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INTRODUCTION

In 2004, the US military at last embraced Buddhism. In July of that year, the Navy commissioned its first full-time Buddhist chaplain, Jeanette G. Shin.1 This practice, though new to the military of the US, was hardly unknown outside it. Shin's ordination arguably marked an innovation in a little-known but long tradition of battlefield military chaplains ordained in Japanese Buddhist denominations, even if the actual context of that chaplaincy differed considerably between Japan and the US. Readers conscious of the contentious position of Yasukuni Shrine (Yasukuni jinja 岳母神社) in early twenty-first century Japan might understandably assume that Japan's "native religion" of Shinto 神道 historically monopolized the pastoral care of, and memorial rites for, Japanese soldiers. In fact, Buddhist groups took leading roles in those tasks under the Empire of Great Japan (Dai-Nihon Teikoku 大日本帝國, 1889–1945). Buddhist military chaplaincy (jūgun fukyō 征軍布教; literally "promulgation of the Teaching following the military") constituted one important area of collaboration between powerful Buddhist denominations and military authorities.

Given the relative lack of research on this topic in either English or Japanese, it remains difficult to estimate even roughly the overall scale and scope of modern Buddhist chaplaincy at any time in this period. To be sure, the Meiji period (1868–1912) is recent and well documented, and a relatively substantial body of scholarship treats its military history, both in Japanese and English. However, Meiji Buddhist chaplaincy of any kind remains only incompletely treated in Japanese, and it has only recently registered as a distinct topic of interest in the work of Anglophone historians.2 The study of such chaplaincy promises to illuminate a number of issues, only some of which can be treated in the present article: relations between religious groups and the modern nation-state; the adaptation of Buddhist discourses concerning violence to serve the demands of a modern military; and the ways in which individual chaplains brought their religious practice to bear in dealing with solders, on and off the battlefield.

This study treats texts written by one Japanese Buddhist cleric active as a battlefield chaplain in the Russo-Japanese War: Shaku Sōen 枠宗演 (1860–1919), a high-ranking Zen cleric of the Rinzai denomination (Rinzai-shū 銓鈾宗). First, it surveys existing scholarship about Meiji Japanese Buddhism and war; next, it examines Sōen's biography and his wartime writings to present the scope of his battlefield chaplaincy; and finally, it concludes by treating some tensions inherent in his wartime writings. Sōen's chaplaincy—conducted on paper as much as in person—was largely devoted to calling for his audiences to manifest unswerving spiritual strength in battle. There are, however, also short episodes in which the narrative Sōen fails to manifest that strength, which stand out as curious, if sparse, anomalies. As the present study argues, though, these are less conscious efforts to present Sōen's human vulnerability, than results of tensions inherent in the very project of a Buddhist battlefield chaplaincy.

In short, this piece will revisit the apparent contradiction between an idealized vision of a peacefully enlightened Zen master, and the documented horrors of modern Japan's militarist aggression.3 While it primarily treats Sōen's publications in Japanese, such contradictions are not difficult to find in the pronouncements of his translated for the Anglophone world, either.4 As Judith Snodgrass has noted, the text of one of the talks that Sōen contributed to the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions asked plaintively, "And what is gained by war? Nothing; it only means the oppression of the weak by the strong; it simply means the fighting among brothers and the shedding of human blood. The stronger gains nothing while the weaker loses everything."5 Back in the US in 1905, however, Sōen would offer a different message: "War is an evil and a great one, indeed. But war against evils must be unflinchingly prosecuted till we attain the final aim."6 The present study will seek to account for Sōen without discounting either of these pronouncements, or reducing them to mere epiphenomena of Japan's transformation into an overseas empire in the years between his two trips.

In treating these apparent contradictions as tensions worthy of consideration in their own right, this study represents another effort to move beyond the impasse that has characterized the study of modern Japanese Buddhist involvement with military activities since the issue attained prominence in the 1970s. Both in Japanese and in English, such scholarship has sought sometimes to denounce those activities, and sometimes to exculpate or to recontextualize them, but not, on the whole, to investigate specific cases in detail. As with some other contentious cases of collaboration in the mid-twentieth century, consideration of wartime collaboration by Japanese Buddhist clerics has, for the most part, remained mired in questions of its legitimacy or propriety.

PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

Such overtly normative stances have cast a long shadow over the limited body of research that has treated Meiji Buddhist military chaplaincy since the 1970s. To begin with, Japanese scholars have not even agreed that the military chaplaincy was always an authentically Buddhist occupation. For
instance, in his 1976 treatment of the Japanese Buddhist contribution to the war against Qing China (1894–1895), Yoshihisa Kyōichi (1915–2005) argued that Buddhist involvement with this war retained some principles that he classed as authentically Buddhist. These included a certain level of adherence to the precept against killing, and a willingness to perform memorial rites equally for both Japanese and non-Japanese soldiers. Yoshihisa argued, however, that Japanese Buddhist clerics neglected these principles in their involvement with the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905). In this and subsequent twentieth-century wars, he concluded, “external pressure from the absolutist state and the decadence (taibai 退廃) of Buddhists themselves brought about a loss of religious faith (shakuyōteki shinkōset 宗教的信仰性) on the battlefield and on the home front.” For reflective members of Yoshihisa’s generation, who experienced the Fifteen-Year War (1931–1945) firsthand, the disavowal of the actions of the wartime state and its supporters would have held a special urgency.

Perhaps reflecting the authority of such pronouncements, research lagged, and it was only from the late 1980s onward that scholars in Japan began to consider battlefield Buddhist chaplaincy during the late Meiji decades. Based principally on periodicals published by some of Japan’s larger Buddhist denominations, a small but pioneering body of scholarship in Japanese documented the alacrity with which these denominations officially endorsed their followers’ participation in warfare. This scholarship has also noted the speed and willingness with which individual Buddhist clerics volunteered for battlefield chaplaincy work, sometimes even before their denominations called upon them to join in Japan’s military endeavors. There seems to have been no lack of interest in military chaplaincy: In the case of the Nichiren denomination, even after the Japanese government set limits to the number of chaplains who could accompany troops overseas in 1904, the number of willing volunteers well exceeded the quotas. As these studies have also shown, clerics individually prominent in these denominations were often involved in outreach to soldiers.

Kiba Akeshi’s scholarship is particularly notable for its attention to the messages directed by Buddhist denominational authorities to recruits. Examining a published collection of war sermons (literally, “war Dharma talks,” sensō hōwa 戦争法話), and a statement issued to military recruits by seven True Pure Land temples in the region around Kanazawa 金沢, Kiba showed that these two documents legitimized both killing and dying in combat by citing or paraphrasing a range of orthodox sources, including the Ekkotarāgama (Jpn. Zoichī aongyō 増一阿含経, T. 125); the Net of Brahma Sūtra (Jpn. Bonmōkyō 梵網経, T. 1484); the Sūtra on Contemplating the Buddha of Measureless Life (Jpn. Kanmuryōjukyō 觀無量壽経, T. 365); and even the famous aphorism of Shandao 善導 (613–681), “A sharp sword is none other than the name of the Buddha Amitābha.” After identifying over a dozen other documents similar to these two, Kiba further demonstrated that each of the two major True Pure Land denominations also produced pamphlets for direct distribution to soldiers during the Russo-Japanese War. According to the statistics that he cited, some 780,328 copies of such pamphlets were distributed by the Honganji denomination, and some 526,355 by the Ōtani denomination.

In Anglophone scholarship, critical attention to the relationship between Japanese Buddhism and modern Japanese overseas aggression grew dramatically in the 1990s. In 1997, Brian Daizen Victoria’s mass-circulation Zen at War alerted a wide readership to the pervasive, largely uncontested, and apparently enthusiastic cooperation of some leaders in the modern Japanese Zen Buddhist community with Japan’s wartime mobilization through 1945. Although Zen at War has been criticized in both English and Japanese, it still poses problems that students of Zen Buddhism have only just begun to confront. Noteworthy as one response is Christopher Ives’ 2009 study, Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen’s Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics. Engaging deeply with the post-war writings of the Zen cleric and antiwar activist Ichikawa Hakugen (1902–1986), this book positions modern Zen wartime cooperation in its long historical context, and prescriptively looks to the Zen heritage for resources to insure a more peaceful future. Chaplaincy per se, however, does not rank among its major concerns. For its part, Victoria’s study briefly covers Ōn’s chaplaincy, as well as adducing several different authors’ recollections of the roles played by Buddhism on the battlefields of the Russo-Japanese War, but it does not attempt to offer a comprehensive treatment of the topic.

Existing scholarship in both Japanese and English, then, has made a number of valuable accomplishments, but primarily by focusing on the pronouncements of high-ranking Buddhist figures with only limited involvement, if any, in chaplaincy. This work has contributed to a sense that the chief modes of Buddhist complicity in the war effort were domestic and ideological. Needless to say, some very basic questions remain. For one, what general picture of chaplaincy would emerge from a focus on other sources—for instance, from documents produced by the clerics who acted as chaplains, rather than descriptions found within official denominational organs? Within these sources, what activities characterize the normative vision of chaplaincy? To what degree do these sources present that normative vision as having been fulfilled? Because it is well documented but still incompletely studied, the case of Shaku Ōn as military chaplain makes for a fertile area of inquiry.

