

神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

Kiyoshi Miki (1897-1945) : age, life, works and implications for jungian psychology

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2010-11-30 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 村本, 詔司 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/447

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



Kiyoshi Miki (1897-1945): Age, Life, Works and Implications for Jungian Psychology

Shoji Muramoto

Kiyoshi Miki (1897-1945), a Japanese philosopher, was born twenty-two years later and died sixteen years earlier than Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961). So this short-lived Japanese philosopher and the Swiss psychologist were contemporaries.

While reading Miki's writings, I have often found myself comparing him with Jung because they seem to help me clarify both my sympathy and my dissatisfactions with Jung and at the same time give me a clue to fill a gap between the stereotype of his psychology and what may have been his original intention.

By the stereotype of Jung's psychology I mean that it seems to reduce all things to the psyche by depriving society, history and body of their own positive reality, and making them at best the screen to which unconscious contents are projected. A little closer reading of his writings reveals, however, how these factors provide keys to Jung's ideas. Even his writings on alchemy, especially in the 1930s and the early 1940s mostly included in his *Complete Works* (hereafter CW) Vols. 12 and 13, don't show his antique hunting but his unique attempt to explore the meaning of what was currently happening in Europe. But Jung's deep concern with these matters is hardly reflected in popular psychology books and introductory psychology classes, at least in Japan.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to explore how Miki's thoughts may help us clarify problems and potentials in Jungian psychology. But I must first point out an unfavorable situation in literature on the sub-

ject for Westerners. While Miki's works have been since 1966 available in Japanese as *Miki Kiyoshi Zenshu* (hereafter MKZ followed by the volume number) [*The Complete Works of Kiyoshi Miki*] in twenty volumes, and some of them, even in soft-cover edition of low price, for example *Notes on Human Life* (1954), none of his writings has been translated into English. Though not a few books in studies of modern Japan (for example, Parkes 1987, p. 159; Powle, Kosuge and Kibata 2000, p. 106) have already mentioned Miki in some way or other, the only secondary literature on Miki available in English is Shigenori Nagatomo (1995) and Suzan Townsend (2009). I may not be wrong to assume that he is hardly known in the West.

So, the main procedure of my present paper is to briefly present Miki's age, life and thoughts and to suggest their implications for Jungian psychology at passages where it seems appropriate to do so. A systematic comparison of both men is not my intention here.

Japan before Miki's birth and during his childhood and adolescence

When Miki was born, Japan had already been on the way to a leading modern state in East Asia for more than thirty years by rapidly assimilating the Western civilization. It had won the first war with China and got Taiwan (1894-5). When he was a child, his country, supported by the Anglo-Japanese Alliance signed in 1902, also won the war with Russia (1904-5). It was the first and epoch-making victory of an Asian country over a European one in the modern era. Coupled with the increasing consciousness of being a great power claiming to be treated as equal to Western developed countries, Japan was to begin the invasion of East Asia by annexing Korea in 1910. Japan participated in the allied forces during World War I, and expanded its influential zone in East Asia.

In 1936 at the age of almost forty Miki experienced in Tokyo a coup d'état by young commissioned officers. In an essay on youth of the year he notes three different generations sharing the same historical event.

He means by the first generation those who directly participated in the formation of modern Japan, which include liberalists in the most explicit sense. The second generation, with which Miki identifies himself, consists of people who spent their youth during the phase in which Japanese capitalism reached its peak in its development after the Russo-Japanese War. The third generation, young people at the time, grew up after the manifestation of its contradictions or impasse, sharing a mood of anxiety and despair (MKZ 13, p.227).

Miki writes there that he owes to Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) this way of seeing people's different behaviors and thoughts concerning the same historical event in terms of different generations, but it is very likely that he also learned it from a 1927 paper on generation by Karl Mannheim (Wolff 1971, pp.xlix-l) as mentioned later.

Pure Land Buddhism as Miki's spiritual background and clue to his thoughts

Miki was born in a relatively rich farmer's family, raised as a devout Pure Land Buddhist and learned to read Buddhist sutras, a common practice in the region. He was not later converted to Zen like his philosophical colleagues of the Kyoto School. He writes in 1941, "many Japanese philosophers want to speak of Zen and consider it as representing Eastern thoughts, but I feel far more sympathy with Pure Land Buddhism with a desire to explicate its philosophical significance" (MKZ 1: p. 383). In fact, one of Miki's unfinished works before death was the philosophy of history in Shinran (1173-1263), the founder of Pure Land Buddhism (MKZ 1).

This faith-oriented sect of Buddhism teaches that anyone will be reborn in Pure Land if he or she calls the name of the Amitabha Buddha at the time of dying. It is characterized by a deep conviction that one cannot be liberated from samsara by *jiriki*, one's power, an insight which necessitates the reliance on *tariki*, the other's power. Miki rarely mentions Buddhism in his philosophical writings, but his deep commitment to Pure Land Buddhism may be the key to his works. He seems to have

found an answer to his primary question on individuality in history in Shinran's words that the Amitabha Buddha's vow is just addressed to him as an individual (MKZ 18, p.487).

