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Introduction

Yorimitsu Hashimoto

1. Charles H. Pearson as a Prophet of Yellow Peril

Charles H. Pearson, Pessimistic Prophet

The yellow peril contributed to the consolidation of Western consciousness in
the name of a new crusade by invoking the menace of an awakening or invading
Asia. Historically the expression of the ‘yellow peril’ is said to have been made
popular by Wilhelm II, the German Kaiser in 1895 just after the Sino-Japanese
war. The repeat illustration of ‘The Yellow Peril’ drawn by Knackfuss from a
design by the Kaiser was propagated throughout Germany and to world journals
and papers, which sometimes modified the original version with a hint of the
sardonic, but generally contributed to the spread of the idea. At the same time,
Wilhelm II wrote letters to his cousin, the Russian Tsar Nicholas II to warn him of
the menace of Asia and to encourage the new crusade in order to turn Russian
eyes away from Europe to the Far East.1 In fact it found shape in the German,
French and Russian Triple Intervention guided by Wilhelm II, a response to the
Japanese seizure of the Liaotung peninsula in China in 1895, which was one of the
causes of the Russo-Japanese war in 1904.

As some have indicated2, however, we can find an early prototype of the
‘yellow peril’ in a number of sources, especially in Charles H. Pearson’s National
Life and Character: a Forecast (1893)3. His pessimistic prediction of Western
civilisation’s decline, due to the limitations of white colonisation in the tropics,
made a significant impact on the contemporary English speaking world, on such
figures as Theodore Roosevelt in America and Alfred Deakin, the future Prime
Minister of Australia4. In the twentieth century, influential books on racism and
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1 The letters are called “The ‘Willy-Nicky’ Letters” for the reason that they were usually addressed to
‘Nicky’ and signed ‘Willy.’ They were found in Russia after the revolution in 1918 and published in
1920. See, N. F. Grant (ed.), The Kaiser's Letters to the Tsar: Copied from the Government Archives
in Petrograd, and Brought from Russia by Isaac Don Levine (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1920).
2 Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought (2nd edn. Boston, Beacon Press,
Originally presented as the author’s thesis, University of Wisconsin, in 1957), p.20. Heinz Gollwitzer,
Die Gelbe Gefahr: Geschichte eines Schlagworts, Studien zum Imperialistischen Denken (Göttingen,
4 Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism, pp.188-9. John Tregenza, Professor of Democracy: the Life
Anglo-Saxonism like Putnam Weale’s *The Conflict of Colour* (1910) or Lothrop Stoddard’s *The Rising Tide of Color* (1920) were also inspired by Pearson’s prediction. Putnam Weale, an English writer noted for his books about Eastern Asia, considered *National Life and Character* as an ‘informing work’ dealing with the ‘problems very similar to the present ones’. On the other hand, he admitted that ‘the melancholy conclusions which Professor Pearson reached twenty years ago regarding Europe and its civilisation are those on which British statesmen base their decadent diplomacy’.

Lothrop Stoddard, one of the representative writers who developed modern racism in America, referred to Pearson as an ‘Australian thinker’ who ‘wrote of the Chinese a generation ago in his epoch-making book, *National Life and Character [sic]*’. Stoddard respected Pearson’s achievement and said that ‘Much of what Professor Pearson prophesied has already come to pass’. In spite of its great influence strangely little attention has been paid to the relationship between contemporary British society and Pearson’s predictions. In this introduction, I intend to examine Pearson’s prototype of the ‘yellow peril’ and its historical contexts in British society.

### Pearson on the Limits to European Acclimatisation

*National Life and Character* was published in January 1893, just one month before Herbert Spencer’s provocative article modifying the catchwords used occasionally for justifying imperialism, ‘the survival of the fittest’. Although Lafcadio Hearn, an ardent Spencerian, who moved to Japan and wrote Pearson-inspired articles on turn of the century Japanese society, considered Spencer to be Pearson’s ‘intellectual milk’, there was only a single reference to Spencer in *National Life and Character*. In May of the same year, at Oxford, T. H. Huxley delivered a lecture, *Evolution and Ethics*, to emphasise the
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7 Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, p. 244.


contradiction between ‘social progress’ and ‘cosmic process’ arguing against Spencer’s so-called harmonious optimism. Suspending judgement, Huxley posed a problem, one of the crucial issues of modern society, whether national interference is desirable if the physically strongest does not mean the ethically best; free economy or protectionism in terms of political economy. He questioned, ‘if the cosmic process has no sort of relation to moral ends; if the imitation of it by man is inconsistent with the first principles of ethics; what becomes of this surprising theory?’

Nor should we miss the synchronicity of Max Nordau’s *Entartung*, published the year before, the English translation of which, with the title *Degeneration*, provoked great controversy in 1895. Certainly Nordau also considered the fin-de-siècle as fin-de-race, but his argument is based not on struggle among the races but on an attack upon contemporary and cultural phenomena, which he viewed, or diagnosed from his professional medical knowledge, as a pathological disease. Pearson shared with Nordau the argument about degeneration using not decadence but ‘decay of character’, arguing from the standpoint of the decline of modern literature compared with ancient. But Pearson did not mention Nordau. Among these four writers, Spencer, Huxley, Nordau, Pearson, whose objectives and styles are different from each other, there seems to be no direct connection or influence although Spencer suggested that Huxley was inspired by Spencer’s *Principles of Ethics* (1892-3) that Huxley had obtained some two weeks before a lecture, *Evolution and Ethics*.

Putting aside the problem of who was the originator, the revision of evolution itself had been presented in the 1880s. The representative revisionist was E. Ray Lankester, whose *Degeneration* (1880) cut the Victorian knot tying evolution and progress together. He confirmed the law of decline in every race; ‘the modern Egyptians’ and ‘even the Australians’, according to him, had degenerated from their ancestors. Lankester applied the law to evolution and demonstrated that
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11 James Paradis and George C. Williams (eds.), *Evolution & Ethics*, p.83.
the environmental adaptation, generally from the complex to the simple, could be biologically perfect but intellectually disastrous.

It is possible for us----just as the Ascidian throws away its tail and its eye and sinks into a quiescent state of inferiority----to reject the good gift of reason with which every child is born, and to degenerate into a contented life of material enjoyment accompanied by ignorance and superstition.

Allegedly this nightmarish vision cast a shadow over Lankester’s friend H. G. Wells who depicted in his Time Machine (1895) the degeneration into a class conflict-ridden, men-eat-men world. As Lankester’s case suggests, the possibility of degeneration had been widely perceived and propagated throughout the late nineteenth century. Therefore, in a broader context, in terms of the supposed disintegration of static superiority, or the bitter realisation that the Golden Age of progress had passed, we can say that Pearson belonged to the same framework. The point is that Pearson had articulated it clearly and persuasively from his historical and global perspectives.

Pearson’s National Life and Character consists of six chapters and two appendices, dealing with the proportions of races in tropical Africa and the United States. The first chapter, considered the most controversial at the time, deals with the limits of the white people. According to him, the Aryan race can live only in the temperate zone although Chinese or other races are more adaptable. Hence, the Chinese people will colonise the tropical zone instead of the White and the overpopulation of Chinese people will cause the decline of the West. In the second chapter the breakup of the West is compared with the end of Roman Empire in the sense of ‘vandalism’ through alien invasion. China will become ‘a formidable military power’ and it will result in western people’s dependence on the state. In the following chapter, he took up the serious gap between the city and the country. Cities, which formerly engendered progress, were now producing unfit, weak people. According to chapter IV, on the decline of the nation, the people’s dependence on the state will be much greater than on the church. The next chapter showed that this dependence on the state encouraged individualism to destroy the family system, and with it respect for the

16 Lankester, Degeneration, pp.118-9.
father. In the last chapter, as the title ‘the decay of character’ indicates, social disorder would make people’s work more ephemeral with the realisation that most of the literary subject matters had already been exhausted and most of the great laws of the sciences had been discovered. In the introduction and at the end of the book, he put in some contradictory statements as his conclusion. In the introduction, he indicates that patriotism will be all the more necessary as a remedy for decline. On the other hand, in the end of the book, he recommends resignation in the face of the stagnant world ‘with less adventure and energy, less brightness and hope’.

Pearson was one of the earliest people to articulate the limits of European colonial growth. Until the end of the nineteenth century, the globe seemed to be open to the mission to civilise and Christianise. European people were supposed to have the Midas touch which turned ‘the coloured’ into gold in the global labour market. Above all, blessed British people considered it their mission to paint whole continents red. Civilisation was equated with Christian proselytism, and both were tightly woven into colonisation. The cursed heathen was going to be wiped out by the European Midas touch as if the invisible hand of God was seen. From the survey during his global grand tour (1831-6) on HMS *Beagle*, Charles Darwin drew the conclusion that ‘[t]he varieties of man seem to act on each other in the same way as different species of animals----the stronger always extirpating the weaker’. And he lamented over the passing of a race in New Zealand when he had heard ‘the fine energetic natives saying, that they knew the land was doomed to pass from their children’18. In 1866-7, nearly thirty years later, promising politician Charles Dilke jotted down a similar comment from a Maori person during his All-Red tour that ‘We are gone----like the moa’19. Presenting an outline of worldly-disseminated loyal subjects of Queen Victoria, Dilke, possibly influenced by the advent of Origin of Species (1859), gave a blessing to the English people that they had replenished the land growing to five times the size of the Persian or Roman empire and they would multiply themselves up to three hundred-million around 1970, one hundred years later20. As for the exported institution or civilisation, Dilke thought they were copied and multiplied without any deterioration or abuse. He said, ‘We English are great acclimatizers:

we have carried trial by jury to Bengal, tenant-right to Oude, and caps and gowns to be worn over loongee and paejama [sic] at Calcutta University’\textsuperscript{21}. In \textit{The Descent of Man} (1871), Darwin revisited the same problem which he had speculated on aboard the \textit{Beagle}. Collecting a number of materials from medical records and travelogues, he still wondered why the ‘savages’ had become extinct so quickly as if the ‘breath of civilisation’ were ‘poisonous’\textsuperscript{22}. As a matter of fact, English people had acclimatised themselves and multiplied like rabbits in every corner of the world where the local people had made room due to their lack of immunity to newly brought diseases\textsuperscript{23}. Niall Ferguson wittily named such a European biological expansion as a ‘White Plague’ because ‘[l]ike the rats of the medieval Black Death, the white men were the carriers of the fatal germs’\textsuperscript{24}.

Pearson thought that the tide might have been blocked or turned. From his own personal experience in Australia, Pearson followed Darwin and marvelled at European replacement of the local people by the new comer.

In Australasia, and in the islands of the Pacific, where Europeans have settled, or where they trade much, the Maori, the Kanaka, and the Papuan are dying out. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that certain weak races----even when, like the Kanaka, they possess some very high qualities----seem to wither away at mere contact with the European\textsuperscript{25}.

This is a mere repetition of Darwin’s wonder since his voyage on the \textit{Beagle}. Significantly, however, Darwin added a qualification in a similar discussion in his later \textit{Descent of Man}. Darwin summed up European contagious contact saying that ‘[w]hen civilised nations come into contact with barbarians the struggle is short’. That was, however, ‘except where a deadly climate gives its aid to the native race’\textsuperscript{26}. Pearson might have stretched the qualification although there is no mention of Darwin’s \textit{Descent of Man}. On the contrary, Pearson characterised Darwin’s career as a decline of science because the writer of the groundbreaking \textit{Origin of Species} ended up as one of ‘a cohort of skilful investigators’ for a single species such as muck-eating earthworm\textsuperscript{27}. This indicates the limit of Pearson’s

\textsuperscript{21} Dilke, \textit{Greater Britain}, p.391.
\textsuperscript{22} That is Poeppig’s observation quoted in Charles Darwin, \textit{The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex} (London, Penguin, 2004), p.212 note 34.
\textsuperscript{23} As for the case of New Zealand, see Crosby, \textit{Ecological Imperialism}, chapter 10.
\textsuperscript{25} Pearson, \textit{National Life and Character}, p.34.
\textsuperscript{27} Pearson, \textit{National Life and Character}, pp.330-1. Here Pearson suggested Darwin’s last work, \textit{The
understanding of the science. For him, the subtle sophistication or fruitful diversification seemed to be a segmentation or dilution of great learning.

Yet, Pearson’s negative comment on European acclimatisation was one of the typical arguments which had paved the way for another branch of science: tropical medicine. After the publication of *National Life and Character*, a number of articles discussed the similar difficulties of tropical colonisation and its prescriptions, although they did not mention Pearson. Here again, Max Nordau, author of *Entartung*, went ahead of Pearson and claimed, in *The Asiatic Quarterly* of July 1891, that European colonisers were doomed to deteriorate in Africa. In September 1895, Frederick Boyle published an article against the tide and received negative feedback on both sides of the Atlantic. This well-known journalist and adventure novelist, based on his wide travels in the tropics, maintained that white men could colonise and cultivate the tropics. Around the same time, American ‘manifest destiny’ also stumbled onto the tropics. Seizing the opportunity of the Spanish-American war in the Caribbean and the Philippines in 1898, Benjamin Kidd, well-known as an author of *Social Evolution* (1894), sent a proto-White-Man’s-Burden message to the States. In *The Control Of The Tropics* in 29 July, 13 August issues and 15 August of *The Times*, Kidd reconfirmed the impossibility of colonisation in the tropics and for that reason underscored the need for control by Western civilisation. More professional analysis was presented by Dr. L. W. Sambon who had recently returned from Central Africa; he made a controversial speech ‘Acclimatization of the White Man in Tropical Lands’ at the Royal Geographical Society on 27 April 1898. In the same year, with a sense of common purpose, Dr. James Cantlie, who had returned from China, inaugurated *The Journal of Tropical Medicine* and published the ‘Possibility of Europeans and Their Families Becoming Naturalised in the Tropics’ in the journal. Patrick Manson, ‘the doyen of tropical medicine’, published *Tropical Disease* which would be used as a long-standing standard

---


30 ‘Tropical Acclimatisation’, *The Times*, 28 April 1898.
textbook\textsuperscript{31}. This led to the foundation of The London School of Tropical Medicine in 1899\textsuperscript{32}. Unfortunately, Pearson passed away in 1894 and did not see the flowering of tropical medicine developed by ‘a cohort of skilful investigators’ for a single species of germs or insects such as the mosquito. It is not only a mere irony personally for him, it also suggests that Pearson’s argument on limitation of acclimatisation, from the late Victorian contexts, included the germ of regeneration as well.

**Pearson’s Prediction**

Based on Pearson’s analysis of the world and its contexts, I am going to move on to Pearson’s discussion of what the world would become. The following famous passage from Chapter I ‘Unchangeable Limits of Higher Races’, which has been quoted in almost every commentary on Pearson, sums up his points.

The day will come, and perhaps is not far distant, when the European observer will look round to see the globe girdled with a continuous zone of the black and yellow races, no longer too weak for aggression or under tutelage, but independent, or practically so, in government, monopolising the trade of their own regions, and circumscribing the industry of the European; when Chinamen and the nations of Hindostan [sic], the States of Central and South America, by that time predominantly Indian, and it may be African nations of the Congo and the Zambesi [sic], under a dominant caste of foreign rulers, are represented by fleets in the European seas, invited to international conferences, and welcomed as allies in the quarrels of the civilised world. The citizens of these countries will then be taken up into the social relations of the white races, will throng the English turf, or the salons of Paris, and will be admitted to intermarriage\textsuperscript{33}.

The first point is, as mentioned above, that the White people, ‘the higher races’

\textsuperscript{31} An anonymous review article ‘Climate and Colonisation’ in 1899 surveyed this academic trend in Europe, mentioning the publications by Sambon, Cantlie and Manson. See, ‘Climate and Colonisation’, *Quarterly Review*, cx, 1899, pp.268-288.
\textsuperscript{33} Pearson, *National Life and Character*, pp.89-90.
according to Pearson, could not develop outside the temperate zones and into the tropics unlike Chinese or ‘Hindoos’ but necessarily limited their space only to the Temperate Zone. The second is that ‘the less higher races’ will be modernised and industrialised to secure their own place in the tropical zone. The third is that the cultural and genetic intermarriage, the miscegenation between the ‘higher’ races and the ‘lower’, will in his view be inevitable after the decline of the White races. The second chapter, following on from ‘The Unchangeable Limits of the Higher Races’, focused on the hierarchy of societies. As well as the forecasting the decline of the Anglo-Saxon people, Pearson moved on to expand the issues from race relations to social ones.

To sum up he was embarrassed and anxious about the mediocritisation of the British society caused by the destabilised borderlines between race, religion, class, gender, literature and country. This anxiety about the nation’s standard lowered by the majority might be the reversed version of optimism in progress, spread around the former half of the nineteenth century, that the world will be civilised into the higher state of equality. In that sense, Elaine Showalter’s analysis will be suggestive. According to her Sexual Anarchy, the British fin-de-siècle society suffered from an obsession over the anarchy triggered by the blurred borderline between race, gender and class particularly after ‘General Gordon’s defeat by an Islamic fundamentalist, the Mahdi, at Khartoum in 1885’34. Of course the objective of the argument is completely different, but Pearson’s National Life and Character is based on the same ground as Elaine Showalter demonstrating that the ‘crisis in race and class relations in the 1880s had a parallel in the crisis in gender’35. According to Pearson, the shape of what will come is not anarchy but rather a stagnant dead world after the mixing up of the high and the low. This argument followed the same steps as E. Ray Lankester, who had indicated that biological evolution from the complex to the simple could be intellectual degeneration. Furthermore, we can easily discover that his view is influenced by contemporary pessimism based on the discovery of the second law of thermodynamics. Jerome H. Buckley, in his The Triumph of Time, indicated that the law discovered in the 1850s permeated British society until the 1890s. The coming death of the sun was considered the end of the world36. The same
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34 Elaine Showalter, Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin de Siècle (New York, Viking, 1990), p.5.
35 Showalter, Sexual Anarchy, p.6.
pessimism, according to Buckley, obsessed writers like Joseph Conrad, H. G. Wells and Henry Adams despite there being no mention of Pearson. On the other hand, Hofstadter indicated that Henry and Brooke Adams were influenced by the apparent destiny of decline in Pearson’s book. Buckley’s and Hofstadter’s works suggest that Pearson also held the same framework of pessimistic vision based on the second law of thermodynamics. According to Buckley, the pessimistic vision is described most vividly as the dying sun and earth in the dead world after hundreds of thousands years in H. G. Wells’ *Time Machine* (1895).