**SHAKU ŌN**

An existing corpus of published material in both Japanese and English treats Ōn’s life and work. Readers interested in an overview of his prodigiously energetic and well-documented career may refer to it. Suffice it to say here that Ōn was undoubtedly one of most widely traveled and cosmopolitan
clerics of his day. Unlike most Buddhist clerics of his generation, he attended a secular educational institution—modern Keio Gijuku University—although he did not graduate from it. After leaving Keio, in 1887, Soen undertook an extraordinary journey to British-occupied Ceylon, where he trained in the Theravada Buddhist tradition until 1889.

Today, Soen remains relatively familiar in the Angophone world because he visited the US as one of the Japanese Buddhist representatives to the Chicago Parliament of World Religions in 1893. Soon after his return to Japan from Manchuria in 1904, he made another trip to the US in 1905, this time for a prolonged stay in San Francisco. In 1906, his circuitous journey back to Japan took him again to Illinois, and this time through much of the eastern US, thence to Europe and India. A collection of lectures given during this sojourn—translated and heavily redacted by his disciple, D.T. Suzuki—was published as early as 1906, becoming the first book to be published about Zen in the English language. If the popular magazine Tricycle: The Buddhist Review is any index to the interests of a powerful segment of the contemporary US. Buddhist community, then Soen retains some relevance. In “Apology of a Buddhist Soldier,” a piece contributed to the April 1996 issue of Tricycle, a former US counterintelligence officer prominently used the example of Soen’s military chaplaincy to suggest that Buddhism, like Christianity, admits of the legitimacy of “just wars.”

At the time of his service as a military chaplain, Soen was already forty-six years old, and he simultaneously held abbacies at two of the most important temples in the world of Japanese Rinzai Zen, the Kenchoji 建長寺 and the Engakuji 東大寺. The high standing that Soen enjoyed in the Zen community is strongly reflected in his written account of his chaplaincy—not only in the enthusiastic groups of monastics and lay followers who appear to greet Soen at seemingly every train stop from Kamakura onward, but also in the very fact of his appointment to work directly under Prince Sadanaru 貞愛親王 (1858–1923) of the imperial house of Fushimi, a member of the royalty who was then in service as a general, and who later rose to the rank of field marshal.

In keeping with his high rank, even on the battlefield, Soen was accompanied by attendants and was shielded from the dangers threatening a typical infantryman. Other clerics would have been less fortunate. By 1904, Buddhist clerics had long ceased to be eligible for deferrals from Japan’s universal male military conscription, meaning that most clerics would presumably have been drafted for service as regular soldiers. Nor would most chaplains have shared in Soen’s privileged status. One Manchurian encounter mentioned in passing by Soen involves his meeting with a fellow Japanese cleric of the Sôtô Zen denomination (Sôtô-shū 曹洞宗), Inoue Shūten 井上秀天 (1880–1945). Inoue had been dispatched as a chaplain by his denominational authorities in 1904, at the age of twenty-four, and was serving as an interpreter attached to the Eleventh Army Division when Soen met him. Until Soen, who never explicitly renounced his support for Japan’s overseas military actions, Inoue returned to Japan to become a socialist and a pacifist. Inoue’s reaction to chaplaincy was highly unusual, but it suffices to imply that Soen’s reactions to the battlefield were not wholly determined by his function as a chaplain.

Given his distinct background and high position, Soen can in no sense serve as a representative of the conduct of Meiji Buddhist military chaplaincy. However, his story may suggest something of the possibilities and limitations circumscribing even chaplains with considerable cultural capital and financial resources.

THE DIARY OF SUBJUGATING DEMONS

Soen not only kept a personal record of his time in Manchuria, but also actively worked to disseminate it on his return to Japan. Late in 1904, well before the conclusion of the war in September 1905, he published his Diary of Subjugating Demons (Gôma nisshi 降魔日史; henceforth, Diary). This account of his chaplaincy with the Japanese First Army Division in Manchuria spans the period from March 12 to July 25 of 1904. In considering this source, it is useful to remember that, unlike many of its global counterparts, the diary form in Japanese letters has not necessarily functioned as a forum for private confession or introspection. Instead, from the ancient period onward, many Japanese works circulated in something like the English diary form—if at times only in limited ways—filling such varied roles as object of literary appreciation, manual for proper ritual practice, travelogue, and record of official transactions.

Despite its evident importance as a rare firsthand account of Buddhist chaplaincy in Japan, and its historical value as a primary text in the life of one of modern Japan’s outstanding Zen figures, the Diary remains incompletely studied in both Japanese and English. Most Japanese biographical summaries of Soen treat his time in Manchuria in the briefest of terms. Even when they do discuss it, they have typically used his correspondence from the battlefield to emphasize the physical hardship of his service. One exception to this tendency is Inoue Zenjo’s laudatory biography of Shaku Soen, published in 2000. Inoue’s biography treats the months of Soen’s military chaplaincy almost entirely through a series of short excerpts taken from the Diary. Nonetheless, Inoue’s treatment is strictly chronological, not thematic, and does little to put the individual episodes into a broader context. In English, Michel Mohr’s 2010 article constitutes the first scholarly treatment of the Diary as a text in its own right.

