A CRITIQUE OF THE ARTICLES BY RICKMAN AND KLENBORT

Edward S. Krebs
Georgia State University

Castle's concerns seem consistent and in character for a person of his background. His concerns also seem to reflect the general feeling of the American public at the time. Would there have been a point at which Castle would have withdrawn his favor for Japan (something less than Pearl Harbor)?

To offer perspective a brief survey of the relationship between Japan and China is appropriate. At the beginning of the century the Chinese admired Meiji Japan for its many successes and hoped to emulate its neighbor. Among the revolutionaries, Sun Yatsen's movement included several Japanese "Pan-Asianists," whose idealistic approach reflected many of the same goals that Japan would later pursue by means of military aggression. From the middle teens through the end of World War II, however, Japan adopted aggression as her basic approach in China, and in the process did much to stimulate the growth of Chinese nationalism.

Castle was accurate in his assessment of Japan's role in East Asia and its place in American diplomacy: Japan holds a pivotal place in Asia because of its geographical position and its modern achievements. With the exception of World War II, Americans have basically seen Japan as a positive

influence, and often as a friend. There have been periods, however, when part of American feeling has been apprehension. For the period since World War II, Article 9 of the United State-approved postwar constitution keeps Japan from the more active role the United States has wanted Japan to play in international affairs. Article 9 renounces war as an instrument of national policy and allows only a self-defense force, not a standing army.

The commentator's interest in anarchism has acquainted him with earlier critics of Marx, especially Peter Kropotkin. Like Hicks, Kropotkin observed that Marx was still Hegelian in approach, and that the dialectic method was not appropriate for "the modern natural sciences" (with a link to the social sciences implied). Hicks gave attention to late medieval times, and here too Kropotkin differed from Marx, viewing merchant activity in the rising commercial cities as the beginning of free association, his ideal for human community. But these early positive developments were aborted, according to Kropotkin, first by the growth of the modern state under monarchial power, and then by the growth of the merchant class itself, which abandoned its better inclinations during its struggle with monarchs in the English and French Revolutions.

Klenbort's paper makes little mention of the period of time from the Protestant Reformation through these two revolutions,

which Marx -- and historians generally - -regard as critical to the development of modern capitalism and the political structure that supports it. Did Hicks regard these developments as essential?

The commentator sought a common theme between the two papers by referring to Klenbort's introductory comments on the disillusionment with progress that many people feel today. What seems to be missing is a sense of community. The two papers suggest the role of culture as a basis for community. Japan is one of the best examples of a society that has achieved modernity while not just preserving something of its traditional culture, but in many respects because of its culture. This comfortable relationship between tradition and modernity perhaps has made Japan attractive to William Castle and the other diplomats whom Rickman has studied -- and to many other Americans. On the other hand, China's traditional culture has inhibited modernization (here "modernization" should be distinguished from "Westernization"). However, Chinese life today displays much of the sense of community that often passes in the modernization process; it may be that the Chinese will manage to retain this sense of community as their effort at further modernization continues.