So far there is no evidence to indicate Pearson’s influence on Wells. But, as the following quotation shows, the vision of the decaying sun, which Wells depicted two years later, was specifically referred to in what may well have been the first review of Pearson’s book in *The Times*.

> Just as evolution tells us that in some remote future the sun itself will have given out all its available light and heat, and will thenceforth continue its course through space a cold, inert, and invisible sphere, so Mr. Pearson would have us believe the civilisation and progress of the higher races of mankind, now in their period of storm and stress, will gradually relax their forward movement and tend towards a stationary condition paralysing to high effort and destructive of lofty ideals, but nevertheless compatible with a higher standard of social wellbeing and material comfort than has hitherto been the lot of the great mass of mankind.\textsuperscript{37}

The review in *The Edinburgh Review*, October 1893, also began with the destiny of the dying sun like *The Times* review.\textsuperscript{38} After summarising Pearson’s statements, the reviewer, historian Spencer Walpole according to the identification in the *Wellesley Index*, argued against them although he admitted their persuasiveness. The first point refutes the linkage between the rapid increase in the inferior races and the deterioration of the white races. Walpole states that ‘an expansion of the Chinese race does not necessarily involve an extension of Chinese dominion’.\textsuperscript{39} Although he respected Pearson’s career in Australia, he pointed out that it misled Pearson.

\textsuperscript{37} *The Times*, 19 January 1893.
\textsuperscript{38} *The Edinburgh Review*, clxviii, 1893, pp.277-304.
\textsuperscript{39} *The Edinburgh Review*, clxviii, 1893, p.284.
Pearson as ‘Liberal’ in Australia

As the rather strange title of Pearson’s biography, Professor of Democracy, suggests, his political and educational achievements in Australia were considered as democratic and liberal although his last work possibly contributed to the White Australian Policy. In his days in Australia as a minister, he tried to promote the welfare of the people and women’s equal opportunities for education since he viewed the Australian colonies as the outpost of civilisation, facing as it were a wave of Chinese immigrants. While we may hesitate to mark him out as a liberal, O. J. Falnes, in 1954 a few years after Hofstadter’s work, described Pearson’s ideas in National Life and Character as liberal without any reference to his political career. Falnes thought highly of Pearson’s prediction about the potential menace of China as his article was published in the Cold War. He wrote in note 14 that it was ‘validated to the hilt six decades later’ by the fact that ‘Mao-Tze-Tung [sic] directs his aggressive Communist armies from Peiping (former name of Beijing)’. Naturally Pearson would not wish to restore the aristocracy like Carlyle, but he indicated the importance of patriotic sentiment for the White people’s vested interests and against the rising ‘Yellow and Black belt’.

Without paying attention to the ambiguous nature of Pearson, Colonial Liberalism by Stuart Macintyre puts Pearson into the line of democratic liberals in Australia. In the pages about National Life and Character, Macintyre cunningly does not refer to Pearson’s argument about China and the Australian exclusion act but concentrates on his apprehensions about excessive modernisation and his resignation about the lost virtues of ancient times. Nevertheless, Pearson does strongly support the exclusion acts in Australia or America occasionally based on his experience in Australia. In his view, the inferior races would increase more quickly than the higher races and the overpopulation and industrialisation of non-European peoples would produce the disorganisation of civilisation in the temperate zone. As in the following passage, Pearson deftly distinguished ‘we’ from ‘coloured’ and suggested the English reader think globally; the immigration problem in Australia seemed to be a storm in a teacup at the outpost of civilisation, however, it could be a tidal wave attacking the whole English speaking world because Australia was, according to

---

Pearson, a crucial arena of colour conflict.

The fear of Chinese immigration which the Australian democracy cherishes, and which Englishmen at home find it hard to understand, is, in fact, the instinct of self-preservation, quickened by experience. We know that coloured and white labour cannot exist side by side; we are well aware that China can swamp us with a single year’s surplus of population; and we know that if national existence is sacrificed to the working of a few mines and sugar plantations, it is not the Englishman in Australia alone, but the whole civilised world, that will be the losers.

Ignoring these arguments, Colonial Liberalism does not deal with Pearson’s full support of immigration controls in the United States and his contribution to the White Australian Policy. In the new Commonwealth Parliament in 1901, the Prime Minister, Edmund Barton, quoted two passages from National Life and Character to confirm the necessity of the ‘Immigration Restriction Bill’ which originated the White Australian Policy. This was a natural result of Pearson’s doomsday scenario and its potential prescription in his Introduction. ‘[T]he growth of what we may call patriotism, as each man identifies himself more and more with the needs and aspirations of his fellow countrymen’, Pearson said, would compensate for the loss fostered by ‘individualism’. From a global perspective, Pearson emphasised the importance of a broader or greater British community spirit; but the community should be gated and exclusive to the ‘Higher Races’.

The following passages about Ah Toy will provide us with a clue to Pearson’s double standard on British community, possibly contrary to Macintyre’s intention. Ah Toy, in spite of being a British subject from Hong Kong, was not permitted to land in Australia by Victorian officers. Obeying the Imperial Government’s objection to ‘discriminatory colonial legislation’ the majority of the judges of the Supreme Court found Ah Toy’s exclusion unlawful ‘on the ground that the colonial government had no statutory authority’. Against this decision, Pearson said ‘We are really fighting again that battle which Chief Justice Highinbotham

43 Pearson, National Life and Character, p.17.
44 Pearson, National Life and Character, p.16.
46 Pearson, National Life and Character, p.29.
[whom Macintyre identifies as another colonial liberal] began----for the right of this people to govern themselves----and we intend to vindicate that right as an integral part of our liberties’. Naturally, as Macintyre suggested, this quotation shows the importance of autonomy, which seems, especially for today’s Australian people to be a liberal idea that the British Imperial Government should not interfere in the colonies. But, as far as National Life and Character is concerned, self-government is second to a federation of nations under State Socialism. In the Introduction, which is based on his article in the Contemporary Review of 1868 three years before his move to Australia, he had warned America against being swamped by immigration. Therefore, in terms of the white race in the temperate zone, he thinks that the ‘laissez-faire system’ had been disadvantageous and the regulation of immigration in English colonies as ‘self-preservation’ was instructive for the ‘English race’ because it is free from ‘the limitations of English tradition’. The following example will be suggestive for Pearson’s attitude toward Ah Toy.

Planted in Africa, the Englishman so adapts himself to the circumstances of the real population, the indigenous negro, that the black man finds his sufficient paradise under the British flag, in Natal or at the Cape, rather than in Liberia47.

In National Life and Character the scope of Pearson’s liberalism cannot be applied to Chinese people even when they are British.

It is beyond the objectives of this introduction to consider whether Pearson’s ideas and activities should be considered liberal. As Falnes and Macintyre show directly or indirectly, judgments concerning Pearson seem to be fairly bound up with the context of the viewer. It will be more interesting to think about the historical meaning of his ambiguous attitude toward modern society because his prediction about the decline of British society caused not only the acceptance of the fate but also the quest for regeneration, particularly through the Boer war and eugenic movement.

Degeneration and Regeneration

These two ambiguous sides, the resignation to degeneration and the longing for regeneration, can be found in Pearson. The reviewer in The Times also took up the evident contradictions between what Pearson did in Australia and what he said in the book. Referring briefly to Pearson’s progressive achievement in the

47 Pearson, National Life and Character, p.18.
colony, the reviewer admitted that in spite of his career the book was ‘an effective counterblast’ to the common belief in optimistic progress. In fact, Pearson’s arguments swayed between the extremes of unavoidable decay as the law of the universe and human being’s struggle to prolong life. In the end, the book conveys a sense of depression, like the defeatism of Sisyphus.

However, Pearson showed that the inevitability of extinction implied in thermodynamic and evolutionary theory could be followed by the quest for improvement as a necessary reaction. Just as the investigation of the poor people in London made by General Booth (Pearson mentioned this in passing) caused the founding of the Salvation Army, the anxiety about degeneration could be followed by a quest for efficiency and the eugenics movement. It is well known that the national improvement movement became a live issue as a result of the British hard fight against the Boer and the rejection of numerous volunteers contrary to expectations. Pearson, referring to the British defeats in Natal (presumably against the Zulu), predicted that it represented the symptom of the decay of the white people in the tropics and that the fate of Natal was the fate of Africa48. As mentioned above, he worried about the physical deterioration of the people in the city and predicted the increasing intervention and protection of the state instead of the church in these social concerns.

The next interesting point in The Times review was the analogy made between Pearson and Edmund Burke. Pearson’s prediction about the rise of State Socialism in the face of state decline is considered as a ‘modern version of Burke’s famous lament over the extinction of the age of chivalry and the substitution for it of a dreary age of ‘sophisters and economists”. It is not of importance to our discussion whether the connection with Burke is adequate or not. What matters is the anxiety about modern materialism and nostalgia as its reversed side, in other words a kind of chronic disease of the modern. As Raymond Williams demonstrates in The Country and the City, the problems of urbanisation resurfaced as medievalism together with modernisation at the latter half of nineteenth century, especially projected in the future like Richard Jefferies’s After London (1885) or William Morris’s News from Nowhere (1890)49. In the broader context, including the regeneration movement of life in the country pursued by such figures as Henry Rider Haggard who warned in his Rural England (1902) that there were only ‘dullards, the vicious or . . . wastrels’ left after the emigration to the city50, medievalism could also be considered a remedy

50 William Greenslade, Degeneration, Culture and the Novel, 1880-1940 (Cambridge, Cambridge
for degeneration, however backward looking. As a distant echo of the utopian pastoral vision developed by Morris, we can take an example from a member of the Fabian society Ebenezer Howard, although strangely enough Raymond Williams’ book has no mention of him. Inspired by Edward Bellamy’s Looking Backward (1888), which Morris criticises for its State Socialism and publishes News from Nowhere as his reply in 1890, Howard tries to present a more practical solution as a garden city movement unifying city and country.

Nevertheless, Pearson, who was originally a medieval historian, does not seem to have any illusion about medievalism or rural life in his introduction when he sarcastically touches on William Morris’s ‘charming vision’\textsuperscript{51}. Pearson knew too much to beautify the medieval world. An excellent example is in his famous academic work The Early and Middle Age of England (1861). According to Barczewski’s study of medieval hero myth constructed in the nineteenth century, the idea of the British as a ‘mixed race’ came to be left untouched or considered as an untouchable taboo when race theory had typecast each race as immutable in the late 1850s. A major stumbling block is King Arthur, who should be hailed as a national hero although much evidence demonstrated his Celtic origin. Pearson seemed to feel embarrassed when he realised that King Arthur belonged to a race widely perceived and constructed as ‘inferior’\textsuperscript{52}.

No doubt, there were some real noblenesses in Arthur’s character, which have given him a life beyond the grave, as the type of the knightly ideal which the imaginative Keltic [sic] race has exalted through all time, above the more statesman-like virtues that secure life and property or success in national enterprises.

As Barczewski indicated, Pearson tried to keep face on all sides and suggested that the Saxon people possessed ‘statesman-like virtues’ which ‘imaginative’ Celtic King Arthur lacked\textsuperscript{53}.

Pearson, therefore, did not see the past as a utopia and did not consider that a return to the past would be useful for the future. This is the major difference between Pearson and other contemporary thinkers although they share the same
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\textsuperscript{52} L. Perry Curtis, Jr., Apes and Angels: the Irishman in Victorian Caricature (Rev. edn. Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997). I will discuss the relationships between racialised Irishness and yellow peril.
dilemma about degeneration and regeneration in the 1890s. Pearson’s bewilderment about interracial relations in King Arthur’s court turned out to be resignation to a British fate of racial anarchy in his last book. While Pearson argued the necessity of patriotism to protect ‘national life and character’ in the introduction, he concluded that the fate of decomposition is inevitable and recommends the reader to accept this lot without complaining, as follows.

We were struggling among ourselves for supremacy in a world which we thought of as destined to belong to the Aryan races and to the Christian faith; to the letters and arts and charm of social manners which we have inherited from the best times of the past. We shall wake to find ourselves elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile, and thought of as bound always to minister to our needs. The solitary consolation will be, that the changes have been inevitable.

Certainly, Pearson’s ‘pessimistic’ arguments and ‘liberal’ deeds in Australia seem to alternate between unavoidable decay as a law of the universe and the human being’s struggle to prolong life. But historically, Pearson’s ambiguous remarks, between the acceptance of the decline and the necessity of patriotism as its remedy, became prevalent in the contemporary discourse of degeneration. In other words, Pearson’s ambiguity can be located as a racialised prototype of Huxley’s lecture on the unexplained gap between ‘Ethics and the Survival of the Fittest’ although Huxley himself just mentioned Pearson’s idea about the difficulties of tropical colonisation by the white races as pessimistic.

Certainly Pearson’s *National Life and Character* would have sounded pessimistic for the Victorians. It seemed necessary that they needed to see the bright optimistic side in Benjamin Kidd’s bestselling *Social Evolution* (1894) and *Control of the Tropics* (1898), which, ignoring Pearson, assured the reader that Western civilisation could progress with religion even if some individual (culture) might corrupt and the Westerners could control the tropics if not adapt themselves to the heat. In other words, the works of Pearson and Kidd represented two sides.
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of the same coin. For example, in a review of *Social Revolution*, A. R. Wallace, originator of ‘Darwinism’, considered Kidd as ‘a very able thinker who deals with the fundamental problems of civilisation and progress in a far more hopeful manner than does another recent author, also of great ability----Mr. Pearson’. It is hardly surprising, therefore, to find that the last passage of the book apparently looked pessimistic or defeatist but also slightly suggested the way for the regeneration movement. Here, Pearson emphasised the necessity of chivalric morale for the reason that chaotic darkness is coming at the twilight of God.

When Christianity itself began to appear grotesque and incredible, men reconciled themselves to the change of belief in an age of reason, of enlightenment, of progress. It is now more than probable that our science, our civilisation, our great and real advance in the practice of government are only bringing us nearer to the day when the lower races will predominate in the world, when the higher races will lose their noblest elements, when we shall ask nothing from the day but to live, nor from the future but that we may not deteriorate. Even so, there will still remain to us ourselves. Simply to do our work in life, and to abide the issue, if we stand erect before the eternal calm as cheerfully as our fathers faced the eternal unrest, may be nobler training for our souls than the faith in progress.

With the ebbing tide of religious faith, this emphasis on individual decision and morality toward ‘the eternal calm’ or nirvana as Buddhists would say, was shared by and among the English people at the beginning of the twentieth century. While the tidal wave of materialism triggered disbelief in the harmonious progress of Christianisation and civilisation, the necessity of self-strengthening was to be reconfirmed by the Edwardian movement for youth improvement, for example Baden-Powell’s Boy Scout movement. On the other hand, Pearson passed away the next year, 1894, without seeing how ‘nobler training’ was reincarnated by the British people who followed. It is not very meaningful to decide whether Pearson is pessimistic or liberal. Suspending the judgement, I would like to suggest that his ambiguity is based on the discourse of degeneration and an answer to his ambiguity lay in the quest for an efficient society which emerged from the eugenics movement, mainly led by another Pearson, Karl.

2. Opening a Pandora’s Box?: Pearson’s Concern about the Gospel of Civilisation over ‘Secondary Intelligence’

Slipstream and Back stream of Colonisation

Charles H. Pearson pessimistically thought that the expansion of non-Western people would only bring about the deterioration and degeneration of Western civilisation. Possibly for Pearson, the best way for ‘the lower race[s]’ to accept Western civilisation, would not be to assimilate themselves into the civilised community, but to die out to make room for ‘the higher races’, just like the old saying, ‘the only good Indian is a dead Indian’. According to his historical view, the world has mostly been ‘peopled by races, either like the negro very little raised above the level of brutes, or at best, like the lower-caste Hindoo and the Chinaman’. Even complete assimilation would only dilute the essences because ‘such secondary intelligence’ has ‘added nothing permanent to our stock of ideas’\(^59\). Pearson, however, was strongly concerned that European beneficent mission or medical intervention were opening a Pandora’s box; from which unnecessarily increased lower races would spill out or, even if it was unlikely so far, an awakened djinn would emerge. This kind of anxiety against the potential menace of ‘secondary intelligence’ was mainly directed toward India due to its longer history of British colonisation in the East. Pearson said, ‘We carry the sanitary science and the engineering skill of Europe into the East’, which caused ‘fate for multiplying the races that are now our subjects, and will one day be our rivals’ although ‘the people [in India], as is only natural, are taking advantage of the prosperity by multiplying rather than by raising their standard of comfort’ and ‘[t]he education [...] are wanting’\(^60\).

Whereas Pearson held against the ‘Chinamen’ and ‘Hindoo’ and uttered a prediction, ‘such secondary intelligence’ namely Sun Yat Sen and M. K. Gandhi, imitated the Western mentors and struggled to turn the tables against them.

Acquiring the tools of civilisation and the know-how of Christianisation, some Orientals began to speak out against Western hypocrisy and mammonism, while others tried to reorganise or reinvent the community bonds and tradition across the supposed rigid racial and religious hierarchy. Pearson himself seemed to acknowledge the sign of the rising and awakening of the East although he considered these by-products of Western civilisation and colonisation as a mere freak that would destabilise the boundary of civilised Christian communities. Ah Toy, therefore, was to be expelled from Australia although he was a British subject

from Hong Kong. In *National Life and Character*, Pearson mentioned another example of such Australian self-defence policy against ambiguity, the case of Yee Quock Ping. Yee acquired a diploma from a medical school in China but the Medical Board in Victoria refused to register him ‘on the ground that he had not studied anatomy’\(^{61}\). In either case, both Chinese remained passive subjects at the mercy of the situation, but many other Ah Toys and Yee Quock Pings, of the Eastern rising generation mainly born in the 1860s, began to be no longer voiceless victims and to protest against racial assault trying to change the situation. E. J. Hobsbawm has indicated that the ‘Age of Empire’ created the conditions and platforms which formed not only new imperialists but also anti-imperialists in the process of cross-fertilisation of ideas among the Western impact areas such as Russia, India, China and Japan\(^{62}\). In terms of the process, John M. MacKenzie has demonstrated the copious and complex ‘[c]ultural cross-referencing’\(^{63}\) between east and west. The following argument attempts to supplement and modify their framework.

