

Care and Justice Counterpoised: The Key to Realizing Benevolence in the Public World

Jitaro Mizuno

Contents

1. Introduction—The Realization of Peace and Security in the Public World
2. Care Ethics and Justice
 - (i) Justice and Benevolence
 - (ii) Care Ethics
 - (iii) Care and Justice Counterpoised
3. Practicing Grief Care
 - (i) ‘Wholeness’ Encompasses Others
 - (ii) A Caring Mind and a Welcoming Kindness
 - (iii) An Awareness of the Wholeness of Life—Learning from *Tuesdays with Morrie*
4. Case Studies—Three Case Reports
5. Conclusion
 - (i) Loving Human Beings in the Spirit of a Parent
 - (ii) Care and Wholeness
 - (iii) The Principle of Benevolence in the Public World
 - (iv) The Characteristics of Supreme Morality

1. Introduction—The Realization of Peace and Security in the Public World

I learned about Moralogy from my parents, so that some of my beliefs and values were formed even before I could judge what was right and wrong for myself. All the jobs in the world, I was told, really exist for the benefit of others, with people receiving money in exchange for their services to people; that is the correct way to make a living. However, since most people in fact work for their own profit, conflicts eventually arise between them. I am thankful that I was taught very early in life that we owe our existence to others and can survive only when we put all our energies into working for them. Even as a youth I already cherished the idea that I must use my own powers to

help those who were suffering.

Genuine relationships with others seem to grow only when we try to bring them peace and security. Dr. Chikuro Hiroike said that the practice of benevolence means alleviating the sufferings of others and helping them to attain security, and that acting in this spirit also enables one to enhance one's own character. Since I was brought up by my parents in accordance with these ideas, it is natural that from my youth onwards I was drawn to studies that deal with human weakness and suffering. Clinical anthropology eventually became my major focus, and today my specialized fields of study cover care and caring, death education, and grief care.

An inspirational figure who drew me towards clinical anthropology was Dr. M. J. Langeveld (1905-1989). Although he came from the Netherlands to visit the Hiroike Campus many times in my younger days, I had not at that stage identified my core interests and so I could not relate directly to what he was saying. Later, though, when Professors Hayao Kawai and Shuji Wada invited him to Japan again, I became reacquainted with his approach to clinical anthropology and now feel a deep sense of gratitude to him and to those Japanese scholars who gave me a second opportunity to learn from him. My memories of Dr. Langeveld are very special to me indeed.

Now retired, I teach death education to adult learners and engage in the spiritual care of terminally ill patients, as well as training grief care counselors. So I would like to try to explain here what I have learned from these activities and how they can help us to understand what Dr. Chikuro Hiroike meant when he talked about integrating justice and benevolence. This will then lead me to sketch out some guidelines for resolving the conflicts that seem to exist between justice and benevolence.

2. Care Ethics and Justice

(i) Justice and Benevolence

Everyone seems to agree that justice is the most important ethical principle in the public world. Its task is to act as an advocate for people's rights, rectifying wrong practices and coordinating the multitudinous interests of different people through just mediation. When we talk about justice we therefore invariably focus on the public world, one in which we must perforce deal with many people unknown to us in our quest for the common good. Care, by contrast, operates in the sphere of private ethics, where its tasks include protecting people's dignity by understanding the fundamentals of their existence and the unique circumstances in which they find themselves, and offering

proper support to help them sustain their lives. So while justice is a matter of applying rules in the public world, care allows us to choose correctly among our feelings and put our choices into practice by supporting others in accordance with the rules of justice. Whether as a result we encounter gratitude or criticism from others, in all such cases we may say that care and justice are drawn into ever closer proximity as they dance together.

Dr. Chikuro Hiroike argued, however, that modern people choose incorrect thoughts and the wrong methods for the realization of peace. We can summarize his views on the matter as follows.

(a) Since ancient times people in general have considered justice as the way to realize peace, and civilized peoples today also believe in the same principle—*Si pacem, cole justum*: If you desire peace, do what is just. This, though, is a serious misconception.

(b) National laws are no more than expedients, established out of necessity, by which judges, representing the sovereign, use power forcibly to make decisions as to what is right or wrong. They are not, therefore, an efficient means for realizing true or everlasting peace.

