

# Takeuchi, Keiichi

---

## Strategies of Heterodox Researchers in the National School of Geography and Their Roles in Shifting Paradigms in Geography

---

Organon 20 21, 277-286

---

1984 1985

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



*Keiichi Takeuchi* (Japan)

STRATEGIES OF HETERODOX RESEARCHERS  
IN THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS OF GEOGRAPHY AND THEIR  
ROLES IN SHIFTING PARADIGMS IN GEOGRAPHY

In Japan, as in any other civilisation, geography has existed from ancient times, whether in the shape of chorographical description, or in the shape of an environmentalist interpretation of the phenomena of the earth's surface, or in the sense of the consideration of spatial organisation. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, after the introduction of geography in the Western sense, either through material obtained directly at the source or through Chinese writings on Western geography, the term *chiri* had begun to be used by intellectuals (literally, it means the "logic" or "pattern" of the earth's surface). The usage of this term became common after the Meiji Restoration, especially after the establishment of the compulsory education system in 1877. At this point, the role of geography in the school curriculum came to be considered an important one. This was partly because it served to awaken a sense of national identification on the part of the Japanese people but partly, also, because it brought up the viewpoint whereby Japan was observed in a relativist perspective, especially in comparison with advanced industrialised countries; hence, it inspired the people with the necessity of modernising their own country. Thus, in the second half of the nineteenth century, numerous geographical writings with this purpose in mind were published. The necessity for the formation of geography teachers resulted in the establishment of geography institutions of higher education and, also, the publication of geographical textbooks of higher-education level.

Should we use the term "national school of geography", we generally mean it to refer to a group of geographers having common characteristics based on (1) The sharing in common of cultural circumstances pertaining to the nation-state; (2) institutional frames proper to a nation-state; and (3) human relationships within a geographical circle in a given nation-state, especially a circle operating under the aegis of prominent maestri. We can con-

firm the establishment of the Japanese school of geography at the turn of the century, when specialised course in geography and chairs of geography were established at institutions of university level. This newly established orthodoxy of academic geography was characterised by (1) The introduction and adaptation of the Western geography of the day, hence the predominance of environmentalist interpretations; (2) unlike the case of earlier authors of geographical works, an apparent formal detachment from direct involvement in the encouragement of a nationalist sentiment; and (3) a strong self-awareness on the part of the geographers of their positions as academicians. They worked for the establishment of academic geography in Japan and, partly because of the teacher's license examination system, their publications, which were considered authoritative, enjoyed a large commercial success (most of these academic geographers were members of the examiners' commission for the teacher's licence examination) and gave rise to a large number of geographical technical terms or academic jargon.

Numerous studies on these geographers, who comprised the first generation of the academic geographers of Japan, are to be found, and the large contribution made by them towards the prosperity of geography in Japan cannot be denied. However, from the viewpoint of the reexamination of the history of modern geography in Japan, some researchers in the history of geographical thought are now taking notice of certain figures who, while they lived or at least while they worked most actively, were considered heterodox researchers or "outsiders". Some of them were pioneers in modern geography in Japan and achieved a high degree of systematisation in geography comparable to that achieved by later researchers in academic geography who had easier access to source materials and equipment. Some of them developed a geography which, in the beginning, was considered heterodox or at least original but which came to be recognised in the end as a pioneering achievement in the circles of academic or orthodox geography.

In the volume *Languages, Paradigms and Schools in Geography: Japanese Contributions to the History of Geographical Thought II*, Mr Tsujita traces an outline of Japanese geography in the nineteenth century and mentions Yukichi Fukuzawa, Shigetaka Shiga, Kanzo Uchimura and Bunjiro Koto among Meiji period writers of geographical works. According to my classification, Koto should be considered one of the founders of academic geography in Japan, though his main interest was geology. For Yukichi Fukuzawa, geographical writings constituted an instrument by means of which emphasis could be laid on the necessity of modernisation according to the Western mode. For Shigetaka Shiga, geographical knowledge and the geographical viewpoint were to be utilised as a means of expressing his nationalistic ideology but, at the same time he recognised the importance of geography as a scientific discipline in education and other applied fields, as in the age of colonisation schemes. Geography for Kanzo Uchimura was a somewhat

different proposition compared with that for Shiga, though these two writers belonged to the same generation and were both graduates of the Sapporo Agronomical College. Fundamentally, Uchimura recognised the validity of geography in the practical or applied field, i.e., in economic activities, but he did not share the nationalist sentiments of Shiga. Except for Koto, the geographers examined by Tsujita were neither academic geographers nor outsider or heterodox researchers because they did not aim at constructing geography as a scientific discipline *per se*.

