Only Shinran Will Not Betray Us:

Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1967), the Ōtani-ha Administration, and *Burakumin*

Jessica L. Main

Faculty of Religious Studies

McGill University, Montreal

April 2012

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Table of contents

Abstract[1]

Shin Buddhism in Japan supports human rights today because it was forced to come to terms with its own discrimination against *burakumin*—a Japanese minority that has experienced severe caste-like disadvantage and exclusion based on heredity, occupation, and place of birth. The majority of *burakumin* follow Shin Buddhism, in which they have been treated as outcastes, just as they have been within other Buddhist schools and within Japanese society as a whole. Over the course of the twentieth century, *buraku* advocacy groups pressured the Shin sects to respond to specific doctrinal and structural incidents of discrimination, both contemporary and historical. One of these sects, the Ōtani-ha, developed its institutional policy on this serious social problem precisely by interacting with *buraku* advocacy groups, both secular and sectarian, and responding to their specific criticisms.

The story of this institutional struggle can be effectively told through the story of one of its priest-bureaucrats, Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1967). Takeuchi, who flourished in the Ōtani-ha administration from the 1920s to the 1950s, worked to alleviate *buraku* discrimination and put forward a Shin Buddhist theory of social engagement. Takeuchi's story reveals how a Buddhist bureaucrat and his faction—with time, personnel, and money—worked under pressure to create an ethical social policy based on Shin doctrine.

In addition to examining the issue of *buraku* discrimination, a Shin Buddhist

---

[1] *Keywords*: Shinshū Ōtani-ha (真宗大谷派); Shin Buddhism (Jōdo Shin-shū 浄土真宗); Japanese Pure Land; Higashi Hongan-ji (東本願寺); discrimination (*sabetsu* 差別); Japanese modern period (1868-present); descent-based and caste-like discrimination; human rights (*jinken* 人権); Takeuchi Ryō'on (武内了温, 1891-1967); *hisabetsu buraku* (被差別部落); *burakumin* (部落民); Levelers' Soceity (Suiheisha 水平社); Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei 部落解放同盟); Buddhist ethics; ethics in history; religious bureaucracy; religious order (*kyōdan* 教団); social activism; social work; socially engaged Buddhism.

sect, and a member of its "middle management"—topics rarely addressed in English language Buddhist studies—this dissertation performs two important tasks. First, it describes a type of Buddhist ethical thought that is self-consciously historical and concerned with the religious organization, the "order" (*kyōdan*), as a whole in its actual and ideal aspects. My examination of this type of ethical thought provides a rare but important complement to scriptural, philosophical, and individualistic accounts of Buddhist ethics. Second, it challenges current scholarly models of Buddhist social engagement, or "socially engaged Buddhism," which tend to neglect the early twentieth century and large, established Buddhist groups. I find social engagement in pre-1945, large, conservative organizations, and not just in post-1960, small-scale, progressive groups. This is because social engagement is a Buddhist response to modernity itself and not tied to a particular modern political ideology.

Résumé[2]

Aujourd'hui au Japon, le bouddhisme Shin appuie les droits de la personne parce qu'il a été contraint d'assumer sa responsabilité relativement à la discrimination qu'il a lui-même exercée à l'endroit des burakumin, une minorité japonaise qui a subi de graves préjudices en matière de caste et qui a souffert d'exclusions basées sur l'hérédité, la occupation, et le lieu de naissance. La majorité des burakumin adhèrent au bouddhisme Shin. Au sein de celui-ci, tout comme au sein d'autres écoles bouddhiques et au sein de la société japonaise dans son ensemble, les burakumin ont été traités comme des hors-castes.   Au cours du vingtième siècle, des groupes de défense buraku ont exercé des pressions sur les sectes Shin pour que celles-ci réagissent à des cas spécifiques – passés et contemporains – de discrimination doctrinale et structurelle. En interagissant avec les groupes de défense buraku (tant des groupes séculiers que des groupes religieux) et en prenant en compte les critiques de ceux-ci, l'une de ces sectes – la secte Ōtani-ha – a élaboré une politique institutionnelle qui traite directement de ce grave problème social.

   L'histoire de Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1967), l'un des prêtres-fonctionnaires de la secte Ōtani-ha, permet de retracer dans les faits l'histoire de cette lutte institutionnelle. Takeuchi, qui a œuvré au sein de l'administration de la secte Ōtani-ha à partir des années 1920 jusqu'aux années 1950, s'est affairé à contrer la discrimination exercée à l'endroit des burakumin et à développer une théorie

---

[2] *Mots clés* : Shinshū Ōtani-ha (真宗大谷派); bouddhisme Shin (Jōdo Shin-shū 浄土真宗); école japonaise de la Terre pure; Higashi Hongan-ji (東本願寺); discrimination (*sabetsu* 差別); période moderne au Japon (1868-aujourd'hui); discrimination fondée sur la lignée et sur la caste; droits de la personne (*jinken* 人権); Takeuchi Ryō'on (武内了温 1891-1967); *hisabetsu buraku* (被差別部落); *burakumin* (部落民); Société des niveleurs (Suiheisha 水平社); Ligue de libération *buraku* (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei 部落解放同盟); éthique bouddhique; éthique et histoire; fonctionnariat bouddhique; ordre bouddhique (*kyōdan* 教団); activisme social; travail social; bouddhisme engagé socialement.

bouddhique Shin concernant l'engagement social. L'histoire de Takeuchi montre comment – grâce à du temps, du personnel et de l'argent – un fonctionnaire bouddhiste et ses alliés ont travaillé sous pression afin de mettre sur pied une politique d'éthique sociale fondée sur la doctrine Shin.

En considérant le problème de la discrimination exercée envers les burakumin, ainsi qu'en traitant d'une secte bouddhique Shin et d'un membre de l' « administration intermédiaire » de celle-ci, la thèse se penche sur des thèmes qui sont rarement abordés dans les études bouddhiques de langue anglaise. Par ailleurs, la thèse remplit deux autres fonctions importantes. Premièrement, la thèse décrit un type de pensée éthique bouddhique qui se perçoit réflexivement comme une pensée historique et qui se préoccupe de l'organisation religieuse – l'« ordre » (*kyōdan*) – dans sa globalité, tant sur le plan du réel que sur le plan de l'idéal. L'analyse que j'effectue de ce type de pensée éthique contribue singulièrement et substantiellement aux approches textuelles, philosophiques et individualistes portant sur l'éthique bouddhique. Deuxièmement, la thèse critique les modèles universitaires actuels de l'engagement social bouddhique, ou du « bouddhisme engagé socialement ». Généralement, ces modèles négligent la période du début du vingtième siècle et ne tiennent pas compte des groupes bouddhiques institutionnalisés à grande échelle. J'observe que l'engagement social est manifeste au sein de grandes organisations conservatrices antérieures à 1945 et que celui-ci ne se manifeste pas seulement au sein de petits groupes progressistes ultérieurs aux années 1960. En définitive, l'engagement social constitue une réaction bouddhique à la modernité elle-même et il n'est lié à aucune idéologie politique moderne particulière.

Acknowledgements

My advisors, Victor Hori and Katherine Young, opened my eyes to the world, for which I am very grateful. At every step of my education at McGill, they offered their generous support. Victor Hori continually introduced novel comparisons and ways of tackling my subject matter. His critical and sharp eye quickly identified the weaknesses in my thought and helped me repair them. Katherine Young, with her considerable background in ethics, was always willing to question my ideas and herded me gently to greater organization and clarity.

Without the support of several organizations, the Japan Foundation, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Monbukagaku Ministry of the Japanese government, my dissertation research would have been impossible. A SSHRC doctoral fellowship (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) and Internal SSHRC grant were invaluable. The Japan Foundation funded training at the Japanese-Language Institute, Kansai for 4 months in 2003. I would like to thank the library staff and my teachers there, Yazawa Michiko, Okano Sachiko, and Fujiwara Chiemi, who generously offered their time and expertise. Yazawa continued to offer assistance and friendship throughout the final stages of my dissertation research. The head of the Institute, Kawashima Yoshio, especially in his capacity as the director of HuRights Osaka (Ajia Taheiyō Jinken Jōhō Sentā) met with me to discuss my research and respond to questions about the state of human rights activity in the Japanese legal world. Thanks go to Patricia Fister for her assistance when I applied to stay at the Nichibunken in 2006 to perform short-term research and to the academic community there.

The Assimilation (Dōwa) and Human Rights (Jinken) bureaus in Buddhist and governmental organizations were very welcoming, official representatives of Kōyasan Shingon Buddhism, and the Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha sects of Shin

A note on usage and conventions

I write the names of people who wrote or spoke in the Japanese language in Japanese order, family name first. Some people have alternative names, pennames, or religious names and these are given in parentheses at first occurrence. For example, Asano Onchi (Yoshitomo) (朝野温知, 1906-1982) and Ōtani Kōen (大谷光演, 1875-1943, Shōnyo 彰如, Kubutsu 句仏). In some cases, I prefer the alternative name as a form of disambiguation, or because that individual is best known by his alternative name (such as "Shōnyo" for Ōtani Kōen and "Senchō-in" for Ōtani Eishō (大谷瑩韶, 1886-1962, Senchō-in 宣暢院)). Otherwise, I place the personal name first at first occurrence in a chapter.

Non-English terms are italicized with diacritical marks excepting modern Japanese place names. Japanese transliterations follow the modified Hepburn system and all foreign language terms are Japanese unless otherwise noted: S. for Sanskrit, P. for Pāli, C. for Chinese, etc. Japanese characters or *kanji* are included at first occurrence in the main text and footnotes. Characters for Japanese authors in the bibliography, who are not being treated as historical figures, are not included in the main text. The names of Buddhist historical and literary figures follow Japanese transliteration with their Sanskrit or Chinese names provided at first occurrence in a chapter: for example, Ajase (S. Ajātaśatru) and Shakamuni (S. Śākyamuni). I capitalize the first letter of titles of Japanese texts and legal documents (for example, the 1871 *Senshō haishi rei* 賤称廃止令). At the first occurrence of a name of an institution, association, or department, a translation of the name will be given followed by the transliteration and characters in parentheses. If the name is used very frequently, I assign it a nickname or abbreviation following Japanese convention: for example, the Ōtani-ha Council of Temples Related to Assimilation (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai 同和関係寺院協議会),

hereafter Dōkankyō 同関協.

Working mainly in the middle of the twentieth century, I use several terms to mark periods of time: *prewar* (pre-1945) and *postwar* (post-1945, end of World War II); *interwar* (1917-1937) to mark the period from the end of World War I to the start of intensive Japanese military activity in mainland China; and, *wartime* (1937-1945). The Japanese modern period begins with the establishment of the Meiji government in 1868 and continues to the present.

For consistency, I refer to Buddhist groups as "schools" (*shū* 宗) and "sects" (*ha* 派), terms that cover most established (*kisei* 既成) Buddhist groups in Japan. The former refers to broad types of Buddhism, such as the Pure Land school (Jōdo-shū 浄土宗), while the latter covers organizations that have legal standing as "religious juridical persons" (*shūkyō hōjin* 宗教法人) under Japanese law, such as the Ōtani sect (Ōtani-ha 大谷派) of the True Pure Land school (Jōdoshin-shū 浄土真宗). The True Pure Land school is often called "Shin Buddhism" in English, and I follow this usage throughout.

Scholars of modern Japanese Buddhism are often faced with the issue of how to transliterate words that have both a premodern and modern pronunciation. Examples: *kyōka* vs. *kyōke* (教化), *zange* vs. *sange* (懺悔). In these cases, I have tended to use the modern pronunciation and eliminate honorifics from technical terms wherever possible, such as"御," which is alternatively pronounced as *on, mi, go,* or *o.*

In Shin Buddhist studies, there has been intense concern about using English equivalents with a Christian flavor. However, since this dissertation is not focused primarily on doctrine, I compromise with working translations of doctrinal terms, such as "faith" for *shinjin* (信心). It is a larger issue for this dissertation that there

are few evocative terms for the religious group in English that are not Christian. In certain ways, "the church" would be a useful translation for *kyōdan* (教団); both Shin Buddhists and Christians, in fact, use the term *kyōdan* in Japanese. *Kyōdan* refers to the sectarian "group" (*dantai* 団体) as a whole, just as the older terms "sect" (*shūmon* 宗門) or "head temple" (*honzan* 本山) do, but with a modern feeling. *Kyōdan* can also refer to the group's "institution" (*kikan* 機関), "administration" (*gyōsei* 行政), temple network, and entire membership, encompassing the entire Shin "organization" (*soshiki* 組織). Moreover, it is often emotionally laden, referring to the group in its ideal, abstract form. Almost all of these words point to entities that can "act," and often occupy the subject position in Japanese syntax. I compromise with Minor Rogers' translation of *kyōdan* as "order," which, although it lacks a nostalgic punch, has a similar referent and more elegance than "religious institution." A religious order, in a general sense, exists within a larger religious group, such as "Shin Buddhism." It possesses a coherent authority structure and refers especially to those who perform clerical roles, such as Ōtani-ha temple priests (*jūshoku* 住職). All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

Introduction: Buddhist ethics and *buraku* discrimination

The social activities of older religious organizations are different from those of newer ones in at least one important way: they might have caused the social problems in the past that they work to address in the present. In other words, an organization with history can be historically responsible. This is true for the two largest sects of Shin Buddhism, the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha, in their struggles to reduce discrimination against Japan's largest minority group, *burakumin* 部落民.

Most *burakumin* are Shin Buddhists.[1] As *burakumin* activists spoke out against the discrimination they experienced in Japanese society during the twentieth century, they also condemned the actions of other Shin Buddhists and Shin governing institutions. On many occasions, these activists succeeded in eliciting a response from both the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha. The sects, in turn, promised reforms and restitutive social action both as part of ongoing social programs and as a way to address the legacy of their discriminatory pasts. This dissertation concerns *burakumin* and *buraku* discrimination (*buraku sabetsu* 部落差別) inside one of these Shin sects, the Ōtani-ha. The Ōtani-ha organized its social activities as it was confronted by, and negotiated with, *buraku* activists. Priest-bureaucrats—an often overlooked category of religious actor—were at the forefront of these interactions and essential to implementing the Ōtani-ha social policy.

---

[1] Fujitani (1970, 397) quotes a 1932 survey that listed 498 temples inside *buraku* areas with eighty-five percent of *burakumin* as Shin adherents. See below for further survey data and numbers of *buraku* temples (*buraku jiin* 部落寺院).

This dissertation examines *buraku* discrimination in Buddhist institutional and historical contexts as a case study for Buddhist ethics and an example of how Buddhist organizations with long histories have been socially engaged. Moreover, it reveals how the work of Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrats was crucial to the institution's social ethics and social action. The relative invisibility of the priest-bureaucrat explains, in part, why the social engagement of established Buddhist groups in Japan is so often unnoticed. After reviewing the scholarly study of Buddhist ethics and socially engaged Buddhism, describing how this dissertation makes an original contribution to each, I conclude with an outline of the dissertation itself, chapter by chapter.

Shin Buddhism and *burakumin*

Shin Buddhism is the short name for the "True Pure Land school" (Jōdoshin-shū 浄土真宗), a Japanese Buddhist tradition that looks to the medieval Buddhist practitioner, Shinran (親鸞, 1173-1263), as its founder. Despite "its own kinds of discrimination against them," Galen Amstutz explains that Shin Buddhism "has had a special relationship with the...*burakumin* 'outcaste' class" (1997, 24). Into this relationship, Japanese modernity brought concepts of equality, dignity, and rights, the new apparatus of the nation-state, and a bewildering variety of political ideologies. Such concepts quickly permeated Shin sects and were deployed in conflicts between those of high and low status, the wealthy and the impoverished, non-*burakumin* and *burakumin*. They provided a new, modern language for the expression and critique of Shin Buddhism itself.

As *burakumin* organized in the early twentieth century to demand equality, dignity, and an end to discrimination, some aimed their demands squarely at the two large sects of Shin Buddhism, the Honganji-ha and the Ōtani-ha. Their demands challenged the structure of Shin institutions, scrutinizing authentic

religiosity and blood lineages,[2] status and social order, and ideas of good and evil. Their voices joined a broader struggle in the modern period over the true ethical vision of Shin Buddhism, and these visions were always justified by ascription to the founder, Shinran.

Shinran was born in the old imperial capital (present-day Kyoto), and came of age in a time of famine and unrest as the military government took power from its seat in Kamakura. He left behind a monastic career on Mount Hiei to dedicate himself to a new style of exclusive devotion to Amida (阿弥陀, S. Amitābha or Amitāyus), the Buddha of Infinite Light and Life. Shinran became a follower of the teacher of this new style, Hōnen (法然, 1133-1212)—an affiliation that resulted in his exile from the capital several years later. He abandoned his monastic precepts and Mt. Hiei, moreover, for a life that he described as "neither lay nor monastic."[3] As a writer, he brushed several compilations, commentaries, letters, and songs of praise, and garnered a modest following in the Kantō region in eastern Japan. This following supported him during his twilight years back in the imperial capital.

Whatever his individual circumstances were, Shinran's decision to break his vows, marry, and have children set a unique course for the groups that make up Shin Buddhism today. Since his time, authority structures have relied on both the transmission of blood and the transmission of teachings; its leaders from the medieval period onwards were both the hereditary descendants of Shinran and his

---

[2] The "blood" of elite Shin priests descended from the founder is pure and sacred, woven into authority structures, ritual, and doctrine. The "blood" of the marginalized *burakumin* is often connected to impurity. Matsutani reports a conversation with an elderly woman in the 1980s near Nanba Betsu-in temple (難波別院) where she said of the *burakumin*: "You can't trust them; their blood is different" (1995, 62). See Caron (1999, 434) who applies premodern and modern articulations of a "symbolics of blood" to *burakumin*, relying on the work of Michel Foucault. See also Orbaugh (2007).

[3] *hisō hizoku* 非僧非俗. The interpretations of this important phrase are endless, and many use it to argue for an anti-authoritarian or independent political position for Shin Buddhists. Here, I focus on the idea of a clerical group set apart from laypeople, whose marriage and familial relations are important for sect structure.

dharma-heirs. Some of these descendants led Shin sects that gained great size, wealth, and power. Accordingly, Shinran's descendants, the leading family, especially the head priest (*hossu* 法主) and his male relatives (*renshi* 連枝),[4] formed part of elite Japanese society in terms of financial resources, worldly power, and aristocratic status.

Almost all *burakumin* belonged to one of the Shin sects—many say eighty-five percent and quote an even higher number for western Japan (Wagatsuma 1966; Kondō 2010, 23).[5] *Burakumin*, meaning literally "people of the village," denotes people from "discriminated-against villages" (*hisabetsu buraku* 被差別部落) who suffered severe forms of disadvantage, isolation, and ostracism.[6] Aside from a financially secure, elite stratum, most *burakumin* experienced poverty. They form "a modern underclass—with higher unemployment, lower literacy, poorer housing, and shorter lives" than the average Japanese citizen (McKnight 2006, 143).[7] *Buraku* and *buraku*-compound words were modern euphemisms introduced to identify this marginalized group of people. As euphemisms do, each time a new one was created it quickly took on negative meaning. Although they feel too blunt to be considered politically correct in Japanese, the terms *burakumin* and *buraku* are still widely used in English, a convention I follow throughout. I do not capitalize these terms to emphasize the fact that this is not a racial or ethnic group distinct from

---

[4] The leading family is the Ōtani clan (*Ōtanike* 大谷家), called the "first family" (*ikkeshū* 一家衆). The family became increasingly important from the fifteenth century onwards. Women from this family, too, played important political and religious roles as, for example, wives in marriage alliances or by representing their sons' interests in matters of succession. For more information on *ikkeshū*, see Ishida Yoshihito's (石田義人) description in Akamatsu and Kasahara (1963, 278–284). For a discussion of Eshin-ni, Shinran's wife, see Dobbins (2004).

[5] Eighty, eighty-five, and ninety percent are numbers repeated frequently in Japanese articles (BYJ 160).

[6] The report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur, Doudou Diène (2006), also uses the term "caste-like."

[7] Caron describes them as a "cultural/economic underclass," and many residents of the Kyoto *buraku* areas he studied worked in "the 'sanitation' sector—garbage hauling, waste recycling, and building maintenance" (1999, 433). Many *burakumin* perform "3K" work ("difficult" *kitsui* きつい, "dirty" *kitanai* 汚い, and "dangerous" *kiken* 危険) as day laborers, and are overrepresented in work that is considered undesirable.

"the Japanese." They are, in fact, invisible.

As a term, "*buraku*" refers to specific people, to specific places, or to people indirectly through place. There are regions in Japan where *buraku* simply means "village," but I will use it consistently to mean *buraku* "people" (*min* 民). Many movements that address the *buraku* "issue" or "problem" (*mondai* 問題) and *buraku* "discrimination" (*sabetsu* 差別) include both *burakumin* and non-*burakumin* individuals. Some, however, such as the *buraku* liberation movement established in the 1920s, were formed by and for *burakumin*. Indeed, "*burakumin*" itself is a modern identity, complex and not restricted to the lineal descendants of premodern legal outcastes or other marginalized groups. It comprises a large number of regionally diverse groups with different histories.

Burakumin number in the millions, although it is difficult to determine just how many millions, now or in the past. Population estimates for the modern *burakumin* vary widely between two to six percent of the total population of Japan.[8] One reason their population size is difficult to calculate is that *burakumin* are an invisible minority that formed in the modern period. Due to discrimination, moreover, many have no desire to self-identify as *burakumin*. It is known, however, that the *buraku* population, *burakumin* elite groups, and *buraku* political activists are concentrated in western and southwestern Japan, with an estimated fifty percent of *burakumin* residing in the Kinki or Kansai region.

The story of a *burakumin*, "Satoru Kawada"

Narratives make the reality of *buraku* discrimination immediate. They powerfully convey the despair, depression, and thoughts of suicide commonly expressed by

---

[8] See for example Neary (1989, 4–6), Roth (2005, 73), and McKnight (2006, 143).

modern *burakumin*. They relate the pain of having opportunities taken away and relationships arbitrarily terminated when *buraku* status is discovered. The first chapter of Roger Yoshino and Sueo Murakoshi's *The Invisible Visible Minority* presented one such story of a young *burakumin* man from Kyoto whom they named "Satoru Kawada" (1977, 2-17).

Kawada writes of his birth in one of the urban *buraku* of Kyoto, and his father's birth in a Nara *buraku*. He gives the *buraku* population of Japan as "3,000,000 of us who reside in some 6,000 segregated buraku"—the figures accepted by the dominant *buraku* advocacy organization, the Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei 部落解放同盟).[9] He describes his childhood memories of the physical space of the *buraku*: narrow streets, inadequate sanitation, crowded housing, and the one road leading to the Buddhist temple.[10] Without roadways and adequate infrastructure, the danger of fire was high. He recalls family visits to Shin Buddhist temples in Kyoto for large annual ceremonies such as expressing gratitude and remembering Shinran on his death-day (*hōonkō*). He notes that the majority of *burakumin* belong to Shin Buddhism. He mentions, too, that a system of segregated temples[11] existed within Shin during the Edo period (1603-1867).

Kawada's father was a shoemaker, one of the traditional leatherworking crafts

---

[9] In liberationist movements, population has become a slogan: "3,000,000 brothers and sisters in 6,000 *buraku*!" The Buraku Liberation League estimates a larger *burakumin* population, whereas official government surveys give lower numbers: a 1985 government survey lists 1,163,372 *burakumin* and 4,594 *buraku* (Minority Rights Group International 2008). For an explanation of this discrepancy, see Neary (1989, 4-6). In Kyoto, the proportion of *burakumin* in the population is thought to be as high as five percent. In the 1910s, the serial *Kōdō* 公道 published a map showing the population density and distribution of *burakumin* in Japan. *Burakumin* were five percent of the population in the provinces near Kyoto, around one in twenty people, and one in fifteen people in Kyoto itself (Uesugi 2006, 13). For estimates of Edo period (1603-1867) *eta-hinin* groups, see Neary (1989, 21).

[10] Shimahara (1984) describes *buraku* from the 1950s and 1980s, including sociological data and changes to legislation.

[11] Literally, "extremely defiled temples" (*etadera* 穢多寺) or "polluted temples" (*eji* 穢寺). Discussed further in chapter 2. More on the difficult terms *eta* and *e* below.

associated with *burakumin*, despised and considered unclean due to its connection with animal death. It was difficult to sell products directly to other Japanese groups, without the necessary and oppressive intermediary roles and transaction rituals of the wholesaler and the local boss. He describes his encounter with discrimination at school, and later, of "passing" in the big city, Tokyo, where he hid his identity. He relates bitter disappointment when rejected for jobs he was qualified to perform, and painful rejection by his girlfriend, who was pressured by her family to end the relationship. These rejections came after background status investigations [12] (*mibun chōsa* 身分調査) had discovered his links to the *buraku* in Kyoto. For an invisible minority, residence in a *buraku* area is the easiest way to mark someone as *burakumin*. Kawada tells of despair, continuing problems at work, and the intense personal crisis of contemplating suicide. Following this crisis, he leaves Tokyo to return to his family home in the Kyoto *buraku*.[13]

Elements of Kawada's story appear over and over again in the self-narratives of *burakumin*: childhood memories of the "village" (*buraku*), of Shin Buddhism and the temple, of leaving the *buraku* for the big city, of being discovered, of the subdued return to the *buraku*, and of the pain of lost relationships, lost opportunities, and the contemplation of suicide.

Kawada's story makes clear the way that discriminatory structures and practices isolate *buraku* residential areas and limit the connections *burakumin*

---

[12] Status investigations (*mibun chōsa* 身分調査) are normally performed by private investigators hired by a family to examine the pedigree of a potential marriage partner, or company to examine a potential employee. They are illegal, but still occur. Because Buddhist temple registers sometimes contain information about status and place of residence, private investigators often approach temples to determine a person's status.

[13] Kawada ends his story with a hopeful tone, describing his encounter with *buraku* advocacy in Osaka with the Buraku Liberation League. He describes meeting his future wife and their continuing struggles against discrimination together. As a narrative in a Buraku Liberation League sponsored publication, it is no surprise that it leaves the reader with the sense that hope, comfort, and support is to be found in a life of struggle against discrimination.

have outside of their communities. If, for example, it is discovered through interaction (or background investigation) that people are connected to *burakumin*, they run the risk of arbitrary exclusion from marriage, property ownership, property rental, and employment—the very social relationships and transactions that undergird a modern citizen's survival and success. Once people are recognized by others in Japanese society as *burakumin*, they can experience sporadic contempt, avoidance, aggression, and even violence. That is, their relationships with others become unstable and difficult to face without anxiety. Although there has been a reduction today in discrimination in many "public" arenas,[14] such as employment and property transactions, "private" arenas such as marriage are still significantly affected.[15]

Explaining Buraku *discrimination*

Why do *burakumin* suffer discrimination? Although explanations are as varied as population estimates, *burakumin* suffer discrimination because they are considered *permanently* polluted, contaminated, and inherently defiling to others in Japanese society. Pollution is a culturally defined "substance" that disqualifies people, making them unable to perform their social role.[16] In most cases, pollution is temporary. In Japan, pollution or defilement (*kegare* ケガレ, 穢) can be removed with culturally defined techniques—such as Japanese forms of purification via ritual,[17] water, salt, fire, avoidance, or seclusion (or even modern

---

[14] Like other minority groups, the *burakumin* are sometimes subject to systematic discrimination by law enforcement and legal systems in ways similar to racial profiling. Some of the longest running and strongest Buraku Liberation League protests involve claims of unfair treatment by elements of law and law enforcement.

[15] See Kitaguchi (1999, 8-10) for mixed-marriage statistics, opposition to marriages, extended family relations in mixed marriages, and so forth. Mixed-marriages have increased over the course of the twentieth century. See also Morgan (2007).

[16] Japanese understandings of pollution have varied by historical period, social class, occupation, and so on (Namihira 1987, S65).

[17] Such as Shintō ritual purification (*okiyome* お清め), where a practitioner waves a sakaki branch or a *gohei*

techniques of personal hygiene). Once pollution is removed, that person may resume his or her social role. But *burakumin* are given no recourse to these techniques. They are viewed as permanently polluted,[18] defiled by culturally defined "dirt" or "contagions"[19] that are perceived as dangerous to others in Japanese society and to society itself.

For *burakumin*, this polluting substance is often thought to reside in the blood[20] and the body. Ian Neary (1989, 2), for example, describes how *buraku* discrimination included "bizarre aspects," which identified *burakumin* as somehow inhuman. Their bodies were thought different, to function differently, or to interact with their environment in ways impossible for human beings. Because this difference was believed to be dangerous and contagious, *burakumin* are "outcaste": cut off from commensality, contact, and community. There will be no public acknowledgement of consanguinity and an avoidance of kinship ties through marriage. Pollution is made up of a complex web of premodern and modern justifications that refer to Buddhist ideas of moral pollution and evil work, blood ties, inferior and marginal bodies, and membership in hereditary, low social status

御幣 over the polluted object or person.

[18] When impurity is linked to occupation, this "permanent" state of defilement is easy to explain. Premodern and modern groups whose occupations bring them into daily contact with death and other defiling substances do not have the ability to maintain purity. Neary (1989 14-15) asserts that the defilement from animal death became permanent and hereditary in the early Edo period, but new research suggests that *buraku* village areas and *buraku* temples existed as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Neary 2009, 55; Yamamoto 1999), and other scholars find examples of permanent, inherent pollution back as far as the Heian period (794-1191) (Ohnuki-Tierney 1989, 90; Orbaugh 2007, 186-187).

[19] Japanese sources for impurity are multiple. The two most powerful are death or "black impurity" (*kuro fujō* 黒不浄), and blood or "red impurity" (*aka fujō* 赤不浄, and "avoidance of blood" *chi no imi* 血の忌み particularly that associated with the female reproductive functions of menstruation, pregnancy, and childbirth) (Kashiwahara 1988, 16-17). Sexual activity is sometimes thought defiling, and so is contact with bodily excreta and disease. Crime and illness were also treated as polluting, understood as such by both Buddhist and Shintō traditions. The pollution of crime adhered to the immediate family of a criminal as well as to those who judged, handled, or punished criminals (Namihira 1987, S69-S70).

[20] "Caste difference was regarded as immutable and adherent in blood" (Geiger 2011, 16). See also connections with disease, contagion, and "civilized" embodiment (Orbaugh 2007, 189-190; Robertson 2002; 2005; and Caron 1999).

groups. Although purity and pollution thought (*jōe shisō* 浄穢思想) and views of "contacting defilement" or contagion (*shokue* 触穢) are normally discussed in reference to folk religion or the Shintō tradition, Buddhism is a part of these discourses. I address Japanese and Shin Buddhist forms of pollution further in chapters 1 and 2.

A state of permanent defilement is the defining feature of *buraku* discrimination. This discrimination, then, consists of practices and social structures that segregate and demean with the goal of controlling dangerous pollution or defilement (*kegare*) thought to be inherent within *burakumin*. When absolute segregation of space, objects, and families is impossible, ritual is used to mitigate the spread of pollution from *burakumin* to other Japanese people.[21] Neary (1989, 2) mentions a few of these, such as limiting interaction to liminal spaces like the threshold of a home or passing coins through water during the exchange of money.[22] As it protects Japanese society and social order, discrimination prevents *burakumin* from fully participating in that same society.

Most theories agree that pollution resides in the people, places, or things that challenge social order and social elites.[23] Actions taken to segregate, avoid, and ritually control were neither arbitrary nor simply based on irrational "belief"

---

[21] In descriptions of these interactions (such as Pharr 1990, 76-77), examples are given of spatial segregation, obligatory deference behaviors like prostration, curfews, and ritual behavior when entering the dwelling of higher status.

[22] Carefully controlled ritual interactions with pollution can harness its power in beneficial ways. See Ohnuki-Tierney (1984, 40), Rambelli (2002, 44), and Faure's (2003, 282) assertion that premodern Japanese Buddhism exhibits a "fascination for transgressive or marginal elements" and acknowledges the power of defilement.

[23] Mary Douglas correlated societies with highly regulated group life, and strong differentiation between insiders and outsiders, with strong or inherent notions of pollution (summarized in Bell 1997, 44-46). Rambelli (2002, 41,43-44) links the production of "docile bodies" with the concrete exercise of power of religious institutions and these to the marking of bodies and forms of expulsion. Rambelli seems to prefer ideas of bodily marking to discourses of impurity, whereas I see the two as inseparable. See also Ohnuki-Tierney (1984), Faure (2003), and Namihira (1987).

(Namihira 1987, S65). They had real consequences for elite groups and allowed them to maintain their social position.[24] In other words, managing pollution was and is an exercise of power. In order to express this threat to power, some models label permanently polluted groups as "scapegoats" for the maintenance of social order[25] or as the foil that allowed majority Japanese to understand themselves as "pure" (Orbaugh 2007, 188). Herman Ooms, for example, explains that Edo period discrimination was a combination of the operation of state power and legal regulation, systems of status (*mibun* 身分), purity-pollution thought, and race- and caste-like ideas that ascribe biological difference to premodern outcastes (1996, 245-248).

Because the *burakumin* are considered polluted, it follows that this group challenges social order. And, if Fujino Yutaka and Kurokawa Midori (2009) are correct that *burakumin* emerged as a coherent identity only in the modern period (late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries), the social order that the *burakumin* threatened was that of the emerging Japanese imperial nation-state.

In part, Japanese Buddhism has served the vehicle for its own, older ideas of pollution. Many of the symbolic components of the modern *burakumin* identity stretch back historically to medieval and early modern outcastes whose occupations involved them in animal death—even if *burakumin* are a product of the Japanese modern.[26] Buddhism, in particular, is thought responsible for

---

[24] Although Marxist theories see pollution ideas and practices as a secondary phenomenon justifying social order, most anthropological and sociological approaches see pollution and social order having a more complex, dialectical relationship.

[25] Repeated by Marxist activists (for an early example, Takahashi 1924, 21) and historians, subscribers to the theory that *burakumin* have their origins in the exercise of power by premodern authorities.

[26] Yamamoto (1999, 39-44) argues that earlier Japanese notions of pollution are tied to social order, but that this connection had weakened by the end of the medieval period. Following Fujino and Kurokawa (2009), then, what we see is a reconfiguration of pollution beliefs that allows older notions to continue within a new social order, the modern, alongside new ideas of pollution from poverty, endemic crime, and epidemics. I discuss this

extending ideas of pollution to animal death (Ohnuki-Tierney 1998, 39). "Butcher" (*toji* 屠児), for example, a negative term appearing often in Buddhist texts, became a central symbol for the defilement of modern *burakumin* and their premodern forbearers. Some have even claimed that Buddhist condemnation of butchery and meat eating alone explains the historical emergence of *burakumin*, though this theory has few proponents today (Fujitani 1970, 395).

Although there were many, the most common premodern term for outcastes implying occupations involving animal death was *eta*[27]--a term with very negative connotations rarely used outside of the study of historical sources. *Eta* became a broad label for groups that tended "to deal with large, domestic animal corpses, leatherwork, and low-level public order" (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 1). The term itself has an unclear history. Some scholars, following the thirteenth century miscellanea *Chiribukuro* 塵袋,[28] believe it derived from the term *etori*, referring to an occupational group associated with butchery that provided meat to feed the hunting falcons of elite clans in classical Japan. In truth, this is only one part of a longer *Chiribukuro* entry that attempts to answer the question of why the group called "purifiers" (*kiyome* キヨメ) are called "*eta*." It described people who use the term *eta* as confused about the details of its historical emergence. As a result of this confusion, they considered the *eta* less than human and the indistinguishable from a number of other marginalized groups:

> Some people apply the name *eta* to a group of inhumans (*hinin* 非人), such as

---

further in chapters 1 and 2.

[27] Additionally, the term "leather worker" (*kawata*, with various characters applied: 皮多, 革田), and "prison guard" (*chōri* 懲吏, 長吏) sometimes used as alternatives for *eta* (BYJ 218-219). Their status occupations included creation of leather goods, prison guards, low-level police, and cleaners. On the term *kawata*, see also Ooms (1996).

[28] Price (1966, 19-20), KBS (1:45, 98-99), Kawada (1995b, 26-32), Okumoto (2003, 104). Kawada discusses several interpretations of this passage, along with the controversy over the appearance of the characters 穢多 next to the main entry.

those who take on the appearance of a begging Buddhist monk but are not true monks (*ransō* or *rōsō* 濫僧), and other groups calling them inhuman, beggars,[29] *eta*, and all [the names of groups] that do not mix with humans…In India those called "outcastes" (*sendara* 旃陀羅) were butchers (*tosha* 屠者). They were evil people (*akunin* 悪人) in the form of *eta*[30] who killed living things and sold them. (Kawada 1995b, 26)

This tendency to confuse or elide terms for low status groups is an interesting one that continues into the modern with the elision of despised categories of race and disease, for example.[31] Uesugi Satoshi (2006, 3, 14) also asserts that many premodern terms were used synonymously: *eta* = *hinin* = *kawaramono* 河原者 ("riverbank dweller") = *toji* ("butcher") = *kiyome* 清目 ("purifiers").[32] Uesugi provides further descriptors: "eaters of meat," "wall-painters," "killers of horses and cattle," "those who pierce animal flesh with needles," "those who are blind," "those forbidden to enter religious sites," "those who produce *nenbutsu*[33] talismans," "those who live on hillsides," "hunters," "those who are human but animal-like," "those who carry swords and are without rice," "those who skin beasts," "those who are beggars," "those who carry out criminal punishments," "makers of leather goods," and so on (Uesugi 2006, 14). In addition to synonymy, the tendency to slip between negative categaory and another, this list illustrates

---

[29] *katai* (*kattai* 乞丐) listed as a synonym for *kojiki* 乞食 (BJY 60, 107-108).

[30] Could also read, "evil people with extremely defiled bodies" *eta tai no akunin* エタ体ノ悪人.

[31] Roth (2005, 74) notes this continues to happen today, when categories of race, disease, and status tend to be confounded. The "confusion" of these stigmatized categories of people might be part of stigmatization itself. Fujino and Kurokawa (2009, 46) note a modern synonymity linking *burakumin* with leprosy (Hansen's disease) with urban slum dwellers with Korean residents—all groups considered problems for the progress of the imperial Japanese nation-state. The *hibakusha*, people who were exposed to radiation during the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, experience a similar kind of discrimination. People refuse to associate with them and they have difficulty getting married.

[32] See BJY for more information on any of these terms. The dictionary itself defines hundreds of terms for low status groups.

[33] *Nenbutsu* 念仏 practice is to contemplate or utter the name of Amida Buddha. These talismans would have been inscribed with Amida Buddha's name, and possibly refer to a class of itinerant priest, *nenbutsu hōshi*, connected with the Ji-shū 時宗, a pure land school founded by Ippen (一遍, 1234–1289), a younger contemporary of Shinran (親鸞, 1173-1263).

the tremendous variety of terms and descriptions inherited from the premodern period.[34]

At some point in the medieval period, characters were applied to the syllables *eta* (穢多), that meant literally "many impurities" or "extremely defiled." Discrimination against outcastes labeled *eta* was institutionalized during the Edo period (Amstutz 2010, 52-56). Although modern *burakumin* have sometimes used the term in a radical, dignified claiming of identity, most avoid using it at all.[35]

Despite the older provenance of some components of *burakumin* identity, the forces that shape them are modern: *burakumin* become the prototypical "social problem," and anti-modern group in need of uplift, assimilation, or elimination.[36] This places the attempts of Shin Buddhists to uplift and assimilate *burakumin* in ironic perspective: although they rejected certain older Buddhist ideas of pollution as "superstition," they consented to modern components of *buraku* pollution, such as "bad blood" or genetic difference. I discuss this further in chapter 1.

The *burakumin* are invisible. As the first scholar of modern *buraku* history, Kita Sadakichi (1871-1939), asserted as early as 1926, *burakumin* "are certainly not different from other village dwellers...It is simply that in the past they were made victims of hierarchical consciousness and social superstition based on the

---

[34] In addition, Fujino notes that particular groups were regional and specific: "In early modern society, low status was not just "extremely defiled" (*eta*) and "inhuman" (*hinin*). Different low status groups were created depending on the region… even for those groups labeled *eta*, they might also be called prison guards (*chōri*) or leather workers (*kawata*) depending on the region" (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 1).

[35] Takahashi (1924) discusses members of the Levelers' Society doing this in the 1920s, and it appears in the "Levelers' Society Declaration" (*Suiheisha sengen* 水平社宣言, 1922) (GS 12).

[36] In the modern period, earlier elisions between the pollution of crime, illness, and low status—and the spread of this pollution through kinship ties—continue. Namihira (1987, S70) notes that Meiji ideas of public health rearticulated illness impurity, and certainly sees different forms of pollution thought in different realms of Japanese society, whether folk, political, economic production, and so on (S71). See also Ohnuki-Tierney (1984). Geiger (2011, 24) notes that early proposals for the elimination of the *eta* through migration and industrialization were seen as related to "Japan's quest for status as a civilized nation equal to those of the West."

occupations some people chose" (1926, preface). Although they are not visibly, racially, or ethnically different[37] as these terms are understood in the modern period, the social practices of most Japanese citizens based on concepts of pollution mark *burakumin* apart and make them visible to, or discoverable by, others in Japanese society.[38]

Invisibility makes the case of *burakumin* intriguing. What is more, English language scholarship has barely scratched the surface of religion and *burakumin*, even though Japanese religious groups have marginalized *burakumin* and marked them apart from followers of other status levels in their own ways. As Fujino Yutaka notes, the strong political and ideological forces that have constrained the study of *buraku* history have lessened, including those modernist and Marxist assumptions that caused religion to be overlooked (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 1-14). *Buraku* discrimination, manifest as social practices of avoidance and ostracism, is intimately connected with the idea that *burakumin* are permanently polluted and contagious. If Shin Buddhist organizations have contributed to and circulated these ideas of pollution both historically and in the present—as I believe they have—then examining the social activities of Shin Buddhism takes on a vital significance.

Institutional ethics and conflict within the Ōtani-ha sect

This dissertation is about Buddhist ethics, what is claimed to be right and wrong,

---

[37] The lack of visible difference is one of the key points of the 1965 Commission report (Neary 2009, 71).

[38] This is true for the premodern forbearers of the *burakumin*. During the Edo period the hairstyles, dress, customs, and footwear of low-status groups were legislated by central and local government. In other words, it was possible to tell just by looking what status a person belonged to (in fact, all status groups in Japan were subject to these kinds of regulations to a greater or lesser extent). See Howell's (2005) discussion of how the regulation of "customs" (*fūzoku* 風俗) created visible markers of status difference during the nineteenth century.

good and evil, according to an abstract entity called "Buddhism."[39] It does not, however, study Buddhist ethics in what has become the conventional way. Normally, academics turn to an authoritative source, usually an ancient Buddhist scripture, treatise, or revered teacher to determine what is good and evil according to Buddhism. When these academics take up a modern social issue, almost always, they will apply the what they have derived from their chosen authoritative source to provide a Buddhist position or solution to that issue. Here, I have taken up the modern social issue of discrimination against a Japanese minority group, the *burakumin*. But my approach to Buddhism and discrimination in this dissertation is different from the usual way of doing Buddhist ethics in a least three ways.

First, my authoritative sources are not scriptural, ancient, nor written by Buddhists trusted for their expertise in either doctrine or practice. They are the texts written by a neglected category of religious professional: which I call the "priest-bureaucrat." Second, my social issue, *buraku* discrimination, and the Buddhist sect I examine, Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism, is one where Buddhism is thought to be historically responsible for the social problem itself; rarely do academics of Buddhist ethics consider the cases where "Buddhism" is the bad guy. The Ōtani-ha has been constantly reminded of its historical responsibility for discrimination by *burakumin* advocacy and rights groups over the course of the twentieth century. When they thought about what they ought to do about discrimination, they could never escape considering what they had done. Third, rather than have a static conception of Buddhist ethics that is then applied to the problem of discrimination against *burakumin*, my sources of authority, these

---

[39] In a subject-driven field like religious studies, it falls to each individual researcher to consider questions of theory and method. Taves (2011, 289), in her 2010 presidential address at the American Academy of Religion describes religious studies as a "raider-discipline," taking from different methodological approaches.

modern texts written by priest-bureaucrats, reveal an ethics that was *iterative*, evolving over time, born out of the very organizational attempt to grapple with the problem of discrimination in the first place.

My approach allows me to take up issues of group and institutional ethics in modern Shin Buddhism relying on the case of *buraku* discrimination, and explore the way considerations of the "group" and "group history" affect Buddhist ethical thinking. Ethical thought and sect policy inside the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy was produced in a historical context of tense relations[40] over the course of the twentieth century between the Ōtani-ha administration, Ōtani-ha *buraku* temple priests and followers, and external *buraku* advocacy groups. In this context, it was Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrats who helped to formulate sect ethical positions, implement sect policy, and come to terms with historical and present responsibility for *buraku* discrimination.

I focus on one priest-bureaucrat named Takeuchi Ryō'on (武内了温, 1891-1967) as emblematic of the role of priest-bureaucrat in general. During his career, he helped manage the sect's official response to *buraku* discrimination by proposing a permanent bureau and a semi-autonomous association: the Society Department (Shakaika 社会課), which was part of the Ōtani-ha administration, and the True Body Society (Shinshinkai 真身会), which received both sect and government funding. I focus on Takeuchi because he and several generations of like-minded priest-bureaucrats have had a strong influence on the policy of the Ōtani-ha today. Moreover, he is a good example of something not normally studied

---

[40] I take an interactionist approach to both discrimination and the formation of ethical thought (especially indebted to the sociologist Erving Goffman) (Goffman 1963; Goffman 1983; Lemert and Branaman 1997). Ethical thought and moral behavior emerge through interaction, specifically through mediated and face-to-face communication (Ritzer 2005, 744–746). Thus, the disputes, conflicting claims, and factionalism in the relations between the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy and *buraku* advocates is the very place to look for Buddhist ethics.

in Buddhist ethics: someone who spent his career in "middle-management"—neither an elite administrator nor a low-level officer. Today, the bureau founded by Takeuchi is called the Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements (Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu 解放運動推進本部) and the Ōtani-ha publically champions human rights and speaks out against *buraku* discrimination, clearly seen in the activities of the current head priest, Ōtani Chōken (Jōnyo) (大谷暢顕 (浄如), b. 1930). I return to the contemporary Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, and to the contemporary situation of Ōtani-ha *buraku* priests and followers, in my conclusion.

The Ōtani-ha sect of Shin Buddhism

The Ōtani-ha is also known as the "Eastern" (*higashi* 東) sect of Shin Buddhism, and its head temple is Higashi Hongan-ji 東本願寺 in Kyoto.[41] Its official name is Shinshū Ōtani-ha—here "Ōtani-ha" for short[42]—and it consists of a large network of nearly 9,000 member temples and 5.5 million followers spread throughout the country. Although this has changed somewhat in recent years, the political and ritual power, wealth, and prestige of the Ōtani-ha was possessed by those elite priests descended from Shinran. The current and twenty-fifth head priest, Jōnyo, for example, is both a blood descendent of Shinran and cousin to the emperor of Japan, Akihito. Yet, because Shin Buddhism spans the full spectrum of social status

---

[41] It is the second largest branch of Shin Buddhism, next to the "Western" sect, Honganji-ha, which has as its head temple the Nishi Hongan-ji 西本願寺. As of 2008, in Japan, the Ōtani-ha had 8,551 temples, 32,841 ordained ministers (*sōryo* 僧侶, 48% women), 17,458 certified teachers (*kyōshi* 教師, 16% women), and 7,717 temple priests (*jūshoku* 住職, 1% women) (*Shūmon gensei no hōkoku* 宗門現勢の報告 [Report on the Present State of the Sect]; SS No. 1253, August 2008, 50-51). The *Shūkyō nenkan* (宗教年鑑 [Religions' Yearbook]) provides similar numbers for the Ōtani-ha in 2008: 8,608 temples and 119 teaching assemblies (*kyōkai* 教会), 16,148 male and 2,565 female *kyōshi*, with around 5.5 million total adherents (Bunkachō 2008, 68–69).

[42] The Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha, have many short, sometimes affectionate, names such as: *ohigashi* お東 and *onishi* お西, *daiha* 大派 and *honpa* 本派, *tōha* 東派 and *saiha* 西派. *Monzeki* 門跡, a title granted by the imperial court, is sometimes used to refer to the Ōtani-ha, Honganji-ha, their head temples or head priests.

and socio-economic levels[43] including *burakumin*, its history has been deeply affected by their interaction.

The modern Ōtani-ha elite attempted to assist its followers of low status and few means. Outspoken Shin priests and leaders recognized by the 1890s that *buraku* followers were suffering greatly, almost wholly excluded from the benefits of economic modernization, having lost former economic monopolies.[44] By the early 1900s, this informal paternal and charitable approach gave way to centrally organized charitable foundations, special preaching policies, and relief work. In the early 1920s, the Ōtani-ha administration created new bureaucratic divisions and semi-autonomous groups implemented to oversee a systematic policy aimed at reducing *buraku* discrimination and providing social services—wherever possible—to *buraku* followers. Although the language used has shifted over time, the Ōtani-ha's "charity" (*jizen* 慈善), "relief" (*kyūsai* 救済), "improvement" (*kaizen* 改善), "moral reform" (*kanka* 感化), "moral exhortation" (*kyōka* 教化), and "social work" (*shakai jigyō* 社会事業), and present-day "social welfare" (*shakai fukushi* 社会福祉),[45] were modern in form. Early twentieth century charitable work has given way to the human rights campaigns and petitions of the present; but the pattern of elite priests using the resources of the administration, its bureaucracy, and its temple network to address the problem of *buraku* discrimination continues.

---

[43] Historically, Shin Buddhism also displays a wide variety of sociological forms, spanning urban and rural areas, centralized authority, hierarchical lineages of patronage and tribute, as well as regional or local autonomy for confraternities. The actual leadership was almost wholly male (though wives and mothers could play important religious and political roles), whether priestly, lay, or somewhere in between. Such leadership could be inherited or granted.

[44] Outcastes formerly had a monopology over the production of leather goods, for example (Wagatsuma and Totten 1966, 34-35).

[45] Inaba (2006) briefly outlines how the content of social work, the "issues," changed over time from children, poverty, and education in the prewar, to the elderly, handicapped, peace movement, anti-nuclear, and so on in the postwar period. The activities of civil society groups like the Ōtani-ha tend to be entangled with or overseen by state government.

On the other hand, low status members of the Ōtani-ha have attempted to criticize the elite and suggest reforms for sectarian institutions. *Buraku* advocates—including *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism—criticized discrimination inside the Ōtani-ha. These organized watchdogs protested specific discriminatory incidents, phenomena, and structural inequalities [46] through demonstrations, official letters, legal battles, official visits, and formal denunciation meetings. Whenever recognized representatives of the sect failed to live up to their stated ideals of equality and human rights, *buraku* advocates and followers offered scathing critiques in popular media and in person.

In the center, but not at the top, Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrats mediated between the projects of those representing high and low, elite and marginal, in the course of their work. They were responsible for implementing the social projects of elite priests and represented the sect as a whole to Ōtani-ha *buraku* followers and external advocacy groups. Taking Takeuchi Ryō'on as emblematic of mid-twentieth century priest-bureaucrats who handled *buraku* discrimination, I trace his ethical and organizational thinking, which combined Shin thought and practice with specific kinds of restitutive and moral social action. His goal was to increase the material and social well-being of *burakumin* and to reduce discriminatory consciousness within the sect and throughout Japanese society.

The Ōtani-ha as a religious organization or "order" (kyōdan)

Almost invariably in modern discussions of Buddhist ethics, the agent of ethical action is assumed to be the individual person. In the case of the Ōtani-ha and *buraku* discrimination, it is the "group" that is important for several reasons: (1)

---

[46] Literally, "discriminatory incidents" (*sabetsu jiken* 差別事件), "discriminatory phenomena" (*sabetsu jishō* 差別事象), and structural discrimination in the "nature" (*taishitsu* 体質) of the sect itself.

the group "Ōtani-ha" is held to be responsible in both legal and popular discussions as a corporate actor[47]; (2) *buraku* discrimination is a violation of collective or group human rights; and (3) in response to *buraku* discrimination, priest-bureaucrats such as Takeuchi thought extensively about the group "Ōtani-ha" in its ideal form—about what this collective entity ought to be. For this reason, when I use the term "Shin Buddhism" or "Ōtani-ha," I refer primarily to this organizational or group dimension.

Many theorists acknowledge or emphasize the group dimension of religion (Lincoln 2006) and a few sociologists and anthropologists prefer it to all others (Spiro 1966b, 96-98), claiming that there is no such thing as a "religion" without a corresponding social group, that religion is an "eminently collective thing."[48] To be Shin Buddhist for the purposes of this study is to be a member or a representative of a Shin Buddhist group, meaning that Shin Buddhist doctrines and practices are precisely those espoused and enacted by Shin group members. Another tendency in Buddhist ethics—in religious studies in general, in fact—is to look to "ancient" or "original" texts to determine what is legitimately Buddhist. By relying on the group to determine what is legitimately Buddhist, I can include modern ideas and practices. For example, if a member or a representative of a Shin Buddhist group incorporates ideas such as human rights or Marxist theories of *buraku* discrimination, I consider those ideas "Shin Buddhist" here.[49]

---

[47] Many of the claims I analyze revolve around whether a group did or did not discriminate, did or did not protect human rights; such claims are, quite simply, more likely to affect members who formally identify with a sectarian Shin community than those who do not. Although it is a choice to focus on one aspect of a much wider phenomenon called "religion," it is also an opportunity to consider group aspects of religion as important as experiential, practical, or doctrinal aspects.

[48] Tweed (2008, 51) quoting Émile Durkheim (1976, 29–47).

[49] In doing so, I hope to avoid the politics of definitions in general while highlighting the ideological and normative claims embedded within them. Definitions are never neutral and there are moral consequences in defining who is considered Buddhist and *who or what is not*. Said, discussing claims about who or what

I focus especially on the Ōtani-ha central institution rather than the Ōtani-ha community.[50] In a useful differentiation of "institution" and "community," Bruce Lincoln explains that a community consists of people with a shared identity. Even when community members "disagree with one another, their disagreements are framed by reference points on which they can concur." By contrast, the institution consists of the officials, bureaucrats, priests, and other representative authority figures that attempt to regulate the religious community as a whole (Lincoln 2006, 7). The twentieth century Ōtani-ha institution was managed by a governing bureaucracy staffed with trained professionals. Ōtani-ha bureaus were not subject to market forces—budget funding was allocated by a central authority.[51] The priest-bureaucrats who staffed these bureaus specialized in particular tasks. An individual's authority in the bureaucracy was based on his position within the organizational hierarchy, rather than on other factors. The bureaucracy's rules and policies were formal, written, and highly prescriptive—one of the primary reasons why religious bureaucracies are an interesting case for ethics.

In discussions of Shin Buddhism and *buraku* discrimination, identity and group membership are crucial.[52] The claims made about discrimination[53] are deeply

---

constitutes "Islam," wrote in a similar vein: "I will not adjudicate between these claims, except to say that I have explicitly avoided taking stands on such matters as the *real, true, or authentic* Islamic or Arab world, except as issues relating to conflicts involving partisanship, solidarity, or sympathy" (Said 1985, 95; italics mine). In the same way, I read claims about authentic or original Buddhism for the way they indicate *who* is truly Buddhist at the historical moment when the claims are made.

[50] I focus on formal members and the institution because I am concerned with how institutional ethics change over time. See Tweed's (1999, 71–73) discussion of this less complex view of religious identity and adherence and his criticisms of this approach in the case of American Buddhism.

[51] Today the budget is proposed by the cabinet, and voted on by members of the priestly and lay houses of the sect diet.

[52] Membership and identity are complex categories. Individuals are often members of more than one group, and speak for more than one group. These shifting speaking-roles imply that speakers are not merely individuals, nor merely members of a group. Rather, they "speak for" or "act for" a particular group while embedded in a particular context. For example, one could be a member of the postwar Honganji-ha subgroup, the Companions Movement (Dōbō Undō 同朋運動), or a *burakumin* activist organization such as the Levelers' Association (Suiheisha 水平社), all the while writing texts about how Shin Buddhism ought to respect human

connected to the idea that there are coherent and identifiable groups that persist over time called "*burakumin*" and "Shin Buddhists." Without some notion of identity and its moral dimensions, the very idea that *burakumin* were discriminated against *because of their group identity*, or that they were treated in demeaning and alienating ways by another group called "Shin Buddhists," is incomprehensible.

In terms of group ethics, in everyday moral discourse, too, groups are regularly treated as agents, thought to bear responsibility, and to have moral reputations for being good or evil. A group is judged based on its actions. Theoretically, this everyday understanding implies that a group has "a personality and existence distinct from" its members, and it can act in ways that its individual members cannot by virtue of its structure and organization—the set of relationships of the members with one another (May 1987, 44, 55). But how exactly is the Shin Buddhist institution perceived to act and bear responsibility by members and non-members alike? In practice, it is the representatives of the group that act for the group as a whole and who are most responsible or liable.[54] For the highly organized Ōtani-ha institution, representatives such as the head priest, his male

rights. As well, there have been Buddhist-*burakumin* organizations, such as the prewar transsectarian Shin Black Robe League (Kokue Dōmei 黒衣同盟) or the Ōtani-ha Council of Temples Related to Assimilation (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai 同和関係寺院協議会). There can be a doubling and trebling of identity where individuals speak normatively for or on behalf of one or more groups, and often towards other groups where they are members. Shin Buddhism is both an "us" to be approached for support and help, as well as a "them" to be reformed through denunciation.

[53] In the modern period, this kind of claim is discussed thoroughly by Taylor as "identity politics" (Taylor and Gutmann 1994; Taylor 1997; Taylor 1999).

[54] A group is a social phenomenon. Its agency and personality are built upon the ontological reality of members and non-members but the group does not itself exist. It has agency, but it is not as full-fledged as individual agency. As a social phenomenon, groups are treated as if they exist by law, social institutions, and by members of society. This way of understanding groups is sometimes called "moderate collectivism." My thinking on group morality is loosely based on common threads from the *Journal of Social Philosophy*, especially the special issue on collective responsibility (2007). See the works on groups rights or collective human rights in May (1987), Felice (1996), Sistare, May, and Francis (2001).

relatives, cabinet members, or priest-bureaucrats such as Takeuchi Ryō'on spoke and acted for the sect as a whole.

Highly structured and organized groups, such as the Ōtani-ha order or the Buraku Liberation League—with their leadership, authorized representatives, and hierarchies—are stronger agents than unorganized groups, such as a minority group like *burakumin* dispersed throughout Japan. Unorganized groups also tend to be involuntary, with membership based on birth (into a particular sex, race, religion, ethnicity, caste, status, or language group). However, the capacity for responsible action is *not* a condition for a group having rights, interests, or the ability to harm and be harmed (May 1987, 6). And, in fact, unorganized groups tend to be more vulnerable to harm.

Group identity is also important in the case of *buraku* discrimination since human rights related to racial, social, and cultural discrimination are group rights.[55] The human rights of the group are meant to protect that group from interference, discrimination, and harm by other actors in society, especially by the state (Felice 1996, 4). Many individuals suffer discrimination and human rights violations *because* they are considered members of a particular group,[56] and there are two basic kinds of groups addressed by collective human rights. The first kind consists of groupings of individuals within, or which cross-cut, the family, such as sex and age groups. The rights of women and children are prominent examples. In

---

[55] Some basic United Nations instruments concerning collective rights are 1976 Universal Declaration of the Rights of Peoples, 1986 African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and the 1991 Draft Declaration on the Rights of Minorities.
[56] Felice points out that *individual* human rights cannot clarify or combat the systematic discrimination faced by African Americans in the United States. As of 1996, the proportion of African to Caucasian Americans under the poverty line was the same at it was in 1959, three to one (Felice 1996, 6). Despite protection of political and civil rights for African Americans as individuals, the social, economic and cultural rights of African Americans as a group have not been adequately addressed.

the case of Japan, examples include persons with certain diseases (AIDs and Hansen's disease or leprosy), sexual and gender minorities, the elderly, children, women, disabled persons, people who have been convicted of a crime and completed their punishment, victims of crime (and their families), and victims of human rights violations on the internet.[57] The second kind consists of groupings that overarch family structures, or to say this differently, groups that tend to *consist of* families and communities. These groups are based on "racial, ecological, national, linguistic or religious" characteristics (Felice 1996, 23). In the case of Japan, this kind consists of status, cultural, and racial groups such as the *burakumin*, Ainu, Okinawans, Japanese Koreans, and foreign residents.

Acts of discrimination have often been understood as corporate acts in twentieth century Japan.[58] If a Shin Buddhist priest committed actions that precipitated a "discriminatory incident" (*sabetsu jiken* 差別事件) (Matsune 1993), the responsibility for that priest's actions was extended to the Shin sect he worked for.[59] Under pressure from *buraku* advocates, the sect as a whole was obliged to claim responsibility and act to reform itself. The group was and is the basic category in ethical thinking about historical responsibility for discrimination.

For the modern Ōtani-ha, the basic term for the group is "order" (*kyōdan* 教団). Order is a concept loaded with doctrinal, historical, emotional meaning, appearing frequently in discussions of how the Ōtani-ha institution is and ought to be. Individuals are often addressed as "people of the order" (*kyōdanjin* 教団人), or

---

[57] See the website of the Japanese Ministry of Justice (2009).

[58] I do not address the issue of whether Japan has a different notion of what constitutes "human rights" when compared with some other country. Rather, I see several forms and understandings of human rights in Japanese modern history, just as several forms are seen in the evolution of rights concepts in Western countries, and in the consensus-driven arena of the United Nations following World War II.

[59] I have not yet run across a discriminatory incident committed by a female priest.

equivalent terms, [60] and possess the religious and social responsibilities of Ōtani-ha followers *as members* of the institution. As expected, priests and administrators tend to have greater responsibilities *as formal representatives* of the institution. The pressure applied by *buraku* advocacy groups and *buraku* followers of Shin compelled such Ōtani-ha representatives to return time and time again to their conception of what the order (*kyōdan*) ought to be, how it ought to be structured, and how members ought to understand and respond to their own history.

Buddhist ethics and socially engaged Buddhism

Takeuchi Ryō'on might be an interesting individual—and looked on as such by his institutional followers—but here he is a typical priest-bureaucrat, a type of actor crucial for understanding institutional history and group ethics. A descriptive approach to Takeuchi's type of work and institutional positioning is novel in the study of Buddhist ethics in two ways. First, it brings Takeuchi's activities and organizational texts to bear on the more general study of Buddhist ethics, which has rarely used such material. In so doing, it highlights the history of ethical thinking about the Ōtani-ha "group." Second, because Takeuchi's activities and thought are strikingly similar to many aspects of "socially engaged Buddhism," his example challenges ideological assumptions embedded in the scholarly use of "socially engaged" as an analytical concept for modern Buddhism. These scholars tend to exclude conservative, established, and nationalistic Buddhist organizations from their definition of this concept. Priest-bureaucrats are interesting because they are the most likely to consider the role of the religious organization in society and to be the location of social engagement within established, older Buddhist

---

[60] Such as *shūmonjin* 宗門人.

groups.

The climate of the field of Buddhist ethics[61] has shifted together with religious studies as a whole towards a more inclusive view of what counts as primary source material, studied with increasing methodological specialization and diversity. I locate the present study within this expanded Buddhist ethics and take a descriptive, historical approach to the topic of discrimination and human rights.

First, by "ethics," I refer broadly to morally[62] evaluative ideas that speculate about what is good or evil. This speculation concerns the nature of the agent[63] and the cultivation of the agent over time.[64] It also concerns morally relevant actions taken toward some object or being and the reasons given for action or self-cultivation. Ethics must rely on some ontology or metaphysical understanding of the world insofar as this defines the "possible." An ontology allows for choice amongst possible actions and for anticipating their consequences. Additionally, this broad understanding of ethics covers speculation about group agency, group responsibility, as well as ideal or utopian conceptions of the religious group.

The earliest studies of Buddhist ethics in English were written as Buddhist studies itself emerged in the late nineteenth century.[65] Later during the interwar years (1917-1939), books on ethics within Pāli Theravāda and Sanskrit Mahāyāna sacred texts appeared. After World War II, the first short regional or national

---

[61] See the recent summary by Clayton (2011), Unno's (1999) review essay, and Harvey's (2000) encyclopedic introduction to the field.

[62] Morality often refers to inherited customs and ethics to systematic reflection on morality. I generally use the two terms synonymously with ethics as a general category of study. The historical materials I focus on blur any rigid distinction between inherited moral practice and systematic ethical reflection.

[63] Sometimes called moral anthropology.

[64] In western philosophy, this kind of speculation falls into the category of virtue ethics.

[65] With the exception of Paul Carus' book *Karma: A Story of Buddhist Ethics* (1894), these early studies commonly described Buddhist ethics and morality as part of broader works on Buddhism or religion, such as Anesaki's (1912) article "Buddhist Ethics and Morality" in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 5, and Reischauer's (1917) "Buddhist Ethics," in *Studies in Japanese Buddhism*.

treatments of Buddhist ethics were published for East Asia, India, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Myanmar, along with two important books on Theravāda ethics (King 1964; Saddhātissa 1970). The mid-1970s to the mid-1990s saw the first book-length studies of Indian Mahāyāna ethics and comparison of more than one Buddhist tradition (Keown 1992; Kalupahana 1995). As well, two groundbreaking books on the role of moral emotions foreshadowed the later diversification of the field (Aronson 1980; Burford 1991).[66]

The mainstream of Buddhist ethics to date is "metaethics": the analysis of sacred texts and comparison with the categories, concepts, and schools of thought in philosophical ethics or in other religions. Examples of this are studies categorizing Buddhist ethics as either consequentialist, deontological, or virtue-based.[67] Other studies make the case for emic categories—that is, using terminology from within Buddhism itself to describe its ethics.[68] Damien Keown, in his landmark study, argued two theses: (1) that ethical practice is integral to the Buddhist path and its ultimate goal; and (2) that Buddhism is best categorized as character-based, similar to neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics.[69]

Since 1990, the field has expanded significantly. Scholars have examined the ethical dimensions of giving, sacrifice, asceticism, ritual, and meditation—in

---

[66] See also the publication of Webster's thesis (2004).

[67] Clayton (2007) discusses both character-based and consequentialist aspects of *bodhisattva* practice in Śāntideva's *Sikṣamuccaya*. Further afield, Kalupahana (1995) discusses its rule-based and deontological aspects, and Olson (1993) outlines similarities with Kantian ethics.

[68] *Emic* terms such as W.L. King's (1964) use of *kammic* and *nibbanic* ethics. See also Spiro (1982) and Aronson (1979). Several treatments of Buddhist ethics follow Buddhist lists and divisions, for example, lists of the six or ten perfections (S. *pāramitā*) practiced by the bodhisattva, or focus on rules for expulsion from the monastic order.

[69] Currently, most argue following Keown (1992), who argues on the basis of Pāli and Sanskrit texts that Buddhism is a neo-Aristotelian virtue ethic, similar to that described by Alastair MacIntyre. This type of virtue ethic is labeled "neo-Aristolelian" because it relies on concepts such as *eudaimonia* derived from the writings of Aristotle.

addition to the narratives of exemplary bodhisattvas, monastics, and lay practitioners. Buddhist ethical "anthropology"—the study of the nature of agents, their bodies, minds, emotions, capacities, and limits—has shown remarkable development especially from the point of view of sex, gender,[70] and embodiment.[71] Scholars have also considered dilemmas and transgressions, such as Buddhist cases for permissible lying, violence, and licensed evil (Dobbins 2002b; Rambelli 2004). Many of the most recent works are willing to draw from sources that are not strictly canonical and pay attention to other sorts of texts circulated and used by Buddhist groups.

Part of this expansion has been a renewed interest in modern Buddhist ethics, including the study of ethics in socially engaged Buddhism, which I discuss in more detail below. A good example is the recent volume of essays in honor of Damien Keown, *Destroying Māra Forever* (Powers and Prebish 2009), in which modern historical approaches and examinations of social engagement and politics represent more than half of the offerings. In this dissertation, I trace modern Buddhist ethics and social engagement. I reflect upon the importance of history and the group itself that emerge from a descriptive approach to ethical thinking in the modern Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. I reflect, too, on how the case of the Ōtani-ha might expand current definitions of socially engaged Buddhism.

A descriptive approach to modern Buddhist ethics

In the academic study of Buddhist ethics, there are two basic approaches—normative and descriptive. Roughly speaking, "normative ethics" consists of evaluative ideas understood *prescriptively*. It articulates the answer to

---

[70] Including the Buddhist ethics of marriage, family, sexual relations, and celibacy.
[71] See the work of Mrozik (2007), where she examines a "physiomoral" discourse of the body in classical South Asian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts, especially those by Śāntideva.

questions such as: What is good? How should we act? What kind of people should we be? It consists of the values, principles, actions, characteristics, character types, and so on, that humans implicitly or explicitly recommend to themselves and others.[72] On the other hand, "descriptive ethics" is the attempt to record and explain normative ethics *without* recommending them to others. Descriptive treatments might, for example, explain the roles and social values of groups and individuals at a particular time and place without prescribing what these should be.

Normative approaches often take the position that Buddhist ethics are in need of help and providing this help is the proper task of the scholar. In a response to several articles on Zen ethics, John Maraldo (2006) summarized the normative positions that authors take towards their subject matter. He found that all of the articles under review took a strongly normative stance: "their primary concern is with what a Zen social ethics *could* be or *should* be" (2006, 1). They argued that reforming Zen ethics *is the proper task* of "concerned scholars and world citizens," and that this task is necessary in some way for the survival of Zen itself as a flourishing and relevant religion.[73]

---

[72] "Metaethics" is the study and categorization of normative ethics. Metaethics has its own history within the academic discourse of philosophy. For example, metaethical studies often offer a broad division of normative ethics into four types: consequentialist, nonconsequentialist (duty-based), rights-based, and character-based (virtue). Metaethical studies might also categorize and explain modes of moral argument and behaviors. Alternatively, they might elaborate on the kinds of knowledge that any given set of normative ethics relies on: views of what is real or possible, the human being, how and what human beings can know, causation, time, other ethical systems, and action—the content of "ethics" described above. "Applied ethics" is the examination of how a given set of normative ethics ought to apply to a specific case or specific aspect of human society such as abortion or the death penalty. Another standard set of categories is telological and deontological. Sometimes this distinction is explained as the distinction between "the good" and "the right." Finally, "comparative ethics" is the overarching study of more than one set of ethics either within or between cultures. Studies of Buddhism and human rights are most often applied and comparative.
[73] Maraldo (2006, 2-3) summarizes the articles on Zen social ethics in the *Journal of Buddhist Ethics,* volume 13: Tom Kasulis argues that Zen might fail by forcing "itself into a culture with a predominately different ethical orientation—one based on integrity and responsibility rather than intimacy and responsiveness." Jin

The idea of saving religion by taking a normative approach to its ethics is constructive. That is, these scholars are constructing ethics for the religions they study, whether they are practitioners or not. Construction is one of the most fiercely recommended positions in the field and is particularly apparent in discussions of contemporary issues (such as international development, environment, human rights, abortion, war, capital punishment, euthanasia, and so on). Construction is apparent, for example, in Sumner B. Twiss and Bruce Grelle's "Human Rights and Comparative Religious Ethics: A New Venue" (1995). Twiss and Grelle see the study of religion and human rights as an appropriate venue for "advancing human well-being" (1995, 23, 29).[74] Constructive scholarship is also valorized by William Schweiker (2006), who states that the proper job of the scholar of religious ethics "must be to aid in the articulation and reconstruction of religious outlooks in order that they might serve their own most humane expression." Schweiker asserts that to do otherwise, to refrain from judging and directing religions towards the "humane," is morally timid. It is to "embrace a remorseless cynicism about the power of ideas in human life as cowardly as it is vacuous" (Schweiker 2006, 137). Putting aside concerns over power that are familiar in Buddhist studies when "speaking for" a tradition,[75] the unintended

Park thinks that Zen might fail by forcing itself "into the atmosphere of traditional normative ethics where clear distinctions between right and wrong are deemed essential." Dale Wright argues that Zen will fail if it does not change and go "beyond itself, and evolve its notion and practice of enlightenment to include competence in ethical reflection," and Christopher Ives, that it will fail if it conforms to certain "ideologies, much as Japanese Zen nearly did before and during World War II."

[74] Or the normative dimensions of comparative religious ethics for "advancing human well-being" (Twiss and Grelle 1995, 23,29), and that scholars of religious ethics ought to be "critical-constructive intellectuals who can occupy mediating positions between disparate publics and serve as translators, critics, and creators of alternative moral visions and languages (1995, 48).

[75] To take a normative position towards one's subject matter is necessarily to take a position of power and authority, and to participate in the production of knowledge and identity for others. The particular concerns of a scholar in the Western academy specializing in an Asian religion have been discussed thoroughly by Edward Said (1979) and his descendents in post-colonial studies. There is a persistent fear in postcolonial theory of dominating, suppressing, crushing, and killing the subjectivity or agency of the marginalized other. See Kawahashi and Kumamoto (1998).

consequences of normative ethics in the case of *buraku* discrimination deserve special attention here. The promotion of an ethical position—any ethical position—can have complicated consequences.[76]

The study of human rights within Buddhist ethics is most often approached normatively. In this study, I approach questions of human rights and discrimination descriptively. I do this for two reasons. First, normative approaches obscure historical disagreement and dissent over Buddhist ethics and the way these ethics have changed over time. And second, as seen in the paradigmatic case of "butchery" as an evil occupation and the avoidance of killing as morally pure, normative assertions can play a role in social discrimination: by identifying the good and valuable, they also identify its opposite. If a Buddhist monk adhering to the precepts is "good," what about everyone else? Because normative ethics carry implicit value judgments, they identify those who do not conform to its formulations of the ideal as degenerate, inauthentic, and so on. Identifying the "evil"[77] is one unintended consequence[78] of positive normative assertions. I return to this problem again in chapter 4.

Approaching ethics historically and descriptively, two things become apparent: what is good and evil changes over time and people disagree at any given time. It is important to acknowledge this diversity. In the Japanese modern

---

[76] I return to the problem of ambiguity and the subject position of *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism in chapter 4.

[77] There is a strong modernist and anti-Judeo-Christian discourse in Buddhist studies asserting that Buddhism does not possess a strong distinction between good and evil. In my view, Buddhism and Shin Buddhism contain a multiplicity of views on the nature of action and character ranging from strong or absolute judgments of good and evil to antinomian rejections of worldly moral standards.

[78] Shin Buddhist thinkers have ruminated on the complex outcomes of ethical ideas, and this complexity is precisely why Takeuchi Ryō'on argues that the only way to implement a particular ethical position is in very specific, limited circumstances—with extensive knowledge of those circumstances. For Takeuchi, solutions to problems and effective working towards ethical ideals in the real world rest in the details and constant self-criticism (TRI 1950).

period, new political ideologies and critical discourses of gender, race, and other social categories have influenced the moralities circulating in society. Often, Buddhist organizations have contributed their voices, selectively highlighting and drawing out aspects of their tradition most in line with emerging moralities. Based on modern Ōtani-ha organizational and popular writings, it is clear that priest-bureaucrats have also thought and argued about ethical issues, and taken action with respect to them. They argued about ethics using ideas believed common for all Buddhists and those specific to Shin Buddhism. Priest-bureaucrats tended to address a specific category of people, the Shin follower or "member" of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*), and not the abstract individual. Their arguments display remarkable variety, suggesting factions or schools of thought within the Ōtani-ha regarding moral action and good character. A descriptive approach allows me to take this variety and factionalism seriously.

The new moral position important in this case is the idea that *buraku* discrimination is unacceptable. However, social actors disagree about which immoral acts, beliefs, and social structures cause *buraku* discrimination, and therefore disagree about the appropriate responses to it. Shin Buddhists, too, display diversity in their understanding of *buraku* discrimination, and some wonder whether Shin Buddhists should even be in the business of supporting human rights today. I suggest that pervasive disagreement[79] exists for two reasons. First, within *buraku* and Shin Buddhist groups, there are factions which span the ideological spectrum from left-wing to right-wing, and these have shifted over time. Second (and at a deeper level), disagreement and factionalism exist because the social practices that produce discrimination or reconciliation emerge

---

[79] See, for example, Abeysekara's (2001) anthropological examination of shifting political factions and ideas of the ideal monk in modern Sri Lanka.

from the interactions of individuals and groups. That is, the *content* of ethical thinking on discrimination is inseparable from its interactive and often unpredictable *context*. I discuss this further in chapter 1 using the ideas of stigma and interactionism.

The study of socially engaged Buddhism

In the last decades of the twentieth century, scholars working on Buddhist ethics began to pay close attention to what they saw as a discernible trend in the public and social activities of modern Buddhist individuals and groups. One particular Buddhist caught and fired their imagination: the Vietnamese monk and activist, Thich Nhat Hanh (b. 1926). Nhat Hanh introduced the term "engaged Buddhism" into English and most scholarship on socially engaged Buddhism begins with him, the 1960s, and sometimes with the war in Vietnam and the self-immolation of Thich Quang Duc (Rothberg 2006, ix; S.B. King 1994, 14; Ama 2003).

Socially engaged Buddhism is defined by scholars as "the rise of political activism and social service by Buddhist communities and organizations in Asia and the West since the 1950s" (Queen 2005, 4:2785). According to these scholars, engaged organizations apply Buddhism to society in ways that are nonviolent, progressive, and critical of power. They reinterpret Buddhist teachings and practices for social meaning and relevance. What is more, the organizations themselves are new, grassroots groups that do not conform to older sectarian boundaries, often possessing charismatic leadership.[80] Thich Nhat Hanh, too, can

---

[80] The study of engaged Buddhism is brand new, with only a few volumes and papers devoted to it (Eppsteiner 1988; Kraft 1992; W.L. King 1994b; Queen and S.B. King 1996; Harvey 2000 ("Engaged Buddhism" 112-113); Tanaka and Nasu 1998; Strain 1998; Queen 2000; S.B. King 2000; Queen, Prebish, and Keown 2003; Queen 2003; S.B. King 2005; Queen 2005; Rothberg 2006; S.B. King 2009; Ip 2009). I do not comment on whether "engaged" Buddhism is "authentic" or not. See also the bibliographies compiled by Rothberg (2004) and Queen (2005). In Japanese, see the work of Mukhopadhyaya (2005) and Ama (2003).

be seen as the charismatic leader of several new, engaged organizations. Taking Thich Nhat Hanh as the model, I note where contemporary scholarship on socially engaged Buddhism aligns with his example and—most importantly— where it diverges. Nhat Hanh sees himself as continuing an earlier movement, with roots prior to the 1950s.

In *Vietnam: The Lotus in the Sea of Fire* (1967), Nhat Hanh rejects the image of the Buddhist monastic as otherworldly and parasitic, or as selfishly interested in worldly things.[81] Rather, he argues that concern for suffering in the world is the natural expression of Buddhist cultivation (1967, 9-11, 18). For him, modern Buddhist action to develop society and alleviate suffering began with the revival of Vietnamese Buddhism in the 1930s—part anti-colonial enterprise and part inspiration by the "renovation of Buddhism in China led by the great Chinese monk Thai-Hu [Taixu 太虛, 1890-1947]" (50).[82] The revival itself consisted of new modern study groups and associations, with their publications, including a youth movement heavily involved in education and social welfare. "In the 1930s the Buddhist scholars had already discussed the engagement of Buddhism in the modern society and called it *nhan gian Phat Giao* or engaged Buddhism" (52), and Nhat Hanh further notes the close ties of Buddhist revival with Vietnamese nationalism (52, 56). He describes the formation of the Unified Buddhist Church after the fall of the Diem regime in the 1960s, and continued youth group[83] efforts in Saigon to "'actualize' Buddhism" and "mobilize the potential force of their

---

[81] "So the Buddha is not in the mountain. He is considered to be in everyone, so that the peace and well-being of the whole people require that every Buddhist should fulfil his responsibility to the community while not neglecting his inner life" (Nhat Hanh 1967, 18). Critique of the "disengaged" Buddhist and rejection of the separation of religion and society is a large part of socially engaged rhetoric.