**Stories of Oriental Doctors**

One of the best examples of cross-fertilisation can be found in Hong Kong, a tiny outpost of British civilisation in China. The key persons were the influential doctors of tropical medicine, Patrick Manson and James Cantlie. In 1887, Cantlie, Manson’s protégé, who had practised medicine in London, went to Hong Kong to study tropical diseases with his mentor. Adding to Cantlie’s awareness of the job as his calling, personal reasons also affected the decision; he had been deeply attracted to China and the Chinese, and one of his wife’s ‘childhood ambitions had been to sit on the Great Wall of China’\(^{64}\). On the long way to Hong Kong, this Scottish-born doctor came up with the idea of teaching Western medicine to young Chinese. After his arrival he worked hard for a College of Medicine for the Chinese and the college opened on 1 October, 1887 with the help of the London Missionary Society and ‘the anglicized elite of Hong Kong’\(^{65}\). As stated in the inaugural speech delivered by Major-General Cameron, a government official, the aim was ‘to promote medical science among our fellow
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citizens and to involve the grand object of spreading the gospel of medical science through the whole of China’\textsuperscript{66}. Dr. Manson, the dean, re-affirmed these Herculean missions and stated that the graduates with experience and knowledge of Western medicine and knowledge would have ‘to overcome native prejudice and fight the vested interests in the native profession.’\textsuperscript{67} Manson, however, did not imagine any conflict between ‘the gospel of medical science’ and the Chinese empire; he added that ‘[t]here has not been nor apparently will there be any sudden reform’ and ‘therefore no sudden revolution or other cataclysm’\textsuperscript{68}. He was wrong in his prediction. After five years passed, Cantlie, who succeeded Manson as the dean of the college, sent out the first graduates with the diploma ‘Licentiate in Medicine and Surgery, Hong Kong’\textsuperscript{69}, including his life-long friend Sun Yat Sen, the future first President of the Republic of China.

Although these speeches were filled with evangelical words, as the advent of Sun Yat Sen appropriately indicated, medical education at the College in order ‘to overcome native prejudice’ did not separate the students from the Chinese tradition. Interestingly, a Chinese who had obtained a master’s degree at Edinburgh delivered an address to the College students in 1890, in which he said the students could and should achieve a harmonious hybrid between Confucianism and ‘the physical sciences’\textsuperscript{70}. In the speech ‘Chinese Education and Western Science’, Kaw Hong Ben, whose biographical details are unknown except for his title, began with Manson’s inaugural address, emphasising ‘the results of the western arts and sciences’\textsuperscript{71}. Kaw admitted the useful and practical side of the sciences, but he confirmed how important it was ‘to follow the ancient rules of his forefathers’ from the \textit{Book of Songs}, one of Five Classics in ancient Chinese Confucianism, introducing an episode with Cantlie who asked him to translate its original four Chinese characters\textsuperscript{72}. Due to ignorance of or contempt for the Classics, a number of the young students who had studied in America or Europe considered themselves useful for the modernisation of China, but in Kaw’s opinion, ‘[t]hese young men turned out to be neither intelligent nor
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useful’73. According to Kaw, the pursuit of ‘the physical sciences’ had created materialism, which destroyed ‘nations and races’74. He was suggesting, in today’s terms, that civilisation or modernisation would eradicte the locality and cause an identity crisis. He also highlighted the discontinuity between ‘Hebrew culture’ of Christianity and modern science since the ‘revival of the Greek Culture’ of Renaissance. First of all, the ‘savage Germanic races, although now they had become masters of Europe, had no culture of their own guide’ and according to T. H. Huxley, ‘the scientific theories of the present day’ had begun only after the arrival of Descartes75. Kaw went so far as to emphasise that modern sciences should be more compatible with Confucianism, particularly I Ching, another of the Five Classics, known as Book of Changes. He wondered if ‘the law of the Conservation of Energy in Physics, the law of the Atomic Theory in Chemistry, and the law of Evolution in Natural History [we]re explicitly enunciated in that book?’76 This speech was delivered when Sun studied medicine but unfortunately, there seems to be no clue about Kaw in the writings and biographies of Sun Yat Sen and Cantlie. Whatever the relationship was, Sun, with his attire westernised, was proud and confident of Chinese traditional culture and took the middle-way between ‘Chinese education and Western science’.

In 1892, just after his graduation, Sun worked as a doctor in the Portuguese colony of Macao, and sought the difficult middle course between Western and Chinese medicine77. This was possibly because ‘the Board of Directors of any Chinese hospital’ in China had never encouraged Western medicine and the inhabitants of Macao, in spite of Portuguese government, were mostly Chinese78. Contrary to Manson’s expectations, it was ‘not the obstructive ignorance of the East, but the jealousy of the West’79, according to Sun’s own words, which thwarted his progress. The law of Portugal forbade that without a Portuguese diploma which was ‘obtainable only in Europe’, anyone could practise medicine among or prescribe for the Portuguese people. The details were unknown and unclear from Pearson’s explanation, but similar cause might have affected the medical board of Victoria to render the invalidation of Yee Quock Ping’s diploma. In 1893, when National Life and Character was published, Sun had to leave
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Macao for Canton where he continued to practise medicine. His stay in Macao was, however, never futile; he first came across a political movement which turned his attention to cure the body-politic of China instead of the Chinese people and led him to form a “Young China’ Party”80. As Pearson called for global British community bonds across the colonies, Sun Yat Sen moved around global Chinese communities and planned to modernise the Chinese government.

During his grand tour from Hawaii via the United States to Europe, he was captured and kept in detention at the Chinese Legation at No. 40 Portland Place, London on 11 October, 1896. It was Cantlie and Manson, the father of tropical medicine, who made a great effort to save Sun, otherwise the father of the Chinese revolution would have been executed after repatriation. How he was arrested and saved from the Chinese legation was vividly recorded in his English-written book, Kidnapped in London (1897), which was published at the request of H. A. Giles, a sinologist and professor at Cambridge University and with the aid of an English-speaking friend, probably Cantlie 81. According to the book, the mastermind of the scheme was Sir Halliday Macartney, the Counsellor of the Chinese Legation 82 according to a Chinese worker, ‘the Minister is but a figure-head here, Macartney is the ruler’83. After Sun’s sudden disappearance and his suspicious letter asking for arrangements to send his luggage to the Chinese Legation, Manson and Cantlie directly visited the Legation to see Sun, but in vain. Then, they went to the Foreign Office and told the story to the newspaper reporters, and action followed immediately. On October 22, ahead of The Times, The Globe published a special edition concerning Sun’s detention and a long interview with Cantlie. The next day, 23 October, he was released from the back door of the legation because every morning newspaper had seized the topic and the building was beset by the police, journalists and curious onlookers84.

On 24 October, after the affair was over, The Times carried the news for the first time. It reported that Lord Salisbury had requested the Chinese minister to release the prisoner and Macartney stated that he was not Sun Yat Sen85. The editorial also sided with Sun and accused the Chinese Legation of violating the law86. Macartney’s plot was manifestly doomed to failure. Two days later, his letter dated 24 October from No. 49 Portland Place to The Times appeared;
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objecting to the one-sided attitude he confirmed that there was no inveiglement and detention whatever ‘the pundits of international law’ might have said. The effect was, however, opposite because his letter appeared between news reporting Cantlie’s concern about ‘Christian’ Sun’s health and Sun’s letter of appreciation dated 24 October from No. 46 Portland Place. Sun appreciated ‘the generous public spirit’ and ‘the love of justice’ in the British government and press, and then reiterated his determination to ‘pursue the cause of advancement, education, and civilization [sic] in my own well-beloved but oppressed country’87. T. E. Holland, one of ‘the pundits of international law’, also sent a letter to the editor and restated that ‘Sun Yat Sen, while on British soil as a subditus temporarius, was under the protection of our Laws, and his confinement in the Chinese Legation was a high offence against the rights of the British Crown’88. A part of these articles, some of which were undated, were reprinted in an appendix to Kidnapped in London (1897) and Macartney’s statement was also included possibly because the materials spoke for themselves.

This incident is noteworthy in terms of the twisted relations between colonial Britain and China. Through newspaper reporting and publication of his book Sun’s ‘delicate cast’, ‘very good English’89 and determination to civilise despotic China was favourably accepted and he became internationally acknowledged as a representative leader of the ‘China for the Chinese’ movement; as a matter of course Sun wisely avoided such a phrase associated with the exclusion of foreign intervention. In other words he was expected to act as a civilised agent of modernisation among the mass of faceless, stereotyped, heathen Chinese. On the other hand, Sir Halliday Macartney seemed to represent the sinister mandarin’s cloak-and-dagger behind the scenes of the imperial court in Peking. The confrontation was interestingly twisted; a battle between Oriental pen and Occidental sword and a generation clash between the leader of the Young China Party born in 1866 and the British mandarin born in 1833, three years younger than Charles H. Pearson. Macartney was related to Lord George Macartney, the first British ambassador to China in 1793, and his family history and background symbolised the history of British colonisation. After he had fought against the Taiping, he was employed as secretary and interpreter to the Chinese Legation
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which was founded in 1877\(^{90}\). Even if he had to follow his professional obligations, this abduction and detention made the impression of, borrowing Sun Yat Sen’s words, ‘Sir Halliday Macartney, that embodiment of retrograde orientalism’ \(^{91}\). Orientalised Macartney and Occidentalised Sun, therefore, signified that British colonial relations were not one-way but two-way; as the coloniser would be partly colonised, the colonised would not be a perfect copy. For instance, Sun was baptised by an American Congregationalist in the 1880s during his secondary school days \(^{92}\) but he carefully avoided reference to Christianity in his book and letter of appreciation expressing the determination to civilise the Chinese government. When he contributed his reminiscences to *The Strand Magazine* after he became President of the Republic of China in 1912, he appreciated his ‘father’s conversion to Christianity and his employment by the London Missionary Society’ due to accessibility to English language and medicine, but he did not mention his baptism\(^{93}\). On the other hand Cantlie intentionally or unintentionally called Sun a Christian in the news next to Sun’s letter on *The Times* in 1896.

His stay in London in 1896-7 and tour in North America gave Sun another opportunity to assimilate and appropriate the Western civilisation, Jeffersonian democracy and British liberalism, especially from the works of John Stuart Mill. American land reformer Henry George’s *Progress and Poverty* (1879) is most noteworthy. In discussions with Japanese friends, Sun Yat Sen was deeply impressed by his plan in which the tax on all the land would lower the rent and therefore fill the financial gap between the landowner and the farmer. This idea was developed into one of the three principles in Sun’s theory of revolution, ‘the principle of the people’s livelihood’\(^{94}\). Although Henry George in *Progress and Poverty* respected China, which ‘possessed a high degree of civilization . . . when our ancestors were wandering savages’\(^{95}\), he was one of the leading demagogues propagating Chinese immigration’s economic, hygienic and religious menace to American white labour. In his widely circulated article the ‘Chinese on the Pacific Coast’ (1869), George detailed the ‘vices of the East’: meanness, cruelty,
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abduction and assassination. He described how the Chinese had formed ‘a State within a State’ and their quarters were ‘fit breeding-places for pestilence’; they would or could not understand Christianity and ‘the Chinese among us’ would ‘remain the heathens’96. George harshly speared and alienated the Chinese ‘dragon’ who could be accommodated but not be assimilated whereas the black people were ‘docile’ accepting white American ways.

[Here were] dragon’s teeth enough for the sowing of our new soil----to germinate and bear ere long their bitter fruit of social disease, political weakness, agitation and bloodshed; to spring up armed men, marshaled [sic] for civil war. Shall we prohibit their sowing while there is yet time, or shall we wait till they are firmly imbedded, and then try to pluck them up?97

Allusion to Cadmus in the Greek myth seems to be more than rhetoric. Cadmus, founder of Thebes and introducer of the alphabet into Greece, sowed the slain dragon’s teeth and the armed soldiers sprang up from the earth to attack him. Then, he threw a precious stone among them and they scrambled for it and killed each other98. These two themes, creation’s revolt against the creator and the West’s competitive scramble for the jewel of the East, were repeated and recycled in the following discourses of the yellow peril.

Seeking an endorsement, Henry George sent a copy of his article to John Stuart Mill. Concerning the economic side of the Chinese problem, Mill agreed with Henry George but he made a distinction between moral and economy and suggested that once education prevailed, the Chinese would be ‘raised to the level of Americans’99. George, however, thought and stated that a Chinese was capable of learning to some extent but had ‘a limited point of development beyond which it was impossible for him to go’100. His underestimation of the Chinese brain and overestimation of the tenacity was summed up in the following lines from ‘Chinese on the Pacific Coast’ (1869).
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The Chinaman can live where stronger than he would starve. Give him fair play and this quality enables him to drive out the stronger races.\(^{101}\)

In this article, Henry George expressed the proto-idea of yellow-peril and repeated the similar argument in Lalor’s *Cyclopædia of Political Science* (1881-3). He assumed that the Chinese in America would remain Chinese just as ‘the Englishman in India’ would not become ‘a Hindoo’. According to George, the Chinese in America were not only inassimilable like yellow oil on white water, but also corrupting; ‘with that higher patriotism which regards the whole world as its country and all mankind as brethren’, he said, it would be obvious that Chinese immigration to the United States would bring about ‘the degradation of the superior civilization without any commensurate improvement of the lower’\(^{102}\).

This precursor of Pearson’s prediction, however, might have had little influence on British intellectual soil and neither did Pearson mention it. After opening up the self-sufficient China and incorporating cheap labour into the global market since the opium war, an Indian word ‘coolie’ was brought and coined in China\(^{103}\) and then American and Australian counteraction against Chinese or Indian ‘coolie’ had slowly made the British followers of liberalism and the Manchester school revise the principle. As far as his writings and the biographies on him are concerned, Sun Yat Sen seemed to be ignorant of the discussion on Chinese problems by his guides, George and Mill. Not because of ‘a limited point of development’, but because of his ignorance of Henry George as anti-Chinese immigration ideologue, Sun Yat Sen might be able to adopt and assimilate the idea of Henry George’s *Progress and Poverty*. The wave of a global market exchanging food, thought and coolies made George feel the sense of crisis against Chinese immigration and at the same time allowed Sun Yat Sen to pursue the way to prevent the break up and brawn drain of China. Although Asian American studies and Sun Yat Sen studies have not dealt with this convergence deeply, this relationship between Henry George and Sun Yat Sen seemed to be another example representing the complex and reciprocal nature of the ‘Western impact on China’.

Sun Yat Sen’s case was an example of an interesting Oriental offshoot from the
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gospel of Western civilisation. I would like to briefly touch on one of its orthodox disciples or apostles of medicine. Things had advanced more than Pearson had thought. The ‘secondary intelligence’ had left under the Western tutelage and attempted to win the rat race of the medical world, particularly in the field of bacteriology. Contrary to Pearson’s analysis, civilisation over the ‘lower races’ had brought about not only quantitative increase but also qualitative change. A breakthrough from natural history to germ theory seemed to be beyond Pearson’s imaginings or comprehension and the science, he lamented, had disintegrated into ‘an exhaustive inquiry into a single species of Scarabæus or Bakterion [sic]104’. The discovery of new bacillus, however, was important because its bacterial vaccine could be produced. Since Robert Koch launched into the unknown microbe world in the 1880s, a number of teams from the world had competed for new discoveries. It may be noted that all the major discoveries had been made by foreigners——German, French, even Japanese——not by British105. When Ernest Hart, editor of British Medical Journal and avid collector of Japanese art, visited India in 1894 to deliver an address to the Indian Medical Congress, he professed that the discovery of plague bacillus by Japanese was ‘a specially humiliating fact’106.

This microbe hunter was Shibasaburo Kitasato who had studied in Germany under Koch from 1885 to 1891107. In the aforementioned Quarterly Review108, his name was briefly referred to as one of the ‘noble workers’ of tropical pathology, just next to Manson. When the plague outbreak shook Hong Kong in 1894 after an absence of nearly two hundred years, Kitasato’s research team was sent from Japan and was followed by a French bacteriologist Alexandre Yersin of the Pasteur Institute. The race to discover the plague bacillus was now between the Kitasato team and Yersin with his collaborator Hamish [first name unknown]. Cantlie lent Yersin the immersion lens and Hamish’s wife worked busily ‘all day making soup for Hamish’s germs to grow on’109. With the lens, Yersin discovered the bacilli but Kitasato was the first, with the help of effective
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teamwork, slightly earlier than his rival. Cantlie entertained Kitasato’s research team to a ‘post game’ luncheon but Yersin did not turn up\textsuperscript{110}. Possibly in return for Cantlie’s fairness and kindness, Kitasato invited Mrs Cantlie and her friends during their stay in Tokyo to his laboratory and hospital in 1895 and gave her ‘a plague specimen’\textsuperscript{111}. This seems to us a personal and exceptional episode about a warm international interaction in the age of empire but it would also suggest, from a broader historical perspective, that the medical world had already and unavoidably acknowledged the Oriental newcomers, or at least their achievements. Even \textit{The New York Times}, with its strict and severe stance toward the ‘progress in Japan’, praised Kitasato’s discovery and said its application would eradicate the disease even if a ‘Chinese dwelling’, quoting Kitasato’s comment, was ‘a suitable hunting ground for the plague bacillus’\textsuperscript{112}. To put it cynically it was necessary to share the potential tools and weapons of civilisation due to the jungle law of the age, even if the civilised and supposedly Christianised Western communities stumbled before Japanese claims of full membership.

\textbf{Light from the Occident: Indian Alternatives to Christianity and Civilisation}

Whereas Pearson was ignorant or simply ignored the change of the tide, ‘Hindoo’, another ‘secondary intelligence’ had already emulated the British people. Among them were Dadabhai Naoroji, the first Indian Member of Parliament (1892-1895) at Westminster,\textsuperscript{113} Sir Phirozshah Merwanji Mehta, well-known lawyer in India after studying in England and Cornelia Sorabji who was the first woman to graduate from Bombay University and also the first woman to take a law degree at Oxford in 1893\textsuperscript{114}. They were more or less moderate reformists to British rule in India. However, a tiny wave of revolt was being created from the corner of the British Empire, Durban.

In 1896, a year after the outbreak of plague in Hong Kong, Bombay was infected with the same disease. It was uncertain whether ‘Kitasato’s Bacillus’ was imported from Hong Kong to Bombay but Oriental origin had been emphasised\textsuperscript{115}; \textit{The Times} speculated, ‘it has its endemic foci in China and the
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Euphrates Valley, just as cholera has an endemic focus in the Gangetic delta.\footnote{116}

In South Africa, British settlers had been scared of such a contagious contact with Asia, i.e. through Indian immigration. Following a similar logic to Henry George’s anti-Chinese coolie, it was rumoured that the arrival of Indian merchants would lower the wages and the menace was sensationally called an ‘Asiatic Invasion’. The Cape Times, according to The Times, declared that ‘if the Asiatic invasion is not stopped in time European shopkeepers must be driven to the wall.\footnote{117} The news of the plague outbreak in Bombay poured oil onto the flame.