Among the first of the outsider or heterodox geographers, I would like here to point first of all to Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (1871–1944). He published three important geographical books, the *Jinsei chirigaku* (*Geography of Human Life*) in 1903, *Kyoju no togochushin to shite no kyodoka kenkyu* (*Study of the Homeland as the Centre of Integrated Teaching*) in 1912, and *Chirikyoku no hoho to naiyo no kenkyu* in 1916. He graduated from the Teacher's Training College in Hokkaido in 1893 and in 1896 passed the examination for teachers of geography at middle schools. It was while teaching at the Hokkaido Teacher's Training College that he wrote the draft of *Jinsei chirigaku*. In 1901, he left Hokkaido to come to Tokyo where he worked mainly as a school teacher, and was always interested in the problem of geographical education. *Jinsei chirigaku* was published with a foreword by Shigetaka Shiga and was highly recommended by the latter. Shiga was then a famous writer on political and international problems; he also expatiated a great deal on the beauty of the Japanese landscape in that blend of patriotic pride and aesthetic appreciation of nature peculiar to the time. According to him, the "*Geography of Human Life* is a systematic exposition on the interrelationships between natural phenomena and phenomena concerning human life on the earth's surface". In effect, therefore, this 995-page book is the first systematic treatment of human geography in Japan. (The original manuscript was much longer and Makiguchi shortened it to about half the original length at the suggestion of Shiga.)

Makiguchi discovered new fields of research in human geography in various papers and books written in Japanese and involving fields other than geography. He was not proficient in foreign languages; perhaps he was able to read English but it is improbable that he actually read the German literature which he cites as reference works in his book. Nevertheless, this work treated numerous topics that were new at the time and that are also interesting from the present-day viewpoint of the system of geography; for instance, in the chapter on agricultural geography, he introduces J. H. von Thünen's locational model and, in the chapter on manufacturing industries, he presents considerations based on the locational viewpoint later systematised by A. Weber. It is necessary to remark that, if from a somewhat functionalist viewpoint, he gave great weight to the subject of urban settlements and that, where rural settlements were concerned, he presented a pertinent morphological typology. Topics such as these were rarely to be found in

contemporary geography textbooks in Western countries, and only later came to be recognised as themes pertaining to human geography.

The publication of Makiguchi's book took place over several years; in 1903 alone, the first edition was printed three times and in 1908, on the occasion of the eighth printing, it underwent considerable revision by the author. By 1914, it had been printed eleven times. We may, therefore, conclude that, as a publication, this work had considerable success; at the same time, it was rarely referred to by newly emerging academic geographers of that time. In academic journals, the only favourable review was that written by Takuji Ogawa in the geographical journal *Chirigaku zasshi*, Vol. XVI, No. 181. of the Tokyo Geographical Society. The book review commences with a reference to Shiga's preface to Makiguchi's book; it was chiefly because Shiga had written the preface that Ogawa wrote the review. Since the book sold well, we can only suppose that the greater part of its readers consisted of elementary school teachers, especially those who aspired to a teacher's license for teaching at middle school. Makiguchi himself perhaps did not think that he would be accepted in academic geographical circles and his later years were dedicated to the developing of a new teaching methodology applicable not only to geography but to other fields of study as well. In 1930, he founded the Soka Kyoiku Gakkai, literally, the Association for Creative Education, origin of the present Soka Gakkai, a comparatively new, militant Buddhist sect which today exerts a considerable social and political influence in Japan.