The full title of the Diary is telling for its effort to align Soen’s military service with broader themes in traditional Buddhist cosmology. The Sino-Japanese gôma 降魔, “to subjugate demons” or “to subjugate Māra,” represents one of eight phases or scenes (bassô 八相) commonly highlighted in biographies of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni. This is the Buddha-to-
be's defeat of Mara, demon king of the sixth heaven of the Realm of Desire, which immediately preceded the Buddha's awakening. Shaku Soen drew on the biography of the Buddha, and the notion of demonic forces threatening cosmic order, in selecting the term gōma. Shortly after his return from the battlefield to Japan, Soen published an article in the September 1904 edition of the popular Japanese general-interest magazine Taryo 太陽 (The Sun). Here he opined, "The only element that truly permeates the entire life of the Buddha is the two Chinese characters gōma." After enumerating the major moments in the life of the Buddha, Soen summed up the entire career of the Buddha as follows: "In short, [these actions] emerge from the Buddha's great compassion, which attempted to cut down these great enemies, to subjugate (gōbuku 降伏) the ašuras, rākṣasas, evil spirits, and the entire tribe of demons, and to manifest the great brilliance [of awakening] for the sake of sentient beings."27

Soen went on to expound with dramatic flourish the detailed course of a cosmic battle witnessed by the Buddha-to-be while he was engaged in ascetic training on Mount Dantálōka (Dandokusen 極特山). There he beheld Māra's near-defeat of Indra, king of the gods. In our world, Soen dilated, the demon king Māra is personified by none other than Imperial Russia, seeking to swallow up the entire globe and to plunge it into darkness. Thus, he contended, "we must call [this conflict, i.e., the Russo-Japanese War] not just a great just war (gisen 義戦) in this world (sekai 世界), but rather a fully-fledged great battle to subjugate demons throughout the [entire] cosmos (uchô 宇宙)."28 Presumably, it is this urgent sense of participation in a vast conflict that accounts for his choice of title for the Diary.29 When Soen published the Diary, then, he had already assured the reading public of its universal significance.

THE CONTENT OF SOEN'S CHAPLAINCY

Soen carried his existing social identity to the battlefields of Manchuria. To be certain, he does complain of material privation more than once in the Diary, as in a memorable entry for May 20:

Since I crossed the sea and came here, nearly a month has passed, but I haven't washed my face, or body, or clothing. My head is covered with dust, my clothing with filth, and my whole body has been given over to the bites of fleas. This I can still endure, but when it comes to being thirsty but unable to drink, or wishing to boil [rice] but being unable to find fuel, it is [as though] the realm of the hungry ghosts (gakidô 竜鬼道) has appeared before my eyes.30

The Buddhist cosmos has a rich and vivid catalogue of states of suffering, to which Soen's writing has repeated recourse.

Having said that, Soen's entries are replete with transcriptions of military orders, reports of troop movements and the outcome of battles, poetic verses composed in literary Chinese, and notes concerning correspondence received and sent. They give the general impression of an elite cleric who has thoroughly adapted himself to military concerns. The Diary itself states as much in an entry for April 25, which Soen recorded off the coast of Korea, before his division had even reached Manchuria:

Since I set off in the service of His Highness, two months have already passed. In my walking, standing, sitting, and lying down, I now closely approximate military discipline. Since boarding this ship, my daily activities are exactly the same as the officers and men, which is to say that I wear a uniform in the semi-secular fashion, and I partake of simple food with some meat.31

As he must have done within Japan, Soen continued to associate primarily with men of the higher social ranks, a predilection that would have limited his personal contact with common soldiers.

Perhaps for this reason, the Diary devotes relatively little space specifically to the pastoral activities that Soen undertook. The key activities that do appear are individual meetings and public Dharma talks. These took place on various scales, some with dozens of listeners, and some (those in Japan proper) for groups of over one thousand. Soen recorded visits of consolation to injured soldiers and participation at memorial rites for dead soldiers, each undertaken at the invitation of high-ranking officers. For the great majority of the Dharma talks, Soen records only the audience for the talk, the place of the talk, and sometimes the theme.

Those themes are presented in a form that is abbreviated, but often suggestive. On April 22, before an elite group of officers heading toward Manchuria, including Prince Sadanaru, Soen spoke on the theme "no-self is none other than the Great Self" (muga sunauachi taiga 無我即大我).32 On May 2, for a company of men in his division, he spoke on the theme of "liberation from samsâra" (shōji gedatsu 生死解脱).33 Again for a group of officers including Sadanaru, on May 4, Soen expounded on the theme "equality is none other than differentiation" (byôdo soku shabetsu 平等即差別).34 On the battlefield, on June 19, Soen spoke before a company of soldiers in another division on "the utility of religion" (shûmon yûyô 宗門有用).35 Here, the term that I have glossed as "religion," shûmon, may also be understood as "Buddhism," which for Soen would have been tantamount to "Rinzai Zen." Meanwhile, the first three themes represent Soen's own variation on well-established topics in Zen or Mahâyâna Buddhism.