(c) So-called justice is effectively like a compass indicating the standard for adjusting how much, and the degree to which, benevolence is to be exerted. Justice, therefore, like reason, embodies ‘cold’ morality, representing the intellectual aspect of humankind, in contrast to the ‘warm’ morality of benevolence. Justice may be considered a mere intellectual exercise in which discretion is used to make moral judgments. Thus in any conflict, each party will take a stand based on its own conception of justice, and these will inevitably collide. There is confusion in society and states today mainly because people have given up morality, or the justice of God, choosing rather to depend on human intellect alone and fight for human justice (*Toward Supreme Morality*, III, 54-55).

Dr. Hiroike concludes, therefore, that to realize peace we must have resort to benevolence, because justice by itself cannot solve conflicts between people and may even exacerbate them. Justice is based on the intellect, whereas benevolence is located at the heart of morality; its warm nature allows it to nurture and sustain others. Justice, we must conclude then, exists to adjust the degree of benevolence to be applied in each case and to reveal the standards for realizing benevolence.

(ii) Care Ethics

Where does care fit into all this? Care obviously means being concerned

for others. From the beginning of human history, human beings have taken care of others and have been taken care of by them. In some cases, though, care means an acceptance of others in their entirety, and here a deeper level of concern is required. For example, caring for terminally ill patients or for people with impairments requires a concern not only for their physical lives, their bodies, but also for their spiritual wellbeing, i.e., for the wholeness of their existence. In such cases benevolence acts to nurture the emotional and spiritual aspects of care, giving it an organic and integrated character. Above all, benevolence works to foster concern for others, and it is this emotional leaven that is especially important in caring. This is why care resembles so closely the principle of benevolence, differing from it only in the way it is put into practice; for care needs to be properly adjusted to the circumstances of each individual being cared for, and it also depends on professionally honed skills.

Since justice and care must each occupy their own specialized fields in order to function properly, they naturally do not always mesh smoothly. The principle of justice is characterized by universality, and so it deals with concepts such as rights, equity, and fairness. Care, on the other hand, is characterized by a concern for individuals. But even though justice and care may inevitably collide in some circumstances, in general each should act each as a counterpoise to the other. Thus, for example, the application of justice in respect of an individual in a very feeble condition may go against the principles of fairness and equity, depending of course on the degree of feebleness. In such cases, it is better to refrain from applying justice.

In the grief care group work in which I involve myself I have come across other situations where this same rule holds. The people I encounter include some who are suffering the indirect consequences of crime, having been deprived of their loved ones by the irresponsible conduct of others, as when a death is caused by drink driving. Even where justice is applied in such cases and the offenders are severely punished, this does not bring the relatives of the dead person any meaningful sense of healing. On the contrary, it leaves them feeling a certain hollowness of spirit.

Those who find themselves in such situations may win a lawsuit, but this never fills their hearts with joy. Instead of seeing the offenders punished, such people often have a far stronger desire to hear them apologize sincerely and express themselves in the true spirit of penitence that alone can reach the heart. One such situation of which I have personal knowledge involved parents who had lost a son as a result of serious neglect by others. Even though they had won a lawsuit against the offenders, the parents agreed to a mediated settlement and accepted the offenders' apology. In such cases, people clearly wish

to feel that those responsible care about the loss they have caused, rather than try to derive satisfaction from the retributive punishment offered by justice. Since care alone can revivify our humanity in such cases, it is morality based on benevolence, rather than on justice, that is most needed here.

(iii) Care and Justice Counterpoised

We need, then, to integrate justice and care and, more widely, justice and benevolence. Care theory can act as a counterbalance and supplement to justice, and caring can minister to people regardless of the specific nature of their individual situations. Furthermore, to be effective, care, which underpins all our relationships with others, needs the third party perspective that Dr. Hiroke advocated. He set out the ethical principle that any situation involving justice should be viewed not just from the perspectives of the two parties directly involved, but also from that of the third party, lest its interests be damaged. So in any matter of moral judgment, a third perspective is needed that, while not negating, goes beyond the interests of the two original parties. On this basis we can argue that care ethics should act as a counterpoise to the principle of justice, and so Dr. Hiroike's proposal, appropriately modernized, can contribute to the advancement of social and public philosophy.

