan. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1950.
- _____. "The Political Role of Japanese Intellectuals." Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan 5 (December, 1957): 106-119.
- Ishida, Ichirō. "The Spirit of Meiji." Philosophical Studies of Japan 9 (1969): 1-39.
- Jansen, Marius B. ed. Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- _____. "Monarchy and Modernization in Japan." Journal of Asian Studies 36: 4 (August 1977): 611-622.
- _____. "New Materials for the Intellectual History of Nineteenth Century Japan." Harvard Journal of Asiatic studies 20: 3-4 (December, 1957): 569-594.
- _____. ed. The Cambridge History of Japan: The Nineteenth Century. Vol. 5, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Keene, Donald. The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720-1830. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Keenleyside, Hugh L., and A. F. Thomas. History of Japanese Education and Present Educational System. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1937.
- Kinmonth, Earl H. "Fukuzawa Reconsidered Gakumon no Susume and Its Audience." Journal of Asian Studies 37: 4 (August, 1978): 677-696.
- _____. "Nakamura Keiu and Samuel Smiles: A Victorian Confucian and Confucian Victorian." American Historical Review 85 (June, 1980): 535-556.
- _____. The Self-made man in Meiji Japanese Thought: from Samurai to Salary Man. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, © 1981.
- Kiyooka, Eiichi. tr. and ed. Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education (selected works). Japan: University of Tokyo Press, 1958.
- Lane- Poole, Stanley. The Life of Sir Harry Parkes, K. C. B. G. C. M. G. sometimes Her Majesty to China & Japan. London: Macmillan, 1894.
- Lockwood, William W. ed. The State and Economic Enterprise in Japan: Essays in the Political Economy of Growth. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Lu, David John. Sources of Japanese History. 2 Vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, ©1974.
- Maruyama, Masao. Studies in The Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan. Mikiso Hane. tr. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1974.
- Matsumoto, Shigeru. Motoori Norinaga 1730-1801. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Michell, Richard H. Censorship in Imperial Japan. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.

- Miyamori, Asataro. A Life of Mr. Yukichi Fukuzawa. revised by E. H. Vickers, Tokyo: n. p., 1902.
- Miwa, Kimitada. "Fukuzawa Yukichi's 'Departure from Asia' A Prelude to The Sino-Japanese War." Monumenta Nipponica (Special Issue, 1968): 1-26.
- Nagai, Michio ed. Development in the Non-Western World Proceeds of the Conference on Development in the Non-Western World held in Tokyo 22-31 March 1982. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1984.
- _____. "Herbert Spencer in Early Meiji Japan." Far Eastern Quarterly 14 (November, 1954): 55-64.
- Nishikawa, Shunsaku. "The Historical Legacy in "Modern" Japan: Competition, Paper Currency, and Benevolence." The Japan Foundation Newsletter 16: 1 (July, 1988): 1-8.
- Pyle, Kenneth B. "Advantages of Following: German Economics and Japanese Bureaucrats, 1890-1925." Journal of Japanese Studies 1 (1974): 127-164.
- _____. "The Emergence of Bureaucratic Conservatism in the Meiji Period." Undercurrent: The Japan Scene, Past and Present 1 (March, 1983): 13-29.
- _____. "Meiji Conservatism." In The Cambridge History of Japan. Vol 5, edited by Marius Jansen, 674-720. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- _____. The Making of Modern Japan. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, © 1978.
- _____. The New Generation in Meiji Japan, Problem of Cultural Identity, 1885-1895. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969.

- Fassin, Herbert. Society and Education in Japan. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.
- Pittau, Joseph S. J. Political Thought in Early Meiji Japan, 1868-1889. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Rozman, Gilbert ed. The Modernization of China. New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, © 1981.
- Shively, Donald H. "Nishimura Shigeki: A Confucian View of Modernization." In Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization, edited by Marius Jansen, 193-241. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Smith, Thomas C. Political Change and Industrial Development in Japan: Government Enterprise, 1868-1880. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.
- _____. The Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, © 1959.
- Sugiyama, Chuhei and Hiroshi Mizuta. Enlightenment and Beyond: Political Economy Comes to Japan. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, © 1988.
- The First Japanese Embassy to the United States of America. Tokyo: The America-Japan Society, 1920.
- Totman, Conrad D. Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu 1600-1843. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Tsunoda, Ryusaku, Theodore De Bary and Keene Donald, coms. Source of Japanese Tradition. New York: Columbia University Press, © 1958.
- Ward, Robert E, ed. Political Development in Modern Japan. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Yamamura, Kozo. A Study of Samurai Income and Entrepreneurship: Quantitative Analyses of Economic and Social Aspects of the Samurai

in Tokugawa and Meiji Japan. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.

II. Unpublished Dissertations:

- Abosh, David. "Katō Hirayuki and the Introduction of German Political Thought in Modern Japan: 1868-1883." Ph.D dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
- Conte, James T. "Overseas Study in the Meiji Period: Japanese Students in America, 1867-1902." Ph.D dissertation, Princeton University, 1977.
- Fisher, Jerry Kamm. "The Meirokusha." Ph.D dissertation, University of Virginia, 1973
- Hall, Ivan Parker. "Mori Arinori: A Reconsideration." Ph.D dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.
- Hane, Mikiso. "English Liberalism and the Japanese Enlightenment, 1868-1890." Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1957.
- Havens, Thomas Robert Hamilton. "Nishi Amane (1829-1897) in Japanese Intellectual History." Ph.D dissertation, University of California Berkeley, 1965.

III. Works in Japanese:

- Asō Yoshiteru. *Kinsei Nihon Tetsugakushi* (History of Resent Japanese Philosophy) Tokyo: n. p, 1942.
- Fukuzawa Yukichi. "Datsu Ran" ("Departure from Asia") *Jiji-shimpō* (1886): 238-240.
- Furuta, Hikoru. "Nishi Amane-keimaki no tetsu gakusha." ("Nishi Amane, Philosopher of the Enlightenment Period.") *Nihon no Shisaka* (Japanese Intellectuals) Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, n. d.