[82] See DeVido (2009) for further study of how Taixu influenced the Vietnamese Buddhist revival and Thich Nhat Hanh's conception of engaged Buddhism.

[83] Through a "School of Youth for Social Service" at the newly founded (1964) Van Hanh University (Nhat Hanh 1967, 58).

religion to rebuild their society" (56). It is only in the historical context of war and regime change of the 1960s that this engaged Buddhist movement takes on certain characteristic features. It becomes socially progressive, apolitical, antiwar, nonviolent,[84] postcolonial, internationally- and globally-minded, ecumenical, and critical of ruling establishments. These ideological features, when added to the belief that authentic Buddhist realization manifests in ethical social action, form the core of socially engaged Buddhism as it is understood by scholars today. Nevertheless, what this definition cannot effectively explain is the earlier 1930s Vietnamese Buddhism[85]—when the term "engaged" was first being used—with its revivalism, nationalism, and goal of recreating society. Whether conservative and war-supporting or anti-establishment and pacifist, these movements have more in common with each other than they do with premodern Buddhist altruism.

There are two ideological features that most scholarship on socially engaged Buddhism insists upon: (1) nonviolence, and (2) independence from the nation-state. Queen (2003), for example, dismisses Buddhist projects associated with the nation-state and S.B. King (2009) insists on nonviolence as a key feature. This places socially engaged groups as critics of state action, as closer to "the people" than to "the state." Engaged Buddhists are supposed to be suspicious of the nation-state, especially when that state is involved in the use of force. All other Buddhist forms are co-opted by it.[86] What is more, groups defined as socially

---

[84] S.B. King (2009, chapter 4) takes nonviolence as a core characteristic, and discusses the pervasive influence of Mohandas Gandhi (1869-1948). "It should be very clear that groups and individuals who violate the norm of nonviolent words and deeds cannot be considered to be Engaged Buddhists" (2009, 26).

[85] There are other examples viewed as proto-socially engaged but often with ambivalence or criticism: early and mid-twentieth century Buddhist activists like Walpola Rahula (who contributed to the growth of Sinhalese Buddhist nationalism) is critiqued by Tambiah (1992, 18-30) and Queen (1996, 19). B.R. Ambedkar, as well, was supportive of military service during World War II, and so on.

[86] Juliane Schober, for example, divides Burmese Buddhism into two halves. One "is the nationalist, centralized, and ritualistic patronage of Buddhism" by the state which uses "large-scale rituals to legitimate a political hierarchy of the state," and the other is "the *socially engaged Buddhism* advocated by Aung San Suu Kyi that

engaged are "new" and many have a "charismatic" leadership typical of new religious movements.[87] There is no discussion of older groups, such as the established (*kisei* 既成) Buddhist schools and sects in Japan, as socially engaged.

In contrast, this dissertation argues for including revivalist, nationalistic Buddhist forms oriented to social action typical of the early twentieth century (1920s and 1930s, in particular) into the definition of socially engaged. Moreover, I argue that a middle level, priest-bureaucrat in a large, established, and conservative sect managed that sect's social engagement. The Ōtani-ha's Takeuchi Ryō'on was an engaged Buddhist, typical of his time and context.

With the aim of revising the current scholarly definition, I suggest that socially engaged Buddhism be understood as one style of response to the conditions of modernity itself by Buddhist communities, old or new. What socially engaged Buddhist groups share is not a particular political position, or form of nonviolent activism, but a structured anti-secularism and a resistance to the modern tendency to restrict religion to a private, interior experience. It always contains the argument that religious realization must manifest in ethical social action: "that working for social betterment in and of itself constitutes an essential part of Buddhist practice" (Stone 2003, 66). Put another way, socially engaged Buddhists hold that there is no authentic Buddhism without ethical action in society. "Socially engaged" should be used by scholars as a label for any Buddhist group where there is a *conscious erasure* of barriers that separate Buddhist belief, practice, and

---

emphasized personal, social engagement, ethics," and meditation, and resists "spiritual and material exploitation by the state" (Schober 2005, 113-114).

[87] For descriptions of socially engaged Buddhism as comprising new movements, with new institutional structures and charismatic leadership, see Queen (1996, 1-2, 6). It is not surprising that movements within established Buddhist branches will not look to a *new* charismatic leader, but back to the original founder. Charismatic leadership is found in the retelling of founder stories. Stories of Nichiren or Dōgen, for example, provide the same unifying and inspiring example as stories of Buddhadasa Bhikkhu or Sulak Sivaraksa.

organizational life from those activities considered morally relevant in modern secular society and its governance. It is found wherever there is a conscious connection between Buddhism qua Buddhism and the political functions of the nation-state and its public sector tasks: such as education, health, counseling, relief, and so on.

From the 1920s to the 1950s, Takeuchi Ryō'on developed a policy that condemned discrimination against *burakumin* and created a program of social work designed to address what he saw as the causes and effects of that discrimination. In Japanese scholarship, phrases like "society-creating Buddhism" (*shakai o tsukuru Bukkyō* 社会を作る仏教) and "socially participating Buddhism" (*shakai sanka Bukkyō* 社会参加仏教) are used for social engagement (Ama 2003; Mukhopadhyaya 2005). In a similar way, Takeuchi referred to Shin Buddhism's "social meaning" (*shakai teki igi* 社会的意義) and its activities "for the sake of society" (*shakai no tame* 社会の為). For Takeuchi, social work is the "true transmission" (*tadashii senpu* 正しい宣布) of the Shin Buddhist teachings (TRI 264-265), and defined "benefiting others (*rita* 利他) [as]... *none other than the goal itself*" (TRI 1920, 15). And what Takeuchi meant by "transmission of the teachings" (*kyōgi o senden* 教義を宣伝)," was "precisely to sympathize well with the sufferings of people, know them, and create institutions (*shisetsu* 施設) to respond to them" (TRI 1920, 17). It is not the case for Takeuchi that Buddhist practice was somehow separate from social work. "Shin Buddhist social work *must be learned in the doing*" (TRI 1920, 18). Using Shin ethical language, Takeuchi expressed this learning-by-doing as the Shin ideal of a true companion (*dōbō* 同朋) who acts out of gratitude. The true companion of "the poor and oppressed" learns to be a companion "*by having that very goal*. In this way, Shin social work becomes an act of continuous gratitude" (TRI 1920, 18). The result: authentic, good Shin Buddhists are social workers.

Current definitions of social engagement cannot account for priest-bureaucrats like Takeuchi. The groups he began and worked within were neither new, nor independent, nor anti-establishment. Ideologically, too, Takeuchi is difficult to place. Takeuchi was nationalistic, pro-(Meiji) emperor, supported the war effort[88] and national public health campaigns of a fascist nature.[89] But he was also deeply sympathetic and supportive of left-wing, Marxist liberation movements for *burakumin* and Korean residents of Japan. He spoke against systematic discrimination against women and children, and much of his moral vision for the Ōtani-ha order was radically egalitarian. One of his institutional followers, Asano Onchi (Yoshitomo) (朝野温知, 1906-1982), also known as Yi Su-ryong 李壽龍, remembers how his appearance confounded those who wanted to place him in an ideological box. Takeuchi, "that old friend of the *buraku* liberation movement, tall in stature, hair swept back, a wide forehead, and large eyes," dressed like an old right-wing conservative in his worn-out traditional clothing. Yet, according to Asano, on the inside Takeuchi was very progressive (1988a, 236).

Takeuchi saw the Ōtani-ha's proper position as standing between political ideologies to advance social goals, not against the establishment. Social problems were a shared, rather than individual, responsibility. Like other socially engaged Buddhists, he developed a critique of individual, charitable action,[90] as well as a

---

[88] Although he considered war one of the most horrible forms of human suffering (Takeuchi 1941, 5-7), he supported comfort missions to bereaved families, war memorials, mobilization of sect resources for the war effort, and colonial migration (Asaji 2009). Morality, for Takeuchi, was to strive in the midst of corruption, violence, and human evil—since there are only greater or lesser degrees of evil, never an absence of it.

[89] Takeuchi, whose work in the 1930s and early 1940s accorded with state projects to segregate Hansen's disease sufferers, manage colonial holdings, and engage in war are vulnerable to critique (Fujino 2002, *kaisetsu* 解説, 2-9). In particular, his activities connected to leprosy have been harshly criticized since the repeal of laws mandating the quarantine of leprosy patients in 1996. For more on leprosy and Japanese policy see Burns (2003; 2004). For a discussion of the similarities between *buraku* and leprosy discrimination in Japan, see Fujino and Kurokawa (2009, 42-46). See the last part of chapter 7 for critiques of Takeuchi.

[90] The critique of charity is interesting in the sense that while the approach to action has been reimagined, the relationship of donor and recipient reconsidered, the actual action of passing food, clothing, shelter, and care

critique of established Buddhism's institutional history. Takeuchi may have been quirky and driven, but he was not a charismatic leader of a new group as such. Charisma was located elsewhere, in the founder-exemplar, Shinran, not in the priest-bureaucrat, Takeuchi.

Dissertation outline: reading Shin Buddhist ethics in modern history

Before the narrative of Ōtani-ha social policy and its architects is told, I must first introduce the players: *burakumin*, Shin Buddhism, the Ōtani-ha institution, and *buraku* followers of the Ōtani-ha. Parts I and II provide the background necessary to understand modern debates surrounding Shin Buddhism and *buraku* discrimination. Part III provides an example of an Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrat who spent his career working to alleviate *buraku* discrimination. Part IV provides an overview of the Ōtani-ha today, noting the persistence of discrimination against Ōtani-ha *buraku* followers and the present state of institutional response.

Part I: Causing discrimination: Shin Buddhism's historical responsibility

Part I queries how we should understand claims that Shin Buddhist institutions are historically responsible for *buraku* discrimination.

In order to clarify the role that Shin Buddhism has played, chapter 1 briefly introduces the study of *buraku* history, one of the most recent models of *buraku* discrimination in Japanese scholarship, and an older, but still useful, model in English scholarship. Armed with the understanding of *buraku* discrimination as both a *modern* and *multilayered* phenomena, Shin Buddhism is responsible for discrimination in two ways: (1) as a source of pollution beliefs, both old and new; and (2) as social actors that can deploy any of the full range of pollution beliefs

---

from one pair of hands to another has not.

available in the modern period. This is the case despite rhetoric that Shin Buddhism rejects purity-pollution beliefs. I end with several examples of *buraku* discrimination from popular texts written by Shin Buddhist preachers (*fukyōshi* 布 教師) in the early twentieth century. These examples display a complex and ironic position of Buddhist actors rejecting their own premodern superstitions for the modern superstitions of *burakumin* polluted by inferior race, bodies, hygiene, poverty, and morality.

Chapter 2 continues the theme of pollution and argues that Shin Buddhism contained its own criteria for purity and pollution. I begin with Shin "in a nutshell"—a concise, egalitarian moral vision of the Ōtani-ha contained in its 1981 Ōtani-ha Sect Constitution (see *Shūken*). This modern, egalitarian vision conflicts with the historical legacy of *buraku* discrimination within the Ōtani-ha. Why did the Ōtani-ha discriminate? Because it, too, contained criteria for considering the *burakumin* permanently polluted. Shin notions of pollution are related to devotion, which orients the individual practitioner and the community as a whole towards specific objects: Amida Buddha, the head temple, the founder, and the male blood relatives of the founder. Honoring and protecting the purity of these objects created a hierarchy of high and low, pure and impure, which organizes the color of robes, titles and ranks, and administrative procedures. Devotion explains, in large part, the unique manifestations of *buraku* discrimination within Shin.[91] I end the chapter with a few fragmentary historical examples[92] that remain alive in ongoing

---

[91] That there are unique types of discrimination provides good reasons for the particularistic and contextual study of Buddhist ethics as recommended by Hallisey (1996). I argue here that any attempt to understand Buddhism, discrimination, and human rights *in history* must recognize that ethical thinking on these issues will be found in conversations that are *sect-specific*, as well as those common in many Buddhist forms. A full picture of Shin Buddhist engagement with discrimination and human rights must include those teachings and practices Shin does not share with other forms of Buddhism as, so often, it is the local, sect-specific issues of *buraku* discrimination that have sparked the most intense instances of protest, apology, and reconciliation.

[92] Some of this is a result of the fragmentary nature of the evidence for historical discrimination in Shin

ethical arguments and organizational interactions between the Ōtani-ha and *buraku* advocates.

Part II: Curing discrimination: Shin Buddhism's revolutionary potential

Part II takes up claims that Buddhism, including Shin Buddhism, is egalitarian in its doctrine, struggles against discrimination in practice, and holds the key to eliminating discrimination entirely.

Chapter 3 presents a series of straightforward arguments against discrimination and for human rights. I translate a very early essay by Shimaji Mokurai (島地黙雷, 1838-1911) on Buddhism and human rights written in 1874. In it, Shimaji portrays Buddhism as the cure to discrimination, including *buraku* discrimination. In many ways, this essay is prototypical of twentieth and twenty-first century claims that Buddhism supports human rights—and reflects those made in English scholarship on Buddhist ethics. Arguments that Shin is egalitarian and supports human rights continue today.

Chapter 4 tackles the complex arguments that result when revolutionary egalitarian ideas and discrimination are found in the same place: Shin Buddhism. I examine the ambiguities that arise for *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism when faced with discrimination and exclusion by followers of their own order (*kyōdan*) and its governing bureaucracy. Shin Buddhism is somehow both cause and cure. In almost every case, arguments separate the pure "essence" of religion from its corrupt "forms." Thus, the *buraku* follower argues that Shinran and his early community did not discriminate, but the institution created in his name did and continues to do so. In some cases, these impassioned calls to Shinran become

---

Buddhism. Because it is so difficult to interpret, it has been used in widely varied ways. See Yamamoto (2007).

revolutionary, reappropriating *burakumin* as the elect, uniquely loyal to Shinran's original vision; that they have "strong faith," and are the true preservers of the authentic teachings of Shinran.[93] *Buraku* priests and followers, including Marxist liberationists such as Saikō Mankichi (西光万吉, 1895-1970), present Shinran as the true friend or companion of *burakumin*, the institution as the discriminator, and *burakumin* as leaders in the struggle to restore authenticity within the Shin orders. Authenticity is to be "taught back" to corrupt Shin institutions by returning to a pure, original religious spirit or intent—"returning to Shinran"—or by a return to an earlier organizational form: small, egalitarian societies of "companions" (*dōbō*).

Part III: Engaging *buraku* discrimination: the priest-bureaucrat

In Part III, I turn from arguments and theories to social action. I follow the administrative career and ethical thought of the priest-bureaucrat, Takeuchi Ryō'on, who was representative of a faction within the Ōtani-ha institution. He saw the Ōtani-ha as historically responsible for *buraku* discrimination and having the potential to do something about it. Out of a negotiated relationship with *buraku* liberationists[94] both within and outside the Ōtani-ha itself, Takeuchi and his faction articulated the ethical position that formed the kernel of official Ōtani-ha policy on human rights and *buraku* discrimination today. By the latter part of the twentieth century, Takeuchi's faction[95] had become mainstream.

There are good reasons to examine Takeuchi in order to learn about the ethics

---

[93] This, of course, makes the discrimination of the institution so much worse in retrospect—as they took advantage of this strong faith.

[94] Although left-wing groups were prominent, anti-discrimination and reform proposals came from other ideological positions within Shin as well.

[95] Through it all, his followers took Takeuchi as a kind of modest, bureaucratic founder-figure, and carried his ideas and activities forward inside the Ōtani-ha institution.

of the Ōtani-ha group—beyond the biographical narrative lending coherence and interest. Takeuchi is a formal representative of the sect whose career mirrors the trajectory of Ōtani-ha organized social engagement. When Takeuchi and his faction were ensconced in well-funded bureaus, the Ōtani-ha was most active in addressing *buraku* discrimination. When they were at arms-length or lower down in the hierarchy, the Ōtani-ha was relatively less active in dealing with *buraku* discrimination. Although I do not have the space to discuss his faction and followers in any detail, I take Takeuchi's life as illustrative of its basic trends.

Chapter 5 focuses on Takeuchi's early career from the 1920s to the 1930s, and his work as a priest-bureaucrat. Takeuchi entered the Ōtani-ha at a time of tremendous change in the way social problems like discrimination were understood, and how organizations formed to combat them. He outlined an organizational response to discrimination and poverty as "social work" (*shakai jigyō*). Beginning with his upbringing and education, early work with *buraku* communities at the Shiga Prefectural Government, I trace Takeuchi's career through the 1920s. As Japan's overseas involvement and militarism increased during the 1930s, the Ōtani-ha directed significant financial and human resources to its social work and made its strongest arguments for *buraku* equality—couched, of course, in the language of emergency, crisis, preparation for war, and the imperial nation-state. After the war, Takeuchi and his institutional faction were marginalized. Takeuchi acted only in a consultative capacity and his followers worked in an underfunded bureau inside the administration.

Chapter 6 is a guided tour of the genres of priest-bureaucrats, including both organizational and popular texts. One of the reasons that scholars of Buddhist social ethics and engaged Buddhism have overlooked the activities of established Buddhist sects in Japan, like the Ōtani-ha, is that they have not looked in the right

places. Shin doctrine and prescriptive claims are embedded in the memos, mission statements, budgets, reports, and so on, produced by the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. These prescriptions are then disseminated through pamphlets, lectures, films, newspaper articles and other popular forms, also written by priest-bureaucrats. These are some of the "scriptures" for modern Buddhist ethics. Takeuchi, in his administrative prime, brushed many pamphlets, memos, articles, and essays. He wrote for the public from the late 1910s until the mid-1960s.

Last, chapter 7 presents a summary of key ideas in Takeuchi's thought taken from texts produced throughout his career. I focus especially on his articulation of Shin Buddhist doctrine for social work (*shakai jigyō*) and the mobilization of the Ōtani-ha organization for social engagement. Although he does not have a systematic theology typical of Shin "doctrinal studies" (*kyōgaku* 教学), Takeuchi does base his social policies on innovative interpretations of Shin doctrine. For instance, he portrays Shinran's "eating meat and marrying" (*nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯) as the conscious choice of the founder to enter society to live with those who suffer. For Takeuchi, the modern and innovative twist comes when he argues that *nikujiki saitai* demands that all Ōtani-ha temple priests be social workers. Relying on passages from the *Larger Pure Land Sūtra* (*Muryōjukyō* 無量寿経), the writings of Shinran (especially the "Lamp for the Latter Ages" *Mattōshō* 末燈鈔), and Rennyo's pastoral letters, Takeuchi outlines a standard for criticizing evil action, diagnosing social problems, and organizing responses to them which are ultimately oriented towards pure land ideals and a vision of a utopian Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*). In this vision, each temple is a microcosm of the head temple, its priest a responsible manager and social worker, welcoming all equally with kindness, hospitality, and warmth.

Although he was a bureaucrat, Takeuchi had much to say about ethics.

Although he was a nationalist, he was heavily involved in social engagement. I hope to expand the range of texts and materials where Buddhist studies scholars look for ethics and the range of organizations and modern historical periods where they look for social engagement. Takeuchi's life demonstrates an innovative form of ethical thinking characteristic of "socially engaged" Buddhism, despite being found within a Japanese Buddhist sect considered traditional, conservative, or established (*kisei*), during an era when it is believed absent.

Part IV: Continuing discrimination and response: present day Ōtani-ha

I conclude with a difficult fact: even as institutional efforts to reduce *buraku* discrimination continue inside the Ōtani-ha, so do incidents and examples of discrimination. In this concluding chapter, I describe Takeuchi as one priest-bureaucrat among many with a brief overview of his "faction": a group of middle managers who, for one reason or another, came to specialize in the Ōtani-ha's response to *buraku* discrimination and staff its bureaus and consultative councils. I next describe the results of a recent survey of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples, completed in 2009 under the auspices of this same group of priest-bureaucrats that clearly shows structural and liturgical differences between *buraku* temples and non-*buraku* temples—and the persistence of discrimination. I end with my reflections on examining ethics in Buddhist institutions and in historical context. Without this context, there would be no way to explain why the Ōtani-ha has continued to acknowledge its historical and present responsibility for *buraku* discrimination, and, in this light, to think so carefully about reforming the institution itself.

PART I Causing discrimination: Shin Buddhism's historical responsibility

1 Theories of *buraku* discrimination and the role of Buddhism

Informed observers of Japan are sometimes surprised to learn of the existence of the *burakumin* minority group[1] as there is comparatively little scholarship available in English[2] and a strong discourse of Japanese homogeneity,[3] which is so strong, in fact, that public figures have denied that Japan has minorities at all. *Burakumin* are an invisible minority who live, or whose relatives have lived, in discriminated-against residential areas in both urban and rural settings. Informed observers might be more surprised to learn that almost all *burakumin* are Shin Buddhists, and that Shin is complicit in discrimination against them.[4]

In 1902, a Shin preacher (*fukyōshi*) by the name of Ryūge 龍華 incensed *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism and sparked widespread protests against the

---

[1] *Buraku* discrimination cuts across categories of caste, status (*mibun* 身分), and race. They have been "outcastes" in the absence of a caste system, differentiated from other groups in society even in the absence of a legal regime. *Buraku* status continues to have caste-like features. See Howell's (2005) strong argument that "status" (and not caste) is the best systematic descriptor of how Japanese society functioned overall during the nineteenth century. Shimahara (1984) disputes the use of "caste" and "outcaste."

[2] The classic English works on the *burakumin* are the multi-author, collaborative volume edited by DeVos and Wagatsuma (1966b), and the political history by Neary (1989).

[3] Weiner's (2004) collection of essays challenges the idea of a homogenous Japan.

[4] Belonging to either the Ōtani-ha or the Honganji-ha. Amstutz (2010, 50), referring to Brooks' dissertation (1976, 105–106), explains that the largest concentrations of *burakumin* population are found in regions where Shin Buddhism has been strong (Kinki region, Okayama, Hiroshima, and Yamaguchi prefectures, Shikoku and parts of Kyushu). Only two areas, one in Saga prefecture where *buraku* temples belong to Nichiren, and one in Okayama where they belong to Shingon, "excluding these, everything West of Nagoya is entirely Shin Buddhist" (Yamamoto 2006, 5,15).

Honganji-ha. He made a series of remarks while fundraising for the Honganji-ha's new charitable foundation.[5] Ryūge told a story about two *buraku* followers, whom he called "extremely defiled" (*eta* 穢多), in order to prompt his non-*burakumin* audience to greater magnanimity. In his story, the two *burakumin* wished to give a donation to the charitable foundation, but Ryūge worried that: "allowing *eta* people to enter the temple hall would defile it."[6] He kept them outside in the courtyard, while he took their money from atop the wooden walkway. After they gave ten *yen* each to the foundation, Ryūge disparaged their faith, describing how they "prostrated themselves like insects" on the ground. He compared them to "worthless worms."[7] He then told his audience that it was precisely for these worthless, less-than-human, people of inferior race that he was collecting money. Ryūge goaded his listeners: if such people gave ten *yen*, should not a pure, praiseworthy race like the Japanese give more? The ensuing protests by *burakumin* across Japan succeeded in having Ryūge dismissed.

Burakumin emerged as a group in the modern period (1868-present). As evident in the Ryūge example, they suffer discrimination based on beliefs that they are *permanently* polluted, contaminated, and dangerous to others in Japanese society. This explanation uses a model for modern Japanese purity-pollution (*jōe* 浄穢) that takes seriously both the putative sources of pollution (death, blood, bodily excreta, poverty, disease, crime, and so on) and the role of power in defining

---

[5] Great Japanese Buddhist Compassionate Association (Dai Nihon Bukkyō Jizenkai 大日本仏教慈善会) established in 1901 and still in operation. So-called Discriminatory Remarks of the Preacher Incident (*Fukyōshi sabetsu hatsugen jiken* 布教師差別発言事件). See Neary (1989, 38), Matsune (1993, 45), Murakoshi (1982, 31), and DBS (1:74ff.).

[6] Ryūge's statement that "allowing *eta* people to enter into the scripture hall is a disgrace to the temple" (*etadomo o shoin ni noborashimete wa jiin no ojoku* 穢多共を書院に昇らしめては寺院の汚辱) appeared in the November 12, 1902 edition of the *Chūgai Nippō* 中外日報 in a slightly different form: "allowing *eta* to enter the main hall defiles the temple" (*eta o midō ni noborasete wa jiin no yogore* 穢多を御堂に昇らせては寺院の汚れ) (DBS 1:74ff.).

[7] *hiratagumo no yō ni teitō heishin shi* 平蜘蛛のように低頭平身し.

a group of people as permanently defiled—and thus, less than human. Ryūge, an official representative of a Shin sect, used criteria for pollution old and new, religious and secular, all in the name of modern charitable work.

This chapter introduces one of the most recent models of *buraku* discrimination in Japanese scholarship from a recent edited volume by Fujino Yutaka and Kurokawa Midori (*Modern and Contemporary Buraku History: A Reorganized Structure of Discrimination*, 2009)[8] capable of accounting for Shin preachers like Ryūge. In this model, Japanese religions and religious institutions are both a source of specific pollution beliefs and social actors that use the full range of pollution beliefs in their interactions with *burakumin*. To understand the unstable deployment of these in face-to-face interactions, I turn briefly to an understanding of *buraku* discrimination as "stigma" from the work of Erving Goffman (*Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, 1963)—an older, but still useful, model from English scholarship capable of explaining the protests and interactions that followed. I conclude with examples of Shin preachers circulating discriminatory ideas about the *burakumin* early in the twentieth century, returning to Ryūge once more.

The study of *burakumin* in English language scholarship

Predictably, the study of *buraku* history is less developed in English than in Japanese. A few, scattered English language articles on *burakumin* began to appear early in the twentieth century,[9] but the standard English works appeared in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s in sociology, anthropology, and political history. Three crucial works are George DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma's *Japan's Invisible Race* (1966),

---

[8] *Kingendai burakushi: saihen sareru sabetsu no kōzō* 近現代部落史: 再編される差別の構造. See bibliography.
[9] Such as Ninomiya (1933), Passin (1955), Donoghue (1957).

John Donoghue's *Pariah Persistence in Changing Japan* (1978), and Ian Neary's *Political Protest and Social Control in Pre-war Japan* (1989).[10] *Buraku* advocacy organizations and research institutes have also been involved in producing English academic works.[11] By 1980, the English terms used to analyze treatment of *burakumin* were already in circulation: "caste," "outcaste," "invisibility," "race," "impurity," and "pollution."

More recently, following the 1966 watershed volume by DeVos and Wagatsuma, *burakumin* have been studied in the fields of Japanese literature,[12] education,[13] and law (Upham 1987; Reber 1999). Some work is branching further afield to study the character of discriminatory language (Gottlieb 1998; 2005; 2006), the modern economic mobility and political activism of *burakumin* (Meerman 2003), and *burakumin* as exile, outcaste, and "other" from a cultural studies perspective (Amos 2005). There are several works surveying the dominant trends in Japanese-language *buraku* history (Davis 2002; Amos 2007; 2011) and more.[14]

---

[10] See also McLauchlan's (2001; 2003) recent work on *burakumin* political history and state treatment of *burakumin* population. DeVos and Wagatsuma (1966b), Donoghue (1977), and contributors to the DeVos and Wagatsuma volume: Price (1966), Norbeck (1966), Cornell (1966), Berreman (1966), Wagatsuma (1966), etc. Neary has written extensively on the political history of *burakumin* and human rights in Japan (Neary 1986; 1989; 2003; 2009; Goodman and Neary 1986). Several articles also appeared during these decades, such as Cornell (1961; 1970) and Nagahara (1979).

[11] For example, Yoshino and Murakoshi (1977) and Harada and Uesugi (1981).

[12] Such as Fowler (2004), McKnight (2006), Raeside (2007), and Orbaugh (2007). There are a number of English translations of important works either about or by *burakumin*, including the works of Shimazaki Tōson (島崎藤村, 1872-1943), translated by Strong (Shimazaki 1974), Sumii Sue (住居すゑ, 1902-1997), translated by Wilkinson, and Nakagami Kenji (中上健次, 1946-1992), translated by Zimmerman (Nakagami 1999). These works often contain references to Buddhism and Buddhist temples, especially Shimazaki. Due to considerations of space and disciplinary approach, I regret that I cannot deal with literature here.

[13] Scholars have paid close attention to education, both in terms of *burakumin* levels of education and education as a tool to promote human rights and reduce discrimination. See the works of Gordon (2006a; 2006b; 2008) on factors that affect educational access and achievement among *burakumin*. See also Shimahara (1971) and Hawkins (1983), and Takayama (2009).

[14] Lie (2006), Hane (2003), Pharr (1990), Ohnuki-Tierney (1984; 1989; 1994; 1998). For a survey of new writing on *burakumin*, see Davis (2002). See also the collected essays in Weiner (2004) on *burakumin* as

Despite this small but continued interest in *burakumin* within the broader study of Japan, their religious lives are rarely addressed in English language research. With the exception of essays by William Bodiford on Sōtō Zen Buddhism, Leslie Alldritt on Japanese Buddhism in general, and Galen Amstutz, Hiroshi Wagatsuma, Ugo Dessì, and myself on Shin Buddhism,[15] "Buddhism" is a short passage, sentence, or just a footnote. The study of *burakumin* and *buraku* history in Japanese is another matter entirely. The sheer volume of Japanese scholarly and popular works fills small libraries and I restrict my discussion to those that address Japanese religion in general, and Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism in particular. I draw on the limited English language scholarship, supplementing with Japanese works connected to the Ōtani-ha, and studies in Japanese history, sociology, and anthropology that mention *burakumin* and religion.

Although groups officially labeled "extremely defiled and inhuman" (*eta-hinin* 穢多非人) were discussed by premodern scholars as "people of low status,"[16] modern academic *buraku* history[17] had its beginnings in the 1910s with folklore-anthropologist, Yanagita Kunio, and historian, Kita Sadakichi.[18] Of the two,

---

"indigenous others" within the Japanese nation-state.

[15] Wagatsuma (1966), Bodiford (1996), Alldritt (2000), Dessì (2007, chapter 3), Amstutz (2010), and Main (2010). Some work connects *buraku* liberation and anti-discrimination efforts with "critical Buddhism" (*hihan Bukkyō* 批判仏教), such as Bodiford (1996), Hubbard (1997), and Shields (2011).

[16] *sensha* 賤者. By national learning scholars such as Motoori Uchitō (本居内遠, 1792-1855). In the twentieth century, "low status people" or "base people" (*senmin* 賤民), and "discriminated against people (*hisabetsumin* 被差別民) have become standard terms for referring to the wide range of groups that have faced discrimination in the premodern and modern periods.

[17] *burakushi* 部落史. See Amos (2007, 159-162) on prewar *buraku* historiography covering Yanagita Kunio (柳田国男, 1875-1962), Kita Sadakichi (1871-1939), Sano Manabu (佐野学, 1892-1953), and the postwar scholar, Inoue Kiyoshi (井上清, 1913-2001). Amos examines discourses of race, liberation, and Marxist history. Yanagita (1913) and Kita (1919; 1922; 1926). Other imporant scholars who have worked on medieval low status groups including Kuroda Toshio (黒田俊雄, 1926-1993) and Amino Yoshihiko (網野善彦, 1928-2004).

[18] KBS (2:164-165) and Neary (1989, 9, 22). See Amos (2007) review of Kita's work, the 1928 *Senmin gaisetsu* 賤民概説 which he translates, "Introduction to Outcastes." Kita differentiated between the "inhumans" (*hinin*) and "extremely defiled" (*eta*). He also ascribed discrimination in all historical eras to the custom of Buddhist pollution prohitions (*shokue kinki* 触穢禁忌). In an earlier work, Kita (1919, 24-25) explained that the *burakumin* are hated as "extremely defiled" (*eta*), hated by the deities (*kami* 神) for handling meat and

Yanagita was first to write about *burakumin*, and Kita was first to write about the relation of Buddhism and *burakumin*.[19] Studies after Kita looked for those medieval groups connected to leather goods and proposed that these leather workers were the origins of the *eta*. Likewise, these studies emphasized the continuation between ancient, medieval, and early modern "low status people" (*senmin* 賤民). *Buraku* history grew quickly in the postwar period with the dominance of Marxist historical scholarship in Japanese universities and government funding of Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei) research institutes. *Buraku* history has retained these two basic streams, folklore-anthropology and history—which have both been influenced by Marxist thought. Scholars argue fiercely about the origins of the people who are today called *burakumin* and why they experience discrimination. This has meant intense, politicized disagreement that pits one sort of reductive theory of *buraku* discrimination against others.[20]

Old and reductive theories

The twentieth century debate over *burakumin* origins and explaining *buraku* discrimination is a clash between reductive and irreconcilable theories. There are two basic sides to this debate. On the first side, there are ahistorical, mainly anthropological, theories that look for discrimination in the essence of some Japanese cultural practice or institution. In these theories, this essence continues

---

hides. Kita continued that the fundamental reason they are despised is the superstitious belief that they are polluted (*kegareta mono* 穢れたもの), a belief resulting from the spread of Buddhism and its condemnation of killing and meat-eating. According to Kita, Buddhism is the reason why Shintō deities began to despise meat and meat-eaters. See also Kita on *buraku* temples (1919, 191-201).

[19] Yanagita was known for avoiding Buddhism (brief literature review given by Yamamoto 1999, 1–18). Kita made a number of interesting observations: that most *burakumin* followed Shin; that "extremely defiled priests" (*etasō* 穢多僧) and other elites in *buraku* areas were not always hereditary descendents of low status groups (1919, 48); and so on.

[20] For a lengthy and detailed history of these debates, see Morooka's (1980) six volume work.

to cause discrimination because it persists, or "survives," despite historical change. On the other side, there are Marxist theories that reduce discrimination to the operation of power specific to a historical period.[21] When Shin Buddhism is seen through this lens, it causes discrimination to the extent that that it serves as an instrument of power, its institutions mirror power, or it reproduces the structures of power within itself. Critics have accused Shin of reproducing the status system within its temple hierarchy in the Edo period and the modern emperor system in the relation between head priest and follower in the Meiji period (Murakoshi 1982, 29). In this second type, cultural practices and beliefs are deceptive ideologies used by those in power to maintain the status quo and justify the exploitation of laboring classes.

Reductive theories have great political advantage: by outlining a clear cause for discrimination, they facilitate consensus on possible solutions and accountability. If, as Marxists claim, the exercise of political power[22] created *burakumin* as a group and structured the discrimination they suffered, then political power should address discrimination.[23] *Buraku* advocates, through the Buraku Liberation League, have been successful during the postwar period, standing alongside other movements that pressed the Japanese government for change, especially during the 1960s and 70s.[24] If Shin Buddhism is the cause, for

---

[21] When Shin Buddhism is seen through this lens, it causes discrimination to the extent that that it serves as an instrument of power, its institutions mirror power, or it reproduces the structures of power within itself. Critics have accused Shin of reproducing the status system within its temple hierarchy in the Edo period and the modern emperor system in the relation between head priest and follower in the Meiji period (Murakoshi 1982, 29).

[22] As a strategy for demanding government compensation, this type of theory relies heavily on the idea that the present *burakumin* are related in a contiguious, linear manner to premodern low status groups.

[23] The Marxist historiography of the Buraku Liberation League no longer dominates, although it is still influential. As Fujino notes, these strong political and ideological forces that have constrained the study of *buraku* history have lessened (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, preface). The modernist and Marxist assumptions that have caused the overlooking of religion, too, have lessened.

[24] A 1965 report by the Commission of Enquiry into Assimilation Policies was followed by the enactment of

example, then the representatives of Shin sects become targets for social action and Shin sects, the institutions that must be reformed. Political usefulness in part explains why the proponents of reductive theories of *buraku* discrimination are still at odds.

There are many reductive, single-cause theories that have been considered and discarded over the course of the twentieth century.[25] As mentioned above, most fall into either an "historical power" or "ahistorical cultural essentialist" style of explanation. Claims that locate *burakumin* and *buraku* discrimination in specific instances of power include the politically dominant "early modern governance theory."[26] Others locate discrimination in the power of the Heian capital, the ancient *ritsuryō* system, the medieval estate system, modern capitalism, or even the operation of modern mass media. Referring to specific applications of power. Still others claim that *buraku* discrimination and *burakumin* have their origins in captured prisoners of war or in the punishment of rebellions.[27] By contrast, ahistorical theories argue that *burakumin* and *buraku* discrimination result from essential racial,[28] occupational, genetic, or medical difference, as a structural

the 1969 Special Measures Law (renewed to 2002)(Neary 1996, 12-15; Minority Rights Group International 2008). The law provided infrastructure, housing, and educational funding to ameliorate the material aspects of *buraku* discrimination. Most sources agree that while material conditions have improved, discrimination remains a serious problem. Japan does not have either a Basic Law regarding the *burakumin*, discrimination, nor a human rights relief law. See also Meerman (2003) and Upham (1987).

[25] For overviews of these origin theories see Amstutz (2010, 63-64), Kitaguchi (1999, 78–97), BYJ (282-286), and for an Ōtani-ha source, see Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu (2006[1978], 73-85).

[26] "government origin theory" (*seiji kigen setsu* 政治起源説) (BYJ 285-287). This theory maintained dominance until roughly the 1980s due mainly to the widespread influence of Marxist historiography and the political importance for *buraku* liberation groups of holding the government responsible for discrimination. These Marxist and liberationist scholars claimed that the Tokugawa shogunate created *burakumin* in the form of legal outcastes and enforced discrimination as a mechanism of overall social control and to gain a monopoly on leather products for military use. Outcastes were both extensions of that authority and its scapegoats.

[27] See Amstutz (2010, 66-67) for a summary of *buraku* origin theories that focus on a connection to Shin Buddhism in the late medieval *ikkō ikki* 一向一揆 rebellions.

[28] Ideas of racial difference and racial forms of prejudice against *burakumin* still occur, but have no legitimacy in public discourse. Seemingly "objective" and "modern" criteria such as hygiene, crime rates, literacy, poverty, etc. are still deployed in symbolic, prejudicial ways in public.

necessity of the emperor system, as something essential to the nature of Japanese agrarian society, or from fundamental contradictions between Japanese regional cultures. Reductive theories that identify Japanese religions as the cause serve as an illustrative example.

Religious origin theories

In most English accounts of *buraku* discrimination, religion is referred to incidentally or as an afterthought[29]—often in the claim that discrimination was caused by ideas of avoiding pollution in premodern times. Neary, for example, describes discrimination as "based on deeply-rooted prejudices, some of which derived from concepts found in the *Shintō* or Buddhist religions" (1989, 2).[30] DeVos and Wagatsuma (1966b, 325-326), described Buddhism as transmitting "ritual pollution" via its "sanctions against taking life, especially the killing of animals for food and the use of hides for leather products."[31] Other scholars, too, focus on Buddhist pollution from "the taking of life" and "meat eating" (Donoghue 1957, 1000; Ohnuki-Tierney 1998, 34-35).

When *buraku* discrimination is ascribed solely to Buddhist causes, we have an example of the reductive "religion origin theory" (*shūkyō kigen setsu* 宗教起源説): "In Buddhism, there are precepts such as that against killing (*sesshō kai* 殺生戒), where the killing of living beings is condemned, and the eating of meat, despised" (BYJ 284). According to this theory, both Buddhist and Shintō ideas of pollution

---

[29] Most who study *burakumin* have not been scholars of religion and those scholars most likely to mention their religious lives specialize in anthropology. Price (1966, 17–19) discusses religious causes for *buraku* discrimination in English, and the BYJ (284-285) surveys the "religion origin theory." Origins have also been posited in politics, occupation, and racial difference with no one theory providing a satisfactory model.

[30] Other scholars who repeat this claim include Alldritt (2000), Amos (200, 160-161, quoting Kita 1919), Dessì (2007, 164), Pharr (1990, 76), and Shimahara (1984, 340). Many scholars refer to a "fusion" of Shintō avoidances and Buddhist condemnation of killing and meat-eating.

[31] I discuss purity and pollution thought further in chapter 2.

and immorality cause discrimination against those involved in animal slaughter (*tosatsu* 屠殺). These ideas intensified inside religious organizations especially from the mid-Muromachi period onwards (roughly the fifteenth century). Because so many premodern outcastes belonged to Shin Buddhism, some scholars have even sought the origins of *burakumin* solely within Shin Buddhist doctrine or history. One such theory suggests that suppression of Shin rebellions (*ikkō ikki* 一向一揆) during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries created the groups that later became *burakumin*.

The "butcher" (*toji*)—a negative term appearing often in Buddhist texts[32]—became a central symbol of *burakumin* and their defilement,[33] complete with images of animal slaughter, harvesting animal skin to make leather, and harvesting their meat for selling and eating. This symbolic association between Buddhism, pollution, and animal death and consumption was evident enough that, earlier in the twentieth century, some believed it alone accounted for the historical emergence of *burakumin* (Fujitani 1970, 395). Scholars that view religious ideas of pollution as the fundamental cause of modern *buraku* discrimination, beginning with Kita Sadakichi, must subscribe to the view that these premodern beliefs and practices somehow survive into the modern period. However, as I argue below, *buraku* discrimination is more complex than reductive theories imply, and the role of religion is by no means limited to transmitting premodern pollution beliefs. I

---

[32] In Indian Buddhist texts, there was "consistent denigration of occupations such as butcher, hunter, or fisherman" (Benn 2004), as forms of wrong livelihood or as terms of moral censure. The character for butcher (*to* 屠) often appears in translations of "outcaste" (*sendara* 旃陀羅, S. *caṇḍāla*) and symbolic of the evil person (*akunin* 悪人) (DDB). Another crucial term for outcastes from Buddhist texts is "inhuman" (*hinin* 非人). More on these terms below and in chapter 2. For Buddhism and butchery in the case of discrimination in Japan, see Ooms (1996, 247), Price (1966), and Orbaugh (2007, 185). Although Burma is an exception, Price (1966, 7) indicates "an almost universal association" with butchering of animals "when outcastes and the Buddhist religion are found together."

[33] For a detailed review of pollution and defilement associated with killing, hunting, and meat-eating, see Grumbach (2005).

discuss this further below.

The problem with exceptions:

Much of the debate over *buraku* origins and discrimination surrounds "exceptions," as there is simply no universal criteria for inclusion in the *burakumin* group, nor in the premodern category "extremely defiled and inhuman" (*eta-hinin*). Some *burakumin*—but not all—are the modern descendants of premodern low status groups referred to by the compound *eta-hinin*.[34] Not all *burakumin* have had occupations involving animal death, nor did all premodern outcastes live on liminal, non-arable land. Nor were all outcastes or *burakumin* impoverished and marginalized. Nor have all *burakumin* been the lineal descendants of *eta*.[35] And so on.

Scholars criticize reductive theories of discrimination using these exceptions. Because there are exceptions to the general rule that *burakumin* are affiliated with Shin Buddhism, theories of discrimination relying on Shin Buddhism are believed untenable (BYJ 284-285). If discrimination is believed to be caused by contempt for those who violate Buddhist precepts against killing, as in some "religious origin" theories, why did warriors, hunters, and fishers not experience discrimination in the same way that as the "extremely defiled" (*eta*) or "leatherworkers" (*kawata* 皮多, 革田)? Moreover, in an apologetic vein, some point out that medieval Japanese Buddhist figures like Eison, Nichiren, and Shinran made groups such as the "inhuman" (*hinin*), "extremely defiled" (*eta*), and "evil

---

[34] See also Amos (2007) for a brief description of how simple, linear theories of origin, especially those put forward by Dōmei Marxist historians, are being overturned. It is tremendously difficult to generalize about *buraku* origins other than by projecting the modern *burakumin* identity backwards in history—a move which has been politically important for the Dōmei, the *buraku* liberation movement, and its Marxist historical narrative.

[35] Despite medieval historical evidence for discrimination against groups like the *eta, toji, hinin*, and "riverbank dwellers" (*kawaramono* 河原者), there is no single origin for these groups (BYJ 182)

persons" (*akunin*) special targets of compassion and salvific action.[36] How, they wonder, could Japanese Buddhism be the origin of discrimination against groups they attempt to aid? Because of these exceptions, reductive theories lack a significant following today. They seem to contradict the plural and local nature of premodern low status groups, as well as the multiple criteria for pollution and difference used in any historical period (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 2). I would add that plurality is an inescapable feature of the way discrimination occurs in practice; discrimination is an unstable phenomenon.

To avoid an endless indication of "exceptions," then, the field of *buraku* history must rethink its approach to reductive theories. Specifically, it must reconsider the relationship between a discriminatory rationale, such as involvement in animal death, and the plural and inconsistent application of a given rationale historically. This requires a more complex understanding of how discrimination works and how pollution beliefs are applied. In recent contributions to the study of modern *burakumin*, this shift seems to be occurring. At its root, however, a myopic focus on exceptions involves a conceptual error. Many participants in the debate outlined above will accept a theory only when the *content* of discriminatory ideas and rationales correlates with underlying historical realities. That is, they will uphold a theory only when discriminatory ideas are historically true. This is not how discriminatory ideas work.

Terms used to despise others have only a tenuous connection with the actual

---

[36] Often, when Buddhist directs compassion towards, or includes, a particular social group, it is taken as evidence that Buddhism positively valued that group. This type of argument is often made for positive Buddhist valuation of women, *burakumin*, and sufferers of leprosy (Hansen's disease). The reality, however, is far more complex. Ironically in these cases, Buddhist compassion is shown to be powerful and inclusive to the extent that its targets are considered lowly and excluded.

people and activities implied by the terms themselves.[37] "All *burakumin* are the lineal descendants of premodern *eta* and worked with animal corpses" is not a factual statement, but a discriminatory one. Indicating that all *burakumin* today are not, in fact, descendants of the *eta* nor did they all work with animal corpses, is analogous to pointing out that discriminatory beliefs are not accurate. Yet, inaccuracy makes them no less powerful and influential in the lives of real people.[38] Scholars in this field must come to terms with the power of these inaccurate ideas.

A person can despise another as a "butcher" or "meat-eater"—as Buddhists have done—whether he or she performs those activities or not. More interestingly, people can despise others as "butcher" or "meat-eater" even while carving, cooking, and eating meat themselves. It is important to distinguish between the use of "butcher" and "meat-eater" as terms of censure and the actual activities of butchery and meat eating. Discrimination and the use of negative symbols for *burakumin* relate to the former more than the latter.[39] As an example of this disjunction, Lisa Grumbach (2005, 7) notes that a hierarchy of pollution was applied even to meat itself, with "the 'defiled' meat of the larger animals" with four legs "associated with 'the outcaste classes.'"[40] To put this differently, amongst

---

[37] Amos (2011) provides extensive documentation on the ways that narratives and symbols of *burakumin* have little relation to historical fact. By arguing about the way that current historical narratives and discriminatory concepts do not match reality, Amos attempts to replace these with more accurate understandings of *burakumin*.

[38] See also my discussion of "stigma," a specific type of discriminatory symbol, below.

[39] See Orbaugh's (2007, 185) comments on the "role" of *burakumin* as a historical foil to define the "normal" and the "Japanese," and how this is different from *who* or *whose descendents* were actually marginalized at any given time and place. Premodern outcastes at the dawn of the Meiji (1870s) "were still considered dirty/impure, animal-like, genetically different, and inferior. Although the centuries-old Buddhist prohibition against meat-eating was vigorously countered by the Meiji government and beef became a fashionable food item, the association of *buraku* dwellers (now *shin-heimin*) with the affiliated industries of butchering and leatherwork continued to be seen as 'dirty' by the majority of Japanese" (Orbaugh 2007, 188).

[40] She qualifies outcaste classes as *eta*, *hinin*, and non-Japanese groups. More on these terms below. See for example ideas that modern *burakumin* consume the least desireable meats (Orbaugh 2007, 191).

meat-eaters, *burakumin* were believed to eat the worst meat.

A new "multilayered" theory

A recent volume edited by Fujino and Kurokawa (2009) provides an elegant solution to the problem of reductive theories of *buraku* discrimination. They reject any idea that discrimination is simply a result of premodern survivals or remnants that intrude upon the Japanese modern. Providing examples, they argue that the policies of central institutions of the Japanese state were discriminatory, and "solicitous of popular discriminatory consciousness."[41] Discrimination did "*not merely exist* among the people as a feudal remnants or defilement (*kegare*) consciousness" (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 6, emphasis added). Rather, older forms were embedded within the new discriminations of modern capitalist society, premodern and modern layered on one another (2009, 9). *Buraku* discrimination continues to exist today precisely because it is produced by the modern.[42] This new theory takes seriously the specific content of ideas of pollution when they are situated within their proper, modern historical context. They outline a modern structure for both new and inherited ideas of pollution.

What does it mean to say, as Fujino does, that discrimination is "multilayered" (*jūsōsei* 重層性)?[43] It means that premodern ideas are taken up in modern

---

[41] *sabetsu ishiki* 差別意識. This interesting, and strongly Marxist, term is used by most Japanese works on discrimination regardless of disciplinary approach. "Consciousness" (*ishiki*) in this sense enters Japan in the early Meiji period with Marxist thought, becomes a common term in discussions of discrimination in the 1920s, and now is used in both anthropological and historical explanations of discrimination, as well as by political activists, educators, and popular media. In these explanations, discriminatory consciousness connects ideology, material relations and social structures, with discriminatory behavior. See Pharr (1990, 77) for examples.

[42] Most research on *burakumin* and *buraku* history is motivated by the desire to lessen contemporary discrimination, and by strong political and ideological agendas. Although this affects the direction of research in ways unsatisfying to some (Yamamoto 1999, 2-4), it has produced a tremendous body of work intent on exposing the underlying causes of *buraku* discrimination. Each of these causes implicated modern Shin Buddhist sects in different ways.

[43] Fujino relies on the work of Hirota Masaki (ひろたまさき, b. 1934) and also traces it through urban history,

discourses, forming part of how the *burakumin* are constructed in relation to economic modernization, modern education, urban development, and the formation of a homogenous Japanese ethnicity linked to the nation-state. This is the reason why older ideas of pollution as religious, moral, and ritual impurity join newer ideas of pollution articulated in discourses of modern hygiene, public health, public order, economic and racial difference.

Modern, multilayered discrimination inflects premodern categories of impurity and contamination in new ways.[44] In the discourse of twentieth century Japanese eugenics,[45] if *burakumin* are mentioned, they are thought to be genetically impure or to be the carriers of congenital diseases and deformities, carriers of congenital criminality, and thus not fit for procreation.[46] Somehow, the body of a *burakumin* is believed to be physically different or "marked." Other modern justifications portray *burakumin* as leading contaminated lifestyles, and having unhygienic habits and living conditions. Still others portray them as "racially" contaminated, as a different race from the "Japanese."[47]

---

specifically the segregation of urban *buraku* during urban expansion for reasons of hygiene. Capitalist development brought the idea of an "average standard of living" and made obvious groups that existed below it (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 9).

[44] Ohnuki-Tierney (1984), for example, traces inflections of older purity and pollution discourses in modern, medical "germ-theory."

[45] Robertson (2002) and Caron (1999). See also the work of Fujino Yutaka, a historian and critic of the modern Japanese state. He has worked on eugenics (*yūsei* 優生), fascism, the history of *burakumin* in the twentieth century, sufferers of Hansen's disease, and women, paying close attention to how state institutions control and exclude these groups.

[46] There were even eugenics-based "sterilization" solutions suggested for the problems of leprosy and *burakumin* prior to the 1920s (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 56). Endogamy and inbreeding were believed to be the causes of *burakumin* genetic bodily difference. Beliefs that exoticized *burakumin* portrayed them as possessing strange organs of sex or excretion, or as unusually strong—the latter belief repeated by Yanagita Kunio in his 1913 essay (Fujino and Kurokawa 2009, 51-53).

[47] The idea that *burakumin* were a different race has premodern precedents as well, but fell out of academic and public use in the latter half of the twentieth century. BYJ (36) mentions race in the writings of eighteenth century Confucian and National Learning scholars. See also BYJ (282-287) and Fujino and Kurokawa (2009, 42-46, 51-53).

In this view, *burakumin* are despised as "poor, unclean (the source of contagious disease), immoral (hotbeds of crime), and believed to have "different bloodlines (*kettō* 血統)" with a tendency towards a racialized discriminatory order under modern, imperial governance.[48] I consider all of these to be components of a broad paradigm of purity-pollution. If we consider purity-pollution a set of irrational beliefs tied to traditional, premodern religion, this move might seem counterintuitive. Nevertheless, as Howell (2005, 88) suggests, fear of pollution and contamination directed towards *burakumin* actually became stronger in the modern period.

Today, premodern justifications based on ritual impurity, despised occupation, residence on liminal non-agrarian land, itinerancy, inferiority and animality, exist alongside modern discourses of crime, disease, poverty, and genetic impurity within the Japanese nation-state. The overall impetus and structure for both, however, is modern. Of course, all of these justifications regulated social intercourse, maintained avoidance of marriage relations between *burakumin* and non-*burakumin*, and reinforced in-group endogamy amongst *burakumin*.

Beyond the stereotypes, slurs, and potential violence common to discrimination everywhere, *burakumin* face specific social practices that circumscribe their interactions with other Japanese social groups. These practices exclude them from marriage, property, educational, and employment opportunities. If one's identity as *burakumin* is discovered through a "status investigation" (*mibun chōsa*) performed by a private investigator, for example, it is likely that marriage engagements will be ended, contracts terminated, and employment offers withdrawn. Social psychological models of discrimination deal

---

[48] Fujino and Kurokawa (2009, 9) summarizing Hirota.

with these concrete practices in detail.

The social psychology of discrimination

A social psychological model that ties discrimination to the way humans are and interact in society explains how individuals can reinforce or reject the ideas within this multilayered discourse of *buraku* discrimination. This is precisely what was at stake in the relation between the Ōtani-ha sect of Shin Buddhism and *buraku* advocates. They engaged in communicative acts that discriminated or tried to mitigate discrimination, that drew on certain components of modern *buraku* pollution and rejected others.

According to Erving Goffman and other interactionist thinkers, [49] discrimination works because it reduces a person's "life chances." It restricts access to the basic networks and opportunities necessary to flourish in modern society. Exclusion, then, is one way that discrimination harms people. Socially, discrimination is expressed in unusual behaviors and affects on the part of the discriminator (and in some cases the victim of discrimination [50]), such as disattention, avoidance, revulsion, contempt, anxiety, and sometimes violence.[51] This can also be seen structurally[52] where discrimination forbids certain social spaces and denies access to social networks or relations (Goffman 1959). *Buraku*

---

[49] This classic interactionist work on discrimination is Goffman's (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. See also Goffman (1974; 1991), Lemert and Branaman (1997), Ritzer (2005), O'Brien (2010).
[50] The reactions of both discriminators and discriminated-against tend to be unstable. While patterns are noted by sociologists, such as the anxiety, depression, and self-hatred sometimes experienced by the discriminated-against, it is difficult to generalize these reactions.
[51] Some of the terms used to describe majority discriminatory behaviors towards the *burakumin* include "ostracism" (*haiseki* 排斥), "exclusion" (*haijō* 排除), "contempt" (*keibetsu* 軽蔑), and "viewed as lowly" (*senshi* 賤視). On violence against the *burakumin* in the Meiji period, see Howell (2005, 79-109).
[52] In *Gender Advertisements*, Goffman describes how the organization and segregation of social practice and space produces meaningful difference from insignificant difference (for example, different bathrooms for men and women) (Lemert and Branaman 1997, lxxx).

discrimination is a specific type of discriminatory practice of avoiding contact,[53] commensality, consanguinity, and social ties with a specific group of people based on an orientation towards purity and away from pollution, broadly understood.[54]

As the name implies, interactionists are concerned with an order in society between the individual and the macro-level of society as a whole (Goffman 1983). Interactionists qualitatively analyze face-to-face encounters and other communicative acts (textual communication thought to be an echo of face-to-face) where two or more individuals mutually influence one another (Ritzer 2005, 744). In so doing, interactionists avoid the question of "origins" or "causes" to focus instead on the fluid ways that broader social structures, statuses, and conventions appear—whether they are reinforced or challenged, upheld or transgressed—within human interaction. In this view, discrimination is something people *do*. It is a specific way of negatively identifying and behaving towards people, which can include moral judgments, practices, and ideas of social order transmitted by religions. Japanese religion is thus one amongst many sources. Religious actors participate in the social practice of discrimination, and religious rules, beliefs, ritual practices, images, and institutions can become—at any given moment—integral to discrimination against *burakumin*.

People exercise discrimination against others they have categorized as

---

[53] Often results in residential and other forms of segregation. See Goffman's (1959) use of "frontstage" and "backstage" to describe how space is experienced by the stigmatized—by those with ambiguous (Amos 2005), or in Goffman's (1963) terms, "spoiled," bodies.

[54] This practice has caste-like features although Japan never had a "caste-system" in its history. Still, scholars use the terms "outcaste," "caste," or "caste-like" in connection with the *burakumin*, especially with reference to their Edo period predecessors (Ohnuki-Tierney 1998, 36). Price (1996, 7) points out that "outcastes" defined by religion and law exist in places where the Indian caste system was not transmitted. See Amos (2005) for a useful review of current research and outline of the general movement towards postcolonial and postmodern frameworks and analysis of power. Amos himself prefers to describe *burakumin* as "exiles," their bodies as "ambiguous" or "displaced," stating that "outcaste" cannot meaningfully capture their lives (Amos 2007, 157).

undesirable, whom they have learned to see as undesirable through socialization (Goffman 1963, 5). An individual or group is undesirable when they are thought to have certain undesirable characteristics—or what Goffman called *stigma*—and thus to be avoided and disqualified from full social acceptance. This is what distinguishes "stigma" from other degrees of discrimination and why it applies in the case of *burakumin*; stigmatized individuals and groups are treated as less than human. Goffman acknowledged both bodily[55] and character-based stigma, and believed these could apply either to individuals or groups (Goffman, 1963, 4). It is important to distinguish here between the contemporary academic and activist stance that asserts there are no physical differences between *burakumin* and other Japanese social groups, and discriminatory discourses *that do assume* that *burakumin* possess different bodies and different moral characters. Stigma refers to this latter, discriminatory assumption.

In religious studies, bodily marks, stigma, and stigmata can also add positive or sacred[56] senses to this basic idea of a visual or discernible marker for social exclusion (Turner and Turner 2005). In a positive sense, "stigmata," for example, among other "marks of supernatural election" (Turner and Turner 2005, 1004-1005), refers to participation in the suffering of Jesus Christ by manifesting the same wounds on the hands and feet. Buddhism, too, provides many examples of bodily marks signifying moral worth and election, such as the thirty-two marks of a great man that distinguished the body of a buddha from others in a positive

---

[55] Although Goffman focuses on stigma in the abstract, the term originally refered to brands or scars on the body intended as visual evidence of a person's loss of status or condemnation by society. In addition, most discriminatory discourses did posit specific physical marks or bodily difference for *burakumin*, such as different blood or a blue bruise-like mark (*aza* 痣) (DeVos and Wagatsuma 1966a, 239), or otherwise assumed that they had different bodies.

[56] For the *burakumin*, both positive (sacred) and negative (defiled) senses are operative, although the negative prevails. See Ohnuki-Tierney (1984, 38-39) on the idea of "guest" or "stranger-diety" (*marebito* まれびと).

sense (Mrozik 2007, 63-67; Turner and Turner 2005, 1004).

Just as "we can speak of 'virtuous bodies'" in Buddhism, however, we can also speak of "their opposite" (Mrozik 2007, 67). Religious meaning attached to marking the body with tattoos or scars identifies "not only recalcitrant individuals but also marginal groups that otherwise have few means to display identity in mainstream society" (Turner and Turner 2005, 1002). In a Buddhist example relevant to the *burakumin*, according to Śantideva, among the vicious human bodies that one can receive for immoral acts such as eating meat, there is birth in very low castes or as an outcaste (*sendara*, S. *caṇḍāla*). Immoral acts can also manifest bodily as physical disability or birth as a woman (Mrozik 2007, 69-70). The body is "a deliberately created badge of identity" (Turner and Turner 2005, 1005), whether it is marked positively or negatively. For the *burakumin*, despite a few counter examples, this deliberate cultural stigmatization is overwhelmingly negative.

Goffman declared that the discovery of stigma eliminates normal obligations to treat people as their positive traits might otherwise require. On that basis, discriminators act *as if* those people are "not quite human" (Goffman, 1963, 6), where the term "human" signifies someone deserving of moral consideration. At the very least, discriminators hold the individual or group to a different standard, reacting in unpredictable, unstable ways to both positive social achievements such as wealth and success, and negative social failings such as criminal behavior. There is always the pernicious assumption that discrimination is somehow *deserved*, that victims are somehow to blame for the discrimination they suffer. In Buddhism, this assumption is often justified by ideas of karma. In all cases, victims of discrimination have "little power to frame events or to combat interpretive frameworks applied to them" (Lemert and Branaman 1997, lxxvi). Stigma, then, is

a general term for a set of negative beliefs, judgments, and narrative elements that underlie the social practice of discrimination in face-to-face or communicative interactions. In our case, stigma are those negative characteristics assumed to be true of *burakumin* that connect intimately with notions of pollution and contamination, which position and define the discriminated-against "other" as different, inferior, and inhuman.

Buddhism as source of discriminatory beliefs:

Japanese religions play a role in defining *burakumin* as permanently polluted and less than human. This role is two-fold: (1) as a source of discriminatory beliefs, practices, and structures; (2) as propagators, drawing on the full-range of discriminatory beliefs implicit in modern *buraku* pollution. As a source, Buddhism's specific contributions to *buraku* discrimination are found in the strong link between moral evil and pollution. Buddhism becomes the standard for distinguishing between moral and immoral, high and low,[57] pure and impure. Immorality, manifest in low social status, disease, weakness, and so on, was not easily "cleansed" and thus, could be inherited.[58] As propagators, Japanese Buddhism further linked negative terms in scripture and commentary with specific, identifiable Japanese social groups, such as *burakumin* or their premodern forbearers, the "extremely defiled and inhuman" (*eta-hinin*). Modern *buraku* advocates point to several terms in Shin Buddhist sacred texts, such as "outcaste" (*sendara*), "inhuman" (*hinin*), words for karma and types of karmic retribution in the three pure land *sūtras* (DBS 1:117) or in verses of praise written by the founder, Shinran, that have been tied to *eta* or *burakumin*.

---

57 For "what is noble and what is lowly (*kisen* 貴賎), or exalted and reviled (*sonpi* 尊卑)" (Kuroda 1996, 244).
58 Neary (2003, 278), summarizing a 1979 article by Niunoya Tetsuichi (丹生谷哲一) entitled "Officers and Purifiers" (*Kebiishi to kiyome* 検非違使とキヨメ).

Problematic versions of karma are all those that link the lowly categories of "inhuman" (*hinin*) and "outcaste" (*sendara*), their bodily and social characteristics, with evil, immoral action. Good persons, according to the *Lotus Sūtra*, will "take no pleasure in associating with such people, or with those engaged in evil occupations such as butchers, raisers of pigs, sheep, chickens, or dogs, hunters, or those who offer women's charms for sale" (Watson 1993, 323).

The term for "inhuman" (*hinin*, DDB) was transmitted through China to Japan in Buddhist texts[59] as a translation for the Sanskrit *amanuṣya* and other related terms. It referred to all non-human beings, whether demonic, divine, ghostly, or animal-like, with a tendency to stress the negative and dangerous members of that broad category. In terms of rebirth, *hinin* implies all levels *below* the human realm (Yamamoto 1999).[60] In China, *hinin* referred to those beings that resembled the dead, had something wrong with their bodies, who did not behave in human ways, and so on. In Japan, in texts such as the *Nihon ryōiki* 日本霊異記, *hinin* labeled beings with a mixture of human and animal characteristics, like humans with cows' heads*. Hinin* became the label for a specific low status groups during the medieval period, such as "beggars, prostitutes, castoff commoners" (Price 1967, 6), and sometimes applied to sufferers of leprosy. Although the *hinin* status was sometimes assigned as punishment, it retained its Buddhist flavor (Yamamoto 1999, 18-19) such that a poor, itinerant beggar suggested the supernatural and monstrous.

---

[59] Yamamoto (1999, 2) credits Kuroda Toshio's 1972 essay "The Medieval Status System and Concepts of Lowliness" (*Chūsei no mibunsei to hisen kannen* 中世の身分制と卑賤観念) for introducing the Buddhist connection in his work on medieval *hinin*. See also Ohnuki-Tierney (1994, 145 n.8-9)

[60] See Ohnuki-Tierney's (1984, 39-40) description of the "dual nature" of certain classes of outsiders in her work on the *marebito* ("stranger-deity"). The *hinin* category can be both positive and negative, but that positive potential must be harnessed through careful, ritual interactions.

The term for "outcaste" (*sendara*, DDB) was also transmitted to Japan through Buddhist texts. It is not surprising that texts transmitted from South Asia would contain terms referring to specific social groups within South Asian society at the time they were written. Regardless of whether these terms were accurate reflections of that society, some became significant and morally charged labels for social groups in other regions and in later periods. One of these terms referred to "outcastes," called *caṇḍāla* in Sanskrit—a term variously Sinicized as 旃陀羅 or 栴陀羅 or 旃荼羅, and pronounced in Japanese as *sendara*. This pejorative term labeled the lowest, most evil members of society: butchers, murderers, fishers, jailers, and so on.

It is illustrative to look further at the idea of animal death in Buddhist scripture. The *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* (*Nehangyō* 涅槃経),[61] as summarized by Fujitani Toshio (1970, 395),[62] lists sixteen evil customs. Most involve animal death, touching on every facet of the animal economy: raising, fattening, hunting, fishing, bird catching, slaughter, butchery, cooking, and sale of animal products for profit. Also ascribed to the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, and clearly similar to types of premodern Japanese outcastes, Fujitani further lists among the sixteen evil customs the occupations and households of prison guards, thieves, liars, those who know incantations and deal with supernatural beings,[63] dyers, oil pressers, prostitutes,[64]

---

[61] S. *Nirvāṇa sūtra*. Fujitani did not cite his list and it is not exactly the same as *Nehangyō* (T 374. 12.0538b09-19).

[62] Fujitani Toshio (藤谷俊雄, b.1912) was an Ōtani-ha affiliated Marxist historian who taught at Ōtani University. In the postwar period, his allegiance within the *buraku* liberation movement remained with the far left and the Japanese Communist Party. Although he does cover religious contributions to discrimination, he gives greater weight to social, economical, and material explanations. For Fujitani, inequalities in power and resources precede religious justifications. He is the originator of the theory that all *burakumin* were forced to become adherents of Shin Buddhism by late medieval and early modern authorities (Yamamoto 2007, 46).

[63] Literally, a compound of "curse/incantation" and "*nāga*/dragon" (*jūryū* 呪龍). See also ideas of impurity connected to spirit possession (Robertson 2005, 332). Izumi Shigeki (private conversation, March 2009), related a story of an Otani-ha "one house" *buraku* area, ostracized in the postwar due to fears of spirit possession.

and liquor sellers. Such customs, *and the people and households that performed them*, were likely avoided and despised using this type of Buddhist justification. And, more important here, they were despised using these Buddhist justifications in the modern period.[65] The constellation of terms and labels for people connected with animal death, and its consequent moral pollution, becomes the primary Buddhist contribution to *buraku* discrimination. Members of the "extremely defiled" (*eta*) group either performed, or were assumed to perform, occupations associated with animal death.

The problem for modern Shin Buddhist organizations is that these pejorative terms from Buddhist scripture became tied to specific low status groups within Japanese society. Scholars believe there was a widespread linking of *sendara* with discriminated-against peoples from the medieval period onwards (Yamamoto 2006, 10-11; Rogers and Rogers 1991, 65), specifically, of "outcaste" (*sendara*) with "butcher" (*toji*) and "extremely defiled" (*eta*). Both premodern, modern, and Buddhist aspects of *burakumin* pollution continue—bound up with one another—to the present day. This is clearly visible in the writings of Shin Buddhist preachers in the early twentieth century.

Shin Buddhist preachers deploying discriminatory beliefs

In the modern writings and propagation work of early twentieth century Shin preachers, both premodern and modern ideas of pollution are used within a

---

[64] See Neary (1989, 15) on "bamboo whisk makers" (*chasen* 茶筅), "indigo dyers" (*aoya* 藍屋) and "riverbank dwellers" (*kawaramono*). See also BYJ, and lists compiled by Price (1966, 10-15) and Geiger (2011, 17).
[65] Status occupations performed by premodern low status groups include: butchery and leather work; removal and disposal of animal corpses, especially cows and horses; cleaners and caretakers of the dead within religious compounds; work associated with prisons, as guards, escorts, and executioners; gardens, landscaping, and general construction; plasterers, carpenters, arms manufacturers; dyers and bamboo artisans; entertainers, prostitutes, diviners; undertakers and caretakers of gravesites; removers of human waste and general cleaning. Ohnuki-Tierney (1998, 37-40) asserts that all are non-agrarian and associated with pollution. See also Shimahara (1984, 340).

modernizing religious framework. A short piece published in 1899 by the Shin preacher, Junkei 荀兮, called "Enlightening the Lowly of the *Buraku*," and similar works serve as examples of the characteristics of *buraku* stigma in circulation in Ōtani-ha circles. In all cases, the preachers saw their outreach and preaching work as good, responsibly modern, compassionate action. They aspired to enlighten and uplift *burakumin* in a new era of rights and freedoms—a typically modern context.

Junkei writes about the characteristics that "mark" one as "extremely defiled" (*eta*):

> ... those names that mean "*eta*," of being used carelessly by the people of the world, suffering exclusion, viewed always as trash and troublemakers—almost as if they were not related to humanity. Those who—as impure people (*fujōsha* 不浄者)—are everywhere denied wide association. They wail within the narrow confines of *buraku* areas, which have dotted our entire country from ancient times. Before the Meiji Restoration, the people of the world treated them in an extremely harsh manner, to the extent that they would never have considered them of the same race (*dōjinshu* 同人種). Since then, the demeaning names of the *eta* were completely abolished and they officially became normal members of the commoner (*heimin* 平民) class. It seemed as if the people of the world would come to treat them a little differently, but as the demeaning names of *eta* identification were being abolished they were restored when the language changed to "new commoners" (*shinheimin* 新平民).[66]

Junkei describes a situation of contempt and segregation, where the social and legal treatment suffered by *burakumin* reinforced ghettoization in specific village

---

[66] *Buraku teki senmin no kyōka* 部落的賤民の教化, appearing in the Ōtani University magazine, *Mujintō* 無盡燈 (4.5). Junkei wrote under his religious name and does not appear in Buddhist biographical dictionaries. He published in popular venues and was a travelling preacher, likely of the Ōtani-ha. Reprinted in the DBS (1:547-549) and referenced by Izumi (2001). On how the term *shinheimin* came to replace earlier discriminatory names, see Ames (1981, 101) and Geiger (2011, 25). KBS (2:122) provides an example of a list of "new commoner temples" (*shinheiji* 新平寺) from 1875, showing use of *shinheimin* in Shin Buddhist registers.

areas. Despite legal emancipation of former outcastes in Japan, when the "demeaning names of the *eta* were completely abolished," Junkei describes how discrimination continued under a new name[67]: although they were not "outcastes" per se, *burakumin* were treated as outcastes by others in Japanese society.

In the turmoil of the early Meiji period (1868-1912), older forms of identity and organization were disrupted, and new ones emerged. Buddhist institutions and premodern outcaste groups alike underwent tremendous change, as so many groups in Japanese society did. Both groups lost their "place" within Japanese society. The positions, privileges, and burdens attached to both groups within the social order of the late Edo period were disrupted—for good or ill—through a combination of the systematic policies of the new Meiji government and popular backlash. What emerged were the modern Ōtani-ha and modern *burakumin*.

This fundamental disruption left the identity of formerly outcaste groups in a state of flux, yet attempts to label and identify the regionally disparate and heterogeneous groups captured under the early modern labels of "*eta-hinin* and so forth" continued. The disruption of status also meant a loss of former (status) occupational monopolies, increasing poverty, riot violence and loss of property, new legal regimes, and a series of new, unstable, and pejorative terms—with the beginnings of a homogenous modern identity as *burakumin* emerging early in the twentieth century.

The term *burakumin* itself refers to a new group, in the sense that *burakumin*

---

[67] As often occurs with euphemistic terms used for discriminated-against groups everywhere, the terms appear and are discarded at a rapid pace. Yanagita (1913, 370) noticed this trend in the 1910s. A variety of Japanese terms have been used in the modern period and most have taken on pejorative connotations. For example, the issue of *buraku* discrimination has been called the "impoverished peoples problem" (*saimin mondai* 細民問題), the "reconciliation problem" (*yūwa mondai* 融和問題), and the "assimilation problem" (*dōwa mondai* 同和問題).

become a coherent group only in the modern period. The historical origins of persons who came to be included in this group are not easy to trace. What is more, *burakumin* and those thought to be their predecessors have been located in socially marginal spaces. The histories of the marginalized are always difficult to bring to light. As John Dower (1986, 235) deftly summarizes, a centuries-long development led to "a diversified spectrum of legally stigmatized hereditary outcastes" by the Edo period that varied by region, local regime, and over time. As Junkei described above, members of this diverse group were considered "outside" and "polluted" in local elite and commoner discourses.

Despite *legal emancipation*, the social practices of discrimination suffered by premodern legal outcastes continued and were restructured with respect to the modern nation-state. From the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, proclamations declaring equality of the formerly outcaste, or freedom of the formerly indentured, appeared throughout the world. [68] Japan, like other nation-states, celebrates that moment of transition from hierarchy to equality through the symbol of legal emancipation. Its emancipation law, promulgated in 1871, reads:

> With regard to the provision abolishing demeaning names (*senshō* 賤称) for those groups such as the "extremely defiled" (*eta*), the "inhuman" (*hinin*) and so forth, from this time forwards, they shall be the same as commoners (*heimin*) in terms of status and occupation.[69]

---

[68] This refers to the legal or legislative emancipation of serfs, slaves, coerced or bonded labor, low status groups, prostitutes, and outcastes. Botsman (2011) covers the Japanese case in detail and treats emancipation as a global process.

[69] *eta hinin nado no shō sutararesōrō jō, jigon mibun shokugyō tomo ni heimin dōsu taru beki koto* 穢多非人等ノ称被廃候条自今身分職業共平民同様タルヘキ事. Popularly called the "Emancipation Edict" or "Liberation Edict" (Kaihōrei 解放令), it is also known by the title *Senshō haishi rei* 賤称廃止令, literally meaning the "Edict Abolishing Demeaning Names" (GS 174). Botsman (2011, 1344-1345) translates *senshō* 賤称 as "outcaste status designations." With the word "such as" or "etc." (*nado* 等), the edict signals the existence of many early modern *senmin* groups, perhaps around fifty (Uesugi 2006, 24-25). In addition to *eta-hinin*, for

Moral arguments were made for Japan's emancipation law (Botsman 2011), arguments that a society with outcastes was not enlightened or civilized,[70] as well as arguments that emancipation was a reform vital to the success of the emerging Japanese nation-state.[71] The law was part of a larger program removing status barriers to a unified census, a coherent land and tax base, and to rational industrial development.[72] However, inside modernizing nation-states, groups that were not considered "enlightened" or "civilized," such as the Ainu and *burakumin* occupied the lowest positions in a new kind of hierarchy. As Junkei noted, discrimination continued in Japan even though the legal regime had ended.[73]

> ... There was no help for the condescension and exclusion [they suffered]. In this manner, their ancestors, for tens and hundreds of imperials eras, suffered the careless usage of the world and this has become a particular kind of spiritual inheritance. Without knowing the power granted to them by heaven (*jiko tenpu no kenri* 自己天賦の権利)[74] or their self-possession of freedom (*jiko senyū no jiyū* 自己専有の自由), they took *themselves* lightly, scorned themselves, dared not desire to associate [widely with others], nor did they attempt to throw off the indignity put upon them by the world...one must lead this kind of people to the light of wisdom, to liberation on all sides (*shimen kaihō* 四面開放), and make it so the same wind blows for them as it

---

example, the Kyoto region included many different low status groups (See BYJ for detailed descriptions of these status groups). The majority (around 70%) of early modern low status groups were *eta*.

[70] See my discussion and translation of Shimaji Mokurai's (島地黙雷, 1838-1911) essay on human rights in chapter 3.

[71] Garon (2003, 46). In addition to eliminating the status system, Garon lists equality before the law, freedom of association and expression, political participation, improvements in infrastructure and communication as part of this process.

[72] This would allow other groups to become involved in, for example, all of the industries associated with the raising, maintenance, and slaughter of cattle.

[73] By the end of WWII, legal outcastes had been abolished all over Asia. Discrimination against former outcastes has continued in the form of social custom (BYJ 182).

[74] Similar phrasing is used in the Imperial Japanese Constitution of 1889. See Neary (1998, 16-19, 25), Garon (2003, 46-47), Thelle (1987, 48-49), and Howell (2005, 78) for further information on the development of rights language in the Meiji period and the "Freedom and Popular Rights Movement" (*Jiyū minken undō* 自由民権運動).

does for all.[75]

Here, Junkei described contemporary forms of egalitarianism, rights thought, and discourses of civilization that circulated during the Meiji period. But, he asserted, *burakumin* are denied (and he believes they deny themselves) access to the dignity, rights, and freedoms of this civilization. He returned again to those things that marked the *burakumin* as polluted and different, that host of negative characteristics or stigma, this time applied to the body:

> ...Corrupting ethics (*rindō* 倫道) and nature, they marry within nearly the same family, over time forming a single blood lineage. Unsightly diseases and physical handicaps (*shūkan naru haishitsu fugu* 醜汗なる廃疾不具) appear one after another: eyes enflamed, completely without hair on their heads, and with mouth and nose rotting and falling-off. And yet the worst must be those completely lacking their four limbs. It is truly like some monstrous place,[76] the very height of hardship in the human world. Ah! For those who wail within the *buraku*, what terrible evil (*zaiaku* 罪悪) is the cause? And in this place, although their ancestors might have been sinful in some way, or might have been prisoners of war, I cannot see any trace of evil in the *buraku* of today's Meiji era....Alas! Even now there is surely a chaplain for those suffering in prison for crimes like stealing, lying, rape, and murder—which ought to be thought hateful. Why will no one clean out these pitiable dens of vice, where *burakumin* are about to commit great crimes?

For Junkei at the turn of the twentieth century, the solution was "moral exhortation" (*kyōka*) of *burakumin*, a segregated education system inside the *buraku*, the provision of assistance in finding work and occupational training, and a "chaplaincy of the *buraku*." By the "constant coming and going of the religionist," Junkei envisioned *burakumin* guided, comforted, and led to the light: "I beg those zealous educators, those sympathetic religionists, rise quickly and administer this

---

[75] Junkei's essay in DBS (1:547-549).

[76] The word used is *kaibutsu yashiki* 怪物屋敷, a "haunted" or "monster-filled" house.

[great work]!" Here we have the situation that characterized the early part of the twentieth century: a heap of negative characteristics attributed to *burakumin* on the one hand, balanced on the other (in the view of religionists), by paternalistic charitable action, and oriented towards the goal of producing modern citizens. This paternal, charitable role is a key component of the modern identity taken on by Shin sects out of the disruptions of the early Meiji and modernization.