Every ship from India was subjected to medical examination and, if necessary, quarantine. On 18 December 1896, the Courland and the Naderi arrived in Durban and the passengers on the two ships were not allowed to go ashore. The incubation period of the plague being twenty-three days, five days quarantine was ordered. Nevertheless, it was extended to over three weeks and a mob on shore opposed their landing. The ‘white men, strong in arms, in numbers, in education, and in wealth’, backed openly by the Natal Government, coerced the passengers to choose the carrot or the stick; ‘If you do not go back, you will surely be pushed into the sea. But if you consent to return, you may even get your passage money back’.\footnote{118} The real object was to reject a bearer of more contagious and dangerous thought, i.e. M. K. Gandhi who had widely revealed the miserable treatment of the Indian as ‘a creature without feelings’ in South Africa and boldly declared its contradiction with ‘the British traditions of justice, or morality, or Christianity’.\footnote{119} He had propagated these ideas in ‘Open Letter’ (1894) and The Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa (1896) or ‘Green Pamphlet’ because of its colour which attracted much attention and sold ten thousand copies.\footnote{120} Due to these activities, he was charged with involvement
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in ‘unmerited condemnation of the Natal whites’\textsuperscript{121}. In spite of the plot to split the passengers, Gandhi organised the meeting and made a speech on the civilisation of the West, which was, according to him, ‘predominantly based on force’ while the Eastern civilisation was based on the ‘principle of non-violence’\textsuperscript{122}. Taking advantage of the situation, Gandhi while still on board appealed against the inconsistency of the immigration policy to the press, \textit{The Natal Advertiser} on 13 January 1897; although they were British subjects, he answered the question about the cause of his protest, the Colony of Natal had imported ‘one class of Indians’ as indentured labours but Indian traders or artisans were not permitted to protect local ‘shopkeepers’\textsuperscript{123}. Furthermore, Gandhi confirmed that he had no desire to swamp or ‘blacken Natal’ with Indian immigration and with reference to Australian effort to exclude Asian immigration, declared that it would be ‘suicidal in the end’ to follow the ‘bad example’\textsuperscript{124}. After the quarantine lifted, he landed in the evening of the 13 January 1897 and was instantly chased and attacked by the angry mob with stones and rotten eggs\textsuperscript{125}.

Beginning in 1893, when Pearson published \textit{National Life and Character}, Gandhi went to South Africa and began to fight against ‘colour prejudice’ as an ‘unwelcome visitor’ or ‘coolie barrister’ who would not take off his turban in court and dared to claim the right to sit in the first class carriage challenging the conductor’s discrimination\textsuperscript{126}. His awakening from a British subject to find the way of \textit{satyagraha} or principle of passive resistance has become legendary. Nevertheless, as he was perfectly honest in his autobiography (1925) about his intellectual debt to Western thought, he was not a mere traditionalist but rather a fusion between West and East\textsuperscript{127}. As John M. MacKenzie also noted\textsuperscript{128}, Gandhi was profoundly inspired by Ruskin’s \textit{Unto this Last} (1860), a manifesto of medievalism against English industrialisation. In other words, Gandhi revived and reorganised Ruskin’s strategy against global industrialisation when he was in South Africa\textsuperscript{129}. More noteworthy is that Gandhi was indebted to Oriental
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studies aroused by or assisted by British colonial rule for turning the eyes back to his native tradition. In his *Orientalism* (1978) Edward Said criticised the aspect of Imperial agent in Oriental studies or even interest in the Orient among westerners 130. Revising these extreme ideas, Hobsbawm emphasised the double-edged effects of Oriental studies, which brought about, for instance, a prototype of a cultural relativism in religion. No matter what the object was, the rise of the close study of the Orient destabilised the alleged superiority of Christianity over, for example, Buddhism so seriously that a number of western people converted to forms of eastern spirituality or something which claimed to derive from the Orient, i.e. Theosophy 131. In 1875 Helena Petrovna Blavatsky from Russia and Henry Steel Olcott from America founded the Theosophical Society in America and attempted to achieve a knowledge of God by mystical experience and esoteric doctrine, sparking a world-wide movement following Hinduism and Buddhism and seeking universal brotherhood 132. Although Hobsbawm did not pursue the theme further, Theosophy was an inspirational factor leading to Gandhi’s rediscovering Indian spirituality 133. This Occidental inspiration during Gandhi’s stay in London has often been mentioned or investigated but not deeply studied in spite of its importance in far more awkward contents and reactions of Victorian Oriental studies 134.

Before relating the connection in detail, it should be reaffirmed that the tidal wave of modernisation from the west had been so dominant and coercive in the nineteenth century, that what we would prefer to call lifestyle or culture was also supposed to be indispensable for the civilisation even in the 1880s, the dawn of cultural relativism. Macaulay’s infamous speech in 1835, a representative example, had still ruled Indian people; according to his overconfident statement in spite of his ‘no knowledge of either Sanscrit [sic] or Arabic’, ‘all the historical
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information which has been collected from all the books written in the Sanscrit [sic] language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgments used at preparatory schools in England’ 135. This sense of superiority cast a dark shadow over Gandhi’s boyhood as well. During his high school days in India, he faced the dilemma between his religious Vishnuite commandment and meat-eating as a way to develop India. At the school his reformist friends encouraged meat-eating, which would empower and emancipate the Indian people from British rule. Gandhi stated how meat-eating was considered a solution for Indian modernisation and quoted a ‘doggerel of the Gujarati poet Narmad’ or Narmadashankar, which was popular among the schoolboys.

Behold the mighty Englishman  
He rules the Indian small,  
Because being a meat-eater  
He is five cubits tall136.

Then, Gandhi compromised himself by abstaining from meat-eating in his parents’ lifetime137. In spite of the prohibition of his caste and danger of being outcast138, this ambitious young man decided to study law in England, which he had idealised at the time as ‘the land of philosophers and poets, the very centre of civilization’139. After he left for London in 1888, he had considered when he should resume his food reform. However, when he had a glance at Bentham’s book during his stay in London, he complained, ‘These abstruse things are beyond me. I admit it is necessary to eat meat. But I cannot break my vow’140. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that he made a great effort to become an ‘English gentleman’ and acquire civilised ways such as elocution, French, and dancing141. In the aforesaid speech, Macaulay confirmed, ‘[l]ess than half the time which enables an English youth to read Herodotus and Sophocles ought to enable a Hindoo [sic] to read Hume and Milton’ and ‘We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom

we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect'¹⁴². Stephen Hay also quoted the passage and adequately concluded that ‘Gandhi almost fitted Macaulay’s model, but not quite’¹⁴³. This ‘Hindoo’ in London who abandoned Bentham was captured by Henry Stephens Salt’s *A Plea for Vegetarianism, and Other Essays* (1886). The book led to Gandhi’s first conversion, from a convinced meat-eater to an evangelist of vegetarianism. With the help of the book, Gandhi realised that what he had thought of as quaint and backward customs was principled and respectable practice of vegetarianism. He confessed that he had ‘become a vegetarian by choice’ and decided to spread the gospel all over the world¹⁴⁴. The tide was turning quickly because, as he acutely observed, ‘[a] convert’s enthusiasm for his new religion is greater than that of a person who is born in [sic] it’¹⁴⁵. He set up a local vegetarian club in Bayswater and invited an inhabitant, Sir Edwin Arnold, editor of *The Vegetarian*, to be president¹⁴⁶, according to Hay’s investigation, in 1891 after a long lecture tour in North America and Japan¹⁴⁷.

Another conversion from a would-be English gentleman to a Hindu traditionalist was Edwin Arnold’s translation of Hindu scripture *Bhagavad-Gita, The Song Celestial* (1885). Arnold, two years younger than Charles H. Pearson, represented the contradictory dual nature of Orientalism in the British Empire. While he was a staunch imperialist and conservative as the editor of the *Daily Telegraph*, he was also extremely fascinated by India and Japan so much that he became a ‘convert to a mild Buddhism’ and ‘one of the first prominent Englishmen to marry a Japanese’¹⁴⁸. His best-selling long poem in blank verse, *The Light of Asia* (1879), had appeared in thirty editions by 1885¹⁴⁹ and popularised the deeds and creeds of Prince Gautama, founder of Buddhism. His travelogues, *Japonica* (1891) and *Seas and Lands* (1891), following the same steps of French travel writer Pierre Loti’s *Madame Chrysanthème* (1887), propagated the myth of Japan as a picturesque and playful fairyland. Particularly, ‘The Musmee’ in *Japonica*, which means a young girl with

---

¹⁴⁹ Green, *Gandhi*, p.108.
connotations of mistress, was a hilarious tribute to a Japanese girl and introduced the word into the British language\textsuperscript{150}. Arnold described a girl in kimono with sleepy ‘brown-velvet eyes’, ‘rosy mouth’ and ‘a small brown face’; ‘The Musmee’s heart is slow to grief / And quick to pleasure, love, and song’, then he prayed ‘Heaven have her in its tender care!’\textsuperscript{151}. The similar rosy picture and prospect was repeated in his stay in America in 1889. Arnold admitted that conflict with the ‘almond-eyed folk’ and opium-smokers in San Francisco was inevitable because they were ‘a perpetual danger to its health and peace’, but he optimistically agreed with an American statistician’s calculation; in 1990 ‘an American people numbering 1,206,400,000, with 86,957,000 coloured persons’\textsuperscript{152}, the opposite forecast to Pearson’s although both of them were based on similar sources\textsuperscript{153}. Half in jest, Arnold termed the prediction as ‘spread-eaglism’ with a vengeance!’ but he was firmly confident that the synthesis of Buddhism, Christianity and Victorian Science should be the most supreme and spiritual marriage\textsuperscript{154}, like ‘the Union from Western to the Eastern Ocean’\textsuperscript{155}.

Although Gandhi had regularly read \textit{The Light of Asia} and \textit{The Song Celestial}, considering the latter the best version above all the translations of \textit{Bhagavad-Gita}\textsuperscript{156}, he was not attracted by Arnold’s visionary Orientalism across the Himalayas. Instead, following the two Theosophists, Bertram Keightley and Archibald Keightley, Gandhi was awakened to discover Hindu tradition and wisdom in \textit{Bhagavad-Gita} through Orientalist writings in the English language\textsuperscript{157}. As he shamefully confessed, however, he ‘had read the divine poem neither in Sanskrit nor in Gujarati’\textsuperscript{158}. Then the two Theosophist mentors introduced him to Madame Blavatsky, the founder of the Theosophical Society, and her best disciple Annie Besant. They tried to convert Gandhi, but he declined\textsuperscript{159}, although he joined as an associate member for a six month period from 26 March 1891 before he left London\textsuperscript{160} and he kept in close contact with theosophists even
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when he moved to South Africa\textsuperscript{161}. The books of the Theosophists did not proselytise Gandhi but emancipated him from Macaulay’s yoke and shadow. Blavatsky’s \textit{Key to Theosophy} (1889), he recalled, ‘stimulated in me the desire to read books on Hinduism, and disabused me of the notion fostered by the missionaries that Hinduism was rife with superstition’\textsuperscript{162}. Once he abandoned Bentham and attributed his inability to his non-meat-eating, Gandhi became an avid reader of philosophical and religious studies if only they were about India or Hinduism. German-born Orientalist Max Müller’s \textit{India: What Can It Teach Us?} (1883) and the translations of ancient Indian philosophy \textit{Upanishads} published by the Theosophical Society seemed to provide another guru for Gandhi\textsuperscript{163}. Reversing the progress of Max Müller who virtually established and propagated the study of comparative religion, Gandhi, via these books, reached proto-cultural relativism. As he recalled, he began to read books about other religions, such as Washington Irving’s \textit{Life of Mahomet and His Successors} (1850) and Friedrich Nietzsche’s \textit{Thus Spake Zarathustra} (1883-92)\textsuperscript{164}. The academic celebrity endorsement he acquired from these books armed him in the previously mentioned ‘Open Letter’ (1894) crying against British rule in South Africa. He crammed quotations and knowledge into half of the letter. At the beginning he validated the letter with a quotation from \textit{The Song Celestial} by Edwin Arnold. In the second part, quoting the theory of Indo-European family of speech from William Wilson Hunter’s \textit{The Indian Empire} (1882), he emphasised that Britain and India had the same religious and linguistic origin\textsuperscript{165}. He asked not only, ‘Am I Not a Man and a Brother?’ to the British people, going beyond merely claiming racial equity in arguing the superiority of Indian philosophy. Gandhi quoted the long passage from Max Müller as if he now denied Macaulay-like contempt and disdain toward Sanskrit writings.

If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant----I should point to India; and if I were to ask myself from what literature we here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the
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thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human----a life not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life----again I should point to India\textsuperscript{166}.

Gandhi and the annotator of his works did not indicate the reference, but the above is from Max Müller’s \textit{India: What Can It Teach Us?} (1883)\textsuperscript{167}, one of the books he had read with the guide of the Theosophists. Then, Gandhi detailed the panegyrics to Hinduism or Sanskrit philosophy from various celebrities; Thomas Munro (Governor of Madras), Henry James Sumner Maine (jurist and historian), French Victor Hugo, German Schopenhauer and even Scottish-American Andrew Carnegie. Interestingly, Gandhi’s next influential political writing, the so-called ‘Green Pamphlet’ (1896) has no such mishmash of Orientalism or European romantic idealisation of India as its endorsements. This process seems to be an interesting by-product of European Orientalism. It would suggest that these Orientalist studies might have facilitated colonialism but on the other hand they had also helped to destroy the British Empire. Once these lights from the Occident inspired and encouraged Gandhi to evaluate and estimate Hinduism to achieve self-confidence and self-rule, he did not need any more endorsement. Nevertheless, after he realised what was the \textit{satyagraha} or ‘Truth’ nearly thirty years later, he confessed in his autobiography (1925) how he was ignorant of Hinduism and how he was converted to the ‘Truth’ via British thought and movements such as Theosophy.

His relations with another Theosophist, Annie Besant, would give a clue to his narrative of conversion or confession. This next leader after Blavatsky’s death in 1891 was more interrelated and intertwined with Gandhi. Besant, born to parents of Irish origin, had proceeded a long winding way, via socialism, Irish nationalism and atheism, to Theosophy, which she thought of as the final and fateful cause for her, after falling in love with and being rejected by George Bernard Shaw\textsuperscript{168}. As a campaigner for Indian Home Rule, this ex-Irish nationalist assumed the presidency of the Theosophical Society and after World War I she presided over India’s National Congress where she feared Gandhi’s
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radical and revolutionary movement. Gandhi did not mention his political differences with her, but appreciated her influence. Gandhi had attended her lecture *Why I Became a Theosophist* (1889) and subsequently read the lecture pamphlet dealing with the conversion to Theosophy and her ‘search for Truth’. This turning from atheism to theism, Gandhi recalled, ‘strengthened my aversion to atheism’. As Stephen Hay suggested, Besant’s ‘search for Truth’ and her usage of the word as a synonym for Supreme Being was nearly repeated by Gandhi, particularly in the title and content of his autobiography *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Gauri Viswanathan’s study of converts, especially the case of Besant, can be comparable to Gandhi’s appreciation and appropriation of Theosophy. She demonstrated that in spite of its assimilative proselytising nuance of Christianisation, conversion to the alternatives could be a wilful opposition to British rule and civilisation. Though she did not deal with Gandhi’s case, Theosophy might be one of the most important inspirations in his stay in London so that he could reverse and apply the narrative of conversion to Hinduism.


‘Servile Parody’ of Civilisation and Christianity?

The case of Sun Yat Sen from Hong Kong and Gandhi from India was a personal but representative example indicating the Oriental appropriation of British colonisation in the late nineteenth century. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, as Charles Dilke proudly indicated in his *Greater Britain* (1868), British colonial policy had successfully produced a number of loyal subjects, more or less variants of ‘Indian in blood and colour’ but ‘English in taste,

170 With information from Stephen Hay, Hunt suggested that Gandhi might have been recorded in an article reporting Besant’s lecture. *Lucifer* (August 15, 1889), the Theosophist weekly, said that ‘the Hindu gentlemen who were present, conspicuous by their quiet mien, nodded their frequent approval in silent but significant manner.’ See, Hunt, *Gandhi in London*, p.31, n.55.
in opinions’ following Macaulay’s minute (1835). In the late nineteenth century, however, the supposedly self-evident superiority of Christianity and civilisation was critically challenged in the British Empire. As Pearson bitterly observed, mammonism spread as a by-product of over-civilisation while Christianity was nearly dethroned by the alternatives or atheism. Pearson’s warning against the growth of the ‘lower races’ in Greater Britain was based on the same anxiety against growing mass materialism in British society. As we have seen in the cases of Sun Yat Sen and Gandhi, civilisation and Christianity were appropriately transferred and transformed by the ‘secondary intelligence’, which certainly destabilised the West but very differently, as Pearson predicted.

This transformation conjured the spectre of anarchy in the old guard, who feared losing their privileged status, which others struggled to reorganise or revolutionise the hierarchy concerning race, gender, class and religion. Analysing these movements pro and con the restructuring process, C. A. Bayly developed Hobsbawm’s perspective in his *Age of Empire* and demonstrated the mutually interactive formation process of the global economy, and religious and secular international organisations. Today’s ‘world religions’ were, according to him, molded after this globalisation. Inspired by or borrowed from the proselytisation of Christian missionaries, the local religions fashioned themselves into ‘Imperial religions’ and propagated the creeds with the help of global transportation and communication systems174; e.g. the birth of Pan-Islamism or Young Men’s Buddhist Associations175. The Theosophical movement, although Bayly spent few pages on it, would precisely fit into his framework.