Judging from the career of Makiguchi and the geography he evolved, we can confirm that, in spite of the immense value of his works, particularly the *Jinsei chirigaku*, his influence on the academic geography of Japan was negligible for the following reasons. Firstly, in introducing Western geography or new geographical analyses, he did not refer himself to original sources but mainly fell back on secondary or tertiary material, comprised of writings in Japanese. Secondly, merely because of what was considered the insignificance of his social position as a lowly teacher at the elementary school level, his work was, officially, ignored by academic scholars and geography students of institutions of higher learning, although we cannot be sure that they did not, unofficially, read his work. Thirdly, though at the age of thirty-three, he had pioneered in the forming of a system of human geography, he later devoted himself mainly to the consideration of teaching methods in general and no longer pursued geographical research either in empirical or in theoretical fields. In a certain sense, his case is the tragedy of a man of brilliant ability and advanced geographical thought who was, nonetheless, outside the academic institution at the period of the institutionalisation of geography or the formation of the national school of geography.

Michitoshi Odauchi (1875-1954) was one of the first graduates of the history and geography courses at the Tokyo Higher Normal School; these courses constituted the highest level geographical education in Japan at

the time (1899). While a student, he was interested in history but, in Waseda Middle School, where he obtained a post after graduation from the higher Normal School, he was assigned to teach geography: hence, his formation as a geographer came about as a result of his having to teach geography. Upon consideration from the viewpoint of his proper interest, i.e., history, he found that the geographical textbooks then in use did not satisfy him; he felt that they attributed too much importance to physical geography and to an environmental determinist methodology, ignoring social and historical factors. In 1902, he published, under the joint authorship of the Association of Geographical Studies, a textbook of geography for middle school readers. As he wrote later, during the period of the preparation of this textbook, he was greatly inspired by Inazo Nitobe's *Nogyo honron (Fundamentals of Agronomy)*, published in 1898 and which introduced the work of A. Meitzen with considerable precision.

According to Nitobe's autobiography, Odauchi visited Nitobe's house for the first time in 1902 or 1903 and this was the start of a close association. Subsequently, Odauchi came under the influence of not only Nitobe but of other folklorists, including Kunio Yanagita who later came to be considered the founder of the Japanese folklore school, members of which gathered regularly for study meetings at Nitobe's house. It is also interesting to remark that Tsunesaburo Makiguchi also frequented the study meetings at that period and, in fact, they met each other at Nitobe's home and, together joined the research trips of the folklorist group in 1910's.

Unlike Makiguchi, Odauchi consulted foreign publications in the original language, and, according to the autobiographical writings, around 1915, he read Patrick Geddes and through him began to be influenced by the Le Play School. On the other hand, he dedicated a great deal of time to field research in various parts of Japan, and the *Waga kokudo (Our Country, Japan)*, mostly based on his own field research, constituted an epoch-making regional geography of Japan. In 1914, he was responsible for the compilation of *Toshi to sonraku (Towns and Villages)* which included some of his own writings. This was the first scientific work on settlement geography in Japan and contained translations of foreign geographical material as well as treatises by Japanese scholars. However, among the contributors to this volume, where both the writing of original papers and the translating of foreign papers were concerned, besides Odauchi himself, the only geographer was Goro Ishibashi, then head of the Department of Geography, Kyoto Imperial University. A perusal of these works enables us to understand easily just why Odauchi was ready to be influenced by Geddes and the Le Play School.

From 1914, Odauchi was a lecturer, though not on a permanent basis, conducting courses in human or settlement geography in private universities such as Waseda University or Keio University, in Tokyo. Thus he was not completely outside the academic circle and, in fact, in 1916, he passed from