For Shin Buddhist sects, the process of disruption occurred through a loss of authority and government funding, a loss of assets and property, seeing negative views of Buddhism enter mainstream discourse, and so on.[77] As Buddhism was removed from state functions, there was a nationalization of sporadic and local contempt directed at Buddhist institutions. Resentment towards Buddhism erupted violently in the form of the "throw away the Buddha, destroy Shakyamuni" (*haibutsu kishaku*) movement which forcibly merged or closed temples, returned priests to lay life, and destroyed or appropriated property. In 1871, for example, the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha lost 232 temples in Toyama prefecture alone.[78]

The Ōtani-ha sect of Shin Buddhism was, along with other Buddhist sects, systematically removed from all functions of the state and government.[79] The former role of temples in census and registration, as well as their role in transmitting and mediating government decrees and citizen petitions, was ended. Buddhist paraphernalia were physically removed from imperial institutions and the state-granted privileges and prestige enjoyed by Buddhist temples and priests

---

[77] Scholars normally treat this process beginning with the "separation of Shintō and Buddhism" (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離) laws and ""throw away the Buddha, destroy Shakyamuni" (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈) *haibutsu kishaku* movement (Ketelaar 1990).

[78] This paragraph is a summary of Kashiwahara (1986, 4-6).

[79] Ōtani-ha troubles were multiplied because, in effect, they had backed the wrong horse. They supported the Tokugawa shogunate and continued to maintain close ties to the Tokugawa family.

were stripped. Buddhist temples and priests lost imperially granted titles, along with their associated privileges and stipends.[80] Professional Buddhists priests, in essence, became common modern citizens and made to take surnames. The state no longer policed priestly conduct and decriminalized marriage, eating meat, wearing secular clothing, and growing hair. In the midst of resisting and recovering from such trauma, the leading Shin Buddhist sects, the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha worked to modernize and redefine themselves as institutions. One of the avenues to modernization was contributing to public projects, along with charitable, relief, and social work. Junkei and other preachers are typical of early attempts, promoting charitable action for the *burakumin* even as they repeated ideas of their permanent pollution and difference.

Even if he himself rejects certain items, Junkei's essay is a perfect example of the "mass" or "bundle" of characteristics that at any given moment might be assumed true of, and thought to be inherent within, those stigmatized as *burakumin*: disease, criminality, gambling and violence, different racial origins, incest and erotic difference, moral and religious evil, inhumanity or animality, congenital difference, abnormal bodies and bodily functions, suffering the karmic consequences of past evil acts, and so on. Another priest, Nanryū 楠龍,[81] called their natures (*konjō* 根性) "distorted," and like Junkei believed *burakumin* consciously segregate and isolate themselves: "To describe them in the words of Buddhism, we ought to say theirs is the world of demons (*shūra* 修羅) and hungry ghosts (*gaki* 餓鬼)"—lower rebirth realms associated with *hinin*. Nanryū goes on to portray *burakumin* as immoral, unclean and unhygienic, subject to disease that

---

80 Such as *monzeki* and *inge* 院家. Priests lost former permanent rights and privileges, and temples lost the prestige rule banning horses and conveyances from entering temple property.
81 DBS (1:549-550). "The *Eta* Problem" (*Eta mondai* 穢多問題) originally appeared in the magazine *Buddhism* (*Bukkyō* 佛教) (167, November 1900).

is paradoxically *both congenital and contagious* (in that sense, behaving more like ritual pollution than bacteria)—a trait believed to be shared by leprosy or Hansen's disease through much of the twentieth century in Japan. Nanryū also introduces another important idea, that *burakumin* are *more religious* than non-*burakumin*, especially in the Shin Buddhist faith—a religious analogue to views that *burakumin* are unusually strong physically and possess other exotic qualities.

Nanryū's suggests the solution was to force *burakumin* to scatter and reside among other groups until they assimilate and disappear:

> This is more pressing than eliminating prostitution. This is more necessary than saving the "Ainu." At once we must extinguish the *eta* in reality. Again, there is nothing of greater necessity than this. Religionists and politicians of the world, for the sake of these people we ought to pity, for the sake of our nation of Japan, dare to undertake this endeavor! (DBS 1:549-550)

For Nanryū, *burakumin* represented the darkness to the light of Japan's new Meiji civilization—more so than contemporary areas of social concern that other Shin Buddhists were involved in, such as the anti-prostitution movement and missions to convert and civilize the Ainu in northern Japan.

Conclusion

Returning to the example that began this chapter, Ryūge, a Honganji-ha preacher on a fundraising tour in Wakayama prefecture in 1902 made a set of similar comments, this time sparking intense protest amongst *burakumin*.[82] In these comments, he disparages two generous *buraku* followers of Shin in order to inspire

---

[82] (DBS 1:77-79, 83).This is thought to be a pivotal discriminatory incident (*sabetsu jiken*) prompting *burakumin* from across Western Japan to band together in protest. See Murakoshi's (1982, 31) and Mōri's (1987, 82-85) description of the Ryūge incident.

his non-*burakumin* audience to give even more money than *burakumin*. Ryūge describes how he was approached by two "extremely defiled" (*eta*) followers of Shin who wished to speak with him and give a donation as Ryūge was fundraising for a Honganji-ha charitable foundation launched the previous year called the "Great Japanese Buddhist Compassionate Association" (Dai Nihon Bukkyō Jizenkai 大日本仏教慈善会).[83] Ryūge agreed to meet with them, but only if they remained in the courtyard outside the temple buildings while he stood above on the wooden walkway. He feared that they would somehow defile or disgrace the temple if they came inside.[84]

Ryūge combines old and new pollution beliefs, ritual segregation of *burakumin* from the sacred and pure space of the main temple hall, with the collection of donations for a new charitable foundation—so typical of modernizing Shin Buddhism. Whereas Junkei and Nanryū both repeated and reinforced paternalistic, negative judgments about *burakumin*, it was Ryūge's bluntly pejorative comments in connection with religious donations that caused a massive uproar and show of solidarity amongst *buraku* communities across Japan. They came together to protest and demand Ryūge's dismissal. They focused their efforts on the institution he represented, the Honganji-ha order. Protests and interactions like these would cause Shin Buddhist administrations to formulate new policy on discrimination, institutional structure, and later, human rights. A multilayered theory of *buraku* discrimination, with its complex and historicized views of pollution, deftly accounts for the structure and nature of Ryūge's deployment of discriminatory

---

[83] Funds from this foundation went to support "saving the poor" (*hinja kyūsai* 貧者救済), fostering orphaned and impoverished children, disaster relief, protection of former prisoners and hostellers, as well as the education of the "impoverished people" (*saimin* 細民)—a category that alluded to *burakumin* (Izumi 2001). Founded in 1901, the association still exists today, located in the "Society Section" (Shakaibu 社会部) of the Honganji-ha bureaucracy.

[84] See beginning of chapter.

ideas. An interactionist view of discrimination as stigma, negotiated and renegotiated through communicative acts, provides a good model of how protest and inter-group relations work. The Ryūge incident did not end with discrimination, but with Ryūge's dismissal and change inside the Honganji-ha bureaucracy. In the next chapter, I turn to the Ōtani-ha and this continuing clash over *buraku* discrimination in a modern Shin Buddhist sect.

2   Shin Buddhism, devotion, and separating the pure from the polluted

The folklorist, Yanagita Kunio (柳田国男, 1875-1962), famously avoided the study of Buddhism—particularly Shin Buddhism (Amstutz 1996, 165-166)—because he believed that Shin communities did not possess the kind of legends, traditions, and myths he was searching for. Neither, he believed, did they participate in taboos, acknowledge common purity and pollution beliefs,[1] perform divination, nor seek worldly benefits through ritual and practice. Pollution, that culturally defined "substance" that disqualifies a person or object from its normal social role, is usually a temporary state that is susceptible to purification and removal. Yet, Shinran did not recommend seclusion or other ritual practices as a means to overcome impurity (Yamamoto 2006, 16). The phrase, "Shin followers just don't know" (*monto mono shirazu* 門徒もの知らず),[2] refers to this lack of concern for common practice and refusal to comment on good, evil, and impurity of things in Shin regions (Odake 2004a, 20).

---

[1] Amstutz (2004, 147) argues that the Shin denial of Buddhist monasticism was also a rejection of "a range of purity-pollution concerns which were tied to the maintenance of the oppressive social statuses of women and eta" (a pejorative term for low status groups meaning "extreme defilement" (*eta*), see Introduction). He further characterizes purity-pollution discourse as less relevant to Shin, indicating that Miyata Noboru's (宮田登) survey of *kegare* does not mention Shin Buddhism (Amstutz 2010, 61). Norbeck (1952, 280-282), for example, explains that the reason why John Embree reported no pollution beliefs or practices in his *Suye Mura* (1939) is because the area he studied was primarily Shin Buddhist.

[2] Yamamoto (2006, 7) argues that this phrase and others, such as Hirata Atsutane's (平田篤胤, 1776-1843), "Tendai for the emperor, Shingon for the aristocracy, Pure Land for the shogun, Zen for the domain lords, Nichiren for the beggars, and Shin followers, everyone below that" (*tenshi tendai, kuge shingon, kōhō jōdo, zen daimyō, kojiki nichiren, monto sore ika* 天子天台公家真言, 公方浄土禅大名, 乞食日蓮門徒それ以下), indicate that Shin Buddhism *itself* (along with the Nichiren school) was discriminated against, had low status, and was symbolized by low status groups "below the beggars"—likely referring to those labeled *eta* during the Edo period. See fifteenth century characterizations of Shin followers as "polluted" (Kusano 2006, 90-91), and also Hirose (1988, 16).

Despite this, Shin Buddhist groups did consider certain people impure and discriminated against them. How is this possible? It is possible because the rejection of *temporary* pollution and purificatory techniques—as Shin rejects all techniques based on personal, egoistic volition as "corrupt" or "poisoned"[3]—does not entail a rejection of more immutable criteria for purity and pollution. The Shin discourse of purity-pollution is based on distinctions between the moral quality of Amida Buddha in contrast to ourselves, and the qualities of Amida's pure land (*jōdo* 浄土) in contrast to our own defiled land (*edo* 穢土). When this distinction appears within society—that is, when specific people and places come to embody Amida's purity within our world—purity-pollution discourse inflected in a Shin Buddhist idiom justifies the exclusion and segregation of premodern outcastes and modern *burakumin*.[4]

This chapter takes up the question of why a religious group considered indifferent to ritual purity, meat-eating, occupations involving death, and so forth—an indifference that became a point of pride amongst modern Shin adherents—would segregate and despise premodern outcastes and modern *burakumin*. How do we reconcile egalitarian, superstition-rejecting moral visions of Shin with hierarchical ones? Although the most common answer is that Shin Buddhist groups merely "adopted" or "conformed to" discriminatory practices in

---

[3] "poisoned good" (*zatsudoku no zen* 雑毒の善) and "false acts" (*koke no gyō* 虚仮の行). CWS (1:84): "We are filled with all manner of greed, anger, perversity, deceit, wickedness, and cunning, and it is difficult to put an end to our evil nature. In this we are like poisonous snakes or scorpions. Though we perform practices in the three modes of action, they must be called poisoned good acts or false practices."

[4] In an examination of medieval outcasts and ideas of defilement, Bialock (2002, 235) suggests that pure land thought was responsible for a "shift in the ontology of defilement" in its contrast between the "defiled land" (*edo* 穢土) and the "pure land" (*jōdo* 浄土). Pure Land "helped solidify the increasingly negative view of defilement from the late Heian period on. As impurity (*fujō* 不浄) was interiorized, defilement (*kegare*) took on the meaning of sinful karmic obstruction" (Bialock 2002, 235). Later, he points out the overlap between demonic embodiment as a result of immoral action and defilement.

broader Japanese society,[5] I argue that historical discrimination within Shin Buddhism was more than mere conformity. Purity and pollution beliefs, albeit in unexpected formats, did exist within Shin communities. They were structured by devotion to Amida Buddha, the founder Shinran,[6] and other exalted objects, such as Shinran's lineal descendants, especially those male descendants who held the position of head priest (*hossu*). Sometimes, this devotion to Shinran's descendants is referred to as "head priest faith" (*hossu shinkō* 法主信仰), where the head priest was viewed as a "living buddha" (*ikibotoke* 生き仏) (Yamamoto 2006, 7; Ama 2004, 174). These objects embodied the "pure" in Shin society. Concerns about protecting the purity of these objects created a hierarchical Shin social order that segregated and despised those known as "extremely defiled" (*eta*) who were associated with animal death.

This chapter contrasts one modern egalitarian vision[7] with hierarchical or exclusive devotional ones, both produced and promulgated by institutional representatives. First, I introduce the Ōtani-ha 1981 Sect Constitution (*Shūken* 宗憲) as a kind of "Shin in a nutshell." I then discuss the center of all modern visions of Shin, the founder. Any vision of the religious group makes claims about "true," "original," or "authentic" Shin, and these claims have an important social function: to provide solidarity for those who belong and identify those who do not.[8] In all cases, I remain preoccupied with this social function and do not adjudicate

---

[5] Kikufuji (1997, 602), for example, locates this ethic of "conforming to" or respecting worldly morality in the prohibitions of Kakunyo (覚如, 1270-1351).

[6] Shinran was the centre of devotional activity and worshipped as a manifestation of Amida Buddha in this world (Dobbins 2001; 2002a, 82). Dobbins (2001, 22, 24) comments on the fluid way that Amida's power manifests in this world and the role of icons.

[7] As Dobbins (2004) notes, modernist portrayals of Shin history tend to exclude many things that were important in earlier periods, which is why it is necessary to identify the normative visions I introduce as "modern."

[8] See, for example, premodern uses of "heresy" and exile to control followers, as well as development of a system of punishments, including the death penalty (Akamatsu and Kasahara 1963, 281-284).

between claims about "true" Shin Buddhism. In my view, Shin Buddhism is a plural tradition with resources for both equality and hierarchy, both inclusion and exclusion, and what constitutes "Shin Buddhism" itself is a matter of constant debate. There is *more than one* true Shin Buddhism in the eyes of historical scholars, but there is *only one* true Shin Buddhism in the eyes of a practitioner making moral claims.

Second, I briefly introduce the scholarship on purity-pollution (*jōe*) beliefs and the avoidance of contagion or contamination (*shokue*)[9] in Japan, normally restricted to considerations of Shintō and folk traditions. Next, I present another dimension of the plural Shin tradition, that of devotion. Devotion is the normative vision of Shin Buddhism that explains the forms that purity and pollution take and why particular Shin communities discriminated against *burakumin* and premodern low status groups. Third and last, I present a series of historical examples. These examples illustrate the way that considerations of devotion and purity appear within institutional Shin Buddhism. In particular, I examine the late medieval tract, *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions*, the "aristocratization" of Shin and the formation of the "priestly and temple ranking system" (*jikaku dōhan seido* 寺格堂班制度), and the segregated temple system. These examples remain alive in modern debates over Shin Buddhism's historical responsibility for *buraku* discrimination.

Shin Buddhism in a nutshell

Scholar-priests, sectarian leaders, popular authors, and academics have been defining and distilling "Shin Buddhism" for a very long time—centuries, in some cases. In order to make a complex religious tradition intelligible, and at the same time provide the ideological or normative orientation necessary for defining

---

[9] *Shokue* is also used to name a type of purification ritual (Nagahara 1979, 388). See also BYJ (164-167).

identity, these authors have relied on a few key narratives and organizing themes.[10] The 1981 Sect Constitution (*Shūken*) provides us with one convenient and concise telling of the Ōtani-ha administration's own normative vision of Shin Buddhism.

Shin Buddhism[11] had its beginnings in the Kamakura period (1192–1333). By the end of the eighteenth century and well into the modern period, it was Japan's largest Buddhist school,[12] claiming "about twenty-five to thirty percent of the whole Japanese population."[13] Today it is closer to ten percent. In the modern period, Shin Buddhist groups have typically consisted of large lay followings led by a married priesthood: paradigmatically, the resident temple priest (*jūshoku*) and his wife (*bōmori*).[14]

In terms of gaining size and power, Shin Buddhism was wildly successful. Leaving the reasons for this success aside, whether political, economic, or ideological, the modest groups of the Kamakura period became large, complex and centralized religious organizations, or "orders" (*kyōdan*). The Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha serve as umbrellas for an array of smaller administrative units and organizations (regional, temple, and crosscutting groups). The basic unit of the order is the temple and temple priest, surrounded by the temple family and the

---

[10] This summary of common narratives of Shin Buddhism is based on the work of Dobbins (1986; 1990; 2002a; 2004), Kashiwahara (1986; 1988; 2003), CWS, Rogers and Rogers (1990; 1991), Amstutz (1997; 2010), Bloom (2003), Blum (2000), Blum and Yasutomi (2006), and Akamatsu and Kasahara (1963).

[11] The material and examples used here to discuss "Shin Buddhism" are those common to most modern works, namely, those connected to the medieval Honganji sect of Shin, and its later divisions, the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha, which formed after the Honganji network of temples and teaching lineages (*kyōsen* 教線) was split apart in the early 1600s.

[12] Shin Buddhism has had a strong influence on Japanese society and culture since late medieval times. Yet, it has not studied in proportion to its size or influence. Amstutz (1997) examines the reasons for this. One cause is a preference for monastic forms of Buddhism.

[13] For detailed figures and trends over the twentieth century see Amstutz (1997, 22–23, 141–142 n.2).

[14] Although the majority of *jūshoku* are men and *bōmori* 坊守 are women, it is now possible for women to become *jūshoku* and men to become *bōmori*.

community of local follower households. The Ōtani-ha, for example, is the second largest sect of Shin Buddhism. It has access to impressive financial resources, with an annual operating budget sometimes in excess of 100 million Canadian dollars. The sect's capital, property, and cash have historically come from the donations of followers and wealthy patrons.[15] Based on survey data from 2007, there are approximately 9,000 Ōtani-ha temples serving 1,300,000 households.[16] Today, there are also Shin Buddhist temples outside Japan, such as those in North and South America.

The Ōtani-ha's 1981 Sect Constitution (*Shūken*) is an organizational text.[17] The preamble and first section succinctly introduce this devotional, non-monastic, and predominantly lay form of pure land (*jōdo*) Buddhism as the Ōtani-ha imagined it in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The *Shūken* starts with Shinran and his devotion to Amida Buddha. It tells how, in its earliest days, Shin Buddhism consisted of several small groups inspired by the life and teachings of Shinran. Later, these groups either became or were absorbed by an extensive network of temples (*jiin* 寺院) and practice halls (*dōjō* 道場) under the leadership of Shinran's direct descendants in the late medieval and early modern periods. Shinran, as his teacher Hōnen (1133-1212)[18] did before him, wrote and preached about the path to awakening created by Amida Buddha. Before I touch on the *Shūken,* it is important to provide a little background on Japanese pure land forms focused on Amida.

---

[15] ONP (302-335), taken from the average budget for the years 1988-1998 and assuming 100 yen to be approximately 20 percent more valuable than the Canadian dollar on average.

[16] Survey data is from the 2007 issue of the official sect magazine, *Shinshū* 真宗 (SS 1241, August 2007, 18-19). The population of the Shin sects has stayed roughly the same throughout the modern period, as the general population of Japan has increased.

[17] It is similar to other mission statements where the Ōtani-ha has outlined its moral positions and vision. For further discussion of organizational texts, see chapter 7.

[18] For more information about Hōnen see Dobbins (2002a, 12-14, chapter 2).

Amida, the pure land, and the defiled land

Amida Buddha established a pure land (*jōdo*) by fulfilling a series of vows made while he was a bodhisattva, a being on his way to full awakening. In this pure land, conditions for sentient beings to attain Buddhist awakening are ideal; the pure land itself "enlightens." Amida's vows established a means for the salvation of beings: the spoken *nenbutsu* 念仏. *Nenbutsu* practice involves calling and hearing the name of Amida with faith and single-mindedness. However, the *nenbutsu* is not an instrumental practice that causes birth. Rather, it is the working of Amida's vows that causes the person who hears and utters the *nenbutsu* to be born into the pure land (*jōdo*)—so very different from our present, defiled land (*edo*).[19] For Shinran, Amida's vows cause the arising of faith (*shinjin* 信心) in the person of the *nenbutsu*, and true faith cannot be the result of any calculated action by that person. For this reason, doctrinal accounts of Shin Buddhism often stress the concepts of grace and indebtedness (*on* 恩) rather than self-cultivation.

Why is our world "defiled" in the sense that it is not an ideal place to practice the Buddhist path? Part of the answer lies in the Buddhist view of history and how long the Buddhist teachings last in the world after the death of the Buddha, in our case, Shakamuni (S. Śākyamuni). The present era is called "the last age of the Buddhist teachings" (*mappō* 末法), and the world, society, and people are thought to have declined significantly since Shakamuni's time, over two thousand years ago.

---

[19] The CWS translation committee consistently used "defiled" to translate the character 穢, and "defiled world" for *edo* 穢土, *e'iki* 穢域, and *jokuse* 濁世 (CWS 1:28, 39, 73, 77, 207, and so on). For a discussion of the "defiled world," see CWS (2:176-177). In the Ōtani-ha *Seiten*, the term *edo* appears a total of nine times in both classical Chinese and vernacular Japanese writings. Shinran used *edo* in a quote from Tanluan's (Donran, 476–572) writings in the *True Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization* (*Kyōgyōshinshō*, *Seiten* 169) and in the *Notes on Essentials of Faith Alone* (*Yuishin shō mon'i*). In the latter (*Seiten* 549, CWS 1:454), he wrote explaining *jinen*, "made to become so" (*jinen*) by Amida's working, that "a person is made to reject the defiled world and come to the true and real fulfilled land."

In *mappō*, the world itself is defiled.[20] It is plagued by false belief, natural disasters, and calamities. People live shorter lives. They are weaker and increasingly subject to their passions (*bonnō* 煩悩). They are in constant conflict with one another. Buddhist attainments, whether meditative, moral, or cognitive, are no longer possible. It is believed that human beings can no longer successfully practice precepts, meditate, or cultivate wisdom—merely a semblance of them. There are no longer any true followers of the Buddhist path to awakening taught by Shakamuni. All the different kinds of people in *mappō*—rich or poor, good or bad, superior or inferior, wise or ignorant, religious master or layperson—are unable to awaken themselves in the manner of buddhas and bodhisattvas of previous ages. All humans in *mappō* are unable to overcome the burden of their heavy, evil karma. The defiled nature of our world and its people make monastic precepts and meditation ineffective. Whatever other meanings precepts have, they are not considered a viable means to attain awakening (Dobbins 2002, 12).

The conditions of *mappō* make obvious what, according to Shin Buddhism, has always been true: self effort or self power (*jiriki* 自力) is always corrupted by calculation and selfish interest. "We cannot perform a non-egoistic act, and for this reason we cannot perform a truly good act. We are self-centered and therefore, compared with the Buddha, we unenlightened beings are evil by our very nature as unenlightened beings" (Williams 2008, 261). When beings attempt to awaken themselves, they only create further evil karma and mire themselves deeper in the cycle of birth and death. Although it is especially timely in *mappō* to hear of the

---

[20] Marra (1991, 72). There are several good descriptions of *mappō* thought in English. See Dobbins (2002a, 36), Stone (1985a; 1985b), and Marra (1985; 1988a; 1988b; 1991), who describes *mappō* thought in the pure land schools (1991, 71). Unno (2004, 4, 64-67) describes the three ages ("true age" *shōbō* 正法, "imitation age" *zōbō* 像法, "last age" *mappō*) and Myōe's attempts to overcome *mappō*. See also passages describing this defiled world from the *Immeasurable Life Sūtra* (*Muryōjukyō* 無量寿経, T 362) (Steward and Inagaki 1995, 41-44) and Shinran's *Hymns of the Dharma Ages* (*Shōzōmatsu wasan* 正像末和讃, *Seiten* 500-511).

other power (*tariki* 他力) of Amida Buddha and his pure land, Amida's salvific power is at work whenever a person realizes the uselessness of self power and the depths of their own evil.

As distance in space and time from Shakamuni Buddha has increased, a pure land path to awakening has been progressively revealed[21] by a series of great teachers. Shakamuni himself appeared in the world in order to teach people about the compassionate working of Amida Buddha. After him, the seven great teachers each strove to spread the teaching of Amida's salvific working by clarifying crucial points of doctrine. Each member of the lineage[22] is thought to reveal a key doctrinal component of the path and the Shin Buddhist school is the result of the unfolding of Amida's path to salvation in this present world—even as the quality of our world's people, and the world itself, declines. As all other Buddhist paths decay, conversely, the pure land path flourishes. All of the doctrinal parts, like pieces of a puzzle, come together to form a whole and effective path just at a time when the causes and conditions for its revelation have matured. This is embodied by the appearance of the founder, Shinran, in the world.

The Ōtani-ha Sect Constitution

The 1981 Ōtani-ha *Shūken* begins with Shinran and his elaboration of the Mahāyāna doctrinal foundations of Amida Buddha's path in his great work known by its short title, *Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization*.[23] In this work, he drew upon several important pure land scriptures, especially the *Immeasurable Life*

---

[21] For a description of sectarian views of history, see Dobbins (2002a, 2–7) and Dessì (2007, 24–28).

[22] The seven great teachers: Nāgārjuna (Ryūju 龍樹, 2nd- 3rd century CE), Vasubandhu (Tenshin 天親, 5th century CE), Tanluan (Donran 曇鸞, 476–572), Daochuo (Dōshaku 道綽, 562–645), Shandao (Zendō 善導, 613-681), Genshin (源信, 942-1017), and Hōnen (法然, 1133-1212). Lineage plays multiple roles, not least of which is establishing Pure Land Buddhism as ancient and legitimate.

[23] *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証. The full title is the *The True Teaching, Practice, and Realization of the Pure Land Way* (*Ken jōdo shinjitsu kyō gyō shō monrui* 顕浄土真実教行証文類) (CWS 1: 3-292; *Seiten* 149-401).

Sūtra, also known as the *Larger Sūtra*[24]:

> In compiling the *Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization*, itself based on the true teaching of the *Immeasurable Life Sūtra*, Shinran clearly demonstrated the path of longing for birth in the pure land (*ganshō jōdo* 願生浄土) by practicing faith (*gyōshin* 行信) in the sacred name of Amida Buddha. The name, [given to us through Amida's] original vow (*hongan* 本願), is the universal great path encompassing equal salvation for all humanity. (*Shūken* preamble)

Having described the importance of Amida Buddha, his vows, and the central practice of *nenbutsu*, the *Shūken* tells us that a community of followers, identified as "disciples," "dharma listeners" (*monpō* 聞法), or "companions" (*dōbō*) are of central importance. This community is said to be responsible for the creation of the head temple, enshrining Shinran's image, and preserving his teachings though history. Shinran's direct descendants have taken care of his memorial and play a crucial but supporting role—especially the fifteenth century "restorer," Rennyo (蓮如, 1415-1499). The preamble continues:

> After the founder's death, his disciples worked together to construct a memorial hall at Ōtani, and placed Shinran's image within it. There, they came together to look upon the founder—who even now teaches the dharma. There, they strove to listen to the teachings and seek the path. This was the beginning of the head temple, Hongan-ji 本願寺, and the people who gathered there became, in time, the community of dharma listeners. This was the original form of our sect (*shūmon* 宗門).

> And in this way the sect has been passed down and protected by the joy and gratitude of the listeners—who revered the head temple as the hall of the true religion (*shinshū* 真宗). At the request of the founder's disciples, the blood descendants of the founder took on the important duty of caring for Shinran's memorial. Rennyo, the restorer [of Shin Buddhism], also served as caretaker for the founder's hall at the Ōtani head temple. He clarified the original

---

[24] *Muryōjukyō*, T 362, also known as the *Daikyō* 大経.

meaning of the sect's establishment among the companions (*dōbō*) and fellow practitioners, and revived the true religion. (*Shūken* preamble)

In the sections that follow, the *Shūken* reads like a factsheet, identifying central figures, texts, and rituals. First are those figures who serve as objects of reverence, devotion, and gratitude, normally enshrined on a temple altar or on a household one. Amida Buddha is the primary image, or focus of reverence (*honzon* 本尊). The subsidiary images are Shinran,[25] prince Shōtoku, the seven great teachers, and holders of the office of head priest, who, like Rennyo, are Shinran's direct descendants (Arts. 9, 10). Second, the *Shūken* identifies a list of texts that form the Ōtani-ha canon or *Seiten* 聖典, its doctrinal sources of authority (Art. 11): the three pure land scriptures[26]; selected commentaries of the seven great teachers; and the writings of Shinran.[27]

Third, it outlines two basic types of ritual: liturgical rites and rites of inclusion. Basic liturgical rituals (*hōyō shiki* 法要式) are performed before an object of

---

[25] At the head temple, however, Shinran is the central image (Dobbins 2001).

[26] *Immeasurable Life Sūtra* (*Muryōjukyō*) (T 362), *Contemplation of Immeasurable Life Sūtra* (*Kanmuryōjukyō* 観無量寿経) (T 365), and the *Amida Sūtra* (*Amidakyō* 阿弥陀経) (T 366). These *sūtra* are also known by their short names, respectively: *Larger Sūtra* (*Daikyō* 大経), *Contemplation Sūtra* (*Kangyō* 観経), and *Smaller Sūtra* (*Shōkyō* 小経) (*Seiten*).

[27] The writings of Shinran include the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, as well as doctrinal notes, compilations of important passages, commentary, and vernacular Japanese prose and verse texts. The Constitution selects the following as the central writings of Shinran: *Passages on the Pure Land Way* (*Jōdo monrui jushō* 浄土文類聚鈔, *Seiten* 402-422); *Gutoku's Note* (*Gutokushō* 愚禿鈔, *Seiten* 423-459); *Hymn of the Two Gateways of Entrance and Emergence* (*Nyūshutsu nimon ge* 入出二門偈, *Seiten* 460-467); *Three Types of Birth in Accord with the Pure Land Sūtras* (*Jōdo sangyō ōjō monrui* 浄土三経往生文類, *Seiten* 468-475); *Two Aspects of the Tathāgata's Directing of Virture* (*Nyorai nishu ekō mon* 如来二種回向文, *Seiten* 476-477); *Notes on the Inscriptions on Sacred Scrolls* (*Songō shinzō meimon* 尊号真像銘文, *Seiten* 512-533); *Notes on Once-Calling and Many-Calling* (*Ichinen tanen mon'i* 一念多念文意, *Seiten* 534-546); *Notes on Essentials of Faith Alone* (*Yuishin shō mon'i* 唯信鈔文意, *Seiten* 547-559); *Hymns of the Pure Land* (*Jōdo wasan* 浄土和讃, *Seiten* 478-489); *Hymns of the Pure Land Masters* (*Kōsō wasan* 高僧和讃, *Seiten* 489-500); and *Hymns of the Dharma Ages* (*Shōzōmatsu wasan*, *Seiten* 500-511). The *Shinshū seiten* 真宗聖典 published by the Ōtani-ha, most recently in 1978, also includes the *A Record in Lament of Divergences* (*Tannishō* 歎異抄, *Seiten* 626-643), the writings of Rennyo, Shinran's wife, Eshin'ni (恵信尼, 1182-1268?), and Shinran's descendents, Zonkaku (存覚, 1290-1373) and Kakunyo (1270-1351) (*Seiten*)(All texts listed up to the *Tannishō* translated in CWS). The text of the CWS translations may be found online here: http://www.shinranworks.com/sitemap.htm.

reverence. The participants offer respect, chant sacred texts, offer praise of the Buddha's virtues, and sincerely express gratitude for Amida Buddha's gift of salvific grace. Rituals of "inclusion," similar to those of passage in the lifecycle of an individual, allow the participant to identify more closely with the sect. These are officiated by the head priest—a blood descendent of Shinran—and share many of the features of rituals that strengthen the karmic bond between follower and Shinran.[28] Examples given include the "refuge ceremony" (*kikyō shiki* 帰敬式), a formal expression of membership, and the "ordination ceremony" (*tokudo shiki* 得度式), a low-level "priestly"[29] ordination in which the participant receives a Buddhist dharma name (*hōmyō* 法名).[30] In most other Buddhist schools, the different grades of practitioner, from pious layperson to fully ordained nun, are distinguished by precepts. Buddhist monks, for example, are known for taking precepts to avoid sexual intercourse. By rejecting precepts, Shinran rejected the criteria that usually distinguishes lay followers, novices, monks, nuns, and so on. Instead, Shin Buddhism has a priesthood of several grades distinguished by training and ritual initiation. Most priests are married.

In a sect that emphasizes "neither monastic nor lay,"[31] and does not bestow monastic precepts, the purpose of the refuge and ordination ceremonies is to draw the participant closer to the institutional orthodoxy and center of power through study, training, and the rite itself. They are performed by the head priest with few

---

[28] The goal is to create auspicious karmic connections (*en* 縁) and good karmic causes (*shukuzen* 宿善) that, in the case of Shin, connect the participant to the salvific power of Amida. Blum (2000, 193) mentions the practice of offering the bones of the recently deceased at the head temple in front of Shinran's image, to be interred with Shinran at his grave site.

[29] To be recognized as an official priest (*kyōshi* 教師) certain educational and training requirements must be fulfilled.

[30] As opposed to a "precept name" or "ordination name" (*kaimyō* 戒名).

[31] *hisō hizoku*, alternatively *sō ni arazu zoku ni arazu* 僧に非ず俗に非ず. This phrase appears in the postscript to the *Kyōgyōshinshō* (CWS 1:289; *Seiten* 399) and *A Record in Lament of Divergences* (CWS 1:681; *Seiten* 642).

exceptions, and often at the head temple. The importance of the head priest and head temple places the segregation of outcaste temples, priests, and followers during the Edo period in stark contrast. Outcaste priests, for example, were not permitted to take ordination conducted by the head priest at the head temple.[32] I discuss these prohibitions further below.

Beyond this bare listing of texts, rituals, and facts, how do we make sense of Shin Buddhism as presented in the Ōtani-ha *Shūken*? As mentioned above, Shin has been introduced in many ways—ranging from sacred history, to philosophical accounts of doctrine tied to the biography of the founder, to the history of Shin institutions. Scholarly introductions exist in more or less intimate conversation with the narratives produced by Shin sectarian institutions, especially their educational, outreach, and judicial branches. The Ōtani-ha *Shūken* discussed above is a good example of an institutional narrative, which justifies specific behaviors and social arrangements.

The *Shūken* preamble presents the Ōtani-ha's mission in contemporary society and its ideal form of egalitarian governance. This was a novel moral and ideological position put forward by a reformist faction inside sect government, which has been in power from the late 1970s to the present day. Yet, in the *Shūken* preamble, this new position is linked with the founder and called "original." This type of egalitarian vision—and the anxiety that it is very fragile and in constant danger of being corrupted—is one of the most common modern characterizations of Shin Buddhism:

---

[32] Dobbins (2001, 43-44) artfully connects the main hall of the head temple where the follower expresses devotion before the image of Shinran, with the moment of arising of faith (*shinjin*). This is the moment that salvation is assured. If being in the presence of the portrait image of Shinran, expressing devotion, is an important opportunity for salvation, what does this say about the spatial segregation of "extremely defiled" (*eta*) and "riverbank dwellers" (*kawaramono*) followers during the Edo period?

Due to the accumulation of many historical changes, the original meaning (*hongi*本義) of our sect was in danger of being lost after Rennyo's time. Yet, the pure tradition[33] of our sect has been preserved by the strength of the companions (*dōbō*). Companions take refuge in the image of Shinran as a symbol of the teachings, listen to and have faith in the teachings, and live according to the teachings.

Established in our sect's strong tradition and the eternal and universal Buddhist teachings, we [the Ōtani-ha] confirm the following as guiding principles in sect administration: (1) All people who belong to the sect shall always strive to have faith, teach others to have faith, and work to manifest a companion society (*dōbō shakai* 同朋社会). (2) Because the image of Shinran placed inside the memorial hall is a refuge for all who belong to the sect, it shall be revered and protected equally by the people, united together as a sect. (3) This sect shall not be administered at the sole discretion of any one person. Administration shall be based on the public and open discussion of all companions.

Established in this fundamental spirit, and ruled, moreover, by this Constitution formed by the consensus of all companions, through manifesting the founding spirit of the sect and the original meaning of its existence in contemporary society, we [the Ōtani-ha] vow to fulfill the great mission that falls upon our shoulders. (*Shūken*)

The *Shūken* posits a "true" or "ideal" form of governance and society that accords with "the spirit of Shinran" (*Shūken* Art. 2), a spirit subsequently clarified by Rennyo. It is called the "society of companions" (*dōbō shakai*)—an egalitarian, democratic association that includes "the unified whole of priests (*sōryo* 僧侶), followers (*monto* 門徒), temples, religious assemblies, and other groups, centered on the [head temple], Higashi Honganji" (*Shūken* Art. 3). The mission of the Ōtani-ha is to manifest this ideal society and form of egalitarian governance. The *Shūken* rejects hierarchy amongst sect followers and expressly forbids an

---

[33] *shijun naru dentō* 至純なる伝統.

authoritarian head priest in matters of administration or doctrine. In this vision, an authoritarian head priest is a deviation from the true form and original meaning of the sect. The salvation offered by Amida is to be equal and universal; discussion and decision-making are to be open, democratic, and non-authoritarian. This mission and structure represent a radical shift from other and earlier arrangements where authority rested with the blood descendants of Shinran.[34]

All three confirmations listed by the *Shūken*, to manifest companion society, to have equal access to the image of Shinran, and to have democratic governance, are all important to the issue of *buraku* discrimination. The first demands an egalitarian society and social relations, without discrimination. The second alludes to prior arrangements where, in fact, equal access to the image of Shinran was not the rule. And last, an open process of governance where *buraku* temple priests and lay representatives may participate. The founder and ideas of the institutions original and correct form are central to modern portrayals of Shin Buddhism.

The founder, Shinran, and the true institution

What other organizing narratives and themes are used to describe Shin Buddhism in the modern period? In addition to the egalitarian institutional vision of the *Shūken*, there are those based on the biography of Shinran himself, treating his life as exemplary, and his thought and doctrine as a radical, innovative culmination of Mahāyāna philosophy and practice. As in the example of the *Shūken*, there are works that trace the overarching plot of Shin institutional history, along with its political and ideological implications, that prefer a vision of authentic Shin as a

---

34 Following this, the *Shūken* sets out the basic rules for the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of sect administration. The head priest has the formal role, at the behest of the Sect Cabinet (Naikyoku 内局), to officially bestow objects of reverence, whether images or hanging scrolls, officiate over ceremonies, including refuge and ordination, to proclaim acts of the sect diet, and to confirm punishments and the stripping of priestly status.

collection of small egalitarian groups.

Shinran appears when the world has fully entered "the last age of the Buddhist teachings" (*mappō*) and all the doctrinal aspects of the pure land path are ready for assembly. In some ways, his main work, the *Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization* as a "compilation" (*monrui* 文類) is symbolic of this: it is an assembled text of quotes from the pure land scriptures, treatises, and works of the great teachers, spliced together with Shinran's creative readings, verse, and prose. He reveals the fully assembled path. The bulk of English language work on Shin Buddhism has focused either on Shinran's assembled doctrine, or on his biography, or on presenting Shinran's doctrinal innovations as the result of his life experiences (Bloom 1968, 2007; Keel 2000; CWS; Ueda and Hirota 1989).

It is often, the unique, radical elements of Shinran's doctrine that are stressed in the modern period. Shinran took ordinary Buddhist practices and meritorious actions and shifted them away from the follower to Amida (the only effective agent). The follower became responsible for nothing, whereas Amida became responsible for everything; the follower must rely solely on Amida's other power (*tariki*) for salvation. There is a logic to other power that replaces the "doer" of typical Buddhist practices, such as chanting, contemplation, or transferring merit, with Amida Buddha. This logic causes those in the Shin tradition to change active language into passive language. For example, in his reinterpretation of "going for refuge" (*kimyō* 帰命), Shinran saw it not as an act of self power, but as the "beckoning command" of the primal vow.[35] In other words, the self that goes for refuge is caused to do so by the imperious power and compassionate working of

---

[35] *hongan shōkan no chokumei* 本願招喚之勅命 (Dobbins 2002, 34). See also the meaning of "made to become so" for *jinen hōni* 自然法爾 (CWS 2: 191).

Amida's original vow. Another example is the focus in Shin on "hearing" rather than "calling" the *nenbutsu*. Hearing is easily seen as a response inspired by the working of Amida, in contrast to "calling," which might imply self power and the egoistic will of the practitioner.

Like the hagiographies of other religious figures, Shinran's story is punctuated by a series of important events. Its meaning depends on how and in what venue it is told, whether in prose, pictures,[36] as part of the most important Shin ritual of the year, expressing gratitude and remembering Shinran's on his death-day (*hōonkō* 報恩講), or in new formats such as popular plays and novels (Porcu 2008; 2009). By stressing different events in Shinran's life, different values can be expressed. For instance, the Shin institution can value high status by stressing Shinran's parentage and links with the aristocracy. Alternatively, a radical liberationist can value solidarity with the poor and oppressed by stressing his experiences during exile and the circumstances of his death in the capital.[37] From his birth, time as a monk, and discovery of his teacher and the pure land path, to his exile, travels, teachings, and eventual death—Shinran's story has been called upon to make a variety of modern ethical claims.

Driven by the development of historical scholarship in Japan more generally, especially the socio-economic approach and Marxist historiography during the Taishō period (1912-1926), historians of Shin Buddhism became concerned with non-elite Shin followers. They focused on everyday practices and forms of social organization, adding local and regional histories to their considerations of the head temple and temple network as a whole. Embedded within much of this scholarship

---

[36] Today, of course, also in movies and *manga* (Porcu 2009).
[37] See chapter 4.

97

is the moral preference for an "original," egalitarian form and a need to explain how it became a complex, hierarchical institution.[38]

The basic story presented in this scholarship is one of institutional growth and decline. After Shinran's time, scattered groups of his followers underwent two centuries of gradual institution building. Next, Rennyo became head priest of Hongan-ji. During Rennyo's tenure, disparate Shin and other pure land groups are brought into the Hongan-ji temple network. His political shrewdness and ability as a preacher make Honganji the most powerful Buddhist sect in Japan, rivaling medieval domain lords. After the defeat of Kennyo (顕如, 1543-1592) at Ishiyama Hongan-ji, Shin Buddhism enters a period that many scholars characterize as "decline" and increasing exploitation by the ruling powers during the Edo and into the modern period. At any given point in this rise and fall, Shin Buddhism is imagined as its social groups. Historical scholars present the details of an incredibly complex system of overlapping social groups (*kō* 講, *sō* 組, *gun* 郡); translocal flows of money, goods, communication, authority, ritual utensils, images, scrolls and letters; and typical group life in farming villages. They provide details of teaching lineages (*kyōsen* 教線), the "trunk-and-branch" (*honmatsu* 本末) temple network, how powerful local temples link into local networks of authority.

In the modern period, many scholars and reformers have preferred the social groupings of ordinary followers over the hierarchical authority of the Shin sectarian elites. They revere Shinran and early organizational forms lauding these as egalitarian. Shinran is described as having reached out to the masses, rejecting

---

[38] See Bloom's (1999, 29-34) description of a discussion amongst postwar scholars of Shin, such as Hattori Shisō (服部之総, 1901-1956), Ienaga Saburō (家永三郎, 1913-2002), and Kasahara Kazuo (1916-2006), about who Shinran spoke for. Hattori, for example, presented Shinran as "spokesman for the lower classes," Kasahara's contention that those who had a strong sense of themselves as "evil" (warriors, hunters, fishers) would have made up the original community.

the link between religion and state, rejecting elite Buddhism, and focusing on the individual. [39] In contrast, late medieval and early modern Shin Buddhist institutions are especially condemned.[40] Such institutions had close relations with the state and local power, and they instituted a temple and priestly hierarchy. These features have drawn criticism in the modern period that Shin was "aristocratized"—became a religion of the elite rather than of the people. I turn here to examine these modern critiques and accusations, made chiefly by *buraku* advocacy organizations against the Shin sects. I argue that aristocratization was not solely the product of self-interested elites, nor something alien to the Shin tradition. I believe that it stems from the structure of devotion itself and this, in turn, is related to the way that purity and pollution appear within Shin Buddhism.

Purity, pollution, and devotion

The academic study of purity-pollution thought (*jōe shisō*) in Japan has seen its highest level of development in the fields of anthropology and folklore, focused on the study of Shintō and folk beliefs and practices. Most works begin with basic Japanese terms connected to purity-pollution, such as "purity" (*hare* はれ, 晴, 霽), "ordinary" (*ke* け, 褻), and "pollution" (*kegare* けがれ, 汚, 穢) (Norbeck 1952; Namihira 1987). If there is disagreement among scholars, it is over the comparative "absoluteness" of each term.

According to Namihira (1987), *hare* refers to clothing, occasions, festivals, and a public or communal orientation that are sacred or pure. It is associated with brightness, cleanness, joy, and celebration. Things that are *hare* are made so by an accumulation of purification rituals. *Ke* refers to clothing, utensils, the body,

---

periods of time, and occupations that are familiar—subject to the accumulation of dirt through everyday use and work. Mixture of these categories causes feelings of dread, anxiety, and fear of death that prompt protective and purificatory measures. The pollution that spreads from this mixture is considered a cause of misfortune, danger, and death. For Namihira, pollution from the mixture of *ke* and *hare* is "*kegare*," and this term captures the intense feelings of dread that motivate seclusion, avoidance, inversion, and purification. Independent of this type of mixture, however, several sources of pollution (*kegare*) are found in Japanese traditions: death, blood (especially menstruation and childbirth), bodily fluids and excreta, meat-eating, animal death, blood, and birth, that which is "outside" and "below" (Ohnuki-Tierney 1984). Mixture and contact with polluted substances can be transmitted or spread like a contagion (*shokue*) through touch, cooking fire, food and drink, occupying the same space, and kinship. In this scholarship, other than the extensive discussions of death pollution and mortuary rituals,[41] Buddhism does not receive much attention.[42]

Purity-pollution thought in folklore-anthropology is a complex and contested subject. I suggest that its complexity derives from the idea that people, space, and objects can change state from pure to polluted and back again. Dimensions of temporality and potential transformation of state are reflected in an extensive set of ritual techniques for purification and managing pollution. By contrast, purity-pollution related to premodern outcastes, modern *burakumin*, and the Shin Buddhist tradition, is much simpler: temporary pollution and purification

---

[41] Where Buddhist professionals are able to mediate: "Buddhism has provided a class of religious specialists perceived as capable of managing the dangers of defilement and mediating between this world and the next" (Stone and Walter 2008, 6).

[42] Norbeck (1952, 274) reports that his Takashima informants denied that purity and pollution have anything to do with Buddhism at all. Norbeck challenges the simple division between Buddhism and Shintō. As well, he describes a connection between the seclusions (*imi* 忌み) and the temporary avoidance of meat.

techniques are removed from the equation. For outcastes and *burakumin*, as I have suggested above, it is *permanent* states of defilement, and the beliefs and practices surrounding that particular subcategory of purity-pollution thought, that are crucial. In Shin Buddhism, purification is not truly possible because egoistic ritual techniques are rejected.[43] Pollution is still contagious and more intractable. At worst, we are all defiled. At best, purity interrupts, or erupts into, our defiled world through no action of our own.[44] All that remains is the management of permanent or intractable states of defilement, where avoidance, mediation, and segregation are the primary practices and structures observed in Shin Buddhism. These revolve around preventing contact between the defiled and the sacred, rather than producing states of purity. Instead of purification rituals, in Shin Buddhism we find devotional practices.

Devotion as an organizing concept

Practices of avoiding polluted people and substances, institutional forms of segregation and mediation between *buraku* and non-*buraku* temples, align with practices of devotion. As an organizing concept, devotion describes the relationship between Shin followers, the evil (*akunin*) and lowly who cannot save themselves trapped here in this defiled world (*edo*), with the sources of salvific power, Amida Buddha and his pure land (*jōdo*). Such evil people (*akunin*) are only saved by the compassionate working of Amida Buddha and never by their own

---

[43] This is not the case for other Japanese Buddhist forms. There are also Buddhist talismans to protect from the pollution of menstruation and childbirth (associated with the *Bloodbowl Sūtra* (*Ketsubonkyō* 血盆経), see Bodiford 1996), or from polluted others like *eta-hinin* (see the Usu Myōō talisman (*usu myōō ofuda* うす明王お札), Kōyasan Shingonshū Dōwakyoku 2000). See also Williams (2005).

[44] Walter (2008, 269) explains that although death impurity is "external" to Buddhism, the logic of purification of death defilement was "assimilated to Buddhist notions of merit transfer." She notes, as well, that Shin Buddhism avoids explaining its funeral rites in terms of merit, preferring to stress gratitude for Amida's compassion and remembering the deceased.

actions. Because the difference between the self and the central object of devotion, Amida, in Shin is extreme—even absolute—an experiential, ritual, or institutional connection and "closeness" to the object becomes precious, an occasion for gratitude.

A Shin devotional orientation performs two key maneuvers: (1) lowering and humbling the self; and (2) exalting and longing for the other.[45] Devotional maneuvers are part of the pivotal, soteriological experience of faith (*shinjin*).[46] Faith is the salvific experience in the life of the follower, caused by the working of Amida's vows. At the instant of the arising of faith, followers' birth in the pure land is assured and they are grasped by Amida never to be abandoned. Followers look forward to this pivotal moment, and naturally respond in gratitude to the arising of faith by calling Amida's name (*nenbutsu*) and participating in collective religious life.

When faith arises in the follower, it brings about a two-fold experience: boundless joy and gratitude for Amida's compassion, as well as intense and painful self-realization of evil and corruption.[47] The second part of this experience, the "self-realization of evil," is inspired by the symbols and exemplars of Shin, especially in identifications with those placed lowest in social and moral hierarchies—including a central symbol of *burakumin* identity, the "butcher."[48]

---

[45] See Blum (2000, 186) for his examination of the pejorative meaning of "self power" (*jiriki*), and the sacred, holy sense associated with "other power" (*tariki*).

[46] There is an ongoing debate about how to translate *shinjin*, as "faith" or "entrusting," or whether to leave it untranslated in English texts. The translation committee sponsored by the Honganji-ha which produced the CWS, for example, elected to leave "shinjin" as is. Because I am less concerned with emphasizing the differences between Shin Buddhist understandings of *shinjin*, and Christian understandings of "faith," faith serves as a working category. For a discussion of similar terminological problems, see Collins' (2010) use of "Theravāda."

[47] This is called "two-fold deep faith" (*nishu jinshin* 二種深信) (*Seiten* 215-216).

[48] Some argue that this soteriological category of the evil person was easily transposed onto social reality, explaining why some Shin preachers reached out to low status communities and why those communities were

On the path opened by Amida Buddha and the power of his vows, all people must abandon thoughts of being—or trying to be—good people, because this is impossible. All must come to know themselves as evil people (*akunin*), foolish people (*bonbu* 凡夫) who are fettered and corrupted by blind passions. The evil person is the true recipient (*shōki* 正機) of Amida's compassionate activity. "Evil person as true recipient" (*akunin shōki*) highlights the limits and imperfections of the devotee[49] in comparison with the salvific power of Amida. It is important to note here that the worst thing people can be in Shin Buddhism is not just "evil," but shameless and proud of their evil. They take advantage of Amida's salvation to indulge in evil desires (*hongan bokori* 本願誇り). Such people are called cruel and shameless (*musan muki* 無慚無愧). The tolerance of evil inclinations becomes a complicated matter, but what cannot be tolerated is the willful disrespect towards objects of devotion.

The evil person is described with a number of terms in Shin texts: is poor and hard-pressed (*bingū konbō* 貧窮困乏), is stupid and ignorant (*gudon gechi* 愚鈍下智), knows little of the teachings (*shōmon shōken* 小聞小見), has broken or is without precepts (*hakai mukai* 破戒無戒), is a foolish person full of blind passions (*bonnō gusoku no bonbu* 煩悩具足の凡夫), has committed the five evil acts (*gogyaku* 五逆), has slandered the dharma (*hihō shobō* 誹謗正法), is incapable of awakening (*issendai* 一闡提), has all good karmic roots cut off (*danzengon* 断善根), and is difficult to save and difficult to cure (*nanke nanji* 難化難治)—the list

---

attracted to Shin teachings. Okumoto (1994, 4) and Kawada (1995a; 1995b) searched for evidence of a historical relationship between Shinran, early Shin leaders, and actual low status communities

[49] In a related example, Shinran extolled figures famous for their evil acts as *bodhisattvas*, such as Chōdatsu (調達, S. Devadatta) and Jase (闍世, S. Ajātaśatru), or who have no capacity for birth in the pure land by their own actions, such as Idai (韋提, S. Vaidehī). See the opening of the *Kyōgyōshinshō* (*Seiten* 149; CWS 3).

continues.[50]

Also part of this list of evil people are the "low types, like butchers and liquor sellers" (*toko no gerui* 屠沽の下類) that Shinran explicitly identifies with.[51] Shinran wrote in *Notes on Essentials of Faith Alone*:

> 'Shackled' describes us (*warera* われら), who are bound by all our various blind passions. Blind passions refers to pains which torment the body and afflictions which distress the heart and mind. The hunter (*to*) is one who slaughters many kinds of living things; this is the hunter. The peddler (*ko*) is one who buys and sells things; this is the trader. They are called "low types" (*gerui*)...it is like tile and pebbles being made to become gold. Such peddlers, hunters, and others are all none other than we (*warera*), who are like stones and tiles and pebbles.[52]

With regard to premodern low status groups, some scholars suggest this identification meant that Shinran welcomed butchers and liquor sellers into his communities.[53] Others, that this teaching and that of the "evil person" in general, made Shin Buddhism particularly attractive to groups that were treated as evil and polluted by broader society. Leaving aside historical veracity, however, these claims are important for modern identity formation among both *burakumin* and non-*burakumin* Ōtani-ha followers. The "us" or "we" (*warera*), for example, in Shinran's writings has been elevated to a symbol of how to be in the world by

---

[50] Dobbins (2002, 13, 85, 185).

[51] Occurs in two places: *Notes on Essentials of Faith Alone* (*Yuishinshō mon'i* CWS 1:459-460; *Seiten* 552-553) and *True Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization* (CWS 1:109; *Seiten* 238). See Amstutz (2010, 64-65) for discussion of this phrase. *Toko* is a cognate term for "outcaste" outcaste (*sendara*) (DDB). See also Kashiwahara (1988, 23-24).

[52] Following autograph version used by Ōtani-ha, note 7, with minor changes.

[53] Amstutz (2010, 65) mentions the work of Kawada, who deals with this in detail (1985; 1994; 1995a; 1995b). He argues that *inuji'nin* (犬神人)— a low status group charged with maintaining public order in the capital area—had a connection with Shinran, perhaps as faithful followers. They held a monopoly on funeral processions and many also made shoes and bowstrings. *Inuji'nin* are shown in the pictorial biographies of Shinran in their pesrsimmon-colored robes and white head coverings. On the other hand, Yamamoto Naotomo (2006, 10–11) asserts that Shinran makes no reference in his writings about any groups or individuals thought to be low status (*senmin*) nor did he talk of status much at all.

modern Ōtani-ha thinkers (Hirose 1988, 15). They read it as an explicit rejection of hierarchical difference between followers.[54]

The other side of devotion is exalting and longing for the other. In Shin Buddhism, devotion is oriented towards Amida Buddha and his pure land (*jōdo*). Amida is at the center of Shin gathering places[55] and calling his name is the central practice. Yet devotional exaltation and longing is also expressed towards those people, places, and objects that *represent* Amida's working in the present, defiled world full of evil people—especially Shinran, Rennyo, and their male [56] descendants. Shinran is the center of the most important annual ritual of the Honganji, expressing gratitude and remembering Shinran on his death-day (*hōonkō*), when his biography is memorialized and gratitude express. His image is also the center of the largest physical structure within the head temple. His descendants, sometimes called "the first family" (*ikkeshū* 一家衆), [57] are represented by the head priest (*hossu*) and male relatives (*renshi*). Followers expressed devotion and hope that an encounter with these embodiments of Amida's purity and power in our world will create the necessary karmic connections for their salvation to be assured.

The devotional attitudes and practices directed towards the head priest are,

---

[54] Devotion is suscetible to a variety of readings, including radical and paternalistic ones, which I touch on in later chapters. Here, the focus is on devotion as a criteria for purity-pollution visible in the organizational structures created by central and local elites.

[55] Amida is the central image in Honganji temples, practice halls, and affiliated homes, whether in the form of a scroll with his name, his image, or in the form of a wooden image in temples. The head priest inscribes and bestows these upon member temples. See Dobbins (2001) for more on this practice, and on the use of the name scrolls (*myōgō* 名号).

[56] Women are important in the history of Shin. Although they have been involved in the ritual and practical aspects of leading Shin communities, in creating alliances through marriage and communicating in letter form, they have played a smaller role as objects of devotion compared to their male counterparts. One could argue, however, for a modern cult of Eshinni.

[57] Refers to both the priests male relatives of the head priest in their role as regional overseers, and to their resident temples (Akamatsu and Kasahara 1963, 278-279).

moreover, sometimes identified as "head priest faith" (*hossu shinkō*). In modern arguments, devotion towards the head priest and his male family members is criticized as a cause of discrimination (Yamamoto 1996, 7).[58] By the late medieval,[59] the head priest was viewed as a mediator between follower and Amida. The head priest was the sole "good friend" (*zenchishiki* 善智識), an encounter or connection with him was thought necessary for birth in the pure land and those who have faith express devotion towards the head priest (Akamatsu and Kasahara 1963, 314). Devotional practices meant to connect the follower to the head priest or *renshi*—the blood descendants of Shinran—and thus to Shinran and Amida, were varied. There are, for example, stories of followers who would attempt to touch the robe of the blood descendent or cook rice with his bathwater.[60]

Historically, when groups express reverence towards these devotional objects, they are also concerned with maintaining the purity and auspiciousness of those objects. Part of exaltation and reverence, of course, are the strategies used to set objects of reverence apart from what is thought to be defiling. One document from the medieval period, "Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions," discussed below, indicates that at least some Shin followers viewed low status groups as defiling, especially those whose occupations brought them into contact with animal death. In the case of *buraku* discrimination, then, devotion explains the criteria used in Shin for who should go first, who can receive the teachings, participate in ritual, and enter certain spaces—as well as the logic identifying those who go last, and cannot

---

[58] It is also possible to add the physical head temple to this list of objects of devotion. See chapter 4 for an account of premodern outcaste followers and fire-fighting at the Shin head temples.

[59] The head priest also had tremendous power to excommunicate and exclude (Akamatsu and Kasahara 1963, 283).

[60] The head priest seen as a "living buddha" (*ikibotoke*), a manifestation of, or "representative of Amida" (*nyorai no daikan* 如来の代官). See the work of Honganji-ha scholar Kodama Shiki (児玉識, b.1933).

receive, participate, nor enter. It provides the criteria for hierarchy[61] in sect structure and ritual procedure, and a hierarchical, Shin Buddhist ideology of purity-pollution (*jōe shisō*). This is how purity-pollution occurs in Shin Buddhism, despite a rejection of other forms in Japanese religions.

Historical discrimination in Shin Buddhism

History is alive in the ongoing, shifting ethical exegesis of modern Shin Buddhism and relations with *buraku* advocates. Shin Buddhist sects are a common target in the *buraku* liberation movement's strategy to overcome discrimination—one among many other targets in political, civil, and private spheres. At certain times, such as the early 1920s or early 1980s,[62] religion became the *primary* target. The prewar Levelers' Society (Suiheisha 水平社, 1922-1942), and postwar Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei, 1955 onwards) have formally interacted with religious organizations to garner their support, or to shame and denounce. Denunciation (*kyūdan* 糾弾) is not the only tactic used by *buraku* advocates, but it is the one used most often against religious groups— especially in the absence of laws criminalizing discrimination. Eventually, the denunciation tactic was adopted by anti-discrimination activists inside the Ōtani-ha as well, although they were not themselves *burakumin*.

Many *buraku* activists have held the view that religion is a source of discrimination, and that it creates discrimination through its teachings, institutions,

---

[61] Although I deal with hierarchical interpretations of devotion here, there are also egalitarian ones.

[62] For Ōtani-ha examples from the postwar period, there are the 1967 Nanba Betsuin Rinban Discriminatory Incident (*Nanba Betsuin rinban sabetsu jiken* 難波別院輪番差別事件), 1970 *Middle Path* Discriminatory Incident (*Chūdō shi sabetsu jiken* 中道誌差別事件) involving Soga Ryōjin (曽我量深, 1875-1971), 1984 Tōri'in Tōri Discriminatory Incident (*Tōri'in Tōri sabetsu jiken* 董理院董理差別事件), 1990 *Collected Works of Kiyozawa Manshi* Discriminatory Thought Incident (*"Kiyozawa Manshi zenshū" sabetsu shisō jiken* 清沢満之全集差別思想事件), 1987 National Promotional Council's *To Manifest a Companion Society* Anthology Discriminatory Incident (*Zensuikyō Dōbō shakai no genjitsu sabetsu jiken* 全推協叢書 "同朋社会の顕現" 差別事件) involving Kurube Shin'yū (訓覇信雄, 1906-1998), and so on (Matsune 1993; GS 53-164; JG 2010).

and organizations (Wagatsuma 1966, 88-92). What is worse, they claim, religion exploits and profits from discrimination, most egregiously in its fundraising practices.[63] No Japanese religious group[64] has earned more cumulative anger from *buraku* activists than Shin Buddhism.

Shin Buddhism is Japan's largest Buddhist group and among the many Buddhist forms, new and old, it still claims the most adherents.[65] Nominal and active Shin Buddhists make up ten percent of the total population of Japan—around twelve million people. *Burakumin* are Japan's largest minority. And from the late medieval period to the present (roughly the fifteenth century onwards), an overwhelming majority of *burakumin*—and the premodern outcastes and low status groups thought to be their predecessors—belonged to one of the two largest Shin Buddhist sects, the Ōtani-ha or the Honganji-ha. For example, a 1960 survey of Toyama prefecture revealed that ninety-nine percent of Toyama *burakumin* were Shin adherents, and ninety-one percent of all temples inside Toyama *buraku* were Shin. Of all the Shin temples in Toyama, roughly ten percent were located inside recognized *buraku* areas (Matsutani 1995, 66). At the beginning of the modern period, with the exception of two areas (Fujitani 1970, 397), all *burakumin* in western Japan were followers of Shin Buddhism. This

---

[63] Amstutz (2010, 86-87) describes how *eta* followers and temples were charged fifty percent more for the services they were allowed to participate in. For the Honganji-ha, Amstutz lists a number of these forms of participation.

[64] This is mainly a result of *burakumin* adherence to Shin Buddhism. There were, for example, late nineteenth and early twentieth century protests against Shintō shrines which excluded local *burakumin* as polluted or impure (DBS 1:9-12, 33-34, ; KBS 2:20-22, 120-121), and public denunciation of authors of all religious backgrounds who discriminated against *burakumin* in print. See also an interesting early attempt by Ise Shrine (DBS 1:8-9) to provide "sacred fire" to local *burakumin*, who took part in purification rituals ridding them of their "old" impurities.

[65] Shin followers as a percentage of the total population of Japan has been gradually declining. Dessì (2006a) relying on 2004 data published by the Japanese Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkachō 文化庁, *Shūkyō nenkan: Heisei 15 nenban* 宗教年鑑—平成 15 年版 [Religions' Yearbook: 2003 Edition]), estimates that Shin Buddhist temples make up twenty-five percent of all Buddhist temples in Japan. In 1998, the Agency estimated the number of Ōtani-ha followers at 5.5 million, and Honganji-ha at 6.9 million.

startling proportion indicates a history replete with controversy over how *burakumin* became followers in the past, how sect administrations have treated them historically, how they ought to treat them today, and how they are actually treated today.

The reason why so many *burakumin* belong to Shin Buddhism, especially the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha, is a matter of debate. Theories for this disproportionate affiliation cluster around two theses: (1) that the *burakumin* who did not already belong to Shin Buddhist sects were forced to do so by the Tokugawa government, in order to quell possible uprisings; and (2) that the *burakumin* freely chose to affiliate with Shin sects due to their inclusive and attractive doctrines and Shin proselytization efforts (Kondō 2010, 26 n.5).[66] There are significant problems with both theses, foremost of which is the reliance on a modern model of individual freedom of religion. Both "forced to" and "chose to" are anachronistic characterizations of premodern Shin history. Arguments over Shin history, however, continue to play an important role in modern inter-organizational relations.

In their religious lives, *burakumin* have faced discrimination, disadvantage, and exclusion. As argued above, these practices are based on a Shin Buddhist discourse of purity-pollution with devotion to Amida's purity and power as an organizing concept. *Buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism have been treated differently at temple gatherings and occasions for Shin practice—such as calling and hearing the name of Amida Buddha (*nenbutsu*), chanting pure land scriptures, commentaries, letters, and songs of praise (*wasan* 和讚), engaging in annual and

---

[66] Kondō references Kawada (1994), Nakao (1976), Yoshida (1987), and Kondō (1983). See also Yamamoto (1999), Wada (2007), and Amstutz (2010).

memorial rites, and listening to the teachings of the founder, Shinran, or the restorer, Rennyo. For temples with a mixed-status membership of *burakumin* and non-*burakumin*, differences in treatment were more evident. There are those today who remember or know of temples where *burakumin* had different seats and seating areas, different bowls, utensils, and trays, and different times for eating; in addition, there are rumors of different ritual procedures and documented cases of different posthumous ordination names.[67] The spaces, objects, and names for *burakumin* were always those less desirable. The differences helped non-*burakumin* avoid contact and contamination.

In more extreme and earlier forms,[68] a bowl for visiting *burakumin* to receive food would sometimes be kept outside, exposed to the elements in the temple courtyard. What is more, *burakumin* visitors were not necessarily allowed into temple buildings at all, especially the main hall, for fear they might defile it. Official Shin documents from the Edo period recommended that premodern outcastes, referred to as "extremely defiled" (*eta*) and "riverbank dwellers" (*kawaramono*), stand or kneel on the white gravel of the head temple courtyard[69] interacting with

---

[67] In Shin, ordination names are called *hōmyō*. In other Buddhist schools, they are called *kaimyō* 戒名. Matsune mentions discriminatory ordination names in the Ōtani-ha (1988, 63; 1993, 52). In English, discriminatory posthumous names are dealt with briefly by Bodiford (1996), Covell (2005), Alldritt (2003; 2000), and Heine (2008). Covell (2008, 306–311) provides an overview of "discriminatory posthumous names" (*sabetsu kaimyō*), where names with discriminatory meanings obvious or encoded were carved into gravesites and kept in temple death registers. As well, he covers the general linking of *kaimyō* to social and economic status. The first Ōtani-ha *sabetsu hōmyō* was discovered in 1983 (GS 167). See Amstutz (2010, 91-93) for further discussion of *sabetsu hōmyō* in Shin Buddhism.

[68] See Izumi's account (DD 36).

[69] There is anecdotal evidence for these practices in the latter half of the twentieth century, and strong objections to them in the early twentieth century. See the protests surrounding the 1902 "discriminatory incident" (*sabetsu jiken*) known as the "Discriminatory Remarks of the Preacher Incident (*Fukyōshi sabetsu hatsugen jiken*)" (DBS 1:74-82; Izumi 2001) covered in chapter 1, which served to increase solidarity between different *buraku* from all over Western Japan. In that incident, a modern Shin preacher reenacted these premodern practices of exclusion: instructing *burakumin* who were kneeling on the white sand, noting their higher donation amounts, keeping them from sharing of *sake* or entering the main temple hall, and so on.

the head priest *at a distance*, without contact and without commensality.[70] For this dubious privilege, they would have been expected to make large donations, roughly fifty percent more than followers of other status groups—if they were permitted to engage in rituals of generosity of any kind. Galen Amstutz (2010, 87-88) states that there were four main forms of "subordination" of outcaste temples and followers in the Honganji-ha during the early modern period: "fifty-percent extra surcharges for institutional participation…; prohibition of local temple *kamisori* ("self-ordination") to *eta* until 1784…and prohibition of normal *kamisori* (at the Kyōto headquarters central temple) even afterwards until the end of the Edo period; isolated, lowest status in certain ritual practices, especially those which *eta* pilgrims engaged when visiting the [head temple]; and exclusion from higher levels of educational opportunity." According to *burakumin* oral history and interview accounts, individuals received similar treatment at local temples: they were turned away at the gates, not allowed inside buildings, and refused contact and commensality. All of these behaviors are clearly attempts by the central bureaucracy and local temples of other status levels to manage pollution.

At the temple level, it was the official policy of the Ōtani-ha during the Edo that there be no joint ceremonies or exchanges between *buraku* and non-*buraku* temples; *buraku* temples[71] whose membership was wholly of outcaste status were

---

[70] These premodern practices are inferred from documents submitted to the Magistrate for Temples and Shrines (Jisha Bugyō 寺社奉行) (GS 177-176). Yamamoto (1999, 1) quotes an infamous line from the *Sensha kō* 賤者考 by Motoori Uchitō (1792-1855), that refers to premodern low status groups such as *shuku* 夙, *sanjo* 散所, *eta* 穢多, *hinin* (appear as headwords in BYJ). It describes them as "despised and ostracized by common people" (*heimin yori iyashime imisake* 平民より賤しめ忌避け), and "sharing no fire and no food" (*dōka dōshoku sezu* 同火同食せず). For Motoori, all evil, defilement, and danger comes from the "yellow spring" of impurity (Yamamoto 1999, 39-40). The name of a postwar group, the Society of Shared Fire (Dōen no Kai 同炎の会), linked to the Ōtani-ha "Council of Temples in Connection with Assimilation" (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai) and begun by Asano Onchi (Yoshitomo) (朝野温知, 1906-1982) in the late 1970s-early 1980s, indicated its egalitarian stance through the symbol of commensality and "sharing fire."
[71] Also known as *eji* (sometimes え寺), *kawatadera* 皮多寺 (BYJ 41-42). The Ōtani-ha reported having 124 *buraku* temples in 1922. Most recent survey data (2009) discussed in the conclusion, with an inclusive

to have "no relations"[72] with other temples. Some believe this extended to everyday dealings and communications. In addition, unlike all other Shin priests, *buraku* temple priests were not allowed to take ordination and tonsure[73] in the head temple. Such documents, and the discovery of a separate temple register (BYJ 160), led twentieth century scholars and activists to assert that Shin Buddhist sects had a segregated temple "system" (*seido* 制度) during the Edo period.[74] In fact, scholars such as Andachi Itsuo (2000) suggest that while phenomena such as discriminatory posthumous names, gravemarkers, entries in the temple's death registry (*kakochō* 過去帳), and talismans to guard against impurity were common in other Buddhist schools, the characteristic form of discrimination in the Shin schools is precisely this segregated temple system.

Within Shin Buddhism, then, there was segregation and contempt in official policy and local practice.[75] As a result, modern *buraku* advocates consistently targeted Shin Buddhism. Both "sides"[76] struggled over how *burakumin* followers of the Ōtani-ha ought to be related organizationally to the sect and how the sect ought to express solidarity with them. It is out of this struggle that the Ōtani-ha

---

definition of *buraku* temple, reports 242.

[72] "No relations outside" (*sotomajiwari kore nashi* 外交り之無). These did exist, however, as Yamamoto describes with the "twentieth day confraternity" (*Nijū nichi kō* 二十日講) (KBS 2:126-128).

[73] "No tonsure in the head temple" (*honzan ni oite teitō kore nashi* 於本山剃刀之無). See also BYJ (161) on how self-tonsure (*jiteitō* 自剃刀) in the Honganji-ha was permitted from 1783, and embroidered robes from 1843—although *buraku* priests wore the robes only inside their own temples.

[74] Hane (2003, 149-150) describes the way that *burakumin* were often excluded from temples and shrines. He next mentions segregated temples, segregated seating, and discriminatory posthumous names in Shin Buddhism.

[75] As Amstutz (2010) and Yamamoto (2006) rightly point out, subordination and contempt directed towards *buraku* temples, and followers of *eta* or *kawaramono* status, looked different "from the perspective of the local temple" where it was "nonuniform, locally-oriented, partly flexible and negotiable" (Amstutz 2010, 88). In an interactionist perspective, smaller and lower-level encounters between individuals and groups does allow for negotiation, challenge, and disregard of macro-level judgments of worth. There were many local situations, too, that reinforced subordination and contempt. Okumoto (1998) suggests that when confraternities and local groups (*kō* and *sō*) were *formed locally* they tended to exclude *buraku* temples and followers. When these groups were created by those higher up without detailed local knowledge, such groupings tended to be mixed.

[76] In Japanese texts, the two "sides" are referred to literally as *gawa* 側.

policy on human rights emerges, including an unavoidable coming to terms with its own discriminatory history. These central and local forms of segregation were, in my view, based on purity and pollution criteria internal to Shin Buddhism itself. In the last section of this chapter, I outline the appearance of this Shin purity-pollution in three historical phenomena that have appeared in critiques of the Ōtani-ha.

Keep them out: *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions*

It is unclear to what extent the fifteenth to sixteenth century network of temples, practice halls and groups connected with the Hongan-ji temple had institutionalized discrimination. There is, quite simply, very little evidence to argue one way or the other. Perhaps the only evidence from the late medieval period is a text entitled *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions* (*Kakunyo jūsan ka jō seikai* 覚如十三ヶ条制戒)—attributed to, but not written by,[77] the head priest, Kakunyo (覚如, 1270-1351).[78] It is the only pre-Edo text yet discovered to refer to treatment of low status individuals, or at least to those priests who attempted to convert them. The text itself is subject to variant interpretations and difficult to date, but scholars agree that it indicates both a widespread linking of the Buddhist term for outcaste (*sendara*) with low status groups, *as well as* purposeful proselytization of low status groups in medieval Shin Buddhism.[79]

The thirteenth prohibition suggests that some Shin followers actively proselytized among low status peoples, while others felt such proselytization was

---

[77] While Shigaraki discusses this as Kakunyo's work, he explains it in the typical manner: as evidence of Kakunyo's aristocratic and authoritarian consciousness, Shigaraki (1984, 69–71).

[78] See Yamamoto (2006, 8–10), Okumoto (2003), Kashiwahara (1988, 36–42), and Takeuchi (2000). This text was discovered during the twentieth century as Shin scholar-monks surveyed temples in order to collect materials for a history of Shin Buddhism, and first introduced in print by Kusaka Murin (日下無倫, 1888-1951). See Okumoto (2003) for a detailed discussion of authorship, dating, and usage during the late medieval.

[79] Yamamoto (2006, 10–11), Rogers and Rogers (1991, 65).

wrong. It prohibits spreading the Shin teaching to low status groups called "outcastes" (*sendara*) and "butchers" (*torui*).[80] Yamamoto Naotomo gives the text of the thirteenth prohibition, which I translate here, following his interpretation:

> Among those who are called followers of Honganji sect, it is said that some seek to convert (*kanka* 勧化) the *sendara* with our teachings. What is more, it is said that they frequent [their places of residence], meeting and talking [with them]. If this is true, it is an extremely, inconceivably evil offence. They ought to be admonished—particularly by their patron temple. If you hear of such an offender, they should be long forbidden to visit the temple and driven out. When seeking to benefit living beings, followers discriminate neither between places nor between people. Thus, the *sūtras* say "the four clans (*shishō* 四姓)[81] who go forth and renounce the world are all the same; they all belong to the family of Shakamuni Buddha." However, from its very beginnings our sect did not withdraw to the mountains and forests; priests and lay people did not seclude themselves from the world. Householders are householders, renunciates are renunciates, aristocrats are aristocrats, and warriors are warriors, [all the status groups maintained just as they are]. One should not mimic the behaviors of another status level. One should simply strive to settle their faith (*shinjin*) and be born in the pure land. Therefore, [priests], those who wish to serve and practice the *dharma* should not go against the customs of the world—let alone spend time with butchers (*torui*)! Is this [truly] the action of friends, the focus of the companions (*dōbō*)? It is the height of disgrace. We proclaim that [these priests who preach to the *sendara*] be immediately punished along with all their families.

Some priests[82] were actively reaching out to those called *sendara* and *torui*. One could read this text as evidence of solidarity and equality among a faction of followers who chose to disregard low status and treat them as companions (*dōbō*). On the other hand, those who produced this text were clearly attempting to curtail

---

80 Okumoto (2003, 104) links these terms to "extremely defiled" (*eta*).
81 A reference to the four Indian castes, S. *varṇa*.
82 Yamamoto calls it "a movement."

this activity. Why would they do this? The text argues that Shin Buddhists are not renunciates, and thus, cannot view the four clans as "all the same." In fact, to proselytize low status peoples is itself "discrimination"—singling out one group of people for special treatment. Customs and activities appropriate to one's status ought to be maintained. The text could mean several different things: (1) that some Shin Buddhists believed association with outcastes and butchers was itself an evil act and bringing shame to the sect (Yamamoto 2006, 11); (2) that association is shameful and evil because of what others in society believed about the nature of "outcastes" and "butchers"; or (3) that the faction which produced this text was attempting to exclude low status groups from membership. I hold it is best viewed as a combination of all three. This text argued that priests should not associate with butchers, that literally visiting, entering their homes, talking, and perhaps eating and drinking with them, were problems. The text reviles behaviors that typically transmit pollution and shuns the offending priests as if they were polluted through contact. Note that the "crime" of association passed to the offending priests' families as well. The final position of *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions* is to avoid the problem altogether—a position shared by most other Buddhist groups at this time—and exclude outcastes and butchers from membership. This textual evidence circulates today amongst Ōtani-ha and *buraku* researchers whose job it to consider historical responsibility for discrimination in Shin Buddhism.[83]

Keep them down: the priestly and temple status system

When premodern outcastes did affiliate with Shin sects, other pollution

---

[83] Most of the evidence at issue in these discussions was discovered during the postwar period. *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions* entered scholarly discussions in the late 1940s, separate registers for *buraku* temples in the late 1970s.

management strategies were employed. From the descriptions of ritual procedure and sect structure submitted to Tokugawa authorities, we know that procedures for dealing with low status temples, priests, and followers were different from those of other status levels (GS 165).[84] Although critique of Shin sects via *Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions* has been restricted to researcher and training groups, critiques using the ranking system for temples, priests, and robes has been ongoing in all facets of Ōtani-ha-*burakumin* advocacy relations.

Prior to the Meiji restoration and changes during the 1870s, *buraku* priests and temples were not allowed to participate in this system, known in the early part of the twentieth century as the "priestly and temple ranking system" (*jikaku dōhan seido*).[85] Once *buraku* temples and priests were permitted to participate in this system, they were more likely than non-*buraku* temples to donate the large sums of money necessary to raise their status (KBS 1:233-235). On the other hand, *buraku* temples and parishioner groups were also more likely to criticize the ranking system itself and demand that it be abolished.[86] For the former, the ability to participate in the system itself represented modern dignity and equality. For the latter, there could be no dignity and equality under the ranking system. Ōtani-ha administrators and *buraku* followers did not agree on the contours of a Shin religious life of equality and dignity, nor did they agree on the ideal place of *burakumin* within sect structure.

---

[84] For Kashiwahara (2003, 31), the persistence of exclusion throughout the Edo and into the modern inside Shin sects served the same purpose as it did for Tokugawa authories in general. It was a form of *pacification* (or scapegoating). According to Kashiwahara, discrimination was "reproduced" in order to placate the emerging modern rural and urban poor.

[85] In the latter Edo, there are examples of *buraku* temple priests permitted to wear colored robes, *but only inside their own temples* (Nadamoto 2002; KBS 1:414).