- Honjo, Eijiro. "Meirokusha ni tsuite." ("Concerning the *Meirokusha* ") *Nihon gaku shi inkya* (Japanese Academy) 26: 2 (separate volume) (1963): 91-113.
- Ishida, Ichiro, ed. *Shisāshi II. (Intellectual History II)* Tokyo: Yamakawa, 1977.
- Ichimura, Hiromasa. *Ronshū Fukuzawa Yukichi e no shiten. (Opinion on Fukuzawa's Symposiums)* Tokyo: Riseishobo, 1973.
- Iida, Kanae. *Fukuzawa Yukichi*. Tokyo: Chūō Koronsha, 1964.
- Ienaga, Saburo. "Nishimura Shigeki ran." ("Discussion on Nishimura Shigeki.") *Nihon kindai shisa shi kenkyū (Research on Modern Japanese Intellectual History)* Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1957.
- Kano, Masunao. "Fukuzawa Yukichi -Seiyō bunka no suishinsha." ("Fukuzawa Yukichi -The Promoter of Western Civilization.") *Nihon no shisaka. (Japanese Intellectuals)* Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, n. d.
- Kobayashi, Yoshihiro. "Meirokusha ni akeru gakujitsu ransa na imi-gakusha shakubun ransā- a tegakari tashite" ("The *Meirokusha*'s Discussion on the Roles of Scholars.") *Nihon shisa shi zasshi (Meirokusha no shisa) (Journal of Japanese Intellectual History (The Meirokusha's Idea)* 26 (1986): 48-68.
- Komata, Noriaki. "Sakatani Shirashi ni miru dentō to keima-sana setten no kaimai." ("Explanation of Sakatani Shiroshi's idea of Traditionalism and Enlightenment.") *Nihon shisa shi zasshi (Meirokusha no shisa) (Journal of Japanese Intellectual History (The Meirokusha's Idea)* 26 (1986): 3-28
- Matsumoto, Sannosuke and Yamanuro Shinichi. *Gakuman to chishiki jin (Intellectuals and Knowledge)* Tokyo: Iwanami Shōten, 1988.

- Matsumoto, Sannosuke. *Kindai nihon no seiji to ningen*. (Modern Japanese Politics and People) Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1970.
- _____. ed. *Meiji shisō shū I-II*. (The Collection of Japanese Thoughts) Tokyo: 1977.
- _____. "Nishimura Shigeki." *Nihon no shisaka* (Japanese Intellectuals). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, n. d.
- _____. *Nihon seiji shisashi genron* (Discussion on History of Japanese Political Thought) Tokyo: Keisoshobo, 1975.
- _____. *Kindai nihon seiji shisashi*. (History of Modern Japanese Political Thought)
- Maruyama, Masanao. "Fukuzawa ni okeru <jitsu gaku> no tengai- Fukuzawa Yukichi no tetsugaku kenkyu josetsu." ("The Revolution of Fukuzawa's idea of 'Practical Learning' -Introductory Research of Fukuzawa's Philosophy.") *Tōyō bunka kenkyū* (East- West Cultural Studies) 3:1 (March, 1948): 1-20.
- Matsugawa, Hiroaki. "Saigaku Rissihen to Jiyū no Ri no seikai- Bukumatsu Jūgaku, Vikutoria chō kyūshin shugi, Bunmei Kaika." ("Self-Help and On Liberty in Bakumatsu period and Bunmei kaika.") *Seijigaku* (Study in Politics) (1975): 9-53.
- Minamoto, Ryōen "Bakumatsu Ishinki ni okeru Nakamura Keiu no Jūkyō" ("Nakamura Keiu's Confucianism in Bakumatsu and Meiji Period") *Nihon shisa shi zasshi* (*Meirokusha no shisa*) (Journal of Japanese Intellectual History (The Meirokusha's Idea) 26 (1986): 69-97.
- Nagai, Michio. "Mori Arinori -Meiji kyoiku no kensetsusha" ("Mori Arinori- Meiji Educational Constructor.") *Nihon no shisaka* (Japanese Intellectuals) Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun, n. d.
- Nihonkodokai. *Haku'o sho dai ni shu*. Tokyo: Nihonkododai, 1913.

- Ōkubo, Toshiaki. *Meirakusha Kō* (Thinking about the *Meirakusha*) Tokyo: Rittaisha, 1976.
- _____ ed. "Kindai" *Meiji keimo shisashu, Meiji bungaku zenzhu. V. III*. ("modern period" Collection on the Idea of the Meiji Enlightenment) Tokyo: Chikuma Shōbō, 1969.
- _____ "Meirakusha no kaisa." (Dissolution of the Meiji Six Society) *Nihon Rekishi* (Japanese History) 91 (January, 1956): 46-48.
- Ogihara, Takashi. *Nakamura Keiu to Meiji keimo shisa* (Nakamura Keiu and Meiji Enlightenment) Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1984.
- Sakatani, Yoshinao. *Sandai no keifu*. (Three Generations.) Japan: Misuzu Shobo, 1970.
- Sugiyama, Chuhei. "Tsuda Mamichi ni okeru keimo to keisai-Meiji keimo no ichi shitsu ni furete." ("Enlightenment and Economic- the case of Tsuda Mamichi." *Shisō* (Idea) 706 (1983): 16-31.
- Takaaki, Inuzuka. *Mari Arinori (Ninbutsusashya)* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1986.
- Takahashi, Masao. *Nakamura Keiu*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1966.
- _____ *Nishimura Shigeki*. Tokyo: Kobunkan, 1966.
- Toyama, Shigeki "Meiraku Zasshi." *Shisō* (Idea) 447 (September, 1961): 117-128.

Sources About Thailand

IV. Books and Articles in English:

- Anderson, Benedict. "Studies of the Thai States: The State of Thai Studies." In The Study of Thailand, edited by Eliezer B. Ayal, 139-257. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Southeast Asia program, 1978.