In a few cases, it is possible to infer something more of the content of Soen's sermons as a chaplain, and these consistently emphasize the necessity for developing inner spiritual strength. If there is any overriding theme to his chaplaincy, then here it lies. Soen was evidently fond of recounting
a particular story about the Chinese founder of the Engakuji, Wuxue Zuyuan (Mugaku Sogen 無極祖師; posthumous title granted in Japan, “The National Preceptor of the Buddha’s Radiance” or Bukkō Kokushi 仏光国師; 1226–1286). At least two references to it appear in the Diary. They are taken from Wuxue’s Recorded Sayings (Ch. yulu, Jpn. goroku 語錄). In 1276, as the Mongols pressed on with their invasion of the Song empire, Wuxue was practicing alone in his temple, staying behind after the other monks had already fled. When the Mongol soldiers arrived to massacre the temple inhabitants, Wuxue reportedly received them with absolute equanimity, and recited the following verse:

In the whole universe, there is no longer a place where I can plant
my solitary bamboo;
I am glad, for man is empty, like everything else.
I salute you, three-foot-long sword of the great Yuan Mongols!
What you seek to behead in your lightning reflection is the wind of
springtime.36

Reportedly, the Mongol soldiers were so impressed at this performance that they left Wuxue alone in peace.

The Diary makes allusion to this episode when a major general comes to Sōen for guidance aboard ship on May 3, and again when Sōen addresses a group of officers in camp on July 1.37 Sōen was urging his listeners to attain a state of clear psychic resolution akin to Wuxue’s, and to confront their own deaths with similar equanimity. A similar message is in evidence in a “spiritual talk” (seisbin kōwa 精神講話) that Sōen delivered to a company of soldiers on June 16, on the theme “the enemy within, the enemy without” (naiteki gaiteki 内敵外敵). In this talk, Sōen told the common soldiers that external enemies—such as enemy troops, and disease—could be controlled, but that “the demons of the mind” (shinma 心魔) must be defeated so that peace of mind could be achieved.38 Again, Sōen’s focus is on the cultivation of unwavering mental strength.

On the battlefield, how might Sōen have instructed soldiers in the concrete cultivation of such mental fortitude? The Diary itself has little to say in this regard, but for a tentative answer to this question, we may look to a later publication by Sōen, A Record of Traps and Snares (Senteiroku 笠取録; hereafter, Record, 1909).39 This compendium of various writings by Sōen includes a section entitled “Methods for Cultivation by Soldiers” (Gunjin shuyo no hoho 军人修養の方法).40 In it, he outlines two methods of cultivation. The first, focus on duty, involves complete exertion in the elimination of all temptations and distractions, and the realization of one’s individual unity with the cosmos, the state, the emperor, and all the people of Japan. The second method that Sōen recommends appears more classically Buddhist: “quiet sitting” (seiza 静坐) which is achieved by “the meditation of counting the breath” (susokukan 数息観, Skt. āna-apāna). Sōen points out that the practice of this method also results in a sense of unity with the cosmos, and that, together with the first method, it can cultivate a state of “great fearlessness” (dai mui 大無畏).

In addition to his preaching to soldiers, Sōen’s Diary also makes passing reference to other ritual modes of work with them. For instance, it mentions Sōen’s distribution of “treasure amulets of the Greater Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra” (Dai Hannakyō hōtoku 大般若経宝幢) to detachments of soldiers on May 13, “for the purpose of praying for the health of the officers and men and the certain victory of the Imperial Army.”41 Other records of such distribution occur on May 17, and then again on May 24.42 Sōen’s distribution of amulets is of particular interest because this practice later drew harsh criticism in print from Satō Gan’ei (1875–1917), a True Pure Land Buddhist military chaplain attached to the Ninth Army Division, based in the True Pure Land stronghold of Kanazawa.43 (Satō was sufficiently judicious not to refer to Sōen or Zen Buddhism by name, though he did locate the reliance on protective amulets squarely within Sōen’s First Division. Military chaplaincy seems to have been as much a project of competition among different Buddhist groups as a unified project drawing them together.) Along with Sōen’s conduct of memorial rites for dead soldiers, visits to the wounded and dying also constitute the remaining major category of chaplaincy work.