Waseda Middle School to the Research Institute of Okura upon the recommendation of Naomasa Yamazaki, then professor of geography at the Imperial University of Tokyo and the Tokyo Higher Normal School. Naomasa Yamazaki who, later in 1915, founded the Department of Geography of the Imperial University of Tokyo, also wrote the preface to Odauchi's book, *Teito to kinko (Tokyo and Its Environs)*. With his background of pioneering studies in settlement geography and the field research he carried out actively in Japan, Korea and China, he was admitted to academic circles and contributed to various academic journals. He was, moreover, a member of the Association of Japanese Geographers from its inception in 1925 and attended the international geographical congress in 1931 at Paris and in 1934 at Warsaw. Hence, we are justified in considering him a representative Japanese geographer of the time, though he never occupied a chair of geography in a university and never had any students or disciples in the sense of forming a school. His influence made itself felt only through his publications and some personal contacts with a limited number of other geographers who were interested in human geography. Only in the period after World War II, when he was more than seventy years old, did his writings begin to be appreciated by a broader range of geographers, especially the younger generation of geographical scholars of that period. In spite of his advanced age, he wrote actively at this time, criticising the natural science-oriented orthodoxy of Japanese geography and insisting on the validity of the application of geography in regional development policies and, also, in social studies in school curricula. It is perhaps symbolic that he appreciated Koji Iizuka's works which were published and wielded considerable influence, ideologically speaking, on human geography in Japan after World War II. In 1955, Odauchi died suddenly in a traffic accident. Iizuka eulogised him in an article in the *Geographical Review of Japan (Chirigaku hyoron)*, organ of the Association of Japanese Geographers. Iizuka, at least before the end of World War II, was considered an outsider geographer, as was Odauchi. Although Odauchi was a pioneer of scientific geographical studies, especially in the field of settlement geography, and stimulated studies in human geography, the true value of his works became recognised on a broad basis only after World War II, due to his basic position "outside" the academy.

As explained in my paper "Two Outsiders: An Aspect of Modern Academic Geography in Japan", two geographers, Ryujiro Ishida (1904–1979) and Koji Iizuka (1906–1970) were academic geographers in the sense that they belonged to academic institutions; but from the point of view of their scientific stance, both were considered "outsiders" prior to the end of World War II. Unlike Odauchi, who because of his advanced age and sudden death, was not able to exercise leadership in the formation of new orientations in geography in Japan after World War II, Ishida and Iizuka, both about

thirty years younger than Odauchi, succeeded in a certain sense in creating a new orthodoxy in Japanese geography. We are able to find certain similarities between these two geographers. (1) They began their academic activities in the prewar period with the assurance of subsequently receiving an academic position. Their influence was rather limited at this early period but, by exercising discretion, they succeeded in promulgating their ideas without provoking already established geographers; (2) partly due to their discrete strategies, and partly because of the inconsistency of their criticism of the totalitarian regime of militarist Japan, they did not manifest a clear and radical stance against the oppression of scientific research during World War II. In this sense, perhaps, Iizuka was the more aware of the two of the cultural and socio-political circumstances of that time; (3) their opinions and viewpoints had mostly been formed during World War II, but it was only after the war that their influence on the new developments in Japanese geography became explicit and affected the postwar generation of geographers; (4) they formed, respectively, new schools of geography centering around themselves, but their influence reached others through channels other than lectures at any one university: hence, their schools had an inter-university aspect. While they maintained little personal contact, they shared a number of viewpoints in common, i.e., against environmental determinism, a progressive or left-wing stance in political ideology, similar observations regarding the indigenous tradition of geographical thought, and so on. An ideological emphasis on the dangers of eurocentricism was stronger in the case of Iizuka; (5) from these common features of the two maestri, it was natural that the two schools over which they respectively presided shared common elements in the shape of the scholars who now constitute a number of the mainstream scholars in Japanese geography; and (6) they greatly contributed towards the revolutionising of the mainstream in postwar Japanese geography. Nevertheless, they fundamentally remained within the framework of classical modern geography, i.e., relying on the paradigm of environmentalism in the tradition of Ratzel on to Vidal de la Blache and under the strong influence of Darwinism. At the same time, they also maintained a more or less holistic view of the man-nature relationship or *l'unité terrestre*. Utilising the terminology of the social sciences, Ishida and Iizuka were able to exercise a strong and effective influence among both geographers of the old school and of the younger generation of geographers of the time who harboured in common a kind of inferiority complex with regard to the humanities and social sciences, disciplines they were not familiar with, in their formation as geographers.