- Batson, Benjamin A. The End of the Absolute Monarchy in Siam. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Bradley, William L. "Prince Mongkut and Jesse Caswell." The Journal of the Siam Society 54: 1 (January, 1966): 29-41.
- Bunnag, Tej. The Provincial Administration of Siam 1892-1915 The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Chomchai, Prachoom. ed. and tr. Chulalongkorn The Great: A Volume of Readings Edited and Translated from Thai Texts. Tokyo: The Center for East Asian Cultural Studies. 1965.
- Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince "The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam." A paper read by H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab at the Rotarian Dinner of the United Club, on August 7th 1925. The Journal of the Siam Society 20: 2 (October 1926): 3-15.
- Feeny, David. The Political Economy of Productivity Thai Agricultural Development, 1880-1975. London: University of British Columbia Press, 1982.
- Girling, J. L. S. The Bureaucratic Polity in Modernizing Societies: Similarities, Differences, and Prospects in the Asian Region. Occasional Paper, No. 64, Singapore: The Institution of Southeast Asian Studies, 1981.
- Hong, Lysa. Thailand in the Nineteenth Century Evolution of the Economy and Society. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, ©1984.
- Ingram, James C. Economic Change in Thailand Since 1850. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.
- Jacobs, Norman. Modernization without Development: Thailand as an Asian Case Study. New York: Praeger Publishers, © 1971.

- Kamalanavia, Sinee. "Thailand Nobility in its Contact with European culture at the turn of the Century." Thai Journal of Development Administration 9:1 (January, 1969): 108-128.
- Keyes, Charles, F. "Buddhism and National Integration in Thailand." The Journal of Asian Studies 33: 3 (May, 1971): 551-567.
- _____. "Buddhist Politics and their Revolutionary Origins in Thailand." International Political Science Review. 10:2 (1969): 121-142.
- _____. Thailand: Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation-State. London: Westview Press, © 1987.
- Leonowens, Anna. The English Governess at the Siamese Court. London: Arthur Barker Ltd., 1954.
- Moffet, Abbot Low. Mongkut The King of Siam. New York: Cornell University Press, © 1961.
- Mosel, James N. tr. "A Poetic Translation from the Siamese Prince Damrong reply in Verse to Rama V." The Journal of The Siam Society 47:1 (June, 1959): 104-111.
- Murashima, Eiji. "The Origin of Modern Official State Ideology in Thailand." Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 20:1 (March, 1988): 60-96.
- Murdoch, John B. "The 1901-1902 "Holy Man's" Rebellion." Journal of the Siam Society 62:1 (1974): 47-66.
- Phitakspraiwan, Titima. "The Acceptance of Western Culture in Thailand." East Asian Cultural Studies 6 (March, 1967): 190-200.
- Rabibhadana, Akin. "The Organization of Thai Society in The early Bangkok Period, 1782-1873." Data Paper: Number 74, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Itaca, New York: Cornell University, 1969.

- Rajadhon, Anuman. The Nature and Development of the Thai Language. Thai Culture, New Series No. 10 Bangkok: The Fine Arts Department, 1963.
- Reid, Anthony. Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450-1680. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- _____ ed. Slavery, Bondage and Dependency in Southeast Asia. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- Reynolds, Craig J. "Buddhist Cosmography in Thai History, with Special Reference to Nineteenth-Century Culture Change." Journal of Asian Studies. 35: 2 (February, 1976): 203-220.
- Riggs, Fred. Thailand: The Modernization of a Bureaucratic Polity. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966.
- Siffin, William J. The Thai Bureaucracy: Institutional Change and Development. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966.
- Sivarakasa, Sulak. Siam in Crisis. Bangkok: Kamol Keemthong Foundation, 1980.
- Terwiel, B. J. A History of Modern Thailand 1767-1942. London: University of Queensland Press, 1983.
- _____ "Mu'ang Thai and the World: Changing Perspectives during the Third Reign." Paper presented at the seminar Asia: A Sense of Place at The Australian National University, 1986.
- Thompson, Virginia. Thailand The New Siam. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- Turton, Andrew and Shigeharu Tanabe eds. History and Peasant Consciousness in South East Asia. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 1984.

- Vajirañāṇa, Prince. Autography: The Life of Prince-Patriarch Vajiranana of Siam 1860-1921. Translated, edited and introduced by Craig Reynolds. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, © 1979.
- Vella, Walter Francis. Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, © 1978.
- _____. Siam Under Rama III, 1824-1851. New York: J. J Augustin, 1957.
- _____. The Impact of the West on Government in Thailand. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955.
- Wales, H. G. Quaritch. Ancient Siamese Government and Administration. London: Brenard Quaritch, 1934.
- Wyatt, David K. "Family Politics in Nineteenth Century Thailand." Journal of Southeast Asian History 9 (September, 1968): 208-228.
- _____. Thailand: A Short History. New Haven: Yale University Press, © 1962.
- _____. "The Diaries of King Chulalongkorn." Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 31 (June, 1968): 382-385.
- _____. The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

V. Unpublished Thai M.A. Thesis:

- Aemthram, Pornpirom. "The Political Role of Thai Newspaper from the Revolution of 1932 to the End of the Second World War." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1973.
- Amarinratana, La-orthong. "The Sending of Student Abroad from 1868-1932." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1979.

- Chougsakul, Srisuporn. "Change within the Sangha: A Case Study of Dhammayuthikanikaya (1823-1912)." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1967.
- Johnson, David Bruce. "The Changing Elite Concept of the State in Nineteenth Century Siam." M. A. theses, University of Washington, 1969.
- Khemmasunthorn, Supasinee. "Political Thoughts of Elite Group During the Reign of King Chulalongkorn During A.D. 1863-1893." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1987.
- Kitthavorn, Phrasana. "The role of Buddhist Sangha in Education During the Reign of King Chulalongkorn." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1981.
- Maetrairat, Nakin. "An Intellectual History of Siam's Political Transformation During 2470-2480 B. E." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1984.
- Ngonrot, Chula. "The Origin and Development of Nationalism in Thailand." M. A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1970.
- Osatharom, Warunee. "Education in Thai Society 1868-1932." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1980.
- Sattayanurak, Attachak. "The Transformation of Historical Consciousness and the Changes in Thai Society from the Reign of King Mongkut to 1932 A.D." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1988.
- Susayanha, Anchalee. "Changes of the *Phrai* System and their Effects on Thai Society in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1981.
- Tittiranond, Nangnoi. "Ministers of Public Instruction or Education under the Absolute Monarchy." M. A. theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1976.

Tongpongna, Pongniam. "A Study of Thai Slavery During the Bangkok Period." M. A theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1963.