In one of his earliest and autobiographical writings (1919), Miki explains the basic motive for his philosophical study to be the confrontation with his personal shortcomings such as vanity, egoism and arrogance and the aspiration for humility. He writes, "Just because we are hopelessly guilty and driven by kleshas, we realize the depth of the Buddha's great compassion and vow. The mind that perceives darkness as such has already seen light." (MKZ 18: p.59), a typical discourse in Pure Land Buddhism that may appeal to some Jungians who stress the importance of becoming conscious of one's shadow.

Like Jung, he is very critical of the current state of the traditional religion, but unlike Jung, he hardly shows a serious doubt on its doctrine. On the contrary, his faith intimately linked with his critical self-observation was the strongest driving force in his psychologically toned philosophy. It must also be said that Pure Land Buddhism is the most historically conscious of all Buddhist sects. According to the Buddhist view of history, we live in the last of the three Buddhist historical periods when doctrine alone is still alive, but there is neither practice nor enlightenment. Pure Land Buddhism claims to be the remedy to this existential predicament.

Philosophy, Literature and Psychology

In "My History of Readings" (1941) Miki confesses that, influenced by current Japanese humanistic literature, he originally wanted to become a literary writer but through the increase in religious concern and the encounter with a new book, *An Inquiry into the Good* (Nishida 1911/1992), he decided to study philosophy with its author, Kitaro Nishida (1870-1945), at Kyoto University (MKZ 1: p.385, 392). Nevertheless, he maintained the deep interest in literature, and became virtually both a philosopher and a literary critic. His writings contain both elements of philosophy and literature and can be characterized as humanistic in the

original sense of the word.

As a child and adolescent Miki read few books, showing little interest in sentimental or romantic literature. He explains this by saying, “A boy living in the country needs no artificial dream because the earth lets dreams grow in his mind” (ibid., p.370). His special attachment to the earth is important in appreciating his style in literature and philosophy as well as his stance to traditional Japanese culture. Nature was for him not something simply beautiful, either as a landscape or an aesthetic object, but the place for living (ibid., p.373). What he sought in literature was not the fantastic substitute for reality as wish fulfillment but human figures striving for sincere life.

Miki was not satisfied with academic psychology so much. During his study abroad in Europe, as mentioned later, he saw true psychology in the French moralist tradition represented by Montaigne and Pascal because it seemed to aptly grasp the whole person in everyday life. Hegel’s dialectic, too, was for him a psychology in a deeper sense. In “Notes on Human Life” (1938) Miki expects psychology to be not the academic study of mind but a psychological criticism and ordering of human activities and these tasks to be fulfilled neither by scientific psychology nor by current philosophy but by literature (ibid., p.207). Miki did not draw sharp lines between philosophy, psychology and literature. I have found so far no reference to Jung in Miki’s writings. Freud is only briefly mentioned as one of representatives of a stream emphasizing the irrational (MKZ 11: p.185; p.213). But his thoughts seem to be very relevant to depth psychology, as we shall see.

Two Souls

One of important affinities with Jung is Miki’s favorable use of contrasting types and aspiration for their synthesis. Remembering the time of youth, both Miki (MKZ 18: 51, 60) and Jung (Jaffe 1961/1989, p.234) quote the same passage from Goethe’s *Faust*: “Two souls live in my bosom.”

Two souls originally seemed to refer to two personalities called

Number 1 and Number 2 for Jung and literature and philosopher as two options in vocational aspiration for Miki. Then in the course of both men's life, they came to differently mean many opposites: in Jung, good and evil, male and female, conscious and unconscious, personal and collective, inner and outer, rational and irrational, thinking and feeling, sensation and intuition, subjective and objective, religion and science, East and West, and so on; in Miki, spoken philosophy and unspoken philosophy, nature and history, subject and object, logos and pathos, process and moment, organicism and dialectic, immanence and transcendence and so on. The procedure of reconciling two souls was elaborated as a therapeutic method by Jung and as dialectic or the logic of imagination by Miki. The principal organ of uniting two souls, too, was differently named by both men. It is for Jung transcendent function or symbolic attitude that produces symbols as their reconciliation, and for Miki imagination that creates types or forms. Names are different but the basic intention is the same in both men, namely to synthesize opposites into some unified concept on a higher level.

History and individuality as both Miki and Jung's main concerns

History and individuality were Miki's primary concerns throughout his career as a philosopher. They were important for Jung, too. In fact, telling how his study of alchemy began in his autobiography, he writes: "it became clear to me that without history there can be no psychology, and certainly no psychology of the unconscious" (ibid., pp.205-206). And individuation is understood to be the core of neurotic process, and the Jungian psychotherapy consists in the facilitation of it, making the patient more consciously involved in the process.