[86] See the many articles that pertain to Buddhism from the magazine *Meiji no hikari* 明治の光, published by the *buraku* activist group the Yamato Society of Friends (Yamato Dōshi Kai 大和同志会, active from 1912-1919, and 1922-1941) collected in volume 1 of the DBS.

During the Edo period, Ōtani-ha temples were organized in a rigid hierarchy.[87] A small practice hall, for example, would have a patron temple, and this temple would, in turn, have its own patron temple, and so forth, all the way to a central head temple. The head temple communicated with the government, either directly or by an intermediary temple in the capital of Edo.[88] Money, communication, and instructions flowed up and down these patron-subordinate temple lines[89] and often the closer and more directly connected a temple was to the head temple, Honganji, the higher its rank and prestige. Temple and priestly status organized this rank and prestige, and represented the ritual, status, and economic hierarchy of the sect as a whole. This system was (and arguably still is) crucial to the whole structure of the Ōtani-ha. It was the core of ritual, economy, and authority. Edo period *buraku* temples were, for the most part, not allowed to participate in this ranking system, wear colored and embroidered robes, nor did their priests participate in rituals because this required a ranking. This created distance between the highest ranked priests, who were the blood descendants of Shinran, and the lowest. When combined with prohibitions against taking tonsure at the head temple, there was a systematic exclusion of *buraku* priests, followers, and their temples within the Shin sects.

Ritual places, roles, powers, procedures, and colors associated with rank went

---

[87] "trunk-and-branch" (*honmatsu* 本末) system. Scholars have attempted to locate *buraku* temples inside the *honmatsu* and other networks of relations between temples (Okumoto 1997).

[88] Over the course of the seventeenth century, the shogunate and its Magistrate of Temples of Shrines (Jisha Bugyō) would structure and define the role of Buddhist temples. Religious groups had to report on their temple hierarchy and procedure to the government, including how they treated persons according to their status. By the end of this period religious groups were forbidden to argue with other groups, to split, or to create more temples.

[89] In Shin Buddhism, these lines were originally based on "teaching lineages" (*kyōsen*), formed mainly during the late medieval period when communities affiliated, and existing temples were converted, to the Honganji sect. They often followed means of transport and communication, such as roads, rivers, and seaports, recalling the movement of itinerant preachers and travelling priests who spread Shin teachings. *Kyōsen* were also relationships of tribute and monetary offerings.

through much iteration over time. The specifics are incredibly complex.[90] The system at any given time controlled ordination rules, use of robes and ritual implements, performance of certain actions during rituals, seating arrangements, and so forth. The general principles of the hierarchy, however, are very simple. In terms of space at the head temple, the closer a temple's rank placed their priest to the head priest during rituals, the higher the rank. In terms of performance, the more important the ritual role a priest was authorized to perform—especially if he had the authority to lead rituals at regional temples, the head temple, or even to stand in for the head priest—the higher the rank. In terms of robes, the more expensive and beautiful and colorful the material and decoration, the higher the rank. Whereas the highest ranked priests could wear silk robes dyed imperial-purple and decorated with gold embroidery, the lowest ranks could only wear black robes made of the simplest materials.

The priestly and temple ranking system has its roots in the medieval period, based on imperial ranks (*monzeki* 門跡 and *inge* 院家) granted to some of the largest temples in the Honganji sect organization.[91] Once this occurred, large temples with important histories and links to the second founder, Rennyo, became "retainers" of the *monzeki*, and over time, these temples were divided into eight separate status levels. These eight levels were based on places and roles within an

---

[90] For example, a 1921 survey, "First Presentation of the Progress and Results of the Survey on the State of the Teachings" (*Kyōsei chōsa no keika to tōkei dai ikkai no happyō* 教勢調査の経過と統計第一回の発表) (SS 1921, n.9, 558-561), listed eighteen temple ranks for over eight thousand temples. The survey also collected data on priestly rank, date of founding, number of member households, number of priests, temple family, size of main hall, size of temple grounds, orginational affiliation (which parish and subgroup), as well as data on temple prosyletization, special preaching and social work. This comprehensive survey was undertaken just as the Ōtani-ha created a "Society Department" (Shakaika 社会課) in its bureaucracy.

[91] "The aristocratic Shin leadership derived some of its prestige from associations with the court. Hongan-ji gave financial assistance to the accessions of emperors in 1521 and 1536, and as Hongan-ji status went up in the sixteenth century, the Honganji aristocratic leaders (specially recognized by the imperial court) assimilated status practices, especially clothing and titles, associated with the monastic traditions" (Amstutz 1997, 19). See also Rogers and Rogers (1991, 5-14, 44).

elaborate system of ritual procedure, order, space, and authority. In the Edo period, this system was extended to almost all temples. Put simply, "high status was being close to the head temple," and sitting close to the head priest during rituals at the head temple (Akamatsu and Kasahara 1963, 343). Many of the ranks themselves were named after seating places inside the main hall. From a set of Ōtani-ha temple rules written in 1886, the eight retainer ranks are listed, followed by five additional ranks based on ritual spaces in the main hall of the head temple: *naijin* 内陣 (whose priests were able to sit inside the boundary marking the area of the central image); *yonoma* 余間; *hien* 飛檐 (whose priests were able to sit in the areas beside the central image); and *gejin* 外陣 (whose priests were able to sit outside and in front of the central image area). Beyond these sat "priests without rank" (*heisō* 平僧). *Buraku* temples were kept out of even this lowest rank, suggesting that their priests would not have sat inside the head temple or large regional temples during important rites.[92]

The early modern status categories of *eta* and *kawaramono* were placed both outside and inferior to the order represented by the temple and priestly (*jikaku dōhan*) ranking system.[93] Many scholars believe that by placing *buraku* temples below and outside this ranking system, by refusing ritual contact, Shin had, in effect, a segregated temple "system" and that this form of *buraku* discrimination is

---

[92] Temples whose rank ranged from *heisō* to *hien*, even if they had "extremely defiled" (*eta*) followers, were allowed to have their priests take tonsure in the head temple. It is also likely that many *buraku* groups were not granted temple status (Nadamoto 2002). See Yamamoto (2009, 23-24) and KBS (1:232-235) for more information on the "templefication" process and how *buraku* temples lagged behind temples of other status levels.

[93] For a description of the ordination practices and the temple rank system in the Honganji, see Nasu (1998). Although Nasu does not mention *buraku* temples, based on his description of the preceptor and head priest of Honganji as a representative of Shinran, the exclusion of *buraku* temple ordinands from contact with the head priest and entering the main hall meant excluding them from participating in founder worship, in familial ties to Shinran. Of course, despite this exclusion, founder and head priest worship continued at a distance, as did the flow of donations from *buraku* temples and parishioners.

unique to Shin Buddhism.

Keep them separate: the *eta* temple system

Kakunyo's Thirteen Prohibitions reflects the intention on the part of some medieval Shin communities to exclude low status groups from membership in order to preserve the purity and reputation of the sect. Once low status groups joined the Shin network, however, another tendency emerged: the *segregation* of low status temples and practice halls inside the sect—again, this can be viewed as a strategy to protect the purity and sacredness of Shin objects of devotion.[94] Those scholars and activists who argue for the existence of a segregated temple system—one that the modern Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha ought to make restitution for—base their claims on very fragmentary evidence. Here, as above, I am less interested in the veracity of the claim in its historical context[95] than its modern deployment in claims against the Ōtani-ha. In the postwar period, *buraku* advocates assumed that Shin sects had segregated and isolated them within sect structure. This segregation continued into the modern period, taking on new forms.

Segregation consists in all regulations, structures, and prohibitions that effectively prevented *buraku* temples, temple priests, and followers from interacting directly with the head priest and entering the head temple, and that obviously treated so-called "*eta* temples" (*etadera* 穢多寺) or "defiled temples" (*eji* 穢寺)[96] as different: as warranting names identifying them as polluted and as

---

[94] Of course, scholars infer that some local communities had ritual (and other) relations with *buraku* temples, such as Yamamoto Naotomo—but because these did not conform to official status discourse, they are absent from texts produced by the centers of Shin institutional power.

[95] For a careful consideration of historical context and all of its variation, see Amstutz (2010). Okumoto Takehiro (奥本武裕), in his many articles, also disputes the idea that there was a "system" based on similar, local variation.

[96] *Eji* and "defiled priest" (*esō* 穢僧) were used in the Honganji-ha from the early modern period onwards. Okumoto (2000, 36) has a fascinating discussion and table showing the usage of terms for *buraku* temples and followers (including cases when they were not identified) such as: "leatherworker practice hall" (*kawata dōjō*

requiring separate registers. [97] Based on the patron-client temple relations exposed by these separate registers, *buraku* liberationist scholars suggested the idea of "*eta* head temples" or "middle" head temples (*chūhonzan* 中本山) that stood between *buraku* temples and the head temples in Kyōto.[98] The *chūhonzan* theory posits that *buraku* temples were gathered under a few large patron temples, and that the head temples in Kyoto preferred that no *buraku* temples be directly linked to them. There are five noted for the Honganji-ha and one for the Ōtani-ha.[99] Some suggest liturgical differences existed as well, with examples of different letters read formally to *eta* priests and followers inside a Honganji-ha *chūhonzan*—not the letters of the head priest which would have been read aloud at other temples (KBS 1:231)—and examples of different and lesser forms of address in communications between the Ōtani-ha *chūhonzan* Kinpuku-ji and the head temple (KBS 1:413).

I will end this chapter with one last example of the type of exclusionary rules that so anger modern *buraku* liberationists and conflicts with egalitarian ideas of Shin Buddhism. In both the early modern Honganji-ha[100] and Ōtani-ha, rules forbidding the ordination and tonsure of *buraku* priests inside the head temple and by the head priest were promulgated. A set of rules for the Ōtani-ha *buraku*

皮多道場), and "leatherworker follower" (*kawata monto* 皮多門徒); "extremely defiled priest" (*etasō*), and "extremely defiled follower (*eta monto*). Okumoto asserts that systematic discrimination against *buraku* temples was lessening by the mid-1800s, but usage of terms meaning "defiled" increasing. See BYJ (71).

[97] Okumoto (1995) introduces work on the *Ejichō* 穢寺帳 registers. The *Go Kinai etadera kachō* 五畿内穢寺下帳 register was reprinted 1990 and made public. See also KBS (1:227-228) and BYJ (160).

[98] These were abolished in the reforms outlined in the 1876 *Shuki kōryō* 宗規綱. See Mōri (1987, 82). Mōri notes that elimination of middle head temples, restrictions on tonsure, and *buraku* temples becoming directly linked with the head temple did not eliminate discrimination. Rather, systematic discrimination remained in the new modern "local group" (*sō* 組) and parish structures. See conclusion for recent survey data on Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples.

[99] For a list of these middle head temples, see KBS (1:229-231), and Amstutz (2010, 83). This theory demands that *buraku* temples had different trunk-and-branch system relations than other temples.

[100] The Honganji-ha permitted tonsure in the head temple for *buraku* priests from the late Edo period (Amemori 2006, 56). See Amstutz (2010, 86-87) for a discussion of both Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha documents.

temples for tonsure and temple relations appeared in a 1802 text submitted to the authorities.[101] The relevant items read:

> Item: For those called extremely defiled temples (*etadera*), the temple priest of the *etadera* is not to take tonsure (*teitō* 剃刀) inside of the head temple. They are of a different type (*besshu* 別種), and are not to have relations with other temples. If there are temples, such as the *heisōji* 平僧寺 and *hienji* 飛擔寺 [temples ranks], that have extremely defiled (*eta*) parishioners together with peasant and city-dweller parishioners, there will be no discrimination whatsoever in their handling. These temple priests are allowed to take tonsure in the head temple.
>
> Item: For the *eta*, those seeking ordination (*hosshin* 法躰), will take tonsure from the *etadera* temple priest or from the priest of their patron temple (*dannaji* 旦那寺). This also applies to those desiring to enter an *etadera*. The [particulars] of the ceremonies, such as clothing, and so on, for those who are ordained in an *etadera*, are to be left to the discretion of the temple priest performing the tonsure.

Although there are scattered records of *etadera* petitioning for tonsure earlier, self-tonsure in one's own or patron temple was not regularly permitted until the late 1700s. Some scholars believe that prior to the late 1700s, tonsure was not permitted for *buraku* priests at all (KBS 1:412).

Conclusions

In this early modern segregated system, *buraku* temples and followers were subordinated within, and segregated from, hierarchies of rank and thus from public participation in religious ritual and sect authority alongside other priests—all the while contributing to it economically. In the Ōtani-ha, temples identified as "defiled" rarely held any rank and were only permitted to associate

---

[101] *Tōha Jōdo Shinshū ippa kaikyū no shidai* 東派浄土真宗一派階級之次第 (included in the 1802 *Koji ruien* 古事類苑) (GS 177-178). See also KBS (1:412).

and perform rituals with other *buraku* temples and their patron temple. There was to be no mixing between *buraku* temples and those of other status levels. If a priest of another status level took tonsure and residence in a *buraku* temple, the sect viewed him as having outcaste status. *Buraku* priests could not ordain their priests in the head temple, nor to enter the Ōtani-ha priestly educational institutions.

Buraku followers were not permitted to enter the main hall and, early in the iteration of these Edo period regulations, were not allowed to participate in rituals of offering at all. When they were allowed, they paid more. Later, there are accounts of *burakumin* having to kneel on the gravel outside the main hall to give offerings, while followers of other status groups would be invited into a special reception room to share *sake* with the head priest (Murakoshi 1982, 28). For the *buraku* followers, either the head priest would not appear at all or, if the offerings were large enough, he would appear on the wooden walkway above the white gravel.

Most *buraku* priests, of course, wore black robes and were not even considered "priests without rank" (*heisō*), the lowest level in the Ōtani-ha temple and priestly ranking system. It is precisely traces of this kind of treatment in the modern—different robes, no-mixing, no meeting the head priest, no-entry, no-tonsure, no-rank—that became symbols of contention between the Ōtani-ha and *buraku* advocates. In the 1910s and 1920s, for example, the black robe became a symbol of solidarity with *burakumin* followers of Shin, and because Shinran was always pictured wearing black robes, black became a symbol of true and authentic Shin Buddhism against colored robes made with expensive materials.

In this chapter, with examples of exclusion and contempt both local and systematic, I argue that followers and temple representatives viewed as defiled were kept separate from the head priest and head temple. Like other forms of

pollution, when contact did occur, it was ritually controlled or mitigated. In the modern Ōtani-ha, managing the pollution integral to *buraku* discrimination did not end. It changed, adapting to new social roles for representatives of the sect with respect to *burakumin*. It is important to remember that even as older systems that were explicitly hierarchical were eroded through modernization, even as egalitarian ideologies became the norm during the twentieth century, attempts to manage the *burakumin* continued.

PART II Curing discrimination: Shin Buddhism's revolutionary potential

3 Buddhism and human rights: egalitarian doctrine and charitable work

In the two preceding chapters, I introduced theories of *buraku* discrimination and the emergence of the *burakumin* as a coherent group during the modern period. Although *buraku* discrimination is a modern phenomenon, it deploys older ideas and stereotypes alongside newer ones. Shin Buddhism has caused *buraku* discrimination in two ways: (1) by serving as a vehicle for older discriminatory ideas, practices, and institutional structures that position the *burakumin* as polluted; and (2) as individual and organizational participants in a "multilayered" modern *buraku* discrimination that continues to position the *burakumin* as polluted. This role in causing discrimination, however, coexists with another modern role: "curing" it. In part II, I survey claims that the "essence" of Buddhism is egalitarian and respectful of human dignity. Moreover, some claim that *burakumin* have a special relation to this egalitarian essence.

I begin with a translation of an early and remarkable example of the argument that Buddhism is a cure for discrimination put forward by in 1874 by the Shin Buddhist priest, Shimaji Mokurai. Shimaji described Buddhism as a doctrine of human rights proclaimed in antiquity by the Buddha himself. This essay is similar to egalitarian, human-rights-supporting, visions of Buddhism put forward today in the study of Buddhist ethics. I end this chapter with a survey of typical arguments made in Buddhist ethics scholarship.

Shimaji Mokurai's "The Theory of Human Rights"

Throughout the modern period, Shin Buddhism has been portrayed as a cure to social ills such as discrimination. Many have stressed that Shin Buddhism is egalitarian and, as such, is a cure for hierarchy, inequality, and discrimination in society. At the very beginning of the Japanese modern, Shimaji Mokurai, an influential Shin scholar-priest and institutional reformer of the Meiji period (1868-1912), presented just this sort of argument, describing a Buddhism that itself destroys evil forms of social hierarchy.

Shimaji was an important and outspoken figure in debates over the course of the Meiji period on the separation of religion and state, various social issues, and sectarian reform. He wrote this short essay after travelling the world as part of a delegation from one of the large Shin sects, the Honganji-ha.[1] The essay was addressed to an avid Japanese reading public in an early Meiji magazine devoted to religious topics, *Hōshi sōdan* 報四叢談.[2] In it, Shimaji recognized the persistence of discrimination against "butchers" and "prison guards" as a violation of human rights. At the time of its writing over 125 years ago, the word for "human rights" or "rights of man" (*jinken* 人権) had just been introduced into the Japanese language. The term *jinken* first appeared in 1868 in Tsuda Mamichi's (津田真道, 1829-1903) translation of Simon Vissering's (1818-1888) lectures on law, given at Leiden

---

[1] At this time, Shimaji began to argue for a separation of religion and state, and a withdrawal of Buddhism from state-supervised program of religious teaching. It was likely his influence that lead to the freedom of religion article in the Meiji Constitution of 1889 (Ketelaar 1990; Amstutz 1997, 27-28).

[2] Shimaji was associated with the Honganji-ha branch of Shin Buddhism. The essay entitled "The Theory of Human Rights (*Jinken ron* 人権論)" was originally published in the second issue of *Hōshi sōdan* in 1874, which was overseen by Ōuchi Seiran (大内青巒, 1845-1918), and is also included in Shimaji's collected works. The years 1873-1874 mark the beginning of the development of religious periodicals in Meiji Japan. The title of the periodical refers to the Buddhist idea of repayment of four types of "indebtedness" (*on*), to parents, to living beings, to the ruler, to the three jewels of Buddhism (or to teachers and sages). Other variations exist. *Hōshi sōdan* was published to promote (*keimō*) Buddhist morality and doctrine but included commentary and information on other religions as well, including Christianity.

University. Tsuda was a lawyer, judge, and founding member of the Meiji Six Society, a group of intellectual reformers active during the early Meiji period (1868-1912). According to Tsuda, *jinken* meant "all people are born the same, and each has these rights relative to one another. These are called 'human rights.'"[3]

Shimaji's essay is the earliest general recommendation of human rights from a Buddhist point of view in Japan. In it, Shimaji vigorously defends Buddhist support of human rights, describes Shakamuni Buddha as an ancient man of learning who proclaimed human rights, and indicates that Indian and Japanese caste discrimination violates these human rights. He views the freeing of slaves in America, emancipation of serfs in Russia, and liberation of outcastes in Japan to be part of the same progress towards human rights by civilized nations. According to Shimaji, then, *buraku* discrimination cannot be condoned by Buddhists. I translate his essay, "The Theory of Human Rights" (*Jinkenron* 人権論), in full:

> The idea that we ought to be equal in human rights (*jinken*) comes from the thorough investigations of European scholars. They clearly argue that equal rights are based on the nature of humanity and that equal rights support happiness and prosperity in the world. These scholars discern the quality of a nation's culture and judge the strength and weaknesses of its ruling government based on whether these rights are allowed—and they do so without waiting for the consensus of the world to form. Nevertheless, there is a gang of inarticulate, confused, and obstinate people who persist in thinking that even if these rights ought to be respected in foreign countries, they need not be implemented in our own county. They say these rights are something that foreign religionists proclaim, and not something that ought to be spoken of by religionists in [this country of Japan]. These claims are deceptive in the extreme!
>
> Equal human rights is an undeniable theory, a principle to be followed without

fail. Even if the countries of the world are different, are they not all nations?[4] Even if people[5] are not of the same race, are they not all humans? Even if there are differences in knowledge and moral conduct [among people], their nature and activity[6] are everywhere the same. Surely, it is impossible to argue that a country or type of people is unique.

[In America,] the black slaves[7] were considered the most inferior race, were thought to be ugly, lowly, and ignorant, and were cruelly forced into slavery. Although some patiently endured their difficult labors, the moment Americans put forward the theory that all humans have the same rights, the North and South clashed in the Civil War. From out of this struggle to make the theory of equal rights a reality, there emerged educators and politicians of great note.

When humans are first born, there is no rich or poor, no high or low—all are the same, foolish children. Education and custom produce an unequal world in spite [of this sameness], where the arrogant overpower and the inferior yield. How could inequality possibly be considered the original nature of humans? Even if humans have the same rights, if these rights are supported [in a country] they flourish. If these rights are suppressed, they lie dormant. This is not due to a particular type of country or race; [situations of inequality and suppressed rights] are completely due to governance and education.

Is there anyone who would not try to take my rights? Of course they would! It is simply that all humans desire to possess rights. If their power were equally matched, the rights of humans would naturally be balanced. Moreover, if that power is not equally matched, rights will necessarily be unbalanced.[8] In a time of advanced culture, on the threshold of these rights being made law, we wonder why human rights were restricted in the undeveloped civilizations of the past. [The answer] is simply that powerful [people] above did whatever

---

[4] Shimaji moves between concrete terms for country, region, area, or land (邦・域) and the term *kuni* (国), which he uses for "nation" in a more abstract sense in the essay.

[5] *ōmoku no tami* 横目の民, literally, "the type of people with horizontal eyes" (DBS 1:537). Allusion to the idea that all humans have horizontal eyes and a vertical nose (*ōmoku jūbi* 横目縦鼻).

[6] The inner "physical and psychical (*seijō* 性情)" nature of humans, and the outer "speaking and doing (*gendō* 言動)" activity and behavior of humans.

[7] *kokudo* 黒奴, literally "black slaves," an unflattering and prejudiced term by today's standards. The term reflects the age of the essay.

[8] In this section "rights" (*kenri* 権利) is differentiated from "power" (*chikara* 力, *i* 威) such that one with power can take rights by force.

they wanted, and the powerless people below them were unable to resist. As a matter of course, those with rights gained more and more, while those without lost more and more. This evil custom became common, and again the people, [as the black slaves did,] endured it and submitted to it. Truly, we must shake our heads at this evil custom of undeveloped culture. These common people, the so-called "black heads,"[9] are looked down upon, and made to bow before the powerful. Although such a system might be the most convenient for governing, the country's strength is undermined, the people have no spirit, and it is impossible to resist foreign powers in any way.

By contrast, in countries with flourishing cultures the people have the right to freedom [from interference by the government] and a spirit of independence. Rights are properly divided between the [government] above and the [people] below, and the country and nation are protected based on this mutual reciprocity. Knowledge progresses, wealth and strength increase. All the people inside the country are unified in thought and prevent all other countries from causing them suffering. This is how [flourishing cultures] establish a nation. Even if they did not seek to be the greatest in the world, how could they avoid being so? Thus, from the beginning, the development of rights in the countries of Europe was not accidental. If you think that such a development would be too long in coming [here in Japan], consider how the arguments of scholars such as Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire allowed the people [of France] themselves to achieve humans rights with great speed.

Concerning those undeveloped cultures of the past, the regions of Asia were no different [from those of Europe]. Investigating rights in this distant past, we find that the European "estate"[10] system resembled India's "caste" system. Each status level was made hereditary and the [highest estate] considered themselves the children of heaven—fundamentally different from ordinary people. (The ruler of China, for example, was called "son of heaven" and made

---

9 *kenshu* 黔首. In premodern Chinese usage, a reference to the common people. They did not cover their hair with hats or other coverings, so their black hair was visible.

10 *sutendo* ステンド, which I believe refers to the German *stand* or *stände*, as in "the three estates of the realm" (*die drei Reichstände*). These are the three hereditary estates of ancient and medieval Europe: an estate handling government and religion, as estate handling military matters, and an estate handling food cultivation and goods.

equal to the gods.) In this system of estates, those called "druids"[11] had control of law, education, and theology, and proudly considered themselves the descendants of the gods, just as in India the *brāhmaṇa* considered themselves the descendants of the god Brahma. The Roman emperor Caligula ordered that he himself be worshipped as a god. There have long been rulers who glorified their own rights! The very fact that not even a whiff of that [sort of practice] lingers today is completely based on the achievements of scholars fiercely arguing [for equal human rights].

The various regions of Asia have not yet reached this point because scholars have not yet argued for them. The progress and decline of culture, as well as the strength and weakness of state force, depend on equal human rights. Given this, our [lack of such scholars] is unfortunate for all citizens of Asia.

But is it true that no one in Asia has ever proclaimed equal human rights? I say, not so! Shakamuni proclaimed them in India long ago. When his theory of rights was put into practice and the evil custom of division into castes[12] had all but disappeared, [Buddhism] was shunned[13] by the *brāhmaṇa* and *kṣatriya* castes. For this reason, Shakamuni's followers were forced to depart for other countries. The Indian castes were again rigorously separated and have remained so to the present day.

The Indian caste system is based on their theory of creation and it is the most binding and hateful governing system for the people. In this theory, humanity is divided into four ranks. The first rank is the *brāhmaṇa*, the second, *kṣatriya*, the third, *vaiśya*, the fourth, *śūdra*. The *brāhmaṇa* came from the mouth of the god Brahma and thus they have the right to teach dharma. The *kṣatriya* came from the shoulders of the god Brahma and thus they have the right to govern.[14] The *vaiśya* came from the hips and would serve and follow their whole lives. The *śūdra* came from the feet and were considered of especially low status. If one came into contact with those [*śūdra*], one became polluted (*oe* 汚穢) and had to be cleansed by bathing. The [caste] system in this country of Japan still

---

[11] *doruiden* ドルイデン.

[12] Shimaji uses the terms *shuzoku* (種族) and *shu* (種) to refer to castes.

[13] *imu* 忌む meaning "to taboo, avoid, or shun."

[14] Shimaji is using Indian Hinduism as a foil against the equal human rights respecting Indian Buddhism. His view of caste-like systems and religious ideologies—which he conflates with Hinduism—is decidedly negative.

strongly views former butchers (*toji*) and former prison guards (*chōri* 長吏) as polluted (*kegare*).

Shakamuni's appearance was, from the very beginning, not for the purpose of governing the human world. His task was solely to teach dharma that enlightened the ignorant and lifted those who were sinking. However, the dharma taught by the *brāhmaṇa* caste threw humanity deeper into ignorance. [Shakamuni's teaching] broke through this [*brāhmaṇa* teaching] by showing that that the ten thousand things, and the five elements of a human being (*goun* 五蘊; S. *skandha*), arise in response to causes and conditions (*innen* 因縁). What is the difference between coming from the god Brahma's mouth, shoulders, hips, and feet? Surely there is no difference. Those who focus solely on religious practice teach thusly. They say, what is this argument for caste? In the end, [Shakamuni] broke the governing system of the *brāhmaṇa*, looking on all living beings as equal and all as recipients of the teaching. To explain this [Shakamuni] taught that "four rivers enter the ocean and become one taste. The four castes leave their households and become the same family of Shaka" (*Zōitsu agon kyō*[15]), and that "this dharma is everywhere equal, without high or low" (*Kongō hannya haramitsu kyō*[16]). There are a thousand different recipients of the teachings, and ten thousand different ways of teaching [for each of them], there are complex and abstract teachings, and there are simple and familiar teachings. These teachings follow the type of recipient, responding to each freely and spontaneously to bring them to enlightenment. In the scriptures, it says "without knowing the feelings of others, they seek to control and oppress them" (*Muryōjukyō*[17]) with the sole intent of admonishing tyranny and preserving the people's rights. And Shakamuni was not alone. Confucious asserted that uncivilized men should not steal rights, Mencius, that the wealthy should not corrupt them, nor the powerful crush them. They themselves were

---

[15] *Zōichi agon kyō* 増一阿含経 (T 125), also know as the *Sūtra of Gradual Increase*.

[16] *Kongō hannya haramitsu kyō* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 (Several versions, T 220, 235-239), also known as *The Diamond Sūtra*.

[17] *Muryōjukyō* (T 362), also known as *Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*, the central text of Shin Buddhism. This quote is taken from the passage on the fifth type of evil, the fact that all people of the world are slothful, undisciplined, and indifferent. This type of person seeks to control and take from others to fulfill their own selfish needs. Shimaji asserts that this passage is particularly relevant to rulers and people in government. He has also quoted in sequence one early, one Mahāyāna, and one Shin Buddhist text.

the beginning of the human right to freedom.[18] So why do people insist that no one has argued for human rights in Asia? There are those who have done so.

In our country, the term *shinōkōshō* (士農工商) refers to the four estates of warrior, farmer, artisan, and trader. Based simply on these occupations, [rights] were divided among them. Originally, the four Indian castes were no different from this type of division. When the [common] people were invited to become soldiers after the Meiji Restoration, the [occupational] monopoly of the warriors was broken. Originally, the rights of the warriors were none other than [the right to the occupation of war].

Even now, criminal law [in Japan] distinguishes those of rank, such as warriors and priests—those who are different from commoners (*heimin*)—from others. For the life of me, I cannot understand why this is so. Perhaps it is due to long years of custom, in contrast to the short days of our new government. Perhaps [criminal law] will become [equal] with the passage of time. However, placing the butchers (*toji*) alongside commoners [with the Emancipation Law of 1871, three years ago], is an act truly based on the principle of equal human rights and should be seen as the symbol of an enlightened government that views all citizens without discrimination.[19] Yet, if it is still said that our country alone should refrain from arguing for human rights and not aspire to this universal principle of the world, this is none other than the stubborn opinion of those that do not want our country's civilization to progress.

What was Shimaji Mokurai arguing and why is this essay important? In 1868, at the very beginning of the Meiji period, the term for "human rights" (*jinken*) entered Japan and joined older understandings of rights or powers (*ken* 権 or *kenri* 権利), roughly equivalent to European notions of "right," "power," or "entitlement." Shimaji clearly assumed that humans enjoyed rights in his essay, although he notes that historically they enjoyed them unequally and according to

---

[18] lit. "right to freedom of human nature" (*jinshin jiyū no kenri* 人心自由の権利).

[19] Allusion to the 1868 Meiji government document with the phrase "viewing all people without discrimination, and extending the same benevolence to all" (*isshin dōjin* 一視同仁). Basically, Shimaji is praising the Meiji government for living up to its own rhetoric.

social status. The language of "human rights," and the closely related "peoples" or "citizens' rights" (*minken* 民権), became part of how Japanese intellectuals and social movements responded to the reconfiguration of Japanese society during the Meiji. They engaged ideas that humans have certain rights or powers (*ken* 権) by virtue of being human (*jin* 人), that such rights are held equally by all humans, as well as the associated ideas that rights are possessed based on some principle beyond human society (heaven, god, or nature) and that human authority cannot interfere with them. The equality and basis for rights, the role of government with respect to rights—these were matters of debate. Shimaji, therefore, attempts to make the case that human rights are equal, that they should be recognized as such and supported by the Japanese government. He strongly asserts that human rights are in accord with the teachings of Buddhism and Buddhists in Japan ought to proclaim them.

Shimaji's case for equal human rights has several parts. First, he asserted the universally similar nature of peoples and countries, by soundly rejecting claims of racial or national uniqueness. He disparaged the "gang" of confused people who reject equal human rights out of a misguided belief that their country or people are fundamentally different from others. Second, he asserted that all humans are born equal. In support, he offered the explanation that inequality is completely a matter of governance, education, custom, and the inclination of all humans to use the power they have to amass rights.[20] Over time, he explained, this process of amassing rights becomes habitual or customary. As those in power continually enforced inequality and those without power continually submitted, hereditary

---

[20] Shimaji strikes a careful and interesting balance throughout the essay between rights and power. A person's exercise of power, and a government's exercise of power, cause rights to be gained and enjoyed. In this case, Shimaji is arguing that the morally correct use of government power is to support an equal enjoyment of rights by its citizens.

and hierarchical systems of occupation, class, and caste were born. As such, social inequality is a failure of government and not a result of a fundamental inequality in human nature.

Third, and important for a Meiji intellectual like Shimaji, he tied the enjoyment of equal human rights to the strength, power, culture, and enlightenment of the nation. His constant reference to countries, peoples, and races reflected the historical context of nineteenth century Japan, and his proposed connection between these rights and the power of the nation-state gave his argument rhetorical force.[21] Shimaji argued that support of human rights is indispensable to Japan's civilization and to becoming a world power. By linking Buddhism to human rights, he portrayed Buddhism as a useful religion for the progress of Japanese civilization (and as more "civilized" than the Meiji state)—not a decadent, foreign faith of little usefulness in modern Japan, as Buddhism's many opponents held. Shimaji wrote this piece immediately after five years of riot violence against, and suppression of, Japanese Buddhist institutions by various sectors of society, the most intense period of the "throw out the Buddha and destroy Shakamuni" (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈) movement (Ketelaar 1993, chapters 2 and 3).

Most relevant to the issue of *buraku* discrimination, Shimaji identifies discrimination against Japanese former outcastes as a violation of human rights. He positioned the Indian and Japanese caste systems, and their ruling, hierarchical ideology, as the polar opposite of human rights, and by extension, of Buddhism. He acknowledged that a "caste system" still existed in Japan in the 1870s with respect

---

[21] As Howell (2005, 156) explains, "for a thinker to be taken seriously in the intellectual world of the first decade or so of the Meiji era he had to invoke the language of civilization and enlightenment" (*bunmei kaika* 文明開化). Throughout the essay Shimaji contrasts enlightened, advanced, literate culture and civilization with undeveloped cultures and evil customs.

to "former butchers and prison guards" who were still viewed as polluted. The terms themselves, "butchers" (*toji*) and "prison guards" (*chōri*), were sometimes used to refer to all premodern outcaste groups, however heterogeneous, just as the official neologism "the extremely defiled and inhuman" (*eta-hinin*) did (DeVos and Wagatsuma 1966b, 4-5). As we have seen in previous chapters, "butchery" and animal death have been central discriminatory symbols for modern *burakumin*, inherited largely from Buddhism. Shimaji praised the Meiji government's decision to emancipate former outcastes by enrolling them in the register of commoners in 1871, but does not connect Japanese "caste" with Buddhism at any point.

In essence, Shimaji argued that Buddhism itself is a theory of human rights. As such, Buddhism "rejects" and "breaks" descent-based or caste-like discrimination against groups such as *burakumin*. Moreover, in Shimaji's view, Buddhism promotes progressive government policies that seek to end that discrimination. Shimaji's theory of discrimination sees it as a result of human desire for power, history, education, custom, and governance—and not related to Buddhism at all. Buddhism, by contrast, is found in the statements of great thinkers like Shakamuni which, though they may have historical effect, are transcendent truths unsullied by the vagaries of history. Shimaji Mokurai, a leading figure in the Honganji-ha to which most "butchers" and "prison guards" belonged, does not address ideas of Buddhist responsibility and complicity in this short piece. It would require the pressure of organized *buraku* advocacy for Shin Buddhist sects to clearly acknowledge historical responsibility for *buraku* discrimination, integrate it into their official policies, and later, into their views of human rights in the postwar period.

Contemporary arguments for Buddhism and human rights

Shimaji's essay, "The Theory of Human Rights," demonstrates that Japanese

Buddhist engagement with egalitarianism, human rights, ideal governance, and so forth, began at the dawn of the Japanese modern period. However, it would take more than a century for human rights to be taken as a subtopic in English academic works on Buddhist ethics. What is striking is the similarity between Shimaji and these later approaches.

Human rights was the theme of the first conference held by the online *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* (1994 onwards), and the proceedings were published under the direction of Damien Keown and Charles Prebish. To date, human rights as a subtopic in Buddhist ethics has been "applied."[22] That is, Buddhist ethical thought is constructively considered in relation to some facet of (usually modern) human society. This scholarship questions whether Buddhism can *authentically* and *legitimately* support human rights, and attempts to determine what is authentic for Buddhists at any point in history. This approach assumes, as did Shimaji, that it is possible to separate local history and institutional practice from the ethical implications of something called "Buddhism." Although there has been some sectarian emphasis on Theravāda or Mahāyāna, most have focused on ideas assumed to be valid for all Buddhists regardless of sect or region or historical period. Damien Keown, for example, notes that his philosophical discussion "is essentially theoretical [and] detailed reference will not be made to particular Buddhist cultures or schools, to specific human rights 'abuses,' or to the human rights 'record' of particular regimes" (Keown 1998, 16).

Most of these arguments decouple Buddhism from its local history. In some

---

[22] These studies discuss ideal social institutions and professions, economic ethics, medical ethics, political ethics, environmental ethics, and so on. In the *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, articles on such applied topics as wealth, poverty, and economic ethics, human rights, animal rights, environment and ecological ethics, business, pacifism and nonviolence, have been published.

sense, history *must* be set aside in order to make claims that are universal, that is, claims that are conceptually and ethically valid for Buddhism as a whole, as that category is understood. This is only possible in cases where historical responsibility for discrimination or human rights violations is not an issue, is denied, or set-aside.[23] As Frank Hoffman (2002, 141) notes, "a critic might point out that there are cases of caste thinking in some Buddhist monasteries…however, one cannot rightly judge Buddhist theory by the practice of a few Buddhists."[24] This type of argument assumes that it is possible to separate local history and institutional practice from the ethical implications of some thing called "Buddhism." The vagaries of Buddhist history are, at best, something that can conform to an authentic standard, *pure* if they do and *corrupt* if they do not (Brook 2005). Judgments of Buddhist history as pure or corrupt occur repeatedly in considerations of human rights.

Arguments in Buddhism and human rights scholarship

In her book, *Being Benevolence* (2005, 127ff.), Sallie King provides an excellent overview of how scholars of Buddhism and Buddhist ethics have approached human rights. I will not repeat her work here beyond a heuristic and limited description of frequently encountered arguments. Before I proceed, however, I will

---

[23] In the context of English academic work on Buddhism, there are issues at stake in textual study and the production of ethical knowledge that are very different from the issues at stake for a late nineteenth century Shin thinker like Shimaji Mokurai, or a mid-twentieth century priest-bureaucrat like Takeuchi Ryō'on (武内了温, 1891-1967). Discrimination, and other human rights violations, tend to appear in historical studies of ethics more often than purely philosophical ones. This is likely because the violations themselves prompt individuals and groups to consider the relationship between Buddhism and human rights. See Schwartz (1994), an anthropological look at the convergence between Buddhist ritual, political protest, and human rights agitation in late 20th century Tibet. See also Hongladarom (1998) for an examination of modern Thai Buddhists on human rights, and Peach (2000) on the issue of sexual slavery, Buddhism, and human rights.
[24] Hoffman summarizes Perera's (1991) commentary on the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. See also Keown (1998). Pāli scholars, such as L.P.N. Perera, K.N. Jayatilleke, Sulak Sivaraksa, and Padmasiri de Silva, stand out for their careful engagements with U.N. documents, human rights philosophy, and attempts to locate parallels to them in Pāli canon texts.

provide an outline of human rights based on United Nations documents.

Human rights in UN instruments

In the last sixty years of United Nations discourse and consensus-building on the concept of human rights, several features emerge time and time again. Human rights are *equal* rights that are based on the *inherent dignity* of humans. When human dignity is specifically violated, they are used as claims for legal remedy. They serve as a foundation for, but not a guarantee of, human well-being in terms of freedom from fear and want, justice, peace, and a society where individuals and groups are free to participate in civil and political life. They enjoin a specific duty on states to provide legal remedy, and the general duty for all to uphold and protect human rights. They cannot be lost (alienated) either by failure to perform this general duty, by personal choice, any action on the part of others, or any arbitrary action on the part of government.

UN human rights documents hint at their long history, committee-style revision and ratification processes, and an array of sources for their important philosophical concepts. The earliest trio of United Nations human rights instruments are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR, 1966), and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, 1966). These three documents form what is known as the "International Bill of Human Rights." In the UDHR, there is the recognition that "inherent dignity" and "equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family"—which they are born with—serve as foundations for "freedom, justice and peace in the world." Humans should act toward one another in a "spirit of brotherhood." In 1966, in the ICCPR and ICESCR, the connection between inherent dignity and human rights is made explicit: "*Recognizing* that these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the

human person." Human rights are *based on* the inherent dignity of a person, rights and dignity being equal in all persons.

UN instruments list many types of human rights. Human rights articles protect both freedom to act and the freedom from certain actions, so-called positive and negative rights, and treat both as equally important. Collective human rights or group rights, [25] such as the right to self-determination to be free from discrimination, are listed together with individual human rights, such as the right to freedom of expression and to vote. Economic rights are listed together with civil rights. This multiplicity of type is handled through the principle of "indivisibility"[26] —the idea that one human right (positive or negative; collective or individual; social or political) cannot take precedence over another in principle. Indivisibility means, in the words of Pierre Sane (Amnesty International), that "you can't choose between torture and starvation" (Felice 1996, 18).

Where these claims conflict, they must be negotiated without the prior assumption that one is more "basic" or fundamental than others. As discussion of UN rights has developed over the last sixty years, the "International Bill of Human Rights" has been expanded through declarations, conventions, and protocols dealing with specifically vulnerable populations (children, women, indigenous peoples and minority cultures) and specific actions (such as torture, and the death penalty). Indeed, early Japanese recognition of the collective or group human

---

[25] The Vienna Declaration also uses phrases, such as "the human rights of women," "the rights of persons belonging to minorities," and "the human rights of children," that indicate the application of human rights to group members based on a shared characteristic over and above being human (Ishay 2008, 485). See also the Beijing Declaration: "Women's rights are human rights" (Ishay 2008, 492). And the Declaration on Indigenous Peoples Rights (2007).

[26] The 1993 Vienna Declaration states: "All human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated" (Ishay 2008, 482).

rights of the *burakumin* to be free of discrimination has most in common with the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, 1966) and the most recent evolution of rights within UN instruments rather than with, for example, the specifically American insistence on individual, political rights. These expansions elaborate the rights contained in earlier instruments and have added fuel to theoretical arguments about the nature of human rights.

UN instruments also enjoin general duties upon those who enjoy rights: "Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance" of human rights. They also enjoin the specific duty upon state parties of UN instruments to "ensure that any person claiming…remedy shall have his right thereto determined by competent judicial, administrative or legislative authorities, or by any other competent authority provided for by the legal system of the State, and to develop the possibilities of judicial remedy."[27] This specific duty of states to provide judicial remedy is one of the core components of human rights: they are claims in accordance with human dignity that require judicial remedy coupled with a demand for their codification as law. When human rights are protected, they provide a foundation or potential for "free human beings" to enjoy "civil and political freedom and freedom from fear and want." Another way of stating this is that human rights attempt to provide a foundation for human flourishing and well-being, described as a state of freedom, justice, and peace.

---

[27] This drive to become law is sometimes forgotten since human rights often become other types of law during codification in particular states. Human rights become, for example, integrated into the law of torts, contract, criminal, or civil law. The drive to become law is present nonetheless as shown by the right to life: "Every human being has the inherent right to life. *This right shall be protected by law.* No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life" (emphasis added, Ishay 2008, 426).

As to what exactly human dignity is and what it is based on, the UN documents have left traces elided and omitted references to certain monotheistic conceptions of the creation of humans in the image of the deity, a reference to traits of conscience, reason, or will—which might underlie or enable that dignity. They also contain ideas of inalienability—that a political and legal power or a moral character is inherent in, and equal among, all defined as human by virtue of their birth. The development of rights has a long and complicated history. Rights language, often in the "rights of man" or "civil liberties" form, was in use in several emergent nation-states in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including Japan—as we see so clearly above in Shimaji Mokurai's 1874 essay. The same term in Japanese, the characters meaning literally "person" and "right" (*jinken* 人権), has been in use since the early Meiji period. It has been used to represent English, and other European language, terms such as "rights of man," "civil rights," "civil liberties," and finally, "human rights."

Buddhist human rights?

To over-generalize and ignore the exceptions, ahistorical arguments rely on ancient scriptures and key Buddhist concepts as primary sources. These primary sources are brought into conversation with philosophical work on human rights in English, usually in an attempt to answer the applied ethical question of whether Buddhism ought to support human rights today. The individual Buddhist agent as the possessor of rights is a key feature, Buddhism is an abstract, transcendental theory, and the role of the author has been mainly normative and constructive—whether in an attempt to save Buddhism from human rights, or to help Buddhism develop an authentic philosophy of human rights.[28] Most conclude

---

[28] Authors contributing to this type of work include Abe (1986; 1995), T. Unno (1988), de Silva (1995), and

that human rights and Buddhist ideas are compatible in meaningful ways,[29] and thus, that Buddhist support of human rights is legitimate. Shimaji's essay is an example of this type. Others argue that Buddhism and human rights are incompatible (Jeffreys 2003), or even that human rights would have a negative impact on Buddhism.[30]

Argument 1: Buddhism is compatible with human rights

This first type of argument is concerned with finding premodern reasons to support the modern ideology of human rights. It is the positive answer to the most basic question that can be asked regarding the relationship between Buddhism and human rights, according to Damien Keown (1998): are there human rights in Buddhism? Buddhism is thus thought to anticipate and be compatible with human rights from a time before human rights are promulgated as a global ethical standard. This argument to recover an originally "pro-human rights" Buddhism that has been somehow lost is similar to Shimaji's argument, and occurs constantly in twentieth century Shin Buddhist arguments for rights. The original spirit of Shinran was lost, they say, and must be recovered in the form of a religious order that is against discrimination and for human rights.

Assuming that human rights rely on notions of human dignity, for example,

---

Thurman (1996). In the early 1990s, books appear by Perera (1991) and Rai (1995). In the late 1998, a volume containing ten essays devoted to *Buddhism and Human Rights* (Keown, Prebish, and Husted 1998) appeared (its contents based on a 1995 *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* online conference). Most recently, book-length works by Swaris (2000) and Robert Florida (2005) have taken up the subject. Authors of English essays written before 1995 are often specialists of a particular Buddhist tradition or established scholars writing on the theme of religion and human rights. After 1995, specialists of Buddhist ethics, as well as scholars and practitioners of engaged Buddhism, become more prominent.

[29] Sallie King summarizes the philosophical sticking points between Buddhist and human rights ideas related to no-self, individualism, neo-imperialism, adversarial nature of claiming rights, Asian Values, and so on (S.B. King 2000, 294–296; 2005, 118–163).

[30] This is often couched in language suggesting that human rights is alien to Buddhism (Keown 1998, 16), neo-imperialist or based on western values antithetical to Asian values (T. Unno 1988; Santikaro 1996).

L.P.N. Perera argues that specific terms from UN human rights instruments have parallels in Buddhism—suggesting the Pāli terms *dhammādhipateyya* or *dhammavitakka* as "reason," and *attādhipateyya* as "conscience"—and traces their use and meaning in the Pāli Canon (1991, 22). Perera holds that humans are born free and equal in terms of dignity and rights according to Buddhism. This is "reflected clearly in the Buddha's emphasis on self-reliance, which He did by extolling what He called *attakāra* (personal effort), *purisakāra* (human endeavour), *purisathāma* (human strength), *purisaviriya* (human energy), *purisaparakkama* (human valour) and *purisadhorayha* (human responsibility)" (1991, 21). Perera argues that the moral and natural law of *dhamma* serves as the absolute source of authority and thus, "Buddhism posits, as Jean Jacques Rousseau did much later, that the essence of human dignity lies in the assumption of man's responsibility for his own governance" (Perera 1991, 28). Perera examines the texts of the Pāli Canon to locate and list Buddhist equivalents to human rights in his article by article commentary on the UNDHR, making claims such as "the Five Precepts (*Pañcasīla*) of Buddhism, broadly speaking, constitute an assertion not only of the right to life [UNDHR art. 3], but of the right to property too [art. 17]; and all the other human rights, explicitly or implicitly, seem to fall into one or the other of these two categories" (Perera 1991, 29). He argues that these Buddhist equivalents to reason, conscience, will, freedom, and human value can play the same role in supporting human rights ideas as they do in UN human rights instruments.

In a sophisticated example of this type, Keown (1998) argues for *implicit* equivalents to human rights in Buddhism and labors over the methodological issues involved in identifying them. Keown develops an "intellectual bridgework" that links duties and rights. Through this link, Buddhist duties and obligations appearing in premodern scriptures provide the content of rights that could be legitimately supported by Buddhism. As well, this link allows Keown to conclude

that Buddhist duties are implicit "embryonic rights" (Keown 1998, 22). Keown then examines Buddhist scriptures, such as the Pāli *Sigalovada sutta*, that describe Buddhist duties (for instance, the role-based duties of husband and wife, ruler and ruled, and so on). Another argument for implicit, premodern equivalents is found in Shiotsu Tōru's (2000) work. Proceeding in much the same fashion, Shiotsu searches for ways Buddhist thought might contribute to the "foundation" (*kiban* 基盤) of human rights. He argues that this foundation is "human dignity" (*ningen songen* 人間尊厳) (2000, 91-93), and that human dignity is the first place where it is possible to connect human rights with Buddhist thought.

Other authors stress the universal potential for buddhahood, or the special status of birth in the human realm as Buddhist parallels for human dignity.[31] Interdependence has also been suggested.[32] Interdependence gives rise to a variety of moral arguments for respect of human rights and is a tremendously rich concept in modern Buddhist ethics generally. Still others argue that Buddhism is in accord with the "intention" behind human rights. S.B. King disregards the objections to the adversarial nature of human rights, because the intention is to protect the less powerful from the more powerful and help the poor and weak. Buddhism, with its emphasis on compassion, "can have no objection to this intention" (1995, 124). Despite being made over 125 years ago, Shimaji Mokurai's argument that the Buddha taught a theory of equal human rights and that Buddhist scriptures advise the protection of these rights, is strikingly similar to this first

---

[31] Authors who argue for this parallel explain that amongst the many types of possible births, human birth is most precious. It is the optimum birth for achieving enlightenment and difficult to attain because it requires the momentum of morally good actions performed in previous births. The particularly human potential for enlightenment and rarity of human birth dignifies the human state. See Keown (1998), Ihara (1998, 50); Abe (1995, 142-143); Clasquin (1993, 96); Perera (1991, 21).

[32] Also known as "dependent origination" (P. *paticca-samuppāda*; J. *engi* 縁起). See Strain (1998, 166); Abe (1995); T. Unno (1988); Inada (1990), and the Dalai Lama, in Powers (1998, 195).

type. Buddhism and human rights are placed on equal footing here, and there is little criticism of human rights ideas.

Argument 2: Buddhism is better than human rights

This style of argument is critical and polemical, placing Buddhism in a privileged position with respect to human rights discourse. Its basic outline is simple: Buddhism, if its ethics and ideals were manifest in society, would accomplish the true goals of human rights, such as protection of human dignity, human flourishing, and a spirit of brotherhood. Human rights are only instrumentally valuable, a useful tool or skillful means (*hōben* 方便; S. *upāya*)[33] to the true ends of Buddhist ethics. Buddhism supports human rights because it is expedient to do so,[34] but human rights cannot replace Buddhist notions of society, ethics, and awakening. This is because human rights are fundamentally flawed. While the first type looked to premodern sources, this second type looks to the future, to a time when Buddhist ideals of enlightenment and society will be realized—eliminating any need for human rights. As Jay Garfield states, if compassion prevails "rights are unnecessary" (1998, 126).[35]

Proponents often elaborate on just how human rights are flawed as well as how they are superseded by absolute Buddhist truths, effectively presenting a Buddhist critique of human rights ideas. And how are human rights considered to be flawed? For a start, they are legalistic, individualistic, egocentric,

---

[33] Authors who relate human rights to *upāya* include Hershock (2000, 10), Abe (1986, 199), Clasquin (1993, 99), and Ihara (1998, 50). Human rights is useful because it fosters an appreciation of this precious human birth (Abe 1986, 203), and allows us to advocate "right conduct on the part of those who govern others" (Junger 1998, 56).

[34] Prayudh Prayutto holds that human rights "are a necessary protection from aggression from other parties, an answer to a negative situation" and that they are "useful in an age of fighting and contention, or when human thinking is divisive and separatist" (quoted in Hongladarom 1998, 104-106).

[35] Inada describes human rights as "ancillary concepts" (1990, 94).

anthropocentric, and adversarial. [36] Buddhism can address these failings, progressively improving or superseding the human rights tradition. Kenneth Inada (1982, 70) argues that from a Buddhist point of view human rights addresses the individual in an "unclear" manner, one that snares the individual "in rhetorical or legalistic tangles." The excessive individualism of rights is seen as a problem to be addressed by Buddhist-style collectivism. Garfield (1998, 129) argues that human rights are "reconstructed and protected with equal vigor on a new basis when they are grounded not in individual autonomy but rather in collective mutual responsibility." And Masao Abe holds that Buddhism is not compatible with ideas of contention in claiming rights; "non-contention" is preferred.[37] Others argue that human rights are based on a flawed understanding of the world where autonomous selves possess rights, interests, and obligations in relation to nation-states. They argue that the Buddhist understanding of the world, in contrast, sees all action taken by beings who consider themselves enduring and autonomous as the source of suffering. Human rights by definition, then, are unable to relieve suffering (Hershock 2000; Junger 1998; Garfield 1998). Human rights, explains Taitetsu Unno (1988, 144), are liable to egocentrism and self-centeredness and may become another form of oppression.

Ironically, according to this view, the very goals of human rights—equality and solidarity—are impossible for human rights to realize. These goals are only truly realized at the absolute level of Buddhist awakening (Abe 1986, 146). If Buddhist awakening is the true goal, and human rights will only be fulfilled when this goal is achieved, human rights become unnecessary. In this kind of argument, other ideas

---

[36] Strain (1998, 162). Sometimes, these kinds of criticisms are strongly related to the Asian Values debate and ideas of incommensurability between "East" and "West."

[37] Abe (1986, 199). See also Ihara (1998, 49).

can take the place of "Buddhist awakening," such as Mahāyāna versions of ideal society, Theravāda ideals of the just ruler, or the wisdom and compassion of bodhisattvas (Junger 1998, 86). Speaking of the bodhisattva ideal, Inada (1982, 75-76) writes:

> The Bodhisattva ideal speaks to us of equality, liberty, and security from the total perspective. Therefore, its reference to human nature is at once on the greater social level, for social nature can be interpreted as an agglomeration of individual human nature. In this way, equality, liberty, and security are enhanced from the holistic nature of things. Indeed, these qualities are meaningful and persuasive only to the extent that they belong to the greater realm of existence. Put another way, these qualities are meaningless and impotent when applied to a single individual, for an individual without the social bindings is simply incomprehensible.

In other words, the goals of human rights (equality, liberty, security) are incomprehensible for individuals (to whom, it is claimed, human rights is addressed). Buddhism, on the other hand, provides a total, collective perspective through the bodhisattva ideal, the only perspective from which the goals of human rights are meaningful.

Argument 3: Buddhism is not compatible with human rights

I will only touch briefly on notable sticking points to which authors return repeatedly in discussion of Buddhism and human rights: (1) the "being" that is thought to "possess" human rights, and claims that human rights is anthropocentric and incompatible with the doctrine of "no-self"; (2) the "type" of moral system represented by human rights, and claims that rights-based systems are incompatible with, or fundamentally different from, compassion- and duty-based systems. There is little need to delve deeply into these controversies since philosophical objections to human rights simply do not occur in the Ōtani-ha historical materials. In the Ōtani-ha materials, human rights are good,

discrimination is bad, and Shinran preached human dignity.

The person who has human rights, as described by UN documents, is a "possessor," has "inherent dignity," and is "human." For many scholars of Buddhist ethics, these features of human rights do not sit well with Buddhism. Hershock (2000, 24) wonders "what kinds of rights can be established and sustained on the basis of there being no equality, no universality, no essential natures, and no autonomous individuals?" Hershock and others view this sort of "self"—the sort which Buddhism vehemently denies we have with its doctrines of "no-self" (S. *anātma*; J. *muga* 無我), "emptiness" (S. *śūnyatā*; J. *kū* 空), and "impermanence" (S. *anitya*; J. *mujō* 無常)—as similar to the "self" of human rights where the agent possesses enduring, inalienable, and inherent dignity and rights. "No-self" is thought to contradict the terms "inherent" in inherent dignity, and "inalienable" in inalienable rights. Another sticking point is a limitation of rights to the "human." Some authors insist that Buddhism addresses all sentient beings, not only humans. Human rights are, therefore, anthropocentric. Junger argues that Buddhist rights would not be limited to the "human" or "agents" or "persons." Rather, according to Buddhism, human rights should apply to all beings, as all beings desire life and happiness, all beings fear punishment and pain (Junger 1988, 62-64). The Dalai Lama states that "all sentient beings, have the right to pursue happiness and live in peace and in freedom" (Keown et al. 1998, v). Buddhism, should it support rights, would extend them beyond the human to include animals and plants, and T. Unno (1988, 144) asserts that rights should not be limited to humans. And Abe explains that human beings are only one part of "all sentient beings," all of which are subject to impermanence. As such, Buddhist "human rights" must be grasped from

a point of view beyond the human-centred (Abe 1995, 144-145).[38] The first precept against destroying life, for Masao Abe (1995, 147), means that "the problem of human rights and human duties...should be grasped in relation to all living beings in the universe," since it is clear "life" extends to all living things and not only humans.

Ahistorical arguments about "Buddhism" and "human rights"

Ahistorical arguments made about Buddhism and human rights, in English and Japanese academic discourse by practitioners and scholars alike, rarely resemble those embedded in the negotiation between *buraku* liberationists and Buddhist organizations. The former frames the discussion as a philosophical comparison between two ahistorical and abstract entities, "Buddhism" and "human rights." The arguments are written for an audience concerned with the international context, with universalist norms, with authentic religious sources of authority, and so on. Although this discourse performs the commentarial, and often sophisticated interpretive task of taking a Buddhist text deemed authoritative and presenting its ethical content, its broad conclusions and concerns (whether Buddhist support of human rights is legitimate or whether it is illegitimate) have little similarity to arguments produced by organizational actors in dialogue—activists and administrators, not scholars or scholar-priests.

---

[38] These authors provide many scriptural and historical examples of the inclusion of animals in the Buddhist view of sentient life, and the activities of Buddhist rulers to set up veterinary hospitals and stress compassion towards animals. They point out that Buddhism takes a long-term view of life, where human passes to non-human and back again through countless cycles of rebirth.

4   Shin Buddhism as both cause and cure from the standpoint of *burakumin*

This chapter concerns the ambiguous position of *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism in the modern period,[1] who are thought to have a special or intense faith (*tokushin* 篤信). I begin by outlining this ambiguous position and the idea that *burakumin* movements in the modern period—to the extent that they remained Shin followers and publically claimed *burakumin* identity—sought to discover dignity as *burakumin*. This search and the longing for dignity fueled a willingness on the part of some *buraku* followers to speak out against the Ōtani-ha institution when their representatives discriminated in obvious and unacceptable ways.

From the Meiji period onwards, *buraku* followers and advocates were willing to take on the order (*kyōdan*) in public, whether through the courts, in print, or in person. I examine the criticisms of *buraku* Shin priests and followers who were part of the early Marxist-liberationist movement in the 1920s. They argued that the Ōtani-ha institution had it wrong, had lost the true, egalitarian spirit of Shinran, and needed the guidance and criticism of its *buraku* followers to recover it. I conclude with the implications for Shin Buddhism when it is considered both cause and cure for discrimination—which has become the mainstream position of the Ōtani-ha administration. Its logic requires those within Ōtani-ha Shin tradition who are not *burakumin*, but who acknowledge the order's historical responsibility for *buraku* discrimination, to agree that the order itself is corrupt. They agree that

---

[1] There is a broader, comparative case to be made regarding the nature of religious adherence for social marginals of other times and places.

the essence of Shin must be relearned, and accept the denunciation (*kyūdan*) and critique of *buraku* activists as *a means to* the restoration of true Shin Buddhism.

Ambiguities for *burakumin*

Ambiguity is an inescapable part of what it means to be *burakumin*. *Buraku* social movements in the Japanese modern period, especially radical and left-leaning ones, have revolved around restoring dignity to *burakumin* identity. Take, for example, the ambiguity embedded in the symbols of the hunter, "butcher" (*toji*), and eater of meat, used to negatively identify the *burakumin* and part of the Buddhist contribution to *buraku* discrimination.

Buddhist precepts forbid the killing of beings and eating of their flesh.[2] This seems like a simple and straightforward ethical position to uphold. It has been used by contemporary socially engaged Buddhists in arguments for nonviolence, pacifism, and vegetarianism. However, present-day Japan has a complex historical inheritance of cultural groups who have performed various subsistence tasks—fishing, gathering, hunting, wet and dry agriculture, sericulture, or animal husbandry. For a variety of reasons, groups who performed or became associated with the killing of animals for their meat and other products were despised and ostracized. Some modern day *burakumin* claim these groups as their ancestors and, at the same time, reclaim a positive association with animal death, rejecting its use in justifications for *buraku* discrimination.

In his 1924 Marxist history of *burakumin*, Takahashi Sadaki (高橋貞樹,

---

[2] The major Mahāyāna precepts forbid killing, and the minor precepts "include such injunctions as not to consume liquor, not to eat meat, not to possess weapons, not to be involved in commercial activities" and so on (Dobbins 2002, 12). See also Daniel A. Getz' article "Precepts" (Buswell 2004, 2: 673-675), and Bodiford's introduction to precepts in East Asian in Bodiford (2005).

1905-1935)[3] presented a "history of meat":

> In the earliest, primal times, leaving behind dens in the desolate plains, looking towards the awesome burning light of volcanoes in the dark night, people put the meat of deer into fire and ate. Deer that they had hunted together, they divided amongst themselves and ate. In that place, there was no fighting over the deer meat. Certainly, they never thought that eating meat might be a crime; to lose this daily provision of meat meant death.

> Then, a cruel overseer appeared, threatened them with naked weapons, and stole the meat. Those who lost in the ugly struggle with this conqueror lived beneath the whip of miserable starvation. And then they were forced to butcher that meat. Since that primal age, at the very bottom of society a group of people have cried out! While they are called "beast!" and "animal!" they butchered beasts, they scraped their skins, and they ate their meat. Sadly, those people did not have the rights of humans. Their raw human skin was scraped off, their warm human hearts rent apart. These people were the *eta*. This was the fate of our ancestors. (Takahashi 1924, 22)

This image of the loss of the egalitarian, harmonious society where people hunt, share, and eat meat together begins Takahashi's history of *burakumin* within Japan, told as a Marxist class struggle. A mythic conqueror took the meat, made butchery and meat-eating moral evils and civil crimes, yet forced *burakumin* to perform butchery. Takahashi (1924, 22) argued that this exercise of power and placing of blame upon *burakumin* was cemented with religious sentiment and morality in order to profit from them—not because hunting and eating meat was wrong.

The Marxist interpretation of religion as an ideological instrument of the elite aside, most historians of *burakumin* agree that the "religious sentiment" that

---

[3] Takahashi, a Marxist and *buraku* liberation activist with the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha), wrote this text, *Tokushu buraku issen nenshi* 特殊部落一千年史 *[A Thousand Year History of the Special Buraku]* (1924), when he was nineteen years old. The book was immediately banned by the government as too radical. In the text, Takahashi relied on the work of Kita Sadakichi, Yanase Keisuke (柳瀬頸介, 1868-1896), and Sano Manabu.

became part of discrimination in Japan drew from Buddhist precepts against killing and eating meat.[4] It is a terrible irony here that the Buddhist precept against killing, thought to be unquestionably good, basic, and universal, is linked to feelings and behaviors of discrimination and repugnance directed towards the "butchers" at the bottom of society—whether they actually performed this task or not. This very same precept is also a pillar of contemporary Buddhist ideologies of peace and nonviolence, themselves tied to harmonious, egalitarian images. Which harmonious, egalitarian society is the better one?[5] It is an open question whether it is possible to have an ethical position or precept without creating feelings and behaviors of *both* moral righteousness and moral repugnance, and ideas of the good do not have predictable effects in historical context. By taking a descriptive approach, I do not choose between egalitarian visions, which allows me to better describe the complexity of these competing moral visions in historical context.

Buddhist ideas of defilement by evil and evil livelihood contribute to the ambiguous subject position of modern *burakumin* with respect to Buddhism. For *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism, this has meant finding dignity within symbols deployed against them.

Strong faith of the *burakumin*

From at least the early nineteenth century, we have evidence of a discourse of strong, intense, or fervent faith (*tokushin*, or *atsui shinkō* 篤い信仰) in Shin Buddhism amongst premodern outcastes, such as the "extremely defiled" (*eta*).

---

[4] Gómez (1992) links these two precepts in the early Buddhist context to avoidance of impurity and concern for self-cultivation, and so Buddhist precepts are potentially related to Buddhist purity and pollution beliefs from a very early period. See Jaffe (2001; 2005) for accounts of criticism directed at the Shin Buddhist school during the early modern and modern periods due to its acceptance of meat-eating.

[5] In Takeuchi Ryō'on's (武内了温, 1891-1967) thought as well, meat-eating takes on the features of a utopian, egalitarian moral vision for the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan* 教団) as a whole. I discuss his use of "eating meat and living with a wife" or "eating meat and marrying" (*nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯) in chapter 6.

Ōshio Heihachirō (大塩平八郎) wrote in 1821 of the *eta* he encountered near what is today the city of Osaka (Uesugi 2006, 59). He wrote of their desire to interact with humans and raise their status,

> ...what the *eta* are most disappointed about is not being able to interact with others. The wise monk, Shinran, understood this well and in his sect [of Shin Buddhism] there is not the slightest hindrance for *eta*. Even if the faithful are *eta* in this world, it is said they will become buddhas of the pure land of bliss. And in their extreme gratitude, there is no one who gives as much money to the Hongan-ji as the *eta*. Regardless of whether it is in this world or the next, the very chance to stand equal with other humans and become a buddha causes such thankfulness that there is nothing they will not strive for. If tasked by humans, feeling there is nothing better than this, they will throw their lives away fighting floods and fires. (Uesugi 2006, 59)

In this example, Ōshio hits upon all the elements of this strong faith discourse[6]: (1) intense devotion and gratitude; (2) self-sacrifice unto death; (3) a special relationship with Shinran and Shin Buddhism as the proper faith of premodern outcastes (BYJ 296); and (4) self-sacrifice in terms of donating money and service to the two Shin sects (BYJ 161). Writing in the postwar period, DeVos and Wagatsuma (1966a, 244) still noticed this discourse: "There is some indication that the Burakumin tend to adhere to their religion with a greater tenacity than is usual in Japan. Many are seemingly very pious and donate a considerable amount of money to their temple." The "strong faith" discourse is used in a variety of arguments: to explain why *buraku* Shin followers were "more" willing to protest instances of discrimination inside the Shin sects; to explain *burakumin* solidarity and how that solidarity assisted in twentieth century anti-discrimination struggles;

---

[6] There are certainly negative sides to this discourse. Ōshio was interested in what good fighters and workers the *eta* would make (as well as what good doctors, given their knowledge of human and animal bodies, Uesugi 2006, 52). The Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha systematically exploited the generosity of *eta* and *burakumin*.

to explain the massive movement expenditure of money by *burakumin* to establish new temples and obtain temple and priestly ranks for existing ones; and to explain why premodern outcastes became followers of Shin Buddhism in the first place (Yamamoto 2006; KBS; Amemori 2006).

In another example, premodern outcastes living near Kyoto were known for their great sacrifice and service to fight fires when they threatened the head temples during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In one particular story recounted in the *Kasshi yawa* 甲子夜話 (composed between 1821 and 1841, KBS 5:555-556) from 1823,[7] based on rumors that were circulating around the capital, when the fire reached the main hall of the Higashi Hongan-ji, "more than 200 of the *eta*" gathered to put out the fire, but this proved impossible. Around half died, becoming "ash along with the main hall," leaving the other half behind "jealous of those who were burned to death along with the main hall, since truly they had achieved buddhahood. In lives to come, they will surely be born as commoners, separating from the *eta* [status]." In another example, this time regarding a fire at the Nishi Hongan-ji, the author relays the stories he heard. *Eta* gathered at the head temple and brought with them leathers and skins to lay down over the pillars, roof, and ridgepole, sacrificing their livelihood in an attempt to halt the flames.[8] In several eighteenth century examples, Ōtani-ha officials and even the head priest went directly to the residences of the outcaste fire fighters to express thanks and

---

[7] See Yamamoto's (2006, 3-4) summary and commentary on the story. See also Amemori's (2006) article. Modern *burakumin* in Kyoto continued fight fires well into the Meiji period. One group was incorporated as a fire-fighting unit under municipal juristiction (Amemori 2006, 59-62).

[8] In the last, most extreme story in this entry from the *Kasshi yawa*, written by Matsuura Kiyoshi (松浦清, 1760-1841), when it came time to rebuild the Higashi Hongan-ji, it was no easy task to find the great tree to replace the ridgepole of the main hall. The only suitable tree was a sacred tree (*shinboku* 神木). Upon hearing this, a "woman of the sect" (it is unclear whether she was *eta* status or not) sacrificed her body saying "use this tree as material for the main hall." After hanging a rope on one of its branches, she hung herself in the tree. Because the tree was polluted by her death, it became the ridgepole for the founder's hall at Higashi Honganji (KBS: 5:556).

give *sake* in gratitude for their service to the head temple (Amemori 2006, 59-62).[9]

Strong faith and dignity

This discourse of strong faith and of a special relationship with Shinran has also been one way that modern *burakumin* find dignity. Just as Takahashi Sadaki imagined his egalitarian, hunter-gatherer society, modern *buraku* liberationists have seen themselves as true inheritors of Shinran's teachings, which are believed to be egalitarian and non-discriminatory.

In the early 1980s, Hirose Takashi (広瀬杲, b. 1924), a professor of Shin Buddhist studies at Ōtani University in Kyoto, was asked by the head temple administration to teach a course on Shinran to priests and administrators working to alleviate *buraku* discrimination. Hirose explains how his eyes were opened to the plight of *burakumin* and his connections with *buraku* communities in Kyoto deepened while he acted as both teacher and guide to this group of administrators. He realized there was another Shinran—a living, breathing Shinran vital in the *buraku* and completely different from the "Shinran" preached by the educated elite, the central institution and its scholar-priests (Hirose 1992). He explains that a "peoples' Shinran" was taught to him by *burakumin*, a Shinran who "walked the mountain" and encountered people of low status, subject to discrimination while he was a monk at Mt. Hiei, and who was later exiled.

Hirose speculates on Shinran's relationship with lowly and outcaste peoples of his own day. When Shinran famously left the monastery on Mt. Hiei to follow a different Buddhist path, eventually developing his distinctive doctrines, Hirose wonders if it was not for the sake of these outcaste people (Hirose 1992, 268–272).

---

9 There were four major fires at Higashi Hongan-ji, in 1788, 1823, 1858, and 1864.

Despite Shinran's compassion, he says, the *burakumin* and their forebearers came to be oppressed by the institution built in his name. In a Kyoto *buraku*, Hirose witnessed this peoples' Shinran in a silent play. The play was about the suppression and exile of Shinran, his teacher, and fellow disciples in the year 1207, and incorporated two legendary images. The first, that Shinran spent all his ninety years in humble clothes. The second, that he was a kind of permanent itinerant, using a rock for his pillow and snow as his bed (Hirose 1992, 313). Played by the people of the *buraku*, Shinran and an attendant came on stage, performing gestures of hardship and rough living. He describes how the audience, who had a moment before been singing and clapping in time with revolutionary songs of *buraku* liberation, wept as they watched the stageplay.

When approaching *buraku* discrimination from the perspective of Shin Buddhism, it is no longer possible to merely point to religious "causes." It is necessary to see debate the over origins and causes as internal to Shin Buddhism itself. Shin Buddhism includes within itself the perspectives of both "discriminators" and the "discriminated-against" (*hisabetsu* 被差別). The story of Shin Buddhism and discrimination, then, is a complicated one of causes, cures, and difficult ambiguities. Formal representatives of *burakumin* and non-*burakumin* Shin followers have fought over historical responsibility for discrimination and the tradition's ideal form. They argue about how, for example, a human-rights-respecting sect ought to be structured, how historical discrimination ought to be redressed, and how the founder of Shin Buddhism and its exemplar-figure, Shinran, viewed and interacted with low status groups in his own era.

Burakumin, to the extent that they remain followers of Shin Buddhist sects, have never been able to view the tradition unambiguously. It is neither good nor

bad, neither egalitarian nor discriminatory—it is both. What we find in the writings of *buraku* activists who are also Shin followers, such as Saikō Mankichi (1895-1970) and the early Leveler's Society executive, is a division of the tradition into two parts: an exploitative and discriminatory order (*kyōdan*), with its decorated priests, and the *burakumin* as "chosen people" (*senmin* 選民)—a play on words with the homonym "low status people" (*senmin* 賤民). Even if the institution was corrupt, they held that the teaching of Shinran was not. If the institution was a source of oppression, the teaching of Shinran was a source of strength, liberation, and solidarity for *buraku* communities. In this view, the *burakumin* have a special relationship with the founder, a special faith, and a duty to transmit the true, egalitarian and liberative teachings of Shinran back to the corrupt Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha orders (*kyōdan*). Here Shin Buddhism is both a cause and a cure for discrimination—a position maintained by splitting the institution from the "essence" of Shin Buddhism, the essence which is possessed by, and embodied by, *burakumin*.

However, *burakumin* were further divided in their views. What exactly needed to change about the Ōtani-ha order? Some *burkumin* factions exercised new freedoms to participate in the modern order (*kyōdan*), the institution that represented Shinran's teaching in this world. These groups actively sought to improve their rank within temple and priestly hierarchies, and paid large sums of money to do so.[10] Others, often influenced by leftist thought, condemned hierarchy itself. They harshly criticized elite priests and administrators at the top of unjust hierarchies, who benefited disproportionately from the labor and

---

[10] The split between the two main views is most clear in the case of the hierarchical temple and priestly ranking system (*jikaku dōhan* 寺格堂班). Some felt, for example, that the system should be abolished. Others saw no problem with the system so long as temples could participate in it freely.

donations of ordinary followers, including *burakumin*.

When discrimination, or discriminatory incidents (*sabetsu jiken*), occurred within the Ōtani-ha order, *burakumin* were willing to protest.[11] When the preacher Ryūge made his remarks in 1902, it sparked one of the largest, most widespread *buraku* protests that had occurred since the beginning of the modern period. Because *burakumin* groups tended to be endogamous, Shin Buddhist networks overlapped significantly with *burakumin* marriage, kinship, and translocal networks. Shin Buddhism was thus intimately tied to *burakumin* group solidarity (KBS 2:125).[12] This unique connection allowed *buraku* communities to effectively protest[13] against discrimination in Shin Buddhism. In turn, protest strengthened networks of *buraku* Shin followers.

Shin Buddhist institutions and *buraku* advocacy groups developed in interaction. Perhaps it is best to say they developed in interaction *and opposition* to one another through the medium of discriminatory incidents (*sabetsu jiken*) and protest. As Shin sects attempted to modernize, restructure, and expand into new kinds of social participation,[14] they overlapped and interacted with *burakumin* when they dispatched preachers to *buraku* for moral uplift and exhortation, for fundraising and to perform charitable work. As *buraku* communities modernized, they reacted strongly when their temples, priests, and practitioners interacted

---

[11] They were increasingly involved in sect administration, for example, protesting the Honganji-ha head priest over a plan to move the head temple to Tokyo in the late 1870s (KBS 2:125).

[12] KBS describes a type of solidarity that is ironic and ambiguous. As *buraku* temples struggled to raise their status, they went into debt and made many sacrifices. Without Shin faith, *burakumin* would have had no solidarity. With Shin faith, *burakumin* had another factor increasing their poverty and hardship.

[13] Shimahara (1984, 341) called these "spontaneous protest movements" in response to discriminatory incidents. They did not lead to a formal, nation-wide organization until the early 1920s.

[14] For the Ōtani-ha this included explicit support and participation in government colonial initiatives in Hokkaido, financing the Meiji government, negotiating marriage connections with the imperial family, working to resist Christianity and Christian groups in Japan, wide participation in preaching and chaplaincy—in prisons, factories, the military, impoverished areas and *buraku* areas, as well as hospitals (ONP).

ritually and administratively with the head temple and other Ōtani-ha temples. These interactions were punctuated by protest and opposition, especially when *buraku* communities saw these interactions as prejudiced, exploitative, and unfair.

Burakumin struggled with the issue of how to express new freedoms: within old structures or new structures? *Buraku* temples displayed active and enthusiastic participation in the temple and priestly status system. Yet, that system placed a heavier economic burden on them than other groups (at a time when most *burakumin* lived in severe poverty).[15] As socialist and anarchist thought flourished in the 1910s and 1920s, two new options appeared: (1) reject Shin Buddhism and religion altogether as an exploitative tool of power (as Takahashi Sadakichi advocated); or (2) pursue a thorough rejection of hierarchy, whether feudal or capitalist, within the sect (as Saikō Mankichi recommended). Shin was at the same time discriminatory and exploitative, as well as a source of motivation, of doctrine for protest ideologies, and of concrete social networks. This tension appears over and over again in factions within *buraku* follower communities.

Taking on the Ōtani-ha's elite priests: incidents and interaction

For many *burakumin* groups, the new modern era meant that avenues previously closed, were now open. In 1876, the "Platform for Regulations of the [Shin] School" (*Shūki kōryō* 宗規綱領), a joint plan for modernizing sect regulations, was agreed upon by the four main Shin sects of the time, including the Ōtani-ha. It eliminated the "trunk-and-branch temple system" (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度), linking all temples directly to the head temple. A direct link to the head temple was, in effect, an increase in prestige. Barriers to increasing temple rank were also eliminated,

---

[15] The 1920s Suiheisha focused heavily on this religious economic discrimination. Within one month of their official founding, the Suiheisha had delivered demands to the Ōtani-ha requesting that they cease asking for donations in *buraku* areas.

and so too were rules that treated *burakumin* followers differently. By eliminating the premodern hierarchy, the new Ōtani-ha regulations created a structure similar to that of the new Japanese state: all followers and temples were equally linked to the head temple and head priest just as all citizens were equally subjects of the emperor. But, as argued in previous chapters, the modern nation-state itself structured discrimination against the *burakumin*. As older structures were abolished, discrimination would appear in new forms.

The changes outlined by the plan have led Mōri Yū (1987, 75) to call the *Shūki kōryō* an "Emancipation Edict" for *burakumin* inside Shin sects. He argues that becoming directly linked to the head temple in the early Meiji period, enabled *burakumin* to challenge discrimination twenty later during the late Meiji. I wonder if it is not also possible that these challenges might have come earlier if the power of intermediary temples, and the organization of *buraku* temples around them, had not been ended so abruptly. If we examine the historical details, the new Ōtani-ha structural changes had at least two negative consequences for *burakumin*. First, by eliminating the temple hierarchy, those intermediate temples that acted as patrons for large numbers of *buraku* temples suddenly lost their financial foundation and their potential to represent and rally *buraku* temples as a group. *Buraku* temples, ironically, gained prestige and autonomy but lost power in becoming directly linked to the head temple.