Thongprecha, Wimolwan. "Prince Damrong, His Life and Work." M. A theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1964.

Tonsiengsom, Surangsri. "The relationship between Thailand and Japan during the Reign of King Rama V to Rama VII." M. A theses, Chulalongkorn University, 1977.

VI. Unpublished Dissertations and Researches:

Dhiravegin, Likhit. "The Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) and the Chakkri Reformation (1868-1910) A Comparative Perspective. Vol. 1. The Research Center, Faculty of Political Science, Thammasat University, Bangkok, 1964.

Prasertkul, Seksan. "The Transformation of the Thai state and economic change (1855-1945)." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1989.

Reynolds, Craig James. "The Buddhist Monkhood in Nineteenth Century Thailand." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1973.

Wilson, Constance M. "State and Society in the Reign of Mongkut, 1851-1868: Thailand on the Eve of Modernization." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1970.

Work in Thai:

VII. Published Primary Sources:

Chulalongkorn, King. "*Nanathramvicharinee*." In *Frachum phraratchanipal pasatai nai ratchakan thii sii phak thii song*. (A Collection of King Mongkut's Works), Vol 2, n. p, n. d.

_____. *Phraboramrachathibay ruang sammakhi*. (The Explanation of Unity) In commemoration of the death of Mr. So Chawakiedkul at the Prayunwongsawat Temple, n. p, 1974.

- _____ *Phraboromratchawat nai ratchakan thii ha phraratchathan kae phrachachulukyather* (King Chulalongkorn's Speeches for His Sons) In the commemoration of Mr. Pisit Paranan at Sommanatvihan Temple, n. p, 1970.
- _____ *Phraratchadamrat nai phrabatsomdet phrachulachamkao chaoyuuhua 2417-2453 B. E.* (A Collection of King Chulalongkorn's Speeches from 1874-1910) Bangkok: Sophonphiphanthanakorn, 1915.
- _____ *Phraratchadamrat thii hasipsang phrabatsomdet phra Chulachomkao chaoyuuhua phrapiyamaharat songtab prachachan chao sayam thii phabpha narprathinang sutthaisawan 1 January R. S 116.* (King Chulalongkorn's speech no 52 to the Thai at Sutthaisawan Palace 1st January 1897) In commemoration of King Chulalongkorn's statue at Dusit Plaza, n. p, 1956.
- _____ *"Phraratchadamrat tab phraboram wangsanuwang rae khathul laangthureeprabat fainar, 21 September R. S 128 "* (King's speech for royal families and government officers, 1909) in *Phraratchadamrat nai phrabatsomdet phrachulachamkao chaoyuuhua (2417-2453 B. E)* (King Chulalongkorn's letters from 1874-1910) Bangkok: Sophonphiphatthanakorn, 1915.
- _____ *Phraratchahattaleka phrabasomdet phrachulachamkao chaoyuuhua songme paima kab somdet phramaha samanachao krom Vajirañāna* (Correspondence between King Chulalongkorn and Prince Vajirañāna) In commemoration of King Chulalongkorn's death. Bangkok: Sophonphiphanthanakorn, 1929.
- _____ *"Phraratchahattalekha phraratchathan somdet phraboram ararsatirat chaofa Vachirunnahit 23 May R.S 112.* ("King Chulalongkorn' letter to Prince Vachirunnahit, an heir, dated on 23 rd

May 1893") in *Chumnum pha ratchaniphan nai ratchakan thii ha phagnakinaka phag 1* (Collection of King Chulalongkorn's Writing, Part 1) In commemoration of Phrachao boromwongther phraongchao Prapharphanpirai's death, n. p, 1950.

————— *Phraratchahattaleka ræ nüangsü krabbangkamthul khong chaophraya Sureantherathibodee*. (Correspondence between King Chulalongkorn and Chaophraya Sureantherathibodee) In commemoration of the cremation of Mrs. Sureantherathibodee, Thepsirintharavas Temple, n. p, 1961.

————— *Phraratchahattaleka ratchakan thii ha phraratchathan mayang nai phantree phraongchao Disvarakuman ratchasangkharak* (The Correspondence between King Chulalongkorn and Prince Damrong) In commemoration the death of Momchao Ditsanuvat Disakul at Tepsirintharavat Temple, n. p, 1966.

————— *Phraratchahattaleka suanphraong samdet phraramathibodee seesinmaha chulalongkorn phrachulachomkea songme phraratchatan kæ samdet phraseepatcharintara boromrachineenat phraboromratchannee* (Correspondence between King Chulalongkorn and Queen Siphatcharin while the King went to Europe in 1897) In commemoration of Queen Siphatcharin's cremation, n. p, 1920, Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince. *Chatmai het mue phrabatsamdet phrachamk'laechaayuu hue sawanakat*. (Documents on the Death of King Mongkut) Bangkok: Sophonphiphanthanakorn, 1929.

————— *Chatmai het prapatton nai ratchakan thii ha*. (Record of King Chulalongkorn's Trips) In commemoration of cremation of Phraya Surapanpisut, Bangkok: Sophonphiphanthanakorn, 1923.

- _____ *Kaykaruhat rü ruan kü kay.* ("Kaykaruhat" means Body) In commemoration of the death of Chaochommandra Chum, Bangkok: Sophonphiphantanakorn, 1923.
- _____ *"Krasæ phraratchadamrat songtab khamthawai phrapan khang nugrean tai krung london 30 June 2477 B. E."* ("Speeches to Thai students in London on 30 June 1930") n. p, n. d.
- _____ *Khwam sangcham.* (Memoirs) Bangkok: n. p. 1971.
- _____ *Kandee thii khapachao ruchak.* (Gentlemen whom I know) Vol. 2-3 Bangkok: Ruamsan co., 1964.
- _____ *Ruam khamru bettareet sam rüang.* (Three Miscellaneous Stories) In commemoration of the death of Chaochommandra Chum, Bangkok: Sophonphiphanthanakorn, 1923.
- _____ *"Tamnan kanthii tai rean pase انگيد."* ("Legend of the Thai studying English.") *Phrachum phranipol bettareet* (Collection of Prince Damrong's Miscellaneous Works) Bangkok: Kurusapa Suksapanpanit, 1962.
- Damrong and Ratchasena. *Thesaphiban.* In commemoration of the death of Phraya Attakraweesunthorn, n. p. 1960.
- Darunawat.* In commemoration of cremation of Momchao Manusiri Kaseamsan Mongkutkasattiyaram, n. p, 1969.
- Mahavakvinaï* (The Buddhist Discipline) V. 2, n. p, n. d.
- Nangsü court khae ratchaken chaanai I I phraong songchuei kanthang* (The Court [which was written by eleven princes]) Vol I, II In commemoration of Phrachaoboromwongther chaofa Phanurangseesawangwong kromphraye Phanupanthuwongvoradet's birthday, Bangkok: Rongpim Thai, 1923.