Prophylactic measures against enemy fire and consolatory visits aside, though, the central message of Sōen’s chaplaincy was an exhortation to resolution and self-control: empty yourself of selfish thoughts, steel your resolve, and when the enemy come to cut you down, their blade will meet nothing but air. The aspiration for absolute transparency here is also an aspiration for absolute invulnerability. As Sōen’s own record shows, the aspiration itself would prove as empty as the air.

THE ROLES OF HORROR

While the Diary is largely lacking in effusive emotional expressions of any sort, it does include memorably vivid expressions of horror at war and its consequences. Of interest to us here is the way in which the Sōen as narrator and character fails to embody the prescriptions for invulnerability made by Sōen as preacher. In the description of a visit by Sōen to a field hospital on May 17, the Diary notes one Japanese officer who in good spirits despite being critically wounded: Both of his thighs had been pierced by shells, and his upper lip was completely ripped off. Then it continues:

There were many others with critical wounds on the verge of death. Among these were [Russian] enemies who had suffered critical wounds, one captain and three others with light wounds, all housed here. [Like Japanese soldiers,] they too were loyal to their country; although they
are our enemies, how could we not feel deep pity for them? I left and arrived at another ward, where I mourned two infantrymen who had died of wounds. Feelings of sadness assaulted me, and I was unable to recite the sūtra text. On this day I thought back over the tide of battle, and my feelings ranged more and more freely. Then I composed a poem:

The giant cannonballs all pour down like rain;
Life and death switch places in an instant’s time.
I gaze with sadness on the fields filled with ochre blood:
Old Tiger Mountain in Liaodong reddened through and through.44

To be sure, expressions of pity for the enemy, when safely incapacitated or dead, may well express a sense of superiority to them. As Mohr has noted of this passage, though, here Sōen the narrator seems so affected by the carnage around him that he cannot fulfill his regular duties.45 Even if only as a result of witnessing their similarly gruesome ends, the narrator here implicitly recognizes a kind of “equality of friend and foe” which Yoshida Kyūichi declared absent from the chaplaincy in the Russo-Japanese War.

Sōen’s dream life, too, constitutes another realm of fear and revulsion in the Diary, although its records are highly cursory. An entry shortly after Sōen’s arrival in Manchuria records: “I put down my pack and took a nap. In my dream, a Russian soldier came and chopped off my head. I awoke in a fright; fleas were swarming through the air around me and biting me everywhere.”46 Although not a part of this Diary, Sōen’s later published journal from San Francisco includes a similar entry: “In my dreams at dawn, I was running through the fields of bloody battles in Manchuria. Jolted awake, I thought back to the traces of times past.”47 On the basis of his own reading of the Diary, Michel Mohr has suggested that Sōen left Manchuria with “physical and psychological wounds,” the latter of which could be read as a kind of “post-traumatic stress disorder.”48 While neither diary makes any effort to interpret either of these short passages, both dreams position Sōen face-to-face with danger. In neither case does his narrative self confront that danger with anything like the equanimity practiced by Wuxue Zuyuan: Sōen’s dream decapitation eventuates only in fright and a real, if slow, bloodletting by fleas.

The climax of horror in the Diary must lie in its vivid description of the aftermath of the crucially important battle of Southern Hill (Ch. Nanshan 南山), fought on May 25 with heavy casualties on both sides. Of some 36,400 Japanese participants in the battle, 4,387 were killed or wounded.49 In order to carry out their assigned role in the attack, the members of the Army’s Fourth Division had to advance uphill, exposed to Russian fire, while clambering over the bodies of their comrades.50 Sōen’s entry for May 27, two days after the battle, includes this passage:

We stayed outside the southern gate of the town of Jinzhou 金州. . . . At seven in the morning, we departed from the southern gate and ascended immediately to the campground at Nanshan, where I visited the various brigades. Everywhere on and below the mountain, the corpses of enemy soldiers were scattered in disorder and piled up high. Some had heads smashed in, the blue blood (bekiketsu 碎血) flowing out copiously; others had bones broken and flesh crushed, their guts staining the ground; others still held their guns, their hair standing on end with rage.51 Others had wholly swollen bodies, festering and emitting stench. They numbered four or five hundred, and the sight was indescribable. My eyes spun and my nose stung; confronted with this [scene], I forgot my hostility, and a feeling of pity welled up in my breast. The Buddha preached of four types of suffering (shikoku 四苦) in the human realm, among which the most painful is the suffering of encountering that which we despise (enzo egū no ku 宠憎会遇の苦). . . . I descended the mountain with my eyes covered, reciting the Four Universal Bodhisattva Vows (shigu no ganmon 四弘の願文) as I went. By the roadside, I mourned the war dead, and then I returned to the encampment.52