In this new Ōtani-ha order, *buraku* temples were hypothetically able to participate in ritual in the same way as all but the most elite temples and priests. *Buraku* temple priests could take ordination inside the head temple and attend Ōtani-ha educational institutions. *Buraku* followers could have their offerings received in the same way as other temples. *Burakumin* could enter temples and not be charged fifty percent more for the same interaction with the receiving priest or

head priest. Moreover, *buraku* temples were able to raise their priestly and temple status in proportion to monetary donations—as other temples did.[16]

They did pay to raise their status.[17] During the Meiji and Taisho periods, there was intense competition between *buraku* temples to found temples and raise temple and priestly status. By entering the temple ranking system alongside other Ōtani-ha temples, *buraku* temples were able, for the first time, to see their temple rank increase in accordance with their monetary donations of gratitude. Hierarchy among temples was transformed from one of status to one of wealth with most temple and priestly ranks available for sale. Discrimination still existed in this capitalized system (as it did within capitalism generally) since *buraku* temples began at the lowest ranks and with the fewest economic resources. There was a similar capitalization of occupations formerly monopolized by *burakumin*, such as butchery and leather goods. *Burakumin* suddenly had to compete with other groups, and saw their economic fortunes worsen drastically during the Meiji period. The structure of discrimination became economic even as feudal and status forms of discrimination were eliminated. Many *buraku* temples and their followers went into debt to raise their temple rank at a time when they faced severe economic hardship. Regardless of what the motivation of individuals or groups was to raise temple and priestly rank, they did so at greater cost with fewer resources.

If the head temple stood in their way, however, *buraku* temples and followers demonstrated that they were not willing to endure exclusion inside Ōtani-ha sect

---

[16] According to KBS (1:415) attempts to raise status were blocked by the resistance of other temples during the early modern period.

[17] The KBS (2:122, 125) gives many examples of *buraku* temples going into debt to raise their status during the Meiji and Taisho periods.

structure. In 1881, the "Temple Status Raising Discriminatory Incident" (*Jikaku shōkai sabetsu jiken* 寺格昇階差別事件) (DBS 1: 22-27) saw *buraku* followers take the head priest to court. In 1879, a particular *buraku* temple from Shiga prefecture applied to have its status raised by two ranks. Although this was very costly, the temple priest, lay representatives, and followers felt that raising their status was desirable. A small group travelled to Kyoto to submit their application in person. For two years, however, they received no news. In 1881, they applied a second time, receiving the Ōtani-ha head temple's verbal permission for raising their temple status. But again, no official confirmation was forthcoming. The *buraku* temple representatives learned that their application had stalled because they were an "extremely defiled temple" (*etadera*). Very angered, the temple group brought suit against the head priest in the Nishikyō courts. Hastily, the head temple decided to allow the change in status.

Resisting charity and paternalistic action

During the early 1900s, Shin Buddhist sects gradually developed a variety of charitable and moral exhortation (*kyōka*) projects. What began as the isolated efforts of volunteers slowly became a centralized and organized effort to fundraise and mobilize interested priests and followers to work on various projects. *Burakumin* communities also display an increasing organization, communication, and centralization. While the government and Shin Buddhist sects feared a popular uprising led by *burakumin* and urban and rural poor, *burakumin*, for their part, were extremely sensitive to unequal treatment within Shin Buddhism. Both sides were developing ways to try and convince or goad the other into what they percieved as meaningful and moral reform. By the end of the 1910s, the "special *buraku*" (*tokushu buraku* 特殊部落) were recognized as appropriate recipients of charity (*jizen*), religio-moral suasion (*kyōka*), and special preaching (*tokushu*

fukyō) provided by the Shin Buddhist sects. *Buraku* followers, however, were growing resentful of the patronizing and arrogant treatment many received as targets of this kind of sect activity.

Ōtani-ha administrative policy looked on charitable giving as the best way to alleviate the effects of discrimination in the *buraku*. Ōtani Eishō (大谷瑩韶, 1886-1962), known by his aristocratic Buddhist name, Senchō-in 宣暢院, the fifth son of the twenty-second head priest, was very active in sectarian attempts to address poverty and discrimination (SJJ 52). He studied in the sectarian school system and abroad in America in the early 1910s.[18] After his return to Japan in 1915, he became an influential leader in children's care and education, the official Ōtani-ha representative in both secular and religious charitable work (particularly the Ōtani-ha's Charitable Association, Jizen Kyōkai 慈善協会, 1911-1918),[19] and a government consultant[20] on committees for the improvement of impoverished and marginalized groups, namely the *burakumin*.[21] He sought to address the ill effects of discrimination and economic modernization on the *burakumin* in the style of the early twentieth century: top-down "charitable" (*jizen*) and "salvation" or "relief" (*kyūsai*) movements.

A marriage for Mr. Senchō-in

Burakumin advocates clashed with Shin Buddhist sects on a variety of issues:

---

[18] This was a time when the settlement movement was gaining popularity as the solution to social problems in the face of a growing critique of charitable organizations (Izumi 2003, 57–59; SJJ 52).

[19] Much of this was directly related to *buraku* discrimination, for example, the Sympathy and Brotherhood Society (Dōjō Yūai Kai 同情友愛会).

[20] He served on government consultative committees and councils (like the Relief Work Investigative Commission (Kyūsai Jigyō Chōsa Kai 救済事業調査会)). Was important during the National Charitable Work Congress (Zenkoku Jizen Jigyō Taikai 全国慈善事業大会) meetings held in Nagoya, Osaka, and Kyoto during the 1910s (SJJ 52).

[21] Representatives of both the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha were invited to join the Buraku Improvement Council (Buraku Kaizen Kyōgikai 部落改善協議会), under the auspices of the Home Ministry. Articles debating this involvement appeared in the *Chūgai nippō* during the early months of 1919 (DBS 1:215ff.).

temple hierarchies, participation in religious activities, charitable work in the *buraku*, fundraising, doctrinal interpretation, and so on. They vented their frustrations in the popular press, and popular Buddhist press, especially the *Chūgai nippō* 中外日報. A scathing and satirical critique of the Ōtani-ha appeared as a letter to the editor, published in the *Chūgai nippō*, on February 7, 1919. The author wrote under an assumed name, from the standpoint of a *burakumin*. By the year 1919, the Ōtani-ha had specifically identified *burakumin* in Kyoto as targets of "special preaching" (*tokushu fukyō* 特殊布教). This most often meant the dispatch of preachers to the villages in question in order to exhort their residents with Shin teachings. There is evidence of *burakumin* having mixed reactions since 1910 to these special preaching activities and to the interference of priests. In this case, our anonymous author took a dim and ironic view of the compassionate activities of Ōtani Eishō, here called Mr. Senchō-in.[22] In, "A Recommendation to Reside Permanently in Yanagihara: Letter to Mr. Senchō-in,"[23] the author wrote:

> What I really want to discuss with Mr. Senchō-in is his recent, clamorous leadership of *buraku*[24] improvement (*kaizen*). Experienced [scholars] have already performed study after study on *buraku* improvement. So many, in fact, that those in the know admitted long ago that, *as research*, all that can be done has been done. The flaw is simply that no one has tried to put this research into practice. Many of our readers continue to believe that if one puts today's research into practice, that which proves effective will become tomorrow's

---

[22] See Izumi (2003) for a discussion of Ōtani Eishō's activities and role within the Ōtani-ha. On February 25, a similar proposal for Ōtani Eishō to marry a *burakumin* woman was delivered to him at the newly-founded Sympathy and Reconciliation Congress (Dōjō Yūwa Taikai 同情融和大会), reported in the March 2 issue of the *Chūgai nippō* (DBS 1:230). On March 6, 7, and 8, another series of articles (DBS 1: 670-672). And, on March 7, an interview about the "marriage issue" with Mr. Senchō-in himself (DBS 1:232-233).

[23] *Senchōin e no Yanagihara eijū kankoku no tōsho keisai* 宣暢院への柳原永住勧告の投書掲載. Yanagihara is a Kyoto urban *buraku* area. See also DBS (1:221-222).

[24] The original text reads *misshū buraku* 密集部落. While *burakumin* and *hisabetsu buraku* (lit. "village people" and "discriminated against villages") are nominally accepted terms, *misshū buraku* and *tokushu buraku* (lit. "crowded villages" and "special villages") were controversial in the prewar period, and considered extremely offensive in the postwar period.

reality. If asked, I would say that there is fortune to be found within Mr. Senchō-in's misfortune of being a single man without a marriage prospect. Since he ought to practice his long-cherished ideals and principles, I would like to recommend that he welcome a wife from the *buraku*. If he can do this, he would not merely conclude a marriage engagement with the *buraku*; he would make his permanent residence in this *buraku*, would truly live together with *burakumin* under the same roof, and lead them with his very body. By this act of body, he would ease the feelings of contempt that outsiders have towards *burakumin*—at long last! I humbly recommend this truly self-sacrificing act. I believe that all the male relatives of the Ōtani-ha head priest (*renshi*), [like Mr. Senchō-in], will surely receive this proposal with delight. (KBS 2:574-575)

This excellent bit of political and religious humor suggests much that was believed to be wrong with the Shin Buddhist sects, including their efforts to address *buraku* discrimination in the late 1910s. Shin Buddhism was a specific target in the growing resistance to charitable and improvement activities undertaken on behalf of the *burakumin*. The letter referred to cohabitation, commensality, and consanguinity through the symbol of marriage. It is avoidance of these that have proven to be the most persistent forms of discrimination against *burakumin*. Women, another vulnerable group subject to systematic discrimination, appear as the marriage partner, a character within the back and forth between *burakumin* and Ōtani-ha elite. (Despite the sophistication of the satire with respect to *buraku* discrimination, the same sophistication is lacking with respect to women.) It played on the common knowledge that low status had been legally eliminated and the common sentiment that discrimination was ideologically and ethically unfashionable.

The letter also referred to the official activities of the Ōtani-ha where the *buraku* were specific targets of religious preaching and charitable activities. These activities were increasingly criticized as inherently hierarchical and patronizing. It addressed the highest of high status within the Ōtani-ha. Senchō-in was a *renshi*, a

male relative of the head priest (*hossu*). Specifically, he was younger brother to the head priest, Ōtani Kōei (大谷光瑩, 1852-1923), or Gennyo (現如). The Ōtani family not only controlled a powerful Buddhist sect, but also had aristocratic status and marriage ties with the imperial family. Devotion to the head priest and his high status was, of course, often blamed for hierarchical and discriminatory structures in the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha, publically, in newspapers and magazines like the Buddhist newspaper, *Chūgai nippō*. The *Chūgai nippō* was widely read, and a typical site where both sides published articles, accusations, and advertised their activities—and where Senchō-in published his response to the marriage proposal.[25]

Saikō Mankichi vs. Ōtani Eishō (or Senchō-in)

Senchō-in, *renshi* and younger brother of the head priest, was again challenged by *buraku* advocates in the early 1920s. He was involved in a somewhat legendary encounter with a *burakumin* Shin priest, Saikō Mankichi (1895-1970), who publically clashed with Ōtani Eishō (大谷瑩韶, 1886-1962) at a meeting of the Equality Society (Byōdō Kai 平等会) in February of 1922 (Neary 1989, 67).

Saikō Mankichi was a *burakumin*, born into a Shin Buddhist temple family affiliated with the Honganji-ha. He later became a priest, painter, and poet—but his primary vocation was political activism. He was a founding member of the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha) and author of some of its most important documents. The Levelers' Society (1922-1942) was the first sustained, national organization for the liberation of the *burakumin* by the *burakumin*, a movement started by a

---

[25] Eishō said that, if it were up to him alone, he would marry a *burakumin* woman. Since marriage is a matter of karmic connections (*en*), if it was his "karma" to take a *burakumin* wife, he would. However, Eishō also expressed the disapproval of his parents and that his marriage was not an individual matter, but a matter for the whole sect (DBS 1:232-233).

young, educated, Marxist-inspired group from the Kansai-area. Saikō himself was exceptionally active in 1920s Marxist, socialist, and labor movements for the liberation of the urban and rural working classes before his arrest in 1928.[26] In addition to Saikō, several early Levelers' Society leaders were known for their Shin faith, such as Sakamoto Seiichirō (阪本清一郎, 1892-1987) and Kurisu Shichirō (栗須七郎, 1882-1950).

Reportedly, Saikō and Senchō-in somehow ended up onstage at the same time at the February 1922 meeting of the Equality Society, and had a very public exchange of words—but there are a few versions of exactly what was said (Murakoshi 1982, 32-33; Morooka 1992, 39-43, Fukuda 1985, 93-95).[27] In every version, however, both Saikō and Senshō-in represent true Shin Buddhism as egalitarian in the way that moderns understand: that it is incompatible with feudal and caste-like discrimination between people—that is, incompatible with *buraku* discrimination. Senchō-in saw himself as part of the solution, engaging in activities on behalf of the Ōtani-ha that attempt to realize equality in society as founder-figures like Shinran and Rennyo (蓮如, 1415-1499) would have wanted. Saikō, on the other hand, saw Senchō-in as part of the problem: a paternalistic elite, an aristocrat whose very status is a betrayal of Shinran. Saikō asserts, in this encounter and elsewhere, that it is the *buraku* followers that understand true Shin Buddhism.

---

[26] Morooka (1992) and Izumi (1981). His activities ended abruptly when he was arrested in connection with the May 15th Incident of 1928, spent 5 years in prison, and recanted (*tenkō* 転向) his Marxist affiliations.

[27] The Equality Society (Byōdō Kai 平等会) held the Great Japanese Conference on Eliminating Discrimination Against Our Brothers (Dai Nihon Dōhō Sabetsu Teppai Taikai 大日本同胞差別撤廃大会) in Osaka, February 1922. Stories based on the recollections of Suiheisha founders collected after the war with a few authors reporting a similar incident (Fukuda 1985). In Murakoshi's version the master of ceremonies, Mori Shūji (森秀次, 1855-1926), brings up Rennyo's mother to point out that he and the two male relatives of the head priest (*renshi* 連枝) from the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha have the same blood.

As the story goes, Saikō was at the meeting with several colleagues to promote the Levelers' Society one month before its official launch. It is unclear, but either Senchō-in or the master of ceremonies, Mori Shūji (森秀次, 1855-1926), mentioned Rennyo's mother. Rennyo was an illegitimate child, a blood descendent of Shinran, eighth head priest, and responsible for transforming the large Shin sects—still a single sect in his day—into large and powerful organizations. Little is known about his mother, leading some to speculate that she might have been of extremely low status and perhaps related to the premodern forbearers of the modern *burakumin*. While speaking to the assembled crowd, Senchō-in stated that if Rennyo's mother was of low status then he is a brother to the *burakumin*—and not the least bit ashamed of that fact—so he speaks as a *burakumin*. "If my ancestor was an *eta* woman, I am also an *eta*." Saikō replies that Senchō-in is an aristocrat through and through: "You say that due to causes and conditions (*innen* 因縁) from Rennyo's mother, you are an *eta*. I am also a real *eta* from Nara prefecture. People treat you as a living buddha (*ikibotoke* 生き仏) and worship your feet. I am the same *eta* yet they spit at mine." Even though they might both be of low status by blood, Saikō points out that Senchōin is worshipped while he is spat upon. Saikō continued, "We might be the same *eta*, but I wish I was an *eta* like you that people treated with dignity (*songen* 尊厳)."[28] Saikō's colleagues Minami Umekichi (南梅吉, 1877-1947) and Komai Kisaku (駒井喜作, 1897-1945) took the opportunity to dump Levelers' Society pamphlets from the auditorium balcony.

Saikō Mankichi: identifying the pure and corrupt aspects of a tradition

For *buraku* followers of Shin Buddhism, their faith is simultaneously cause and cure. The experience of poverty, exclusion, or hardship in the biographies of

---

[28] Based on Yoneda Tomi's (米田富, 1901-1988) recollections (Fukuda 1985, 94-95).

religious figures, accounts of solidarity with peoples of low status, and egalitarian interpretations of doctrine and social order have come to play a role in the self-understanding of *buraku* followers of religion. This situation of simultaneous oppression and liberation by one and the same Shin Buddhism is clearly conveyed in the pamphlets and popular writings of the early Levelers' Society founders, including Saikō Mankichi.[29]

Saikō Mankichi was born[30] in 1895 to a Honganji-ha Shin Buddhist temple in a *hisabetsu buraku* area in Nara prefecture. He went on to become an artist, playwright, priest, and political activist.[31] He was highly critical of the Shin Buddhist orders, yet freely combined Shin Buddhist thought with a transnational set of influences.[32] He employed all of his religious and artistic inclinations in service of his dominant vocation: political activist. Saikō would sell his plays—or

---

[29] One powerful symbol of the ambiguity Saikō felt was the painting "Destroy Shakamuni" (*Kishaku* 毀釈) completed around 1960 as an item for sale to support Saikō's postwar crusade for a pacifist Japan (after his fascist and imperialist wartime period). It is a self portrait, recalling the nineteenth century official and popular suppression of Buddhism in Japan called *haibutsu kishaku* and similar paintings of a popular Zen story of the monk Tanka burning a wooden buddha for warmth. Bringing all of these components together, Saikō here is the old monk destroying a Buddhist altar in an act against an institutional Buddhism viewed as feudal, superstitious, and anti-modern. The true monk is someone who, when warmth and light is needed, does what is necessary to produce it. Yet, it is the altar of his home he is burning, the place where his family has served, and the place that he took as his name. Saikō is warming his hands with the heat of its burning, but turns his face away from the fire (Morooka 1992, 203-205; Saikō 1990).

[30] His birth name was Kiyohara Kazutaka 清原一隆.

[31] Saikō is also one of several figures, like Seno'o Girō (妹尾義郎, 1882-1950) from the Nichiren school, active during the Japanese Interwar period to whom I attach the somewhat clunky label "Buddhist Marxist humanist." See the work of Large (1987) and Lai (1984). After his incarceration in 1928 and recanting (*tenkō* 転向) of Marxism, Saikō went through other ideological phases: drifting to the political right, he participatedin nationalist movements and writing pro-imperialist pamphlets. After the war, he vigorously argued for pacifism, that Japan should protect its "peace constitution," and turn the Japanese "self-defense force" into a "peace corps." Saikō compared the youth who would belong to this army of service "brave *bodhisattvas*" (Morooka 1992, 199; Izumi 1981).

[32] Saikō drew from Russian literary revolutionaries like Maksim Gorky, French humanists like Romain Rolland, as well as Kropotkin and Bakunin, Marx and Engels—the list continues. He also read the writings and translations of leading Japanese socialists, anarchists, and syndicalists, such as Kōtoku Shūsui (幸徳秋水, 1871-1911), Ōsugi Sakae (大杉栄, 1885-1923), Sakai Toshihiko (堺利彦, 1871-1933), Yamakawa Hitoshi (山川均, 1880-1958), and Sano Manabu (1892-1953). See the scholars Kitakawa Tetsuo (北川鉄夫, 1907-1992) and Matsumoto Kappei (松本克平, 1906-1995) for a more complete list of Saikō's influences.

borrow money which he paid back in paintings—all to finance his campaigns for issues such as the liberation, in the Marxist sense, of the *burakumin*.

Saikō's works are pervaded by pathos or sorrow (Fujii 1976, 43). Saikō felt sorrow and despair intensely, and attempted or contemplated suicide at several points during his life (Morooka 1992, 5). This sorrow came mainly from the discrimination he suffered as *burakumin*[33] and he inflected Shin Buddhist themes such that the dignity, equality, and solidarity of humanity are known through the negative experience of being *dehumanized*, exemplified by the suffering, poverty, exile, and isolation of an emphatically *human* founder figure, Shinran.[34] He rejected the Shin Buddhist orders (*kyōdan*) that "follow" Shinran, and argued that only by "walking with" Shinran through darkness and despair can one liberate the *burakumin*, emancipate the working class, and teach others true Buddhism.

Saikō handled the problem of religion by separating its corrupt, oppressive, institutional aspects from what he viewed as its true essence, but something tragic and ambiguous that remains in the portrayal. His creative works especially appear to be straightforward at first glance, but themes of revolutionary struggle or discrimination in Buddhist mythology[35] are complicated by characters with overlapping identities and unclear motivations that often end in tragedy.

In his poetry, newspaper articles, and pamphlets, Saikō began to outline a

---

[33] At each school he attended, including the Honganji-ha Shin Buddhist school, his status as *burakumin* was "discovered." He was segregated from the other students and treated harshly. To escape this situation, he spent many days in nearby libraries, lost in reading. At this time, Saikō describes how he "painted less and read more. From the *Tannishō* transmitting Shinran faith to Marx's *Communist Manifesto*, I read many different texts" (Izumi 1981, 95).

[34] Around 1920 there was a "Shinran boom." Between his Shin Buddhist upbringing and education, the publication of Kurata Hyakuzō's "*Shukke to sono deshi*," Akegarasu Haya's "*Mugedō*," and the *Tannishō*, Saikō had many sources for his portrayal of Shinran (Morooka 1992, 23).

[35] See in particular the plays, "Pure Fire" (*Jōka* 浄火) and "King Biruri" (*Biruriō* ビルリ王) (Morooka 1992, 63-65; Fowler 2004).

process of liberation. Using metaphors of light and temperature, Saikō contrasted the dark, cold nightmare of alienation and oppression experienced by *burakumin*, the working classes, and tenant farmers, with the warmth and light of a world where these people would be free, equal, and their inherent value as human beings, respected. One of Saikō's most quoted lines, the last sentence of the *Leveler's Society Declaration*, refers specifically to this utopian vision: "Let there be warmth in human society; let there be light for all human beings." In another line, he radically reclaims the identity of the "extremely defiled" (*eta*):

> Now, the time has come when we human beings, pulsing with this blood, are soon to regain our divine dignity. The time has come for the victims to throw off their stigma. The time has come from the blessing of the martyrs' crown of thorns. The time has come when we can be proud of being *eta*. (reprinted in Neary 2009, 67).

The crucial point for understanding Saikō's thought, however, is that only those who pass through the dark night of oppression are able to realize this utopian vision that is at once Marxist, humanist, and Shin Buddhist.

In a poem entitled, "Draw near the bell,"[36] submitted to a *buraku* youth association magazine, Saikō uses the metaphor of light, together with that of the "narrow path" to the pure land, and presents Shinran as a companion and guide.[37] Saikō begins the poem with a bell ringing out in darkness. The bell is glorious, sounding of wakefulness, clarity, love, freedom, comfort, joy, and gratitude. Before the listener attains the promise of the bell, which Saikō calls a "human pure land" (*ningen no jōdo* 人間の浄土), the sound of the bell drives the listener into pain,

---

[36] *Kane ni yosete* 鐘によせて. Poem appeared in a 1921 issue of *Warning Bell* (*Keishō* 警鐘) (Morooka 1992, 36-37).
[37] This poem, like many of Saikō other writings also contain Christian imagery. He is especially fascinated with Lucifer, the morning star.

confusion, and hell along a narrow and treacherous path. It is in this dark place of pain that Shinran "practices with you" until reaching the pure land beyond. The pure land here is a utopian vision of human society and not a transcendent, posthumous destiny.

The pamphlets written by Saikō and his colleagues, the 1921 pamphlet, "For a Better Day,"[38] and 1922 pamphlet, "To the Shin Followers in the Buraku!",[39] distributed to *burakumin* across the country in order to spur them into action, contain further images of this Shinran and the special relation of the *burakumin* with him. In the pamphlet, "For a Better Day," Saikō rejects the view of karma and destiny taught by Shin Buddhist institutions, identified as the "disciples" (*deshi* 弟子) of Shinran in order to highlight and criticize their hierarchical organization. This false view of destiny must be corrected by the *burakumin,* who are the "fellow practitioners" (*dōgyō* 同行) of Shinran, a term emphasizing that *burakumin* are equal to and in solidarity with him. Saikō urges *burakumin* not to give in and resign themselves to wait until death for some kind of reprieve. The true destiny of the *burakumin* is to live and to struggle against oppression. Those who struggle bravely will find that the narrow path—with a river of fire on the one side and a river of water on the other—opens up into an infinite road without obstruction (*mugedō* 無碍道) with the sun of a better day shining on the far side.

Early Leveler's Society pamphleteering: *To the Shin Followers in the Buraku!*

Other early Levelers' Society members echoed Saikō's critique of Shin Buddhist institutions. The founding group, likely with Minami Umekichi (南梅吉, 1877-1947) taking a leading role, produced a pamphlet in 1922 to encourage

---

[38] *Yoki hi no tame ni* よき日の為に (GS 5-11).
[39] *Burakunai no montoshū e* 部落内の門徒衆へ! (GS 17-18).

burakumin to stop donating money to Shin Buddhist institutions, entitled "To the Shin Followers in the *Buraku*!"[40] Here, too, a Shinran that practices with the oppressed, in their darkness and suffering, is fleshed out:

> We have been scorned by the people of the world, their offensive voices calling out "extremely defiled (*eta*)!" or "special (*tokushu* 特殊)!" We have not been treated like human beings—even by our fellow followers (*monto* 門徒) of Shinran.[41] If it is left like this, nothing will change, regardless of how many decades and centuries pass. Therefore, we have begun a movement to eliminate this loathsome discrimination, the Levelers' Society. It is our primary task to become more powerful so that we are able to lead lives of dignity.
>
> Although there are many methods to achieve this aim, we must first humbly request that the two Hongan-ji temples, [the Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha], who are like parents to us, *stop taking any money from us for a twenty year period*. We would use that very capital to increase our power in the world. Is it acceptable that the Shin sects carry away huge amounts of offerings (*konshi* 懇志) from us, given our current circumstances? Is it acceptable while we suffer, treated as if we were the people from an enemy nation? How much closer would we come to what Shinran wanted for us if we quickly eliminated this offensive discrimination, if we were called true (*shinjitsu* 真実) fellow practitioners and companions (*dogyō dōbō* 同行同朋), and if we were able to freely associate with anyone!
>
> We have already communicated these things to both Hongan-ji temples, [the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha]. People with means and people with little have kept company with us and agreed with our purpose. It is our fervent hope that in the end this very camaraderie between one human being and another will create a dignified, warm world from out of this world of discrimination where we are at one anothers' throats.

---

40 Izumi Shigeki, personal correspondence, July 21, 2010. In the late 1980s, Mooroka Sukeyuki and several others held a seminar on Saikō Mankichi at Ōtani University. The group felt that the pamphlet released in the name of the Leveler's Society (Suiheisha) was similar to known works of Saikō in its content, but word use and style suggested a different author, perhaps the first executive committee director, Minami Umekichi (南梅吉, 1877-1947).

41 Indicated by the founder epithet, "mountain-opener" (*kaisan* 開山).

Suppose Shinran had been ordained and lived all his days as an ordinary monk? We would not even know that we had received his precious compassion, let alone know his name. But Shinran [did not stay a monk,] he was a foolish being (*bonbu*) like us. How Shinran, too, must have longed for an easy, peaceful life! The very moment he realized the wondrous fact that *every single wretched foolish being is equally a child of the Buddha's compassion*—that was the very moment he was burdened with the same misery that all foolish beings feel. Truly [at that moment] he was pulled inexorably [out of the monastery], desiring from the very bottom of his heart to join hands with his fellow practitioners and companions. And so he wandered without even a home, in the eat-or-be-eaten world.

At his life's end in the capital, without a single relative to care for him, he drew his decrepit body to the desolate house of a fellow practitioner. His last words were that the ashes of his body should be washed away by the waters of the Kamo River. If we think on how Shinran must have felt up until his lonely [death,] his birth in the pure land (*ōjō* 往生), we surely cannot stand cruelly and shamelessly (*musan muki*) silent without even trying to see what we ourselves might accomplish? Surely we cannot flee to a halfhearted repentance (*zange* 懺悔), nor toy with Amida's name (*nenbutsu*)? If we have received the precious gift that all are equally children of the Buddha's compassion, if there is to be no irrational discrimination between fellow practitioners and companions, then there should be no loathsome hatred [between people]. But to know that such hatred persists to the present, even 700 years after the time of Shinran, shows that those who are *called* "fellow practitioners and companions," are not the [true] fellow practitioners of Shinran—a man who wore black robes (*kokue* 黒衣) and worldly clothes, who used a stone for a pillow, and who labored for us with blood and tears. [Those who hate] are the "fellow practitioners" who buy and sell the chanting of *nenbutsu*, who adorn themselves in colorful and gold embroidered robes,[42] [those elite priests of the Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha].

If we are going to chant something carelessly, [it should not be the *nenbutsu*]. It would be impossible to find the lightness of spirit required to sing the *nenbutsu*

---

42 *shikie ya kinran no kesa* 色衣や金欄の袈裟.

as if it were a popular song—the *nenbutsu*!—the *nenbutsu*, upon which [Shinran], in the midst of a horrible situation where lives were being lost, staked his own life, saying "hell will be my true home,"[43] in this world and the world to come. Truly, we cannot take the *nenbutsu* lightly.

On this point, we have thought exhaustively. We must revere the true form of the fellow practitioner [not those false ones that discriminate, interested in money and colored robes].

From the time Shinran was exiled from his beloved capital as a criminal with all his clothing torn from his body, even his black robes, to the time he returned to the capital with crimes forgiven to die in its gutters—within the *nenbutsu* he embraced those who make shoes (*kutsu tsukuri* 沓造), who were despised as [lowly and polluted] inhuman (*hinin*), as revered fellow practitioners and companions without any discrimination whatsoever. Although Shinran mistakenly believed that he was evil,[44] before his compassion we cannot help but devote our bodies and hearts to him. Shinran is our true fellow practitioner. We are Shinran's true companions.

When we are together with our companion [Shinran]—even unto hell—we are strong! We drive the naked blade forward to its very hilt. We are not fooled by gold embroidered robes. Before us, all people are the children of the Buddha's compassion.

These hundreds of buddha halls, these thousands of grand temples, all built with money bullied out of *our* fellow practitioners and companions. How can they be thought precious? How can they repay [the Buddha's] benevolence? It need not be said that these are the merits [pursued] by those of a self-power (*jiriki*) disposition [and not the other power (*tariki* 他力) of our faith]. Those of us who are fellow practitioners of the founder cannot hide in repentance, and do not use our own evil[45] as a shield [to justify inaction]. Together we

---

43 Reference to *A Record in Lament of Divergences* (*Tannishō,* CWS 1:662; *Seiten* 627). Shinran explained that hell is his true home because he is an evil person (*akunin*) incapable of performing good karmic action and attaining liberation from the rounds of rebirth.

44 Literally: "misunderstood himself to be cruel and shameless (*musan muki* 無慚無愧)." That is, Shinran believed himself to be evil and not worthy.

45 As with Shinran above, literally: "we will quit using cruelty and shamelessness (*musan muki*) as a shield." Belief in one's own evil does not justify a refusal to act for social change.

must create a world where we can live in friendship with our fellow practitioners and companions. This would be a true repayment of benevolence. A companion should never say that such a world is impossible.

This pamphlet clearly splits followers of Shin Buddhism into the true and the false. False companions believe in hierarchy and its symbols, the "colored and gold embroidered robes." False companions treat the *nenbutsu* as a commodity to be bought and sold, siphoning money from those least able to pay it. True companions live as Shinran did: in misery, homelessness, exile, and isolation. It is this Shinran that truly sees that all beings are equal, all precious, and all recipients of Amida Buddha's compassion. True companions desire to live equally with others. Those *burakumin* who walk with Shinran must struggle to change the world, teach true Buddhism back to hierarchical Buddhist institutions, and make equality and dignity a reality. In this telling, Shinran belongs with those whose humanity has been stripped by a discrimination that combines capitalist economy and feudal, hierarchical forms of Buddhism.

Conclusion: an ambiguous identity

For members of the Ōtani-ha, accepting historical responsibility for discrimination and a critical view of the order (*kyōdan*) itself as discriminatory, meant accepting some view of themselves as evil. It meant splitting the Shin tradition clearly into the discriminators (the order) and the discriminated-against (*burakumin*), as well, splitting Shin Buddhism into a pure essence represented by Shinran, and a corrupt institution, which had deviated from this essence. However, if those in positions of institutional power were to constantly consider their own discriminatory ways, and strive to be open to being taught by the *burakumin*, this conveniently excludes *burakumin* from the order itself. Yoshida Shō (吉田證, b. 1925), a *burakumin*, Ōtani-ha *buraku* temple priest, a professor and lecturer on issues of discrimination, member of both the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy's Department for the Promotion of

Assimilation (Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部) and the independent Council of Temples Related to Assimilation (Dōkankyō), condemns this split of the Ōtani-ha into two sides. He points out that the logic of order-as-discriminator inherently overlooks discriminated-against members of the Ōtani-ha. It does not provide them with language to express their experience within the order.

PART III Engaging *buraku* discrimination: the priest-bureaucrat

5 Takeuchi Ryō'on's career in Buddhist middle-management

Social work (*shakai jigyō*) in Japan developed during the late Meiji and early Taishō periods with the emergence of an urban, educated class that "staffed government agencies, private corporations, and other specialized institutions" (Ambaras 1998, 1). One of these "other" institutions, were the modernizing religious bureaucracies of the large Shin Buddhist sects. One of the priest-bureaucrats who worked inside the Ōtani-ha sect, Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1967), was among the first Ōtani-ha bureaucrats to propose and implement "Shin Buddhist social work."

Takeuchi, over a long career inside the Ōtani-ha, developed his thinking on modern ethical issues in the crucible of directing sect social work from the early 1920s through to the 1950s. He was later characterized as "a rare Ōtani-ha person who took social problems seriously" (Izumi 1975, 4:21-22). In some ways, Takeuchi was a hybrid: one foot in the world of secular, bureaucratic approaches to social problems (sharing an interest in the latest social policy, both domestic and foreign), and the other foot firmly in the world of a hierarchical temple network. He, like his secular counterparts, identified and worked on social problems. Those that most affected the Ōtani-ha included childcare, education, women, rural poverty, *buraku* discrimination, public health and diseases such as leprosy (Hansen's disease). For the Ōtani-ha, as for the Honganji-ha, the social problem of the "special *buraku*" was perceived as particularly urgent. Unlike his

secular counterparts,[1] Takeuchi's challenge was how to mobilize the Ōtani-ha head temple, temple network, and its managing bureaucracy to respond in effective ways—and to argue that such mobilization was an authentic expression of Shin Buddhism.

Takeuchi is interesting because he is boring. His plans were very ambitious, but he had only modest success. He experienced resistance from the upper levels of the Ōtani-ha administration, but had no real enemies. He was in love for many years, but nothing came of it. He lamented his isolation, but seemed to create and maintain stable networks amongst temple priests working towards a common cause. He was not an uncompromising ideologue, but, like most middle-managers, constantly compromised and worked to repair relations between groups. There are no heroes or villains that stand out in his story: it is simply the story of a member of an overlooked class of religious professionals, busy doing things that Buddhist ethics scholars are very interested in, namely social ethics, engagement, and policy.

In this chapter, I discuss Takeuchi's career as a priest-bureaucrat inside the Ōtani-ha administration—thirty-two years of active service and fourteen years as an advisor. Next, I begin with how he became an educated expert on social problems by way of background on his early life, training, and work in charge of social improvement (*shakai kairyō* 社会改良) at the Shiga prefectural government. I devote the rest the chapter to describing the historical phases of Ōtani-ha and *burakumin* organizational interactions from the interwar to the postwar period, and the way that Takeuchi's career typifies each. Finally, I provide examples of the

---

[1] Secular and official attempts to alleviate *buraku* discrimination involved policy and funding for "reconciliation" or "assimilation" groups, and the creation and management of educational curricula. Neary (1989) writes extensively on the political history of the *buraku* issue, including official reconciliation efforts, and Wagatsuma (1966) writes on educational initiatives.

specific types of work that Takeuchi performed for the Ōtani-ha: founding bureaucratic divisions and groups[2]; building networks of Ōtani-ha temple priests and social workers to combat discrimination inside and outside the sect; and representing the Ōtani-ha to *buraku* advocates before, during, and after wartime (1931-1945). Although Takeuchi did not live to see it, his followers would carry forward many of his insights regarding the unique Shin response to discrimination. Remarkably, they would also integrate the insights of the left-wing *buraku* liberation movement into a conservative Ōtani-ha administration later in the postwar period.

As a priest-bureaucrat, his approach to ethics was bound up with his work to create administrative divisions, societies, and study groups inside the Ōtani-ha administration devoted to the problem of *buraku* discrimination. He worked directly with *buraku* advocates, *buraku* Shin followers, and secular social workers to mediate and implement solutions. He was prolific, expressing his ethical thought in organizational and popular texts, and he kept a vigorous schedule of public lectures, conferences, and meetings.

Takeuchi's early life, education, and work at Shiga prefecture

Takeuchi was born in the 1890s, when Shin sects had largely recovered from early Meiji disruptions, in the midst of a gradual historical pattern that would shift interactions between *burakumin* and Ōtani-ha from the local and voluntary to the central and systematic. Japan had a new Imperial constitution (*Dai Nihon teikoku kenpō* 大日本帝國憲法, 1889) declaring equality before the law and citizens' rights. The Shin sects were actively participating in the Meiji government efforts to "civilize" and expand, both internally and externally. Takeuchi's upbringing,

---

[2] The three main administrative divisions at the head temple, each with regional offices, were the Society Department (Shakaika, founded 1921), True Body Society (Shinshinkai 真身会, 1926-1954), and Society of Light (Kōmyōkai 光明会, founded 1931).

education, and work placed him at the intersection between local and central, between poverty and wealth, and between *burakumin* and religious and secular elites.

Takeuchi Ryō'on was born the first son of a poor Ōtani-ha temple family on December 20, 1891. He passed away at this same temple at the age of seventy-eight, on January 15, 1968.[3] His father, Takeuchi Ryōdō (武内了道), who gave private lessons on the Chinese classics at the temple as an extra source of income, died when Takeuchi was eight years old.[4] His mother, Yura (ゆら), raised Takeuchi and his five older sisters and one younger brother by herself. As the oldest son and heir to the position of temple priest, Takeuchi was forced to perform a priest's duties from a very young age. In his writings, he remembers going around the village performing funerals and chanting scriptures at the first ghost festival after a family member's death (*hatsubon* 初盆).

Takeuchi was unable to provide for his family through the ritual work of a temple priest, however, due to the extremely small number of member households—only twenty-six. It was necessary for him to work odd jobs to make ends meet. As an elementary student, he was already performing the work of a temple priest and working a part time job, causing him to miss or fall asleep during many days of school (Takeuchi 1955, 2). Middle school was not much different. He recalls: "I walked about six kilometers to middle school. After I returned home, I would practice chanting scriptures or visit nearby parishioners on the night before

[3] Born at the temple Shōrin-ji 松林寺 in Hyogo prefecture. Details of Takeuchi's life and personality based on Noma (1973), Izumi (1975), Tachibana (1979), Asano (1988a), Kashiwahara (2003), Hongō (2010), Shiraishi (2009) including his publication of Takeuchi's early writings while employed at Shiga prefecture and full entry from the *Nihonshi daijiten* 日本史大辞典 (1991), Kurube Shin'yū's (訓覇信雄, 1906-1998) preface in Takeuchi's posthumous collected works (TRI), materials from the Ōtani University textbook for the study of *buraku* discrimination (GS), and the booklet for an exhibition of Takeuchi's life and works (JG 2008), held at Higashi Honganji in December to coincide with Human Rights Week.

[4] Variously reported as 1902, when Takeuchi was around ten years old (TRI 304–305).

their relative's death-day (*taiya* 逮夜). I would often fall asleep at school and be scolded by my teachers and called '*bōzu! bōzu!* (priest! priest!)' by my classmates. My lunch was always vegetables, not a single fish in sight!" (Izumi 1975, 24; Asano 1988a, 237).

Being a priest and poor made him a target of his classmates' bullying and teasing at school. Takeuchi's later followers, especially Asano Onchi, argued that the early loss of his father, his work as a very young temple priest, and his struggles with poverty gave Takeuchi a sense of solidarity with *burakumin* and an understanding of discrimination—Takeuchi had tasted both poverty and contempt (Asano 1988a, 237). It is also likely that he became familiar with local *burakumin* at an early age, as there was an approximately sixty-household *buraku* area located between his temple home and his elementary school.

Despite his many absences, Takeuchi performed well in his studies and received high marks. The enthusiastic support of his teachers made it possible for him to complete middle school and enter Kyoto Third Higher School (Dai San Kōtō Gakkō 京都第三高等学校). There, he attracted the attention of Yoshida Kenryū (吉田賢龍, d. 1943)[5] himself born into an Ōtani-ha temple in Osaka prefecture. Yoshida introduced Takeuchi to Ōtani Kōen (大谷光演, 1875-1943), who would later become head priest of the Ōtani-ha with the dharma name Shōnyo 彰如.[6] Shōnyo personally paid for Takeuchi's education until he graduated from Kyoto Imperial University's philosophy department at age twenty-six.

From this time onwards, Takeuchi received considerable financial and political support from the head priest's family. I believe Takeuchi's position as the resident

---

[5] Some works claim that Yoshida was the school principal. Izumi (2009, 7) argues that although Yoshida was somehow instrumental in connecting Takeuchi and the leading family of the Ōtani-ha, he was not the principal nor are the details known.

[6] Shōnyo is also known by his name in the world of Japanese poetry, Kubutsu 句仏, sometimes used as his posthumous designation, Kubutsu Shōnin 句仏上人.

priest of a poor branch temple combined with his connections to the wealth and power of the Ōtani family and head temple gave him insight into the circumstances and organization of the Ōtani-ha as a whole. Certainly, these early experiences, when he was caught within temple poverty as a priest and dependent upon his wealthy and powerful benefactors as a student and as an administrator laid the foundation for the ambivalent, often critical, relationship he would have with the Ōtani-ha for the rest of his life. Takeuchi reflected often on his impoverished upbringing and life within the "completely decadent" religion of Shin (TRI 1955, 2). Indeed, his own, impoverished temple became a template for a different kind of head temple administration and temple network, a place where he experimented with living arrangements and provided refuge for people in distress—for a day, months, or even years if necessary (TRI 1950).

Takeuchi frequently expressed conflicted emotions towards himself, the Ōtani-ha, and the Shin faith. In 1955, looking back upon his relationship with the Ōtani-ha, Takeuchi wrote that even when he was a child, he did not believe that performing funerals for donations was "meritorious and beneficial" (*kudoku riyaku* 功徳利益).[7] He could not accept the teachings that he heard. He wished he could say that he had discovered the great heart of Amida Buddha and Shinran, diamond-like faith, benefits in both this world and the next, and all that remained was to live out the rest of his life in continuous gratitude and be reborn in the pure land. But, Takeuchi wrote, it was not so. He had a job to do: to rant and rail against the ignorance and vice he saw within the sect, recommend structural reforms, and push the sect to undertake social work.

The more he learned the more ugly and evil Shin Buddhism appeared to be.

---

[7] He often echoed contemporary criticisms of Buddhism as "funerary Buddhism." See other criticisms of religion as moribund, formal, and "funerary" (Murakami 1980, 83-85).

Shin Buddhism, for Takeuchi, was worse than the Marxists claimed: priests were not secret pushers of poisonous opium; they sold it *openly* (Takeuchi 1955, 2-4). Yet in his writings he would return again and again to the potential the Ōtani-ha order had to transform society—if only it could achieve reform. Takeuchi maintained this consistent tone throughout his writings. He harshly criticized corruption and evil in himself and others, including the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*). He directed a good deal of venom towards those with the power to affect the lives of others; no one was immune. His writings are laced with a sense of sadness, melancholy, and lamentation. For Takeuchi, this activity of critique and this emotion of lamentation were doorways to the transformation of himself, his religious community, and society.

With the support of Shōnyo, Takeuchi graduated from the Kyoto Third Higher School in 1914 and from the philosophy department of Kyoto Imperial University (present day Kyoto University) in 1917 with a Bachelor of Letters (*bungakushi* 文学士). While at Kyoto Imperial University, he submitted a thesis on the ethical thought contained in the *Lamp for the Latter Ages* (*Mattōshō*, CWS 1:521-574, *Seiten* 600-609), one of Shinran's letter collections. Although the thesis no longer exists (Izumi 2009, 9),[8] we can detect Takeuchi's views in later writings as the *Lamp for the Latter Ages* became one of his favorite sources for quotations, along with the *True Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Realization* (*Kyōgyōshinshō*, CWS 1:3-292; *Seiten* 149-401), the *Larger Sūtra* (*Daikyō* 大経, T 362), and the letters of Rennyo (*Ofumi* 御文, Rogers and Rogers 1990).

Fujii Kenjirō (藤井健治郎, 1872-1931), professor of ethics, supervised his work at Kyoto Imperial University.[9] As with the well-known Ōtani-ha reformer of

---

8 Takeuchi's obituary in SS (March 1968, No. 770, 5) gives his date of death as January 15, 1968, and the title of his thesis as "True Ethics" (*Shinri no rinri* 真理の倫理).

9 Fujii was succeeded by the well-known scholar of ethics, Watsuji Tetsurō (和辻哲郎, 1889-1960).

the Meiji period, Kiyozawa Manshi (清沢満之, 1863-1903), Takeuchi's education at an imperial university was influential in his later thought and administrative career. Fujii's approach to ethics in particular influenced Takeuchi's thought. Unlike other scholars, Fujii did not explore metaethics or practical ethics. He focused instead on the customs and judgments of quality that make up social reality. Today, we might label him an anthropologist or sociologist of ethics. Like Fujii, Takeuchi concentrated on the tendencies and evaluations present in social interactions between people, especially those who claimed to be acting for the benefit of others. For him, it was useless to merely affirm that equality is right and discrimination is wrong without also examining how these ideals might exist in the actual interactions and organization of people.

After graduation from Kyoto Imperial, Takeuchi worked as an English teacher at Osaka Meisei Business School (Meisei Shōgyō Gakkō 明星商業学校) for a brief period before beginning work for the Shiga prefectural government—his first job as a bureaucrat.

Work at Shiga Prefecture, 1919-1920

As I mentioned earlier, Takeuchi began work in the late 1910s in the midst of a great transition in the understanding and approach to issues of discrimination. Takeuchi, a young man with a very specialized training in ethics, went to work in a newly created[10] position for "social improvement" (*shakai kairyō* 社会改良) at the Shiga prefectural government in April of 1919.[11] At the age of twenty-eight, he was its first department head (*shunin* 主任) tasked with improving the customs of

---

[10] The governor of Shiga prefecture announced the position in a budget speech, soon after the summertime Rice Riots. The position would be located in a specialized department with an increased budget (Shiraishi 2009, 34).

[11] This section is based, in large part, on the work of Shiraishi (2009). 1919 is also the year he married Kawauchi Asa (河内朝). He divorced in 1923. He had one daughter, Harumi (温美), born in 1921. See the timeline in TRI (304-305).

the people (*minpū* 民風), and reform and relief work (*kyōka kyūsai* 感化救済) targeting *burakumin*, at the time labeled "impoverished peoples" (*saimin* 細民).[12] The prefectures mirrored the central bureaucracy, which had created a "Society Division" (Shakaikyoku 社会局), by creating "Society Departments" (Shakaika) (Hongō 2010). The Ōtani-ha, too, would follow this movement, transforming its "Relief Department" (Kyūgoka 救護課) into a Society Department, and moving from "charity work" (*jizen jigyō*) to "social work" (*shakai jigyō*).

Much of this bureaucratizing and systematizing activity was the direct result of *burakumin* participation in the 1918 Rice Riots.[13] The riots were sparked by low prices paid to farmers for rice and extremely high prices for rice in the consumer market. Since many *burakumin* at this time were farmers and struggled with poverty, the inflated rice prices hit them hard. After the Rice Riots, the response of local and central governments was more comprehensive and systematic: they were creating administrative units, searching for specialists to staff them, and seeking out the views of scholars. The Home Ministry responded with a plan for creating economically prosperous and loyal citizens (known as the "cultivation of citizens' strength movement" *minryoku kanyō undō* 民力涵養運動) (Shiraishi 2009).

Burakumin participation in the riots sparked intense government concern, and government officials worried, as they had in past, that the difficult circumstances of many *burakumin* could foster anti-government sentiment.[14] Moreover, they worried about the connection between Shin Buddhism and *burakumin* following

---

[12] Shiraishi reports that Takeuchi would have overseen all government efforts in the sixty-seven Shiga *buraku* (4,881 households and approximately 20,000 people), only five of which had preexisting groups devoted to the improvement of *buraku* conditions (2009, 35).

[13] For more information on the 1918 Rice Riots, and rice riots generally in Japanese history, see Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney (1994, 38–39). Ohnuki-Tierney places *burakumin* participation in the riots at thirty to forty percent.

[14] Neary (1989, 59-61) points out that while government worried about the spread of left-wing ideologies and radicalization among *burakumin* following the Rice Riots, funding for improvement programs did not increase until 1920. Izumi (1975, 4:25) notes the a fifty percent increase in the police force followed the riots.

the 1918 Rice Riots and the earlier 1910 High Treason Incident (*Taigyaku jiken* 大逆事件). After the High Treason Incident, officials believed that *buraku* communities were hotbeds of "dangerous thought" (*kiken shisō* 危険思想), rebellion, and unrest. Concerns were raised over connections between *burakumin* and Takagi Kenmyō (高木顕明, 1864-1914),[15] the Ōtani-ha priest arrested in connection with the incident. They worried, too, that the large Shin Buddhist branches, the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha, had been unable to prevent *buraku* participation in the 1918 Rice Riots.

Unsurprisingly, government campaigns for improvement of *buraku* villages[16] and "moral exhortation" (*kyōka*) suddenly increased following each of these events.[17] In its Buddhist sense, the word *kyōka* refers to "spread the Buddhist teachings," and in modern *kyōka* campaigns of the Ōtani-ha, enlightening people with the teachings of the Buddha and Shinran and exhorting people to be good citizens often went hand-in-hand. In Takeuchi's case, there was considerable "exhorting" of those in power as well. In the view of both the government and the Shin institutions, then, Shin Buddhism was supposed to enlighten and exhort *burakumin*.

That Takeuchi was a temple priest with deep ties to the Buddhist world in general, and the Ōtani-ha in particular, was not incidental to his employment at Shiga prefecture. All levels of government looked to Shin Buddhism as a means to

---

[15] For more information regarding Takagi and the High Treason Incident, see Izumi (2002), Ama (2003; 2004), and Rhodes trans. of Takagi's "My Socialism" (2004). Takagi Kenmyō was excommunicated after he was convicted of conspiracy to commit treason. *Burakumin* were members of his temple and he was pejoratively labeled as "priest of the *eta*" (*etasō*). Takagi was the first person in the Ōtani-ha to discuss the historical responsibility of Buddhism for discrimination (Izumi 2003, 52; DD 2002, no.29).

[16] At this time, they were often referred to as "impoverished villages" (*saimin buraku* 細民部落) or "special villages" (*tokushu buraku* 特殊部落). See the work of Yanagita Kunio (1913) and Kita Sadakichi (1919).

[17] For a detailed study of how the Japanese government organized these campaigns, and the translation of *kyōka* as "moral suasion," see Garon (1997, 7). Regional government treated the *burakumin* as a problem for security and social order. See Shiraishi (2009, 34) for description of the budget in Shiga during 1910s for *buraku* relief and improvement work.

achieve social reform amongst *burakumin*. By the end of his short tenure, his identity or standpoint as a "religionist" (*shukyōsha* 宗教者) was foremost in his popular writings, and would likely have drawn the interest of the Ōtani-ha administration before they moved to recruit him. He wrote that faith (*shinnen* 信念) and social action are one in the same: "Since my [social] work is in the propaganda (*puropagandā* プロパガンダー) of the religious spirit, I have no life but the purification of religious spirit."[18] The performance of social work was, for Takeuchi, the same as the purification of his faith.

The dominant understanding of discrimination and how to address it changed rapidly in the aftermath of World War I and the Rice Riots of 1918. The most important component of the discourse for our purposes here was a strong critique of charity. Social and economic upheaval convinced many, both in society and in government, that the poverty and isolation suffered by *burakumin* were society-wide in scope. Since many came to view problems of *buraku* discrimination as social, structural—connected with poverty and vulnerability—many also believed that solutions to *buraku* discrimination ought to be social and structural as well. Few believed that discrimination could be solved by informal, volunteer charitable work, and moral exhortation alone.

Charity came under fire as being an inherently arrogant, patronizing, and corrupting activity and Takeuchi fiercely echoed these critiques. He labeled charitable activities "salvationism" (*kyūsai shugi* 救済主義) and criticized the arrogance and sense of superiority he saw in many who performed charity (TRI 1927, 44-45; Shiraishi 2009, 40-41). He was also critical of the arrogance of the dominant reconciliation (*yūwa*) group, the Imperial Justice Association (Teikoku

---

[18] Shiraishi (2009, 39). *Yo no jigyō wa shūkyō teki seishin no puropagandā ni aru no de kono shūkyō teki seishin no junka no hoka ni yo no seikatsu wa nai* 余の事業は宗教的精神のプロパガンダーにあるのでこの宗教的精神の純化の他に余の生活はない.

Kōdō Kai 帝国公道会) (Wagatsuma and Totten 1966, 39),[19] which sought to direct *burakumin* in what they saw as reform and improvement, from a way of thinking that blamed discrimination on the "unclear" and "immoral" nature of *burakumin* themselves. Takeuchi shared this critique of charity with liberationists and the early Levelers' Society.

Once ensconced in his position at Shiga prefecture, Takeuchi wasted no time in directing his efforts outwards. He represented the prefecture when liaising with Buddhist, civil, and governmental groups working to address discrimination and poverty in various ways. He represented the prefecture to local *buraku*,[20] overseeing surveys of conditions in Shiga *buraku*, official visits, and mediating disputes between *burakumin* communities and other groups that dealt with treatment of *buraku* youth in local schools (Izumi 1975, 4: 25; Shiraishi 2009, 37-38). In addition, he represented the relief work of the prefecture to the general public. Despite his relative youth, Takeuchi wrote a remarkable number of newspaper editorials[21] for the mainstream press and specialist magazines, and frequently gave public lectures. In these, he advocated a scientific approach to implementing policy. In the course of this work, Takeuchi would have witnessed the effects of systematic discrimination on the living conditions in Shiga *buraku*

---

[19] This heavy cross-over between government and civil groups has been discussed as a characteristic of Japanese civil society (Schwartz and Pharr 2003; Hardacre 2004).

[20] Shiraishi gives the population of Shiga *buraku* at this time as comprising 67 areas, 4,881 households, and around 20,000 people. Only 5 of these *buraku* had pre-existing improvement groups.

[21] Four in particular are important statements of his views on *buraku* improvement work: (1) "Regarding the Improvement of Impoverished Villages" (細民部落改善に就て), (2) "Encouraging Realization for Those Engaged [in Relief Work]" (従事者の自覚を促す), (3) "Propaganda of the religious spirit"(宗教的精神のプロパガンダー) and (4) "The Fundamental Spirit of Salvation Work" (救済事業の根本精神, Takeuchi (1919)). I discuss the last in the next chapter. Shiraishi's (2009) theory is that Takeuchi changed dramatically over the course of his short tenure at Shiga prefecture from the paternalistic, moralistic tones of very early twentieth century philanthropists (who argued for "benevolent guidance" *zendō* 善導 and "rectification / correction" *kyōsei* 矯正) into a religionist with a broad view of the causes of discrimination. Moreover, Shiraishi argued Takeuchi because a religionist *who blamed himself* for discrimination, whereas before he blamed the *burakumin*. I think Shiraishi has underestimated the ubiquitous nature of Takeuchi's tendency to criticize.

areas, and the worsening conditions of rural and urban working poor in general.[22]

His position at the Shiga prefectural government led to his first social and political connections with *burakumin* leaders, his first administrative experience attempting to resolve the problems *buraku* communities faced, and an appreciation for the intractable nature of prejudice itself. Addressing discrimination was no longer a "good act"[23] but a "responsibility." Takeuchi described his responsibility to do something about discrimination as akin to the responsibility "to look for food when I am starving" (Shiraishi 2009, 39). For him, there could be no separation between saving the other and saving oneself—both transformations were possible only in the context of social work itself. The things that Takeuchi came to understand about *buraku* discrimination in his work in Shiga during the aftermath of the 1918 Rice Riots, he would later articulate in Shin Buddhist language.

Historical phases in Ōtani-ha and *buraku* group interaction

As a formal representative of the Ōtani-ha, Takeuchi participated in a series of interactions with *buraku* advocacy groups, mainly the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha), founded in 1922, and Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei), founded in 1954. This interaction occurred in several distinct historical phases. In previous chapters, I touched on the earliest phase as both the Ōtani-ha and *burakumin* developed a modern identity, new organizational forms, and approaches towards *buraku* discrimination. I presented examples of charitable work, ideas of *burakumin* circulating amongst Ōtani-ha preachers, and claims by

---

[22] Around this time, he participated in projects to relocate *burakumin* youth to Hokkaidō where ideally they would have received land to farm.

[23] One indication of his "new" understanding of discrimination is his downplaying of a visit by Oe Taku (大江 卓, 1847-1921), then head of the Imperial Justice Association, following a riot in July of 1919 in a Shiga *buraku* area. Takeuchi believed that Oe and the Association viewed the *burakumin* as an obstacle to social progress, and criticized them in his report after their visit. Elite *burakumin* advocates of "improvement work" (*kaizen jigyō*) would voice a similar critique (Shiraishi 2009, 38-40).

burakumin advocates that the Ōtani-ha institution has discriminated against them with unjust forms of exclusion and hierarchy.

Interwar interactions

Takeuchi Ryō'on began his career inside the religious bureaucracy of the Ōtani-ha at twenty-nine years of age early in the second phase, which coincides with the Japanese interwar period (1918-1937). This period was characterized by new, social understandings of discrimination and declining trust in charity. A series of domestic and global disturbances connected to the ending of World War I triggered a change in how in government and civil society saw *buraku* discrimination: the 1917 Russian Revolution and the 1918 Rice Riots, the latter which saw high levels of *burakumin* participation. No longer was discrimination blamed on the immorality of individual *burakumin*, for the first time, discrimination was widely viewed as a "social" problem demanding new kinds of action, particularly the creation of systematic, bureaucratic departments in both state government and large civil groups. Because the majority of *burakumin* belonged to one of the two large Shin sects, the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha immediately came under pressure, on the one hand, for failing to prevent uprisings among *burakumin* during the 1918 Rice Riots and, on the other, for failing to prevent discrimination against *burakumin*. The sects, too, created new bureaucratic divisions and programs in response. Organized, left-wing *buraku* activism appears as well, with the founding of the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha)—the first national *buraku* advocacy group—which offered their own views on systematic action.

In the 1920s, amidst Levelers' Society criticism, the ideological approaches to *buraku* discrimination that would dominate the twentieth century emerged. These approaches were generally split between those espoused by the establishment and those espoused by anti-establishment critics. Ideological differences contributed to

hostility between representatives of each type. State-sponsored, establishment groups—that is, governmental and civil groups that received state funding and were incorporated into state-run federations[24]—were labeled "reconciliationist" (*yūwa* 融和). The official Ōtani-ha response to *buraku* discrimination fell into this category and Takeuchi was known as a *yūwaka* (融和家).[25] The Ōtani-ha Society Department (Shakaika), founded in 1921 handled sectarian response to *buraku* discrimination at first. Then, in 1926, the Ōtani-ha reconciliation group True Body Society (Shinshinkai) was founded. The True Body Society was partially independent and received government support from monies earmarked for reconciliation (*yūwa*) work. Using Shin Buddhist language, Takeuchi described the reconciliation movement, which focused on relations between *buraku* and non-*buraku*, as "companionism" (*dōbō shugi* 同朋主義). The goal of reconciliation was to achieve equality as a product of the faith and responsibility of Japanese citizens for justice (Shiraishi 2009, 32-35).

Anti-establishment groups were inspired by left-wing philosophies such as socialism, Marxism, and anarchism, and took on the label "liberationist" (*kaihō* 解放). They tended to be "insider" movements, made up of *burakumin*, while the membership of reconciliation groups was mixed or non-*burakumin*.[26] Although the ideologies of specific reconciliation (*yūwa*) groups varied widely, the conflict between the two approaches can be understood as one of right-wing vs. left-wing

---

[24] Such as the Central Reconciliation Work Assocation (Chūō Yūwa Jigyō Kyōkai 中央融和事業協会) founded in 1925, which changed its name to Association for Assimilation in Service to the Nation (Dōwa Hōkō Kai 同和奉公会) in 1941 during wartime. "Assimilation" (*dōwa* 同和) is still a dominant term for labelling official groups to the present day. Less than two months after its founding, the Ōtani-ha True Body Society (Shinshinkai) was absorbed into Central Reconciliation Work Association.

[25] Honganji-ha reconciliation efforts were larger in size and scope than those of the Ōtani-ha (Neary 1989, 102; Wagatsuma 1966, 89), which aligns with the proportionally larger population of *buraku* followers in the Honganji-ha (roughly four to five times as many).

[26] Being considered an reconciliationist, then, was often a matter of having a non-*burakumin* identity and there was some ideological variation among these groups. See M. Unno (1998) for further description of these two approaches to *buraku* discrimination and Shin Buddhist social action in the prewar period.

solutions to *buraku* discrimination. Reconciliation and liberation movements both focused on material and economic development inside *buraku* areas (*kyūsai* and *kaizen*), and both pursued ideologically charged, didactic activities meant to reduce discrimination amongst non-*burakumin*, and exhort *burakumin* to realize the nature of discrimination against them and work to overcome it. Whatever Takeuchi's personal leanings were, to *buraku* advocacy groups he represented the right-wing establishment when he spoke for the Ōtani-ha.

Wartime shifts

With the intensification of Japanese conflict with China in the late 1930s, the establishment approach shifted to the political right and tied the elimination of *buraku* discrimination to national goals of unity, total mobilization, and support of the Japanese military.[27] The Ōtani-ha became involved from 1937 onwards in the enthusiastic support of national mobilization strategies and the war effort. The Ōtani-ha reconciliation group began framing the elimination of *buraku* discrimination in terms of supporting the nation, the emperor, and total war (Asaji 2009). Wartime saw calls at the highest level of the Ōtani-ha for an end to *buraku* discrimination in service to the nation.

Reflecting this shift towards an imperial, nationalist approach, the language of "reconciliation" (*yūwa*) was changed to "assimilation" (*dōwa* 同和)—a composite term taken from the Shōwa emperor's accession speech.[28] The government

---

[27] Part of this new approach involved a much lower tolerance for criticism, the view that *buraku* areas could provide a mobile workforce for key industries, and the promotion of colonial migration solutions to discrimination, particularly to Manchuria and Mongolia (Neary 1989, 211).

[28] *Dōwa* became the preferred government term for the remainder of the Shōwa period (1926-1989). The front page of the newspaper *Dōwa kokumin undō* 同和国民運動 for July 10, 1941, discusses the Association for Assimilation in Service to the Nation under the wartime "new order" (*shintaisei* 新体制) and describes how the term "assimilation" (*dōwa*) was taken from the Shōwa emperor's accession speech. The speech itself referred back to similar edicts of the Meiji emperor: "make the hearts and minds of the people the same, widely harmonize the customs of the people, forever proclaim that all are viewed the same and extend the same benevolence, and live in universal brotherhood (*jinshin kore onajiku, minpū kore nikoshi hiroku, isshin dōjin no ka o nobe nagaku, shikai dōhō no gi o atsuku sen* 人心惟レ同シク民風惟レ和シ汎クー視同仁ノ化ヲ

became increasingly heavy-handed in its control of civil groups engaged with issues of *buraku* discrimination, eventually incorporating all groups, reconciliationist and liberationist alike, into a government-run umbrella organization in 1941, called the Association for Assimilation in Service to the Nation (Dōwa Hōkō Kai 同和奉公会) (Neary 1989, 210-211).[29] Groups that did not conform to government ideology were forcibly restructured or dissolved (Pharr 1990, 17, 25). In 1940, the Ōtani-ha True Body Society was incorporated, and in 1942, the Levelers' Society followed (Shiraishi 2009, 32). The ideological diversity and mutual criticism typical of the 1920s and early 1930s were suppressed.

Takeuchi's activities reflected this shift as well. His publications, both internal and external, on the problem of *buraku* discrimination couched social work in nationalist and war-supporting terms (Takeuchi 1937; 1941; Asaji 2009). In the 1930s and 40s, Takeuchi would develop ideas like the "organic unity" of society and service to society along fascist or totalitarian lines. And in the late 1940s and 50s, he would take up democratic and fraternal ideals from American occupation authorities. One of the strongest criticisms of Takeuchi is that in the articulation of his own social program, he lacked sensitivity to the contradictions amongst different political ideologies. He saw the war as a great chance to overcome discrimination, for how could the nation effectively fight if discrimination caused disunity amongst its citizens? Along with a group of elite Ōtani-ha *buraku* followers, priest-bureaucrats, and reconciliationists from the Kyoto area, Takeuchi formed an association for support of the war, the "Society of Blessings Received"

宣ヘ永ク四海同胞ノ誼ヲ敦クセン).

[29] The Association for Assimilation in Service to the Nation was the wing of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association (大政翼賛会, 1940-1945) in charge of reducing the conflict and disunity among citizens caused by *buraku* discrimination.

(Ken'yōsha 眷鷹社).[30] The Ōtani-ha head priest and his wife presided over the opening ceremony. Still, Takeuchi's tendency to criticize himself and others did not serve him well during this time. The sale of his 1938 book, *The Imperial Way Nation-State* (*Kōdō kokka* 皇道国家), was meant to raise funds for anti-discrimination activities but the book itself was banned as inflammatory. Takeuchi had gone too far in reminding his readers that *buraku* discrimination still existed.[31]

Postwar disengagement

It is not an exaggeration to say that the war (1937-1945) and the circumstances of Japanese society in the wake of defeat were the worst thing to happen to Buddhist social engagement in the established sects (*kisei*) in the twentieth century.[32] Financially, social welfare became untenable. The war had caused extensive property damage, poverty amongst membership of Buddhist sects, and thus, loss of the basic sources of financial stability. Ideologically, too, social engagement became problematic. The established sects were severely criticized for their participation in the war. They had no choice but to withdraw from social projects, adopt a pacifist stance, and adapt to the massive changes brought by occupation and democratization (Murakami 1980, 118-119).

Ironically, just as equality and non-discrimination[33] were legally guaranteed

---

[30] According to Tachibana (TRI 302-303), the name is taken from the Imperial Rescript on Education, indicating that the society saw support of war and elimination of *buraku* discrimination as repayment of the Meiji emperor's benevolence.

[31] Shiraishi (2009, 32) claims that the banning of the book and subsequent demotion meant that Takeuchi had lost favor with the Ōtani-ha administration. In the February 1940, during the restructuring of the True Body Society, Takeuchi was demoted to "regular lecturer" (*jōnin kōshi* 常任講師). He spent the remainder of the war years traveling and giving reconciliationist speeches.

[32] Pharr (1990) notes that it was a step backwards for all civil groups.

[33] After the war, democracy and egalitarianism guide the state, the formulation of new laws, and the reform of public institutions. Pharr (1990, 26) explains that by "fusing with indigenous traditions of grass-roots democracy and communitarianism they became, in effect, the 'official ideologies governing social relations'combine with education, internationalization, urbanization, etc. these ideological principles gained force."

as individual, "basic human rights" (*kihon teki jinken* 基本的人権) by the 1947 Constitution of Japan (Pharr 1990, 77), Shin Buddhist sectarian activity dealing with rights and discrimination decreased markedly, especially when compared with their level of activity during the 1920s through the early 1940s. Despite a new language and legal basis for rejecting discrimination based on "race, creed, sex, social status or family origin,"[34] the Shin sects were socially "disengaged" in the early postwar period amidst new secularizing policies and popular backlash. The administrative units that Takeuchi had founded were either separated from the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, stripped down, or repurposed. Some of Takeuchi's initiatives were firmly embedded in the temple network, particularly the settlement of Ōtani-ha priests and social workers in *buraku* areas and childcare programs, and continued after the war.

For Takeuchi, and other priest-bureaucrats who had become involved in the prewar period with the Ōtani-ha's struggle to reduce *buraku* discrimination, this was time "in the wilderness," working outside the bureaucracy proper by consulting, and pursuing independent group activities. As they were now at a distance from the center of Ōtani-ha administrative power, they had many opportunities for left-wing, utopian thinking on the issue of *buraku* discrimination and ambitious reform proposals. During this time, Takeuchi and others were more closely involved with the left-wing liberation movement. In 1946, for example, Takeuchi served as meeting director and consulted[35] with representatives of *burakumin* from all over the country on the formation of a new liberationist group

---

[34] The continued use of international human rights language by the Japanese state can be seen in the ratification of of several human rights instruments, including the two covenants that stem from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Discrimination against Women, and Rights of the Child. Relations between activist groups and the government are increasing framed by the language of "human rights" (*jinken* 人権)—a trend that the government encourages.

[35] Takeuchi's Honganji-ha counterpart, Umehara Shinryū (梅原真隆, 1885-1966), was also invited. He became a consultant to the newly formed committee along with Umehara until 1949 (Shiraishi 2009, 32).

to replace the Levelers' Society.

Reintegration

From the end of World War II, and for the next twenty-five years, the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy was not especially active in the arena of social work. For those who had worked with Takeuchi on *buraku* discrimination in particular, their reintegration back into the bureaucracy required the intense criticism that followed a discriminatory incident. Just after Takeuchi's death, the Nanba Branch Temple discriminatory incident (*Nanba Betsuin sabetsu jiken* 難波別院差別事件, 1967) exploded. The eight denunciation meetings that followed, in which representatives of the Buraku Liberation League harshly and formally criticized the Ōtani-ha, finally caused the central administration to reincorporate Takeuchi's faction back into its structure. As part of Ōtani-ha promises to the Buraku Liberation League, Takeuchi's faction again managed official sectarian efforts to reduce *buraku* discrimination from 1970 onwards.

From the late 1970s to the present day, Japanese Buddhist engagement with *buraku* discrimination changed dramatically. The Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha maintained funded bureaucratic divisions to deal with *buraku* discrimination, but they were not alone. Triggered by yet another high profile discriminatory incident in 1979, known as the Machida Incident, almost all established Buddhist sects allotted funds for an organized, bureaucratic response to discirimination. Although I focus on the period from the 1920s to the 1960s that correspondes to Takeuchi's career in the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, I touch on the Machida Incident and Takeuchi's institutional successors in the concluding chapter. The Ōtani-ha institution has always made its greatest efforts to overcome discrimination in the face of organized and sustained criticism (JG 2010). Today, under the name of Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements (Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu), this division manages sect efforts in support of human rights and liberation

movements of all kinds.

Takeuchi's career in the Ōtani-ha spanned several distinct phases in the relation between the Ōtani-ha and *buraku* advocacy organizations. He appeared on the scene during the broader transition from charity work to social work (1918-1920) (Izumi 2003, 55–67). Central and regional government officials expected the Shin branches to be the "keepers" of *burakumin*, and hoped to use Shin Buddhist groups to ameliorate the situation of *burakumin* and address other areas of social concern. That is, they felt that Shin Buddhism ought to teach *burakumin* to be good citizens, to obey the laws, and not to disturb public order through protest or riot. Takeuchi agreed wholeheartedly that temple priests had responsibilities to society. He disagreed, however, that *burakumin* participation in protests and riots represented the failure of temple priests. For Takeuchi, if *burakumin* suffered discrimination at all, temple priests had failed. Participation in protests and riots, on the other hand, was an understandable and inevitable reaction to historical circumstance. Takeuchi felt that the Shin network of temples and temple priests was crucial to Shin social work. If that network could only be organized and harnessed, it could change society. Organization and mobilization was, in fact, the purpose of bureaucratic departments such as the Society Department (Shakaika) and True Body Society (Shinshinkai).

Entering the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, 1920

You will recall that in the earlier section on Takeuchi's early life and career, we saw that Takeuchi was first hired by Shiga Prefecture to work in social improvement. He was working in the public sector, not in the Buddhist bureaucracy. Although the details of his recruitment by members of the Ōtani-ha administrative elite are unclear, his prior connections with the head priest, his education at an imperial university, and his public declaration of the "religious spirit" of relief work in *buraku* areas while in a secular government posting made Takeuchi an obvious

199

choice for social work inside the sect. There was simply no one else with his particular mixture of knowledge and expertise. Takeuchi was recruited in 1920 by the head administrator, Abe Esui (阿部恵水, 1870-1945), and by another relative of the head priest (*renshi*)—who approached the governor of Shiga prefecture directly to secure his transfer.

As an Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrat, Takeuchi performed specific kinds of tasks on behalf of the administration. Below, I provide examples of these tasks from his prewar career. First, Takeuchi proposed, created, and managed bureaucratic divisions and semi-autonomous groups. Second, these divisions and groups, in turn, worked to create regional networks of temples and Ōtani-ha social workers. Third, Takeuchi and priest-bureaucrats like him represented Ōtani-ha social policy to both governmental and civil groups. In particular, Takeuchi represented the Ōtani-ha during the tense and critical interactions with the Levelers' Society during the early 1920s and early 1930s. As well, there are specific types of texts, for use inside the Ōtani-ha and aimed at external parties or the public, that Takeuchi wrote as part of his work as a priest-bureaucrat. I introduce, translate, and summarize examples of these texts in chapter 6.

Founding divisions and groups

One of the foremost ways that a bureaucrat solves problems is to create specialized groups to manage the problem in a sustained manner. Two groups established by Takeuchi were particularly relevant to *buraku* discrimination in the interwar period: the Society Department (Shakaika) and True Body Society (Shinshinkai).

His first task when he arrived at the head temple on November 31, 1920, was

to plan and lobby[36] for an independent "Society Department" (Shakaika). This department would handle Ōtani-ha engagement with social issues and marshal the network of temples and priests. With the support of the head priest, the Society Department was established in February of 1921, but it was placed within the Doctrinal Studies Section (Kyōgakubu 教学部)—against Takeuchi's recommendation that it be semi-autonomous (TRI 1920 18-19). He worried that Doctrinal Studies leadership would be too conservative and unable to adapt to rapidly changing understandings of social work. The Society Department that he imagined would be a nimble, active, scientific organization. He thought it should be semi-autonomous because it would, in the course of mobilizing the temple network, unavoidably anger all those who believed Shin doctrine and ritual ought to be separate from the affairs of the world.

Takeuchi served as director until 1928. During its existence, the Society Department managed Ōtani-ha responses to a wide variety of social issues: prison chaplaincy, propagation of the teaching and moral exhortation (*kyōka*), youth problems, rural poverty, social welfare, and treatment of those with leprosy, including the reintegration of sufferers into society and the segregation of sufferers into leprosaria (Takeuchi 1931). It also published the official monthly sect magazine (*Shinshū* 真宗), and organized propagation of the teachings through film and visual media.

In 1926, Takeuchi founded the semi-autonmous True Body Society (Shinshinkai)[37] to mirror the Honganji-ha's One Truth Society (Ichinyokai 一如会) founded two years previously in 1924. In part, the financial situation of the

---

36 He wrote the internal memo "Rationale for Establishing the Society Department" (*Shakaika setchi riyū sho* 社会課設置理由書) (TRI 1920). See translation in chapter 6.

37 The Honganji-ha reconciliation group, One Truth Society (Ichinyokai 一如会) was formed in 1924 with Umehara Shinryū (梅原真隆, 1885-1966) as its first director. Takeuchi and Umehara can be seen as counterparts in each of the Shin sects.

Ōtani-ha at the time made it necessary to find outside funding.[38] With no money, social work was very difficult.[39]

Once established, Takeuchi served as its assistant director, while former and acting head administrators of the Ōtani-ha occupied the director's position. The True Body Society took over management of all reconciliation work—all work dealing with *buraku* discrimination—from the Society Department. From 1929 until 1940, Takeuchi served as director. After the government banned one of Takeuchi's books as inflammatory in 1938, he was demoted to a regular employee and lecturer in February of 1940 and continued in that role until the end of the war. After the war ended, he and like-minded priest-bureaucrats attempted to maintain the True Body Society without any Ōtani-ha or government funding until its final dissolution in 1954.

Creating extended networks

Takeuchi was extremely sociable, maintained connections with members of all strata of Japanese society, and had close ties with members of both government-supported assimilation and anti-establishment liberation movements. In other words, Takeuchi was good at networking and building connections. His personality served him well in most informal and face-to-face situations, although he was sensitive and easily provoked to emotion, perhaps a result of his early experiences. Once provoked, no one was spared his sharp tongue; he was careless of where he fought and whom he criticized.[40] Takeuchi was easily angered, easily

---

[38] In 1925, Takeuchi's benefactor and head priest Ōtani Kōen (Shōnyo) was forced to resign due to fiscal mismanagement. Kashiwahara (2003, 22) estimates the sect's debt at 2,000,000 yen. The largest parts of this debt were bad investments in cotton cultivation in China and Taiwan and mining in Hokkaido.

[39] Kashiwahara (2003, 31-33) characterizes Takeuchi as being very perceptive about the nature of discrimination, but that the Ōtani-ha administration fundamentally misunderstood his position and was disinterested in the problem in general. Other kinds of resistance within the Ōtani-ha came from those who feared Takeuchi's activity and addressing "society" was too left-wing, and those who hoped these groups would conveniently serve as a buffer to negative public opinion (Izumi 1975, 4: 26).

[40] This critical tendency sometimes interfered with Takeuchi's goals and ability to work effectively inside the

saddened and moved to tears, passionate, haughty, wild (he was called "Shaka come down from the mountains"), energetic, and eccentric—a poet, a painter, a writer, a priest, and a drinker (and a womanizer, too, if the rumors are true). Takeuchi, in his role as a networker, helped to create stable groups of temple priests that still engage with *buraku* discrimination within the Ōtani-ha to the present day.

Creating Ōtani-ha social workers

Takeuchi's first endeavor as director of the Ōtani-ha Society Department was to create a network and pool of people trained in social work (*shakai jigyō*)—ideally, these would be Ōtani-ha temple priests. To that end, from April to June of 1921, the Department sponsored three months of intensive lectures and training sessions on organized social work. Many of the sixty-seven attendees who completed these first sessions remained connected to Takeuchi throughout his career (forty-five were affiliated with the Ōtani-ha). The training offered at these conferences consisted of basic knowledge[41] necessary to manage the specific types of work the Society Department would undertake: introductions to places of work, regional committees, settlement work, child care, infant protection, mother and child protection, lifestyle improvement, social education, released prisoner protection, farming village problems, urban problems, and *buraku* area improvement.

As part of its network-building activities, the Society Department communicated frequently through official sect publications, attempted to recruit priests widely, and extend its influence to all the individual temples of the Ōtani-ha (JG 2008, 2,5; Hongō 2010). In 1922, this style of training and network-building continued with the first Regional Improvement Conference (Chihō Kaizen Kyōgikai

---

sect. It may also have been part of his charisma, allowing him to create networks in the first place.

[41] This basic knowledge included economics, sociology, psychology, ethics, government policy, criticism of modern thought, constitutional and administrative law, and the relation of social work to religion.

地方改善協議会). By 1924, Takeuchi had written the "Regional Improvement Plan" (*Chihō kaizen hōshin* 地方改善方針), a policy document on Ōtani-ha work to alleviate the material inequalities caused by *buraku* discrimination that depended heavily on this emerging network.

Representing the Ōtani-ha

From the very beginning of his work inside the Ōtani-ha administration, Takeuchi's thought developed in direct response to pressure from Levelers' Society activists and thinkers.[42] Both sides[43] have sought to promote human rights or condemn discrimination in their own ways. In the ideological conflict between reconciliationist and liberationist approaches, however, each side has been dissatisfied with how the other has done so. When the Ōtani-ha has been accused by liberationist advocacy groups of maintaining discriminatory institutional and economic relationships with *burakumin* followers, the administration has attempted to reform the Ōtani-ha order as a whole, reduce discrimination, and articulate a philosophy against discrimination based on Shin doctrine.

Intensive encounter between the buraku liberationists and the Ōtani-ha, 1922-1926

Takeuchi represented the Ōtani-ha official position to *buraku* liberationists, and was there to respond to harsh criticism and protest. Two periods were particularly active in terms of liberationist criticism, the early 1920s and early 1930s.