In Jung, however, the concept of history and individuality remains undifferentiated despite its diversity in the meaning of each. The gulf between suprahistorical concepts in his theory and his deep concern with history on the practical level has not been bridged by his followers. Was history for Jung more than what provides him with evidence of his

assertions? He does not seem to be bothered by basic questions of the philosophy of history such as the relationship between nature and history, or the compatibility of human freedom with being conditioned by natural and historical factors. The Jungian concept of individuation as well needs to be examined more thoroughly. For instance, we would have to raise the questions on the relationship of the individual to the personal and the collective.

In dealing with history and individuality, both Jung and Miki started with the philosophy of German Idealism, especially Kant. However, while Jung saw in Kant a philosophical foundation of his own psychology, Miki's concern was to critically penetrate its intellectual core. It may be worthwhile bringing Jung's psychology back to the intellectual-historical context of German Idealism as his point of departure and elucidating its problems and potentials.

Already in his 1920 and 1921, therefore his earliest papers Miki clearly outlined the perspective of his philosophical enterprise starting with German idealism. He sees in Kant both the completion and overcoming of Enlightenment and examines his [Kant's] understanding of basic problems concerning history and individuality. Quoting Kant's 1786 work: "While the history begins with good because of being the divine work, that of freedom begins with evil because of being the human work" (MKZ 2, p.14), Miki highly estimates him for bringing the element of freedom into the philosophy of history but criticizes the principal inability of his rational and formalistic philosophy to deal with problems of history. In Miki's opinion, history is only possible when an eternal idea individualizes itself as the concrete universal. His budding thoughts are expressed in these illuminating words for overcoming the Kantian dualism that may sound sympathetic for some Jungians: "The individual's freedom and the eternal's freedom embrace each other in darkness deep inside my heart. The irrational and the rational are connected in a more mysterious world. Is that anything but what I really experience?" (ibid., p.44)

Miki finds in teleology as the foundation of aesthetics and biology

proposed in Kant's third critique, *Critique of Judgment*, the point of departure for the post-Kantian development of the philosophy of history in Romantics and Hegel. But he soon becomes aware of facing that basic dilemma between the individual's freedom and the teleological concept of history which was referred to as "cunning of reason" by Hegel. It can be felt as a concern that the individual may become a puppet of history, a reality Miki had to experience in Japan as a totalitarian state during his last years before death.

In Miki's view, individuality begins with the irrationality of the particular, and, as Kant says, the particular cannot be logically deduced from the universal because it loses its particularity the moment it is rationally subjected to general laws and becomes a mere sample of the genre. Miki traces the recognition of this problem back to Leibniz's distinction between eternal truth and factual truth (*ibid.*, pp.121-122).

It is the awareness of limitations of natural sciences that led Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915) to stress the difference in methodology between natural sciences and cultural sciences. He characterized the methodology of the former as nomothetic and that of the latter as idiographic. However, this neo-Kantian dichotomy of nature and history that may be relevant to the academic identity of depth psychology, did not satisfy Miki so much because they were for him not the problem of methodology but that of human existence.

History was for Kant at best something given and contingent while for Miki it is a constituent of the person. With regard to historicity of human being he found Hegel far more satisfying than Kant. By contrast, the young Jung saw in Kant's constructivism a philosophical foundation of his psychology, and Hegel reminds the late Jung of "the megalomaniac language of schizophrenics" (CW Vol. 8: par. 360). Nevertheless, it is worthwhile examining how Jung's psychological thinking belongs to the Hegelian tradition, though we don't discuss here this problem in detail.

Collective or universal?

Miki as a historically and sociologically conscious philosopher would point out the ambiguity in Jung's expression of the collective unconscious. In "The Psychology of the Unconscious" (1942) Jung defines it as "a deeper layer of the unconscious," than the Freudian and Adlerian unconscious, "where the primordial images [later called archetypes] common to humanity lie sleeping" (CW 7, par. 102), "an impersonal or transpersonal unconscious" which is "detached from anything personal and is common to all men" (ibid., par. 103). These words of his suggest that the collective unconscious is something universal, beyond differences of societies.

Yet, the word "collective" usually refers to a group, though far more loosely organized than community and association. Now, collective consciousness is an important sociological concept in Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) which means common beliefs uniting members of traditional or simpler societies. Though I have so far found no passage in Jung's writings where he mentions this concept, it seems to have obviously provided Jung the basis for his coinage of the collective unconscious, making the latter open to social sciences. In fact, Jung, without mentioning Durkheim, draws upon works by his followers such as Marcel Mauss (1872-1950), Henry Hubert (1872-1927) and Lucian Lévy-Brühl (1857-1939) (CW 11, pars.89, 220, 329). But, while for Durkheim society is an organic reality of its own, it is for Jung at best the mass without its own structure and principally reduced to each individual's psyche.