Shikoku, enzo egū no ku, shigu no ganmon: reworked in this distinctly Buddhist idiom, the suffering of the battlefield is here transmuted into the universal suffering of all sentient beings; confronted with suffering on this cosmic scale, Sōen the narrator invokes the universal (gu 弘) vows of the bodhisattva, who commits to their equally universal salvation.53 To be sure, Sōen’s chronologically later Taiyō article, written after his return to Japan, also located the Russo-Japanese War within an overarching Buddhist cosmology. Within the Diary itself, which focuses on more quotidian matters, there is little such slippage into the cosmic register. These two invocations of cosmic scale lead to strikingly different conclusions: The Taiyō article concludes with a rousing direct address to its readers, imploring them to understand the unity of Zen with Bushidō 武士道, the mythical “Way of the Warrior,” but this entry from the Diary ends in aporia, eloquently expressed in a Chinese poem recorded that night by a sleepless Sōen:

The spring is quiet all around; a raw wind fills the ancient fortress.
Among the wildflowers, blood stains the ground; among the dishveled grasses, the ghosts choke back their tears.
I cry out with vigor to the souls of the dead, but there is no reply; all I can do is record the names of the fallen.
In this boundless world, how difficult to communicate my feelings at this time!54

To be sure, Sōen’s Chinese versifying here is not free from stereotype, and the Diary’s transmutation of the Manchurian battlefield into a timeless Buddhist charnel ground may in one sense erase the Russian dead and the
Japanese attack that killed them. Nonetheless, this passage does stand in tension with the call to die (or to contemplate the death of others) with perfect equanimity. Sōen's unfinished wrestle with the key message underlying the Diary spills over into the next day's entry. It begins with another Chinese poem, whose pivotal verse urges, “Open the fist and wield the flash of lightning; brandish the sword and cut through the spring wind.”

Explicitly reworking the language of Wuxue's poem, here Sōen seems no longer to identify with the implacable Wuxue, but rather to assume the role of the Mongol warriors, who wield the sword to strike the lightning blow against the spring wind. Perhaps this verse implicitly acknowledges that no amount of mental cultivation can confer invulnerability in battle, and even suggests that the only path left is that of aggression.

The battle at Southern Hill reappeared in Sōen's other public writing. In a short letter published under the heading “From the Battlefield” in Taiyō (The Sun) in August 1904, Sōen recognizes that his readers must already know well about the battles fought in Manchuria, but goes on to describe the battle of Southern Hill regardless, using language similar to that in the Diary description. Published in the US, Sōen's 1906 English-language Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot includes “At the Battle of Nan-Shan Hill” and “An Address Delivered at a Service Held in Memory of Those Who Died in the Russo-Japanese War.” Each of these sermons does indeed affirm Buddhist participation in war, but not before first returning to Southern Hill through explicit invocation of the “mutilated, disfigured, and decomposing corpses” of the “[h]undreds and hundreds of dead and wounded . . . scattered all over the hill, friends and foes indiscriminately.”

Whether Sōen's published accounts express some kind of personal psychic trauma or not, I suggest that they do reflect a serious grappling with the tensions inherent in a Buddhist military chaplaincy. Put simply, Sōen repeatedly produced and disseminated not ideologically watertight writing demonstrating the attainment of single-mindedness, but rather work whose narration struggles to stay in tune with its dominant theme. How, these texts seem to ask, could a Buddhist aspiring to save all sentient beings urge them to die with selfless fortitude? In the next breath, they reply: how could he not?

CONCLUSION: TENSIONS WITHIN JAPANESE BUDDHIST MILITARY CHAPLAINCY

To recognize that Sōen's writing at times undermines its own stated themes, and to recognize in it a degree of inconsistency, multivalence, or multiplicity, is not to endorse the Russo-Japanese War or the Japanese Buddhist military chaplaincy that supported it. Rather, it is to suggest another way of thinking Meiji-era Buddhist military chaplaincy as a viable field of research, and to suggest a way forward through focus on the tensions attendant in this project of chaplaincy. In doing so, we may take figures like Sōen not only as objects of study, but also as our interlocutors. To do so would entail the recognition that their writing, consciously or not, may already embody some of the very tensions with which scholars and practitioners continue to wrestle today. It would also help the field to overcome the cycles of accusation and defense that have so strongly colored the study of Japanese Buddhism and modern warfare for the past several decades. The project of Buddhist chaplaincy may then not yet have ended, even if we learn from it something other than its intended lessons.

NOTES


3. As Robert Sharf has presciently suggested, this apparent contradiction may owe more to “our” expectations than to any historical stances on the part of Zen institutions: “This does not mean that a medieval Zen abbot would have taken what we believe to be the moral high ground on the issue of Japanese imperialist aggression during the first half of the twentieth century. The real question, as I see it, is why we would expect him to.” Robert Sharf, “Whose Zen? Zen Nationalism Revisited,” Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, & the Question of Nationalism, eds. James W. Heisig and John C. Maraldo (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1995), 51.