In 1922, the very day after a young group of left-wing *burakumin*, including

---

[42] Neary (1989, 80-81,138-139) describes the strong concern of the early Levelers' Society with discrimination within Shin Buddhism, and the influence that Shin Buddhist history and thought had within the Levelers' Society.

[43] Literally, "sides" *gawa* 側. Despite the fact that many *burakumin* are Ōtani-ha followers, different ideological commitments created two antagonistic sides represented by *buraku* advocacy organizations and the Ōtani-ha administration.

Saikō Mankichi, established the Levelers' Society[44] (Suiheisha) in Kyoto, they immediately turned their attention towards the Ōtani-ha and the Honganji-ha. The third resolution adopted at the Levelers' Society founding meeting reads:

> The absolute majority of *burakumin* are Shin followers. On this occasion, we will hear the frank views of the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha towards our movement. Depending on their response, we will take suitable action. (GS 13)[45]

A delegation of six members of the executive officially approached both Shin head temples to determine their position and demand their support in struggling against discrimination. At the Ōtani-ha head temple, Higashi Honganji, Abe Esui and Takeuchi Ryō'on received the delegates and their demands. They issued the following statement in response: "Because the intent of the Levelers' Society is in accord with the teachings of Shin Buddhism, we will offer as much support as we are able" (GS 14).

After the Honganji-ha and Ōtani-ha expressed their agreement and support of the movement in response, the Levelers' Society proceeded to a next step: to stop the flow of money from the impoverished *burakumin* to the Shin sect headquarters. On April 10, 1922, the executive committee chair sent to the Shin sects the following request by registered mail: "Hereafter, we would have you halt fund raising from *buraku* temples and *buraku* followers for any reason for a period of twenty years" (GS 14). At the same time, the Levelers' Society released the pamphlet "To the Shin Followers in the *Buraku*!" (*Burakunai no montoshū e* 部落内の門徒衆へ!) (GS 17-18) to encourage *burakumin* to "refuse to donate." The Levelers' reiterated this demand strongly at each annual convention, from 1922 to

---

[44] Izumi (1975, 5: 20-23). There are good descriptions of the founding of the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha) in in DeVos and Wagatsuma (1966) and Neary (1989), so I do not go into great detail here.

[45] Wagatsuma and Totten (1966, 45) translate the third resolution as follows: "as both the East and West Honganji Temples, of which the majority of Burakumin are parishioners, to express candidly their attitude towards our movement and then to decide on our own action depending on their reply."

1924, holding massive protests at both the Shin head temples. On the way to the 1923 convention, eight hundred *burakumin* stopped to protest.[46] Miura Sangendō (三浦参玄洞, 1884-1945), a Honganji-ha priest working as a journalist for the *Chūgai nippō*, covered the protests at Higashi Hongan-ji in 1923 (Miura 2006, 69-71).

Miura described how, early in the morning of March 3, hundreds of *burakumin* walked down one of the main streets of downtown Kyoto to the temple gates. They entered singing the Levelers' song and disturbed morning service for those inside the Founder's Hall. Carrying hundreds of flags with the emblem of the crown of thorns, the protesters marched through both the Founder's Hall and Amida Hall. Miura wrote that they bowed low before Amida, sat in silence for some time, and lamented a world where they must come to bring such an offering (of marching and flags) to the temple. One of the executive committee spoke: "The Levelers' Movement founded seven hundred years ago by Shinran has been profaned by this gilded hall and the faction of religious elite who protect it." Another description of the protest recounts how the speaker outside the temple, standing atop the donation box, shouting: "The true Shinran is not in this revered hall. As we stake our lives in this movement, for the first time we are able to worship the true Shinran...We believe that it is our movement that will revive the Hongan-ji temples" (Izumi 1975, 5:21). In the face of such criticism, Takeuchi apologized on behalf of the sect explaining that people of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) must critically consider and lament their responsibility for discrimination.

In the 1930s, Takeuchi represented the Ōtani-ha when discriminatory incidents occurred. After the publication of a commentary on the term "outcaste"

---

[46] There is a photo of this protest in Fujino and Kurokawa (2009, 163) depicting a member of the Levelers' executive committee standing on the donation box in front of the main hall at Nishi Hongan-ji.

(*sendara*, S. *caṇḍāla*) from the *Contemplation Sūtra* that linked outcaste to *burakumin*, Takeuchi and the True Body Society began to respond publically to the problem of scriptural interpretation with didactic texts and lectures. Takeuchi wrote, "Regarding the Interpretation of '*Sendara*': An Appeal to Preachers"[47] in *Shinshū*, the official sect magazine that is distributed to all priests nation-wide.[48] Discriminatory incidents occurred in the Honganji-ha as well,[49] and they were criticized for their interpretation of the term *sendara* in 1934.[50]

By 1935, delegations[51] from the Levelers' Society to the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha head temple administrations demanded that they take responsibility for discriminatory incidents committed by Shin priests or at Shin temples. As well, they demanded that the sect end its participation in reconciliation (*yūwa*) activities because these were thought "deceptive." Delegations also visited the two head temples for formal interviews on problems associated with the interpretation of the term "outcaste" (*sendara*) in contemporary Shin publications. Takeuchi received them as the head of the True Body Society. Yet again, in 1940, the Levelers' Society and the two Shin sect administrations met to discuss issues surrounding the ideology of "reconciliation" and the interpretation of *sendara* at a roundtable conference held at the head temple of the Ōtani-ha.[52] This kind of

---

[47] I summarize and discuss this text further in chapter 6.

[48] The True Body Society also distributed the pamphlet "The Great Heart and Amida's Compassion" (*Ōmigokoro to nyorai no ojihi* 大御心と如来のお慈悲), which exhorted Ōtani-ha followers to abandon discriminatory ideas.

[49] In 1931, discriminatory incidents at Honganji-ha temples in Mie and Osaka involved the discriminatory treatment and unfair dismissal of *burakumin* priests and women working at the temples. In the latter case, denunciation (*kyūdan*) meetings drew as many as 500 protesting *burakumin* to denounce the sect. In 1935, liberationists took issue with the public stance of a Kumamoto parish official on *burakumin*. After the national Levelers' Society approached the Honganji-ha head temple, the incident was resolved with a formal apology to local temples and Levelers' branch office (DBS 1:159).

[50] In 1934, the "Incident of the Interpretation of Sendara" (*Sendara sabetsu kaishaku jiken* 旃陀羅差別解釈事件 occured (DBS 1:187).

[51] Members of the national Levelers' Society executive committee were part of the delegation such as Asada Zennosuke (朝田善之助, 1902-1983), Nakamura Jin'ya (中村甚哉, 1903-1945), Imoto Rinshi (井元麟之).

[52] A roundtable was held in 1940 on the topic of "Regarding the Interpretation of *Sendara* and the Mission of Religion for the Reconciliation Problem" (*Yūwa mondai ni okeru shūkyōka no shimei, sendara kaishaku ni tsuite*

interaction would be repeated concerning discriminatory interpretations of karma, posthumous names, and so forth, into the postwar period. Of importance here is the process through which Ōtani-ha arrived at its official ethical positions. Its ethical positions were formulated within this bureaucratic context of conferences, negotiations, and meetings—where Ōtani-ha representatives apologized and promised reform.

In the face of intense criticism from the Levelers' Society, Takeuchi reaffirmed *buraku* discrimination as a social issue that the Society Department and True Body Society[53] would address, their willingness to work with the Levelers' Society, and confirmed their historical responsibility for *buraku* discrimination. Playing a unique role throughout the historical phases of Ōtani-ha interaction with *buraku* advocates, Takeuchi's faction continually met, debated with, and was denounced by the Levelers' Society and its organizational successor, the Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei).

融和問題における宗教家の使命、旃陀羅解釈について). The roundtable included Levelers' Society executive head, Matsumoto Jiichirō (松本治一郎, 1887-1966), Imoto Rinshi and Kurisu Shichirō, Honganji-ha priest, Honda Eryū (本多恵隆), Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrat, Yasuda Riki (安田力), head of the Kinki Yūwa Alliance, and *Chūgai nippō* journalist, Miura Sangendō, and representatives from the Kyoto prefectural Society Department (DBS).

[53] Once the Ōtani-ha had established a Society Department, the Honganji-ha soon followed. And once the Honganji-ha had established the One Truth Society (Ichinyokai 一如会, founded 1924) as a reconciliationist (*yūwa*) group to deal with *buraku* discrimination, the Ōtani-ha followed suit with the Shinshinkai.

6   Takeuchi's organizational and popular texts, the genres of the priest-bureaucrat

Takeuchi Ryō'on, and priest-bureaucrats like him, wrote what I label, "organizational texts"—memos and mission statements, plans and reports, budgets and budget justifications, short essays for the sect's "official magazine" (*kikanshi* 機関誌). These are the ephemera and limited circulation texts of Shin Buddhist bureaucrats, administrators, and accountants. These texts were either part of the management of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) and its relations with other organizations, or they targeted members of the order (*kyōdanjin*) to promote the institution's policies. To reach their membership and beyond, priest-bureaucrats also wrote "popular texts" in order to represent the Ōtani-ha order's (*kyōdan*) positions and activities to the outside world—pamphlets, booklets, posters, newspaper articles, and other small circulation texts that are rarely archived.

In these organizational and popular texts (at least in those that have survived)[1] a trove of ideas on social ethics and institutional reform are to be found. [2] I suggest that those who study Buddhist ethics should take these distinctive, bureaucratic textual genres seriously—despite the fact that they are not scriptural, sacred, nor venerable.[3] There are precedents for taking newer texts

---

[1] Masaki (1979, 42) mentions that there remains little detailed record of the activity of the True Body Society, or of the interactions of the Ōtani-ha administration with the Levelers' Society. One of Takeuchi's followers, Tachibana Ryōhō (橘了法, b.1910), gathered all of the materials that remained at Takeuchi Ryō'on's temple.

[2] Pamphleteering and public speaking were central to Takeuchi's activities. Yet, these pamphlets rarely survived and notes or transcripts of lectures were not kept. What is more, when records were kept, often these did not survive within the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. There must have been little desire to preserve the texts of a faction that dealt with an issue, namely *buraku* discrimination, that reflected negatively on the Ōtani-ha order as a whole (and thus, many lost documents). What we do have are published works, timelines, announcements, mentions in other texts, and recorded memories.

[3] Huxley (1995, 192) makes his own argument for taking ethics in commentarial and legal texts seriously in Southeast Asia: "as a legal historian, I am impressed by the shift in attitude towards ethics as between the canon and the commentaries. I understand it as a move from simple to complex, from amateur to professional

seriously. When scholars of Buddhist ethics enaged in constructive and applied projects, elaborating Buddhist ethical systems or positions on specific issues, these also represent "new" ethical texts. [4] The ethics espoused by modern and contemporary Buddhist leaders, too, are new.[5] Whether scholar or practitioner, these authors take older lists of virtues, moral trainings, moral heroes from Buddhist narratives, scriptural passages, and so on, and interpret them in modern genres: the "academic book," "essay," "journal article," "dharma-talk" or "public lecture." This is not different from what Takeuchi, and priest-bureaucrats like him, have done. He took the moral heroes, doctrines, values, and etiquette of Shin Buddhism and interpreted them in light of contemporary Japanese social problems and sect organizational policy.

Because of priest-bureaucrats' location inside the central, managing body of a Buddhist group they are often intensely concerned with the group itself. In Takeuchi's case, this meant a concern with the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*), its structure and policy. This focus on the group is striking when compared with the overwhelming attention paid to the individual by scholars of Buddhist ethics to date. Takeuchi and the priest-bureaucrats he inspired inside the Ōtani-ha self-consciously addressed history and the moral position of a religious institution *qua* institution.

Collected, summarized, and translated here are important examples of organizational and popular texts written by Takeuchi between 1920 and 1965.

---

and from the boring to the interesting...From the 13th to the 20th centuries, authors, particularly those from the Middle Mekong and Upper Burma regions, were concerned to extract practical implications from the Pāli canon and apply them to contemporary society. Their thoughts were expressed in many genres, including sermons, chronicles, birth-stories, law texts."

[4] These constructive projects involve a "melding" or "grafting," in Whitehill's (1994, 3) words, of Buddhist and Western ethical philosophies, and he gives several examples. There are also attempts by scholars to reinterpret "problematic" doctrines, such as karma, in relation to ethics (W. King 1994a; Wright 2004).

[5] Much of what scholars of Buddhist ethics do is point out ways that such contemporary reinterpretations or assertions deviate from premodern ones (Harris 1994; Keown 1998).

Although he wrote about many other topics as well,[6] the texts below stand apart as they all deal with *buraku* discrimination. A familiarity with these texts is useful for understanding Takeuchi's ethical thought, which chapter 7 will discuss in more detail.

Takeuchi's texts

Takeuchi developed his views in a series of memos, books, newspaper articles, and pamphlets from the late 1910s until the mid-1960s (TRI 1920, 1927, 1929, 1950; Takeuchi 1919, 1921, 1955, 1965). There were a few common themes in his work, which I address in this chapter through summary and translation:

(1) *Arguments regarding the structure of the Ōtani-ha order*. During fifty years of writing, Takeuchi presented recommendations for Ōtani-ha governance and policy, and for the organization of concrete activities and institutions. He had a concrete picture of how social work ought to be structured in order to combat *buraku* discrimination. He argued that the Ōtani-ha had to develop specific kinds of institutions and support them adequately with money and personnel. Moreover, he argued that the Ōtani-ha ought to grant them limited autonomy within the sect bureaucracy. Early in his career, when Takeuchi was firmly

---

[6] In the 1920s and early 1930s, for example, he wrote about rural poverty in a few pamphlets, including the 1923 *Rural Poverty and the Ōtani-ha* (*Nōson mondai to Shinshū Ōtaniha* 農村問題と真宗大谷派) and the 1930 *Temples and Farming Villages* (*Jiin to Nōson* 寺院と農村). As well, he wrote several texts dealing with Hansen's disease (leprosy) such as the 1931 *Elimination of Leprosy and the Ōtani-ha Society of Light* (*Rai zetsumetsu to Ōtaniha Kōmyōkai* 癩絶滅と大谷派光明会). He wrote extensively on children, childcare, education: "Children and Religion" (*Jidō to shūkyō* 児童と宗教) 1922; "On the Relation Between the Protection of Children within the System of Religious Education and Religious Education Itself" (*Shūkyō kyōiku no tōsei ni kanshi jidō hogo to shūkyō kyōiku no kankei o ronzu* 宗教教育の統制に関し児童保護と宗教教育の関係を論ず) 1923; "The Meaning of Child Protection" (*Jidō hogo no igi* 児童保護の意義) 1926; "Taking Issue with Public Opinion Encouraging the Ministers of Education and the Interior to Reflect on the Preschool Law and the Regulations for Childcare Facilities" (*Yōchien rei, narabi ni jitsugen semu to suru takujisho junsoku ni kanshi Naishō Bunshō no hansei o unagashi ippan yoron ni uttafu* 幼稚園令，並びに実現せむとする託児所準則に関し内相文相の反省を促し一般輿論に訴ふ) 1926; "The Sunday School of Austerity and Effort" (*Genkaku to doryoku no nichikō* 厳格と努力の日校) 1927; "Religious Education and Child Protection" (*Shūkyō kyōiku to jidō hogo* 宗教教育と児童保護) 1929. And he wrote about women: "Nuns and Prostitutes" (*Nisō to kōshō* 尼僧と公娼) 1921; "The Two Great Ways in the Conduct of Women" (*Fujin shosei no nidai hōto* 婦人処世の二大方途) 1927. For a list of selected writings, see TRI (297-301).

embedded in the bureaucracy, he proposed structural changes in proposals, mission statements, and society rules. In the postwar period, when he was in a consultative, arms-length position, these ideas were developed in a series of books, essays, and manuscript proposals distinctly utopian in flavor. In the first part of this chapter, I translate and summarize a few of his early, prewar proposals and his late, postwar dreams for the order (*kyōdan*) as a whole.

(2) *Moral critique and moral exhortation*. In the second part of this chapter, I present summaries of several editorials written by Takeuchi where he addressed an audience both internal and external to the Ōtani-ha sect. He tried to rally sect followers to support social work, and convince outsiders that Ōtani-ha social work was both proper and effective. Newspaper editorials are both his earliest and latest forms of public writing. The first appeared in the late 1910s, and the last, in the mid-1960s. In his often harsh and fiery tone, in specialist journals, the Ōtani-ha magazine, and Buddhist press, he criticized failed attempts to address *buraku* discrimination by other individuals and institutions, as well as obvious examples of discrimination. He exhorted his readers, asserting that Shin Buddhist institutions had a vital public role to play and tried to convince members of the Ōtani-ha order that social work to mitigate *buraku* discrimination was a necessary pursuit.

(3) *Reporting on the kind of work being done*. For a priest-bureaucrat, meticulous records of institutions supported, groups formed, lectures held, and meetings convened represents a kind of modern "merit book"[7]—a ledger of the moral acts of the sect submitted for government and public review. In the third and last section, I summarize a typical report. Reports are an

---

[7] See Spiro (1966a, 1167-1172) for a description of merit-making and Burmese "merit account books," where Burmese Buddhists kept a record of meritorious and demeritorious deeds.

interesting genre. They bring together scientific surveys, information, lists—the attempt to produce accurate knowledge about *burakumin*--with mission statements and plans. In the case of the Ōtani-ha, reports are text where the latest, scientific approaches to social work and social problems come to the foreground in a religious institution's text.

Early career proposals for the structure of the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy

In this section, I translate and summarize two proposals. The first is a memo from 1920 related to the social engagement of the Ōtani-ha. The second is the mission statement and society rules for True Body Society (Shinshinkai) (1926-1954).

An internal memo from 1920

The paradigmatic example of Takeuchi's internal, organizational proposals is a memo entitled "Rationale for Establishing the Society Department."[8] This memo was discovered at his temple, Shōrin-ji 松林寺, in Hyogo prefecture after Takeuchi's death, when a few of his followers were sifting through his books and papers (Izumi 2009, 12). It is the only known copy and is unquestionably the most important internal document written by Takeuchi. Written in 1920, the memo argued for the creation of a bureau for social work, just like those being created within the national and prefectural government bureaucracies.

In addition to presenting arguments relating Shin doctrine and social work, Takeuchi also addressed organizational structure and funding. As an administrator, he realized that social work needed adequate funding and some degree of autonomy. Without money, organized social work is impossible. Without organized social work, there would be no recreation of society. Takeuchi often faced resistance and antagonism from the Ōtani-ha Budget Department. Although the

---

[8] *Shakaika setchi riyū sho* 社会課設置理由書 (TRI 1920, 13-20; GS 235-238).

Society Department budget reached as high as 10 percent of all traditional doctrinal studies expenditures, Takeuchi felt it was still insufficient. Indeed, part of the reason he established the True Body Society, in addition to the Society Department, was to get access to matching government funding. Takeuchi knew that the Ōtani-ha could not fund activities and institutions to the extent that national and regional Japanese governments could, but nonetheless he believed that sect administration ought to devote substantial financial resources to social work and use its existing institutions to the fullest. "Existing institutions" meant the available network of thousands of temples, tens of thousands of temple priests, national and local Ōtani-ha women's and youth groups, and other established programs to mitigate the effects of *buraku* discrimination. Without autonomy, he argued that a new department for social work would simply be unable to adapt to the most up-to-date, scientific knowledge necessary for effective social work.

Because of its importance, I translate Takeuchi's "Rationale for Establishing the Society Department" here in full:

> When I observe the state of popular society today, when I think about a meaningful role for the temple priest, and when I contemplate the nature of social work (*shakai jigyō*) that our founder, Shinran, would have intended—I believe most strongly in the need for a "Society Department" (Shakaika) in our sect.
>
> 1. *The meaning of the temple priest*. A meaningful role (*sonzai no igi* 存在の意義) for the temple priest is twofold: (1) a social role fulfilling the basic needs of society,[9] and (2) a religious role acting to fulfil what society requires from our religion. Historically, we see this meaningful social role when Shakamuni taught the *Medicine Buddha Sūtra* (*Bussetsu igyō* 仏説医経),[10] when Kūkai

---

[9] Literally, "fufilling the actual demands of society" (*shakai no genjitsu teki yōkyū manzoku* 社会の現実的要求満足).

[10] Although the title is slightly different, Takeuchi was likely refering to the *Bussetsu butsui kyō* 仏説仏医経 (T 793), known in modern Japan. It is a short *sūtra* on causes of disease, diet, and hygiene practices recommended for all people by Shakamuni Buddha.

built roads, when Saichō[11] was the teacher of the whole nation—[in other words] the social role that temple priests previously played as part of education and government before the Meiji Restoration. In terms of their religious role, we see it in the transmission of doctrine and the particular rituals of each school and sect of Buddhism. Shin Buddhist temple priests today, however, play little social role. Even their religious role of preaching, chanting the scriptures, and performing rituals, is lacking. I must strongly declare that, since the Meiji Restoration, the temple priest's social role has truly disappeared. Moreover, when we shift our gaze to their religious role, all agree that we must deeply reflect on our failings. The foundations for a meaningful role are being eroded further and there is cause for the greatest anxiety about the future. This is truly a dangerous time for the temple priest, and must be recognized as a crucial time of reflection for the whole sect. (TRI 1920, 14)

2. *The state of popular society.* Although there are many causes for the disappearance of the temple priest's meaningful role, one cause is the individualistic and materialistic popular society that has emerged through social transformation. Regardless of how hard temple priests work, they fail. It is simple fact that the karmic conditions (*shukuen* 宿縁) for success have not developed and the world is full of beings lacking good karmic conditions (*mushukuzen no ki* 無宿善の機).[12] It is critical that this shameless and negligent (*hōitsu musan* 放逸無懺) society that places all its faith in material things reflect upon itself and its failings. Individual hearts crumble into anxiety and the organic unity of society has become fragmented. We must now seek a new road, engage in a variety of social work, cultivate a spirit of social service, withdraw from the material and turn towards the spiritual, and take refuge (*kimyō* 帰命) in the heart that benefits others rather than a heart that benefits ourselves. This is our opportunity to recreate contemporary society. (TRI 1920, 14-15)

3. *Social work.* Even though there are different definitions of social work and different types of institutions, the movement that underlies them all is none other than the attempt to eliminate the inequalities and hardships of society,

and to transform the people's hearts so that they are conscious of society and seek to benefit others.

4. *Shin Buddhism and social work*. Social work cannot develop on its own; [it requires Buddhism.] Recently, society has begun to look to Buddhism again, despite turning its back in the past. It is not without reason that many Buddhists actually work in areas like government administration and engage in social work. (TRI 1920, 15)

Contemporary social work tends to agree with socialism. Both attempt to realize a society of freedom and equality in the phenomenal, [material] world. To achieve that goal, socialists perform social work in order to recreate society. However, socialism is what "they" [those in authority] fear—and this is not without reason. It is more than simply a fear with regard to the nation-state (*kokutai*).[13] Rather, the fear stems from socialism's fundamental focus on the material. In other words, socialists' seek a society of lasting freedom and equality *within* the material world. In the end, because of this misguided [focus on the material,] they are unable to seek the path to realizing a heart that is truly at peace (*anjin ryūmyō* 安心立命).[14] [They are unable to provide salvation.] (TRI 1920, 15)

Again, the present generation actively preaches being socially conscious and benefiting others. They are looking to Buddhism only for this ethic of altruistic love, without understanding that this love is *not thoroughgoing* and merely instrumentally valuable. They cannot get past this.[15] (TRI 1920, 15-16)

When we look at this from the Shin Buddhist standpoint, however, benefiting others is not an instrumental value—*it is none other than the goal itself*. We do not seek freedom and equality in this material world of impermanence and various good acts (*shogyō* 諸行).[16] In a direct intuition of pure spirit, this

---

[13] This refers to a belief held by many in government that the spread of leftist, Marxist, and socialist thought threatened the cohesion of the nation-state. See Neary (1989, 151).

[14] A state of peace and confidence associated with faith. In Shin doctrine, it characterizes life in this world following the arising of faith (*shinjin* 信心), when the practitioner's birth in the pure land is settled. As Murakami (2004) explains, this state sustains and motivates in the present despite its orientation towards the future pure land.

[15] That is, society merely seeks ethics from religion. Takeuchi portrays Shin social work as activity that improves both the material and ethical situation of society in addition to cultivating the causes and conditions of its salvation. He argues, then, that what is unique about Shin social work is that it accomplishes the goals of socialism and ethics in society while transcending both to offer salvation.

[16] *Shogyō* refers to acts that are good, such as charity, referring to "all religious, moral, and ethical teaching

world is immediately, bodily attained (*taitoku* 体得) with the arising of joy and diamond-like faith (*kongō no shinjin* 金剛の信心).[17] Within this world of inequality and conflict—just as it is—we have faith in the great compassion of Amida Buddha. Thus it is said: "within beings filled with greed, anger, and blind passions, the pure, undefiled heart longing for birth in the pure land is born." This Shin way of life is not one of aggression or possession; it is one of repentance (*zange*)[18] and gratitude (*hōsha* 報謝). Should a modern person (*gendaijin* 現代人) encounter this excellent faith, that person will be immediately saved. The activities of Shin Buddhism in society are the very ideal of social work. Such work will be the reason why those on the outside of Buddhism such as politicians rely on it, and why temple priests on the inside will come to think on their great and weighty responsibility. If we view it like this, it is not going too far to say that social work will only be accomplished by a movement of Shin Buddhist temple priests and followers. (TRI 1920, 16)

And what is the form of this "Buddhist movement" now? We must first consider the transmission of the teachings (*senden* 宣伝). In the midst of today's chaos, it seems that priests and their activities are merely a habit. Because of this, temple priests are thought useless and superfluous. Although we might be tempted to dismiss this as ignorant slander by those outside our sect, we must reflect on the inadequacies of our Buddhist movement. And what is this "inadequacy"? *It is nothing other than the view that it is strange for Buddhists to engage in social work at all*.[19] As our head temple determines their position on social work, they should learn from the founder, Shinran, who "ate meat and married" (*nikujiki saitai*). (TRI 1920, 16)

In a period of social transition, there is contradiction and conflict between old and new ways of thinking. The new are awash with destructive discontent and disobedience.[20] The old stubbornly and imprudently settle with hypocrisy and

---

other than the *nenbutsu*" (CWS 2: 170). In Shin Buddhism these acts do not lead to salvation.

[17] *Shinjin* is the arising of faith that assures salvation through birth in Amida's pure land. Takeuchi is positing a kind of immediate change in the "way of life" of a person with the arising of *shinjin*. This is the way he proposes to improve the ethical situation of society.

[18] For Takeuchi, repentance (*zange* 懺悔) is strongly linked to reflection (*hansei* 反省) and lamentation (*kanashimu* 悲しむ). The social work of Takeuchi's counterpart in the Honganji-ha, Umehara Shinryū, in response to *buraku* discrimination has been called a "repentance movement" (*zange undō* 懺悔運動) where the motivation for social action and transformation begins with repentance, shame, and humility of the actor.

[19] Here, Takeuchi addressed people inside and outside the Ōtani-ha that believed Buddhism should not be involved in the public realm or politics.

[20] The "new" are also the young and the marginalized, the "old," the established and empowered. To become a

autocracy. In this situation, pious persons who bring peace and salvation to human hearts look first to the suffering of the people—and so become companions (*dōbō*) of the new, shedding their discontent and disobedience. Sympathizing with the realities of the situation, removing such discontent and disobedience, they become companions (*dōbō*) of the old—[in the end] removing their hypocrisy and autocracy. (TRI 1920, 16)

Why did the founder "eat meat and marry" (*nikujiki saitai*)? Hypocritical people of Shinran's day tolerated their own corruption; these "false-good" people (*gizensha* 偽善者) did not reflect (*hansei*). Shinran abandoned the useless elaboration and propping up of dead doctrines. He listened well to the voices of the people and reflected (*hansei*) deeply in his heart. He made clear the existence of suffering, he sympathized with the new, removed their discontent and disobedience—this is the very sign of a true heart. (TRI 1920, 17)

When I say "transmission of the teachings" (*kyōgi o senden* 教義を宣伝) I mean precisely to sympathize well with the sufferings of people, know them, and create institutions to respond to them (*shisetsu*). To forget to create such institutions is a kind of death. If it were merely a matter of transmitting "doctrine," the founder would not have eaten meat and married. Shinran threw himself into this world, a house on fire with the defilements of passion and ignorance. He acted in the spirit of the true doctrine. We must consider him a great comforter who provided peace and safety amid the world's abuses. (TRI 1920, 17)

Today's social work is both sought within, and goes against, Buddhism. The reason why it goes against Buddhism is that the established form of benevolence and charity (*jinji sen'ai* 仁慈博愛) quickly moves away from sympathy with the poor and oppressed—it actually *causes* discontent and disobedience. [Shin Buddhists engaged in social work, on the other hand,] come into contact with the oppressed with their own bodies, come to see them as their close companions (*dōbō*), and seek to fulfill their needs. (TRI 1920, 17)

We must consider Amida, who sympathized with the evil (*zaiaku*) [person]. Vainly modeling moral rules and didactically transmitting the teachings will,

---

"companion" (*dōbō*) in Takeuchi's view also means becoming a mediator between social classes.

ironically, cause the oppressed to suffer and resist. As society becomes more complicated, the temple priest will be the only one who sympathizes (*dōjō* 同情) with suffering beings. The temple priest will become their close companion (*dōbō*) as both the *method* of transmitting the teachings and developing faith (*shinjin*), as well as the *content* of a life of gratitude. Other sects are wrapped up in the form of their doctrine, depart from reality, and are unable to remove the discontent and disobedience of the people [as Shinran did].

Shin Buddhist temple priests becomes the true companion (*dōbō*) of those who suffer by closely examining the peoples' suffering and understanding the social work that will fulfill their needs. *With that knowledge and technique*, they become a true companion—and this must be their duty. (TRI 1920, 17)

Shin social work is different from worldly social work. It seeks to strengthen the organic unity of society. Shin temple priests transcend the utilitarian standpoint and fulfil all the needs of the people. The temple priests must think of this work as the karmic condition (*shukuen*) [in the people] for the arising of diamond-like faith (*shinjin*). They must think of this work as their true purpose and their lives as a living out of continuous gratitude. Shinran's eating meat was not merely to fulfill material needs [like the social work of the socialist]. It was sympathy (*dōjō*) in response to reality. The Shin temple priests are the ones who will lead [society] away from the danger of the utilitarian, [the merely ethical,] standpoint and cause people to know a life of true gratitude. This is their responsibility. Necessarily, the attitude of Shin Buddhist social work *must be learned in the doing*, and the truth of being the companion of the poor and oppressed, is not neglected, *but learned by having that very goal*. In this way, Shin social work becomes an act of continuous gratitude. (TRI 1920, 18)

5. *Reasons for establishing the Society Department*. As mentioned above, the reasons for establishing the Society Department in our sect administration are: (1) to respond to the needs of the present age, (2) to craft the social role of the temple priest, and in so doing, (3) to perfect the religious role of the temple priest.[21]

---

[21] Notice here that knowing the current conditions of society and creating an effective social role for priests are more important than a "religious" role (preaching, chanting, ritual, etc.) in society. A religious role is, for Takeuchi, only secondary and predicated on priests' social role.

6. *Reasons for the independence of the Society Department*. Social work establishes a new kind of preaching (*fukyō* 布教). And because social work requires special knowledge and technique, it would be best if the Society Department were not managed as an administrative sub-department of traditional doctrinal studies (*kyōgaku*). This is the foremost reason that the Society Department should be separate. (TRI 1920, 18)

Social work should also be independent because of ignorant outsiders, and malicious insiders who have fallen into mindless habit. These people think that social work and Buddhism have no relation; worse, they think Buddhists should not do social work. *They are just like those people who hated the founder, Shinran, for eating meat and marrying*. However, the founder proclaimed eating meat and marrying—as if he anticipated our current state of affairs. This great act makes clear the proper position of the head temple. If the Society Department were merely a sub-department [of traditional doctrinal studies (*kyōgaku*)], it would be difficult for it to live up to Shinran's great act. Our goal is to remove the misunderstandings of outsiders and awaken complacent insiders frozen in their habits. To build up a Department capable of answering this great challenge, I seek its administrative independence. This is the second reason.

In summary, the Society Department must be independent in order to carry out its various affairs such that it: (1) contributes to the social role of the temple priest, (2) takes the lead in contemporary social work, and (3) stands firmly within the phenomenal world, rather than the literary world of traditional doctrinal studies. (TRI 1920, 19)

In this memo to the highest levels of the Ōtani-ha administration, the chief administrator, head priest, and cabinet, Takeuchi argued forcefully that the true meaning of Shin Buddhist temple priests is found in social work. He connected this with a variety of Shin doctrinal terms such as "karmic conditions," "shameless and negligent," "diamond-like faith," "companion," and so on. Then, he distinguished this Shin social work from other types present in society (altruistic and socialist). Last, he argued that a Society Department must be independent from traditional doctrinal studies within the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. Not only would such a department prioritize scientific knowledge and technique, but it would constantly

220

innovate in how it connected Shin teachings and ideals with the performance of social work.

1926 mission statement for the True Body Society

For a variety of reasons, such as sectarian finances and politics, in 1926 Takeuchi decided to create a partially independent reconciliation (*yūwa*) group for the Ōtani-ha, just as the Honganji-ha had done two years prior. With access to government funding and a measure of organizational autonomy, he hoped he would be able to approach the issue of *buraku* discrimination in ways impossible from fully inside the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. The short, mission statement for this new reconciliation group, appeared in government reports and the sect magazine: "Mission Statement for Establishing the True Body Society"[22]:

> The problem of relations between our majority and minority compatriots is the most important social problem of the present day. Currently, both governmental and civil [groups] perform a variety of social work to address this problem. In our sect, since the establishment of the Society Department (Shakaika) in 1921, considerable funds, much administrative activity and official directives (*kunji* 訓示) by the head administrator and instruction by the Society Department bureaucrats have been directed at this problem. However, due to various circumstances inside the sect, it has become difficult to continue this work. It is with regret for this deplorable situation that we cannot expect much [of sectarian social work] either now or in the foreseeable future.
>
> But we cannot neglect this problem even for a single day! All across the country contributions by each individual and from each standpoint are being made. Truly, the order (*kyōdan*) of those who live in religious faith ought to take the initiative and apply itself diligently and attentively. Especially when we look back upon our sect's history and doctrine, we feel an even greater sense of responsibility. Even if there were no difficult [circumstances in our sect], we would have to acknowledge the necessity for a thoroughgoing movement [to end discrimination].

---

[22] *Shinshinkai setsuritsu no shuisho* 真身会設立の趣意書 (GS 239).

Here, due to these conditions and circumstances, we create a new group, a "True Body Society," with the goal of contributing to the reconciliation movement. We will open a true path of gratitude for the order (*kyōdan*), and based upon our society's rules, pursue various kinds of [social] work. By this work, we will always strive to uphold the intention of our school (*shūi* 宗意).

Vowing thus, we rely on the earnest support and enthusiasm of all of you who share the faith of our school of Buddhism possess in your innermost hearts. By achieving the goals of this society, we long to rip out the roots of this inauspicious thing [discrimination] in this auspicious age as quickly as possible. [dated March 25, 1926] (GS 239)

Moral critique and moral exhortation: editorials, tours, and lectures

Takeuchi's fiery and critical tone was well suited to newspaper editorials, and it is no surprise that his earliest and latest published works were editorials for the mainstream press. He wrote, too, for the popular Buddhist newspapers and presses, such as the *Chūgai nippō* and Bunka Jihōsha 文化時報社. He was also a prolific contributor to Ōtani-ha sectarian publications and specialist publications addressing the *buraku* problem. Finally, he was also an energetic lecturer, although records beyond the announcement of these lecture dates, and sometimes their topic, are now lost. We know, for example, that he maintained a busy lecture schedule until the end of the war in 1945.

He exhorted his readers to specific kinds of action and he harshly criticized what he saw as failures and misconceptions. He exposed views that were simply wrong, or wrong because circumstances had changed. Chief among these, for Takeuchi, was the view that religion had no place in society. Takeuchi argued fiercely against those, both inside and outside the Ōtani-ha, that believed temple priests ought to take care of ritual and doctrine only. Takeuchi viewed criticism as a way to force an individual or a group to "wake up" to their own evil and incompetence. Realizing one's own evil is part of the Shin Buddhist path to awakening; for Takeuchi, criticism had a soteriological as well as a social

dimension. Criticism was a method for transforming oneself and others, planting good karmic causes and conditions in society, and connecting society with Amida's salvation. I discuss this further in the next chapter.

His last editorial as a secular governmental official in 1919

One of his last editorials before he left his Shiga Prefecture job and moved into the Otani-ha bureaucracy, was published in the Osaka *Mainichi shinbun* 毎日新聞 and entitled, "The Fundamental Spirit of Salvation Work."[23] In the editorial, Takeuchi distinguished Shin social action from all other types and motivations for social action (whether from scientific social policy or humanitarian charity). He argued, too, that social action commonly called "salvation work" (*kyūsai jigyō*), relieving those in misery (*fukō* 不幸), itself changes in nature and scope over time (Takeuchi 1919, part 1). In this editorial, he lashed out against altruists, humanitarians, and indifferent bureaucrats.

He argued that all other standpoints, apart from the standpoint of Shin Buddhist social action, had their flaws, an argument he made consistently throughout his career. He applied it to charity, altruism, and secular morality, as well as various political ideologies (feudalism, capitalism, socialism, liberal democracy). None, in his view, offered a correct understanding of the human being nor caused the proper motivation for social action to arise. For example, he argued that the humanitarian is wrong to believe that truly benefiting others is possible; "saving" others is not possible and one's desire to benefit others is always defiled (*fujun* 不純) by self-interest and selfishness. Altruists are, in fact, pretentious and hateful. [24] They participate in contradiction, incoherence, and false good

---

[23] *Kyūsai jigyō no konpon seishin* 救済事業の根本精神 (Takeuchi 1919). The subtitle of the work is "A Discussion with Takeuchi Ryō'on, Bachelor of Letters and Responsible for Regional Improvement in Shiga Prefecture" (*Shiga-ken chihō kairyō shunin bungakushi Takeuchi Ryō'on shi no dan* 滋賀県地方改良主任文学士武内了温氏の談).
[24] *unubore teki iyami teki* 自惚れ的いやみ的.

(hypocrisy).[25] He argued that "savers" are liable to this criticism because they have not critically reflected upon themselves (*hansei*) (Takeuchi 1919, part 2). According to Takeuchi, "savers," in the end, have no faith in the dignity (*songen* 尊厳), and the fundamental worth, of those they try to save. Always, they consider "the 'saved' as evil persons (*akunin*)[26]" (Takeuchi 1919, part 3).

In the world of social policy, too, Takeuchi criticized the flaws of that type of social action. The bureaucrat (*hōkan* 法官) does not suffer from arrogance and despising the objects of social action—they suffer from indifference and a lack of love (*aijō ga nai* 愛情がない). Takeuchi pointed out that, for the bureaucrat, the objects of relief or salvation work are just that, "objects." They are hindrances to social development. They, too, are unable to see the person being targeted by social policy as a human being of worth and dignity (Takeuchi 1919, part 4).

Although Takeuchi used the term "religious" (*shūkyō*), he meant Shin Buddhism. In the last two parts of this extended editorial, he discussed Shin Buddhist salvation work in society (Takeuchi 1919, parts 5-6). He observed that the proper standpoint on social action does not distinguish between the "saver" and the "saved." Saving others is like the responsibility to eat when one is hungry; the "saved" are viewed as oneself.

> To feel anger towards the outside world, this is evidence that one is not yet saved. To have resistance, hatred, this means the self is not yet saved. We must see that the disabled, the homeless, all of this arises from discrimination within the self.[27] (Takeuchi 1919, part 5)

Takeuchi described how the belief that there are "people to be saved" springs from one's own evil, discriminating "unsaved" self. Discrimination in society may be

---

[25] *unubore de mujun de dōchaku de gizen de* 己惚で矛盾で撞着で偽善で.
[26] *hikyūsaisha wa doko made mo akunin* 被救済者はどこまでも悪人.
[27] *subete kore sabetsukan teki jiko yori shōjitaru mono ni suginai* すべてこれ差別観的自己より生じたるものにすぎない.

traced back to a fundamentally evil human nature:

> I must know myself as subject to inescapable suffering and unavoidably defiled[28]—how then can I feel anger towards the homeless and impoverished? This anger is only anger towards my self. How then is it possible to hate others? (Takeuchi 1919, part 5)

Takeuchi waxed eloquent about this state of realizing one's own evil and defilement. He clearly connected it to the salvation of Amida Buddha, the Buddha of Immeasurable Light, and explains it with the familiar Mahāyāna logic of two truths, conventional and ultimate, self and other:

> I hear the voice of heaven. I see inconceivable light shining in the midst of chaotic, inconceivable suffering. I do not doubt the compassion that grasps me. I live *because* I do not doubt the light that grasps me. I support benefiting others (*rita* 利他), but there is certainly no benefitting others done by me. I believe greatly in the dignity of benefitting others. Without love for others, saving is impossible. The other is none other than me. But, in my own salvation towards the other, in the "me" that unites self and other, there is no discernible principle of salvation. The moment I am aware of myself, I know that I am un-saveable. Thus, when I have the conviction that *I can save*, I cannot save. Rather, from my standpoint, I have the conviction that *I can be saved*. For this reason, I certainly cannot become a "saver." This is why the fundamental spirit of salvation work *must be religious*... there is a necessary relation (*hitsuzen teki kankei* 必然的関係) between religious faith *shinnen* and salvation work. (Takeuchi 1919, part 6)

For Takeuchi, only the religious—the Shin Buddhist standpoint of salvation—allows us to avoid social action based on arrogance of the self or an indifferent neglect for the worth of the other. The fact that he lambasted the "humanitarian" and the "bureaucrat" was so that they could realize their mistakes, and wake up to their own evil, defiled natures.

---

[28] *yogoroshi to shite kaihi suru koto wa dekinai* 汚しとて回避する事は出来ない.

A 1921 appeal to Buddhist administrators nation-wide

Lest we think that Takeuchi directed his criticisms and exhortations at those outside the world of religion, there remains his 1921 article "An Appeal to the Administrators in the Head Temples of Each School and Each Sect,"[29] published in the *Chūgai nippō*.

Summary: Takeuchi addresses Buddhist head temple administrators—people like himself—questioning whether they are aware of the current, lamentable life of temple priests.[30] Priests lack proper training, and have been weakened by society's disdain, persecution, and government control. In this situation, temple priests who seek to benefit beings are hindered and held in contempt—yet at the same time the government holds these priests responsible for social work and blames them when there is social unrest.[31] Takeuchi argues here that it is the government and society who are to blame for hindering Buddhist social work. These hindrances are typical of the latter days of the Buddhist teaching, an age of decayed morals. The government's policy of using Shintō to prop up morality will not work. Everyone has forgotten to consider the causes and conditions of social problems.

Takeuchi calls upon the administrators of all Buddhist sects to critically reflect on the meaning of their existence (*hansei*). Is it to passively maintain religious affairs? To protect the prestige of one's own small sect? It is to be responsible for the temple priest! Takeuchi explains that head temple administrations are to blame for the loss of temple priests' social role. They are responsible to do this organizational work. They must reforge the link between Buddhism, government, and society that was broken in the Meiji restoration (which now prevents Buddhist social engagement). The ruling government and its politicians are more dangerous [than socialist radicals] because they have immorally neglected the impoverished, and the bodies and minds of the people. Takeuchi calls on head temples to benefit living beings and restore the Buddhist teachings, and to open the way from the temple priest. To claim that the head temples do not have this responsibility, to blame the temple priests for their circumstances—this is just like a politician that blames the *burakumin* (*saimin*) for their circumstances and says they cannot be helped! Only the effort of head temple administrators can assist the

---

[29] *Kakushū kakuha no honzan tōkyokusha ni gekisu* 各宗各派の本山当局者に檄す (TRI 1921, 21-23).

[30] They have lost the jewel of the *dharma*.

[31] I suspect this is an oblique reference to suggestions by certain individuals in government and civil society that the Shin sects are to blame for *burakumin* participation in the Rice Riots of 1918.

temple priest with their current circumstances.

Takeuchi then breaks temple priests into two categories: the bad and the good. Bad temple priests only rely on habit and custom, hurting themselves and others. Good temple priests critically reflect on their social responsibility and work hard to lead a meaningful life serving living beings. Bad priests are the reason for social criticism of Buddhist sects. Good priests languish without support. Head temple administrators must wake up to the sad conditions of the temple priest, whip the bad priests into shape, and open the way for true priests.

A 1921 exhortation in the official Ōtani-ha magazine

The article "Regarding the Opening of the Training Facility for Social Work,"[32] appeared in the official sect magazine, *Shūhō* 宗報, in February 1921. Takeuchi's first act as head of the Ōtani-ha's Society Department was to create this training facility and recruit temple priests and potential social workers. His main "exhortations" were meant to convince his readers—followers and priests of the Ōtani-ha—that: (1) temple priests ought to perform social work, and (2) that the sect administration had to be properly structured to support their social work.

Summary: Takeuchi begins with the idea that religion has always been involved in society. The term "social work" is new, so people assume the work itself is new. Moreover, they assume that social work has nothing to do with religionists. Takeuchi describes how the current age is afflicted by war and suffering on both the eastern and western sides of the ocean. But no matter what the age, humans are corrupt: selfish, individualist, arrogant (*gaman* 我慢), negligent (*hōitsu* 放逸), seeking pleasure, collapsing into the anxiety about pain, shameless (*musan* 無慚), pathetic, distressed, conflicted, and so on. He explains that the temple priest must become the companion (*dōbō*) of all who suffer in the current age. Amidst suffering and distress, dangerous thought and economic troubles, the temple priest works hard to experience the ocean of faith (*shinkai* 信海) that is benefiting others (*rita*). Takeuchi explains that this is "social work" (*shakai jigyō*).

Takeuchi argues, however, that temple priests have been denied the chance to be

---

[32] *Shakai jigyō kōshū sho kaisetsu ni tsuite* 社会事業講習所開設に就いて (Takeuchi 1921, 16, 20; SS 232, 16, 20).

companions of those who suffer, to perform social work. An entire generation of people without faith has appeared. Takeuchi laments the fact that most temple priests merely repeating the rituals and customs of the past out of habit. They are not taken seriously and thought useless to society. He explains next that a unified head temple organization, the Ōtani-ha order, would turn outward to recommend that society rely on its temple priests and inward to make the temple priests worth of reliance. This is what the training facility is meant to accomplish. Takeuchi described how the facility would help develop priests who could truly live lives of continuous gratitude performing social work, priests who would know the facts of contemporary social suffering, the institutions necessary to combat it, and who would teach their local followers. Takeuchi then refers the reader to the rules for the new training facility.

According to these rules, the facilities are to be located in regional sect offices. Participants are temple priests or certified priests belonging to the Ōtani-ha and the purpose of training is to increase knowledge necessary to combat social problems. Training sessions are to last from three to seven days. All lecturers, schedule, attendees, etc. are to be recorded and submitted to the Doctrinal Affairs Division (Kyōgakubu 教学部).

Exhorting Shin preachers in 1932

By the 1930s, the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha) had been publically shaming individuals and groups that used discriminatory words for almost a decade. The Levelers' Society targeted words in Buddhist sacred texts that had shaped *buraku* discrimination, such as "outcaste" (*sendara*), "inhuman" (*hinin*), words for karma and types of karmic retribution found in the three Pure Land *sūtras*[33] or in verses of praise (*wasan*) written by the founder, Shinran. When the Levelers' Society discovered that "outcaste" (*sendara*), which appears in the *Contemplation Sūtra* (*Kangyō* 観経, T 365) as a term of moral censure, had been glossed as "extremely defiled and inhuman" (*eta hinin*)[34] yet again in a published commentary, they

---

[33] See for example the 1911 commentary by Kashiwahara Yūgi (柏原祐義, b.1884) on the three Pure Land sūtras where he tied *sendara* to *eta hinin* (DBS 1:117).

[34] Eta hinin 穢多非人, as discussed in previous chapters, is a composite and extremely derogatory, premodern official term for low status groups. It is rarely used outside the study of historical sources. Although the formation of the term eta is unknown, at some point in the medieval period, characters were applied to

began to make demands (Matsune 1988, 59-60).

Takeuchi Ryō'on, a spokesperson for Ōtani-ha administration, exhorted its preachers towards a less discriminatory understanding of "outcaste" (*sendara*). Takeuchi and the True Body Society (Shinshinkai) engaged in a very conscious project of scriptural reinterpretation.[35] In 1932 Takeuchi wrote an article entitled "Regarding the Interpretation of '*Sendara*': An Appeal to Preachers"[36] in *Shinshū* 真宗, the official sect magazine distributed to all Ōtani-ha temple priests nation-wide.

Summary: Takeuchi entreats Shin preachers (*fukyōshi*) to use the term *sendara* with care, if in the course of their work they must explain the term at all. He described the term's use in the *Contemplation Sūtra* in the context of the story of Prince Ajase (S. Ajataśatru). Ajase had imprisoned his father and denied him food. When Ajase heard that his mother, Queen Idaike (S. Vaidehī) had been smuggling nourishment to her husband on her body, he was enraged. Ajase intended to kill his mother. When his ministers heard about Ajase's plan to commit matricide, they described the act as that of an "outcaste" (*sendara*). They said:

> Your Majesty, if you commit such an outrage, you will defile (*wa* 汚) the warrior (S. *kṣatriya*) class. As your ministers, we could not bear to hear what people will say. As this would be the act of an outcaste, you could no longer remain here.[37]

Takeuchi explains that *sendara* is clearly used as a term of shame and chastisement, an indication of the deep moral evil of Ajase's intent. He then makes two specific requests of

---

represent its syllables, meaning literally "extremely polluted," "many impurities," or "much filth" (穢多).

[35] The Honganji-ha was also taken to task for its interpretation in the "Incident of the Discriminatory Interpretation of Sendara" (*Sendara sabetsu kaishaku jiken* 旃陀羅差別解釈事件, 1934). There was also protests following the publication following the publication of the first volume of the *Seiten kōsen zenshū* 聖典講讃全集, regarding interpretation of Shinran's use of *sendara* in his *Hymns of the Pure Land* (*Jōdo wasan*) (DBS 2:669-672; CWS 1:321-357).

[36] *Sendara kai ni tsuki fukyōshi shokun ni uttafu* 旃陀羅解につき布教師諸君に訴ふ (DBS 2:669-672). Published in *Shinshū* (366.4, 1932) and reprinted in the magazine, *Good Neighbor* (*Zenrin* 善隣) (99-100, 1933).

[37] Translated by Inagaki and Stewart (1995, 66), with minor changes. *Ō kon i shi, setsugyaku shi ji wa setsu ri shu, shin bu nin mon, ze sendara, fu gi ju shi* 王今爲此 殺逆之事 汚刹利種 臣不忍聞 是栴陀羅 不宜住此 (*Seiten* 91). Takeuchi interprets the last phrase as referring to Ajase and not his ministers: "you (Ajase) could no longer remain here."

his readers: (1) to avoid considering *sendara* a demeaning name (*senshō* 賤称) for Japanese low status people, as it was understood during the Edo period; and (2) if the term *sendara* is unavoidable, explain that *sendara* are the true recipients (*shōki*) of Amida's salvific vow. (DBS 2:669)

In the first case, Takeuchi recommended severing the tie between the Japanese status group, *burakumin*, and the term, *sendara*. In the second, he positively reinterpreted *sendara* as referring to the paradigmatic Shin practitioner and recipient of Amida's saving compassion (*shōki*), the "evil person" (*akunin*). He thus shifts a core doctrine of the Shin school from *akunin shōki* (悪人正機) to *sendara shōki* and, by extension, to modern *burakumin*.[38] According to Takeuchi, *burakumin* are the "highest rank" (*sai jōi* 最上位) with respect to Amida's salvific vow. Takeuchi next argued that interpreting *sendara* in this way is the humane demand of those sympathetic with the reconciliation movement, the national body (*kokutai* 国体), and the true spirit of Shin Buddhism:

> Our suffering brothers [i.e., *burakumin*] seek only the settled ground of faith through the exclusive *nenbutsu*. Their deep longings are betrayed from the very start when they hear our preachers explain "outcaste" (*sendara*) and they return home in tears. Not only does this destroy a family or clan for a hundred years, it defiles the national body of our majesty, the Emperor. (DBS 2:669)

In an extreme example, Takeuchi next related the story of a Shin preacher who was pulled down from the *dharma* seat and beaten for such an interpretation. (Takeuchi suggested this was deserved.) Informing the reader that the *sendara* issue had made the agenda for the national meeting of reconciliation groups[39]

---

[38] There is a set of difficult problems embedded in the logic of salvation traditions. On the one hand, Takeuchi asserts *burakumin* are true recipients of Amida's compassionate working. Yet, in order to be such a paradigmatic recipient, the group or individual must be low, hard to save, and excluded. The same is true for arguments that Amida compassionately saves women, evil persons, and other marginalized groups. The salvation is glorified to the very extent that the marginalized group is debased. Normally, in Buddhist social ethics, the emphasis is on emulating the bodhisattva or cultivating compassion. In this form of Pure Land Buddhism, the emphasis is on the meaning of being the victim of social injustice.

[39] National Reconciliation Work Conference (Zenkoku Yūwa Jigyō Kyōgikai 全国融和事業協議会), founded in 1926.

sponsored by the Tokyo Prefecture Home Ministry, Takeuchi recommended that head administrators of the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha quickly issue directives on the *sendara* matter to their preachers. Takeuchi continued,

> ***Summary***: As for preachers that continue to use the old interpretation linking *sendara* as a term of moral censure to *burakumin*, he is harsh in his criticism. These preachers "profane (*bōtoku* 冒瀆) the companions (*dōbō*, [i.e., *burakumin*])." They are "disloyal, unfaithful, and heretical."[40] He argues that it is simply inappropriate to use feudal, pejorative terms for low status groups. He explains that because *sendara* is a reference to the lowest level in the ancient Indian caste hierarchy, a social group became the symbol for the most heinous evil acts and people to be avoided, "humans outside of humanity, a society outside of society" (DBS 2:670). He argues that this dead, feudal, historical word continues to cause pain and suffering. In other words, the word is *alive*, a "living, inexhaustible curse." The *word itself* is a cause of discrimination in the lives of *burakumin* who struggle with poverty, have limited access to education, difficulty in finding employment, and are avoided in marriage. He describes equality as an unfulfilled promise of the Meiji restoration. The wayward preachers who continue to discriminate must lament their disloyal, unrighteous, unfaithful, immoral selves:
>
>> As for the interpretation of *sendara*, are there one among you preachers who can explain this tragic term, say decisively that they are the lowest of the low, that they cannot sit in the same seats or join hands with us because they are evil and immoral (*akugyaku mudō* 悪逆無道)? It is not just that such a preacher is unrighteous, immoral, disloyal, and unfaithful—deservedly ripped down from the high seat and beaten. Has not that preacher committed an unforgiveable evil (*zaiaku*) [by considering *burakumin* evil]? (DBS 2:671)

Takeuchi inverted the moral-immoral divide that the old interpretation of *sendara* entailed. The preachers who use the term are evil, and the *burakumin*—the true recipients of Amida Buddha's compassionate working—are good. He further explained that the interpretation of *sendara* as evil and immoral mistakes the true meaning of the *Contemplation Sūtra*, and betrays the true meaning of Shin Buddhism. This is because the *sūtra* is not directed at "good people" (*zennin* 善人),

---

[40] *fuchū fushin ianjin* 不忠不信異安心 (DBS 2:669).

but to the lowest foolish, evil beings who are never excluded from Amida's compassionate vow:

> Evil people are the ones who are treasured; it is for them [that Amida] manifests his great compassion. It is precisely the *sendara* who have been despised and avoided who are the true object of the *sūtra's* message, people who we ought to join hands with. (DBS 2:672)

Takeuchi went so far as to say that preachers who do not know this do not know the Shin Buddhist faith. And, in a classic modernist reinterpretation of Buddhism recalling Shimaji Mokurai's from chapter 3, Takeuchi asserted that all Japanese citizens are equal because Shakamuni Buddha, "taught the principle of equality, destroyed caste hierarchy, and made clear that all entering the Buddhist path are the same family" (DBS 2:672).

Takeuchi directed his last tirade towards those "bigoted old men" who persist in despising *sendara*, who know nothing of humanity or buddha-nature,[41] who arrogantly say things like "that defiles the name of the sect" or use pejorative terms for *burakumin* as adjectives for immoral behavior. (He claimed they would not even pass a middle school history class!) He ended with one last impassioned call to avoid the feudal, discriminatory use of *sendara* (DBS 2:672).

Reports: collecting knowledge and publicizing action

Takeuchi Ryō'on's role as a priest-bureaucrat is very clear in the "report." When Takeuchi began his work in the Ōtani-ha, it was in the midst of rapidly changing ideas about discrimination, social work, and a declining trust in charity. His consistent position that the temple priest and Ōtani-ha order must rely on scientific knowledge for social work emerged from this situation. Reports detailed

---

[41] *busshō* 仏性. Takeuchi does not use this term often. It occurs in the piece as a Buddhist statement of inherent human worth and equality, following close on other Buddhist statements of equality.

the extent to which this new knowledge had become part of Ōtani-ha social policy. Reports also gave extensive and detailed lists of the Ōtani-ha social activities. In order to solve a problem, one needed the most up-to-date, scientific knowledge about that problem.

From Takeuchi's other writings, and from the later reminiscences of fellow priest-bureaucrats, such as Noma Osamu (野間修), too, we get a sense of the concrete activities, organizations, gatherings of people, and financial and educational resources that formed part of Ōtani-ha social work. In terms of physical buildings and public spaces, this work, overseen by the Society Department and the True Body Society, took place in central, regional, and local temples, *buraku* temples, and local government and community buildings. It included a variety of activities. The first set of activities involved outreach both inside and outside of the *buraku*, mainly in the form of public lectures. Outreach included lectures, promotion (*keimō* 啓蒙), moral reform (*kanka*), moral exhortation (*kyōka*), and social education. The second set of activities concerned education and training of *burakumin* with the explicit goal of improving standards of living. The Society Department in particular oversaw everything from early childhood education, youth groups, seniors' groups, womens' and mens' groups, Sunday schools, lifestyle improvement, vocational training for men, and vocational training for women (sewing, cultivating flowers and tea).

The third set of activities concerned the education and training of preachers, priests, and administrators—basically, the creation of Shin social workers. For Takeuchi, Shin social workers needed at least basic knowledge of economics, sociology, psychology, ethics, government policy, criticism of modern thought, constitutional and administrative law,[42] and an understanding of the relation

---

[42] This is the knowledge that the intensive training discussed above was meant to provide.

between social work and Buddhism. The fourth set of activities revolved around what such Shin social workers actually did: settlement (*rinpo* 隣保) and regional undertakings, both urban and rural. This meant the "settlement-for-life" of temple priests in *buraku* communities, *buraku* practice halls, and *buraku* temples. This required the support and organization of temples located within *buraku* and *burakumin* followers.

Regional improvement activities discussed in the report below, targeted infrastructure. The Ōtani-ha encouraged and funded the creation of co-operatives, places of free lodging, and medical dispensaries. A major focus here for Takeuchi was programs for the care and welfare of infants, children, boys and girls, women and mothers, and former prisoners. Shin social workers, themselves organized in a network, sought to create regional networks to aid in improvement activities and to provide introductions to places of work for *burakumin*. A fifth area of activity was the centralization and systematization of charitable activities, welfare, and protection of vulnerable persons. Sixth and last, beginning with the Society Department, Takeuchi and his network of social workers engaged in dispute resolution and mediation—a continuation of Takeuchi's earliest social improvement activities at Shiga prefectural government (JG 2008, 2,5; Noma 1973, 7).

A 1924 plan and report, with a corporate author

An exemplar report is the Ōtani-ha Society Department's "Regional Improvement Plan,"[43] released in 1924. This report is a composite document: part list, part survey research, and part pamphlet. The report detailed the Ōtani-ha plan for "regional improvement (*chihō kaizen* 地方改善)," a contemporary bureaucratic term for attempts to eliminate discrimination within *buraku* areas. Although it

---

[43] *Chihō kaizen hōshin* 地方改善方針 (DBS 1:869-875).

appeared under corporate authorship, Takeuchi spearheaded the content of the report.

Summary: The booklet begins with Takeuchi's remarks on trends in regional improvement and the official directive (*kunji*) from the head administrator of the Ōtani-ha. This is followed by a statement from the regional directors meeting of the Society Department (held February 2, 1923). The statement apologizes to *burakumin* on behalf of the Ōtani-ha, noting the negative feeling towards the head temple demonstrated by the "reject fundraising" movement (*bozai kyohi undō* 募財拒否運動) among the Levelers' Society and *buraku* followers—especially considering that *burakumin* are often in situations of economic hardship. Next, the report reaffirms the order's humility in the face of past mistakes and commitment to understand and work towards improvement of *buraku* areas. The Society Department must explain the Ōtani-ha's plans in this regard to local officials and have temple priests associated with the Department create appropriate institutions with all haste.

The next section locates *buraku* improvement as part of the Ōtani-ha administration's overall strategic plan. In the area of promotion (*keimō*), the plan aims to:

> ...encourage *buraku* temple priests and local temple priests related to the issue to put their efforts towards "improvement and reconciliation work" (*kaizen yūwa no jigyō* 改善融和の事業), and awaken them to the significance of these issues for society and especially our order (*kyōdan*).

The head temple, through the Society Department, plans to hold conferences, training meetings, publically commend any special contributions by sect followers, and support special institutions, perform survey research, and dispatch Department employees to lecture, study, or mediate. In the area of settlement (*rinpo*), the strategic plan states that *buraku* temple priests have often lost educational opportunities due to social discrimination, and had their activities hindered. The report explains that the Ōtani-ha should recruit religionists to live in *buraku* areas and strive for the original form of the Shin temple, which it describes as a place:

> ...where followers and temple priests, abiding in the relationship between teacher and follower, establish well the temple as a meaningful place of practice for this world and the next...

Because many *buraku* temples are poorly equipped, the head temple plans to recruit religionists for settlement relocation work (*rinpo shokumin jigyō* 隣保植民事業). The report continues with the statement that the head temple administration, with the

understanding of local officials and local powerful temples, has already begun encouraging relocation and achieving good results.

In the area of preaching (*senden* 宣伝), the report outlines a three-pronged strategy: (1) assist and support institutions run by *burakumin* for local improvement, (2) teach non-*burakumin* to be less prejudiced, and (3) engage in typical religious ministry (ideally while living in the *buraku*). The report exhorts temple priests as follows:

> While constantly reflecting on how easily the preacher can fall into neglect and inequality, our sect must tirelessly explain the problem of discrimination to local bureaucrats, educators, activists, Shintō priests, Buddhist priests, and must encourage efforts towards the improvement of industry, education, hygiene, and good customs by *burakumin* themselves. Gather supporters, establish institutions!

In the area of meditation (*chōwa* 調和), the report advises preachers, in the course of other activities, to take the opportunity to reduce the growing conflict between groups inside and groups outside *buraku* areas. The goal is to reduce the conflict (between liberationist and reconciliationist groups) that hinders local development.

In the area of youth groups (*seinenkai* 青年会), the report highlights *buraku* youth groups as the heart of local improvement efforts. It is part of the Ōtani-ha strategic plan to create Buddhist youth groups in *buraku* areas in order to help harness this energy and move forward.

In the area of support and encouragement (*hojo shōrei* 補助奨励), Ōtani-ha policy is to offer monetary support for improvement institutions established by *burakumin*, to assist in removing prejudice amongst them, and to publically commend achievements in improvement. As well, the Ōtani-ha plans to renew the efforts of local priests and organize conferences and training meetings in *buraku* areas.

Hopes for the future: through settlement (*rinpo*) and living in the *buraku*, temple priests will become advisers in both material and spiritual matters. The greatest religious achievement possible is the beauty of "companions" (*dōbō*). Through communication with the Society Department, the order will encourage the flourishing of this type of religious person. As well, individuals will be encouraged to provide detailed reports of their activities to the Society Department—as well as report on priests and followers that sully the name of our sect with their careless activities, causing conflict, or forcibly collecting donations for their own benefit. All priests are to request the guidance of the Society Department when there is discrimination between priests while conducting

236

rituals and giving teachings. The report encourages temple priests to suggest items to be added to the agenda at local training meetings.

Report on past activities: a pamphlet has been prepared for use at gatherings hosted by the Society Department planned for Otsu, Nagahama, Kyoto, and Kanazawa in 1923. The pamphlet is already in use at gatherings organized by *buraku* priests and employees of the Department, and is distributed when priests are dispatched to secular gatherings. What follows is the literal text of the pamphlet:

> Let's respect people! Eliminating abominable discriminatory ideas, let us respect people. Let us not betray the great heart (*ōmigokoro* 大御心) of the Meiji emperor, who proclaimed the equality of the four peoples (*shimin byōdō* 四民平等). With our revered fellow practitioners and companions (*dōgyō dōbō* 同行同朋), hand in hand, let us long to follow the founder, Shinran, quickly to the pure land. Receiving the same *nenbutsu*, we have mutual respect for the preciousness of human beings. As the great practice of gratitude, we proceed to make this world the most welcoming possible place to live. Let us mix together with a heart that places palms together before Amida.
>
> In society, various ideas of respect (*kei* 敬) conflict with one another. Whether we are aware of it or not, this assaults people's hearts with anxiety. With deep, internal reflection on how we have caused this anxiety, a stronger, more unified progress is born. Religious realization (*jikaku* 自覚) is found in the deepest heart of critical self-reflection. Here, upon religious faith, attaining even a little of the truth of gratitude, in order to express the meaning of the religious order (*kyōdan*), we take the opportunity to work on regional improvement, holding lectures in the following places:...

The report continues with news of past conferences, settlement work, and kinds of support offered: Held the annual conference that brought Ōtani-ha priests together in Kanazawa. The goal is to have annual conferences in *buraku* regions to determine the circumstances of discrimination and the best institutions to establish.[44] Settlement work addresses a variety of issues in addition to *buraku* discrimination, since temples are the heart of local culture. Six people have settled in *buraku* as religionists affiliated with the Society Department: four in Shiga prefecture, and one each in Wakayama and Kyoto

---

[44] This practice of holding conferences in *buraku* areas and visiting *buraku* temples is still followed by the Ōtani-ha Head Department for the Promotion of Assimilation (Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部) and Council of Temples Related to Assimilation (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai) today.

prefectures. Support for improvement institutions run by *burakumin* is difficult for an impoverished head temple, especially in terms of material support. However, the head temple will use its budget to support local *buraku* and settlement priests in their efforts at improvement, both material and spiritual. The report lists several public commendations: the head temple has recognized the contributions of five individuals with a certificate of thanks and a small gift for outstanding service and for manifesting a spirit of constant gratitude in the area of regional improvement.

Next, the report lists rules and regulations for youth groups. Youth groups will be associated with a local temple, and uphold the Shin social policy of ultimate and worldly truth (*shinzoku nitai* 真俗二諦).[45] Youth groups will organize religious and educational gatherings, as well as cultural activities and local improvement (local institutions, cooperative labor, frugality and savings groups, comfort visits to the army). In addition, youth groups will pursue activities related to sports, health, and hygiene. The report then proceeds to outline procedure for the groups, and addresses their financing and governance.

The second annual regional improvement conference, held April 24-25, 1924, at Kyoto's Takakura Kaikan, served as a forum for the discussion of settlement, preaching, strengthening of the temple network for social work, donations, and recognition of outstanding contributions. At the conference, the following goals and resolutions were made: (1) to impress upon the order (*kyōdan*) as a whole the importance of the problem of *buraku* discrimination; (2) to mediate between different movements addressing it[46]; (3) to build a unified network and facilitate good relations between sect members connected to the problem; and (4) to make the demands placed upon our sect clear to the head temple administration and consult on any institutions it creates. The network of related temple priests and followers will consist of all temples with 30 *buraku* households or more. They will participate in improvement work in their local *buraku*, in the strong faith (*tokushin* 篤信) typical of *buraku* followers, and listen to the recommendations of local sect offices.

The report closes with a the results of a 1923 survey of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples and

---

[45] The policy began in the Meiji period and is now a controversial topic in Shin Buddhist studies. Put simply, the policy assumed that Shin doctrine and worldly law and authority were absolutely separate. Because they were separate, Shin doctrine could never be in conflict with the dictates of the Japanese government. A good Shin follower, according to this policy, adhered to wordly law and was loyal to government and emperor. For a history of this idea and its modern usage, see Bloom and Tokunaga (2000).

[46] This is likely a reference to conflicts between groups holding Marxist-liberationist (*kaihō*) and conservative, right-wing views, as part of the reconciliationist (*yūwa*) network.

followers in 16 prefectures[47]: columns are organized from right to left by prefecture, regional sect office (*kyōmusho* 教務所), number of *buraku* households, total *buraku* population, number of *buraku* temples, and number of *buraku* preaching halls (*sekkyōjō* 説教場):

Prefecture	Regional sect office	Households	Total Population	Temples	Preaching halls
Kyoto	Kyoto	5,374	23,883	16	--
Tottori	Kyoto	3,389	19,550	4	--
Shiga	Kyoto	2,515	12,037	18	1
Shiga	Nagahama	743	4,026	7	1
Mie	Kuwana	1,810	9,702	27	2
Aichi	Nagoya	2,720	11,283	1	--
Okayama	Himeji	1244	4,490	6	--
Saga	Ogaki	623	2,853	14	1
Kochi	Himeji	614	2,264	3	1
Nara	Osaka	321	1,560	4	--
Osaka	Osaka	298	1,563	3	--
Tokushima	Himeji	290	1,105	--	--
Toyama	Toyama	79	366	1	--
Fukui	Kyoto	225	775	2	--
Oita	Yokkaichi	72	370	4	--
Kumamoto	Kurume	50	400	1	1
		20,377	**106,227**	**111**	

Society department activities in the 1940s, a promotional report

What was the state of Ōtani-ha social work (*shakai jigyō*) at the height of the Pacific War? A promotional report published by the Ōtani-ha head office, *A Handbook of Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism*, neatly summarizes all aspects of the sect including its

---

[47] Note that the population is concentrated within or near the Kansai region.

social activities.[48] According to the handbook, in 1943 the Ōtani-ha was involved in a variety of social issues involving public health, social welfare, public order, and local assistance. Approximately 2,000 temples were providing seasonal childcare in rural areas.[49] The sect was operating twenty shelters through its branch temples for the unemployed and sufferers of leprosy, as well as financially supporting shelters run by municipalities. Preachers and comfort missions were dispatched to these shelters and Ōtani-ha officers assisted in the relocation of leprosy (Hansen's disease) patients to national leprosaria. In terms of public health, the Ōtani-ha was actively participating in national educational campaigns and supported six eye disease centers in cooperation with medical universities and the Yomiuri newspaper corporation. The Society Department, twenty-three years after it was originally proposed 1920 by Takeuchi, handled all of these activities in addition to the publication of outreach materials.[50]

Early wartime activities represented the most extensive implementation of Takeuchi's original desire to mobilize the temple network. According to the handbook, social work for *buraku* areas (at this time under the label of "assimilation" *dōwa* 同和) fell under the heading "settlement work" (*rinpo jigyō* 隣保事業)[51] and was organized in cooperation with the True Body Society—and all priests were considered members. Settlement work was promoted throughout the Ōtani-ha temple network. Its leaders were elite priest-bureaucrats: the head

---

[48] *Shinshū Ōtaniha Honganji yōran* 真宗大谷派本願寺要覧 (Shinshū Ōtani-ha 1943, 49–53). The description is self-promotional and impact is difficult to assess. In the handbook, for example, cooperation with national goals.

[49] The description is full of patriotic language. Here, childcare frees workers for planting and harvest "as the country cries for more rice production!" Activities connected with children made up the lion's share of social work.

[50] This continued until the formation of the Promotion of the Teachings Division (Kyōkabu 教化部) and Ōtani-ha publishing group (Ōtaniha ShuppanKyōkai 大谷派出版協会).

[51] Settlement work included "harmony work" (*kyōwa jigyō* 協和事業) directed at the increasing population of Korean residents, and over one thousand priests working on regional issues of poverty and public health, "regional work" (*hōmen jigyō* 方面事業).

administrator (*sōchō* 総長) served as director, while the head of the Doctrinal Affairs Division (Kyōgakubu)[52] served as assistant director, with seven regional (parish, *kyōku* 教区) offices.[53]

Late career proposals for the structure of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*)

After the war, Takeuchi's thinking moved in directions typical for the time, incorporating democratic values and valorizing a separation of religion and state. He also came to agree more fully with the Marxist idea that discrimination was not incidental to social hierarchy, but inherent within it. In other words, he established himself as a liberal democrat with left-wing sympathies. Because the war and its aftermath had effectively halted the Ōtani-ha order's social projects, and because Takeuchi had been gradually pushed out of leadership positions during wartime, he was at a greater distance from the center of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) in the postwar. It was this distance that allowed him to dream, think about the ideal order, and play with ideas like a new "managerial" ideal for the Ōtani-ha head priest (TRI 1950, 269).

One manuscript survives containing Takeuchi's reform proposals for the order, which were presumably composed in the postwar period.[54] In print, his utopian dreams appeared most fully in a short 1950 essay for a *buraku* advocacy magazine and in a 1955 book, *Reforming Religion and Rebuilding Religion: From the Standpoint of the Shin Buddhist Order*,[55] well over two hundred pages in length.

---

[52] The assistant director assigned officers of the Society Department and True Body Society, and the latter continued to receive external, government funding.

[53] The handbook next details Ōtani-ha involvement in prison chaplaincy since 1871-1872. By the 1940s, almost all chaplains were Shin Buddhists, ninety-five from the Ōtani-ha. The social activities of the Ōtani-ha also included acting as "wards" or "protectors" for young children, juveniles, and released prisoners.

[54] "A Proposal for Reform of the Shin Buddhist Order" (*Shinshū kyōdan kaikaku an* 真宗教団改革案), part of collected materials for the Human Rights Week Gallery Exhibition on Takeuchi Ryō'on, held at the Ōtani-ha head temple (JG 2008).

[55] *Shūkyō kaikaku to shūkyō saiken: Shinshū kyōdan no tachiba kara* 宗教改革と宗教再建: 真宗教団の立場から. Takeuchi (1955).

This book echoed many of the basic positions he took in the 1950 essay, but allowed him the space to develop a number of concrete reforms for the head temple, including a recommendation to abolish all ranking and hierarchy between temples and priests.

The 1950 essay notably revealed Takeuchi's changed position and his left-ward political shift. Instead of responding to criticisms by *buraku* advocates as a representative of the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, he treated Ōtani-ha *buraku* followers as integral parts and agents of change for an ideal Ōtani-ha order.

An 1950 essay addressing buraku *advocates*

In 1950, Takeuchi wrote a short piece entitled "How the Shin Buddhist Order Ought to Be."[56] This important and concise postwar essay was published in the magazine, *Buraku* 部落, as part of a special issue on Shin Buddhism. Because reconciliationist (*yūwa*) groups,[57] like the Ōtani-ha's True Body Society (Shinshinkai), had been vilified by the Levelers' Society (Suiheisha), Takeuchi defended the unique, idealized Ōtani-ha approach to a readership of *buraku* advocates. This essay is a concise statement of Takeuchi's utopian hopes for the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) and I translate the essay in full:

> Originally, before the wartime troubles and the central consolidation of assimilation (*dōwa*) work, the True Body Society (Shinshinkai) was the reconciliation (*yūwa*) group within the Ōtani-ha religious order. It cooperated with the Honganji-ha's One Truth Society (Ichinyokai 一如会), and with similar groups at the prefectural level. Put simply, the True Body Society has now "resumed" its prewar reconciliation efforts[58]—just as the Committee for Buraku Liberation (Buraku Kaihō Iinkai 部落解放委員会) has resumed the

---

[56] *Shinshū kyōdan no arikata* 真宗教団のありかた (TRI 264-269).
[57] See chapter 5 for information regarding reconciliationist, improvement, assimilationist, liberationist approaches to *buraku* discrimination.
[58] In the prewar period, the True Body Society was funded by the Ōtani-ha administration and the Central Reconciliation Work Assocation (Chūō Yūwa Jigyō Kyōkai 中央融和事業協会). In the postwar, Takeuchi, Asano Onchi and other s used their personal funds (GS 234).

work of the prewar Levelers' Society. Because of the prewar opposition between reconciliation groups and the Leveler's Society, however, one might believe the True Body Society was merely a political or moralistic movement without special religious, institutional (*kyōdan teki igi* 教団的意義) significance, [but that belief would be in error.]

The Ōtani-ha had already devoted considerable funds to the reconciliation movement before the prefectures began to create reconciliation groups. This undertaking was not [merely] a democratic or economic movement, but a movement based on Shin doctrine. In that sense, [the True Body Society] is on neither "side" of the opposition between the Levelers' and reconciliation movements. Rather, it is the true transmission (*tadashii senpu* 正しい宣布) of Shin teachings. (TRI 1950, 264)

Because of this, it has deep ties with the Levelers' and cooperates with reconciliationists. When the movement for *buraku* liberation restarted, I was asked to serve as a consultant.[59] Socialism, [the ideology of the Levelers' Society], judges all religion, government, law, and morality to be part of the "superstructure" of society, and thus a hindrance to progress, an opiate of the people, the enemy of the masses. In the case of many corrupt religions, I agree with this socialist judgment.

But the true teachings of Shin Buddhism—the spirit of the founder Shinran—are completely different. The teachings of Shin are both the highest ideal of humanity, which gives rise to all economic and political behavior, and the means for attaining it. If we imagine a human without the desire to live, there would be no politics and no economy. Religion determines this fundamental intention to live, to live fully and well. In this fundamental intention, all the efforts of myriad human beings to idealize reality, law, morality, economy, and politics are brought together and expressed. Within each individual's daily economic life, this highest religious ideal is critiqued and expressed. Although each individual expression might be different, with one prioritizing economy and another politics, or another, methodology—what unites us is the great spirit of service that takes my brothers' suffering as my own. (TRI 1950, 264-265)

---

[59] See chapter 5 for Takeuchi Ryō'on's postwar engagement with *buraku* liberationists as a consultant and committee member. Takeuchi's counterpart in the Honganji-ha, Umehara Shinryū, also participated.

The True Body Society is in complete agreement with the essence of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*). As the order exists, so too must the movement exist. Without the movement, the Ōtani-ha order would have no meaning. For Shinran wrote, in the "Lamp for the Latter Ages": "Change in the heart that has been evil and deep warmth (*nengoro* 懇) for one's companions (*dōbō*) are signs of long years of the *nenbutsu* and longing for birth; these are signs of rejecting the world. You must understand this well."[60]

The true Shin Buddhist life is one that uncovers the deep truths about reality of suffering, makes clear the causes that lead towards the highest ideal, and has faith in reaching it. We are taught that the "heart that has been evil," which views our everyday companions as enemies, competitors, and others, is transformed by relying on "mutual deep warmth between companions." This is the meaning of the Shin Buddhist life: the mutual practice of understanding, sympathy, and respect characterized by deep warmth. Here, within the relationships and society of deep warmth (*nengoro*), the unique Shin order (*kyōdan*) is established. For that reason, the fundamental meaning of the order is to express this heart of deep warmth—Amida's heart—to our companions.