Hayao Kawai (1928-2007), the Japanese first Jungian analyst, further deprived this term "collective" of an implicitly social-scientific potential by translating it into a Japanese expression *fuhenteki-muishiki* (1967) that might be translated back into English as the universal unconscious. I wonder whether there is not something in the unconscious that is not universal but collective, therefore needs to be approached by social sciences, not by *philosophia perennis*.

In fact, Kawai was mainly interested not so much in the universal mind but in the cultural, if not national, identity of Japan (Kawai 1996).

So the universal unconscious for him may have been virtually the Japanese unconscious, not the unconscious of mankind.

How is individuality possible?

Miki would principally agree with the Jungian emphasis on individuation as the goal of psychotherapy and human growth, but point out that in the Jungian system the collective or the universal is not differentiated into the concrete and the abstract like in German Idealism and express the concern that this may lead Jungians to the failure to correctly address a situation he later experienced in the totalitarian state of Japan. Miki notes: "The passion for the abstract gives rise to the consciousness of the individual as the most concrete. This is the secret of human existence. Without the passion for the abstract of mankind a man cannot become a true individual" (MKZ 1, p.243). The meaning of this statement is clear from the current historical situation in which nothing higher was acknowledged than the deified emperor as the embodiment of the state of Japan.

Inspired by Miki, we could say that individuation may vary, depending on the degree and the mode of modernization: in the developed countries, it means the process of counterbalancing the ego by the collective unconscious; in the developing countries, it refers to that of counterbalancing the collective consciousness by the ego; and in totalitarian countries it is principally impossible, perhaps without a miraculous work by some mythical or heroic figure.

Individuality is for Miki not so much a political but the primal ethical problem. In his view, it is accessed neither from sensations nor from the intellect but from imagination. Quoting Goethe's words "Personality is the highest happiness for children of the earth", he even equates it with *eudaemonia* (ibid., p.211), the ultimate ethical concern of which people at the time were not allowed to think of. It is a theme unaddressed by Jung as well.

Heidelberg

In 1922 Miki went to Europe, first to study with Heinrich Rickert (1865-1936), the representative neo-Kantian philosopher in Heidelberg. But nothing new was found in this German philosopher because his philosophy of history lacked the historical consciousness, as later clarified in the 1929 essay "Historicism and History" (MKZ 3, p. 393).

However, it was only during the period of the study abroad, only a few years after the end of the First World War, that Miki directly experienced the reality of world history by knowing the difference in financial situation between Japan and Germany. Suffering from postwar inflation, German scholars were willing to be hired as private tutors for Miki and other Japanese students.

Karl Mannheim (1893-1947), a Jewish Marxist exile from Hungary, for example, gave Miki private lessons on historicism as well as Max Scheler (1874-1928), the founder of the sociology of knowledge and philosophical anthropology. Miki's 1929 criticism of Scheler's essentialism and his dichotomy of sociology and history as static (MKZ 10, pp.12) is obviously based on Mannheim's 1925 writing "The problem of sociology of history" (Wolff 1971). Their criticism may be fruitfully applied to Jung's psychology.

It is very likely that Mannheim, a friend of Gyorgy Lukacs (1885-1971) as the founder of Western or humanistic Marxism, got him equipped with the theoretical basis for the confrontation and collaboration with socialists after his return to Japan. Miki's unique humanistic or anthropological reformulations of Marxism (MKZ 3) would have been impossible without Mannheim's influences. Four years after the publication of his main work: *Ideology and Utopia* (1929), Mannheim was dismissed as professor in Frankfurt and moved to London. He was the first Jew that occurred to Miki when he knew persecutions of Jews in Germany (MKZ 1, pp.417-8).

The author whose writings Miki studied most intensively in Heidelberg was Max Weber (1864-1920) who had died just a few years ago. It may be added that, studying with Rickert and Jaspers, Erich Fromm

(1900-1980), a student of Alfred Weber (1868-1958), promoted in 1922 with the dissertation on diaspora and was trained to become a psychoanalyst through Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1889-1957) in Heidelberg. But I have found no evidence for Miki's contact with Fromm.

In sum, it may be during the stay in Heidelberg that Miki acquired the basis for the social-scientific way of seeing things and got ready to engage in activities after the return to Japan.

Heidegger and his disciples in Marburg

In the fall of 1923 Miki, advised by Rickert, moved to Marburg to study with Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) four years before the publication of *Being and Time* (1927). Heidegger, fascinating Miki with his very unique reading of Aristotle, suggested him the intimate link of the philosophy of history and Aristotle and advised him to study them with Hans Georg-Gadamer (1900-2002). Miki later in 1930 founded the Japanese Association for Plato and Aristotle Studies, and in 1929, 1935 and 1938 published three books on Aristotle (MKZ 9). It is not exaggerate to say that studies of Greek philosophy in Japan began with Miki.