Pearson did not mention Theosophy and its reappraisal of Buddhism but bitterly criticised ‘the most noticeable form of anti-Christian worship’ as ‘a servile parody of Catholicism’176. Since the sixteenth century, Buddhism had been repugnant to most Europeans, particularly the Jesuits, because its practices appeared to be bizarre parodies of Catholic rites177. In the nineteenth century, however, the theology of Buddhism and Indian philosophy such as Nirvana was highly re-evaluated by the Orientalists including Rhys Davids and Max Müller178. For instance, when Pearson affirmed that the ‘Hindoo’ had ‘added nothing
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permanent to out stock of ideas"\textsuperscript{179}, T. H. Huxley attempted to interpret Nirvana, Karma, Atman and transmigration from the viewpoint of the ethics of evolution, based on Rhys Davids's \textit{Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion: as Illustrated by Some Points in the History of Indian Buddhism} (1881) and \textit{Buddhism} (1890)\textsuperscript{180}. Thereafter he concluded that 'not only we, but all things, in the worlds without end of the cosmic phantasmagoria, [we]re such stuff as dreams are made of'\textsuperscript{181}. It is highly suggestive that Huxley’s lecture coincided with the World’s Parliament of Religions at Chicago in 1893 because this passage alluded to the line in Shakespeare’s \textit{Tempest} (1611), which Prospero says before he is going to relinquish his magic and his island kingdom. Borrowing Greenblatt’s interpretation of \textit{The Tempest} as a story of British imperialism\textsuperscript{182}, the World’s Parliament of Religions presented one of the best opportunities for Prospero’s monster-like slave Caliban and other brothers who sought to praise their gods (or Setebos in case of \textit{The Tempest}) and claim their right in their acquired language, English; i.e. ‘This island’s mine, by Sycorax my mother, which thou tak’st from me’\textsuperscript{183}. Interestingly these self-assured speakers were closely related to the Theosophical movement, which was frequently criticised due to its selective exploitation of the Orientalists’ academic work but largely contributed to the propagation and reassessment of Buddhism even among the Orientals. In this section I would like to argue how the Theosophical movement was appropriated by the Orientals before and after World’s Parliament of Religions based on the historical context of Britain.

\textbf{Warfare of Theosophy in America, Ceylon and Japan}

The founder of the Theosophical Society, Olcott, was antagonistic to Christianity and attracted by spiritualism which was in vogue around the mid-nineteenth century in America. The rise of spiritualism in America and
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Britain was closely related to the decline of Christianity and the overt conflict between creed and science; therefore this demand for communication with the nether world occasionally using scientific tools might be an ideal solution for the conflict between old beliefs and new sciences\textsuperscript{184}. This conflict was a major concern at the time. Scientific developments spurred the trend as well. John William Draper of New York University, who was born in England and educated in London, attended and spoke at the legendary meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Oxford in 1860, when Huxley declared victory over Wilberforce concerning Darwin’s idea of evolution\textsuperscript{185}. In 1875, Draper published the classic study, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1875) in which he demonstrated that science progressed and triumphed over, in this case, Catholicism. Coincidentally another classic was issued by Andrew Dickson White of Cornell University; i.e. *The Warfare of Science* (1875). White revised and enlarged the book into two massive volumes: *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896) in which White slightly modified Draper’s story of science’s triumphant victory over dogmatism. However oversimplified were both works from today’s study of the history of science, these monumental and ground-breaking works were so influential as to impress the historical conflict between science and Christianity\textsuperscript{186}. Although these two works did not deny Christianity itself and the spiritualist movement attempted to harmonise the contradictions, the disenchantment with Christianity and mistrust of its alternative solution still remained. The incompatibility between Christianity and science was exaggerated and appropriated, giving rise to the reappraisal of paganism; its distant echo could be heard in Kaw Hong Ben’s criticism of Christianity as unscientific and his revaluation of Chinese classics.

In 1874, Olcott had a fateful encounter with Blavatsky, a spirit medium who had allegedly made contact with ‘Mahatmas’ in Near East or Himalaya\textsuperscript{187}, which seemingly offered an escape route from this cul-de-sac. In the next year, they founded the Theosophical Society; they inspired and co-operated with each other. Dredging the academic studies and translations of the Orient from Max Müller’s


works to forged scriptures, Blavatsky put them in her melting pot. Her first major work *Isis Unveiled* (1877) of 1200 pages was a patchwork of ancient wisdoms, even including the following dubious legend in Mongol.

According to local tradition, the tomb of Ghengis [sic] Khan still exists near Lake Tabasun Nor [sic]. Within lies the Mongolian Alexander as though asleep. After three more centuries he will awake and lead his people to new victories and another harvest of glory. Though this prophetic tradition be received with ever so many grains of salt, we can affirm that the tomb itself is no fiction, nor has its amazing richness been exaggerated.\(^{188}\)

In contrast with her necromancer approach, Olcott was fascinated with Buddhist creeds. Conveniently for the Society, an anti-Christian movement and Buddhist revival had already spread over Ceylon since the 1860s. Seizing the opportunity, Olcott and Blavatsky moved to the island in 1880 and declared themselves Buddhists. Predictably, their Theosophical movement articulated, aroused and reinforced the Sinhalese Buddhism revival\(^{189}\). The well-known example was Anagarika Dharmapala, a leading figure of the international Buddhist revival and Sinhalese independent movement. He was five years older than Gandhi and named David after the biblical figure. In 1880 teenage David was impressed by Olcott’s speech and awakened as a Buddhist changing his name to Dharmapala, meaning roughly ‘homeless defender of the Buddhist Doctrine, Dharma’\(^{190}\). Unlike Gandhi, however, he began to keep a distance from his guru Olcott and Theosophy and criticised their Creole Buddhism at the beginning of the twentieth century\(^{191}\). Nonetheless it could not be ignored that Olcott played a significant role in adapting the Christian missionary approach to Ceylon: he published *Buddhist Catechism* (1881) and founded the Young Men’s Buddhist Association in Colombo in 1898\(^{192}\). His catechism was hugely influential; more than forty


editions issued, translated into over twenty languages, and still used today in Sri Lankan schools.

These activities of the Theosophical Society were also subject to criticism by experts. In 1893, Max Müller, from the viewpoints of religious studies, criticised the Theosophist’s imaginative forgery mixing up Buddhism and Hinduism. More debunking attacks were made by the Society for Psychical Research. In 1884, The Society sent a researcher Richard Hodgson to India to investigate the medium activity of Blavatsky. The Society published a report in which Hodgson accused her of wholesale fraud and he also suggested that she was a Russian spy stimulating Indian ‘disaffection towards British rule’. Coincidentally key persons of the Theosophical Society had their origins in overt or covert opposition to the British Empire; Blavatsky was German-Russian, Olcott was American and Besant was Irish. In 1910 Valentine Chirol, highly influential journalist of The Times and expert on the Orient, did not resort to a conspiracy theory but bitterly recalled how the rise of Hinduism was exacerbated by its contact with ‘sympathizers in Europe and America’. In a book based on his articles from The Times, Chirol reported a distorted interpretation of the classics like Kaw Hong Ben in Hindu revivalists, who claimed ‘to have discovered in the Vedas the germs of all the discoveries of modern science, even to wireless telegraphy and aeroplanes’. Intentionally or not Chirol ignored T. H. Huxley’s well-known Evolution and Ethics (The Romanes Lecture, 1893) in which this representative intellect in Britain compared heredity to transmigration. Then Chirol’s concern over the movement was prompted by Orientalist works by Max Müller and the Theosophists.

The advent of the theosophists, heralded by Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, gave a fresh impetus to the revival, and certainly no Hindu has done so much to organize and consolidate the movement as Mrs. Annie Besant, who, in her Central Hindu College at Benares and her Theosophical...
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Institution at Adyar, near Madras, has openly proclaimed her faith in the superiority of the whole Hindu system to the vaunted civilization of the West. Is it surprising that Hindus should turn their backs upon our civilization when a European of highly-trained intellectual power and with an extraordinary gift of eloquence comes and tells them that it is they who possess and have from all times possessed the key to supreme wisdom; that their gods, their philosophy, their morality are on a higher plane of thought than the West has ever reached?199

Chirol overestimated the foreign origins of the Hindu or Buddhist revival and underestimated their indigenous motivation against British rule. Certainly the reappraisal of heathenism appeared for him to be fanaticism or caricature at best, but that was a necessary process to exorcise Macaulay’s shadow and emulate the colonisers psychologically just as in Gandhi’s ‘Open Letter’ (1894).

The wave of the Buddhist revival in Ceylon Island, stimulated by Olcott, had reached another island off the Yellow Sea, Japan. Since its opening to the West in 1868 the Japanese government had smoothly undertaken a programme of westernisation, but the counteraction had spread in the 1880s, as the rise of nationalism and a negative campaign against Christianity. The Times reported that Japanese Buddhists had expounded the doctrine powerfully and eventually commenced the publication of a missionary magazine written in English, The Bijou of Asia encouraging Buddhism instead of ‘the moribund creed of the West’200. The Bijou of Asia, published in Kyoto, was short-lived from July 1888 to July 1889, but the editor’s first article ‘What We Mean’ repeated the familiar criticism against Christianity, incompatibility with science and disablement against materialism; ‘the rude explanations of the human nature, and of his origin and destiny, must fail to satisfy the developed intellect’201. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Olcott’s Buddhist Catechism (1881) had been welcomed and appropriated so much that his lecture tour was planned and the committee was organised under the chairmanship of a lay Buddhist Kinza Hirai202. On 9 February 1889, two days before the promulgation of the constitution, Olcott arrived in Kobe port with Dharmapala203. The Times reported that Olcott urged
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the audience, like Kaw Hong Ben’s address to the medical students in Hong Kong in 1890, ‘not to prostrate themselves before the shrine of foreign civilization’ and to preserve the creeds of Buddhism which were superior to Christianity because ‘[l]iving in an atmosphere of disregard, if not contempt, for their old traditions and customs, taught to value only foreign systems and philosophies, the Indian spirit of patriotism and independence had been numbed’\textsuperscript{204}. In Olcott’s view, the mission was accomplished. His 76 lectures had an average attendance of 2500 and he conjectures ‘I could very soon build up an International Buddhistic League that might send the Dharma like a tidal wave around the world’\textsuperscript{205}. Nonetheless Olcott’s lecture tour had less significant impact on Japanese people than on the Sinhalese people. The main reason was the language barrier; the majority of the audience understood no English and depended on the Japanese translation. Additionally, the address encouraged and revived pride in the Buddhists but the theological argument was far less sophisticated for the Buddhists of different sects\textsuperscript{206}. Olcott contrasted the Japanese with ‘the natives of India, who seemed to have lost the sentiment of nationality’\textsuperscript{207}, while nationalism had been strongly and solidly forged in Japan as a basis of their pride.

The process was vividly recorded by Lafcadio Hearn, Irish-Greek writer, who moved to Japan in 1890 and worked there as an English teacher. On his first day of Japan, he visited a temple in Yokohama where a young attendant asked about ‘Buddhists in England and America’, to his great surprise, in excellent English and showed to him ‘an English copy of Olcott’s ‘Buddhist Catechism’ if he was interested in Buddhism\textsuperscript{208}. Impressed by ‘a voluminous theology, a profound philosophy’ in Buddhism, Hearn, however, realised that Shintoism was ‘the soul of Japan’\textsuperscript{209}; ‘ancestor-worship combined with nature-worship’\textsuperscript{210}. Shintoism, in Hearn’s observation, ‘has no philosophy, no code of ethics, no metaphysics’ but for this very reason, it could ‘resist the invasion of Occidental
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religious thought as no other Orient faith’ could. Hearn catalogued its character as ‘the spirit of filial piety, the zest of duty, the readiness to surrender life for a principle without a thought of wherefore’ and then considered them as nearly a racial instinct.

Emperor worship, then, was combined with Shintoism. The issuance of the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890 was an attempt to institutionalise what Hearn called an instinct. He also recorded how the Governor reverentially respected and lifted ‘Imperial Words on Education’ to his forehead and ceremoniously read them at the school meeting. After this proclamation, bowing or saluting the Emperor’s picture at schools or public offices was widespread but it caused serious trouble among foreign or Japanese Christians.

The practice of emperor worship was a theological stumbling block for Christians and this was a provocative litmus test because the salute, although Basil Hall Chamberlain, authority of Japanology, laughed it away just as a custom, was considered as idolatry. In 1891, for instance, Kanzo Uchimura, one of the closest Christian friends of Inazo Nitobe, author of Bushido, refused to bow low enough upon the reading of the Rescript at the First High School of Tokyo even though he did not expect that he would be forced to resign from his teaching position. Lafcadio Hearn, then working as an English teacher for a Japanese Middle School, said sardonically that ‘some students, under missionary instigation’, refused ‘this simple tribute of loyalty and gratitude’ on the ground that they were Christians, and thus got themselves ‘ostracized by their comrades’. He saw you [Hearn] bow before our Emperor’s picture at the ceremony on the birthday of His Majesty. You are not like a former English teacher we had’. ‘How?’ ‘He said we were savages’. ‘Why?’ ‘He said there is nothing respectable except God----his God----and that only
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vulgar and ignorant people respect anything else’.
‘Where did he come from?’
‘He was a Christian clergyman, and said he was an English subject’.
‘But if he was an English subject, he was bound to respect Her Majesty the Queen. He could not even enter the office of a British consul without removing his hat’217.

Hearn, then, admired Japanese youth’s devotion to their Emperor and predicted that Japan should have a rosy and promising future.

Nonetheless Hearn doubted that this ultra-stoicism and nationalism was compatible with costly and copious food for thoughts; which were ‘created by beefsteak and mutton-chops, by ham and eggs, by pork and puddings, and were stimulated by generous wines, strong ales, and strong coffee’218. Just as Gandhi gave up trying to understand Bentham’s work due to his non-meat-eating custom, Hearn was concerned if his students could digest and assimilate the rich and substantial Western civilisation on a diet of ‘boiled rice and bean-curd’ which ‘no English boy could live on’219. Although it was viewed from the opposite perspective of Henry George and Pearson, Hearn also had held the similar idea that invaluable Occidental civilisation could not be attained nor refined by Oriental cheap labour despite their spiritual or religious sophistication.

Certainly the medical community had already acknowledged the Oriental contribution exemplified by the case of Kitasato, but the major strategy of Orientals to revive their pride at the end of the nineteenth century was to emphasise the spiritual superiority of their religious heritage even if the interpretation was distorted and the approach was inspired or appropriated by Western oriental studies, whether they be academic or dubious ones like Theosophy. Taking these contexts into consideration, Pearson’s reluctant appeal to British patriotism might have appeared to be desperate at times. While Pearson called for racial, not religious, community bonding beyond the British islands, national or international community movement based on the alternatives to Christianity was widely spread across the British Empire. A review of Pearson’s National Life and Character dared to articulate what the author suggested; ‘it [wa]s not to be expected that our ideals of morals and religion will triumph among the black and yellow masters of the globe. Those ideals [we]re

218 Hearn, ‘From the Diary of a Teacher’, p.129.
losing their hold even upon civilisation'\textsuperscript{220}. Coincidentally, eight months after Pearson acrimoniously forecasted that the Western Aryan nations would have to treat the coloured races as a guest at ‘international conferences’ in the not so distant future, the best platform was organised for the spiritual revival in the Orient, whether inspired by Theosophy or not. That was the World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago in September 1893, where heathen religious leaders were assembled to expound their creeds to the Christian. This congress was in America where Pearson first realised the limit to white men’s acclimatisation\textsuperscript{221}. Predictably, Pearson’s view of the United States was ambivalent; he considered that the land was merely ‘subject to insurgent negroes’\textsuperscript{222} although he seemed to anticipate its potential power as an heir of the British Empire; he said, the ‘reputation which the Englishman of Great Britain enjoyed ha[d] now been in great measure transferred to the Anglo-American’\textsuperscript{223}. Partly because the similar ambivalent attitude to America was commonly shared, the conference was on the whole ignored by British people. Later, with hindsight, they would find the symbolic meaning of these turning points in the late nineteenth century.

\textbf{How ‘I’ Became a Heathen: the 1893 World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago}

In September 1893, as a part of Chicago’s Columbian Fair, the World’s Parliament of Religions was held with a number of picturesquely attired religious leaders of the world, such as Christians, Buddhists, Muslims and Theosophists. In a sense, as the titles of studies of the parliament suggest, it might be regarded as a ‘Museum of Faiths’\textsuperscript{224} or a ‘Dawn of Religious Pluralism’\textsuperscript{225}. Apparently, the congress seemed to be a religious version of the Chicago World Exposition, a hierarchical exhibition of non-Christian and non-Europeans, commemorating the 400th anniversary of the ‘discovery’ of America, from the viewpoint of Imperialism and Social Darwinism\textsuperscript{226}. As the name of Columbus suggested the
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triumph of Western civilisation in the world, the Columbian fair exhibited a triumph of Western Imperialism and anthropology. Anthropologists propagated and illustrated the new term anthropology to the general public by an exhibition in ‘the Anthropological Building’. They also participated in the layout of the national buildings, particularly the centre of the fair called the ‘Midway Pleasance’, along which the visitor would see the passage from a Dahomey village and its inhabitants transported through ‘darkest Africa’, a Moorish castle, semi-civilised Oriental nations, and Western powers. It presented a pedagogical and panoptic view from ‘least civilized’ to ‘most civilized’. Certainly, some of the Oriental countries such as China and Japan were not transferred as living ethnological specimens by the colonisers, but they represented themselves based on their own nascent national consciousness. The Japanese Buddhist monks unintentionally revealed the ambiguous hybrid position of the ‘semi-civilized’ nation. In Midway, they enjoyed the flamboyant fair as tourists, but at the same time they also became a tourist attraction in the eyes of curious Western visitors.

The World’s Parliament of Religions reflected this hybridity and ambiguity of the semi-civilised country. The Congress supposedly sought a harmony between religions based on mutual respect and understanding but the same Western ethnocentric hierarchy of the Exposition was hidden underneath. Nevertheless, contrary to the paternal and patronising intention of the organiser, John Henry Barrows, head of the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago, the Parliament involved the propagation of the differences of the Orient, mainly demonstrated by Japanese Buddhists. The presentation emphasised the spiritual and monolithic side of the Orient against the Occident. In an inspiring paper on the Parliament, James Edward Ketelaar named this conscious appropriation of Orientalism as ‘Strategic Occidentalism’. This was a perfect opportunity for each isolated appropriation of Orientalism, turning the tables on Occidental exotic interest in Buddhism, opposing Occidental mammonism compared to Oriental spiritualism.