Pallegoix, *Laarüang krung sayam*. (Story of Thailand), translated by Santa T. Komolbuth, Bangkok: Kaowna, 1963.

Patakatha ruang samdet phrachao baram wangther kramphraya Damrong Rajanubhat ræ phrawat luglae (Prince Damrong Life written by His Daughter) Bangkok: Suksaphanpanit, 1963.

Phatsakorawong, Phraya. "*Rüang Suan*." ("On Farming.") *Vajirayan Viset* 4 (1889).

_____. *Tamnan sangkram chin kab yeapun*. (History of war between China and Japan). n. p., n. d.

Phrabaramrachawat nai phrabat samdetphra Chulachomkhae chaoyuuhua ræ phrabat samdetphra Mongkutkae chaoyuuhua. (King Chulalongkorn's and King Vajiravudh's Speeches) In commemoration of the cremation of Lieutenant Prasob Chutinan at Sommanutviharm Temple, n. p., 1960.

Phrachum phrakat ratchakan tni sii B. E 2401-2404. (The Collection of Announcements in the Reign of King Mongkut 1858-1861) Bangkok: Kurusapha, 1961.

Phrachum pangsewaden pak thii ha ruam chatmaihet rüang thutai pai prathed angkid B. E. 2400. (Siamese and English Record of the Siamese Embassy to England in 1857-1858) in commendation of the death of Mr. Pin Thepcharuam, n. p., 1927.

Siriphatchanapak. (Good Words) 1: 1 (15 November, 1908).

Thammesakmontee, Chaophraya. *Thammachariya*. (Thamma and Ethics.) Vol IV. Bangkok: Pisanbanniti, 1901.

_____. *Thammai rao tang rean phasa angkid*. (Why do we need to learn English?). In commendation of the cremation of Krommamern Nikornnathee (That Ratchatarat), n. p., 1921.

- The committee of *Watmahan* school's Centennial Celebration. *Phraphuraem phraratchatan kansuksa oakthung prachachan*. (The King who Established Public Education) Bangkok: n. p., 1965.
- Thiphakorawong, Cheophraya. *Phraratchaphangsewaden krung rattanakosin ratchakan thi sam... thi sii*. (The History of Ratanakosin Period from the Reign of King Rama III to Rama IV) Bangkok: n. p., 1963.
- _____. *Kitchanukit*. (A Book Explaining Various Things or Duties, Great and Small) Bangkok: n. p. 1965.
- Vajirafāna, Prince. *Anusasane thi samdet phrabaramwangther krammaphra Vajirafāna daiprathenkae kangsuape naiwanthunamkaokang thii 6 May R.S 130*. (Prince Vajirafāna speeches for soldiers trainee on 6th May 1911) Bangkok: Sammit, 1911.
- _____. *Phra prawat*. (Biography) Bangkok: Mahamongkut, 1971.
- _____. "Phraracha pen huanar khang manus." ("The King is a leader of the people.") *Thammakadee* (The Buddhist teaching Account) In commemoration of the fifth year of Prince Vajirafāna's death, Bangkok: Mahamongkut Academy, 1971.
- _____. *Phrawatsat barankadee*. (History and Archeology) Bangkok: Mahamongkut Academy, 1971.
- _____. *Phramongkol visetkatha*. (Preaching for Propitiousness and Supremeness).
- _____. "Sammakkhi khū kham phromphiang." ("Sammakkhi is unity") *Thammachaksu* 5: 6 (May 1899): 660-663.

VIII. Primary Sources in National Archive:

Chatmaihet ratchakan thii ha (Banchikaa) (Chronicles in King Chulalongkorn's Reign (old account) 153/11 "*pakot rüang prugsæ ratchakan thumnem banmuang*" (153/11 "The announcement of counseling management of customs.")

Chatmaihet ratchakan thii ha (Banchikaa) "*rüang kodmæi, prarachaniyam ræ kanphangkrang*. (Chronicles in King Chulalongkorn's Reign (old account) "Law, Royal Customs, Custom and Administration") 234/5 "*prakot rüeng thumnem mabkhan kæ phrabaramwangsawong*." (234/5 "The Announcement of Abolishing Clawing Custom for Royal Family."

NA, R5, MC, no. 8. 1 (1-15) *Khangnun khongtrawen panæ chin*. (Inspectors of the Chinese communities.)

NA, R5, MC, no. 8. 7 / 8 *Lai phratchahattaleka rüing nangsupim chin* (11 January- 16 February). (King's letter concerning a Chinese newspaper 11 January-16 February 1908).

NA, R5, K'S, M, no. 1-8 *Prabatsamdet prachulachomkao phrabaram rachabai nai kan kækæi kanpagkhong phandin "chaonai lae kheratchakan krabhangkhamtuul khamhen chatkanpianplaeng rabiab ratchakan phaendin, 8 January, R. S 103*. ("Royal family and official government's petition concerning changes in the political system 8 January, 1885.")

NA, R5, K'S, M, no. 1-8 *Prabatsamdet phrachulachomkao phrabaram rachabai nai kan kækæi kanpagkhong phandin "phraratchadamrat ratchakan thii ha rüang pliang phrapenee kanpagkrang ratchakanphaendin*. ("King Chulalongkorn's speeches concerning political reform.")