Naturally, there were also differences between these two geographers; for instance, Ishida adhered until the day of his death to the idea of being a geographer *per se*, while Iizuka exercised the stronger influence on the trends among postwar Japanese geographers who adhered less strongly to the idea of being geographers. In fact, Iizuka's followers were diverse, and



included specialists in social and economic history, folklore studies, intellectual history, and so on.

Our appraisal of the above four geographers leads us to certain conclusions. (1) The close relationship between the establishment of the institutional framework and the development of the scientific content of geography. The establishment of geography in the academy or in research and higher educational institutions derived, both directly and indirectly, from the development of school geography. The best of the human elements in school geography, such as Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, early dedicated themselves to work in the field of school geography and were thus engaged at the time of the establishment of academic geography in Japan. In this sense, Makiguchi's contributions to the development of modern geography is extremely important but, for this same reason, his proper position remained an outside one with regard to the academy; and he himself never complained of this situation. (2) Although differences existed between Department of Geography in the Faculty of Letters of the Imperial University of Kyoto and the departments of Geography in the Faculties of Natural Science in the Universities of Tokyo, they shared in common an environmentalist paradigm; and criticism of a classical geography of this sort came mostly from outsider geographers who had been trained in other disciplines, or at least those who were familiar with non-geographical disciplines. In the case of Odauchi, the disciplines other than geography with which he was involved were agronomy and folklore; in the case of Iizuka, it was the economic sciences and in the case of Ishida it was history and the humanities. (3) It should be noted that, even in the time now past when academic outsider geographers were particularly singled out for being outsiders, some aspects of their studies earned them the appreciation and respect of orthodox academic circles. For instance, Naomasa Yamazaki, the first head of the Department of Geography at the Imperial University of Tokyo, recommended that some of his students specialising in human geography contact Odauchi, in order to obtain a more thorough knowledge of settlement geography. (I have recently learned these facts from interviews with certain senior geographers who were students of Yamazaki in the 1920's) In his autobiographical writings, Odauchi gave voice to the complaint that he was isolated from the academic community but, at the same time, he wrote that he enjoyed a close relationship with and the support of Goro Ishibashi, the second in succession to head of the Department of Geography at the Imperial University of Kyoto (the first head was Takuji Ogawa). (4) As I mentioned before, where Ishida and Iizuka were concerned, they enjoyed the privileges conferred upon academicians though, prior to World War II, they did not exercise a great deal of influence in geographical circles. In the history of modern geography in Japan, political and social circumstances played an important role in influencing the development of geography under the militarist regime that later collapsed with Japan's defeat in World War II. Had this regime been allowed to continue in one

way or another, Makiguchi or Odauchi would never have attained, as they did, the recognition of postwar geographers. As for Iizuka and Ishida, had the postwar democratisation of society not taken place, they would not have been able to bring their influence to bear over a broader range of geographers. (5) These outsiders, however, never overtly opposed the wartime militarist regime and its concomitant, the oppression of freedom of speech and research. It is true that Makiguchi was arrested in 1943; but this was mainly for his religious activities which contravened the idea of the absolute divinity of the *tenno* (emperor). The other outsiders, Odauchi, Ishida and Iizuka, outwardly at least, appeared to support the course of imperialist colonialism and expansionism pursued by militarist Japan. (6) The influence of academic outsiders such as Iizuka and Ishida was very strong after World War II, but because they persisted in remaining within the framework of a modern version of classical geography or an environmentalist paradigm, the very strength of their influence constituted a hindrance to the realisation of the quantitative revolution in geography in Japan. The emergence of this revolutionary movement in geography and the subsequent humanistic reaction against this positivist geography were brought about by elements who, academically speaking, were marginal, or who were outside the sphere of influence of the important new teachers in post-World War II geography, such as Iizuka or Ishida.