However the tone of the general argument by the Oriental gurus was moderate. Accommodating themselves to the intention of the organiser and the audience, they were not able to criticise the other religions and therefore tended to emphasise the similarities instead of the differences and harmonious community

---


instead of survival of the fittest. As a representative of Theosophy, William Q. Judge’s paper was included in the Congress book but he briefly referred to Annie Besant as a matter of course, and did not propagate the united Buddhist brotherhood against Christianity\textsuperscript{229}. As Olcott was deeply moved by the attendances of Judge and Besant\textsuperscript{230}, participation in the pantheon was what really counted. Dharmapala, whom Olcott brought on his lecture tour around Japan, was also invited as a delegate of South Asian Buddhism. Dharmapala made a short and perfunctory criticism of the method of Christian missionaries and urged them to send more ‘tolerant’ and ‘unselfish’ persons\textsuperscript{231}, but one of the titles of his papers told everything; ‘Points of Resemblance and Difference between Buddhism and Christianity’. As a matter of course, emphasis was put on the resemblance. Unsurprisingly, in his two papers, Dharmapala, like Gandhi in his ‘Open Letter’ a year later, began his argument with quotations from the same authorities: Edwin Arnold, Max Müller and William Wilson Hunter, author of \textit{The Indian Empire} (1882)\textsuperscript{232}. More important for the audience was his theatrics. His exotic and saint-like atmosphere was lionised in the press and most of the articles gave most space to his attire rather than the content of his paper\textsuperscript{233}. The most famous and acclaimed figure from the Orient was Swami Vivekananda, born in 1863, six years before Gandhi. He was perfectly representing what the audiences and the organiser had expected from the Oriental gurus in terms of appearance and message. This disciple of Ramakrishna was photogenic and eloquent, and invited as ‘official representative’ of the ‘Hindoo[sic] religion’\textsuperscript{234}. When Vivekananda opened his speech with the few words, ‘Brothers and Sisters of America’, it caused four minutes of applause and cheering. It suggested that expression of brotherhood, not information on ‘Hinduism’\textsuperscript{235}, was what the audience really wanted to hear\textsuperscript{236}. In fact after his
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successful performances at the Congress, he had a lecture in London and New York (1895 and 1896) and the title was not Hinduism but ‘The Ideal of Universal Religion’ in which he appealed for the universal divine brotherhood beyond sectarianism. His popularity could be easily explained by the fact that his lecture tour was exactly coeval with ‘cooie barrister’ Gandhi’s struggle over dignity as a British subject in South Africa. Despite Vivekananda’s good intentions and the audience’s zeal, his Oriental attire in a turban would not have been allowed as a court lawyer in South Africa. Although Vivekananda criticised, in a discussion, the Christian indifference to the sufferings of famine in India, his emphasis on spiritual equity and brotherhood was more widely noticed possibly because it might have sugar-coated the material iniquity and discrimination.

On the other hand, Japanese Buddhists regarded the invitation as a direct challenge by Christianity within the international Ecumenical-Council-like arena of religious debate. The Japanese Buddhist, Kinza Hirai, would be an extreme example. Hirai, one of the organisers of Olcott’s lecture tour in Japan, contrasted Western imperialism with Japan’s harmonious syncretism. His paper, entitled ‘The Real Position of Japan toward Christianity,’ was at first rejected by the organiser Barrows, due to its too harsh criticism against ‘false Christianity,’ according to Hirai. Blaming the Western countries on the basis that they ‘misunderstood’ and ‘misrepresented’ Japan, Hirai emphasised that the Japanese had tolerantly accepted all religions with entire harmony from the beginning of history. He further suggested that this syncretism, ‘Japanism’ he called it, would be a prototype of the ideal of the Congress in another paper at the Congress. But he indicated the dissimilarity of Christianity as a minion of imperialism, taking an example of the Christian mission in Japan. His main
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points can be summarised as inconsistency between the deeds and words of so-called Christendom. Hirai’s strategy was to attack the contradiction between colonisation and Christian philanthropy in order to revise Japan’s unequal treaties with the West. Though they preached the equality of human beings, they imposed unequal treaties on Japan and discriminated against Japanese in America like ‘dog[s]’; he went so far as to quote several anti-Japanese immigration slogans such as ‘Japs must go’ or ‘No Japanese is allowed to enter here’. Making accusations of hypocrisy and distinguishing Christianity from ‘false Christianity’, he said, ‘we are perfectly satisfied to be heathen’. Contrary to Hirai’s expectation, ‘the thousands of Christians’ ‘rose again to their feet and gave him three mighty cheers’. His speech can be interpreted as a reverse of the conversion of paganism to Christianity at the mission show, possibly inspired by the theosophy movement. As a matter of fact, the central concepts of Buddhism at the Chicago congress presentations were translated into theosophical terms. This theosophical connection, as seen above in the case of Gandhi, also implies that the theosophy movement and Buddhism cult as an alternative Christianity inspired Hirai’s severe condemnation of Western civilisation and reassessment of synthetic or spiritual Buddhism. This appropriation was followed even by Japanese Christians in the tidal wave of nationalism and emperor-worship which Lafcadio Hearn described. Many Japanese Christian intellectuals struggled to make Christianity compatible with Japanese society and claimed authenticity of Japanised Christianity by criticising the hypocrisy of Western Christianity. For instance, the Rev. Hiromichi Kozaki, who had attended the World’s Parliament of Religions in 1893 as a Japanese Christian, later said that ‘Japan is the place where the world-problem of Christianity is . . . being gradually solved’ due to its syncretism beyond sectarian strife.

Hirai’s performance and harsh criticism against ‘false Christianity’ and anti-Oriental immigration in America could be compared with the activities of Wong Chin Foo, who was the earliest Chinese activist for Chinese civil rights, and
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allegedly the first to use the term ‘Chinese American’\textsuperscript{250}. Recently he has been reappraised as an example indicating that Chinese people in America were not mere voiceless victims but his relation with Theosophy has remained unexamined. It is not certain when Wong came to know of Theosophy, or what connection existed between him and Madame Blavatsky, but at least in May 1877, Blavatsky seemed to have met Wong in New York. She noted in an article dated 5 May 1877 on \textit{The New York World} that ‘Of Wong Chin Foo’s merits or shortcomings I know nothing, except that since his arrival his conversation and behaviour have impressed, very favourably’\textsuperscript{254}. In her above-quoted work, \textit{Isis Unveiled} (1877) she also mentioned ‘Wong-Chin-Fu, the Chinese orator’\textsuperscript{252} and quoted a conversation with him about Nirvana; ‘This condition’, he said, ‘we all understand to mean a final reunion [sic] with God, coïncident [sic] with the perfection of the human spirit by its ultimate disembarrassment of matter. It is the very opposite of personal annihilation’\textsuperscript{253} and ‘[i]t is the missionaries in China and India, who first started this falsehood about Niepang [sic], or Niepana (Nirvana) [sic]’\textsuperscript{254}. As a matter of course, Blavatsky used his name as her authority on Buddhism, but Wong’s words suggested that it should be ‘we’ Orientals who were, to borrow from Said’s \textit{Orientalism}, ‘dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient’\textsuperscript{255}. The forerunner of Hirai’s presentation was found in Wong Chin Foo’s paper on \textit{The North American Review}. Triggered by ‘Why am I a Unitarian?’ in 1886, each sect’s declaration of belief followed almost every month such as ‘Why am I a Methodist?’ and ‘Why Am I a Baptist?’. In 1887, Wong Chin Foo
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contributed an article entitled ‘Why am I a Heathen?’ as the first non-Christian in this why-am-I-series. He did not mention Theosophy but his attack on Western materialism from the standpoint of the Chinese civil rights movement had common points with the later conversion narrative of Gandhi. Deriding the sectionalism of Christianity alluding to a number of why am I’ belonging to this sect, he praised Chinese culture and society for being free of serious sectionalism. On the other hand, he criticised Western mammonism and the opium trade imposed on ‘the points of Christian bayonets’. Reasonably Wong attacked the inconsistency between the deeds of Christians in America and words in The Bible, criticising Irish-American Denis Kearney’s agitation ‘Chinese must go!’ What was necessary, he suggested, was fraternity, not patronizing charity, stopping short of saying ‘there, dog, take your crust and be thankful!’ He then narrated the Chinese supreme sentiment to God, taking a strategy to forge a counterpart to Christianity or simply appropriating the theosophical way of worshipping God and synthesising the hotchpotch of gods, because this kind of monotheism most likely did not derive from Chinese thought. Explaining why he remained a heathen, he concluded his article with the words, ‘I earnestly invite the Christians of America to come to Confucius’.

There is no document to demonstrate the connection between Wong Chin Foo and Kinza Hirai or other Chinese activists including Kaw Hong Ben or Sun Yat Sen. Despite differences in approach and style, there are striking parallels and synchronicity, from South Africa to America, in their abandonment of their original Christina conversion narrative in the context of harsh racial discrimination. Finally, I will point out the similarities of the appropriation, an attack on the hypocrisy of Christianity and racial discrimination with How I became a Christian: Out of My Diary (1895), written in English by Kanzo Uchimura, who had resigned his profession, although he was one of the patriotic Japanese Christian representatives, due to his denial to bow low at a ceremony of the Imperial Rescript in 1891. His How I became a Christian was based on the diary during his stay in America from 1884 to 1888. As Gandhi had idealised
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England as ‘the land of philosophers and poets, the very centre of civilization’\textsuperscript{263}, this ‘Heathen Convert’ named ‘Jonathan’ and baptised in 1878, pictured America as ‘a Holy Land’\textsuperscript{264}. Until he graduated from Amherst College in 1887, however, the Promised Land had turned out to be ‘a land of mammon-worship and race-distinction’\textsuperscript{265}. In his confession of conversion to Christianity, he narrated how he was severely discriminated against and how this racial prejudice was closely connected with the anti-Chinese exclusion act from 1882. Uchimura thought that Chinese immigration was unreasonably exaggerated as an economical, biological, religious menace, as Henry George had sensationally instigated in 1869. He denied the vulgar belief that ‘The Chinese by their low wages do injury to the American laborer’\textsuperscript{266}. He also sympathised with ‘a poor pox-stricken Chinaman who [wa]s dungeoned by the San Francisco quarantine in a manner as if he had upset then imperial thrones’\textsuperscript{267}. Uchimura wrote angrily, \begin{quote}
If we had done to American or English citizens in our land half as much indignities as are done to the helpless Chinese in America, we would soon be visited with fleets of gunboats, and in the name of justice and humanity, would be compelled to pay $50,000 per capita for the lives of those worthless loafers, whose only worth as human beings consists in their having blue eyes and white skins and in nothing more\textsuperscript{268}.
\end{quote}

He also criticised the mission show in which converted heathens told how they were awoken from ignorance and became Christian merely ‘in fifteen minutes’ on the grounds that they were exhibited as mere ‘living illustration’ or ‘some wieldy specimens from the Indian jungles’ such as ‘tamed rhinoceroses’\textsuperscript{269} in the circus. After his return from the Holy Land, he thought that there was no place like home:

\begin{quote}
I rather reckoned my heathen relationship a special privilege of my own, and thanked God once and again for having brought me out into this world as a
\end{quote}
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‘heathen,’ and not as a Christian\textsuperscript{270}.

He then realised that his aim was to unite the heathen Japanese spirit and Christianity. This argument was very similar to the Rev. Kozaki’s optimism; Japan would be the Promised Land giving a solution for Christian sectarianism and racial discrimination. Critical of Christian missionary and Japanese Christians as he was, Hearn, possibly alluding to these so-called ‘real’ Christians like Uchimura, derisively wrote that some of the Japanese Christians had ‘openly expressed their desire to dispense altogether with the presence of foreign proselytizers, and to create a new and peculiar Christianity, to be essentially Japanese and essentially national in spirit’\textsuperscript{271}. Taking a favourable viewpoint, this Creole Christianity might be one of the other religious swaraj movements; the spiritual and sometimes political struggles to achieve independence from patronising tutelage.

**Oriental Dilemma between Silence and Eloquence**

As seen above, Orientals, isolated and discriminated against, struggled to revive their pride from the 1880s onwards. With or without the help of Theosophy or Oriental studies, religious traditions were reorganised, recast and revised to fashion their own heathenism or ‘real Christianity’. These movements, a prototype of Oriental nationalism, coincided with the rise of alternatives to Christianity and material civilisation. This can be another example of the destabilisation and reorganisation of hierarchy based on the close relations between Christianity and civilisation at the Fin de Siècle, about which Pearson maintained a serious anxiety. The World’s Parliament of Religions in 1893 was, therefore, historically important because Orientalism was appropriated and reversed systematically by the Orientals exactly at the same time as Pearson published his forecast.

However, the language was still a barrier. Gandhi, Dharmapala, Vivekananda, Wong Chin Foo and Kinza Hirai had a sufficient command of English to propagate their ideas in speech or writing because English was or became nearly their first language. On the other hand, Sun Yat Sen, Uchimura and particularly the Japanese Buddhists except Hirai at the Congress had difficulties in their English performances\textsuperscript{272}. Uchimura’s *How I Became a Christian*, for instance, was almost ignored in America due to its perceived
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heathenism in language and content. However Orientals like Uchimura sought to claim authenticity over the Orient or Christianity, their language was not persuasive enough.

It is worthwhile reviewing briefly the problem of Occidental representation of the Orient, harshly criticised by Said’s *Orientalism* (1978). As we have seen, Said’s *Orientalism* begins with a well-known quotation from Marx’s *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1869), ‘[t]hey can not represent themselves; they must be represented’273. As Said suggested, this condescending and patronising attitude was widely and deeply rooted in Orientalism. Although Said did not deal with the problem of English language in colonisation, the above-mentioned Macaulay’s ‘Minute on Indian Education’ (1835) was a representative example274; Macaulay said, ‘[w]e have to educate a people who cannot at present be educated by means of their mother-tongue’275. For this reason, if only the British institution created ‘Indian in blood and colour’ but ‘English in taste, in opinions’, in Macaulay’s rosy vision, ‘[t]o that class we m[ight] leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population’276. As Gandhi’s ‘conversion’ has shown, Macaulay’s hope was practically betrayed; the creature would revolt against the creator, just as in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818). Nonetheless, in terms of the English language rule, Gandhi admitted that his fight for independence might be a losing battle. In *Hind Swaraj* (1910), the fundamental work for his nonviolent resistance and political independence movement in India, Gandhi had argued against a young radical reader but almost agreed with the reader’s radicalism as he had for English education.

Reader: Do I then understand that you do not consider English education necessary for obtaining Home Rule?
Editor[Gandhi]: My answer is yes and no. To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them. The foundation that Macaulay laid of education has enslaved us. I do not suggest that he had any such intention, but that
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had been the result. Is it not a sad commentary that we should have to speak of Home Rule in a foreign tongue?277

Needless to say, Gandhi’s comment referred to Macaulay’s ‘Minute on Indian Education’. Macaulay laid down the policy of indirect rule by the Indian elite who had acquired the English language but, as Gandhi fairly explained, it was not Macaulay’s intention to ‘enslave’ the Indian people by promoting English to the masses.

This was a turn of the century dilemma for Orientals to represent the Orient. If silent, they would have been represented by the Occident. In order to write or speak back seriously, they had to risk linguistic colonisation. Otherwise, their speech could be ridiculed and dismissed like Pidgin English. As these tide changes were beyond the British Isles, most of the absent-minded British imperialists were ignorant of these counter attacks from the 1880s. The reminiscence of H. G. Wells would be a typical one. He wrote about how he saw the world about the year 1880 when he was fourteen years old; ‘I thought China and Japan were made to be laughed at, though their porcelain and silks and fans were clever. I knew that there were also savages for whom Britain provided missionaries and machine-guns. Savages were generally cannibals and wore few or no garments, which seemed to me very rude of them indeed’278. Then, he confirmed that this was what ‘most people in Great Britain were seeing . . . at that time’. As in well-known juvenile literature The Cuckoo Clock (1877)279 or the nursery rhyme The Nodding Mandarin (1883)280, China was considered on the mass level as a fairy land in Chinese cabinets or the land of the nodding mandarin. The anonymous pamphlet The Decline and Fall of the British Empire (1881) brightly reflected the differences between the homeland and the colonies. This was supposedly written by a Chinese historian Lang-Tung, tutor to Prince ‘Sing and Hang’, for ‘the use of Junior Classes in School’ in China in the far-off future of 2881. As the name of the author was obviously a pun for lantern and the supposed translator ‘Yea’ possibly alluded to the nodding mandarin, this

nightmare of the downfall was only projected onto the Chinese screen, half in jest and half in earnest. While Olcott reversed the methods of the Christian missionary in his *Buddhist Catechism* (1881) and reinforced the Buddhist revival across Asia, this parody of catechism presented a topsy-turvydom between British barbarian and Chinese agency for civilisation and Christianity.

Q. Are not efforts being now made to reconvert the English to Christianity? 
A. Yes. Within the last few years the Chinese Church Missionary Society has spent upwards of 400,000 dollars in endeavouring to reclaim this interesting race. There are now nearly one hundred places of worship in the British Islands, in which upwards of 15,000 persons assemble every Sunday to hear the gospel preached by Chinese missionaries. Several schools have been erected, to which the people flock in great numbers, and display much earnestness, if not aptitude, in their efforts to learn reading and writing.\(^{281}\)

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the pamphlet ended with British projection of a most unlikely expectation for China; ‘it is hoped and believed that, in a few years’ time, the blessing of Christianity and civilization will once more be diffused throughout these interesting islands’\(^{282}\).

Pseudoscience had also endorsed Oriental childishness or backwardness. The application of ‘Mongolian’ to a type of idiot due to resemblance of a physiognomy of the Mongolians would be enough; Dr. John Langdon Haydon Down proposed this term in his ‘Observations on an Ethnic Classification of Idiots’ in the *London Hospital Reports* in 1866 based on his assumption that the Mongolian should be a degraded Caucasian on the racial linear ladder.\(^{283}\) According to *Oxford English Dictionary*, his proposition was authorised in a dictionary in the field in 1892. The mandarins had already ceased nodding and a reformer mandarin Marquis Tseng, for instance, predicted and promised the modernisation of China in 1887.\(^{284}\) Nevertheless it is no wonder that few British people took it seriously in this context.

In spite of its struggle for westernisation, Japan still held almost the same status as China in the British hierarchical psychological map of the times. The

\(^{282}\) Lang-Tung, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, p.32.  
\(^{284}\) Marquis Tseng, ‘China: the Sleep and Awakening’, * Asiatic Quarterly Review*, January 1887, pp.2-10. As for his diplomatic career, see his obituary in *The Times*, 15 April 1890.
land of the nodding mandarin was also associated with Japan, possibly due to the figures and landscapes on its Chinaware and lacquer ware. The famous opening chorus of *The Mikado* (1885) expressively depicted this peculiar image, on which caricatured British society could be easily projected, as in *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (1881).

If you want to know who we are,
We are gentlemen of Japan:
On many a vase and jar--
On many a screen and fan,
We figure in lively paint:
Our attitude’s queer and quaint--
You’re wrong if you think it ain’t, oh!