Thus, it is impossible for the Shin order to neglect the immoral, unjust discrimination between the companions (*dōbō*). As long as Shin Buddhism exists and the order (*kyōdan*) exists, it must offer solace and service. The [people of the] order must be practitioners who clarify the causes of discrimination's suffering and remove them—whether these causes are in politics, economy, morality, law, or in the deeply evil nature of humans. (TRI 1950, 265)

There are many who think this issue is someone else's problem, someone else's misfortune. They only pay attention when people argue about it. There are many who think that the problem has already been solved. At long last, after the wartime disruption of the citizen's promotion movement [to reduce discrimination], we have a democratic government that considers discrimination a clear violation. Yet, somehow, we are more reluctant to press the issue even though *buraku* discrimination is even more urgent today than before the war! The True Body Society is the group that screams, "what exactly

---

[60] "Lamp for the Latter Ages" (*Mattōshō* 末燈鈔) No. 19, based on translation at CWS (551), *Seiten* (609). See Dessì's (2007, part 2) discussion of how this quote is used by modern Shin ethical thinkers.

are you doing about it?" at the Ōtani-ha order. This is what we have resumed.

This is extremely difficult. I stopped somewhere along the way wondering how to move forward. I even wonder whether an order (*kyōdan*) whose members have deep warmth (*nengoro*) for one another is even possible. A heart of deep warmth is the heart of great compassion. It is altruism, sympathy, and solidarity. It is just as difficult as a socialist revolution and reformation of the economic structure of society. How much have religionists, politicians, and moralists exhausted themselves arguing for institutions [to address *buraku* discrimination]?[61]

When we ask how many Shin followers,[62] preachers, or *sūtra*-chanting priests have lived this heart of great compassion, the socialist attack on religion seems natural. [Few Shin followers manifest Amida's heart.] Regardless of whether a person is drowning, or burning alive, priests turn a blind eye and profit from reading the scriptures, make a business from the tears shed at funerals. When a priest like this sees human misfortune, they sum up their [indifferent] realization saying, "this world is a land of suffering" or "all is impermanent." If that misfortune affects them even a little, they deal with it very seriously. And what of the head temple and the order itself? Don't they exist to increase priests' sense of superiority and high-class smugness? This is why it is extremely difficult to make [*buraku* discrimination] a problem for the order itself (*kyōdan jitai no mondai* 教団自体の問題). (TRI 1950, 266)

There are so few at the head temple who would make the 10,000 temple priests take up the great matter of the next birth from the bottom of their hearts. There are so few who would make the 10,000 temple priests try to be good neighbors (*zenrinkan* 善隣館).[63] In a time of rich economy, democratic governance, rational laws, and beautiful morals like altruism, perhaps the reason why [people of the order] have not lived with a heart of deep warmth (*nengoro*) is because we restrict our lives only to religion. Anyone would think it strange that today's order (*kyōdan*) attempts to realize the goals of MacArthur and Truman [only inside the order itself]. To think that Shinran

---

[61] Takeuchi's use of the term "morality" (*dōtoku* 道徳) refers to secular moralists or humanists who eschew deeper metaphysical or religious explanations for human morals. Here he posits an equivalence between the tasks of the left-wing progressive and the right-wing conservative, both which seek to create something new.

[62] Members of confraternities (*kōsha* 講者).

[63] A reference to one of the primary forms of social work, settlement in the *buraku* and community centre creation.

would restrict the altruism sought by Truman to the world of Shin Buddhism is like seeking fish amongst the trees.

A second issue is that governance in the head temple follows the [Japanese] mainstream with majority voting. But if we know that the majority of people are unwilling to face the problem of *buraku* discrimination, it will be difficult for the administration to take up. Moreover, it is extremely difficult for the Japanese citizens to face the problem of discrimination. Most criticize [active responses to it] saying "do not wake the sleeping child." There are many among the *burakumin*, too, who do not want to participate and wash their hands of the movement. There are deceptive and fraudulent anti-discrimination movements that people want to avoid. There is no other issue so plagued by difficulties as this one. It is very difficult to make the [Ōtani-ha] head temple accept this. (TRI 1950, 267)

It would be wrong not to speak out on this important issue, even with a single word. Those who take a benevolent position and scold others, those who play with abstract concepts so that concepts become an opiate—getting such "heartless" (*kokoro naki* 心なき) people to deal with the problem of discrimination is very hard.

Whether the problem of discrimination is originally a product of feudalism or capitalism, if we consider Shin Buddhism's highest ideal, the pure land,[64] there is no difference between stranger and family. There is neither controlling nor possessing people. Moreover, there is no "possession" or "control" of things. The pure land is the most extreme form of socialism's preferred utopia, for everyone [in the pure land] equally receives the most ideal bodies and minds. Indeed, there is no "individual"; in the ideal, everyone is a single body-mind. It is called "a body of emptiness; an unsurpassed body."[65] It is pathetic that, when people get together in this life, they are self-absorbed, viewing society as nothing but an opportunity for fulfilling their own wants. Indeed, they have been taught to do so in order to succeed. The National Diet is a gathering of dead men, suffering from "ministerial" sickness. So, the principle that will let us

---

[64] Literally, "extreme pleasure" or "paradise" (*gokuraku* 極楽), often found in the compound "pure land of happiness" (*gokuraku jōdo* 極楽浄土).

[65] *komu no shin, mukyoku tai* 虚無之身無極体. Quote from the *Larger Sūtra* (*Daikyō* 大経, T 362 (*Seiten* 39) from a description of birth in the pure land where there are no humans and no deities—all have the same body.

reach the highest ideal is a single-body world, where there is neither self nor other, neither this nor that. In the pure land, there is absolutely no ownership or control. [So the scriptures say:] "no thoughts of desire, hate, or malevolence; no attachment to the six senses."[66] But, in our reality, the entirety of human life revolves around the ownership and control of things. To leave this aside would be like killing a bull for its horns. The true existence of this present reality, and the true existence of the highest ideal, both must be honestly acknowledged. The causes and conditions (*inga* 因果) that link the two must be scientifically studied. In Shin Buddhism, one devotes the whole of human life, always and without interruption, to realizing the ideal. (TRI 1950, 268)

The temple and priest are the symbols and representatives of this Shin Buddhism. Rennyo (蓮如, 1415-1499) treated all things as if they were the possessions of Amida Buddha and the founder, Shinran. When he accidentally stepped on his own clothing, [he would think to himself that he was not worthy of the clothes,] that they were wasted on him. When preaching, Rennyo would address his listeners with respect and taught his disciples to do the same. When offering wine to his fellow practioners (*dōgyō* 同行), he would considerately offer it cool in the summer time, and warm in the winter. When friendly offerings of money were brought, he would forget all about the obligations of this life, gain and loss, and truly enjoy his "forget the year" year-end party without any regrets.

This utopia is not a utopia. In the midst of harsh reality, in the midst of ignorance, [utopia] is working to make real a life of peace. The priest has gathered the money and things offered daily. The fellow practitioners and companions (*dōgyō dōbō*) gratefully accept those same things at the temple, forgetting that they had offered them. There is no high and low, poor and rich, wise and foolish. There is only the temple where we sleep, seeking the Buddhist teachings, where all the same children of Amida Buddha. There is only the temple that performs various kinds of social work and social policies in response to the hard work of its followers. If only we could create this [kind of temple], the reconciliation problem and liberation movement would naturally be served. Knowing that our companions work hard, we can rely on

---

[66] *fuki yokusō, shinsō gaisō* 不起欲想 瞋想害想; *fuchaku shiki shō kō mi soku hō* 不著色聲香味觸法. Quote from the *Larger Sūtra* (*Daikyō* 大経, T 362) (*Seiten* 27), from a description of the immeasurable merit of Amida planted while a bodhisattva.

those of the same faith. (TRI 1950, 268)

At my temple, discriminated-against companions (*dōbō*) have done me the honor of living with me for four years, and one and a half years, respectively. One or two companions convicted of thought-crime stayed with me as my brothers for long periods once they were released on probation. Eight companions were called up [from my temple] during the war. The head temple administration needs to create *this kind of temple*, and with the head priest as the symbol of the ideal temple manager. (TRI 1950, 268-269)

The temple exists as a legal authority outside of [state] governance, different from society's competition for power and wealth. Thus, it can become the foundation for purifying and idealizing that very society. That was the goal of the creation of the True Body Society, and today's relaunch. If those who live in the discriminated-against *buraku* realized that they could firmly establish *this kind of* order (*kyōdan*) centred on the head priest [as the ideal temple manager], and acted as the vanguard of this movement, my dream would not end as a utopia, Shinran would surely rejoice, Truman would have great respect, Stalin would tremble in awe, and a single roadway of light would radiate forth for peace in the world. But, and most likely in the midst of so many difficulties, I am prepared to continue this movement alone. (TRI 1950, 269)

Conclusions

Having introduced Takeuchi's bureaucratic and popular texts in this chapter through brief commentary, summary, and translation, I next examine key features of his ethical thought. In particular, I take a few of the Shin doctrinal terms, ideas, and moral exemplars scattered throughout his writings and explain how Takeuchi characteristically used them.

7   Takeuchi's ethical thought and policy on the human evil of discrimination

Takeuchi Ryō'on disdained the kind of discussion common among Shin scholar-monks in doctrinal studies (*kyōgaku*) to focus instead on the problems arising from the contradictions of a stratified society, such as *buraku* discrimination and poverty (Izumi 1975, 4:22-23). Yet many Shin doctrines—such as "the evil person is the true recipient of Amida's salvation" (*akunin shōki*), the "deep realization of the self's evil" (*ki no jinshin* 機の深心), and the arising of "diamond-like faith" (*kongō no shinjin* 金剛の信心)—appear in his writings, linked to organized social work and reconciliation activities.

This chapter is a summary of Takeuchi's institutional ethics developed during a lifetime of organizational and popular writing. I translated and discussed prominent examples of these in chapter 6, all related to the problem of *buraku* discrimination.[1] In these texts, Takeuchi articulated an ethics for the group *as a group*, and for individuals *as part of groups*, by linking Shin Buddhist doctrines to the modern and institutionally-embedded figure of the "Shin social worker," the temple priest who becomes the "companion (*dōbō*) of all who suffer...[who] works hard to experience the ocean of faith (*shinkai*) that is benefiting others (*rita*)" (Takeuchi 1921, 16). He created an institutional ethics for the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*), its head temple bureaucracy, and its temple priests.

By developing a particular view of historical necessity, Takeuchi argued that

---

[1] This necessarily excludes other significant topics addressed by Takeuchi in his writings: education and childcare, leprosy, rural poverty, and women. See chapter 6.

the "good" in Shin Buddhism takes a form specific to both the historical time and the people. The good in mid-twentieth century Japan, according to Takeuchi, was an order (*kyōdan*) structured to facilitate social work carried out by its members, especially by temple priests. These Shin "social workers" would, in the practice of their vocation, come to realize their own responsibility for the very social problems they sought to address. In other words, they would realize their evil nature as people who have discriminated against the *burakumin* and their complicity as members of an order that has done the same. Takeuchi positioned these realizations of the "self–as-discriminator" and "order-as-discriminator" as part of Amida's working in the world and the possibility of true good action. The existence and activity of individual social workers, their network, and their managing bureaucracy, in Takeuchi's view, would structure the appearance of Amida's working in our world. However, although the good (Amida's compassionate working) can appear in this world, in Takeuchi's ethical paradigm, the order (*kyōdan*) and its members will always discriminate; there is no possibility of a wholly good Shin Buddhist order or Shin Buddhist follower. It is simply that the form of discrimination and the good response to it will change over time.[2] Struggling against discrimination, then, is portrayed as a constant, endless practice (Takeuchi 1955).

Faith and the possibility of truly good action

The basic problem for all Shin Buddhist ethical thought is the impossibility of good action. People in this defiled world must rely on Amida's compassionate vows

---

[2] Takeuchi (TRI 1920, 14) refers to the activities of historical Buddhist figures to provide practical guidance and fulfill the basic material needs of the people. He uses classic images of good Buddhist acts: building wells, roads, and bridges, dispensing food and medicine, providing education and exhortation. Takeuchi asserts that Shin temple priests had a social role prior to the persecution of Buddhism (*haibutsu kishaku*) in the early Meiji period (1868-1912) (TRI 1921).

because they are all evil (*akunin*). They cannot intentionally do good, because every action they take is poisoned by their desire, hatred, and delusion.[3] If this is so, how is it possible for Takeuchi Ryō'on to propose a Shin social ethics?[4] Takeuchi explained the possibility of social ethics and good action in the same way that the possibility of enlightenment is explained in Shin Buddhism generally. For the ordinary foolish and evil being, enlightenment does not arise,

> due to action by the individual, but rather by the 'activity of Amida Buddha' (which Shinran redefined as the ultimate reality of enlightenment). Only through involuntary 'yielding' or 'entrusting'…could enlightenment emerge. (Amstutz and Lewis 1997, 147)[5]

For Takeuchi, good action in society is the heart of Amida Buddha[6] emerging within us, accomplished not through any action of our own. As Takeuchi explained: "I support benefiting others (*rita*), but there is certainly no benefitting others done by me" (1919, part 6). We are "made to become so" (*jinen hōni* 自然法爾), that is, we are made to become good by the power of Amida's activity. In Takeuchi's words, "we are disciplined by Amida's heart" and so become able to practice out of gratitude (1955, 152). Amida's heart manifesting within foolish beings is the experience of faith (*shinjin*), sometimes translated as "entrusting" (Bloom 2007). For Takeuchi, the arising of faith and the arising of the good in the world are one and the same.

---

[3] All of our actions are "poisoned good" (*zatsudoku no zen* 雑毒の善), tainted by hypocrisy and desire (Takeuchi 1955, 152, 154). For discussions of the problems of intentionality in Shin Buddhist ethics, see Amstutz and Lewis (1997), Ama (2004, 175), and Tanaka (2000, 346-347). See Dessì (2007) for a short overview of Shin ethics (38ff.) and an examination of five themes that recur in ethical arguments (79ff.).
[4] Ama (2004) argues that "social ethics" itself is a modern idea dependent upon the emergence of the nation-state.
[5] For Amstutz and Lewis (1997, 148) this means that Shin is unable "to generate the expected kind of stipulative moral rhetoric" and "preclude the promotion of any meaningful praxis."
[6] This is the heart (*ongokoro* 御心) of Amida. Elsewhere (Takeuchi 1955, 140), the "heart-light" (*shinkō* 心光) of Amida Buddha's compassion.

At its foundation, Takeuchi's ethics relies on the transformation of the evil self that occurs at the moment of the arising of diamond-like faith (*kongō no shinjin*) caused by Amida Buddha's working (TRI 1920, 16). A poem found brushed on the inner cover of his diary is emblematic of this transformation:

From the heart that quietly laments the self, true strength is born.[7]

From lamentation on one's own evil (*kanashimu* 悲しむ) (GS 234), "true strength" is born—an allusion to the other power of Amida breaking into the world. This two-fold structure of lamentation and true strength is based on the two-fold structure of faith, or "two-fold deep faith."[8] Both aspects of deep faith have affective dimensions, the first associated with sadness, and the second, with joy. In the first, parallel to Takeuchi's "lamentation," a deep conviction or awareness arises of oneself as an evil (*zaiaku*), foolish being (*bonbu*), trapped in birth and death from beginningless time, without the necessary karmic connections (*en* 縁) to separate from it. In the second, parallel to Takeuchi's "true strength," a deep conviction arises, without a hint of doubt, that one is grasped by Amida's vows and will ride this vow-power (*ganriki* 願力) to birth in the pure land. From the strength and immeasurable virtue of Amida's heart, the motivation for good action arises. This motivation, however, arises from Amida and not the ordinary, evil person. Immediately, Amida's true heart transforms ordinary life into a life of repentance (*zange*) and gratitude (*hōsha*)—where those who receive this heart "strive as if they had received a direct command to serve Amida Buddha" (Takeuchi 1955, 154).

---

[7] *Shizuka ni onore wo kanashimu kokoro yori, shinjitsu no chikara ga umaru* 静かに己れを悲しむこころより真実の力が生る (JG 2008, 2; TRI 303).

[8] *nishu jinshin* 二種深信 (*Seiten* 215-216). The deep realization of the self's evil (*ki no jinshin* 機の深心) (CWS 2:176) and deep gratitude for Amida's salvation (*hō no jinshin* 法の深心) place *ki* 機 and *hō* 法 in dualistic opposition. See Suzuki's (2004, 34-35) commentary on these two difficult terms in Shin Buddhism.

However, the arising of Amida's heart within ordinary beings solves only the problem of the possibility of good action. It does not yet address the everyday activities of foolish beings, nor connect to Shin social work specifically. First, Takeuchi accounted for the actions of ordinary members of the Ōtani-ha, capable only of "poisoned good" (*doku no zen*), by outlining a life of service within which the truly good activity of Amida could potentially arise. Part of this life of service is the practice of constant, critical self-reflection (*hansei*). And second, Takeuchi argued that the content and institutional context of this life of service and practice was social work. Takeuchi presented the life of the Shin social worker, embedded within a larger organization, not as arbitrary, but as perfectly suited to the present historical age and its people. There was, as Takeuchi held, a "necessary relation (*hitsuzen teki kankei* 必然的関係)" (Takeuchi 1919, part 6) between the arising of faith and social work.

Ordinary, "poisoned" good action

If all of our actions are "poisoned good" (*zatsudoku no zen* 雑毒の善), tainted by hypocrisy (*gizen*) and desire (*ton'yoku* 貪欲), what is the purpose of attempting to benefit others? According to Takeuchi, the purpose is found in working hard to make the attempt. A true Shin Buddhist life is "a life of effort," the continuous attempt to improve (or "idealize" *risōka* 理想化) our world (1955, 154-155)—despite the impossibility of success based on our own, self-deluded efforts. It is always worthwhile for a discriminator to attempt to eliminate discrimination because this activity creates the setting for the arising of Amida's heart within discriminators.

Creating opportunities for the good

At the level of the conventional, ordinary self who acts in the world, capable only of poisoned good, Takeuchi recommended a life of social work in service to others for

the member of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdanjin*), especially its paradigmatic representative, the temple priest. Takeuchi understood this life of service as one of hard work and constant critical self-reflection (*hansei*) and lamentation. Such an ordinary temple priest is, by definition, defiled by blind passions and selfish calculation, unable to intentionally help others. If that priest is a social worker striving to address *buraku* discrimination, they are still a discriminator.

By recommending a particular type of life, embedded in a particular type of institution, Takeuchi is able to connect the effort and intentional action of ordinary beings with the possibility of truly good action. This life is the *situation* or *context* for the manifestation of the truly good in the world. While living this kind of ordinary life, the Ōtani-ha social worker is the site and social work is the specific behavioral context (that is, social work to eliminate *buraku* discrimination) for Amida's working, his heart, to break through into society—thus planting the good karmic causes (*shukuzen*) for salvation in society as a whole.[9]

To be an ordinary Ōtani-ha social worker, is to be part of a larger system of training and placement, managed by a central bureaucracy. This is why Takeuchi's ethics are bureaucratic in nature, and why they are represented by his proposals and policies for the large, corporate body of the Ōtani-ha—the order (*kyōdan*) as a whole. The organization, its policies, and management are not separate from the individual social worker. The organizational structure itself is also the site and the specific structure through which Amida's working breaks through into our defiled world. Describing Takeuchi's bureaucratic Shin ethics colloquially, then, at the

---

[9] To describe this, Takeuchi used the metaphor of a single sandalwood tree, symbolizing the heart of the *nenbutsu*, purifying a forest of nauseating eranda trees, this defiled world full of the three poisons and inescapable karmic evil (quote from Daochuo (Dōshaku 道綽, 562–645), *Seiten* 171). Social work, for Takeuchi, has the ability to perfume the poisoned world.

organizational level it is a little like the movie *Field of Dreams* (1989): build it and Amida Buddha will come.

Metaphorically, Takeuchi compared the possibility of ethical action in Shin Buddhism to a generous and vital gift, one that a person could never obtain for herself.[10] Passion-riden, foolish beings express themselves morally not in their efforts to obtain the gift, but in their attitudes towards the giver, Amida Buddha, and in the daily performance of life that the gift has enabled. Whether the gift of faith (*shinjin*) is to arise in the future or has already arisen in the life of the Shin Buddhist follower, it is always appropriate to feel and express gratitude to Amida and work for the benefit of others. On the other hand, it is never appropriate to take the giver and the gift for granted (*hongan bokori*).

His creation of plans and policy for social work, to organize the temple network and reform sect governance, aimed to undercut the worst vices of the members of the order—almost as if the organizational structure and activities of the group could serve as another voice calling its members to critical self-reflection (*hansei* 反省). Self-reflection and organizational reform have the same goal of reducing the worst of the vices of inherently evil human hearts. The worst vices in Shin Buddhism, for Takeuchi, are all those human traits, such as "arrogance" (*kyōman* 驕慢) and "wrong-headedness" (*jaken* 邪見), characteristic of an individual who believes himself to be a good person, acting appropriately, based on correct knowledge of the situation. Or, even worse, the traits characteristic of one who knows herself to be evil and does not care, and is thus "cruel and shameless"

---

[10] Takeuchi (1955, 154-155) in a discussion on ideal offerings of followers to temples, discusses the heart of Amida as a gift. One who receives this offering is able to truly practice (*gyō* 行), work hard, and experience gratitude.

(*musan muki*).[11]

Within this careful balance of truly good action and poisoned good, of transformation caused by Amida's other power (*tariki*), and everyday action out of devotion, gratitude, and service towards the giver, Shin ethics have developed in diverse ways. In Takeuchi's understanding, a life of gratitude and service to the giver in the form of social work presents the very opportunity for Amida's heart to manifest within the world—but we cannot be complacent or assume that our social work is good. We are, after all, limited, foolish, evil beings full of blind passions and heavy karma.

Learning by doing social work

In his earliest writings on Shin social work (TRI 1920), and in some of his latest (TRI 1950), Takeuchi discussed the unique standpoint or attitude of Shin social work. It is through the performance of social work itself that one is presented with the opportunity to experience morally good attitudes of gratitude and humility. It is not the case that a Shin Buddhist has attained these good attitudes and brings them into social work. The only way to become a true companion (*dōbō*)—a concept that Takeuchi used throughout his writings as shorthand for a person able to maintain morally good, egalitarian and warm, relations with others—is to perform social work. Takeuchi wrote:

> Necessarily, the attitude of Shin Buddhist social work *must be learned in the doing*, and the truth of being the companion (*dōbō*) of the poor and oppressed,

---

[11] Takeuchi (1941, 1-4) contrasted people "with hearts" (*kokoro aru* 心ある) and those who are "cruel and shameless." People with hearts experience shame (*zanki* 慙愧), repent (*zange* 懺悔), reflect on their own evil, care about society, are motivated to act. The heartless do not reflect on their own evil (*muhansei*). They are arrogant and self-satisfied that they know what is right, and have no faith. People who judge others as bad and themselves as good (which is the fundamental action of discrimination), are always committing an evil act.

is not neglected, *but learned by having that very goal*. In this way, Shin social work becomes an act of continuous gratitude. (TRI 1920, 18)

It is important to emphasize here the specificity of Takeuchi's ethical vision. It is specific to the social problems of a given historical age. During Takeuchi's career, the specific problem of modern *buraku* discrimination was also the specific human relation within which an ordinary Shin temple priest becomes a companion (*dōbō*).[12] The experience of lamentation and the arising of faith, too, are portrayed as historically specific, and specific to the individual. Takeuchi understood himself and other members of the order as discriminators. As temple priests, they discriminated by virtue of their social role and status,[13] as much as by their thoughts, words, and deeds. Faith arises within the individual who is already at work serving society. This work, according to Takeuchi, provides the *opportunity* for the good to blossom into our world via the working of the sole, truly good agent: Amida Buddha.

The practice of critical self-reflection

Just as he recommended the practice of social work as the only possibility, the opportunity, for truly good action and good relations with others—one becomes a true companion (*dōbō*) precisely by attempting to be a companion to others—he recommended that Shin social workers engage in a psychological, therapeutic[14] practice of lamentation (*kanashimu*) and critical self-reflection (*hansei* 反省). One becomes a person able to experience true lamentation and true strength, made to

---

[12] Hongō (2010), in a brief commentary on Takeuchi's thought, describes engagement with *buraku* discrimination and knowing oneself as a discriminator as the only means to create solidarity with those who are discriminated-against.

[13] Like other individual members, the temple priest needed to realize, reflect upon, and lament the banal evils of their specific social position, for example, their standard of living within rural villages. Only then would they understand the causes for suffering in the village and their lives be transformed into "great compassion, their waking and sleep...[constant] repentance" (TRI 1927, 38).

[14] The psychological dimensions of Takeuchi's thought would be an interesting study.

become so by Amida's working, precisely by attempting to diagnose one's own conceits, desires, and failings.

Takeuchi was generous in his criticism of himself and others in the hopes that they, too, would be moved to critical self-reflection. He would reflect at length on his specific failings as human, as a priest, and as social worker. He described his pride at being a non-conformist, how he was hideously lucky person, selfish day and night, how he bathed in the advantages, special connections, and special treatment his job as at the Ōtani-ha administration afforded, describing all his acts as poisonous good acts (*doku no zen*): "I lay claim to my darkness and fearfully await the next world" (Takeuchi 1941, preface).

This therapeutic practice also had a collective dimension in Takeuchi's writings. He extended the self-realization of evil (*ki no jinshin*) to encompass the group. If the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) realized its evil, discriminatory nature, then the motivation to struggle against discrimination would arise within the order. The Ōtani-ha order, too, needed to realize, reflect upon, and lament its own discrimination. Through critical self-reflection, the order (*kyōdan*) would come to understand the causes and conditions of its historical failings, the potential for an institutional will to reform and struggle against discrimination is created.

Takeuchi repeatedly applied this paradigm, where deep awareness of evil leads directly to actions of restitution and service, over and over again to different individuals and groups, and individuals as representatives of groups. He explained that the whole order "must deeply reflect (*hansei*) on our failings," and that the loss of a meaningful social role for the temple priest is a "crucial time of reflection (*hansei*) for the whole sect" (TRI 1920, 14). He demanded that the Ōtani-ha sect reflect collectively on "the inadequacy of our Buddhist movement" for social work (TRI 1920, 16). In fact, the whole of society "must reflect upon itself and its

failings" for it is shameless and negligent (*hōitsu musan*), placing its faith in material things (TRI 1920, 14-15). A collective reflection on the historical failures of the order (*kyōdan*) was, for Takeuchi, a natural part of a welling up of new motivation and strength for social work.[15]

History, necessity, karmic causes and conditions

Takeuchi paid attention to history. He constantly questioned the role the order (*kyōdan*) and its members should play in their particular historical age. Takeuchi's modern interpretation of karmic causality provided a way to understand the successive arising of different ideologies and social movements in history (TRI 1927, 37, 39),[16] reasons for the temple priests *qua* social workers to rely on social science and historical investigation, and explained how social workers are able to mediate Amida's working in the whole of society—a kind of modern, collective karma.[17]

Takeuchi saw that social work (*shakai jigyō*) was the most recent and necessary historical development of social engagement, coming out of earlier charitable and salvation work (*jie kyūsai jigyō* 慈恵救済事業). It was inevitable that one kind of historical, social movement would give way to the next, and that each movement would respond to the failings of the movements that came before it. Takeuchi held that Shin teachings ought to suit the historical age and the

---

[15] Takeuchi (TRI 1927, 29) discussed this same process of critical reflection, lamentation, and investigation applied to historical movements, such as early twentienth century charitable and improvement undertakings. See also TRI (1927, 35-36).

[16] This is similar to the Marxist view and one of the positive features of Marxist thought, according to Takeuchi, in addition to its egalitarianism.

[17] Although historically there are Buddhist concepts such as "shared karma" (*gūgō* 共業) (DDB), these are normally restricted to smaller groups. A "collective" karma applied to the nation or society or country as a whole in the manner of Takeuchi, however, is a modern understanding and related to his view of planting "good karmic causes" (*shukuzen*) in society.

recipient.[18] As such, he devoted himself to social work during his career because it was the natural expression (*jinen* 自然) of the Shin temple *at that moment in history* (Takeuchi 1941, preface). Beginning with an honest, critical reflection on history, the methods by which the appropriate teachings for the time and the recipient are determined involve careful scientific and historical investigation.

Without taking the form appropriate to the historical time, Takeuchi explained that Shin social action will fail: "regardless of how hard the temple priest works, they fail. It is simple fact that the karmic conditions (*shukuen*) for success have not yet developed and the world is full of beings lacking good karmic conditions (*mushukuzen no ki*)" (TRI 1920, 14-15). The work of temple priests to help beings encounter Amida's salvation is hindered by a lack of "karmic conditions." The *absence* of these conditions is, in fact, a direct result of the *presence* of social fragmentation, hardship, suffering, and inequality. Temple priests must "engage in a variety of social work, cultivate a spirit of social service…This is our opportunity to recreate contemporary society. (TRI 1920, 14-15). Social work, in accord with the time and recipient, is able to create good karmic causes and conditions in society, that is, create the opportunity for the arising of faith in society as a whole.

Recreating society by working to alleviate suffering and inequality is itself the karmic act that allows salvation to occur. For Takeuchi, the "temple priest must think of this [social] work as the karmic condition (*shukuen*) [in the people] for the arising of diamond-like faith (*kongō no shinjin*)" (TRI 1920, 16). Karmic causes and conditions that make it possible to encounter the teachings of Shinran and Amida Buddha's salvation. Takeuchi ties these soteriological causes and conditions to

---

[18] Izumi (1975, 4: 22–23) interprets this as Takeuchi's use of the concept of "teachings adapted to the historical age and the recipient" (*jiki sōō no hō* 時機相応の法).

actual social causes and conditions, and recommends that the Ōtani-ha head temple organize temple priests to create the *social* conditions that lead to *soteriological* ideals. That is, a temple priest working to alleviate poverty locally is, by that very activity, creating the karmic conditions for Amida's salvation.

This interpretation of Shin Buddhist karma and causality provided a conceptual framework for the actual elimination of the causes of discrimination, shifting away from a discriminatory paradigm that blames the sufferer for their sufferings. If the people cannot improve their own situation, that would be the fault of temple priests. If priests cannot plant good karmic causes in society, that would be the fault of the head temple bureaucracy.

How, then, does the member of the Ōtani-ha order determine that "social work" is the appropriate form of Shin Buddhist teachings for the twentieth century? To answer this question, Takeuchi recommended a scientific understanding of causality applied both to this world of discrimination and to the non-discriminatory ideal of the pure land. As Takeuchi explained, "the causes and conditions (*inga* 因果) that link the two must be scientifically studied. In Shin Buddhism, one devotes the whole of human life, always and without interruption, to realizing the ideal" (TRI 1950, 268). The structure for social work that is causally related to Amida's pure land is the only one that will be effective.

Takeuchi described the pure land as radically and wholly non-discriminatory, as a place with no distinction between stranger and friend, no possession or control, no self and other, no distinction between individuals, no this or that. Takeuchi encouraged members of the order to reflect upon and know this real world and this ideal pure land, to scientifically examine the causal links between the two, and then to unceasingly *attempt* to realize the ideal—despite the fact that the ideal can never be made manifest. It is a goal that cannot be reached in the here

and now. And so, the proper life of the temple priest is constant reflection upon individual, group, and social evil, and unceasing labor attempting to transform that discriminatory evil into the non-discriminatory good (TRI 1950).

One duty of the Shin social worker is to discover the complex causes of discrimination, wherever in society they might be found (TRI 1920, 17). The members of the order (*kyōdanjin*) must "be practitioners who clarify the causes of discrimination's suffering and remove them—whether these causes are in politics, economy, morality, law, or in the deeply evil nature of humans" (TRI 1950, 265). By comparing these causes with the pure land, the social worker develops the knowledge and technique to orient society away from that discrimination. There are several parts to this causal knowledge: (1) discerning the causes of discrimination; (2) discerning the nature of the pure land; (3) discerning the causal and conditions that, if estaliblished, would allow our defiled world to turn towards Amida's pure land—even though this world cannot be fully purified.

Utopian visions: Takeuchi on the role of the temple

As Takeuchi's career progressed, he would further develop his views of an Ōtani-ha order represented by the temple and temple priest. There are two types of utopian visions[19] in his work. One of these is the absolute or transcendent utopia of the pure land. The other, is the immanent utopia of the local temple community and "individual" temple priest—which are synonymous with the collective Ōtani-ha order. The temple network of the order (*kyōdan*) mediates the ideal of the pure land. The local temple and temple priest together represent the site of Amida's working:

---

[19] My use of utopia here is not technical. For an extended and excellent discussion of utopia in Buddhism, see Collins (1998).

262

The temple priest will become their close companion (*dōbō*) as both the *method* of transmitting the teachings and developing faith (*shinjin*), as well as the *content* of a life of gratitude. (TRI 1920, 17)

Priests, through their social work, creates the conditions for the arising of faith (*shinjin*)—they should not merely preach, chant, and perform rituals. The purpose of the True Body Society (Shinshinkai) is to create this kind of temple (TRI 1950). In all of Takeuchi's writings, the local temple priest is the paradigmatic representative of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*), and figures like Shinran and Rennyo, are paradigmatic local temple priests. He placed the temple priest, and thus the order, into the role of mediator. For example, Takeuchi advocated for a consultative relationship between various experts and temple priests. Only with the most up-to-date, scientific understanding of the world of cause and effect (such as the best farming techniques for agricultural villages, or experts in health for childcare facilities), could the temple priest cultivate faith among the people (*shinnen kan'yō* 信念涵養) (TRI 1920, 15). The temple priest was supposed to mediate between those with helpful knowledge and those who would benefit by it. Part of this process was to abandon unscientific, superstitious views on, for example, karma and religious ritual.

Mediation, however, was to go beyond the mediation of worldly knowledge. The temple priest, the local face of a vast, centrally organized network of temple priests, mediated between those in power and those oppressed, and between the reality of our world and the transcendent ideal of Amida's pure land. If skillfully done, Takeuchi believed this mediation could reduce social contradiction and conflict, thereby creating the conditions for the causes of suffering to be known and addressed (TRI 1920, 16). The pure land of Amida was the ideal that oriented this endeavor. Knowledge of this ideal, combined with accurate, technical knowledge of the real, was supposed to guide social work.

Resisting secularization: becoming a companion (*dōbō*)

To end this chapter, I will briefly discuss Takeuchi's use of two important symbols, Shinran's "eating meat and marrying" (*nikujiki saitai*) and the ideal of the true companion (*dōbō*). He deployed these symbols in a number of ways: (1) to resist the modern secularization and privatization of religion (TRI 1920, 16); and (2) as a model for the Shin temple priest *qua* social worker. In the case of relations between *burakumin* and non-*burakumin* followers of Shin, these two symbols suggest a mode of religious and social practice that does not segregate or avoid contact, that does not reject commensality and consanguinity, and that consciously adopts the very practice—meat eating—that forms part of *buraku* discrimination itself.

During the Edo period, "eating meat and marrying" (*nikujiki saitai*) was used by Shin priests "as a sort of shorthand for their distinctive clerical practices."[20] It referred generally to the state of a male monastic living as a householder and thus doing things normally forbidden to a monk, such as wearing lay clothes, taking a wife, raising children, eating meat, drinking alcohol, and neglecting the tonsure. At various points in Shinran's life, he broke or was forced to break, monastic precepts. He lived *nikujiki saitai*, and declared himself "neither a monk nor a layman" (*hisō hizoku* 非僧非俗). In Takeuchi's vision of Shin social work, Shinran's *nikujiki saitai* played a key role: "As the head temple determines their position on social work, they should learn from the founder Shinran's 'eating meat and marrying'" (TRI 1920, 16). Takeuchi considered "eating meat and marrying" a unique feature of

---

[20] Jaffe (2001, xvii), while others used it, and related pejorative terms for sexual intercourse, to criticize Shin Buddhist priests. After 1872, *nikujiki saitai* comes to refer to a set of decriminalized practices, including growing one's hair and not wearing robes. It is a symbol of "clerical laxity" (2001, 5). See also Mochizuki (1958, 5:4023-4024) who covers scriptural examples of clerical marriage, precepts against meat-eating, types of forbidden meat. For a summary of the doctrine's positive usage in Shin Buddhism, see Numa and Kozuka (1982, 492-494, 1066-1071).

Shin Buddhism. Unlike premodern Shin apologists (Jaffe 2001, xiv–xviii, Chapters 2–3), however, Takeuchi describes it as something to be proud of and the very foundation of Shin Buddhism's significance in the modern world. It is the very lifestyle that expressed Shin awakening and action in society initiated by Shinran himself. Its twentieth century form, manifest as the Shin social worker who refused to limit "religion" to some private, interior realm.

Shinran's "eating meat and marrying" was, for Takeuchi, a way of life that placed Shinran between antagonistic opposites (good people vs. evil people, rich vs. poor, monastic vs. lay, powerful vs. powerless, conservatives vs. radicals). Other moral approaches, such as charity and altruism, are unhelpful according to Takeuchi, because they reify these antogonistic opposites. They do not remove inequality and hardship; charity and altruism but, in fact, cause them. Modelling good behavior does not help those defined as "evil"; it merely earns their animosity and resistance. Shinran's "eating meat and marrying," by contrast, collapses the dichotomy in a compassionate breaking of the precepts. Shinran could become the true companion (*dōbō*) of those who suffer, something the charitable donor cannot do. In Takeuchi's vision, eating meat and marrying, and becoming a companion, meant that Shinran could mediate between opposing political factions and opposing social strata in a way that reduced conflict and suffering for society overall (TRI 1920, 16-17).

Takeuchi also took "eating meat and marrying" in a more concrete fashion: as the act of spending time, living together, and sharing food with others. True companion (*dōbō*) temple priests do precisely this, "come into contact with the oppressed with their own bodies…seek to fulfill their needs," and "create institutions to respond to them. To forget to create such institutions is a kind of death" (TRI 1920, 17). This concrete living together was the main goal of the

settlement activities sponsored by the Ōtani-ha.

The problem with ideology

One important implication of the Shin position that all humans are evil people (*akunin*) in Takeuchi's thought, is that ethical systems based on intentional good acts and identity as good people (*zennin*) are impossible. Good action is only possible out of the self-realization of evil (*ki no jinshin*). Despite the common goal of eliminating "the inequalities and hardships of society" (TRI 1920, 15), Takeuchi pointed out the flaws in any system that admitted the possibility of good action[21]: altruism, socialism, charity, utilitarianism (TRI 1920); Marxist liberationism, moralism (Takeuchi 1955, 166); scientific social policy, humanitariansim (Takeuchi 1919); and even human rights (Takeuchi 1955, 156).[22] Shin social work "does not come from any fixed ideology; it comes from the heart that suffers, having stepped forward to experience the suffering of the people" (Takeuchi 1955, 147). To state this in different words, good social work emerges within social workers. It is Amida's heart of great compassion appearing within the ordinary, foolish social worker, who has realized that they are incapable of truly helping others.

Those active in society who understand themselves as capable of good action, as "good people" (*zennin*), in the end, have no faith in the dignity (*songen* 尊厳), and the fundamental worth, of those they try to help. According to Takeuchi, this is because they must view those they help as "evil persons (*akunin*)[23]" (Takeuchi 1919, part 3). The key to truly good social work is to reverse this relation and act,

[21] According to Takeuchi (TRI 1920, 17), flawed ideologies and moral systems actually cause social conflict and inequality.

[22] Takeuchi compares these ideologies to the "various good acts" (*shogyō* 諸行), such as charity, which in the Shin understanding, are defiled and do not lead to salvation.

[23] *hikyūsaisha wa doko made mo akunin* 被救済者はどこまでも悪人.

understanding oneself as incapable of good action, as an "evil person" (*akunin*). Thus, Takeuchi wrote, "I must know myself as subject to inescapable suffering and unavoidably defiled[24]—how then can I feel anger towards the homeless and impoverished" (Takeuchi 1919, part 5)—those who society considers defiled. To act from the position of the good person is to reify discriminatory social structures.

It is for this reason that Takeuchi claimed that social work "must be religious"; because Shin Buddhism realizes that we cannot truly, intentionally help others, there is a "necessary connection" (Takeuchi 1919, part 6) between faith and social work. Benefiting others in Shin Buddhism "is not an instrumental value—*it is none other than the goal itself.*" Accordingly, Takeuchi wrote, "it is not going too far to say that social work will be accomplished only with the Buddhist movement of Shin temple priests and followers" (TRI 1920, 15-16). The performance of social work by the Ōtani-ha order, with its organized network of temple priests, was itself the natural (*jinen*) working out of Amida's vow to save all beings in a manner appropriate to the present age—without the tragic flaw of other ideologies and moral systems.

I suggest that the impossibility of truly good action outside of the Amida Buddha and his pure land, made it difficult for Takeuchi to deal with ideology in general. Because he viewed all ideologies and moral systems as flawed in some way, Takeuchi tended to emphasize the small-scale and the local (Takeuchi 1941, preface). For example, he wrote extensively on the ideal temple, a relatively small-scale institution, part of an extended network of simlar, small-scale institutions. At the level of the national, he displayed a strong willingness to use

---

[24] *yogoroshi to shite kaihi suru koto wa dekinai* 汚しとて回避する事は出来ない.

the terms of the dominant ideology to achieve his goals.[25] From what he labeled the "unique standpoint" of Shin Buddhism, it was possible to take up, use, and discard ideas and techniques at need.

This flexibility and lack of loyalty to a particular political ideology became a major target of criticism in the postwar period. Critics point out the limitations of his understanding of society, that he rarely took issue with existing power structures[26]—despite his willingness to criticize the moral vices of those within them. At no point, for example, did he suggest the elimination of the positions of head priest or emperor. Takeuchi did cooperate with imperial projects and with the Japanese nation-state's control of spaces internal to Japan (such as the setting up of leprosaria) and spaces external on the Asian continent (such as tours and missionary endeavors in Japanese colonial areas). Then again, he also defended Marxist groups like the Levelers' Society in print, criticized the ruling government, and saw democratization as a worthy social goal in the postwar period. This feature of his thought more than any other makes Takeuchi difficult for postwar Buddhism and Buddhist scholarship to categorize. He was ambiguous figure, whose thought changed over time.

Conclusions

Based on a passage from *A Record in Lament of Divergences* (*Tannishō*),[27] Kenneth Tanaka (2000, 348) explains a common understanding that, in Shin Buddhism, the

---

[25] This is particularly evident in his support of imperial reconciliationist rhetoric (DBS 1:869-875), wartime mobilization policies (Asaji 2009), and postwar discussion of democracy (TRI 1950).

[26] There is evidence that Takeuchi had begun to criticize structure in the latter part of his career during the postwar period. See for example the structural reforms he suggested for the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) (Takeuchi 1955) and his criticism of the Minister of Justice in his last newspaper editorial (Takeuchi 1965).

[27] The passage reads: "Compassion in the Path of Sages is to pity, commiserate with, and care for beings. It is extremely difficult, however, to accomplish the saving of others just as one wishes. Compassion in the Pure Land Path should be understood as first attaining Buddhahood quickly through saying the nembutsu and, with the mind of great love and compassion, freely benefiting sentient beings as one wishes" (CWS 1:663).

practice of compassion is postponed. Compassion lies only in the saying of Amida's name (*nenbutsu*), because foolish beings are unable to benefit others according to their intentions. In other words, compassionate practice is postponed until the attainment of enlightenment. When arguing for a Shin social ethics, however, this must be rejected.[28] Takeuchi's rejection of this position explicitly links *nenbutsu* to the practice of social work, moral exhortation (*kyōka*), and offering material assistance. "*Nenbutsu* without this activity and this work is necessarily a lie. *Nenbutsu* [without social work] is evil, like an empty husk or hollow vessel, without a true body (*shinshin* 眞身) and without content."[29] The sign of the arising of faith, *nenbutsu*, will always be accompanied by social action appropriate to the time and the people. Takeuchi consistently describes this world and this present moment as a place and time of crisis and chaos. It is impermanent, in constant flux, and we can only try to engage in various, sundry good acts to improve it (though these are all, ultimately ineffective). It is characterized by evil, foolish people filled with greed, anger, and blind passions. It is no wonder that such a world is plagued by inequalities, poverty, suffering, and discrimination.

The multifaceted experience that is the arising of faith (*shinjin*) allowed Takeuchi to reconcile responsibility for *buraku* discrimination with organized efforts to reduce it. For him, the realization of the self as evil (*ki no jinshin*) would always be tied to the concrete forms of evil itself. Thus, the Ōtani-ha order and its members must realize their specific evil of discrimination. By realizing one's own evil, a social worker is transformed into a being, through the working of Amida, who addresses the specific evil they realize in themselves. Anti-discrimination

---

[28] Tanaka (2000) rejects this argument and lists others who do as well. See also Dessì (2007).

[29] *Kono kōi, kono jigyō naku shōmyō wa, kanarazuya uso no shōmyō de aru. Shinshin no nai naiyō no nai 'shiira' kara tsubo no shōmyō wa zaiaku de aru* この行為, この事業無き称名は, 必ずやうその称名である. 眞身の無い内容の無い「しいら」からつぼの称名は罪悪である (Takeuchi 1955, 147).

activities arise naturally via the self-liberation of the discriminator. The specific form of response to faith, however, is important here. The discriminator works to overcome discrimination.

PART IV Continuing discrimination and response: present day Ōtani-ha

Conclusion: Ethics in modern Buddhist institutions

This dissertation addressed the history of *buraku* discrimination inside Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism up to the 1970s, after the passing of priest-bureaucrat, Takeuchi Ryō'on.[1] Sadly, *buraku* discrimination continues inside the sect. Yet, so do institutional policies and programs to combat it. Steven Covell, in his work on modern Tendai Buddhism, points out that anti-discrimination efforts and discriminatory behaviors within the Tendai are, in fact, simultaneous: "the process of weeding out offensive gravestones by the sect and by antidiscrimination groups is ongoing, just as phone calls to temples requesting information regarding the backgrounds of individuals continues" (2008, 307).

This dissertation began with the problem of *buraku* discrimination as a case study for Buddhist ethics by examining Japanese Shin Buddhism, especially the modern Ōtani-ha sect. In early chapters, I presented a multilayered theory of modern *buraku* discrimination, including the role that respresentatives of the Ōtani-ha have played. From the beginning of the Japanese modern period, *buraku* advocates have contested discrimination. When organized and sustained, this resistance both inside and outside of the Ōtani-ha organization has meant that the

---

[1] Although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, the 1970s to the present represents an important time in the history of Buddhism and *buraku* discrimination in Japan. Inside the Ōtani-ha, a reformist government came to power, the head priest became a symbolic leader, and measures to combat discrimination, part of central and regional sect regulations. For Japanese Buddhism as a whole, this period saw the 1979 Discriminatory Remarks of Machida Incident (*Machida sabetsu hatsugen jiken* 町田差別発言事件) and the formation of the Network of Religious Organizations Responding to the "Assimilation Problem" ("Dōwa Mondai" ni Torikumu Shūkyō Kyōdan Rentai Kaigi 「同和問題」にとりくむ宗教教団連帯会議) also known as the Dōshūren 同宗連.

Ōtani-ha has remained conscious of its historical responsibility at an institutional level. In parts I and II, I outlined the issues in ongoing ethical arguments that are connected to *buraku* discrimination and Shin Buddhism. In part III, I provided wholly new material on the Ōtani-ha institution's response, using the career and writings of one priest-bureaucrat named Takeuchi Ryō'on.

Takeuchi was not a lone figure, but typical of priest-bureaucrats that struggled with *buraku* discrimination *as institutional representatives.* My early chapters discussed what has been "said" about discrimination, and later chapters, an example of what representatives of large, established Buddhist sects have "done" about it. In this conclusion, I reinforce the characterization of Takeuchi as one among many priest-bureaucrats concerned with *buraku* discrimination. Today, this group forms a left-leaning faction within the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy, many of whom work for the Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements (Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu), or worked for its institutional predecessors. In the present, this faction is the "middle-management" behind the Ōtani-ha's official support of human rights, *buraku* liberation, women's rights, and Hansen's disease patients' rights. After a brief description of this faction, I present a contemporary example of human rights campaigning by the current Ōtani-ha head priest, Ōtani Chōken (大谷 暢顯, b.1930), known by his ordination name, Jōnyo 浄如.

To say that the sect bureaucracy and leadership continue to engage problems of human rights and discrimination does not mean that *buraku* discrimination has disappeared inside the Ōtani-ha. The Buraku Liberation League (Buraku Kaihō Dōmei) has denounced the Ōtani-ha on several occassions in the postwar period (JG 2010). The results of a recent survey of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples speaks to the persistence of discrimination and the need for arm's length groups such as the Council of Temples Related to Assimilation (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai), an association of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples known by its short name, Dōkankyō. The

Dōkankyō has lobbied the head temple for reform since its creation in 1974. I present this unique and important survey and a short description of the Dōkankyō's history.

Last, I reflect on the investigation of Buddhist group and institutional ethics. Any investigation of group ethics ought to pay attention to locations within the group most likely to consider and implement social policy. This means attention to the Buddhist organizational context, its distinct textual genres, and its ethical visions for the group itself. In the case of the Ōtani-ha, this is its head temple bureaucracy, staffed with priest-bureaucrats.

Takeuchi's institutional faction

Takeuchi Ryō'on and his colleagues worked to establish and staff several departments and associations.[2] The first two, founded in the 1920s, were the Society Department (Shakaika), in charge of all Ōtani-ha social programs and publishing for a time, and the True Body Society (Shinshinkai), in charge of the sect's response to *buraku* discrimination in particular. In these groups, a number of priest-bureaucrats may be counted as members of Takeuchi's circle of friends and colleagues, Noma Osamu (野間修), Tachibana Ryōhō (橘了法, b.1910), and Asano Onchi (1906-1982, also known by his Korean name, Yi Su-ryong).[3]

In the final stages of the war and its aftermath, the Ōtani-ha institutional will to respond to *buraku* discrimination had declined. Social activities, connected as they were in popular consciousness with general Ōtani-ha support of the war and Japanese nation, became problematic. Takeuchi and his faction attempted to keep the True Body Society alive with their private funds and donations, but finally

---

[2] Takeuchi was involved with other groups as well, but I discuss only those connected to *buraku* discrimination here. See part III for more on Takeuchi's activities.

[3] Izumi (1975, 4:21-22) lists seven key members, including Noma Osamu, Nishikawa Gishō (西川義精), and Watada Shōshin (和多田誠心).

allowed it to dissolve in 1954. Takeuchi's faction gathered together in 1964, and from then onwards, according to Asano, created a movement to continue his work (Asano 1988a, 240). After the pressure on the Ōtani-ha applied by denuncations after the 1967 Nanba Incident (*Nanba Betsuin rinban sabetsu jiken*), this group was successfully reintegrated into the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy. They staffed the Assimilation Society (Dōwakai 同和会), created in 1969 and renamed the Assimilation Committee (Dōwa Iinkai 同和委員会) in 1970.[4] Once the reformist faction of the Companion Society Movement (Dōbōkai Undō 同朋会運動) was firmly in power, Takeuchi's faction remained in charge of departments connected to *buraku* discrimination, increasingly including other forms of discrimination and human rights issues into their mandate. In 1971, the Assimilation Department (Dōwabu 同和部) was created. In 1977, it was renamed the Department for the Promotion of Assimilation (Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部), and in 2006, to the Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements (Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu).

The True Body Society (Shinshinkai, 1926-1954), gave rise to two later independent and critical groups,[5] the most important of which is the Dōkankyō.[6] Takeuchi's early work surveying and assembling representatives of Ōtani-ha

[4] There were conservative and reformist, left-leaning factions inside of the Companion Society Movement (Dōbōkai Undō). In the tumultuous era of 1970s sect government, when conservative factions were in power, they created their own department to handle *buraku* issues, with personnel separate from those with links to Takeuchi. While the faction was on the outs, they formed the Shin Buddhist Assimiliation Problem Research Society (Shinshū Dōwa Mondai Kenkyūkai 真宗同和問題研究会).

[55] The other is the Society of Shared Fire (Dōen no Kai), founded by Asano in 1980. The Society made presentations to the Ōtani-ha cabinet regarding its handling of the 1984 Tōri'in Tōri Discriminatory Incident (*Tōri'in Tōri sabetsu jiken* 董理院董理差別事件) and 1984 Discriminatory Remarks of the Former Cabinet Member in Charge of Doctrinal Studies (*Moto kyōgaku tantō sanmu sabetsu hatsugen jiken* 元教学担当参務差別発言事件). The Dōkankyō was an association of *buraku* temple priests only, the Society of Shared Fire, open to both *burakumin* and non-*burakumin* members of the Ōtani-ha.

[6] The Dōkankyō (1996, 5) views itself in the lineage of the True Body Society, as internal critics who play an important role in making the order (*kyōdan*) realize its discriminatory nature (*taishitsu*). Many members had played the role of internal critics and mediators during the eight denunciation meetings that followed the Nanba Betsuin Rinban Discriminatory Incident (Nanba Betsuin rinban sabetsu jiken, 1967). See Dōkankyō (1996, 2-3) for its 1974 mission statement.

buraku temples when he worked for the Society Department created a network that would later form the membership of the Dōkankyō. There were 130 temples invited in 1974, twenty years later, the Dōkankyō had 175 member temples. It was formed with the goal of manifesting a spirit of liberation (*kaihō* 解放), a nod to left-wing ideas of eliminating *buraku* discrimination, for all members of the Ōtani-ha order (DD 1975, no.1) and to give voice to the anger of *buraku* followers over the sect's inaction and persistence of discriminatory phenomena and incidents. Member priests vowed to work as long as a single Ōtani-ha household experienced discrimination.

> Asano (1988b, 172) explained that the Dōkankyō,
>
> must be separate from sect administration (*shūsei* 宗政), and not something created by the head office. We who live in *buraku* (*dōwa*) areas, impoverished and discriminated-against, having even been cast out from a head temple that takes companionism (*dōbō dōgyō*) as its central doctrine, take Dōkankyō as a name of pride for those temple priests who have protected their followers while enduring this difficulty. (Asano 1988b, 172)

One of the first acts of the Dōkankyō as an internal critic of the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) was to submit a list of three demands to the administration in January of 1981 (DD 2005, no.35). They demanded funding for a survey of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples, creation of both an Assimilation Council and Dōkankyō in every Ōtani-ha parish; and a reduction of obligatory donations and an offer of financial assistance to *buraku* temples (DD 1996, 13-14). The Dōkankyō has held study meetings, site visits, published a newsletter, consulted on the creation of priestly training materials, and formally addressed the Ōtani-ha cabinet in pursuit of eliminating the temple and priestly ranking system, and oversaw the creation of a Shin doctrine of liberation (DD 2003, no.32). Both types of group associated with Takeuchi's faction—both within, and at arm's length from, the Ōtani-ha bureaucracy—also had regional offices. Both have taken positions as internal

critics.

Active both before and after the war, Asano Onchi was an interesting figure in his own right: a Korean immigrant, a *buraku* temple priest, a disciple of Takeuchi Ryō'on, a Suiheisha and *buraku* liberation activist and administrator at the national level and for Shiga prefecture, member of almost all the Ōtani-ha anti-discrimination groups to the end of the 1980s. This dissertation could have focused on his work rather than Takeuchi's; he is certainly worthy of further study.[7] For Asano, the Ōtani-ha, especially Takeuchi's faction within it, was a refuge, a place where he was not discriminated against as a Korean. He hoped that it had the ideological and soteriological potential to overcome discrimination. At the same time, he saw the sect and its *buraku* temples as sites of discrimination against the *burakumin*, its doctrines employed to this end, and priests calling on *burakumin* followers to endure rather than improve their circumstances. Like Takeuchi, Asano also held that authentic religion would manifest in social action. Asano agreed with a series of Marxist criticisms directed at the *kyōdan*—namely that it became a tool of the imperial system that itself creates oppressed peoples.

Asano became directly involved with combatting the social effects of discrimination: both against Korean residents of Japan, *burakumin*, and the overlapping discrimination against Korean residents of the *buraku*. Asano was a hybrid of a radical Marxist and anarchist activist and an Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) priest-bureaucrat. Priest-bureaucrats like Asano made it possible for critiques of social structure and Marxist-liberationist (*kaihō*) understandings of discrimination to be incorporated into this Ōtani-ha faction. This incorporation is visible in the decision to change the name of their department from the

---

[7] In conversations during the 2009 study meeting of the Dōkankyō, it was suggested that Asano has not received the attention he deserves due to "double" discrimination as a Korean and *buraku* area resident.

"Department for the Promotion of Assimilation" to the "Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements."

Takeuchi's faction, alive today in the Department for the Promotion of Liberation Movements, inherited Takeuchi's understandings of how best to respond to *buraku* discrimination (*sabetsu*)—and shifted them slightly to the left. Today, this faction professes a "theology" of the discriminator (*sabetsusha* 差別者) that continues to address "members of the order" (*kyōdanjin*). Discrimintors must realize the depth of their own evil and can only do so while working to eliminate discrimination itself. That discrimination continues to exist within the "consciousness" (*ishiki* 意識) and "nature" (*taishitsu* 体質) of the Ōtani-ha demands continued engagement (Izumi 1975, 4:22). Takeuchi's faction still has lingering tension with representatives of doctrinal studies (*kyōgaku*), both inside the administrative and academic arms of the sect, and with conservative, right-wing elements.

Head priest Jōnyo campaigns for human rights

Based on the work and institutional presence of these priest-bureaucrats from Takeuchi onwards, today the head priest of the Ōtani-ha, Jōnyo, actively campaigns for human rights. On November 11, 2009, Jōnyo presented a petition to Chiba Keiko, Minister of Justice for the newly elected Democratic Party of Japan. Signed by approximately 940,000 individuals and 6,400 groups, the petition demanded that the newly elected Hatoyama administration[8] enact a law granting relief in cases of human rights violations (*Jinken shingai kyūsai hō* 人権侵害救済法).

At first glance, Jōnyo's struggle for human rights might seem a timely effort by a large religious organization to connect with a global issue. However, this

---

[8] Hatoyama Yukio (鳩山由紀夫, b. 1947) became Prime Minister of Japan in 2009 as leader of the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ, Minshutō 民主党).

dissertation has shown that today's struggle emerges from the local history of the Ōtani-ha; his current activities and the social policy of his sect today were formed in interaction with the movement for *buraku* liberation. Confirming this, Jōnyo stated:

> There are great hopes with a change in government, but the steepness of the path to save the vulnerable (*jakusha* 弱者) has not changed. For many years, I have demanded a government policy on *buraku* liberation and human rights. In particular, the establishment of a human rights violation relief law is necessary for a society where human rights and peace are not violated. It is our mission to take the lessons learned and experiences gained from the *buraku* liberation movement and transform them into actual results to pass on to the next generation.[9]

The introduction of human rights language marks the latest stage in a history full of interaction and conflict between *buraku* advocates, the Ōtani-ha administration, and its priest-bureaucrats.

Human rights language, too, is the latest stage in a complicated history involving the circulation of liberal and socialist political ideologies. From the beginning of the liberation movement in the early twentieth century Japan, *buraku* activists have sought "equality" (*byōdō* 平等) and "dignity" (*songen* 尊厳); they have used the words "discrimination" (*sabetsu* 差別) and "human rights" (*jinken* 人権) in their campaigns in political and civil realms.[10] The use of human rights language increased dramatically following the passage of the postwar Constitution of Japan (*Nihonkoku kenpō* 日本国憲法, 1947) and the United Nations' *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948). Although the movement itself is made up of

---

[9] Jōnyo became chair of the "Central Executive Committee Seeking the Establishment of Policy for Human Rights and Buraku Liberation" (Buraku Kaihō Jinken Seisaku Kakuritsu Yōkyū Chūō Jikkō Iinkai 部落解放・人権政策確立要求中央実行委員会) at its eleventh general meeting on December 10, 2008. See the article, "Establish a 'Human Rights Violation Relief Law' as Quickly as Possible" (*Ichi nichi mo hayaku "Jinken shingai kyūsai hō" seitei o* 1日も早く "人権侵害救済法" 制定を), *Kaihō shinbun* 解放新聞 (November 23, 2009).
[10] *Jinken* 人権, "rights of man" or "human rights" has been in use since the early Meiji period, but its use increased dramatically in the postwar period after 1945.

several, distinct advocacy groups, the main organization in the prewar period was the Levelers' Society. Today, the main organization is the Buraku Liberation League.

Recently, through the non-governmental organization IMADR (The International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism), the Buraku Liberation League successfully introduced the term "descent-based" discrimination into international discussions of human rights.[11] The term is an attempt to refer in a simple, inclusive way to discrimination similar to that of caste, which uses residence, heredity, putative origins, and occupation for its justification, and treats certain groups all over the world *as if* they were outcastes.[12] Discrimination against *burakumin* is clearly based on a division made *within* a racial or ethnic group—making them an invisible minority. "Descent-based" is thus a way to indicate similar invisible discrimination throughout the world, allowing groups representing *burakumin* of Japan and the *dalits* of India to connect transnationally with minority rights organizations from Bangladesh, Germany, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, and Senegal.

Domestically, *buraku* activists have publically shamed politicians, business owners, and other public figures including religious leaders, who commit obvious acts of discrimination through a famous, and highly ritualized, strategy of "denunciation" (*kyūdan*).[13] The most famous recent series of denunciations of a Buddhist leader was directed at Machida Muneo in the early 1980s. At the time, he

---

[11] "Occupation-based" discrimination is sometimes used. The category is broadly inclusive of caste-based discrimination, but is not limited to it. It is meant to include groups who suffer discrimination based on their birth in a certain group, certain place, or within certain hereditary occupations world-wide such as the Japanese *burakumin* and Indian *dalit* groups. See the website of the IMADR, a Buraku Liberation League NGO, on descent-based discrimination (IMADR 2009). See also Mucks (2010, 40).

[12] Since the treatment tends to be systematic and directed at particular groups, I prefer the term "outcaste" to "outcast."

[13] Reber (1999, 331-339) describes the use of and resistance to *kyūdan* tactics.

was head of the Sōtō branch of Zen Buddhism and the Japan Buddhist Federation (Zen Nihon Bukkyō Kai 全日本仏教会). [14] However, as we have seen, denunciations and public criticism of Shin Buddhist sects and their leaders began much earlier[15]: whether on an Osaka stage in 1922, in the popular press, through official letters of demand, or face-to-face. One former head administrator described the Ōtani-ha itself as the order (*kyōdan*) "at the very center of denunciation" (DD 2003, no.32).

In an academic essay on the relationship of Shin doctrine and *buraku* discrimination, Tani Shinri (谷真理, b. 1949), an Ōtani-ha temple priest, priest-bureaucrat, and professor at Ōtani University, writes about one such denunciation (2009). Tani introduces a statement by Yoneda Tomi (米田富, 1901-1988), a founding member of the Levelers' Society and Ōtani-ha *buraku* follower, made at the sixth denunciation meeting (June 1971) after the Nanba Betsuin Incident[16]:

> I also have faith in Shinran...I want to ask a question of the members of the [Ōtani-ha] sect diet and administration, who just now apologized to us [*burakumin*] by saying discrimination is evil and that there is no excuse for it. What I want to know is why you—*as priests*—do not feel it necessary to apologize to your founder, Shinran? It is your duty to lead the people and transmit his teachings correctly, so how can you say that you "overlooked" or "weren't aware of" discrimination? Your very lives preserve it and work to make discrimination persist into the future. (GS 76)

Tani (2009) describes Yoneda's voice, captured on an audio recording of his denunciation, as "choked with sadness." For Tani, this recording is an important

---

[14] Discriminatory Remarks of Machida Incident (*Machida sabetsu hatsugen jiken*, 1979). For a description of the incident, see Bodiford (1996), Hubbard (1997), Kitaguchi (1999), or Shields (2011).

[15] See also Neary's description (1999, 69, 80-90) noting that the Ōtani-ha and Honganji-ha were early targets.

[16] Nanba Betsuin Rinban Discriminatory Incident (*Nanba Betsuin rinban sabetsu jiken*, 1967). A total of eight denunciation meetings were held, which prompted the Ōtani-ha to reinvigorate its organizational response to *buraku* discrimination (GS 53-80).

part of priestly (*kyōshi* 教師) training at Ōtani University today, a precious voice that has awakened many priests-in-training (GS 76-80). Since the mid-1980s, all priests in the Ōtani-ha have been required to complete university courses on Buddhism and human rights as part of their certification.[17]

Human rights language is the latest stage in developments internal to the Ōtani-ha as well. These campaigns moved through several phases. At first, from the 1890s onwards, there were philanthropic individuals and groups, including improvement groups comprised exclusively of *burakumin*. Later, the government and established organizations became involved, often providing didactic "moral exhortation" (*kyōka*), a term with both secular and Buddhist meanings. In Buddhism, *kyōka* refers to the activity of preaching or propagating the teachings. In its secular sense, it refers to activities such as lectures and study meetings to encourage Japanese citizens to be moral.[18] Shin preachers, teachers, officials, and volunteers delivered *kyōka* in both senses to *burakumin*, exhorting them to be better Shin followers and Japanese citizens.[19]

The postwar period was dominated by government special measures legislation[20] and nation-wide *buraku* advocacy organizations. Conditions have improved for *burakumin* and *buraku* communities with documented increases in the standard of living and education due to special measures spending. Many of the prejudicial conceptions that circulated among Shin preachers, priests, and

---

[17] This Ōtani-ha training acknowledges that discrimination might be a part of "human nature" in some sense, or, in Shin language, that discrimination is part of the deeply evil nature of humanity (Tani 2009; GS).

[18] For a thorough description of *kyōka*, see Garon (1997).

[19] I discuss the exhortations of Shin preachers known only by their ordination names (*hōmyō* 法名): Junkei 荀兮, Nanryū 楠龍, and Ryūge 龍華. Junkei was likely an Ōtani-ha priest, while Nanryū and Ryūge were affiliated with the Honganji-ha (Izumi 2001; DBS 1:547-550).

[20] Special Measures Law for Assimiliation Policy Work (*Dōwa taisaku jigyō tokubetsu sochi hō* 同和対策事業特別措置法) (1969-2002). For a description of the legislation beginning with the committee report in 1965, the 1969 special measures legislation, and the last renewal of the measures ending in 2002, see McLauchlan (2003) and Kitaguchi (1999, 98-116).

followers in the early twentieth century are no longer used. However, both premodern and modern notions of purity and pollution continue in *buraku* discrimination inside the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*). Even today, *buraku* followers and priests report marriage discrimination, avoidance of contact, forms of spatial and ritual segregation, [21] and a higher-than-average attrition of temple membership.

Today, the importance of *burakumin* for the Ōtani-ha's social policy is visible both in the ongoing campaign for human rights by the current head priest (*monshu* 門主) and in the persistence of discrimination against *buraku* followers of the Ōtani-ha. Here I briefly introduce the efforts of Ōtani Chōken (Jōnyo)[22] to lobby for human rights legislation, examples of historical *buraku* discrimination in Shin Buddhism, and a 2009 survey on the current situation of *burakumin* in the Ōtani-ha.

Current state of *buraku* discrimination in the Ōtani-ha

What about *buraku* discrimination within the Ōtani-ha today, after more than a century of campaigns to improve the standard of living and end discrimination? A recent, comprehensive survey (2008) of *buraku* and non-*buraku* temples sheds light on the religious lives of *buraku* followers and the state of discrimination in the Ōtani-ha today. The survey was undertaken by the Dōkankyō, an association of Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples led by temples in the Kyoto area and founded in 1974.[23]

---

[21] During an informal discussion with a young *buraku* temple priest, he described how *buraku* and non-*buraku* followers at his temple sit on opposite sides of main hall—and that there is a space between the two groups. He said that this seating arrangement continues despite his attempts to end it.

[22] Jōnyo succeeded to the position in 1996. His accession ceremony is of interest because he did not sit in the special altar area (*naijin* 内陣) nor did he wear colored robes. Jōnyo broke with traditional ritual to place himself on a level equal to the ordinary follower (Odake 2004b, 530).

[23] "Assimilation," or *dōwa* 同和, is an older term associated with imperial, prewar policy to harmoniously assimilate *burakumin* into "mainstream" Japanese society in order to end *buraku* discrimination. The policy and the term have been increasingly criticized, but persist into the postwar period. *Dōwa* itself comes from the Showa Emperor's (Hirohito, 1926-1989) enthronement edict (*sokui no shōchoku* 即位の詔勅) of 1928, made of two characters *dō* and *wa* from a phrase "[children of] the same womb or same nation [are in] accord,

The survey results highlight two important points: (1) that the religious lives of *burakumin* and *buraku* temples are different in important ways from other Ōtani-ha followers and temples, and (2) that Ōtani-ha *buraku* followers and priests report the persistence of discrimination.

The survey covered all 214 "*buraku* temples"[24] in the Ōtani-ha: defined as any temple within an officially recognized *buraku* area, with *burakumin* parishioners, that self-identifies as a *buraku* temple, or that is known by others as a *buraku* temple despite being located outside of an official *buraku* area. Creating the list of 214 temples was a complex process[25] and the sensitive nature of the survey required personal visits[26] by Dōkankyō researchers. In spite of personal visits (with the Ōtani-ha covering expenses), of the 214 temples defined as "*buraku*" only sixty percent reported that they have *burakumin* parishioners.[27] Claiming a *burakumin* identity clearly remains a problem for many Japanese.

Knowing that discrimination persists in Japanese society, it is not surprising to learn that Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples are more isolated and that their memberships are shrinking faster than other temples. The survey shows that isolation and a

harmony, consensus," or "people of the nation [living in] harmony." See also Neary (1986, 562 n. 18).

[24] Built around the base of known *buraku* temples, a sample of other temples (approximately 750) was also included. Of the 8,845 Ōtani-ha registered temples, 1,000 were surveyed. There were 514 usable responses. According to Wagatsuma (1966), 80 percent of *buraku* Shin followers belong to the Honganji-ha and gives the number of Honganji-ha *buraku* temples at 468. However, since the Ōtani-ha estimates that it includes over 200 *buraku* temples, the Honganji-ha number is likely to be much higher. Corroborating this, a 1968 survey of *buraku* related temples reported the Honganji-ha had 1,072, while all other Shin sects had 266, Nichiren sects had 40, and all other Buddhist sects had 72 (Matsune 1988, 57). Asano, too, reported over 1,000 Honganji-ha *buraku* temples.

[25] *Buraku* temple names were garnered from the membership rosters of the Dōkankyō itself, the rosters of twentieth century groups created by Ōtani-ha priest-bureaucrats such as Takeuchi Ryō'on and Asano Onchi, and from Edo period registers and other premodern sources.

[26] The survey was conducted via mail with anonymous questionnaires, supplemented by recorded follow-up interviews. Without this commitment of time and money by the Dōkankyō and Ōtani-ha, useful data would have been almost impossible to obtain. 214 *buraku* temples represents 2.5 percent of all Ōtani-ha temples.

[27] There was a difference in the response rate between Dōkankyō members and *buraku* temples who are not members, with a higher percentage of non-members responding. Those interpreting the data, such as Yamamoto Naotomo, do not believe it is possible to explain this discrepancy and any attempt would be speculative.

certain level of segregation of *buraku* temples continues. Although the Ōtani-ha introduced new temple groupings at the beginning of the modern period,[28] the survey suggests that *buraku* temples have fewer *active* relations with other temples within these groupings. Instead, *buraku* temples are more likely to engage with networks of temples established in the premodern period, such as "teaching lineage" (*kyōsen*) networks formed when the temple was first established or converted, or premodern associations with other low-status temples.

Moreover, although all Shin temples have been gradually losing members and member households since the 1970s, *buraku* temples have lost them faster. *Buraku* temples have gained fewer individual members who moved into the area, that is, they gain fewer new members whose families have no historical ties to the temple (i.e. non-*burakumin*).

Temples report that requests for cooperation in status investigations (*mibun chōsa*) continue. Because *burakumin* are an invisible minority, there is a market for private investigators who examine lineage and places of residence to determine—usually for a prospective employer or marriage partner—whether an individual is connected to *burakumin*. Temple records and registers are one place where such investigators look for information. Survey respondents also report difficulty in marriage for members of the temple family (*jizoku* 寺族) and the families of temple followers.

Some of the most interesting results of the survey reveal organizational and liturgical differences at Ōtani-ha *buraku* temples. In particular, *buraku* temples tend to bear a heavier economic burden (often due to their smaller size), and display alternative trends in their relations with other temples, proselytization

---

[28] That is, they have fewer links on average through administrative groupings (*kyōku* 教区 or *sō* 組) created in the modern period.

activities (*kyōka*), temple associations, and confraternities (*kō* 講). In terms of size, *buraku* temples tend to be either very large or very small. Very large temples have five hundred or more follower households, whereas very small temples have fifty or less. In practice, this means a very uneven distribution of political and economic influence amongst *buraku* temples within the Ōtani-ha.

According to survey averages, annual ritual observances held at *buraku* temples tend to be longer and more frequent than is the case at non-buraku temples. A higher percentage of *buraku* temples hold rituals tied to the time of year—and they tend to last one to two days longer—such as memorial rites for family dead during the spring and autumn equinoxes, mid-summer, and the new year, as well as the most important Shin Buddhist ritual memorializing and expressing gratitude to the founder (*hōonkō*). Survey analyst Yamamoto Naotomo (山本尚友 b.1946), a specialist of *buraku* history and religion, and others suggest that conducting longer and more frequent rituals demonstrates that *buraku* religious belief and practice is zealous, enthusiastic, and committed, based on very intense or strong faith (*tokushin* 篤信), which I discussed in chapter 4. Yamamoto has used this "strong faith" theory elsewhere to explain why so many *burakumin* belong to Shin Buddhist sects, patterns in *buraku* religious history, and relations with the central administrations of Shin sects (KBS 2:125).

The most striking variance from the averages reported by non-*buraku* temples is in memorials for war dead. The proportion of *buraku* temples that perform these memorials is *twice* that of other temples (and like other rituals, memorials for war dead at *buraku* temples tend to be longer). Military service was and continues to be an avenue to higher social status for those with few options. As such, men from lower socio-economic and status groups tend to enlist at higher rates, but are also less able to avoid military service should they so wish. It is also likely that *burakumin* men tended to be assigned dangerous military duties. Taken together, a

higher rate of *burakumin* serving in the military, of sustaining casualties in war, result in a higher rate of war memorials at *buraku* temples. This liturgical difference strongly displays the effects of structural discrimination against *burakumin* during wartime.

The Ōtani-ha has seen significant changes in the way it performs war memorials, partly in response to issues of war responsibility and the postwar trend towards religious pacifism. Currently, rituals held at the head temple commemorate all war dead in all wars. As war and war memorials are problematized, however, how will the Ōtani-ha handle the higher-than-average performance of war memorials by *buraku* temples? This is especially problematic considering that the higher proportion of war dead among *burakumin* is a result of the discrimination they faced in Japanese society.

Lastly, the Dōkankyō survey shows a gap between priestly and lay awareness of discrimination. Priests, as the targets of sect mandated study and training, display a higher awareness of the issues. Moreover, *buraku* priests and temples have a proportionally high rate of political and administrative participation within the Ōtani-ha organization itself. The story of the survey—who performed it, who responded to it, how the data was collected, how it came to be in the first place and what it will be used for—is a study unto itself. What is important here is that *buraku* discrimination is a living issue, with manifestations particular to religious life. Ōtani-ha efforts to respond to its historical responsibility for *buraku* discrimination have not erased its legacy at the local temple, and regional temple association, levels.

Investigating Buddhist ethics in a novel way

Why is Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1967) an interesting figure for the study of Buddhist ethics? Takeuchi was a bureaucrat. He was a full-time professional who specialized in social work (*shakai jigyō*). From the late Taishō to the late Shōwa

(1920s to 1980s), Takeuchi's faction within the Ōtani-ha administration was central to the development of a systematic and centralized policy on reducing *buraku* discrimination, and later, explicitly on supporting human rights. This faction brought Shin doctrine, contemporary political ideologies, and ideas of social work[29] to bear on problems of *buraku* discrimination. This is Buddhist ethics in a different key: by the bureaucrat and committee rather than the scholar or adept. History itself provides the context where moral positions are negotiated and articulated.

Although, as a priest-bureaucrat, Takeuchi is not a normal target of scholarly interest, his writings were dominated by ethical reflection on social issues. Moreover, his activities appear prototypical of "socially engaged Buddhism." Takeuchi's career and writings, in both popular and bureaucratic textual genres, helped form a social policy and ethics that would become dominant within the Ōtani-ha institution by the end of the twentieth century. Takeuchi and his faction did not, and do not, think about Shin ethics in the abstract. They spoke from within the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*) and their ethical thinking bears the marks of the often contentious interactions between Ōtani-ha administration and *buraku* advocacy groups. As well, this thinking displays a strong concern for history and historical responsibility, treating individuals as members of larger organizations and groups. I suggest that this kind of self-reflexive awareness of institutional history has become part of how the Ōtani-ha reasons about human rights today. It might be a characteristic feature of the ethics of the priest-bureaucrat: whereas most approaches are ahistorical and individual, Takeuchi's approach is historical and institutional.

---

[29] This roughly mirrors the historical development of government-organized social welfare. See the centennial webpage for the Japan National Council of Social Welfare (Zenkoku Shakai Fukushi Kyōgikai 全国社会福祉協議会) (2005).

Takeuchi spent a great deal of time and effort planning, managing, and writing on some specific issues: *buraku* discrimination from the point of view of a reconciliationist (*yūwa*), children, rural poverty, women, and leprosy (Hansen's disease). These were the issues he worked on as the director of the Ōtani-ha Society Department (Shakaika), and his faction continues to grapple with many of these issues to the present day. Takeuchi's faction has increasingly adopted the language of human rights (*jinken*), such as "human dignity" (*ningen songen*), and the language of Marxist-liberationist struggle, such as liberation (*kaihō*) and discriminatory consciousness (*sabetsu ishiki*). Currently, the Ōtani-ha administration has explicitly pro-human rights and anti-discrimination policies. These policies aim to liberate vulnerable groups from social and structural discrimination both within the sect and society at large—discrimination which the Ōtani-ha admits they have perpetuated and supported historically.

Discrimination against the *burakumin* in particular, was in part a product of Buddhist ideas of moral defilement connected with animal death. In Shin Buddhism, strategies for managing this defilement through segregation, exclusion, ritual are clearly connected to devotion, whether to Amida, Shinran, or his blood descendents, and a desire to protect the physical space of temples from defilement. Managing defilement, however, is not limited to concepts and behaviors inherited from the past—Shin Buddhist priests and charitable workers reinforced notions of defilement in the modern period, and reinforced the social order and power relations of the modern Japanese nation-state that structure defilement. Takeuchi's thinking on *buraku* discrimination displayed an awareness of the Ōtani-ha's historical and present responsibility, as well as the complicity of modern strategies such as social work in perpetuating hierarchy and exclusion. Takeuchi hoped to overcome this complicity by conceiving social work as based on the self-as-discriminator and Ōtani-ha order-as-discriminator. That is, he tied the constant awareness of historical responsibility and complicity directly to the

possibility of truly effective social work. He tied truly effective social work, in turn, to the arising of faith and working of Amida in the individual and in society.

The case of Takeuchi and the Ōtani-ha provides clues to the ways a historical approach, conscious of group interaction, differs from an ahistorical approach to Buddhist ethics. Takeuchi developed ethical positions and ideologies in response to issues immediately relevant to their historical and institutional context, in this case, *buraku* discrimination. This is different from those developed at arm's length, such as Shimaji Mokurai's essay discussed in chapter 3.

Under scrutiny and subject to criticism, the Ōtani-ha thought about the order (*kyōdan*) as a site of social action (using and structuring the apparatus of the order as a means to address social issues). Because the Ōtani-ha institution was aware of its complicity, the door was open for ethical positions that begin from a position of individual and collective moral blame. Takeuchi's faction began with the assumption that their religious institution, the Ōtani-ha order (*kyōdan*), was fallible and evil. One of the main functions of the bureaucratic divisions and groups formed by Takeuchi was to monitor and remind the order of its evil and responsibility for *buraku* discrimination. Takeuchi was able, for example, to consider how the order itself ought to be constantly reformed, remade into a network of local temples that were oriented towards the non-discriminationatory ideal of the pure land. I suspect that the only time a religious group will conceive of itself as evil and in need of self-policing is under historical and societal pressure. Without studying religious ethics within history, this would be missed.