Due to his early death, Miki seems to have mainly understood Heidegger as an existential philosopher, not as a thinker of Being, and criticized in 1930 the latter's subjectivism without social awareness (MKZ 10, pp. 83-90) and in 1933 his affiliation with Nazis as the loss of reason or Logos (MKZ 10, pp. 310-320).

Karl Löwith (1897-1973), Heidegger's assistant of the same age as Miki, and a Jewish scholar, introduced Miki into the vast world of German intellectual history. He was later to teach in Japan (1936-1941) and then further had to move to New York.

Studying Pascal's Conception of Human Being

In August 1924 Miki further left Marburg and moved to Paris. Mostly staying in his room there, he was absorbed in the study of the French moralist tradition, especially Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) by making use of Heidegger's approach.

Soon after the return to Japan in 1926, he published his first book: *Studies of Human Being in Pascal* (MKZ 1), a monumental work as the first book from existential outlook in Japan.

This work is indeed the result from the application of what Miki learned from Heidegger in Marburg to the early modern French philosopher's thoughts both in method and in content. Miki claims human being to be studied neither by (scientific) explanation nor by (phenomenological) description but by interpretation. Hermeneutics for him consists in the mutual references of basic experiences and concepts. He distinguishes Pascal's and his own anthropology from psychology by rejecting the objectification of human being and regarding the human soul as the specifically human mode of being.

Human phenomena are only understood in terms of existential temporality. While burdened with the past, and planning the future, humans are mostly involved in present *divertissements*, forgetting themselves and becoming anonymous.

It is not so difficult to list correspondences in thought between Pascal as understood by Miki and Heidegger as follows:

Pascal	Heidegger
human conditions	thrownness
<i>divertissements</i>	inauthenticity
misery	anxiety
honesty	authenticity
wager	anticipation

Pascal as understood by Miki, however, slightly and yet significantly differs from Heidegger. His main concern is not so much Being in itself but human being, in other words, not ontology but anthropology, though the two are inseparable.

Miki agrees with Pascal's view that man is a being in the intermediate between all and nothing, or angels and beasts, and that "*le juste-milieu*", the right intermediate, is not the given but something to be found out (ibid., p.18), a point sounding more Jungian than Heideggeri-

an.

There is a subtle difference: While Pascal sees humans being suspended between two poles, convinced of the reality of both transcendence and nothingness, Jung sees opposites within one's mind.

But let me quote another sentence from Pascal which sounds Jungian, appealing to Miki: "What one seeks in the outer world is the prototype of beauty in one's mind" (*ibid.*, p.90), an explanation of falling into love with the opposite sex, what Jungians would call the projection of anima or animus.

Miki notes that Pascal interprets human existence in the dialectic way (*ibid.*, p.153). In Pascal's view, the concrete truth is only reached through the discontinuous ascension of awareness between opposites. From the awareness of misery or smallness concealed in *divertissements* comes that of greatness. As Pascal says, human being is only a reed, but a thinking reed.

Miki as a Hegel scholar adds an important note that dialectic derives from the structure of human existence. In two 1929 essays on Hegel, Miki clarifies that, far from being a mere methodology only to be applied to actual studies, dialectic is the description of how things unfold themselves, quoting Hegel: "This method is in itself contents" (MKZ 2, p.221). He even writes that Hegel's logic is "a psychology in the deeper sense, not the logic of the understanding but that of the heart" (MKZ 3, p.102)

So for Miki, logic, ontology and psychology are inseparable. He later tried to combine Pascal's dialectic with Hegelian and Marxist dialectic to forge the unique logic of imagination. It would be fruitful to ask whether Jung's psychology is a dialectic or not, or what kind of dialectic it is.

Studies of Marxism

When Miki returned to Japan in 1925, his country had been finding its way to a capitalist and even imperialistic state in East Asia, competing for the market with developed Western countries and facing many

domestic labor disputes. Socialist parties were going to be organized, and proletarian trends dominant in Japanese literature. Sensitively responding to the current historical situation, Miki began to study Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872) and Karl Marx (1818-1883), and published three books (MKZ 3) one after another. Chapters of each book are as follows:

The Materialistic Concept of History (1928): “A Marxist form of anthropology”, “Marxism and materialism”, “Pragmatism and Marxism” and “Hegel and Marx.”

Preliminary Concepts of Social Sciences (1929): “The structure of a question”, “Basic concepts of hermeneutic phenomenology”, “Tasks in the critique of sciences”, “Theory, history and policy”, “Organicism and dialectic” and “Materialism and its actual forms.”