If you think we are worked by strings,
Like a Japanese marionette,
You don’t understand these things:
It is simply Court etiquette.
Perhaps you suppose this throng
Can’t keep it up all day long?
If that’s your idea, you’re wrong, oh!285

Japanese ‘gentlemen’ attempted to turn this image upside down but their message of ‘If that’s your idea, you’re wrong’ still sounded ‘quaint’. Generally the curios from Japan had been much more favoured in Britain through the 1880s, rather than the narrative of how they were modernised, converted or awakened. As a leading figure of aestheticism, Oscar Wilde wittily and vividly remarked in ‘The Decay of Lying: An Observation’ (1889) that what counted was inspiration to the art, not what they really were286. According to Wilde’s acute observation, the fashionable character of Japan at the time was completely constructed; as MacKenzie noticed, it could be estimated as the forerunner of Said’s *Orientalism*287. In an imaginary dialogue, a Wilde-like person expounded

---
his idea,

Now, do you really imagine that the Japanese people, as they are presented to us in art, have any existence? If you do, you have never understood Japanese art at all. The Japanese people are the deliberate self-conscious creation of certain individual artists. If you set a picture by Hokusai, or Hokkei, or any of the great native painters, beside a real Japanese gentleman or lady, you will see that there is not the slightest resemblance between them. The actual people who live in Japan are not unlike the general run of English people; that is to say, they are extremely commonplace, and have nothing curious or extraordinary about them. In fact the whole of Japan is a pure invention. There is no such country, there are no such people. One of our most charming painters went recently to the Land of the Chrysanthemum in the foolish hope of seeing the Japanese. All he saw, all he had the chance of painting, were a few lanterns and some fans.

As Ono carefully investigated, that artist whom the speaker derided was Australian-born Mortimer Menpes, disciple of James McNeil Whistler. For Wilde, there might be no such thing as a right or a wrong image because all the images should or could be simply classified as inspiring or not. Ironically twisted, a number of Oriental gainsayers struggled to be understood that ‘they’ were ‘extremely commonplace’; in other words, due to rooted stereotyping, the Orientals had to accept or internalised it as a second nature.

As easily expected from the contexts, the Parliament of Religions in 1893 was derided and overlooked in Britain, nothing more than a feast for the eyes or curious cabinets in Oriental artefacts. Except for a short notice of the Congress, The Times coldly regarded the proceedings of the Conference as ‘grotesque’ and ruthlessly discarded the ‘religious harmonies and unities of humanity’ as ‘surely impossible’. The Times review estimated some of the papers as appealing but ended the review with a cynical remark that all the interesting points derived ‘from their intrinsic merits and not from that fact that they were addressed to a so-called Parliament of religions’. However, with hindsight, Valentine Chirol of The Times, recalled the Congress as a black omen.

---

291 The Times, 20 January 1894.
and expressed concern over the rise of Hinduism in the afore-quoted passage.

Is it surprising that with such encouragement Hinduism should no longer remain on the defensive, but, discarding in this respect all its own traditions as a non-proselytizing creed, should send out missionaries to preach the message of Hindu enlightenment to those still groping in the darkness of the West? The mission of Swami Vivekananda to the Chicago Congress of Religions is in itself one of the most striking incidents in the history of Hindu revivalism\textsuperscript{292}.

As seen above, Vivekananda delivered a rather moderate speech calling for the harmony between East and West, nearly what Chirol wished for here. Intentionally or not, Chirol missed the potential menace in heathenism of Dharamapala or Hirai.

The land of the nodding mandarin also changed at the time although British people were generally uninterested. In fact, even after Sun Yat Sen’s kidnapping in 1896, ‘The Dungeons of Portland Place’ in \textit{The Speaker} on 31 October, 1896 said that ‘this Chinese kidnapping’ was ‘irresistibly diverting’. Cautioning both the reader and himself, the article wondered; ‘Englishman can never take the Chinaman seriously, in spite of Charles Pearson’s prediction that the yellow man will one day eat us up’\textsuperscript{293}. As its negative tone indicated, the tide had slowly but surely changed the land of the chrysanthemum or the nodding mandarin. Extremism fuelled speculation that Pearson’s nightmare might be realised in East Asia. Gradually, disappointment or fear had spread to realise that the lands were also ‘extremely commonplace’ and the British people began to take their statements more seriously than ever. This was due not to the eloquent but easily dismissed propaganda in pidgin English discussed in this introduction, but rather through the silent but substantive propaganda by deed, i.e. the Sino-Japanese war (1894-5).

4. Propaganda by Deed: Lafcadio Hearn and Yellow Man’s Burden during the Sino-Japanese War (1894-5)

\textbf{Lafcadio Hearn: A Great Interpreter of Japan?}

Lafcadio Hearn, of Irish-Greek parentage, came to Japan in 1890 was

\textsuperscript{292} Chirol, \textit{Indian Unrest}, p.29.
\textsuperscript{293} Sun Yat Sen, \textit{Kidnapped in London}, p.130.
naturalised in 1896 after his marriage with a Japanese. He wrote a number of books, based on his working experience as an English teacher, to report Japan from the inside to the English speaking world. As the subtitle of Hearn’s writings suggested\(^{294}\), Hearn was regarded and studied as a great interpreter of Japan\(^{295}\). In spite of his insufficient command of Japanese and his lack of legitimate university education\(^{296}\), he allegedly understood the workings of the Japanese mind. In contrast to Hearn, his close friend Basil Hall Chamberlain, born into a distinguished political family in Portsmouth associated with the British Navy\(^{297}\), became a Professor of Linguistics at Japan’s Imperial University and wrote a long-selling encyclopaedia on Japan, *Things Japanese* (1st edn, 1890; 6th edn, 1939), but he was mainly remembered as a great Japanologist\(^{298}\).

Whether problematic or great, however, the historical contexts of Hearn have not been studied enough. It should not be overlooked that his books on Japan (1894-1904) were published between the Sino-Japanese war (1894-5) and the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5) and for that reason they were highly welcomed as a key to understand or cope with the potential menace of a rising Japan, or the yellow peril.

Interestingly enough, Hearn was impressed by a Cassandra of the yellow peril, Charles H. Pearson. He had read *National Life and Character* (1893) just before the Sino-Japanese war and applied the ideas to his subsequent writings. As his Irish-Greek origin suggested, Hearn was also related to the British Empire and its imperialism, very closely to but very different from elite-track Pearson and Chamberlain. Hearn’s father, Charles Bush Hearn from Dublin fell in love and ran away with Antonia Cassimati Rosa when his army was stationed in Kythira, one of the Greek Ionian Islands. In 1850, Hearn was born in Lefkada, from which his name derived, but his father left for the British West Indies soon after his birth. His father came back occasionally, this British army officer was busily engaged in military service in the British West Indies, Crimea, India and never


\(^{296}\) As for the ‘myth’ of Hearn, see, Yuzo Ota ‘Lafcadio Hearn: Japan’s Problematic Interpreter’ in Hirakawa (ed.), *Rediscovering Lafcadio Hearn*, pp.210-22.

\(^{297}\) He was named after his grand-father Basil Hall, well-known naval officer. Basil Hall was one of the first British men to visit Korea and left a travelogue, *Voyage of Discovery to Corea* (1818).

went back permanently. This environment seemed to allow Lafcadio Hearn to distance himself from the British Empire, imperialism and Christianity. Educated in Dublin, Normandy and Durham, and working as a journalist in Cincinnati, New Orleans and Martinique, he was fascinated by the exotic and pagan peripheries although he always felt out of place. In 1890, he visited Japan and finally settled down until his death in 1904.299

How did this Irish-Greek drifter interpret and revise the prophecy of an Oxonian exile to the Antipodes? And how were Hearn’s writings received in the English speaking world during the Sino-Japanese war? In this section I will show how Hearn read Charles H. Pearson’s pessimistic view on Western civilisation and the effects of the circulation of his revised yellow peril in Britain, Japan and America during the war. As for Pearson’s influence on Hearn, Beongcheon Yu has already indicated that Hearn used Pearson’s statement for his theory of the rise of the East but Yu wonderingly wrote ‘[s]trangely enough, it was not Japan but China that came to the fore in his [Hearn’s] speculative panorama of the West: -East struggle for survival’300. The key to this question can be found in Hearn’s less known lecture ‘The Future of the Far East’ delivered to the Japanese in January of 1894, six months before the Sino-Japanese war. Firstly I would like to examine the correspondence between Hearn and Chamberlain, which vividly indicated how Hearn read Pearson’s National Life and Character and how he developed the idea in the lecture.

**Lafcadio Hearn as a Great Interpreter of the Yellow Peril**

Hearn’s first reference to Pearson was in his letter to his American friend Ellwood Hendric in August 1893, seven months after the publication of National Life and Character. Since, as he wrote, there was ‘no copy here’301, Hearn had not read Pearson yet. Perhaps he knew the name and content only through the reviews but he uniquely summarised and developed Pearson’s idea based on his ideas and experiences in America and Japan. Hearn deeply agreed with Pearson’s prediction that the future should not be ‘to the white races----not to the

---


Anglo-Saxon’, due to, ‘the more awful cost of the character’\textsuperscript{302}. Thereafter, Hearn compared ‘the white races’ to ‘the vast races of creatures----behemoths and megatheriums and ichthysaurians----which have disappeared from the earth simply because of the cost of their physical structure’. Although Hearn sympathised with the humble life and meals of his students only several years ago\textsuperscript{303}, he expected that the biological and ‘instinctive’ struggle of the races would work favourably for the Oriental because they could ‘underlive’\textsuperscript{304} the Europeans.

This revision of Pearson was expanded and developed in his letters to Chamberlain. In his letter dated 16 September 1893, Hearn wrote how Pearson’s book caused a ‘great sensation’\textsuperscript{305} but he had not acquired a copy yet because he wrote that he had ‘sent for Pearson’. Nevertheless he confirmed to Chamberlain that he had reached the ‘same conclusion’ as Pearson due to his life in New Orleans and the West Indies. Inspired by Pearson, Hearn marvellously imagined the future struggle between the two races which might be the precursor of the war with the Martians depicted in \textit{The War of the Worlds} (1898) by H. G. Wells.

My life in the tropics taught me what tropical life means for white races----after the trial of three hundred years;----America taught me something about the formidable character of the Chinese, and taught me also the enormous cost of existing civilization to the Western individual. I think it highly probable that the white races, after having bequeathed all their knowledge to the Orient, will ultimately disappear, just as the ichthyosaurus and other marvellous creatures have disappeared----simply because of the cost of their structure\textsuperscript{306}.

Before he knew Pearson, he lamented that his students were not able to digest the ideas of meat-eating Western civilisation, on a diet of ‘boiled rice and bean-curd’ which ‘no English boy could live on’\textsuperscript{307}. Pearson also, as we have seen, pessimistically conjectured that the Western civilisation should not be ‘bequeathed’ to the low-cost Orientals but merely diluted due to their ‘secondary

\textsuperscript{302} Bisland (ed.), \textit{The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn}, p.245.
\textsuperscript{304} Bisland (ed.), \textit{The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn}, p.246.
\textsuperscript{306} Bisland (ed.), \textit{The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn}, p.33.
\textsuperscript{307} Hearn, ‘From the Diary of a Teacher’, pp.129-30.
intelligence’. As far as Hearn’s statements are concerned, it seems to be Hearn’s original revision and appropriation of Pearson that the decline of the West should not be the end of the world but the rise of the East.

In the same letter, Hearn mentioned the reviews of Pearson, through which Hearn seemed to know about National Life and Character. Hearn sarcastically noted the two contrasting reviews; ‘the Reverend one’ criticising Pearson because he did not “consider ‘Gawd’ as a factor in the case” and Harrison’s review requiring Pearson to ‘count upon Idealism’308. For pro-Oriental Hearn, these critics were ‘amusing’ because they did not or could not admit ‘the terrible truth’. Perhaps with Huxley’s Evolution and Ethics (1893) in mind, Hearn stated that ‘neither moral nor æsthetic development could be counted on as factors in the mere struggle to live’309.

Probably from the point of the date and the content, Hearn meant the Reverend John Llewelyn Davies’s ‘The Prospects of the Civilised World’ in The Contemporary Review (June 1893) and Frederic Harrison’s ‘The Evolution of Our Race, A Reply’ in Fortnightly Review (July, 1893). John Llewelyn Davies agreed with Pearson in terms of ‘the worship of the State’ as the religion of the future310 and ‘a deadly competition in the Eastern markets’, particularly with Chinese labour in America and Australia311. However, he also stated;

[T]he more Christian we are, the more willingly ought we to prepare ourselves for war . . . Christianity imposes upon those who govern the British Empire the obligation of caring little about lives or feelings compared with the security of the Empire and its power to do its appointed work in the world. . . . we know it to be our Christian duty to guard by strenuous effort, and by any required amount of suffering, the priceless inheritance which has been entrusted to us312.

Against the menace from ‘new Asia and Africa’, therefore, a new crusade or ‘the States of Europe’ should be formed as a duty for ‘us of the Aryan race and the Christian faith’313, according to the review.

On the other hand, Frederick Harrison stressed the civilisation of the world

308 Bisland (ed.), The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn, p.33.
309 Bisland (ed.), The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn, p.34.
rather than Christianity. As a well-known positivist, he emphasised that there was no “highest’ race in any absolute sense’ because ‘the coloured races’ had ‘noble intellectual and moral qualities of their own’314, which could be compared with the strategy of Buddhists’ appropriation of Orientalism at the World’s Parliament of Religions two months later. As for missionaries, he criticised them as ‘the mere forerunners of the unscrupulous trader and the ambitious conqueror’315, apart from their pure motives. Instead of Christianity Harrison passionately declared the necessity of the civilising mission; ‘we must raise their [non-European] standard of culture’. Similarly Harrison denied the jingoism or nationalism based on ‘the Aryan race’ and optimistically stated that human beings could establish a diversified co-prosperity sphere:

We see daily instances of Hindoos, Chinese, Japanese, Arabs, Turks, Armenians, Moors, and Negroes, who have reached the higher levels of European culture, both in morality and in knowledge. This is decisive that there is nothing in race, under a systematic education continued over long generations, to prevent the yellow, brown, and black races from ultimately inheriting the higher civilisation of mankind. It may be with varieties, and all the more interesting for that reason316.

Harrison thought and believed that civilisation would never clash with other civilisations or cultures but should unify the world peacefully.

These two reviews agreed with Pearson concerning the limitations of White colonisation in Asia and Africa but they reached the opposite conclusion. Davies’s concept of European union was very close to the Kaiser’s propaganda of Christian European union against the yellow peril whereas Harrison’s idea of the mission to civilise had a common ground with Kipling’s ‘White Man’s Burden’ (1899). Taking these two contrasted reviews into consideration, Hearn might have developed Davies’s idea of a new crusade for the biological survival between the white and yellow races and modified Harrison’s positive idea of harmonious civilised communities into the clash of civilisations between East and West.

In other words Hearn had already set up and developed his own view on a rising East against declining West, via these two reviews before he actually read Pearson. As the letters indicates, Hearn seemed to have read the book by 2 October 1893. In his letter to Chamberlain, Hearn promised to send a copy to

316 Harrison, ‘The Evolution of Our Race’, p.34.
him and reviewed Pearson comparing him to Harrison;

He [Pearson] is a little ponderous; but a thinker worth feeling. He is not, however, a man of magical style, like Harrison, who grips your hand, and makes you feel the warmth of the pulse in it. Pearson has no pulse. He is just as cold and keen as Herbert Spencer, to whom, curious!----he makes but a single reference, though I can see that Spencer was his intellectual milk. How selfish authors sometimes are to their teachers!...

Hearn repeated similar remarks to Chamberlain in another letter dated 14 December 1893; He summarised Pearson’s ‘awful melancholy’ as “[t]he Aspirational [sic] has passed forever out of life”318.

On the other hand, Chamberlain was also impressed by Pearson. Possibly following the optimism of Harrison, according to his letter on 23 October 1893, this all-out rationalist would not mind that ‘England’ should ‘shrink up, like Holland, into political insignificance’319. However, Chamberlain admitted the limitation of the white races in the tropics but objected that it did not mean the certainty of Chinese expansion. On 23 November 1893, Hearn noted his experiences in the tropics and refuted gently Chamberlain’s suggestion of ‘a possible limit to Chinese emigration and acclimation’320.

China can send streams out from three of her own different zones of climate; and her people pour into Siberia as well as into Singapore. I have seen Chinamen everywhere in the West Indies. They are getting all the small-shop trade into their hands in some of the islands. They settle on the Pacific coast from Canada to Southern Chili [sic]. Panama alone proved a deadly climate to them; but the West Indian negroes also died there, and faster321.

Reasonably the argument ended up without any more progress. Meanwhile Hearn expanded these ideas, mainly inspired from the two reviews by Davies and Harrison into the lecture, ‘The Future of the Far East’. Hearn himself reported

317 Bisland (ed.), The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn, p.44.
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on the lecture in his letter dated 30 January 1894. Hearn wrote,

I made a speech by request Saturday on “The Future of the Orient [sic],” and I think the students are going to print it. I never sent you any of my printed speeches from Matsue———there was nothing in them that would not have seemed platitude to you. If this be printed, however, I will send it, as it is a sort of philosophical history of the invasion of the Western Barbarians———a supplement to the Views of Pearson.322

Although Hearn wrote ‘How selfish authors sometimes are to their teachers!’ due to Pearson’s lack of reference to Spencer and also confessed that the lecture was inspired by Pearson, Hearn did not mention specifically Pearson’s National Life and Character in ‘The Future of the Far East’ on 27 January 1894323.

In the lecture, Hearn repeated and expanded the same points which he wrote to Chamberlain: the course of history as the struggle for survival against hunger, the limit of white colonisation in the tropics, and the potential victory of low-cost Orientals over high-cost Occidentals. As for the emigration from China after ‘the West forced China to open her ports’, Hearn suggested the Pandora’s Box; ‘Wise men began to say that it would have been much better to have left China alone’324. Combining Pearson’s Chinese proliferation, Harrison’s Oriental inheritance of civilisation, and Davies’s racial conflict, Hearn accentuated the global racial struggle for existence. He pressed the Japanese audience, ‘Then the weaker races must give way. How give way? Disappear from the face of the earth. Which will give way,----Far West or Far East?’325 It is noteworthy that Hearn encouraged the audience to unite the yellow races, before Kaiser Wilhelm II, from the Far West, propagated the white European crusade against the flaming Buddha on the horizon in 1895. Hearn declared, ‘Both China and Japan must compete with the West in order to defend themselves’326. Admitting that ‘present intellectual level in Japan’ was not as high as in England327, Hearn assured his audience that as the gigantic animals became extinct due to their ‘costliness’, ‘the races most patient, most economical, most simple in their habits

would win’. No review of Pearson suggested the awakening of China by Japanese tutelage before the Sino-Japanese war and, first of all, Pearson was not aware of Japan, merely saying ‘Had Chinamen or Japanese descended upon New Zealand instead of the Maories [sic] . . . no modern European power would have attempted to displace’ them.\textsuperscript{329} As I discuss later, the yellow peril or the threat of the Sino-Japanese co-operation began to be rumoured and propagated through the Sino-Japanese War. It might be said that inspired by the reviews of Pearson, Hearn originally appropriated Pearson’s pessimistic view into the optimistic view of the future of Japan and China.