- NA, R5, KS, M, no. 8.1.9 *Rüang nai Thienwan tawai nuangsü magasin ræ khaorub ratchakan.* (Mr. Thienwan presented his work to the King Chulalongkorn and applied to be a government officer) (20 August 1903- 20 January 1906).
- NA, R5, ME, no. 1/92. *Rüang kan tang nüang sü thammachariya.* (Writing the *Thammachariya.*) (2 January 1906).
- NA, R5, ME, no. 1/57 *Rüang tamralean tangtang khong krom suksatikand tangkun mai* (Writing New textbooks) (2 -17 September 1900).
- NA, R5, ME, no. 1/150. *Rüang rai ngen kansob khangkhan King scholarship 118-119.* (Report on the King Scholarship 1900-1901, 19 April 1900-21 March 1901).
- NA, R5, MF, no. 1-59 *Sadet tang prathed* (Travel Abroad).
- NA, R5 MF, no. 1-84 *Phraratchawang ræ nuglean tai pai tang prathed* (Royal family and students went abroad).

IX. Secondary Sources:

- Ayuwatana, Thamrongsak. *Rachasakul Chakriwang ræ rachasakul samdet phrachao Taksinmaharat.* (Chakri Dynasty and King Taksin's Dynasty) Bangkok: Bannakit Trading Co., 1972.
- Chammarik, Sane. *Kanmuang kab kan suksa tai.* (Politics and Thai Education) Bangkok: Education Developing Project, 1980.
- Disakul, Phunphisamai. *Chevit ræ ngen khong samdet krom phraya Damrong Fejsnubhak* (Life and Works of Prince Damrong). Bangkok: Ruamsan Co., 1959.
- Na tharang, Akkavit. " *Mue kati kenchatksuksa bab tawantak khae ma su sayam.*" (Western Educational System in Thailand) *Sankhamsatparithat* 6: 2 (September- November, 1968): 83-93.

- Phumisak, Jit. *Chamnsakdina tai* (Thai Feudalism) Bangkok: n. p., 1979.
- "*Ruang farangsed kap tai*" ("France and Thailand") *Thammasat-winitchai* 2 n. p., (1893).
- Samuthawanit, Chai-anan. *Akkasan khanmuang khanpagkrang khong tai 2417-2477*. (Documents of Thai Politics and Government 1872-1934) Bangkok: Social Sciences Organization in Thailand, 1975.
- _____. *Chevit rae ngan khong Thienwan rae R. S. Kulap*. (Lives and Works of Thienwan and R. S. Kulap) Bangkok: Theranan, 1979.
- _____. *Kanmuang kanplianplaiang thang kanmuang tai 2411-2475 B. E.* (Political Changes in Thailand 1868-1932) Bangkok: Social Sciences Organization of Thailand, n. d.
- Sathiankoset (Phraya Anuman Rajadhon). *Chevit cheatai samaikon*. (Traditional Life of the Thai Royal Family).
- Sattayanurak, Attachak. "Kankaed naekhid 'nathi palramuang' nai rattai samai mai." ("The Origin of Duties of the Citizen in Modern Thai State") *Rattasatsan* (Journal of Political Sciences) (September, 1988- April 1989): 202-227.
- Sevamat, Vichai. *Kanlathat nai ratchasamai khong phrabat samdet phra chulachamkha cheayuuha*. (The Abolition of Slavery in Thailand) Bangkok: Office of Prime Minister, 1967.
- Sirisampan, Kaseam and Nion Snidwong. "Nee phrarat chadamri thang kanmuang nai phrabatsadet phra chulachamkha cheayuuha." ("King Chulalongkorn's Political Thoughts.") *Sankhamsatparithat* 5: 3 (Journal of Social Sciences) (December 1967- February 1968): 25-46.
- Sivarakasa, Sulak. "Samdet kramphraya Damrong kab sakul phrawattisat Damrong Rajanubhab." ("Prince Damrong and his Historical Writing

- Style") *Ruambatkham prawatsat* (Journal of Thai History) 1 (July, 1980): 23-51.
- _____. *Chevit rae ngan khong samdet khram phraya Damrong Rajanubhab nai thana thii pen payan thang prawatsat nai ruang kan sangsaem sati panya yang khong tai raeng* (The Life and Works of Prince Damrong: A Historical Witness of the Creation Thai Intellectual) Bangkok: ThaiKadee Institute, Thammasat University, 1979.
- Sukhabanij, Kachorn. *Kaorak khong nungsüphim nai prathed tai*. (Journalism in Thailand) Bangkok: Tairat, 1965.
- Suksamran, Sombul, Sombat Chantawong and others. " *Bannanukram wiwattanakan udamkan khong chat tai*" (Bibliography of the Development of Thai Nationalism) (memo.), A report submitted to the Committee of Thai National Identities, 1987.
- Tavonsuk, Sucharit. *Phra phewad rae ngan khong samdet phrachao baramwangther kramphraya Damrong Rajanubhab* (Prince Damrong's Biography and Works) Vol I-III Bangkok: Suksaphanpanit, 1965.
- Wannarat, Saichon. " *Fan ketap khong hma Bradley ta sangkham tai*," (The Influence of D. B. Bradley in Thai society" *Varasan Aksansart* (The Journal of the Faculty of Arts) 14: 17
- _____. " *Kham pliangplang khong phutsatsana nai samai ratanakasin*." (" Religious Changes in the Ratanakosin Period") *Varasan Muang Boran*. (April-June 1987): 65-71.
- Wantana, Somkiat. *Muang Tai yukmai: sampan taphap rawang rat kap phrawatsat samnuk*." ("Modern Thailand: the Relationship between State and Historical Consciousness") In *Yu muang Tai* (Life in

Thailand), edited by Sombat Chantawong and Chaiwat Sathaanan, 71-128. In commemoration of Professor Sanee Chammarik's sixtieth birthday. Bangkok: Thammasart University Press, 1987.

Withawet, With. *Pratchaya kan suksatai B. E 2411-2475*. (Thai Educational Philosophy.) (memo).

X. Works in General:

Alatas, Syed Hussein. Intellectuals in Developing Societies. London: Frank Cass, 1977.

Boudon, Raymond and François Bourricaud. A Critical Dictionary of Sociology. London: Routledge, 1989.

Encyclopedia of the Social Science. "Intellectual." New York: Macmillan, 1949

Gerth, H. H and C. Wright Mills, trs. and eds. From Max Weber: Essay in Sociology New York: Oxford University Press;©1946.