3. Practicing Grief Care

(i) 'Wholeness' Encompasses Others

I have been engaged in grief care as a volunteer worker for eighteen years and in that time have dealt with some 2,000 individuals in the throes of coming to terms with feelings of loss and grief after the death of a family member as a result of illness, crime, accident, or disaster. One very large-scale case in which I was involved was the train crash of April 25, 2005 on the Fukuchiyama Line near Amagasaki, which left 107 people dead and 549 more injured. Even though I was mainly caught up in the effort to care for the families of the deceased, the traumatic impact of the accident on the lives of the railway company workers also affected me deeply. So when I was asked to talk to more than 700 relatives of the dead, the major part of my speech focused on the issues of forgiveness and the overcoming of anger and hatred toward the West Japan Railway Company. I said that if the bereaved could find forgiveness inside themselves, their hearts might possibly be healed, and the spirits of those who had died might even gain a certain peace thereby. I heard later from the organization hosting this meeting that those who had heard my speech agreed strongly with what I had said.

I believe that a vital part of the practice of care ethics is a willingness to listen to people as they describe their sufferings. This allows us to grasp that our motives and conduct should be governed by the idea of bringing the spirit of benevolence to others and ameliorating their lives. My experience of grief care has taught me that caring requires a perspective that allows us to see the wholeness of others and that when we embrace this view and put it at the heart of care ethics, we see benevolence fused with justice. Dr. Hiroike likewise teaches us the necessity of placing wholeness in terms of consideration for others at the core of our understanding of care and benevolence. In this way justice and benevolence are integrated instead of being placed in opposition to each other. This whole approach is perhaps best encapsulated by the English term 'cosmos', which symbolically includes healing, wholeness, health, and holiness.

(ii) A Caring Mind and a Welcoming Kindness

Care basically means 'taking care of, and attending on, others' and it manifests itself in many different contexts. Stores take care of, and pay attention to, their customers by making them feel relaxed and trying to give them satisfaction. Other contexts include the family, the community, and the school where, when academic year begins, every classroom is decorated to welcome the new children. Such examples show us how care means paying attention to the wholeness of others.

This concern for others, the desire to provide them with a comfortable and secure environment, is modeled on a mother's dedication to caring for her children. The German educational philosopher, O. F. Bollnow (1903-1991), argued that the starting point of education is to be found in the concept of *Geborgenheit*, the warmth, security and comfort that a mother provides for her baby and which, together with the presence of the mother herself, allows the baby to sleep soundly even in the darkness of night. I think the feeling of security present in the concept of *Geborgenheit* can be equally well expressed by the term 'wholeness'.

Another dimension of 'wholeness' is revealed by accounts of how Dr. Chikuro Hiroike received guests who had travelled far to visit him. He first offered them the use of a bath to cleanse their bodies (which also symbolized washing away their worries and cares in a secure environment). Then he welcomed them with food and made them feel as comfortable as possible before listening to them describe what was most troubling them. The nature of this hospitality reflected his understanding of the wholeness of his visitors, as well as the depth and breadth of his concern to heal their tired bodies and troubled

minds. We might go so far as to say that such hospitality was learned from the way in which God nurtures all creatures that live on this earth.

If we cannot detect in someone such a feeling for the wholeness of others, we tend to suspect that person, leaving us feeling an emptiness of mind which detracts from our pleasure in life. The World Health Organization has now added spirituality to its definition of health, confirmation that we need spirituality, the awareness of being supported in our wholeness by the world, including a healthy family, community, and natural environment, as the source of our strength and vitality.

Society today lacks a sense of wholeness and is characterized by excessive reliance on professional skills. In education, knowledge is broken into pieces and sold; medical professionals are excessively concerned with isolated parts of the body and tend to ignore its wholeness; bureaucrats have been severely criticized for forgetting to pay attention to the general welfare of the nation because they have lost a vision of wholeness. All this is the result of our no longer having a feeling for wholeness and spiritual dynamism. We urgently need to recapture such a feeling instead of simply trying to deal with the symptoms of problems like truancy or depression.