Nevertheless, Hearn did not propagate the idea of Sino-Japanese co-operation and did not publish ‘The Future of the Far East’ during his lifetime. That was not only because the lecture makes no mention of Pearson but also because it might have brought about unnecessary intervention or caution from the Western powers. Instead of Sino-Japanese co-operation, Hearn praised the Japanese achievement of modernisation without Christianity, innate stoicism, willing self-sacrifice, and ardent patriotism during the Sino-Japanese war. Most of these articles appeared in journals and were republished in two books, \textit{Out of the East} (1895) and \textit{Kokoro} ['mind' in Japanese] (1896).

Hearn declared that ‘some divine connection between military power and Christian belief’\textsuperscript{330} had been broken. Hearn thought that religion was ‘a part of the race life’\textsuperscript{331} and therefore most Japanese returned or rediscovered the value of their religion or ethics after adoption of Western materialism\textsuperscript{332}. For instance, Buddhism, which had provided the Japanese with unselfishness and the ‘capacity to bear all things bravely’, adopted ‘Western science’ and established Buddhist schools with the scholars educated at Oxford\textsuperscript{334}. Nevertheless ancestor-worship was the central idea, in Hearn’s view, in Buddhism or Shintoism. As a prime example of the worship and its relations with the patriotism, he recorded an old man’s ominous statement predicting the coming conflict with Russia:

‘Perhaps by Western people it is thought that the dead never return. But we cannot so think. There are no Japanese dead who do not return. There are

\textsuperscript{328} Italics original, Hearn, ‘The Future of the Far East’, p.399.
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none who do not know the way. From China and from Chōsen [Korea], and out of the bitter sea, all our dead have come back—-all! They are with us now. In every dusk they gather to hear the bugles that called them home. And they will hear them also in that day when the armies of the Son of Heaven [Emperor] shall be summoned against Russia’.

As an example of this loyalty to the dead and the Emperor, Hearn noticed that ‘[m]any killed themselves on being refused the chance of military service’.

Adding to ancestor-worship, Hearn noticed ‘Jiujutsu’ as a secret of Japanese modernisation without colonisation. Little attention has been paid to this martial art until Hearn wrote the eponymous essay. For instance, in 1892, Rudyard Kipling described that a British sailor was thrown by a local policeman ‘with devilish art and craft of wrestling tricks’ in Yokohama treaty port. Kipling keenly considered this incident as a change of Japan as a playground after the Constitution was established in 1890. On the other hand, Hearn was amazed at this ‘devilish art’ due to its way ‘to direct and utilize the power of attack’. He thought that Japan had deployed the same self-defence art intellectually against Western civilisation; ‘She [Japan] has been able to remain herself, and to profit to the utmost possible limit by the strength of the enemy’.

This essay ‘Jiujutsu’ deployed several ideas in ‘The Future of the Far East’. With reference to ‘Dr. Pearson’s recent book, ‘National Character [sic]’’, Hearn declared that ‘Western expansion and aggression’ was approaching an end due to competition with the Oriental because ‘[t]he Oriental can underlive the Occidental’. Hearn, formerly sceptical of the rice-eater’s ability to assimilate meat-eater’s civilisation, revised his ideas: through the Sino-Japanese war, in his view, ‘the Oriental ha[d] proved his ability to study and to master the results of

338 Rudyard Kipling, ‘The Edge of the East’, The Times, 2 July 1892. As if escaping from new Japan, this article ended with his famous poem ‘Buddha at Kamakura’.
our science upon a diet of rice’343. Thereafter Hearn ended the long essay with the vision, which he had conceived via reviews of Pearson: ‘They [Oriental races] would scarcely regret our disappearance any more than we ourselves regret the extinction of the dinotherium or the ichthyosaurus’344. Hearn could not know that the former was a proto-elephant herbivore and the latter a dolphin-like fish eater, as Victorian palaeontology was developing through trial and error; it was still exceptionally radical of him, though, to predict the extinction of the meat-eater by losing a low-cost competition during the heyday of imperialism, when Britain enjoyed the geo-strategic lion’s share.

In ‘Jiujutsu’, Hearn modified Pearson’s pessimistic doomsday vision into the recycling of civilisation from the white to the yellow. However he carefully avoided the Sino-Japanese union. On the other hand, in ‘China and the Western World’ in Atlantic Monthly in April 1896, he cleverly suggested his idea by citing an article from a British paper. He quoted the following passage from St. James’s Gazette dated 6 October 1894.

Consider what a Japan-governed China would be. Think what the Chinese are; think of their powers of silent endurance under suffering and cruelty; think of their frugality; think of their patient perseverance, their slow, dogged persistence, their recklessness of life... And under him [the Mikado, Japanese emperor] the dreams of the supremacy of the Yellow Race in Europe, Asia, and even Africa, to which Dr. Pearson [of National Life and Character] and others have given expression, would be no longer mere nightmares345.

However, he acutely contrasted this ‘nightmare’ with the Russian-conquered China. He did not argue against the Sino-Japanese alliance any more but merely suggested that the real menace might be China and Russia although he himself encouraged Sino-Japanese co-operation in his lecture ‘The Future of the Far East’. Like a provocateur, Hearn ominously emphasised and predicted China’s serious challenge to Western superiority; ‘White labour has never been able to compete on equal terms with Oriental labour’346 or ‘The Future danger of China will be industrial, and will begin with the time that she passes under Occidental

domination’\textsuperscript{347}. At the end of the essay, he presented an opposite proposal from Sino-Japanese co-operation in ‘The Future of the Far East’: after hyperbolically proclaiming, ‘the future w[ould] belong to the races of the Far East’\textsuperscript{348} he carefully avoided naming the Japanese, but referred to Victor Hugo’s “United States of Europe” as a solution. Apparently he might have repeated the Kaiser’s ‘Yellow Peril’ or Davies’s review of Pearson but this was not the point. After the ‘Union’, in Hearn’s vision, ‘universal brotherhood’ would follow ‘by the blending of the best types of all races’ because ‘uniting Western energy with Far-Eastern patience’\textsuperscript{349} would be an inevitable and welcome evolution. Despite the lack of mention of the Japanese, seen from his vision in ‘The Future of the Far East’, Hearn seemed to have thought that he himself worked for this evolution and the Japanese would be the coming race blending East and West. Wisely, Hearn did not include this essay, as well as ‘The Future of the Far East’, in any of his books during his lifetime. Returning to the question which Beongcheon Yu posed, Hearn might have exaggerated the yellow peril namely Chinese menace to the West in order to avoid the Western humiliation of Japan after its victory over China but at the same time he might have believed that his instigation of the racial survival for existence would accelerate the evolution into ‘universal brotherhood’.

The Sino-Japanese War as ‘The Triumph of Civilization’?

Although Hearn emphasised and propagated the Japanese achievement of civilisation without Christianity, the Sino-Japanese struggle for supremacy over Korea at first aroused little British sympathy for Japan’s prospects. Most British people expected that China would speedily defeat her smaller enemy. There was a political reason too. As The New York Times analysed in August in 1894, Britain expected China to win lest Russia should become involved in the affair\textsuperscript{350}. Most British papers, therefore, coldly and cynically gazed at the questionable combination between Western civilisation and Oriental mentality.

The first stumbling block was the sinking of the Kowshing. In July in 1894, the Kowshing, carrying Chinese soldiers under a British flag, was sunk by the Japanese cruiser Naniwa. The news was sensationaly reported and the commander of the Naniwa, Heihachiro Togo, future admiral commanding the Battle of Tsushima in the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5), was harshly accused of
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insulting the British flag. However, two letters the pundits of international law, J. Westlake at Cambridge and T. E. Holland at Oxford, posted on *The Times* put the excitement to rest. Holland, who would defend Sun Yat Sen concerning his detention at the Chinese legation two years later, endorsed that ‘If, as was the fact, it was practically impossible for a Japanese prize crew to be placed on board of her [the Kowshing], the Japanese commander was within his rights in using any amount of force necessary to compel her to obey his orders’.

*The Saturday Review*, however, argued against the application of international law to an Oriental country. It said, ‘We maintain that there was no legal war, even in the slovenly sense of international-law legality. The code, too, such as it is, applies among civilised nations, which are bound by customs of humanity----not among barbarians who have nothing of civilization [sic] beyond a chatter of words and a supply of deadly weapons’.

This anxiety was very similar to Pearson’s pessimistic vision in which Western civilisation would awaken the Oriental menace. The same image of the savage with Western weapons was adequately illustrated in the same day’s *Punch* (11 August 1894). In the caricature entitled ‘The Triumph of Civilisation’, a goddess representing ‘European civilisation’ anxiously looks at the battles of two dragons in the sea. The bigger dragon as China holds a rifle and the smaller dragon as Japan with a torpedo tail, takes aim at the enemy. The poem attached to the illustration epitomised British bewilderment at the hybrid monster like Caliban or Frankenstein.

He ['yellow-man'] will not have our Bibles, but he welcomes our Big Guns,
And he blends with the wild savagery of Vandals, Goths or Huns,
The scientific slaughter of the Blood-and-Iron Teuton!----

... He is}

Heathen Chinee and Pagan Jap have learned our Western ways
Of multitudinous bloodshed; every slaughtering appliance,
Devices of death-dealing skill, and deviltries of Science
Strengthen the stealthy Mongol and the sanguinary Turk;
And Civilisation stands, and stares, and cries, ‘Is this my work?’

Hearn considered this hybrid as a next step to the higher stage of human being,

---
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‘universal brotherhood’, but for the majority of British people it was merely a veneer of civilisation. Japan’s unexpected victory also strengthened the view. The Saturday Review reported in September in 1894, ‘[t]he fact is that she has set herself intelligently to acquire the command of the destructive weapons of civilization [sic] in order that she may act the more effectually like a barbarian’ and ‘the Devil will break loose in Farther Asia’354.

Punch, however, slightly changed the direction. While The Saturday Review predicted the yellow peril, Punch comically compared the battle as Jack against Giant in ‘Jap the Giant-Killer’ (Punch, 29 September 1894). Additionally, the next cartoon wittily illustrated how the first Oriental country which succeeded in westernisation in the nineteenth century stunned Europe. In ‘The Infant Phenomenon’ (22 December 1894), a Japanese boy in strange attire, half kimono and half military dress, teaches strategy to the Western powers. As his juggler-like clothes and circus-like gestures suggested, few British people would have taken this lesson seriously.

Exceptionally, Edwin Arnold defended Japan’s interests in Korea, possibly due to his anti-Russian standpoint, and predicted that Japan would beat China in an article in The New Review355. In another article in The Spectator on 1 September 1894, Arnold warned that ‘Mongol’ and ‘Slav’ were two major menaces to the civilised world and therefore, he declared that ‘in attacking China in Corea [sic], she [Japan] is guarding the civilised world’356. In 1895 when the civilised world was stunned at the Japanese victory over China, Arnold wrote a second article entitled ‘The Triumph of Japan’. The author of Japonica (1891) propagating charming Japanese ‘Musmee’ girl, lamented that such works as Madame Chrysanthème and The Mikado had misled the British people into ignoring Japanese modernisation. Japan, he declared, possibly alluding to The Mikado, had not been a ‘globe-trotter’s playground of undersized frivolous people, living a life like that depicted upon the tea-trays and screens, but a great, a serious, and a most civilised nation’357. As if dispelling the image of Japan as ‘Musmee’ girl that he once disseminated, Arnold published a Gunga-din-like poem. It was about a Japanese bugler who, in spite of his gunshot wound, allegedly kept bugling to his last breath. His lengthy poem ‘A Japanese Soldier’ in The Tenth

357 Wright, Interpreter of Buddhism to the West, p.136.
And, while he brows the boy's blood
Fell, scarlet drop by drop,
The bugle's mouth--and his--imbued,
Nor from that wound would stop
The trickling trickling! Stoutly,
He sounded Susume ['Advance' in Japanese]
The call that bids all soldiers
Close in the deadly fray.
To tune of that brave clamour
The Song-hwan wall was won;
The fierce charge sped, the foeman fled,
The day's great work stood done.
But when they turned, victorious,
There! on the crimsoned ground,
Clasping his bugle, glorious,
Young Genjiro [the name of the bugler] was found358.

Many other songs and poems on this bugler were produced in Japan at the time and Hearn also translated one of them359. Certainly this type of 'brave' conduct changed the previous image of Japan as a playground to some extent, but it does not mean that Japanese 'patriotism' was esteemed in Britain. For instance, The Athenæum quoted the aforementioned passage from Hearn's Out of the East (1895); 'Many killed themselves on being refused the chance of military service'. This review rationally considered these “instances of this form of 'patriotism’” merely as 'grisly'360.

This image of 'Young Little Jap', however, had no serious implications for Britain since both Britain and Japan entertained shared interests against Russian advancement. On the other hand, for a rising Germany anxious to achieve colonial status by the use of its navy, it was crucial. The German Kaiser, Willhelm II, propagated the idea of the yellow peril by the use of a cartoon depicting the crusade against the flaming Buddha. This propaganda worked and formed the triple intervention of Russia, France and Germany preventing Japan's
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359 Hearn, 'After the War' in Out of the East and Kokoro, pp.334-5. See also, Keene, Landscapes and Portraits, p.276.
acquisition of Liaotung peninsula in 1895. More importantly, this incident made
the ordinary Japanese realise the importance of diplomacy and propaganda as the
only Oriental nation in the European club.

In the wake of the war, a number of Japanese had attempted to justify Japan’s
cause in waging the war. One of the earliest examples was Uchimura, author of
How I Became a Christian (1895). He had published an article in The Japan
Weekly Mail, coincidentally on the same date with the afore-mentioned article in
The Saturday Review and The Punch. In ‘Justification for the Korean War’ he
declared that the war was a ‘righteous war’ and such a holy war could be ‘waged
by a nation other than Christian’\textsuperscript{361}. He justified the Japanese intervention in
Korea in terms of international law and anti-laissez-faire. If ‘laissez-faire’ means
‘indifference to all human souls’, he said, ‘Christ and Buddha, Livingstone and
John Howard would never have been were laissez-faire in this sense the
heaven-settled law of society’. Subsequently, he ended this article with the
following Hearn-like conclusion.

\begin{quote}

[O]ur aim [is] her [Chinese] coming to consciousness of her own worth and
duty, and to friendly cooperation with us in the reformation of the East.
Thus we fight with eternal peace in view, and Heaven help our breeding ones
as they fall in this holy war. Never before in our history has the nation been
fired with a nobler aim, and now as one we march to meet our foe\textsuperscript{362}.
\end{quote}

Ironically, after a year, this vision was propagated by the Kaiser as a yellow peril
or flaming Buddha. Whether and how Hearn’s ‘The Future of the Far East’
influenced Uchimura is unknown.

The Kobe Chronicle, the other representative English newspaper, reprinted
the afore-quoted article warning against ‘Japan-governed China’ from St. James’s
Gazette and Hearn, one of the regular contributors, also discussed the article in
‘Dr. Pearson’s Real Views about China’\textsuperscript{363}, but this was in November 1894. It
meant that this idea of Sino-Japanese co-operation was so widely shared and
welcomed in Japan as a national mission, in other words, a yellow version of the
‘White Man’s Burden’ (1899). Whereas Hearn carefully avoided the propagation
of the idea, this ambition or mission was openly propagated by the Japanese

\begin{footnotes}
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themselves. In spite of Uchimura’s hope, his article was not widely circulated. However, this message of the Yellow Man’s Burden was intensified and disseminated through the Sino-Japanese war (1894-5) by the Japanese themselves. And this time, the propaganda was taken more seriously. More than any spiritual creed or moral superiority, the victory of the Sino-Japanese war revived national pride and demanded acknowledgement by the Western powers. This irony was acutely questioned by Kakuzo Okakura, leading figure of the Pan-Asianism movement and the author of *Ideals of the East* (1903) and *The Awakening of Japan* (1904). In his long-selling *Book of Tea* (1906) which was a pioneering book about the tea ceremony, he stated ‘The average Westerner . . . was wont to regard Japan as barbarous while she indulged in the gentle arts of peace: he calls her civilised since she began to commit wholesale slaughter on Manchurian battlefields’364.

For instance, Henry Norman, pro-Russian authority on Oriental affairs, in his widely-read *Peoples and Politics of the Far East* (1895), warned against ‘Japanese confidence and ambition’ and quoted a long passage from a speech of Shigenobu Okuma, ex-minister for foreign affairs, on *The Japan Weekly Mail* on 25 August 1894.

The European Powers are already showing symptoms of decay, and the next century will see their constitutions shattered and their empire in ruins. Even if this should not quite happen, their resources will have become exhausted in unsuccessful attempts at colonisation. Therefore who is fit to be their proper successors if not ourselves? . . . As to intellectual power, the Japanese mind is in every way equal to the European mind. More than this, have not the Japanese opened a way to the perfection of a discovery in which foreigners have not succeeded even after years of labour? . . . It is true the Japanese are small of stature, but the superiority of the body depends more on its constitution than on its size. If treaty revision were completed, and Japan completely victorious over China, we should become one of the chief Powers of the world, and no Power could engage in any movement without first consulting us. Japan could then enter into competition with Europe as the representative of the Oriental races365.

Although I could not find the article on the dated newspaper and cannot deny the

possibility of forgery, this speech indicated that Hearn articulated what the Japanese had held and therefore, the Japanese also intentionally or not repeated the same points which Hearn praised and accentuated in ‘the Future of the Far East’ and other writings. Apart from Hearn’s direct influence on the idea of Sino-Japanese co-operation, the Sino-Japanese war was accepted in Britain as a prelude to a Frankenstein-like monster. It is noteworthy that Hearn was surprised at his students’ indifference to Frankenstein. When he taught the story to the students, it made no appeal but a ‘comic or semi-comic parable’. Hearn thought that it was because the Orientals felt ‘no distances between gods and men’366. However, Hearn’s impression of Pearson could be applied to the Japanese more appropriately: ‘How selfish authors sometimes are to their teachers!’.