Hoare, Quintin and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds. and trs. Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. New York: International Publishers, 1985.

Mann, Michael ed. The International Encyclopedia of Sociology. New York: Continuum, 1984.

Roger Simon. Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982.

Shils, Edward. The Intellectual between Tradition and Modernity: The Indian Situation. The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1961.

Appendix A

The Fief Schools

Table I.(A) Annual Number of fiefs newly establishing schools;

(B) As percentage of hitherto school-less fiefs

	(A)	(B)		(A)	(B)
1770-79	12	0.53	1830-39	13	1.07
1780-89	21	0.97	1840-49	14	1.28
1790-99	28	1.45	1850-59	12	1.26
1800-09	15	0.90	1860-67	8	1.22
1810-19	13	0.86	1868-70	35	15.77
1820-29	16	1.16			

From R P Dore, Education in Tokugawa Japan, (Los Angeles; University of California Press, 1965), p. 71.

Appendix B

Number of Japanese Going Abroad as Students, 1860-1867

Year	Type of Sponsorship				Total
	Bakufu	Han	Private	Unclear	
1860				1	1
1861					0
1862	15				15
1863		5			5
(1861- 63)*		1			1
1864	1		1		2
1865	8	19	1	1	29
1866	16	11	3	1	31
1867	27	21	1	2	51
(1865- 67)*	1	2	1	6	10
Unclear		1		7	8
Total	65	60	7	18	153

* The exact year these students went abroad is unknown.

From: James T. Conte, "Overseas Study in the Meiji
Period: Japanese Students in America, 1867-1902," Ph.D. dissertation,
Princeton, 1977, p. 9 quoting from Ishizuki Minoru, Kindai Nihon no
kaigai ryugaku-shi (Tokyo, 1972), p. 104.

Appendix C

Countries to which Students were going, 1860-67

Bakufu Sponsorship	No.	Han+Private Sponsorship	No.
France	27	England	34*
Holland	18	U.S.	30
England	15	France	5
Russie	6	Holland	2
U.S.	3	Germany	1
Belgium	1	Europe	2
Total	70		74

N 144 **

* This includes two who were to Hong Kong.

** Since this chart includes the cases of students who went to more than one country (usually in Europe), the total is not consistent with that of Appendix II (Appendix B [author]).

From: James T Conte, *ibid.*, p 21 quoting Minoru, *Kindai Nihon no kaigai ryugaku-shi* (Tokyo, 1972), p. 104.

Appendix D

Data Concerning the *Young Siam* Members

Family Background

Name	Birth- Death	Descendants of the King	Age in 1874
1. Chaophraya Phaanu- rangseesawangwong ¹	1859- 1928	45	15
2. Krommamern Naretvorarit	1855- 1925	17	19
3. Phraongchao Kaseamsansophak ²	1849- 1924	26	18
4. Phraongchao Thongthemthawanwong	1857- 1919	34	18
5. Phraongchao Manusnarkmenop ³	1860 - 1921	47	15
6. Phraongchao Thongkongkonhai	1856- 1924	25	18
7. Phraongchao Kaseamseesuphayo	1857- 1915	30	17
8. Phraongchao Dissawarakuman ⁴	1862- 1943	54	12
9. Phraongchao Khatnangyukol	1855- 1909	20	19
10. Phraongchao Sawatdiphrawet	1860- 1914	49	14
11. Phraongchao Thewanuthaiwong ⁵	1858- 1923		17
12. Chaophraya Phetsakorewong	1849 1920	Chaophraya Si Suriyawong's (the Regent)'s nephew	25

- 1 The director and the editor of *The Court*
- 2 The owner and the editor of *Derunong*
- 3 Prince Vajirañāṇa
- 4 Prince Damrong
- 5 Prince Dewawongse

Appendix E

Cross-cultural Experiences and Positions in the Government

Name	cross-cultural experiences	positions in the government
1. Chaophraya Phaasurangseseesawangwong and	In 1871, he went to India with King Chulalongkorn.	Minister of Military Affairs, Special Ambassador to Japan Europe, A member in Privy Council in the reign of King Rama VII
2. Krommamern Naretvorarit	In the reign of King Chulalongkorn, he used to be appointed as the ambassador at England	
3. Phraongchao Kaseamsensopak	-	The Director-general of the Appeal Court's judges, The committee of The Supreme Court (in the Reign of King Rama the Sixth)
4. Phraongchao Thongthemthawanwong		The Colonel of Aide-de-Camp
5. Phraongchao Manuarnkmanop		The tenth of the Buddhist Patriarch in the Ratanakosin period
6. Phraongchao Thongkongkonhai		The Commander of Thai Navy, The Minister of Defense, The Minister of The Court
7. Phraongchao Kaseamseesuphayo		
8. Phraongchao Diesawarakuman		The Minister of Education, The Minister of the Interior

9. Phraongchao
Khatnangyukol
- The Minister of Justice
The Director -general of The
Supreme Court
10. Phraongchao
Sawatdiphrewet
- King Chulalongkorn's secretary
The Director-general of royal's
property, The member of the
Privy Council in the Reign of
King Rama VI
11. Phraongchao
Thewanuthaiwong
- In 1871, he went to India with King
Chulalongkorn. In 1887, he also went
to England, France, Sweden, U.S.A, and
Japan
- The Minister of Foreign
Affairs
12. Chaophraya
Phetsakorawong
- He went to study in England for two years. Royal secretary for
Foreign Affairs, Special
Ambassador to England
(1879), Embassy for Treaty
Ratification with Japan(1887),
Minister of Agricultural,
Minister of Education

Appendix F
Data Concerning the *Meirokusha* Members
Family Background

Name	Birth- Death	Known Facts About Father	Age in 1874
Mori Arinori	1847-1889	med.-high samurai	27
Nishimura Shigeki	1828-1902	high samurai	46