Dr. Chikuro Hiroike understood the idea of wholeness very well, as we can see in his concept of 'ortholinon', a line of succession of those who carry out the task of nurturing all living creatures, doing what some may call God's work. He recommended us to express gratitude by repaying our indebtedness to those who have fostered this wholeness, this being the highest form of morality, and called the restoring of wholeness to our existence 'enlightening human minds'. This reveals how Hiroike perceived cosmic spirituality at work in our everyday lives, and its effect on our daily moral conduct.

Our civilization may well continue to advance by effectively applying our rational powers. But too exclusive a pursuit of rationalism may lead us to lose touch with, and eventually damage, our sense of wholeness. So we have to restore that sense by learning about it from classic works, by building a sustaining culture and, at times, by opening ourselves to nature and bringing ourselves into contact with the influence of its nurturing spirit of parental love. We can understand this better if we can grasp why Hiroike placed so much emphasis on our duty to repay the debt that we owe to our ortholinons for our very existence. We will also see a need to restore a connection with traditional values and revive our spirituality by occasional visits to shrines and temples.

School teachers today tend to neglect their mission to foster this kind of wholeness in children; caught up in a massive educational industry it is all too

easy to lose sight of human wholeness and the source of life.

(iii) An Awareness of the Wholeness of Life—Learning from *Tuesdays with Morrie*

One of my favorite books is *Tuesdays with Morrie* (Doubleday, 1997), a world best-seller about the well-known sociologist, Professor Morrie Schwartz, who, despite contracting ALS (Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis, more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease) had a great influence on many people right up until the end of his life. Mitch Albom, a former student of Morrie's, wrote this book so that the lessons he learned from him would not be lost, and I have gained many new insights into life and human values from passages such as the following:

“The culture we have does not make people feel good about themselves. And you have to be strong enough to say if the culture doesn't work, don't buy it.”

“So many people walk around with a meaningless life. They seem half-asleep, even when they're busy with doing things they think are important. This is because they're chasing the wrong things. The way you get meaning into your life is to devote yourself to loving others, devote yourself to your community around you, and devote yourself to creating something that gives you purpose and meaning” (pp. 42-43).

When Morrie found himself no longer able to wipe his anus for himself, he said, “I began to enjoy my dependency.... I revel in it” (p. 116).

In his infancy, Morrie's mother used to do this for him. Now he had arrived at a fresh recognition of his mother's love and cherished the time when she took care of him in this way. Until he lost his freedom to move he had not been able to realize how grateful he should have been to his mother for giving him a perfect wholeness of life.

Many of us tend to complain bitterly when we lose our freedom of movement, but such a loss can actually allow us to regain the wholeness of our spiritual existence.

4. Case Studies—Three Case Reports

During my eighteen years of my grief work experience, I have encountered many people with serious grief issues that I could not do anything about. Even so, such cases can still serve to illustrate how we may integrate justice and care, as well as benevolence and care. Here are three of them.

Case 1

Twenty years ago, a senior high school student who had gained a place on his chosen university course accepted an invitation from two of his friends to a drinking party. His friends got completely drunk and beat him up, leaving him with a cerebral contusion from which he died several days later. The assailants were arrested, convicted and sent to a juvenile reformatory. The grief of the victim's mother was deep indeed and it took a long time before the healing process could begin. Some years after the incident she felt able to attend a gathering at my house. Although many difficulties in her family happened after the death of her son, she resolved these one by one and was finally able to deal with her grief issues. She then opened her house to those in a similar situation and has undertaken grief care work ever since. Twenty years had passed when one of the offenders showed up at her home and asked to pray for her deceased son in front of the family's Buddhist altar. The father showed him into the house and he offered up his prayer. He then explained to the deceased's parents that he had worked hard after his release from the juvenile reformatory, had got married and now had his own family. As he said goodbye at the entrance, the father asked him to wait a moment before returning with a congratulatory marriage gift. Handing it to him, he heartened him by saying "You have already redeemed your crime. You may not always remember my son, but please raise a good family." Both the parents here have been studying Moralogy for many years, and even after such lengthy suffering, they become able to forgive the man who had killed their son. It is obvious that benevolence, going far beyond justice, was at work here.

