

REVIEW



Nagaoka Takashi 永岡崇, *Shinshūkyō to sōryoku sen: Kyōso igo o ikiru* 新宗教と総力戦—教祖以後を生きる

Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, 2015. 368 pages.
Hardcover, ¥5,400. ISBN 978-4-8158-0815-0.

NAGAOKA TAKASHI's monograph *Shinshūkyō to sōryoku sen: Kyōso igo o ikiru* breaks new ground in the study of modern Japanese religions by providing for the first time a detailed study of a Japanese new religion during the war. The work examines largely unexplored archival resources in order to describe the history of the Tenrikyō religion (f. 1838) in the generations after the passing of the founder Nakayama Miki (1798–1887). The purpose of the book is to reconsider how both scholarly works about the community and Tenrikyō's own official account of church history elide some of the complex dynamics between religion and state that characterized the development of the movement during the imperial period. In the tradition of the sociology of religion, Nagaoka aims to balance his analysis between macro-political forces and the biographies of individuals who make their lives in circumstances not of their choosing. Meticulously researched and sensitive to the difficulties faced by the generation who lived through the war, Nagaoka's study will be of interest to scholars of religion, sociology, and history, and anyone curious about how the war was experienced by religious communities.

Briefly, the twentieth century history of Tenrikyō covered in this monograph can be divided into two periods named for emic categories: *kakushin* or “reforms” and *fukugen* or “return to the scriptures.” The *kakushin* period formally refers to state-mandated reforms to the Tenrikyō institution and its doctrine that began in 1938 (chapter 3). Some parts of the canon were banned, as was the case with the oral story of the cosmogony, the *Ofudesaki*, and the *Osashizu*. The *Mikagura Uta* songs for the service were censored. In general, the nature of the reforms was to excise anything in Miki's teaching that could be seen to question the authority of the state or call for changes to the social structure. The roots of these reforms can be traced to edited versions of the Tenrikyō scriptures that the community was obliged to

submit to the government as part of a long campaign for accreditation as an independent Shinto sect that finally succeeded in 1908.

The subsequent *fukugen* period can be indexed to the postwar “return to the scriptures” which began in earnest in 1945, and which represents the beginning of the postwar orthodoxy (chapter 6). The two periods of Tenrikyō history correspond to the lifetime of the second *shinbashira* (leader), Nakayama Shōzen (1905–1967, subject of chapter 2). Shōzen was a graduate of Japan’s flagship religion department at the University of Tokyo and a student of the famed scholar Anesaki Masaharu (1873–1949). Shōzen developed Tenrikyō’s postwar orthodoxy based on the conviction that the *kakushin* reforms were an unfortunate but unavoidable detour—a compromise that the church had to make to avoid being crushed by the state (as was the dire fate of Ōmoto). In general, this account of events is taken as authoritative within the Tenrikyō community, and scholarship on Tenrikyō by outsiders also bears the influence of this perspective.

Against the grain of this received narrative, Nagaoka argues that however sincere the Tenrikyō leadership’s postwar renunciation of wartime theology may have been, archival resources suggest that, for the Tenrikyō community who lived during the war, there does not appear to have been a general sense that they were somehow on an aberrant trajectory. Rather, it seems that they understood their contributions to the nation state as part of their religion’s capacity to work for the public good, and they appear to have envisioned the best interests of their religion in line with state ideology and the goals of imperial expansion promoted by the government. This argument is presented over the course of six chapters framed by an introduction and conclusion. The structure is as follows: “Introduction: New Religions and Total War”; chapter 1, “Crisis and Reform in the Faith Community”; chapter 2, “Nakayama Shōzen’s Prewar Activities”; chapter 3, “The *Kakushin* Period”; chapter 4, “The Asia Pacific War as Religious Experience”; chapter 5, “Religion in the Holy War (*Seisen*), and the Holy War in Religion”; chapter 6, “The *Fukugen* Period”; and “Conclusions: The Path to Wartime Mobilization.”

The introduction interprets the state of the field of studies of new religions with particular attention to historical research on Tenrikyō. Nagaoka maintains that prior research is heavily influenced by two primary directions that gravitate respectively around problems of politics (public issues) and matters related to individual subjectivity (the private dimension of personal faith). In Nagaoka’s reading, MURAKAMI Shigeyoshi (1972) represents the first approach, and his classic interpretation of Tenrikyō (and many other new religions) is based on the premise that the group’s teaching, rooted in the culture of ordinary folk, implies a kind of egalitarianism. According to Murakami, Miki was gifted with the vision to understand human equality as an ideal, the insight to recognize poverty as the result of structural injustice, and the capacity to communicate these ideas in a prophetic language that ultimately appealed to millions of people. Nagaoka allows that Murakami’s is an insightful reading of Miki’s thought, but he notes that it authorizes an interpreta-

tion of Tenrikyō history framed as a binary between resistance/collaboration with the state—that is, a mythological narrative of heroes and villains. Nagaoka's study suggests that maybe most people did not really experience things this way. Nagaoka attributes the emphasis on subjective experience to SHIMAZONO Susumu's (1998) intervention in Tenrikyō studies. Shimazono's focus on the subjective development of faith in the context of Miki's biography prioritizes deep engagement with the lived experience of social contradictions and personal dilemmas that played a role in the formation of Miki's personality and thought. Nagaoka suggests that there is a divide between politically focused studies and personally focused studies in the secondary literature on new religions, and he relates this to SHIMAZONO's (2010) more recent and influential argument that the State Shinto system dominated public life while relegating religions to the realm of private life and the home. This argument proposes a so-called dual-structure that inherently limited the capacity of religions to resist the state. Nagaoka acknowledges that all of these perspectives have contributed to the understanding of Japanese new religions, but he aims to deconstruct the dual-structure narrative (and, implicitly, to transcend the personal-political binary) by focusing on how the political and the personal intersected in the lives of the Tenrikyō community in multifarious ways.