The Morphology of Ideas (1931): “Historicism and history”, “The structure of epistemology”, “Formal logic and dialectic”, “Limitations and leaps in the development of sciences” and “The social determination of natural sciences.”

These three books are the first philosophical examination of Marxism in Japan, and, as clearly seen from their chapter titles, cover almost all basic problems of this controversial thought.

Features in Miki’s approach to Marxism

Without becoming a Marxist, Miki only defended Marxism from his belief that “any thought moving people and driving history must have some truth” (MKZ 18, p.100). His stance as a philosopher of history is clearly formulated in his words, “Only the consciousness of this age is the actual consciousness for us” (MKZ 3, p.37), a reformulation of existentialist standpoint by integrating historical dimension or even historicist perspective, maybe influenced not so much by Heidegger but by Mannheim.

In “A Marxist form of anthropology” (1927), Miki offers several important concepts: basic experience, logos, anthropology and ideology (ibid., pp.5-19). Each historical era has its own basic experience, a set of experiences not ruled by, but leading, demanding and producing logos,

which in turn involves speaking in society, the public domain. Anthropology as the primary logos expresses basic experience, being the self-understanding of humans in the era. One anthropology, when in contradiction with human life, must be replaced by another. The secondary logos is ideology, and the change in it is mediated by anthropology.

Note two things: One is that Miki maintains his critical stance by treating Marxism as one of ideologies. That is why, while encouraging Proletarian literature as reflecting experiences of have-nots at the time, he warned against the poor and stereotyped depiction of characters in preference to a certain political ideology.

Another thing to be noted is that the base structure in Miki's system is not the socio-economic structure as in orthodox Marxism but basic experience and anthropology, non-Marxist concepts. He seems to share with Mannheim the stance of maintaining the aspiration for both idealism and materialism. He refuses to agree with the Marxist view that religion will vanish in a classless society. We might find in Miki's stance to Marxism a clue to the unfolding of Jungian psychology in a way that integrates social sciences. In the early 1930s the concept of basic experience came to be replaced by the Greek word, *pathos*, with which logos is dialectically united in the logic of imagination.

Reconsidering alchemy

It may be worthwhile comparing these concepts in Miki with Jung's remarks on experiences during "The confrontation with the unconscious" as "*prima materia*" and his subsequent "supplements and clarifications" (Jaffé 1989, p.199). He obviously treats the former as primary and the latter as secondary. Miki would reject this Romantic conception in Jung and, as a dialectical philosopher, see both experiences and their elaborations equally interacting with each other. And this viewpoint seems to help us more correctly appreciate Jung's works as well as the nature of alchemy.

In "Marxism and materialism" (1927), quoting Marx, "*das Bewusstsein* (consciousness, or rather literally being conscious) can never be

anything but *das bewusste Sein*, (the being that is conscious)” (MKZ 3, p.48) Miki deconstructs the idealistic concept of consciousness. He suggests that “material” in Marxism, far from being a pure matter, may be a hermeneutic concept referring to work as human interactions in the world, an idea that may correct Jung’s psychologistic interpretation of alchemy. As is the case with psychotherapy, alchemy was not so much a lonely work of an alchemist but his collaboration with his female attendant called *sorror mystica*.

The idea of “projection” Jung uses to explain the psychological nature of alchemy derives from Feuerbach (1849/1969). As one of Hegel’s followers, he became the initiator of the criticism of religion, the precursor of Marxism and the antecedent to depth psychology of Freud, Adler and Jung by regarding Christianity as projections of interpersonal feelings such as love and friendship. Miki quotes Marx: “The image of lonely hunters and fishermen imagined by Adam Smith and David Ricardo belongs to the eighteenth century fantasy without imagination” (ibid., 50).

History, along with hermeneutics, is for Miki a destructive method (ibid., 53) because it reveals different notions of consciousness in different eras. What we are now witnessing is, in his view, the degeneration of the meaning of consciousness from our emancipator into our spellbinder (ibid., p.55).

Interestingly enough, in “Spiritual problems of modern man” (1928) published approximately in the same period as Miki’s paper, Jung speaks of something apparently corresponding to the reversal of consciousness in its nature. He defines modern man as “one whose existence demands the maxim of consciousness and the minimum of unconsciousness” (ibid., par. 149). Yet, he points out the possibility that the most intensive consciousness of modern man may become its opposite, what Heraclitus called *enantiodromia*. (CW 10, par. 164). That sounds like what dialecticians refer to as the leap from the quantity to the qualitative.

But the affinity may be only superficial. On the one hand, Jung in-

deed admits the mutual reversal of consciousness and the unconscious, but still remains in the sphere of psychology. Miki, on the other, proposes to replace consciousness by logos because language, its original meaning in Ancient Greece, is the only actual consciousness in society (MKZ 3, p.56). He stresses that consciousness, essentially conditioned by society and history, never loses its relative autonomy as a form of institution. So Miki would paraphrase the goal of psychoanalysis or depth psychology in general, expressed in “bringing the unconscious to consciousness”, into the goal of humanism: bringing pathos to logos to create a form.