Fukuzawa Yukichi	1834-1901	medium samurai	39
Katō Hiroyuki	1836-1916	medium samurai	38
Mitsukuri Rinsho	1846-1897	<i>rangakusha</i>	26
Mitsukuri Shūhei	1825-1886	<i>rangakusha</i>	49
Nakamura Keiu	1832-1891	farmer-low samurai	42
Nishi Amane	1829-1897	physician-high	45
Sugi Kōji	1826-1917	physician	45
Tsuda Mamichi	1892-1903	low-samurai	45
Hatakeyama Yoshinari	1843-1876	samurai	31
Shimizu Usaburo	1829-1910	merchant class	45
Sakatani Rōro	1822-1861	samurai	52

From: Fisher Jerry Kamm, "The Meirokusha" Ph.D
Dissertation (History), University of Virginia, 1974 p.222

Appendix G
Education Background
Language Studies and Year and Age at which Study Began

	Dutch	English	French	German
Mori Arinori		'64 (17)		
Nishimura Shigeki	'52 (25)	'61 (34)		

Fukuzawa Yukichi	'54 (21)	'59 (24)		
Katō Hiroyuki	'54 (19)			'60 (25)
Mitsukuri Rinso	'57 (11)	'57 (11)	'66 (21)	
Mitsukuri Shūhei	'43 (19)			
Nakamura Keiu	'48 (16)	'55 (23)		
Nishi Amane	'54 (25)	'55 (26)		
Sugi Koji	'48 (21)	x	'49 (22)	
Tsuda Mamichi	'50 (22)	x		
Hatakeyama Yoshinari		'64 (21)		
Shimizu Usaburo	'50 (21)ca	'59 (30)ca		
Sakatani Rōro				

From: Fisher Jerry Kamm, *ibid.*, p 224.

Appendix H
Travel Abroad Before 1876

	English	France	United States	Other	Relationship with Iwakura Mission (1871- 1873)
Mori Arinori	'65-'67	('65)	('67-'68); '71-'73	('66) Russia	X
Nishimura Shigeaki					
Fukuzawa Yukichi	'62	'62	'60	'62 Europe	
Katō Hiroyuki					
Mitsukuri Rinsho		'67-'68			
Mitsukuri Shūhei	'62	'62		'62 Europe	
Nakamura Keiu	'66-'68	('68)		'66-'67 Russia	
Nishi Amene				'62-'65 Holland	
Sugi Koji					
Tsuda Mamichi				'62-'65 Holland	
Hatakeyama Yoshinari	'65-'67; Iwakura Mission	'67-'68; Iwakura Mission			X
Shimizu Uesaburo		'65-'68	('68)		
Sakatani Rōro					

From: Fisher Jerry Kamm, *ibid.*, p 225.

Appendix I

Meirokusha's Highest position by 1876

Mori Arinori	Gaimusho <u>shoho</u> , Embassy to China
Nishimura Shigeki	Monbusho <u>dajo</u>
Fukuzawa Yukichi	head of Keiō Gijyuku
Katō Hiroyuki	<u>dajo, genroin</u>
Mitsukuri Rinsho	<u>Shiho, dajo</u>
Mitsukuri Shūhei	head of Sansō Gakusha
Nakamura Keiu	head of Dojinsha
Nishi Amane	Rikugunsho <u>dajo</u>
Sugi Koji	head of statistics bureau
Tsuda Mamichi	genroin
.....	
Sakatani Rōro	<u>sanin goyogake</u>

From: Fisher Jerry Kamm, ibid., p 227.

Appendix J

The Imperial Rescript on Education (1890)

Know Ye, Our Subjects:

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyal and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our Education. Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral power; furthermore advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may all thus attain to the same virtue.

The 30th day of the 10th month of the 13th year of Meiji (1890).

- Official Translation

From: Teruhisa Horio, Educational Thought and
Ideology in Modern Japan: State Authority and Intellectual Freedom,
(Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press ©1988), p. 399.

Appendix K
Summary Educational Statistics,
1885-1912

Years	Bangkok		Provinces		Total	
	Schools	Students	Schools	Students	Schools	Students
1885/86	19	1,504	10	510	29	2,014
1886/87	21	1,500	13	488	34	1,988
1887/88	21	1,476	16	602	37	2,078
1888/89	22	1,474	17	568	39	2,042
1889/90	25	1,595	20	730	45	2,325
1890/91	24	1,800	27	915	51	2,715

From: David K. Wyatt, The Politics of Reform in Thailand: Education in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn, (New Heaven; Yale University Press, 1969) p. 387.

Appendix L
Volume and Value of Rice Export

Period	Average Volume per year (Thousand Piculs)	Average Value per year (Thousand Baht)	Average Price per Picul (Baht)
1857-59	990		
1860-64	1,840		
1865-69	1,630		
1870-74	1,870	5,110	2.70
1875-79	3,530	10,110	2.90
1880-84	3,580	9,610	2.70
1885-89	5,320	15,080	2.80
1890-94	7,250	23,780	3.30
1895-99	8,000	36,410	4.60
1900-1904	11,130	61,280	5.50
1905-09	14,760	81,020	5.50
1910-14	15,220	81,230	5.30

From: James C. Ingram, Economic Change in Thailand 1850-1970 (California: Stanford University Press, 1971), p. 38.

VITA

Name: Surangsri Tonsiengsom

Date of Birth: 5 July 1950

Place of Birth: Nakorn Pathom, Thailand

Parents: Suwan-Kalong Tonsiengsom

School Attended: High School from Rachinee Burena, Nakorn Pathom

B. A and M. A in History from Faculty of Arts,

Chulalongkorn University

Certificate in Japanese Studies from Nanzan University,

Nagoya, Japan

Current Position: Assistant Professor in Department of History,
Chulalongkorn University

Publications:

- 380 Years Japan-Thailand Bangkok: Thairot, 1984. (Thai)
- "Evolution of Using Energy in Thailand." Journal of Social Research 3 (January-June 1980): 66-101. (Thai)
- "Dr. Tokichi Masao: Thai Judicial Adviser." Journal of Thai-Japanese Studies 2 (December, 1980): 25-34. (Thai)
- "The Relationship between Thailand and Japan during the Reign of King Rama V to King Rama VII (1868-1932)." (Thai) M. A. Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, 1977.
- "The Relationship between Thailand and Japan in the Ratanakosin Period." Journal of Thai-Japanese Studies 2 (May- April 1980): 118-129. (Thai)