In this way, in the history of the Japanese school of geography, it is possible to observe a number of considerably interesting dialectical interrelationships between centre and periphery and between orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aoki, N. (1982) *Toshi-noson-kenkyu to Obei chirigaku*, Geographical Institute, Kyoto University (ed.) "Chiri no shiso" Chijin-shokan.
- Haga, N. (1972) *Chihoshi no shiso Nihon-hoso-shuppan-kyokai*, 284 p.
- Iizuka, K. (1955) *Odauchi Michitoshi sensei no seikyo o itamu*, "Chirigaku-hyoron", Vol. 28/3.
- Kimoto, C. (1979) *Odauchi Michitoshi no jinmon chirigaku shiso no keisei katei, kyodo kyoiku undo ni kakawarumade no*, "Wako Daigaku Jinbungakubu Kiyō", Vol. 14.
- Kimoto, C. (1980) *Odauchi Michitoshi no nempu oyobi chosaku mokuroku*, "Wako Daigaku Jinbungakubu Kiyō", Vol. 15.
- Kumagai, K. (1978) *Makiguchi Tsunesaburo*, Daisanbunmei-sha, 217 p.
- Kunimatsu, H. (1978) *Jinsei chirigaku gairon*, Daisanbunmei-sha, 268 p.
- Makiguchi, T. (1904) *Jinsei chirigaku*, Bunkaido, 195 p., reprinted in: Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zen-shu, Vol. 1, Daisanbunmei-sha, 606 p. (1981)
- Makiguchi, T. (1912) *Kvoju no togochushin to shite no kyodoka kenkyu*, Nibunkan, reprinted in: "Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zen-shu", Vol. 3, 348 p. (1981)
- Makiguchi, T. (1916) *Chirikyoju no hoto to naiyo no kenkyu*, Meguroshoten, reprinted in "Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zen-shu", Vol. 4, Daisanbunmei-sha, 409 p. (1981)
- Makiguchi, T. *Kyodo kagaku kenkyu*, in: "Makiguchi Tsunesaburo zen-shu", Vol. 3, Daisanbunmei-sha, 348 p. (1981)

- Nakagawa, K. (1978) *Kindai chirikyōiku no genryū*, Kokin-shoin, 360 p.
- Nozawa, H. (1982) *Furansu gakuha to Nihon chirigaku*, Geographical Institute, Kyoto University (ed), "Chiri no shiso", Chijin-shokan.
- Odauchi, M. (1913) *Waga kokudo*, Kenkyū-sha.
- Odauchi, M. (ed) (1914) *Toshi to sonraku*, Hakuyū-sha.
- Odauchi, M. (1918) *Teito to kinko*, Okura Kenkyūjo.
- Odauchi, M. (1928) *Shuraku to chiri*, Kokon-shoin, 310 p.
- Odauchi, M. (1930) *Kyōdo chiri kenkyū*, Toko-shoin, 325 p.
- Odauchi, M. (1948) *Nihon Jinmonshirigaku no keimoki* (1)-(2), "Shinchiri", Vol. 2, 6, 7.
- Odauchi, M. (1948) *Jinmonchiri no konpon shiso. Iizuka Kōji "Chirigaku hihan" o megutte*, Shōhyō (1948-6).
- Takeuchi, K. (1974) *The Origins of Human Geography in Japan* "Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Science", Vol. 15.
- Takeuchi, K. (1976) *General Remarks of Human Geography During the Past Fifty Years*, Kiuchi, S. (ed.), Geography in Japan, University of Tokyo Press.
- Takeuchi, K. (1978) *Some Remarks on the History of Regional Description and the Tradition of Regionalism in Modern Japan*, Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies, Vol. 10, No. 1.
- Takeuchi, K. (1984) *Two Outsiders: An Aspect of Modern Academic Geography in Japan*, in: Takeuchi, J. (ed.) *Languages, Paradigms and Schools in Geography*, Laboratory of Social Geography, Hitotsubashi University.
- Tsujita, U. (1984) *Japanese Geographers in the 19th Century*, in: Takeuchi, K. (ed.) *Languages, Paradigms and Schools in Geography*, Laboratory of Social Geography, Hitotsubashi University.
- Yamaguchi, S. (1943) *Nihon o chushin to seru bankin chirigaku*, Saibi-do, 265 p.