Clarifications of Miki’s own standpoint during arrest

With the onset of the World Depression in 1929, agrarian and labor disputes increased, and the government reinforced the control and punishment of all the movements against national polity with the Maintenance of Public Order Law revised in 1928, organizing special political police.

In May 1930, Miki was arrested due to the suspicion that he had offered money to the Japanese Communist Party illegal at that time and was detained about half a year until November. In a note submitted to the attorney general during the detention, Miki clarified his standpoint by distinguishing it from Marxism, and claimed that it had been consistent from the beginning of his career. He also offers a noteworthy statement that dialectic cannot give a prediction but a prospect of the future, and therefore is not suitable as a methodology of natural sciences, and that leap in it suggests the existence of what cannot be predicted nor reduced to quantities. This concept of leap in dialectic would be interpreted by Jungians as becoming conscious of the unconscious, though not toward time immemorial but toward the future.

Japan during Miki’s last fifteen years

In appreciating Miki’s brilliant activities as a philosopher and a social critic for his last fifteen years from the release from one prison until

his death in another prison, its historical background must not be overlooked: this one and a half decades, the 1930s and the early 1940s, belong to one of the darkest, the most problematic periods in the history of Japan. This period began with the expansion of Japanese militarism to the invasion of Asia and ended with the occupation of Japan by the allied powers. The steps to the catastrophe of Japan are briefly sketched as follows.

In 1932 Japan occupied Manchuria, the north-eastern region of China, and established Manchukuo as its puppet state. In October 1932, Prof. Takigawa was dismissed from the Law School of Kyoto Imperial University due to the charge that his thoughts on civil strife and adultery in his book were anarchistic. So the target of the governmental oppression of freedom was extended from Marxists to liberalists, from people's movements to academy. In March 1933 Japan withdrew from the League of Nations. In February 26, 1936 a group of young commissioned officers attempted a coup d'état in Tokyo, killing many ministers, without any elaborated agenda except the realization of emperor-centered politics. It was unsuccessful but accelerated a runaway military which in turn forced Japan to be more involved in the invasion of Asia. In 1937 the Second Sino-Japanese War began. In April 1938 the National General Mobilization Act was enacted. Japan concluded in September 1940 a military alliance with Nazis Germany and Fascist Italy, and then in April 1941 a neutrality treaty with the Soviet Union. In December 1941, Japan finally rushed into a desperate war with the allied powers by attacking Pearl Harbor. This war lasted five years until dropping of atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Miki's public activities during his last fifteen years

Jung was in Switzerland, a country uninvolved in the war, seeking to find in alchemy, Faust and Wotan the psychological origin of German problem and talked in the Eranos conference with leading intellectuals all over the world about basic problems behind the war. What did Miki do and write in Japan during these awful years?

The 1930 detention neither converted Miki to nationalism or to Romanticism nor made him silent like many other arrested intellectuals. Still in May 1933 Miki could issue with his colleagues a remonstrance against Nazi's burning of books written by Jewish intellectuals. In July of the same year, he organized the Federation for Academic Freedom, protesting Nazism in Germany and Fascism in Italy as well as the increasing governmental control of speech and publication in Japan.

What options were viable for Miki in this hard period to maintain his integrity and to take responsibility as an intellectual in the totalitarian state? Like most intellectuals at the time in Japan, he had no place in which to find a refuge. Antiwar movement was virtually impossible. Miki chose two ways. One was trying to enlighten people and the state by remaining active in Japan. Another was the philosophical or rather moralist contemplation on human life.

From 1934 till 1943 Miki was frequently invited to give lectures, participate in public discussions and write for magazines and newspapers essays and columns on various sectors of life including politics, culture, education and others.

In November 1936, Showa-kenkyukai, a group for studying national policy for the reform of Japan was organized by those anti-Fascist intellectuals who had expected Fumimaro Konoe, a seemingly liberal aristocrat, to be the next prime minister, and Miki was one of its key members. Instead of explicitly opposing to Japan's behavior toward China, he argued that it was only justified when his country had solved its domestic problems, and, in respecting each nation's culture, positively produced the common benefit and served the world history beyond each nation's profit. By doing so, he hoped to make the government control the army's behavior in China. But he was too optimistic.

Under the increasing pressure from the army and the right wing, Prime Minister Konoe was not strong enough to stop or at least limit the war. In November 1940, Showa-kenkyu-kai was virtually resolved into the Taisei-yokusan-kai, an all-nation society newly founded for cooperating with the government in the war, and Miki had to become the

director of its cultural department. Though Miki continued to actively make critical statements thereafter as well, he was clearly forced to function as an ideologue of Japanese fascism in some of his public writings especially after the onset of the war with the allied powers. In the discourse there he was not different at all from nationalists he had severely criticized.