9. Concerning the oversupply of Nichiren-related clerical volunteers for chaplaincy during the Russo-Japanese War, see Annaka, "Nis-Shin/Nichi-Ro sensō ni okeru Nichirenshū jūgōnshō ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu," 11.

10. Needless to say, the very highest level of leadership in various denominations was generally personally involved, but so were other prominent figures now best known for other reasons. When the Honganji denomination dispatched a chaplain to the battlefield in Korea in 1894, he carried a letter of encouragement to the Japanese on the peninsula from no less prominent a figure than Shimagi Mokurai (1838-1911), today best remembered for his invocation of "freedom of religion" in defense of Buddhism, and for his decisive contribution to the True Pure Land denominations' withdrawal from the early Meiji-era Academy of Doctrine (Daikyōin 大学院). See Kiba, "Meiji-ki taigai sensō ni tai suru Bukkyō no yakuwari: Shinshū ryō Honganji-ha o rei to shite," 253. Nawa Tsukinosuke has noted that Shimagi also published his own guide to chaplaincy. See Nawa, "Bukkyō to gunji engo jigyō: Nis-Shin sensō ni okeru Nishi Honganji kyōdō na nōtasho to shite," 24.

11. Meanwhile, the two chaplains dispatched by the Nichiren denomination to both wars were Wataki Gyoji (1860-1928) and Morimoto Bunji (1854-1909), both disciples of the late Edo- and early-Meiji era Nichiren cleric Arai Nissatsu 新渡戸 (1830-1888). These individuals had important careers in the modern remaking of the Nichiren denomination: In 1910-1911, Wataki served as the fourth president of the Nichiren Denominational University (Nichirenshū Daigaku 日蓮宗大学), predecessor to today's Rishō Daigaku 立正大学. See Annaka, "Nis-Shin/Nichi-Ro sensō ni okeru Nichirenshū jūgōnshō ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu," 4. After his return from the war against the Qing, Morimoto went on to serve as head for one of the Nichiren danrin 増林 (traditional denominational academies) in Kyoto. See Kawamura Kawamura Kōshō and Nichiren Monka Bukke Jinnrei 金戒明会日本僧侶 (1838-1888). This entry, not only does Shaku Sōen name the Eleventh Division, but he also points out, the so-called "complete works" are actually far from complete.


18. On Sōen’s checkered career at this secular university, see the painstaking archival work in Mohr, "The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Sōen Revisited," 188-191.


21. From the passage of the Conscription Ordinance (Chōheirei 征兵令) in 1873 until the 1880s, Buddhist clerics above a certain government-issued rank had been eligible for such deferments. Citing both international precedent and monastic law, a group of Buddhist clerics did petition the Imperial Diet shortly after its inauguration in 1890 for the exemption of all Buddhist clergy from draft requirements, but this effort failed. For the text of the petition, see Kusunoki Keijun’s privately published Sōryō heikei menjo seigan riyūsho (Tokyo: Kusunoki Keijun, 1891).


23. In this entry, not only does Shaku Sōen name the Eleventh Division, but he also refers correctly to the Eleventh Division’s head as Tsuchiya Mitsuharu 塚田光敏 (1848-1920). For an overview of the composition of the Third Army, which included both Sōen’s First Division and Inoue’s Eleventh Division, see Harada Katsumasa, Nichi-Ro Sensō no jōten: Kindai Nihon no bunsirei jikō (Tokyo: Kazuo, 1987).


25. In this entry, not only does Shaku Sōen name the Eleventh Division, but he also refers correctly to the Eleventh Division’s head as Tsuchiya Mitsuharu 塚田光敏 (1848-1920). For an overview of the composition of the Third Army, which included both Sōen’s First Division and Inoue’s Eleventh Division, see Harada Katsumasa, Nichi-Ro Sensō no jōten: Kindai Nihon no bunsirei jikō (Tokyo: Kazuo, 1987).


27. Originally presented in the male-mediated Japanese style of literary Chinese (kanji 筆記), this essay was republished in 1929, during his death, among the volumes of his complete works (zenshū 全集). There it was rewritten in the kundoku 講読 style of reading literary Chinese via classical Japanese grammar. This is the edition to which I refer in the present study. As Mohr points out, the so-called “complete works” are actually far from complete. See his, “The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Sōen Revisited,” 186. Mohr has translated the title of Sōen’s published record as Journal on Defeating Demons; I have chosen a slightly different translation for stylistic reasons. Unlike some other published writings by Sōen—and perhaps, unsurprisingly—the Diary was not reprinted between 1945 and 2011.

Mohr, "The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Soen Revisited," 199-201.

Shaku Soen, "Daisenjö tō no nyoyezukan." Tairyo (September 1904), 56.

Shaku Soen, "Daisenjö tō no nyoyezukan," 58.

Shaku Soen, "Göma nisshi," 224.
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