Chapter 1 functions as a preface to the rest of the work by detailing how a division of powers within Tenrikyō developed after Miki's passing. This arrangement saw theological authority primarily invested in a charismatic medium known as the *honseki* ("main seat") Iburi Izō (1833–1907) while bureaucratic functions were delegated to Miki's grandson Nakayama Shinnosuke (1866–1914), the first *shinbashira*. It was under these leaders that official recognition as a legal religion was acquired to mitigate against suppression. After Iburi's passing, ecclesiastical and bureaucratic authority came to be centralized in the Nakayama line. Chapter 2 follows the biography of Nakayama Shōzen during his youth, and Nagaoka emphasizes how the young *shinbashira*'s intellectual interests in scriptural study (returning to Miki's *Ofudesaki* writing), ethnography (the study of foreign cultures for missionary ends), and missiology (the Jesuit missions to Japan as a model) set the mold for the institutional development of Tenrikyō under his leadership from 1929 until his death. Nagaoka argues that these interests situate Shōzen squarely as a man of his times during the expansionist Japanese empire. Like Christian missionaries seeking to spread European culture globally, Shōzen imagined Tenrikyō missionaries as capable of spreading both Tenrikyō and Japanese culture as part of a civilizing mission throughout the empire and the world.

Chapter 3 discusses the trajectory that led to the *kakushin* period, arguing that although Tenrikyō's postwar orthodoxy presents the years between 1908 and 1945 as a narrative of victimhood, the reality was more complicated. The heart of the argument is that Tenrikyō's ability to achieve legal status as the last recognized sect of Shinto in 1908 was tied to the religion's increasing acceptance of responsibilities to contribute to society along lines defined by the state authorities. In particular, this

arrangement entailed Tenrikyō participation in moral suasion campaigns (*kyōka katsudō*) from the 1910s, the expansion of social welfare work including the opening of the Yōtoku'in orphanage, and the creation of a Tenri village (Tenri mura) in colonial Manchuria. Chapters 4 and 5 detail the development of *hinokishin* during wartime. The term refers to collective labor for the public good understood as a form of religious activity. The work of *hinokishin* today is known to refer to voluntary activities like the cleaning of public parks and disaster relief efforts. However, Nagaoka explains that in the first half of the twentieth century *hinokishin* included such diverse activities as participation in state-backed moral suasion campaigns and coal mining to support the war effort. Such works were undertaken in response to demands from the state, and Tenrikyō developed a theological rationale to sanctify these efforts by endowing them with a religious significance.

Finally, chapter 6 details the postwar *fukugen* or “return to the scriptures.” Postwar Tenrikyō theological scholars led by Nakayama Shōzen engaged in a massive research project into their own history in order to establish authoritative versions of the Tenrikyō scriptures, Miki’s biography, and church history. The oral tradition of the cosmogony was restored, the *Ofudesaki* and the *Osazhizu* were put back into circulation, and the *Mikagura Uta* was once again published without state-mandated redactions. These theological developments were celebrated as signs of the restoration of religious freedom, and the postwar mainstream of Tenrikyō theology became rooted in the textualist tradition of scholarship that leaders like Shōzen learned through elite university educations in religious studies and adjacent fields. Nonetheless, Nagaoka invites readers to ask, in the process of establishing the new direction for Tenrikyō in the postwar period, what aspects of wartime history and the experience of the war generation have been swept under the rug?

It is important to recognize that Nagaoka’s investigation of the wartime activities of Tenrikyō serves to place Japanese new religions (or at least those operating legally under the umbrella of sect Shinto) in the same boat as all other legally recognized religious organizations operating during the war, whether Buddhist, Shinto, or Christian. This work raises as many good questions as it answers about the role of new religions during the war, but it is now the standard account of Tenrikyō’s wartime history. Nagaoka sets a high bar for future scholarship on new religions and the war, and I hope that this study will inspire further research in this nascent field.

Adam Lyons

Keio University Faculty of Business and Commerce

REFERENCES

MURAKAMI Shigeyoshi 村上重良

1972 *Kindai minshū shūkyōshi no kenkyū* 近代民衆宗教史の研究. Tokyo: Hōzōkan.

SHIMAZONO Susumu 島蘭進

1998 Utagai to shinkō no aida: Nakayama Miki no tasuke no shinkō no kigen 疑いと信仰の間—中山みきの救(たす)けの信仰の起源. In *Nakayama Miki, Sono shōgai to shisō: Suki to kaihō no ayumi* 中山みき・その生涯と思想—救いと解放の歩み, Ikeda Shirō 池田士郎, Shimazono Susumu, and Seki Kazutoshi 関一敏, eds., 117–45. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

2010 *Kokka Shintō to Nihonjin* 国家神道と日本人. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.