In part I of this dissertation, I addressed claims that the Ōtani-ha is historically responsible for *buraku* discrimination. I described how Shin Buddhist organizations treated their *burakumin* followers as outcastes. As with outcastes elsewhere, *burakumin* were considered polluted--excluded and marginalized based on discourses inherited from the Japanese premodern period, and those that

emerged during the Japanese modern. Shin Buddhist organizations treated the *burakumin* as if they were permanently defiled and drew on notions of pollution—especially those that involve animal death and the Buddhist symbol of "the butcher." In part II, I presented claims that Buddhism is against discrimination and can work to alleviate it. I showed how arguments that Buddhism is egalitarian and supports human rights, were made from the very beginning of the Japanese modern period and are still made today. I also delved into a very difficult topic: the ambiguous position of the *burakumin* with respect to Buddhism. Almost all *burakumin* were followers of Shin Buddhism; that is, they were members of the same faith as those that discriminated against them. To the extent that they remained followers, *burakumin* saw in Shin both the cause and the cure to the discrimination they have faced, and focused especially on the founder, Shinran, as a source of solidarity and authenticity.

In part III, I moved away from claims and arguments about Shin Buddhism, to examine what Shin Buddhist organizations have done about discrimination. I surveyed the career, distinctive texts, and ethical thought of priest-bureaucrat Takeuchi Ryō'on, a middle-manager inside of the Ōtani-ha sectarian bureaucracy. He and others like him were in charge of the Ōtani-ha's evolving response to *burakumin* discrimination in the form of "social work." What is distinctive about Takeuchi's ethics, which I believe to be similar across the category of the priest-bureaucrat, is that in thinking about good and evil he thought about the group as well as the individual; he thought about the responsibility of members of the Ōtani-ha *as members,* about the ideal form of the institution in history, and about its actual historical responsibility.

In closing, this dissertation has broached several topics worthy of future study in Buddhist ethics. Most important among these is Buddhist "group ethics," the way that the life of the institution or organization itself, manifest in the

interactions of individuals who make up that organization, forms the ground of a specific type of practical reasoning.

Abbreviations

BYJ   Kobayashi Shigeru 小林茂, Haga Noboru 芳賀登, Miura Keiichi 三浦圭一, Mori Sugio 森杉夫, and Wakita Osamu 脇田修, eds. 1985. *Burakushi yōgo jiten* 部落史用語辞典 *[Dictionary of Terms for Buraku History]*. Kashiwa Shobō 柏書房.

CWS   Hirota, Dennis, Hisao Inagaki, Michio Tokunaga, Ryushin Uryuzu, eds. and trans. 1997. *The Collected Works of Shinran, 2 Volumes.* Kyoto: Jōdo Shinshū Hongwanji-ha.

DBS   Jōdoshinshū Honganjiha 浄土真宗本願寺派, and Dōbō Undō Honbu Hensenshi Hensan Iinkai 同朋運動本部変遷史編纂委員会, eds. 1983. *Dōbō undō shi shiryō* 同朋運動史資料 *[Materials on the History of the Dōbō Undō], 4 Volumes*. Kyoto: Jōdo Shinshū Honganji-ha Shuppanbu 浄土真宗本願寺派出版部.

DBSNP Jōdoshinshū Honganjiha 浄土真宗本願寺派, and Dōbō Undō Honbu Hensenshi Hensan Iinkai 同朋運動本部変遷史編纂委員会, eds. 1980. *Dōbō undō shi nenpyō* 同朋運動史年表 *[Timeline of Dōbō Movement History]*. Kyoto: Dōbō Undō Honbu 同朋運動本部.

DDB   Muller, Charles, ed. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. March 2012 edition. http://buddhism-dict.net.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/ddb

DD   **Dōkankyō Newsletter (1975-present).** Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai 同和関係寺院協議会. (1) 1975-1978. *Dōwa kankei jiin kyōgikai hō* 同和関係寺院協議会報 *[Bulletin of the Council of Temples Related to Assimilation]* (Nos. 1-7). Ed. Dōwabu 同和部. (2) 1979-1980, 1990-1994. *Dōwa kankei jiin kyōgikai hō* 同和関係寺院協議会報 *[Bulletin of the Council of Temples Related to Assimilation]* (Nos. 8-9, 10-15). Ed. Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部. (3) 1994-2003. *Dōkankyō dayori* 同関協だより *[Newsletter of the Council of Temples Related to Assimilation]* (Nos. 16-34). Ed. Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部. (4) 2004-present. *Dōkankyō dayori* 同関協だより *[Newsletter of the Council of Temples Related to Assimilation]* (Nos. 35-present). Ed. Kaihō Suishin Honbu 解放運動推進本部. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所. (5) 1996 special issue, *Dōkankyō no ayumi* 同関協の歩み.

GS   Kaihō Suishin Honbu 解放運動推進本部, eds. 2005. *Buraku mondai gakushū shiryō shū* 部落問題学習資料集 *[Collected Research Materials for the Study of the Buraku Problem]*. First Revised. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

JG   **Human Rights Week Gallery Exhibitions (Jinken shūkan gyararī ten 人権週間ギャラリー展).** Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu 解放運動推進本部, eds. Ōtaniha ni okeru kaihō undō no rekishi to kadai I-III 大谷派における解放運動の歴史と課題 I-III [The History and Issues of Liberation Movements within the Ōtani-ha I-III] (1) 2008. Takeuchi Ryō'on, sono jiseki to kadai 武内了温 その事跡と課題 [Takeuchi Ryō'on, his Issues and Acomplishments]. (2) 2009. Asano Yoshitomo (I Suryon): shūkyō ni sabetsu no nai sekai o motomete 朝野温知(李壽龍): 宗教に差別のない世界を求めて [Asano Yoshitomo (Yi Su-ryong): Seeking a World Without Discrimination in Religion]. (3) 2010. Kaihō undō to Dōbōkai Undō 解

放運動と同朋会運動 [The Liberation Movement and the Companion Society Movement]. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所. Contributors: Izumi Shigeki 泉恵機, Asaji Takeshi 朝治武, Mizuno Naoki 水野直樹, Hongō Kōji 本郷浩二.

KBS   Kyōto Burakushi Kenkyūjō 京都部落史研究所, eds. 1984-1995. *Kyōto no buraku shi* 京都の部落史 *[Buraku History of Kyoto], 10 Volumes*. Kyoto: Aunsha 阿吽社.

ONP   Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo 教学研究所, ed. 2004. *Kindai Ōtaniha nenpyō* 近代大谷派年表 *[The Modern Ōtaniha Timeline], Second Edition*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

Seiten   Shinshū Seiten Hensan Iinkai 真宗聖典編纂委員会. 1978. *Shinshū seiten* 真宗聖典 *[Shin Buddhist Sacred Texts]*. Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shuppanbu 東本願寺出版部.

SD   *Shindō* **Journal (1979-present)**. Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部, eds. *Shindō* 身同 *[Same Body]* (Nos. 1-25). Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

SJJ   Kashiwahara Yūsen 柏原祐泉, Sonoda Kōyū 薗田香融, Hiramatsu Reizō 平松令三, and Akamatsu Tesshin 赤松徹真. 1999. *Shinshū jinmei jiten* 真宗人名辞典 *[Biographical Dictionary of Shin Buddhism]*. Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Shūken   *Shinshū Ōtani-ha shūken* 真宗大谷派宗憲, promulgated in *Shūtatsu* 宗達, No. 3, 1981, 1-16. See also "The Constitution of the Shinshū Ōtani-ha" (1981, translated by the Kyoto Comparative Law Society, 1990). English translation provided by the "International Affairs Section" (Kokusai Shitsu 国際室) of the Ōtani-ha head temple administration.

SS   *Shinshū*: **Ōtani-ha Official Magazine (1871-present).** (1) 1989-1999. *"Shūhō" nado kikanshi fukkokuban* 宗報等機関誌復刻版 *[Reprint of the Official Serials such as 'Shūhō' (1871-1925)], 25 Volumes*. Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shuppanbu 東本願寺出版部. Between 1871-1925, the Ōtani-ha magazine had several titles, such as *Haishi* 配紙, *Honzan hōkoku* 本山報告, *Tokiwa* 常葉, *Shūhō* 宗報 *[Sect News]*. After 1925, the magazine was named *Shinshū* 真宗. (2) 1925-present. *Shinshū* 真宗 *[Shin Buddhism]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

T   **Taishō Canon**. Takakusu Jinjirō 高楠順次郎, Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭, Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai 大正一切経刊行会, eds. 1924-1932. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. SAT Daizōkyō Database (http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/)

TRI   Takeuchi Ryōʹon 武内了温. 1976. *Takeuchi Ryōʹon: Takeuchi Ryō'on ikō shū* 武内了温*: 武*内了温遺稿集 [Takeuchi Ryōʹon: Takeuchi Ryōʹon Posthumous Collection]. Ed. Takeuchi Ryōʹon Sensei Ikō Kankō Kai 武内了温先生遺稿刊行会. 1976 limited run publication by the Godōbōsha Konwakai 御同朋社懇話会. 1985 reprint by Bunmeidō 文明堂. Note especially:

(1) 1920, Rationale for Establishing the Society Department (Shakaika setchi riyū sho 社会課設置理由書), 13-20.

(2) 1927, *Various Aspects of the Reconciliation Movement and Religion* (*Yūwa undō no shosō to shūkyō* 融和運動の諸相と宗教), 25-188.

(3) 1929, Rules of the Ōtani-ha True Body Society (Ōtaniha Shinshinkai kaisoku 大谷派真身会会則), 189-196.

(4) 1950, How the Shin Buddhist Order Ought to Be (Shinshū kyōdan no arikata 真宗教団のありかた), 264-269.

***Many of Takeuchi's works are now available in the Japanese Diet Library's online Kindai Digital Library (*国立国会図書館，近代デジタルライブラリー*)*.

Bibliography and references

Abe, Masao. 1986. Religious Tolerance and Human Rights: A Buddhist Perspective. In *Religious Liberty and Human Rights in Nations and Religions*, 193–211. Ecumenical Press.

———. 1995. The Buddhist View of Human Rights. In *Human Rights and Religious Values*, 144–153. Eerdmans.

Abeysekara, Ananda. 2001. The Saffron Army, Violence, Terror(ism): Buddhism, Identity, and Difference in Sri Lanka. *Numen* 48 (1): 1–46.

Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀, and Kasahara Kazuo 笠原一男, eds. 1963. *Shinshūshi gaisetsu* 真宗史概説 *[An Outline of Shinshū History]*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店.

Alldritt, Leslie D. 2000. The Burakumin: The Complicity of Japanese Buddhism in Oppression and an Opportunity for Liberation. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 7: http://www.buddhistethics.org/7/alldritt001.html.

Alldritt, Leslie D. 2003. Buddhism and the *Burakumin*: Oppression or Liberation? In *Action Dharma: New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*, ed. Damien Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Christopher S. Queen, 183-206. RoutledgeCurzon.

Ama Toshimaro 阿満利麿. 2003. *Shakai wo tsukuru Bukkyō: engeijido buddizumu* 社会をつくる仏教：エンゲイジド・ブッディズム *[Buddhism that creates society: engaged Buddhism]*. Tokyo: Jinbun Shoin 人文書院.

———. 2004. Towards a Shin Buddhist Social Ethics. In *Living in Amida's Universal Vow: Essays in Shin Buddhism*, ed. Alfred Bloom, 173–188. Bloomington: World Wisdom.

Ambaras, David R. 1998. Social Knowledge, Cultural Capital, and the New Middle Class in Japan, 1895-1912. *Journal of Japanese Studies*: 1-33.

Ames, Walter L. 1981. Dealing with Society's Outcastes. In *Police and Community in Japan*, 94–104. University of California Press.

Amos, Timothy. 2005. Outcaste or Internal Exile? Ambiguous Bodies in the Making of Modern Japan. *Portal Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies* 2 (1): 1-30.

———. 2007. Binding Burakumin: Marxist Historiography and the Narration of Difference in Japan. *Japanese Studies* 27 (2): 155-171.

———. 2010. Liberty Osaka: Creating Opportunities for Intergenerational Learning About Human Rights. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships* 8 (2): 177–182.

———. 2011. *Embodying Difference: The Making of Burakumin in Modern Japan*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Amstutz, Galen. 1996. Missing Hongan-ji in Japanese Studies. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23 (1-2): 155-178.

———. 1997. *Interpreting Amida: History and Orientalism in the Study of Pure Land Buddhism*. Albany: SUNY.

———. 2004. Shinran and Authority in Buddhism. In *Living in Amida's Universal Vow: Essays in Shin Buddhism*, ed. Alfred Bloom, 143-154. World Wisdom.

———. 2010. Shin Buddhism and the *Burakumin* in the Edo Period. In *The Social Dimension of Shin Buddhism*, ed. Ugo Dessì, 106-115. Brill.

Andachi Isao 安達五男. 2000. Aru hisabetsu buraku jiin no kakochō ni tsuite: ningen no inochi (hito no inochi) ni tsuite no kisoku shiryō no bunseki (ge) 或る被差別部落寺院の過去帳について: 人間の命(ひとのいのち)についての基礎史料の分析(下) [Regarding a Death Register from a Discriminated-Against *Buraku* Temple: Analysis of Basic Historical Materials About Human Life (Part Two)]. *Buraku Kaihō Kenkyū* 部落解放研究 132: 54-67.

Anesaki, Masaharu. 1912. Buddhist Ethics and Morality. In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, *First Edition, 13 Volumes*. ed. James Hastings, 5: 447-455. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Publishers.

Anon. 2009. Ichi nichi mo hayaku 'jinken shingai kyūsai hō' seitei o 1 日も早く「人権侵害救済法」制定を [Establish a 'Human Rights Violation Relief Law' as Quickly as Possible]. *Kaihō Shinbun* 解放新聞, November 23.

Aronson, Harvey B. 1980. *Love and Sympathy in Theravāda Buddhism*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Asaji Takeshi 朝治武. 2009. Senjiki no Ōtaniha Shinshinkai to Takeuchi Ryō'on o omou 戦時期の大谷派真身会と武内了温 [The Wartime Ōtani-ha True Body Society and Takeuchi Ryō'on]. *Shindō* 身同 29: 16-42.

Asano Onchi (Yoshitomo) 朝野温知. 1988a. Omou, Takeuchi Ryō'on shi 憶・武内了温師 [Recollections of Takeuchi Ryō'on]. In *Shūkyō ni sabetsu no nai sekai wo motomete (jō)* 宗教に差別のない世界を求めて(上) *[Seeking a World Without Discrimination in Religion (Part 1)]*, 235-236. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

———. 1988b. *Shūkyō ni sabetsu no nai sekai wo motomete (jō, ge)* 宗教に差別のない世界を求めて(上 下) *[Seeking a World Without Discrimination in Religion (Parts 1 and 2)]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

Bell, Catherine M. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Oxford University Press.

Benn, James A. 2004. Diet. In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism, 2 Volumes*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, 1:228–229. Macmillan Reference.

Bialock, David T. 2002. Outcasts, Emperorship, and Dragon Cults in *The Tale of the Heike. Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 13 (1): 227–310.

Bloom, Alfred. 1999 [1968]. *The Life of Shinran Shonin: The Journey to Self-Acceptance, Revised Edition.* Institute of Buddhist Studies.

———. 2003. Kiyozawa Manshi and the Path to the Revitalization of Buddhism. *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 5 (Fall): 19-33.

———. 2007. *The Essential Shinran: A Buddhist Path of True Entrusting.* World Wisdom.

Bloom, Alfred, and Michio Tokunaga. 2000. Toward a Pro-Active Engaged Shin Buddhism: A Reconsideration of the Teaching of the Two Truths (*shinzoku-nitai*). *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 2: 191–206.

Blum, Mark L. 1988. Kiyozawa Manshi and the Meaning of Buddhist Ethics. *Eastern Buddhist* 21: 61–81.

———. 2000. Stand By Your Founder: Honganji's Struggle with Funeral Orthodoxy. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 27 (3-4): 179-212.

———. 2006. Introduction: The Study of Rennyo. In *Rennyo and the Roots of Modern Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Mark L. Blum and Shin'ya Yasutomi, 1–13. Oxford University Press.

Blum, Mark Laurence, and Shin'ya Yasutomi, eds. 2006. *Rennyo and the Roots of Modern Japanese Buddhism.* Oxford University Press.

Berreman, Gerald D. 1966. Structure and Function of Caste Systems. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 277–307. University of California Press.

Bodiford, William M. 1996. Zen and the Art of Religious Prejudice: Efforts to Reform a Tradition of Social Discrimination. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23 (1-2): 1-27.

Bodiford, William M., ed. 2005. *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya: Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Botsman, Daniel V. 2011. Freedom without Slavery? 'Coolies,' Prostitutes, and Outcastes in Meiji Japan's 'Emancipation Moment.' *The American Historical Review* 116 (5): 1323-1347.

Brook, Timothy. 2005. Institution. In *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, ed. Donald S. Lopez, 143–161. Buddhism and Modernity. University of Chicago Press.

Brooks, W.L. 1976. Outcaste Society in Early Modern Japan. Dissertation, Columbia Univeristy.

Bunkachō 文化庁. 2008. *Shūkyō nenkan* 宗教年鑑 *[Religions' Yearbook]*. Tokyo: Gyōsei ぎょうせい.

Buraku Kaihō Kenkyūjo 部落解放研究所, ed. 1986. *Buraku Mondai Jiten* 部落問題事典 *[Encyclopedia of the Buraku Problem]*. Kaihō Shuppansha 解放出版社.

Burford, Grace G. 1991. *Desire, Death, and Goodness: the Conflict of Ultimate Values in Theravāda Buddhism*. P. Lang.

Burns, Susan L. 2003. From 'Leper Villages' to Leprosaria: Public Health, Nationalism and the Culture of Exclusion in Japan. In *Isolation: Places and Practices of Exclusion*, ed. Carolyn Strange and Alison Bashford, 104–118. Routledge.

Buswell, Robert E., ed. 2004. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, *2 Volumes*. Macmillan Reference.

Caron, Bruce. 1999. On the Downtown Side of Japan's Old Capital: Higashi-kujo. *Public Culture* 11 (3): 433-440.

Carus, Paul. 1894. *Karma: A Story of Buddhist Ethics*. Open Court.

Clasquin, Michel. 1993. Buddhism and Human Rights. *Journal for the Study of Religion* 6 (2): 91–101.

Clayton, Barbra R. 2007. *Moral Theory in Santideva's Siksasamuccaya: Cultivating the Fruits of Virtue*. RoutledgeCurzon Critical Studies in Buddhism. RoutledgeCurzon.

———. 2011. Buddhist Ethics. In *The Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*, ed. Jay L. Garfield and William Edelglass, 279-294. Oxford University Press.

Collins, Steven. 1998. *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities: Utopias of the Pāli Imaginaire*. Cambridge University Press.

———. 2010. *Nirvana: Concept, Imagery, Narrative*. Cambridge University Press.

Cornell, John B. 1961. Outcaste Relations in a Japanese Village. *American Anthropologist* 63 (2): 282–296.

———. 1966. Buraku Relations and Attitudes in a Progressive Farming Community. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 154–183. University of California Press.

———. 1970. 'Caste' in Japanese Social Stratification: A Theory and a Case. *Monumenta Nipponica* 25 (1/2): 107–135.

Covell, Stephen Grover. 2005. *Japanese Temple Buddhism: Worldliness in a Religion of Renunciation*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Davis, John. 2002. Review Essay: New Writing on the Buraku Issue. *Social Science Japan Journal* 5 (2): 249–253.

Dessì, Ugo. 2006a. The Critique of Anthropocentrism and Humanism in Present-day Shin Buddhism. *Japanese Religions* 31 (2): 111-125.

———. 2006b. Why Be Engaged? Doctrinal Facets of Jōdo Shinshū Social Activism. *Pure Land* (22): 103-112.

———. 2007. *Ethics and Society in Contemporary Shin Buddhism*. Berlin: LIT Publishers.

Dessì, Ugo, ed. 2010. *The Social Dimension of Shin Buddhism*. Brill.

de Silva, Padmasiri. 1995. Human Rights in Buddhist Perspective. In *Human Rights and Religious Values: An Uneasy Relationship*, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad Naʿīm, 133–143. Eerdmans.

DeVido, Elise A. 2009. The Influence of Chinese Master Taixu on Buddhism in Vietnam. *Journal of Global Buddhism* 10: 413-458.

DeVos, George A., and Hiroshi Wagatsuma. 1966a. Socialization, Self-Perception, and Burakumin Status. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 228–240. University of California Press.

DeVos, George A., and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, eds. 1966b. *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*. University of California Press.

Diène, Doudou. 2006. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Doudou Diène, on his Mission to Japan (3-11 July 2005)*. United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Dobbins, James C. 1986. From Inspiration to Institution: The Rise of Sectarian Identity in Jōdo Shinshū. *Monumenta Nipponica* 41 (3): 331-343.

———. 1990. The Biography of Shinran: Apotheosis of a Japanese Buddhist Visionary. *History of Religions* 30 (2): 179-196.

———. 2001. Portraits of Shinran in Medieval Pure Land Buddhism. In *Living Images: Japanese Buddhist Icons in Context*, ed. Robert H. Sharf and Elizabeth Horton Sharf, 19–48. Stanford University Press.

———. 2002a. *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Medieval Japan*. reprint. Religion in Asia and Africa Series. University of Hawai'i Press.

———. 2002b. Licensed Evil. In *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Medieval Japan*, 47-62. reprint. Religion in Asia and Africa Series. University of Hawai'i Press.

———. 2004. The Medieval and the Modern in Shin Buddhism. In *Letters of the Nun Eshinni: Images of the Pure Land in Medieval Japan*, trans. James C. Dobbins, 107-151. University of Hawai'i Press.

Dōkankyō (Dōwa Kankei Jiin Kyōgikai 同和関係寺院協議会). 1996. *Dōkankyō no ayumi: Hassoku nijū ni nen wo kaerimite 同関協の歩み: 発足の二二年を省みて [Progress of the Dōkankyō: Looking Back on 22 Years since its Founding]*. Ed. Dōwa Suishin Honbu 同和推進本部. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho (宗大谷派宗務所.

———. 2008. Shinshū Ōtaniha ni okeru buraku sabetsu mondai jittai chōsa hōkoku sho 真宗大谷派における部落差別問題実態調査報告書 [Report on Survey of the State of the Problem of Buraku Discrimination in the Shinshū Ōtani-ha]. Survey Report. Kyoto.

Donoghue, John D. 1957. An Eta Community in Japan: The Social Persistence of Outcaste Groups. *American Anthropologist* 59 (6): 1000–1017.

———. 1977. *Pariah Persistence in Changing Japan: A Case Study*. Washington: University

Press of America.

Douglas, Mary. 2002 [1966]. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge.

Dower, John W. 1986. The Demonic Other. In *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*, 234-261. Random House of Canada.

Durkheim, Émile. 1976 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Routledge.

Eppsteiner, Fred, ed. 1988. *The Path of Compassion: Writings on Socially Engaged Buddhism*. Parallax Press.

Eshin-ni. 2004. *Letters of the Nun Eshinni: Images of the Pure Land in Medieval Japan*. Trans. James C. Dobbins. University of Hawai'i Press.

Faure, Bernard. 2003. *The Power of Denial: Buddhism, Purity, and Gender*. Princeton University Press.

Felice, William F. 1996. *Taking Suffering Seriously: The Importance of Collective Human Rights*. SUNY Press.

Florida, Robert E. 2005. *The Buddhist Tradition.* Human Rights and the World's Major Religions 5. Westport: Praeger.

Fowler, Edward. 2004. The Buraku in Modern Japanese Literature: Texts and Contexts. In *Race, Ethnicity, and Migration in Modern Japan: Indigenous and Colonial Others*, ed. Michael Weiner, 21-59. Taylor and Francis.

Fredericks, James L. 2003. Buddhism and Human Rights: The Recent Buddhist Discussion and Its Implications for Christianity. In *Human Rights and Responsibilities in the World Religions*, ed. Joseph Runzo, Nancy Martin, and Arvind Sharma, 247-264. Oxford: Oneworld.

Fujii Jitō 藤井慈等. 1976. Saikō Mankichi kenkyū nōto: eigō ni hito wa: Saikō Mankichi to 'Suiheisha sengen' 西光万吉研究ノート: 永劫に人は: 西光万吉と「水平社宣言」 [Notes on Saikō Mankichi Research: Human are Eternally: Saikō Mankichi and the "Levelers' Society Declaration"]. *Kyōka Kenkyū* 教化研究 75: 37-56.

Fujimoto Masaki 藤元正樹. 1979. Noma Hiroshi shi ni kiku: buraku sabetsu no mondai ni tuite 野間宏氏に聞く: 部落差別の問題について [Listening to Noma Hiroshi: Regarding the Problem of Buraku Discrimination]. *Kyōka Kenkyū* 教化研究 84: 29-62.

Fujino Yutaka 藤野豊, ed. 2002. *Kingendai Nihon Hansenbyō mondai shiryou shūsei: senzen hen* 近現代日本ハンセン病問題資料集成. 戦前編 *[Compilation of Materials on Modern and Contemporary Japan Hansen's Disease Issue: Pre-war], 8 Volumes*. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan 不二出版.

Fujino Yutaka 藤野豊, and Kurokawa Midori 黒川みどり. 2009. *Kingendai burakushi: saihen sareru sabetsu no kōzō* 近現代部落史: 再編される差別の構造 *[Modern and Contemporary Buraku History: A Reorganized Structure of Discrimination]*. Yūshisha 有志舎.

Fukuda Masako 福田雅子. 1985. *Shōgen, Zenkoku Suiheisha* 証言・全国水平社 *[Testimony, All Japan Levelers' Society]*. Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai 日本放送出版協会.

Fuller, Christopher John. 1996. *Caste Today*. Oxford University Press.

Garfield, Jay L. 1998. Human Rights and Compassion: Towards a Unified Moral Framework. In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, ed. Damien Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, 111-140. Curzon.

Garon, Sheldon M. 1997. *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life*. Princeton University Press.

———. 2003. From Meiji to Heisei: The State and Civil Society in Japan. *The State of Civil Society in Japan*: 42–62.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. Regions and Region Behavior. In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 106–140. Garden City: Doubleday.

———. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall.

———. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harper & Row.

———. 1983. The Interaction Order: American Sociological Association, 1982 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review* 48 (1): 1-17.

———. 1991. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Penguin London.

Gómez, Luis O. 1992. Nonviolence and the Self in Early Buddhism. In *Inner Peace, World Peace: Essays on Buddhism and Nonviolence*, ed. Kenneth L. Kraft. SUNY Press.

Goodman, Roger, and Ian Neary, eds. 1996. *Case Studies on Human Rights in Japan*. Richmond: Japan Library.

Gordon, June A. 2006a. Assigned to the Margins: Teachers for Minority and Immigrant Communities in Japan. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 22 (7): 766–776.

———. 2006b. From Liberation to Human Rights: Challenges for Teachers of the Burakumin in Japan. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 9 (2): 183–202.

———. 2008. *Japan's Outcaste Youth: Education for Liberation*. Paradigm Publishers.

Gottlieb, Nanette. 1998. Discriminatory Language in Japan: Burakumin, the Disabled and Women. *Asian Studies Review* 22 (2): 157–173.

———. 2005. Representation and Identity: Discriminatory Language. In *Language and Society in Japan*, 100–119. Cambridge University Press.

———. 2006. *Linguistic Stereotyping and Minority Groups in Japan*. RoutledgeCurzon.

Groemer, Gerald. 2001. The Creation of the Edo Outcaste Order. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 27 (2): 263–293.

Grumbach, Lisa. 2005. Sacrifice and Salvation in Medieval Japan: Hunting and Meat in Religious Practice at Suwa Jinja. Ph.D., Stanford University.

Hah, Chong-do, and Christopher C. Lapp. 1978. Japanese politics of equality in transition: the case of the burakumin. *Asian Survey* 18.5 (May): 487-504.

Hallisey, Charles. 1996. Ethical particularism in Theravāda Buddhism. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 3: 32-43.

Hane, Mikiso. 2003. The Outcaste in Japan. In *Peasants, Rebels, and Outcastes: The Underside of Modern Japan, Second Edition*, 138–171. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Harada Tomohiko 原田伴彦, and Uesugi Satoshi 上杉聡. 1981. *Long-Suffering Brothers and Sisters, Unite!: The Buraku Problem, Universal Human Rights, and Minority Problems in Various Countries.* Buraku Kaihō Kenkyūjo 部落解放研究所.

Hardacre, Helen. 2004. Religion and Civil Society in Contemporary Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 31 (2): 389–415.

Harris, Ian. 1994. Causation and Telos: The Problem of Buddhist Environmental Ethics. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 1: 45–56.

Harris, Ian, ed. 2001. *Buddhism and Politics in Twentieth-Century Asia*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Harvey, Peter. 2000. *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics: Foundations, Values and Issues.* Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, John N. 1983. Educational Demands and Institutional Response: Dowa Education in Japan. *Comparative Education Review* 27 (2): 204–226.

Heine, Steven. 2008. *Zen Skin, Zen Marrow: Will the Real Zen Buddhism Please Stand Up?* Oxford University Press.

Hershock, Peter D. 2000. Dramatic Intervention: Human Rights from a Buddhist Perspective. *Philosophy East & West* 50 (1): 9–33.

Hirose Takashi 広瀬杲. 1988. Buraku Kaihō to Jōdo Shinshū (ge): Shinshū Kyōdan Rengō Chūō Kenshū Kai 部落解放と浄土真宗 (下): 真宗教団連合中央研修会 [Buraku Liberation and Shin Buddhism (Part 2): The Central Training Meeting for Shin Buddhist Institutions]. *Shinshū* 真宗 (May): 14-20.

———. 1992. Minshū no naka no Shinran 民衆の中の親鸞 [Shinran Among the People]. In *Tettei tōgi: Shinran no kakushin wo saguru* 徹底討議: 親鸞の核心をさぐる[A Thorough Debate: Searching for Shinran's Core], ed. Satō Masahide 佐藤正英, 247-318. Tokyo: Seidosha 青土社.

Hoffman, Frank J. 2001. Buddhism and Human Rights. *Contemporary Buddhism* 2 (2): 139–151.

Hongladarom, Soraj. 1998. Buddhism and Human Rights in the Thoughts of Sulak Sivaraksa and Phra Dhammapidok (Prayudh Prayutto). In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, 97–109. Surrey, England: Curzon.

Hongō Kōji 本郷浩二. 2010. Takeuchi Ryō'on no buraku mondai ron: Shinshū Ōtaniha ni okeru yūwa undō no kiseki 武内了温の部落問題論: 真宗大谷派における融和運

動の軌跡 [Takeuchi Ryō'on's Understanding of the Buraku Issue: The Legacy of the Reconciliation Movement in the Ōtani-ha]. *Kyōto buraku mondai kenkyū shiryō sentā tsūshin* 京都部落問題 研究資料センター通信 18: 1-2.

Howell, David L. 2005. *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. University of California Press.

Hubbard, Jamie. 1997. Introduction. In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, vii-xxii. University of Hawai'i Press.

Huxley, Andrew. 1995. The Kurudhamma: From Ethics to Statecraft. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 2: 191-203.

Ihara, Craig K. 1998. Why There Are No Rights in Buddhism: A Reply to Damien Keown. In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, 43–51. Curzon.

IMADR. 2009. IMADR: International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism. http://www.imadr.org/.

Inaba Keishin 稲場圭信. 2006. [Review] Ranjana Mukopadhyaya, Nihon no shakai sanka Bukkyō: Hōonji to Risshō Kōsei Kai no shakai katsudō to shakai rinri ランジャナ・ムコパディヤーヤ, 日本の社会参加仏教: 法音寺と立正佼成会の社会活動と社会倫理 [Japanese Engaged Buddhism: The Social Activities and Ethics of Hōonji and Risshō Kōsei Kai, by Ranjana Mukhopadhyaya]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 80 (2): 520-525.

Inada, Kenneth K. 1990. A Buddhist Response to the Nature of Human Rights. In *Asian Perspectives on Human Rights*, 91–103. Boulder: Westview Press.

Ip, Hung-yok. 2009. Buddhist Activism and Chinese Modernity. *Journal of Global Buddhism* 10: 145–192.

Ishay, Micheline. 2008. *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*. University of California Press.

Izumi Shigeki 泉恵機. 1975. Ōtaniha dōwa undō no rekishi to kadai 大谷派同和運動の歴史と課題 [History and Issues in the Ōtani-ha Assimilation Movement]. *Shinshū* 真宗 853-855 (4-6): 21-26, 20-25, 12-18.

———. 1981. Saikō Mankichi ni okeru "Shinshū" no ichi: Saikō Mankichi kenkyū nōto 西光万吉における'真宗'の位置: 西光万吉研究ノート序章Ⅰ [The Place of "Shin Buddhism" in Saikō Mankichi: Preliminary Notes on the Study of Saikō Mankichi]. *Shindō* 身同 4: 93-112.

———. 2001. Shinshū sōryo no hisabetsu buraku kan 真宗僧侶の被差別部落観 [The Shin Buddhist Priests' View of the Hisabetsu Buraku]. Conference Paper presented at the 10th Meeting of International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies 国際真宗学会, Ōtani University, Kyoto.

———. 2002. Taigyaku Jiken to Shinshū Ōtaniha 大逆事件と真宗大谷派 [The High Treason Case and Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism]. *Ōtani Daigaku Kenkyū Nenpō* 大谷大学研究年報 54: 63–110.

———. 2003. Jinken no yokuatsu to kindai Ōtaniha kyōdan　人権の抑圧と近代大谷派教団　[The Suppression of Human Rights and the Modern Ōtani-ha Order]. In *Shūmon kindaishi no kenshō: 'Shūhō' nado kikanshi fukkokuban, bekkan*　宗門近代史の検証: 「宗報」等機関誌復刻版　別巻　*[A Consideration of the Modern History of the Sect: The Reprinting of the Official Serials such as 'Shūhō', Separate Volume (1871-1925)]*, 35-68. Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shuppanbu　東本願寺出版部.

———. 2009. Takeuchi Ryō'on o omou　武内了温を憶う　[Considering Takeuchi Ryō'on]. *Shindō*　身同　29: 6-15.

Jaffe, Richard M. 2001. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism.* Princeton University Press.

Jaffe, Richard M. 2005. The Debate Over Meat Eating in Japanese Buddhism. In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya: Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*, 255–276. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Japanese Ministry of Justice (Hōmushō　法務省). 2009. Hōmushō Jinken Yōgokyoku furonto pēji　法務省人権擁護局フロントページ　[Main Page of the Ministry of Justice Bureau of Human Rights Protection]. http://www.moj.go.jp/JINKEN/.

Japan National Council of Social Welfare (Zenkoku Shakai Fukushi Kyōgikai　全国社会福祉協議会). 2005. Zenkoku shakai fukushi kyōgikai hyaku shūnen kinen jigyō ichiran　全国社会福祉協議会１００周年記念事業一覧　[Summary of Undertakings for the 100 Year Anniversary of the Japan National Council of Social Welfare]. http://www.shakyo.or.jp/anniversary/index.htm.

Jeffreys, Derek S. 2003. Does Buddhism Need Human Rights? In *Action Dharma: New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*, ed. Christopher S. Queen, Charles S. Prebish, and Damien Keown, 270–285. RoutledgeCurzon Critical Studies in Buddhism. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Junger, Peter D. 1998. Why the Buddha Has No Rights. In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, ed. Damien Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, 53–96. Curzon Critical Studies in Buddhism. Curzon.

Kaihō Undō Suishin Honbu　解放運動推進本部, ed. 2005. *Buraku mondai gakushū shiryō shū*　部落問題学習資料集　*[Collected Research Materials for the Study of the Buraku Problem]*, Revised. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho　真宗大谷派宗務所.

———. 2006 [1978]. *Mihotoke No Mina No Moto Ni: Buraku Sabetsu Mondai Gakushū Tekisuto*　仏の名のもとに: 部落差別問題学習テキスト　*[In the Buddha's Name: A Textbook for the Issue of Buraku Discrimination]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho　真宗大谷派宗務所.

Kalupahana, David J. 1995. *Ethics in Early Buddhism.* University of Hawai'i Press.

Kashiwahara Yūsen　柏原祐泉. 1986. *Kindai Ōtaniha no kyōdan: Meiji iryū shūsei shi*　近代大谷派の教団: 明治以降宗政史　*[The Modern Ōtani-ha Religious Order: A History of Religious Governance from the Meiji Period Onward]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho　真宗大谷派宗務所.

———. 1988. *Bukkyō to buraku sabetsu: sono rekishi to konnichi*　仏教と部落差別: その歴

史と今日 *[Buddhism and* Buraku *Discrimination: Past and Present]*. Jinken Būkuretto 人権ブックレット 9. Buraku Kaihō Jinken Kenkyūjo, Kaihō Shuppansha 部落解放人権研究所・解放出版社.

———. 2003. Kindai Ōtaniha no rekitei 近代大谷派の歴程 [The Historical Passage of the Modern Ōtani-ha]. In *Shūmon kindaishi no kenshō: "Shūhō" nado kikanshi fukkokuban bekkan* 宗門近代史の検証：「宗報」等機関誌復刻版 別巻 *[A Consideration of the Modern History of the Sect: The Reprinting of the Official Serials such as "Shūhō", Separate Volume (1871-1925)]*, 1-34. Kyoto: Higashi Honganji Shuppanbu 東本願寺出版部.

Kawada Mitsuo 河田光夫. 1985. *Shinran to hisabetsu minshū* 親鸞と被差別民衆 *[Shinran and Discriminated-Against Peoples]*. Kyoto: Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo 教学研究所.

———. 1994. *Shinran to hisabetsu minshū* 親鸞と被差別民衆 *[Shinran and Discriminated-Against Peoples]*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten 明石書店.

———. 1995a. *Chūsei hisabetsumin no yosōi* 中世被差別民の装い *[The Guise of Medieval Discriminated-Against People]*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten 明石書店.

———. 1995b. *Shinran no shiso to hisabetsumin* 親鸞の思想と被差別民 *[Shinran's and Discriminated-Against People]*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten 明石書店.

Kawahashi Noriko 川橋範子, and Kumamoto Einin 熊本英人. 1998. Jakusha no kuchi o karite nani o kataru no ka: Bukkyōkai no 'josei no jinken' no katari o megutte 弱者の口を借りて何を語るのか：仏教界の『女性の人権』の語りをめぐって [Speaking with the Mouths of the Weak, What Stories Would we Tell?: Focusing on the Discussion of 'Women's Human Rights' in the World of Buddhism]. *Gendai Shisō* 現代思想 26 (7): 106-205.

Keel, Hee-Sung. 2000. *Understanding Shinran: A Dialogical Approach*. Jain Publishing.

Keown, Damien. 1992. *The Nature of Buddhist Ethics*. New York: St Martin's Press.

———. 1998. Are there Human Rights in Buddhism? In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, ed. Damien Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, 15-41. Curzon.

Keown, Damien, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, eds. 1998. *Buddhism and Human Rights*. Curzon Critical Studies in Buddhism. Surrey, England: Curzon.

Ketelaar, James Edward. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton University Press.

Kikufuji Myōdō 菊藤明道. 1997. Gaijashō to den Kakunyo Jūsankajō seikin: rinrikan o chūshin to shite 『改邪鈔』と伝覚如「十三箇条制禁」：倫理観を中心として [The *Gaijashō* and the *Jūsankajō Seikin* Attributed to Kakunyo: A Focus on Ethics]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 45 (2): 597–603.

King, Sallie B. 2000. Human Rights in Contemporary Engaged Buddhism. In *Buddhist Theology*, ed. Roger Jackson and John Makransky, 293-311. Curzon Press.

———. 2005. *Being Benevolence: The Social Ethics of Engaged Buddhism*. Topics in Contemporary Buddhism. University of Hawai'i Press.

———. 2009. *Socially Engaged Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

King, Winston L. 1964. *In the Hope of Nibbana: An Essay on Thervada Buddhist Ethics*. LaSalle: Open Court.

———. 1994a. A Buddhist Ethic Without Karmic Rebirth? *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 1: 33-44.

———. 1994b. Engaged Buddhism: Past, Present, Future. *Eastern Buddhist* 27 (2): 14–29.

Kita Sadakichi 喜田貞吉. 1919. *Minzoku to rekishi: tokushu buraku kenkyū* 民族と歴史: 特殊部落研究 *[People and History: Research on the Special* Buraku*]*. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Fukyū Kai 日本学術普及会.

———. 1922. *Minzoku to rekishi: sendara kō* 民族と歴史: 旃陀羅考 *[People and History: A Consideration of* Sendara*]*. 8 (5–6). Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Fukyū Kai 日本学術普及会.

———. 1926. *Yūwa sokushin* 融和促進 *[The Facilitation of Reconciliation]*. Chūō Yūwa Jigyō Kyōkai 中央融和事業協会.

Kitaguchi, Suehiro. 1999. *An Introduction to the Buraku Issue: Questions and Answers*. Trans. Alastair McLauchlan. Routledge.

Kodama Gyōyō 児玉暁洋. 1995. Kantōgen: tokushū: shiryō, Shinshū to kokka VI jō: 1931-1933 Chūgoku Tōhoku sensō ki, zenpen 巻頭言: 特集: 資料・真宗と国家 IV 上: 1931-1933 中国東北戦争期・前篇 [Foreword: Special Issue: Materials, Shin Buddhism and the State IV (Part 1): 1931-1933 Northeastern China War Era, First Compilation]. *Kyōka Kenkyū* 教化研究 114-115: 7-9.

Kondō Yūshō 近藤祐昭. 1983. *Buraku sabetsu to Shinshū no kadai* 部落差別と真宗の課題 *[*Buraku *Discrimination and Issues for Shin Buddhism]*. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂.

———. 2010. Bukkyō no byōdōkan to sabetsu mondai 仏教の平等観と差別問題 [The Problem of Discrimination and the Buddhist View of Equality]. *Shitennō-ji Daigaku Daigakuin Kenkyū Ronshū* 四天王寺大学大学院研究論集 (5): 19-27.

Kraft, Kenneth L., ed. 1992. *Inner Peace, World Peace: Essays on Buddhism and Nonviolence*. SUNY.

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄. 1996. The Development of the Kenmitsu System as Japan's Medieval Orthodoxy. Trans. James C. Dobbins. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*: 233–269.

Kusano, Kenshi. 2006. The Kanshō Persecution: An Examination of Mount Hiei's Destruction of Ōtani Honganji. In *Rennyo and the Roots of Modern Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Mark Laurence Blum and Shin'ya Yasutomi, trans. Eisho Nasu, 83–84. Oxford University Press.

Lai, Whalen. 1984. Seno'o Girō and the Dilemma of Modern Buddhism: Leftist Prophet of the Lotus Sutra. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*: 7-42.

Large, Stephen S. 1987. Buddhism, Socialism, and Protest in Prewar Japan: The Career of

Seno'o Girō. *Modern Asian Studies* 21 (1): 153-171.

Lemert, Charles C., and Ann Branaman, eds. 1997. *The Goffman Reader*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Lie, John. 2006. The Politics of Recognition in Contemporary Japan. In *Democratization and Identity: Regimes and Ethnicity in East and Southeast Asia*, ed. Susan J. Henders, 117–132. Lexington Books.

Lincoln, Bruce. 2006. The Study of Religion in the Current Political Moment. In *Holy Terrors: Thinking about Religion After September 11, Second Edition*, 1-18. University of Chicago Press.

Main, Jessica L. 2010. To Lament the Self: The Ethical Ideology of Takeuchi Ryō'on (1891-1968) and the Ōtani-ha Movement Against *Buraku* Discrimination. In *The Social Dimension of Shin Buddhism*, ed. Ugo Dessì, 112-131. Brill.

Maraldo, John C. 2006. Saving Zen From Moral Ineptitude: A Response. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 13.

Marra, Michele. 1985. The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12 (4): 319–341.

———. 1988a. The Development of *Mappō* Thought in Japan (I). *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15 (1): 25–54.

———. 1988b. The Development of *Mappō* Thought in Japan (II). *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15 (4): 287–305.

———. 1991. The Aesthetics of Reclusion: Kamo no Chōmei and the Last Age. In *The Aesthetics of Discontent: Politics and Reclusion in Medieval Japanese Literature*, 70-100. University of Hawai'i Press.

Matsune Takashi 松根鷹. 1988. Shinshū Ōtaniha 'dōbō shakai no kengen' Kurube Shin'yū shi sabetsu mondai o megutte 真宗大谷派「同朋社会の顕現」訓覇信雄氏差別問題をめぐって [Concerning Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism's Kurube Shin'yū's 'Manifesting a *Dōbō* Society' Discrimination Problem]. *Buraku Kaihō* 部落解放 283: 92-100.

———. 1993. Shūkyō to sabetsu jiken: 'Dōshūren' kessei igo no gaiyō to kadai 宗教と差別事件:「同宗連」結成以後の概要と課題 [Religion and Discriminatory Incidents: Summary and Issues Since the Formation of the 'Dōshūren']. *Buraku Kaihō Kenkyū* 部落解放研究 90 (2): 44-53.

Matsutani Ryōshun 松谷了秀. 1995. 'Tamashii no kaihō' no jitsugen o motomete: Toyama no Shinshū jiin no ichi jūshoku to shite 「魂の解放」の実現を求めて: 富山の真宗寺院の－住職として [Towards Realizing 'Liberation of the Spirit': Speaking as a Temple Priest from a Toyama Shin Buddhist Temples]. *Buraku Kaihō* 部落解放 391: 60-67.

May, Larry. 1987. *The Morality of Groups: Collective Responsibility, Group-based Harm, and Corporate Rights*. University of Notre Dame Press.

May, Larry, and Raimo Tuomela. 2007. Introduction (Special Issue: Collective

Responsibility). *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38 (3): 365-368.

Meerman, Jacob. 2003. The Mobility of Japan's Burakumin: Militant Advocacy and Government Response. In *Boundaries of Clan and Color: Transnational Comparisons of Inter-Group Disparity*, ed. William A. Darity and Ashwini Deshpande, 130–151. Routledge.

McKnight, Anne. 2006. Imperial Syntax: Nakagami Kenji's 'Monogatari' and Modern Japanese Literature as Ethnography. *Discourse* 28 (1): 142-165.

McLauchlan, Alastair. 2001. Japanese Authorities and the Buraku Issue: Was It Really 130 Years of 'Conniving'? In *Asian Nationalism in an Age of Globalization*, ed. Roy Starrs, 178–204. Routledge.

———. 2003. *Prejudice and Discrimination in Japan: The Buraku Issue*. Edwin Mellen Press.

Minority Rights Group International. 2008. World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples -- Japan: Burakumin (Buraku people). http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/49749cfec.html.

Miura Sangendō 三浦参玄洞. 2006. *Miura Sangendō ronsetsu shū* 三浦参玄洞論説集 *[Collected Works of Miura Sangendō]*. Ed. Asao Atsuya 浅尾篤哉. Kaihō Shuppansha 解放出版社 .

Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, eds. 1958. *Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten* 望月仏教大辞典, *10 Volumes*. Revised and Expanded. Kyoto: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会.

Morgan, Charlie V. 2007. A Case Study of Buraku and Non-Buraku Couples in Japan. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 38 (1): 31-54.

Morooka Sukeyuki 師岡佑行. 1980. *Sengō Buraku Kaihō Ronsō Shi* 戦後部落解放論争史 *[History of Postwar Theories of Buraku Liberation], 6 Volumes*. Kyoto: Tsuge Shobō 柘植書房.

———. 1992. *Saikō Mankichi: hito to shisō* 西光万吉: 人と思想 *[Saikō Mankichi: The Man and his Thought]*. Tokyo: Shimuzu Shoin 清水書院.

Mrozik, Susanne. 2007. *Virtuous Bodies: The Physical Dimensions of Morality in Buddhist Ethics*. Oxford University Press.

Mucks, Nicolas. 2010. Shadows of Modernity: Hybrid Identities of Buraku Outcastes in Japan. *Asia Pacific: Perspectives* 9 (2): 36-42.

Mukhopadhyaya, Ranjana ムコパディヤーヤ・ランジャナ. 2005. *Nihon no shakai sanka Bukkyō: Hōonji to Risshō Kōsei Kai no shakai katsudō to shakai rinri* 日本の社会参加仏教-法音寺と立正佼成会の社会活動と社会倫理 *[Japan's Socially Participating Buddhism: The Social Activities and Social Ethics of Hōonji and the Risshō Kōsei Kai]*. Tōshindō 東信堂.

Murakami, Shigeyoshi. 1980. *Japanese Religion in the Modern Century*. University of Tokyo Press.

Murakami, Sokusui. 2004. The Joy of Shinran: Rethinking Traditional Shinshū Views on the

Concept of the Stage of the Truly Settled. In *Living in Amida's Universal Vow: Essays in Shin Buddhism*, ed. Alfred Bloom, 123-142. World Wisdom.

Murakoshi Sueo 村越末男. 1982. Nihon Bukkyō to buraku mondai 日本仏教と部落問題 [Japanese Buddhism and the Buraku Problem]. In *Shūkyō to buraku mondai 宗教と部落問題 [Religion and the Buraku Problem]*, ed. Buraku Kaihō Kenkyūjo 部落解放研究所, 24–49. Osaka: Buraku Kaihō Kenkyūjo 部落解放研究所.

Nadamoto Masahisa 灘本昌久. 2002. Kyoto No Burakushi (chōkonpacto Han) 京都の部落史 (超コンパクト版) [Buraku History of Kyoto (Compact Version)]. *Kyōto Buraku Mondai Kenkyū Shiryō Sentā Tsūshin 京都部落問題 研究資料センター通信* 9: 1–4.

Nagahara, Keiji. 1979. The Medieval Origins of the Eta-Hinin. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 5 (2): 385–403.

Nakagami Kenji 中上健次. 1999. *The Cape and Other Stories from the Japanese Ghetto*. Trans. Eve Zimmerman. Stone Bridge Press.

Nakao Shunpaku 仲尾俊博. 1976. *Dōbō undō 同朋運動 [The Dōbō Movement]*. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂.

———. 1997. Aku byōdō ron to shukugō ron 悪平等論と宿業論 [Theories of Evil Equality and Karma]. In *Shinran kyōgaku ronsō: Murakami Toshimi sensei kiju kinen 親鸞教学論叢: 村上速水先生喜寿記念 [Collected Essays on Shinran Studies: On the Occassion of Professor Murakami Toshimi's Seventy-Seventh Birthday]*, 129-138. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂.

Namihira, Emiko. 1987. Pollution in the Folk Belief System. *Current Anthropology* 28 (4): S65–S74.

Nasu, Eisho. 1998. Ordination of the Honganji Priests in Premodern Japanese Society. In *Engaged Pure Land Buddhism: Challenges Facing Jōdo-Shinshū in the Contemporary World: Studies in Honor of Professor Alfred Bloom*, ed. Kenneth Ken'ichi Tanaka and Eisho Nasu, 201–220. WisdomOcean.

National Diet of Japan. 2009. The Constitution of Japan: Promulgated November 3, 1946. *House of Councillors, National Diet of Japan*. http://www.sangiin.go.jp/eng/law/index.htm.

Neary, Ian. 1986. Socialist and Communist Party Attitudes Towards Discrimination Against Japan's Burakumin. *Political Studies* 34 (4): 556–574.

———. 1989. *Political Protest and Social Control in Pre-war Japan: The Origins of Buraku Liberation*. Manchester University Press.

———. 1996. In Search of Human Rights in Japan. In *Case Studies on Human Rights in Japan*, ed. Roger Goodman and Ian Neary, 1–26. Japan Library.

———. 2003. Burakumin at the End of History. *Social Research* 70 (1): 269–294.

———. 2009. Burakumin in Contemporary Japan. In *Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity, Second Edition*, ed. Michael Weiner, 59-83. Routledge.

Nhat Hanh, Thich. 1967. *Vietnam: The Lotus in the Sea of Fire*. London: S.C.M. Press.

Nihon Daijiten Kankōkai 日本大辞典刊行会, ed. 1976. *Nihon kokugo daijiten* 日本国語大辞典 *[Unabridged Dictionary of the Japanese Language]*. Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館.

Ninomiya, Shigesaki. 1933. An Inquiry Concerning the Origin, Development, and Present Situation of the Eta in Relation to the History of Social Classes in Japan. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 10: 47-154.

Noma Osamu 野間修. 1973. Dōwa undō to Ōtaniha 同和運動と大谷派 [The Assimiliation Movement and the Ōtani-ha] (Originally Published in the 1966 July-August edition of the Official Sect magazine *Shinshū*). In *Buraku Mondai Kōen Ronbun Shū* 部落問題講演論文集 *[Collected Papers and Lectures on Buraku Discrimination]*, ed. Shinshū Ōtaniha Shūmusho Dōwabu 真宗大谷派宗務所同和部, 1–8. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

Norbeck, Edward. 1952. Pollution and Taboo in Contemporary Japan. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 8 (3): 269-285.

———. 1966. Little-Known Minority Groups of Japan. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 184–199. University of California Press.

Numa Hōryō 沼法量, and Kozuka Yoshikuni 小塚義国, eds. 1982 [1913]. *Shinshū koji seigo jiten* 真宗故事成語辞典 *[A Dictionary of Shin Buddhist Idioms]*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

O'Brien, Jodi A., ed. 2010. *The Production of Reality: Essays and Readings on Social Interaction*. Pine Forge Press.

Odake Shōkyō 小武正教. 2004a. *Shinran to sabetsu mondai* 親鸞と差別問題 *[Shinran and the Problem of Discrimination]*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

———. 2004b. Shinshū kyōdan to mibun seido: hondō kenchiku yōshiki to sekiji 真宗教団と身分制度: 本堂建築様式と席次 [The Shin Buddhist Institutions and the Status System: Layout and Seating in the Main Hall Buildings]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 52 (2): 526-530.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1984. Japanese Germs. In *Illness and Culture in Contemporary Japan: An Anthropological View*, 21–50. Cambridge University Press.

———. 1989. The Special Status People in Japanese Society. In *The Monkey as Mirror: Symbolic Transformations in Japanese History and Ritual*, 75–100. Princeton University Press.

———. 1994. Rice as Self, Rice Paddies as Our Land. In *Rice as Self: Japanese Identities Through Time*, 81–99. Princeton University Press.

———. 1998. A Conceptual Model for the Historical Relationship Between the Self and the Internal and External Others: The Agrarian Japanese, the Ainu, and the Special-Status People. In *Making Majorities*, ed. Dru C. Gladney, 31-54. Stanford University Press.

Okumoto Takehiro 奥本武裕. 1995. Kenkyū nōto Yamato kuni no 'buraku jiin' no honmatsu kankei ni tsuite 研究ノート大和国の「部落寺院」の本末関係について [Research Note on the Trunk-and-Branch Relations of *Buraku* Temples in Yamato Province]. *Nara Kenritsu Dōwa Mondai Kankei Shiryō Sentā Kenkyū Kiyō* 奈良県立 同和問題関係史料センター研究紀要 2: 113–121.

———. 1997. Yamato no 'buraku jiin' to furegashira 大和の「部落寺院」と触頭 [' Buraku Temples' and the Government Liaisons in Yamato]. *Nara Kenritsu Dōwa Mondai Kankei Shiryō Sentā Kenkyū Kiyō* 奈良県立 同和問題関係史料センター研究紀要 4: 74–93.

———. 1998. 'Buraku jiin' no honmatsu, jidan sōron o megutte 「部落寺院」の本末・寺檀争論をめぐって [Concerning Disputes in the Trunk-and-Branch and Membership of *Buraku* Temples]. *Nara Kenritsu Dōwa Mondai Kankei Shiryō Sentā Kenkyū Kiyō (*奈良県立 同和問題関係史料センター研究紀要*)* 5: 97–114.

———. 2000. Kinsei Nishi Honganji kyōdan ni okeru buraku jiin kan no henyō: Sangōwakuran ki no Yamato no buraku jiin no dōkō o megutte 近世西本願寺教団における「部落寺院」観の変容: 三業惑乱期の大和の「部落寺院」の動向をめぐって [The Transformation of Views of *Buraku* Temples in the Early Modern Honganji-ha Order: A Look at Trends in the *Buraku* Temple of Yamato During the Sangōwakuran Period]. *Nara Kenritsu Dōwa Mondai Kankei Shiryō Sentā Kenkyū Kiyō* 奈良県立 同和問題関係史料センター研究紀要 7: 1–42.

———. 2003. 'Eta' mura ni okeru Shinshū kyōsen no tenkai ni tsuite no oboegaki 「穢多」村における真宗教線の展開についての覚書 [A Note Regarding the Development of Shin Buddhist Teaching Lineages in 'Eta' Villages]. *Nara Kenritsu Dōwa Mondai Kankei Shiryō Sentā Kenkyū Kiyō* 奈良県立 同和問題関係史料センター研究紀要 10: 103–113.

Olson, Phillip. 1993. *The Discipline of Freedom: A Kantian View of the Role of Moral Precepts in Zen Practice*. SUNY Press.

Ooms, Herman. 1996. Status and State Racism From *Kawata* to *Eta*. In *Tokugawa Village Practice: Class, Status, Power, Law*, 243–312. University of California Press.

Orbaugh, Sharalyn. 2007. Theories of Embodiment. In *Japanese Fiction of the Allied Occupation: Vision, Embodiment, Identity*, 157–212. Brill.

Passin, Herbert. 1955. Untouchability in the Far East. *Monumenta Nipponica* 11 (3): 247-267.

Peach, Lucinda J. 2000. Human Rights, Religion, and (Sexual) Slavery: The Trafficking of Women Within the Thai Buddhist Tradition. *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 20: 65–87.

Peek, John M. 1995. Buddhism, Human Rights and the Japanese State. *Human Rights Quarterly* 17 (3): 527–540.

Perera, L. P. N. 1991. *Buddhism and Human Rights: A Buddhist Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Karunaratne and Sons.

Pharr, Susan J. 1990. *Losing Face: Status Politics in Japan*. University of California Press.

Porcu, Elisabetta. 2008. *Pure Land Buddhism in Modern Japanese Culture*. Numen Studies in the History of Religions 121. Boston: Brill.

———. 2009. Anniversaries, Founders, Slogans and Visual Media in Shin Buddhism. *Japanese Religions* 34 (1): 53-73.

Powers, John. 1998. Human Rights and Cultural Values: The Political Philosophies of the Dalai Lama and the People's Republic of China. In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, ed. Damien Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, 175–202. Curzon Critical Studies in Buddhism. Curzon.

Powers, John, and Charles S. Prebish, eds. 2009. *Destroying Māra Forever: Buddhist Ethics Essays in Honor of Damien Keown*. Snow Lion Publications.

Price, John. 1966. A History of the Outcaste: Untouchability in Japan. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 6-32. University of California Press.

Queen, Christopher S. 1996. Introduction: The Shapes and Sources of Engaged Buddhism. In *Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia*, ed. Christopher S. Queen and Sallie B. King, 1-44. Albany: SUNY.

———. 2003. Introduction: From Altruism to Activism. In *Action Dharma: New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*, ed. Charles S. Prebish, Damien Keown, and Christopher S. Queen, 1-37. Routledge.

———. 2005. Engaged Buddhism. In *Encyclopedia of Religion, Second Edition, 15 Volumes*, ed. Lindsay Jones, 4: 2785-2791. Macmillan Reference USA.

Queen, Christopher S., and Sallie B. King, eds. 1996. *Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia*. Albany: SUNY.

Queen, Christopher S., Charles S. Prebish, and Damien Keown, eds. 2003. *Action Dharma: New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*. RoutledgeCurzon critical studies in Buddhism. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Queen, Christopher S., ed. 2000. *Engaged Buddhism in the West*. Wisdom Publications.

Raeside, James. 2007. The *Burakumin* as 'Other' in Noma Hiroshi's *Circle of Youth*. In *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature*, ed. Rachael Williams and Mark Hutchinson, 145–164. Routledge.

Rai, Lal Deosa. 1995. *Human Rights in the Hindu-Buddhist Tradition*. Jaipur: Nirala.

Rambelli, Fabio. 2002. Buddha's Wrath: Esoteric Buddhism and the Discourse of Divine Punishment. *Japanese Religions* 27 (1): 41–68.

———. 2004. 'Just Behave as You Like; Prohibitions and Impurities Are Not a Problem': Radical Amida Cults and Popular Religiosity in Premodern Japan. In *Approaching the Land of Bliss: Religious Praxis in the Cult of Amitabha*, ed. Richard K. Payne and Kenneth K. Tanaka. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Reber, Emily A. Su-lan. 1999. *Buraku Mondai* in Japan: Historical and Modern Perspectives and Directions for the Future. *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 12: 297–407.

Reischauer, August Karl. 1917. Chapter 6: Buddhist Ethics. In *Studies in Japanese Buddhism*, 268-294. New York: Macmillan.

Ritzer, George, ed. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Social Theory, 2 Volumes*. SAGE.

Robertson, Jennifer Ellen. 2002. Blood Talks: Eugenic Modernity and the Creation of New Japanese. *History and Anthropology* 13 (3): 191-216.

———. 2005. Biopower: Blood, Kinship, and Eugenic Marriage. In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Japan*, ed. Jennifer Ellen Robertson, 329–354. Wiley-Blackwell.

Rogers, Minor L., and Ann T. Rogers. 1990. The Honganji: Guardian of the State (1868-1945). *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 17: 3-28.

———. 1991. *Rennyo: The Second Founder of Shin Buddhism: With a Translation of his Letters*. Asian Humanities Press.

Roth, Joshua Hotaka. 2005. Political and Cultural Perspectives on 'Insider' Minorities. In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Japan*, ed. Jennifer Ellen Robertson, 73-88. Wiley-Blackwell.

Rothberg, Donald. 2004. Resources on Socially Engaged Buddhism. *Turning Wheel* (Spring): 30-37.

———. 2006. *The Engaged Spiritual Life: A Buddhist Approach to Transforming Ourselves and the World*. Beacon Press.

Saikō Mankichi 西光万吉. 1990. *Saikō mankichi no e to kokoro* 西光萬吉の絵と心 *[Saikō Mankichi's Paintings and Heart]*. Osaka: Ōsaka Jinken Rekishi Shiryōkan 大阪人権歴史資料館.

Saddhātissa, Hammalava. 1970. *Buddhist Ethics: The Path to Nirvana*. Allen and Unwin.

Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.

———. 1985. Orientalism Reconsidered. *Cultural Critique* 1: 89-107.

Santikaro, Bhikkhu. 1996. Buddhadasa Bhikkhu: Life and Society Through the Natural Eyes of Voidness. In *Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia*, ed. Christopher S. Queen and Sallie B. King, 147-194. SUNY.

Schober, Juliane. 2005. Buddhist Visions of Moral Authority and Modernity in Burma. In *Burma at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Monique Skidmore, 113-132. University of Hawai'i Press.

Schmidt-Leukel, Perry. 2006. Buddhism and the Idea of Human Rights: Resonances and Dissonances. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 26: 33-49.

Schwartz, Frank J., and Susan J. Pharr, eds. 2003. *The State of Civil Society in Japan*. Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, Ronald D. 1994. *Circle of Protest: Political Ritual in the Tibetan Uprising*. Columbia University Press.

Schweiker, William. 2006. On the Future of Religious Ethics: Keeping Religious Ethics

Religious and Ethical. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 74 (1): 135–151.

Schweiker, William, ed. 2005. *The Blackwell Companion to Religious Ethics*. Blackwell Companions to Religion. Blackwell.

Sharma, Ursula. 1999. *Caste*. Open University Press.

Shields, James Mark. 2011. *Critical Buddhism: Engaging with Modern Japanese Buddhist Thought*. Ashgate.

Shigaraki Takamaro 信楽峻麿. 1984. Kakunyo ni okeru shin no shisō: Shinshū kyōgakushi ni okeru shin kaishaku no mondai 覚如における信の思想: 真宗教学史における 信解釈の問題 [The Idea of Faith in Kakunyo: The Problem of the Interpretation of Faith in Shin Buddhist Doctrinal History]. *Ryūkoku Daigaku ronshū* 龍谷大学論集 424: 46–73.

Shimahara, Nobuo. 1971. *Burakumin: A Japanese Minority and Education*. Martinus Nijhoff.

———. 1984. Toward the Equality of a Japanese Minority: The Case of Burakumin. *Comparative Education* 20 (3): 339–353.

Shimazaki, Tōson 島崎藤村. 1974. *The Broken Commandment*. Trans. Kenneth Strong. University of Tokyo Press.

Shinshū Ōtaniha 真宗大谷派. 1943. *Shinshū Ōtaniha Honganji yōran* 真宗大谷派本願寺要 覧 *[A Handbook of Ōtani-ha Shin Buddhism]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所.

———. 2008. Shūmon gensei no hōkoku 宗門現勢の報告 [Report on the Present State of the Sect]. *Shinshū* 真宗 1253 (August): 50-51.

Shiotsu Tōru 塩津徹. 2000. Daijō Bukkyō to jinken 大乗仏教と人権 [Mahayana Buddhism and Human Rights]. *Tōhō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋学術研究 39 (2): 90–105.

Shiraishi Masaaki 白石正明. 2009. Takeuchi Ryō'on no ayumi (ichi) 武内了温の歩み(一) [Takeuchi Ryō'on's Progress, Part 1]. *Saga buraku kaihō kenkyūjo kiyō* 佐賀部落解 放研究所紀要 26: 31-90.

Sistare, Christine T., Larry May, and Leslie Francis, eds. 2001. *Groups and Group Rights*. University Press of Kansas.

Spiro, Melford E. 1966a. Buddhism and Economic Action in Burma. *American Anthropologist* 68 (5): 1163-1173.

Spiro, Melford E. 1966b. Religion: Problems of Definition and Explanation. In *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, ed. Michael Banton, 85-126.

———. 1982. *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes*. University of California Press.

Stewart, Harold, and Hisao Inagaki. 1995. *The Three Pure Land Sutras: A Study and Translation from Chinese, Second Revised Edition*. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

Stone, Jacqueline. 1985a. Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Dharma Age: *Mappō* Thought in Kamakura Buddhism. *The Eastern Buddhist* 18 (1): 28-56.

———. 1985b. Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Dharma Age: *Mappō* Thought in Kamakura Buddhism (II). *The Eastern Buddhist* 18 (2): 35-64.

———. 2003. Nichiren's Activist Heirs: Sōka Gakkai, Risshō Kōseiki, Nipponzan Myōhōji. In *Action Dharma: New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*, ed. Charles S. Prebish, Damien Keown, and Christopher S. Queen, 63-95. Routledge.

Stone, Jacqueline I., and Mariko Namba Walter. 2008. Introduction. In *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Jacqueline I. Stone and Mariko Namba Walter, 1–26. University of Hawaii Press.

Strain, Charles R. 1998. Socially Engaged Buddhism's Contribution to the Transformation of Catholic Social Teachings on Human Rights. In *Buddhism and Human Rights*, ed. Damien V. Keown, Charles S. Prebish, and Wayne R. Husted, 165–166. Curzon Press.

Sulak, Sivaraksa. 1990. Human Rights in the Context of Global Problem-Solving: A Buddhist Perspective. In *Ethics of World Religions and Human Rights*, 79–91. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.

Sumii Sué 住居すゑ. 1989. *The River with No Bridge*. Trans. Susan Wilkinson. Tuttle.

Suzuki, Daisetz T. 2004. Shin Buddhism. In *Living in Amida's Universal Vow: Essays in Shin Buddhism*, ed. Alfred Bloom, 31–50. World Wisdom.

Swaris, Nalin. 2000. *Buddhism, Human Rights and Social Renewal*. Hong Kong: Asian Human Rights Commission.

Tachibana Ryōhō 橘了法. 1979. Ryō'on no tatakai 了温の闘い [Ryō'on's Struggle]. *Shindō (*身同*)* 2: 2–10.

Takagi Kenmyō 高木顕明. 2004. My Socialism. In *Living in Amida's Universal Vow: Essays in Shin Buddhism*, ed. Alfred Bloom, trans. Robert F. Rhodes, 189–196. World Wisdom.

Takahashi Sadaki 高橋貞樹. 1924. *Tokushu buraku issen nen shi: Suihei undō no kyōkai hyō* 特殊部落一千年史: 水平運動の境界標 *[A Thousand Year History of the Special Buraku: Landmark Achievements of The Levelers' Movement]*. Kōsei Kaku 更生閣.

Takayama, Keita. 2009. Progressive Struggle and Critical Education Scholarship in Japan: Toward the Democratization of Critical Education Studies. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education*, ed. Michael W. Apple, Wayne Au, and Luís Armando Gandin, 354–367. Taylor and Francis.

Takeuchi Ryō'on (武內了温). 1919. Kyūsai jigyō no konpon seishin: Shigaken chihō kairyō shunin bungakushi Takeuchi Ryō'on shi no dan 救済事業の根本精神: 滋賀県地方改良主任文学士 武內了温氏の談 [The Fundamental Spirit of Salvation Work: A Discussion with Takeuchi Ryō'on, Bachelor of Letters and Responsible for Regional Improvement in Shiga Prefecture], 6 Parts. *Ōsaka Mainichi Shinbun* 大阪朝日新聞, October 2 to October 12.

———. 1921. Shakai jigyō kōshū sho kaisetsu ni tsuite 社会事業講習所開設に就いて [Regarding the Opening of the Training Facility for Social Work]. *Shūhō* 宗報 232.2: 16, 20.

———. 1923. *Nōson mondai to shūkyō* 農村問題と宗教 *[Farming Village Problems and Religion]*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

———. 1930. *Jiin to Nōson* 寺院と農村 *[Temples and Farming Villages]*. Kyoto: Ōtani-ha Honganji Shakaika 大谷派本願寺社会課.

———. 1931. *Rai zetsumetsu to Ōtaniha Kōmyōkai* 癩絶滅と大谷派光明会 *[Elimination of Leprosy and the Ōtani-ha Society of Light]*. Kōmyōkai 光明会.

———. 1937. *Chōki kokunan to Shinshū kyōto no kakugo* 長期国難と真宗教徒の覚悟 *[The Long Period of National Crisis and the Readiness of Shin Buddhist Followers]*. Kyoto: Shinshinkai (真身会).

———. 1938. *Kōdō Kokka* 皇道国家 *[An Imperial Way Nation-State]*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

———. 1941. *Taisei yokusan to Jōdo Shinshū* 大政翼賛と浄土真宗 *[Great Imperial Assistance and the Jōdo Shinshū]*. Kyoto: Ōtani Shuppan Kyōkai 大谷出版協会.

———. 1955. *Shūkyō kaikaku to shūkyō saiken: Shinshū kyōdan no tachiba kara* 宗教改革と宗教再建: 真宗教団の立場から *[Reforming Religion and Rebuilding Religion: From the Standpoint of the Shin Buddhist Order]*. Kyoto: Bunka Jihōsha 文化時報社.

———. 1965. Takahashi hōshō e: sabetsu jiken o kanashimu 高橋法相へ: 差別事件を悲しむ [To Takahashi, Minister of Justice: Lamenting Discriminatory Incidents]. (copies of newspaper clippings in collected materials for JG 2008). April 2 to April 14.

Takeuchi Yoshinobu 武内善信. 2000. Shinshū kyōdan to hisabetsumin: Jitsunyo jidai ni okeru Kii Shinshū no ichidanmen 真宗教団と被差別民: 実如時代における紀伊真宗の一断面 [The Shin Buddhist Order and Discriminated-Against Peoples: One Aspect of Kii Shin Buddhism during Jitsunyo's Era]. In *Kenkyū sosho 4: Jitsunyohan Gojō ofumi no kenkyū* 研究叢書 *4:* 実如判五帖御文の研究 *[Collected Research Papers 4: Reserach on the Five-part Letters Signed by Jitsunyo]*, 45–79. Kyoto: Dōbō Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo 同朋大学仏教文化研究所.

Tambiah, Stanley J. 1992. *Buddhism Betrayed: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Sri Lanka*. University of Chicago Press.

Tanaka, Kenneth K. 2000. Concern for Others in Pure Land Soteriological and Ethical Considerations: The Case of *Jōgyō Daihi* in Jōdo-Shinshū Buddhism. In *Buddhist Theology: Critical Reflections by Contemporary Buddhist Scholars*, ed. Roger R. Jackson and John J. Makransky, 346–366. Curzon.

Tanaka, Kenneth Ken'ichi, and Eisho Nasu, eds. 1998. *Engaged Pure Land Buddhism: Challenges Facing Jōdo-Shinshū in the Contemporary World: Studies in Honor of Professor Alfred Bloom*. WisdomOcean.

Tani Shinri 谷眞理. 2009. Buraku sabetsu mondai to Shinshū gaku 部落差別問題と真宗

学 [The Problem of Buraku Discrimination and Shin Buddhist Studies]. *Shinran Kyōgaku* 親鸞教学 94: 1-16.

Taves, Ann. 2011. 2010 Presidential Address: 'Religion' in the Humanities and the Humanities in the University. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 79: 287-314.

Taylor, Charles. 1997. The Politics of Recognition. In *New Contexts of Canadian Criticism*, ed. Ajay Heble, Donna Palmateer Pennee, and J.R. Tim Struthers, 98-131. Broadview Press.

———. 1999. Conditions of an Unforced Consensus on Human Rights. *The Politics of Human Rights*: 101–119.

Taylor, Charles, and Amy Gutmann. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press.

Thelle, Notto R. 1987. *Buddhism and Christianity in Japan: From Conflict to Dialogue, 1854-1899*. University of Hawaii Press.

Thurman, Robert A.F. 1996. Human Rights and Human Responsibilities: Buddhist Views on Individualism and Altruism. In *Religious Diversity and Human Rights*, ed. Irene Bloom, J. Paul Martin, and Wayne L. Proudfoot, 87–113. Columbia University Press.

Turner, Victor Witter, and Edith Turner. 2005. Bodily Marks. In *Encyclopedia of Religion, Second Edition, 15 Volumes*, ed. Lindsay Jones, 2:1000–1005. Macmillan Reference USA.

Tweed, Thomas A. 1999. Night-Stand Buddhists and Other Creatures: Sympathizers, Adherents, and the Study of Religion. In *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*, ed. Duncan Ryūken Williams and Christopher S. Queen, 71-90. Routledge.

———. 2008. *Crossing and Dwelling: A Theory of Religion*. Harvard University Press.

Twiss, Sumner B., and Bruce Grelle. 1995. Human Rights and Comparative Religious Ethics: A New Venue. *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23. 21-48.

Ueda, Yoshifumi, and Dennis Hirota. 1989. *Shinran: An Introduction to His Thought*. Hongwanji International Center.

Uesugi, Satoshi 上杉聡. 2006. *Buraku sabetsu to wa nani ka* 部落差別とは何か *[What is Buraku Discrimination?]*. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Kyōto Kyōku Dōwa Kyōgikai Kenshū 真宗大谷派京都教区同和協議会研修.

Unno, Mark T. 1998. Shin Buddhist Social Thought in Modern Japan. In *Engaged Pure Land Buddhism: Challenges Facing Jōdo Shinshū in the Contemporary World: Studies in Honor of Professor Alfred Bloom*, ed. Kenneth K. Tanaka and Eisho Nasu, 67-87. WisdomOcean Publications.

———. 1999. Questions in the Making: A Review Essay on Zen and Buddhist Ethics in the Context of Buddhist and Comparative Ethics. *Journal of Religious Ethics* 27 (3): 509-536.

———. 2004. *Shingon Refractions: Myōe and the Mantra of Light*. Wisdom Publications.

Unno, Taitetsu. 1988. Personal Rights and Contemporary Buddhism. In *Human Rights and the World's Religions*, ed. Leroy S. Rouner, 129-146. University of Notre Dame Press.

Upham, Frank K. 1987. *Law and Social Change in Postwar Japan*. Harvard University Press.

Victoria, Brian D. 2001. Engaged Buddhism: A Skeleton in the Closet? *Journal of Global Buddhism* 2: 72–91.

Wada Kōji 和田幸司. 2007. *Jōdo Shinshū to buraku jiin no tenkai* 浄土真宗と部落寺院の展開 *[Jōdo Shinshū and the Development of* Buraku *Temples]*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Wagatsuma, Hiroshi, and George O. Totten. 1966. Emancipation: Growth and Transformation of a Political Movement. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 33–67. University of California Press.

Wagatsuma, Hiroshi. 1966. Non-Political Approaches: The Influences of Religion and Education. In *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, ed. George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, 88-109. University of California Press.

Walter, Mariko Namba. 2008. The Structure of Japanese Buddhist Funerals. In *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Jacqueline I. Stone and Mariko Namba Walter, 247–292. University of Hawaii Press.

Wayman, Alex. 1990. Human Rights in Buddhism. *Studia Missionalia* 39: 341–358.

Webster, David. 2004. *The Philosophy of Desire in the Buddhist Pali Canon*. RoutledgeCurzon.

Weiner, Michael, ed. 2004. *Race, Ethnicity, and Migration in Modern Japan: Indigenous and Colonial Others*. Taylor and Francis.

Whitehill, James. 1994. Buddhist Ethics in Western Context: The 'Virtues' Approach. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 1: 1-22.

Williams, Duncan Ryūken. 2005. *The Other Side of Zen: A Social History of Sōtō Zen Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton University Press.

Williams, Paul. 2008. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations, Second Edition*. Taylor & Francis.

Wright, Dale S. 2004. Critical Questions Towards a Naturalized Concept of Karma in Buddhism. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 11: 78-93.

Yamamoto Naotomo 山本尚友. 1999. *Hisabetsu buraku shi no kenkyū: Ikōki ni tsuite* 被差別部落史の研究: 移行期について *[Research on the History of the Discriminated-Against Buraku: The Period of Transition]*. Tokyo: Iwata Shoin 岩田書院.

———. 2006. *Kyōdan to buraku sabetsu no rekishi* 教団と部落差別の歴史 *[The Order and*

the History of Buraku Discrimination]. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha Kyōto Kyōku Dōwa Kyōgikai Gakushūkai 真宗大谷派京都教区同和協議会学習会.

———. 2007. Shinshū to hisabetsu buraku: kenkyū shi no seiri 真宗と被差別部落: 研究史の整理 [Shin Buddhisma and the Discriminated-Against Buraku: A Survey of the History of Research]. *Riberashion, Fukuoka-ken Jinken Kenkyūjo* リベラシオン, 福岡県人権研究所 (125): 44-58.

Yanagita Kunio 柳田国男. 1913. Iwayuru tokushu buraku no shurui 所謂特殊部落ノ種類 [Types of So-called Special *Buraku*]. In *Teihon Yanagita Kunio shū* 定本柳田国男集 *[Collected Works of Yanagita Kunio]*, 27:370-387. 1964th ed. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房.

Yanase Keisuke 柳瀬頸介. 1901. *Eta hinin: shakaigai no shakai* 穢多非人: 社會外の社會 *[*Eta-hinin*: The Society Outside of Society]*. Daigakkan 大學館.

Yoshida Shō 吉田證. 1987. *Shinran kyōdan to dōwa mondai* 親鸞教団と同和問題 *[Shinran's Order and the Assimilation Problem]*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten 明石書店.

Yoshino, I. Roger, and Sueo Murakoshi. 1977. *The Invisible Visible Minority: Japan's Burakumin*. Osaka: Buraku Kaihō Kenkyūjo.