And finally in March 1945, he was arrested again for the charge that he had harbored a suspect of the violation of the Maintenance of Public Order Law, and died in the prison due to a poor sanitary condition forty days after the end of the war.

Pathos and the logic of imagination

Miki's intellectual standpoint behind his energetic activities during these hard years can be called humanism, the philosophy of history, anthropology and the logic of imagination. In him they were almost interchangeable, though the expression "humanism" only appeared in the 1930s, mainly in confrontation with Fascism.

Miki agrees with Scheler's view that in our age it has been no more self-evident what it is to be a human (MKZ 5, p.229), but criticizes him because of the lack of historicity in his anthropology. However, Miki was also dissatisfied with the Marxist conception of human being simply in terms of social and political conditions (MKZ 10, p.303).

Facing the upheaval of the irrational in totalitarianism such as Fascism and communism, he came to acknowledge an independent realm of the inner world by newly adopting the Greek word pathos as the opposite of logos which had been used since the 1920s. Logos and pathos respectively refer to objectivity and subjectivity, or the rational and the irrational. Human being is now understood to be the dialectical unity of logos and pathos.

Refusing to agree with Brentano and Husserl's phenomenological view that every consciousness has its intentional object, Miki writes in 1933 that deep pathos is consciousness without any object, leading to the encounter with nothingness and that it is the origin of myths. In his

view, the transcendence of consciousness takes place in two directions: outward and inward, and pathos is consciousness transcending inward (MKZ 11, p.208). Careful readers will note its resemblance to the Jungian idea of the introversion of libido.

When Miki even writes: “Such an objectless pathos is not seen as consciousness but rather as the unconscious. It is art that gives an expression to this objectless pathos” (ibid., p.213), he seems to be very close to depth psychology. He identifies pathos with psychology depicted in literature, and regards the analysis of the relationship between pathos and language as the task of literature criticism. Further, opposing the Kantian rationalist ethics and echoing Schopenhauer and Wagner, he sees the foundation of ethics in inter-subjective connection through pathos (ibid., p.192).

Miki does not fail to point out, however, that pathos becomes one-sided and pathological in the negative sense unless it is dialectically united with logos (ibid., p.200).

This dialectical union is not accomplished by reason or sensations alone but by imagination, which in turn leads to the creation of a new type or a new form, the goal of humanism as the defense of human dignity. In *Notes on Human Life* Miki writes: “Egoists don’t look ruthless because of the lack of love or sympathy but because of the lack of imagination. Thus, imagination is so basic to human life. It is not reason but imagination that distinguishes humans from animals. What were love without imagination?” (MKZ 1, p.291)

Finally, I conclude my talk by showing points where Miki’s philosophy seem to be promising in further developing Jung’s psychology or psychology in general in these points:

- (1) it makes Jungian psychology more conscious of historicity
- (2) it avoids psychological reductionism by viewing imagination not only as the central faculty of psychology but as a constituent of social reality
- (3) it provides the anthropological and ontological foundation for the link of psychology with ethics.

References

- Feuerbach, Ludwig (1849/1969), *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam.
- Kawai, Hayao (1967), *Jungu-shinrigaku Nyūmon [An Introduction to Jungian Psychology]*, Tokyo: Baifukan.
- Kawai, Hayao (1996), *The Japanese Psyche*, Spring Publications.
- Jaffe, Aniela (1961/1989), *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Miki, Kiyoshi (1954), *Jinsei-ron Noto [Notes on Human Life]*, Tokyo: Shincho-bunko.
- Miki, Kiyoshi (1967), *Miki Kiyoshi Zenshu [Complete Works of Kiyoshi Miki]*, in 20 volumes, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Nishida, Kitaro (1911/1992), *An Inquiry into the Good*, Yale University Press.
- Nagatomo, Shigenori (1995), *A Philosophical Foundation of Miki Kiyoshi's Concept of Humanism*, Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Parkes, Graham (ed.) (1987), *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, University of Hawaii Press.
- Towle, P., Kosuge, M. and Kibata, Y.(eds.) (2000), *Japanese Prisoners of War*, London: Hambledon Press.
- Townsend, Suzan (2009), *Miki Kiyoshi 1897-1945: Japan's Itinerant Philosopher*, London: Brill Academic Pub.
- Wolff, K.H. (1971), *From Karl Mannheim*, New York: Oxford University Press.

以上は、2009年7月にイギリスのカーディフ大学で開催された国際ユング学会 (The International Association of Jungian Studies) における筆者の講演原稿、The Quest for the Unity of the Inner and the Outer in Jung and Mikiに加筆修正を施したものである。