Case 2

About ten years ago, a freshman student who had failed his first attempt to enter his chosen university, crammed hard for a year and succeeded the second time around. The president of the university warned in his speech at the entrance ceremony that anyone who forced freshmen to drink would be expelled from the university, but this had little effect and at an initiation drinking party for a university club, senior students enticed this particular student into drinking more than he could take. He lapsed into a coma and died shortly afterwards from acute alcohol poisoning. His parents desperately wanted to know exactly what had happened at the party, but those present refused to provide any information. No witnesses could be found to testify in court and so that the parents could not file a case. The mother in particular had hoped that some the young people present would have had a moral sense strong enough for them to come forward but this did not happen. She and her

husband could therefore only keep quiet and suffer in silence.

Soon after the incident this mother joined my grief care group, and she gradually began to recover from the loss of her son. A few years passed and the senior students involved had by now found at top companies or in government departments. One day, completely out of the blue, one of them invited the parents to the very room where their son had died and confessed to what had happened there. The parents now knew that their son had been forced to drink to excess. However even though having this knowledge gratified the parents, they did not take the case to court. After revealing the truth, those responsible visited the household Buddhist altar on the anniversary of the student's tragic death and offered their sincere apologies, something they have continued to do ever since. Hearing their apologies, the mother said, "We will forgive you. We want you to become creative members of society and do something good for others in memory of our son." On hearing these words, the faces of the former students expressed a sense of release. The mother said to me, "When I forgave them, they seemed to grow into better persons." This proves that the principle of benevolence does exist in the universe and that it can nurture humanity in others. Today this mother is an important member of our grief care group.

Case 3

A few years ago a young man died from serious injuries sustained in a motorbike accident after the emergency team attending him mistakenly decided not to take him to hospital immediately. The dead man's mother castigated them for this but those in charge refused to offer any apology. The mother was not able to accept her son's death and grieved for a long time. In her sadness she decided to take the case to court, not to gain monetary recompense but because, despite feeling that her son might not have wished her to pursue this course, she wanted to hear those responsible apologize. Having won the case, she accepted the path of conciliation and the chief officer of the emergency services visited her to apologize.

These three cases have some common themes. In each of them, parents suffered after their son died as a result of illegal actions by others, and their greatest need was for care rather than justice. Indeed, in the second case, the family of the victim was not able to bring the assailants to the court and so could not appeal for justice at all. In the third case, although the mother won in court, she accepted the offer of conciliation.

All these cases also reveal the problematic relationship between the ethics of care and those of justice. The third case is particularly relevant here. When she won her case, the court ruled that her grief for her loss had to be

compensated in terms of money. This is a complete revelation of the absurdity and the limitations of the social institution of justice. The social practice of trying to utilize monetary compensation to realize social justice is shown here for the folly that it truly is.

In all these cases, too, those who had suffered gravely because of the wrongful behavior of others were unable to gain satisfaction from monetary compensation or judicial punishment, and decided instead to accept the apologies offered by those who had wronged them. Despite having gone through the darkest of sufferings, they forgave the offenders, embracing them with a benevolence which extends beyond justice, as we can clearly see. By offering to partake of their pain, our grief care group played a part in helping to bring about this change of attitude. But before this point could be reached, the problems they faced were so grave and of so public a concern that we were unable to offer advice or advocacy. We could only listen to, and empathize with them by sharing their pain. But in our hearts we all felt the benevolent spirit of God which resembles parental love.

5. Conclusion

(i) Loving Human Beings in the Spirit of a Parent

Chikuro Hiroike cited the important work of bringing enlightenment and salvation to human minds as an example of benevolence, telling us to “Love humans with the spirit of parents”, that is, to deal with others as if we were their parents.

The ultimate task in the practice of supreme morality is the enlightenment, or the bringing to salvation, of the minds of others. One who learns about supreme morality and then wishes to practice it must necessarily acquire a parent-like concern for others. Not only one’s inferiors but also one’s superiors (even one’s superiors in the practice of supreme morality), one must love with a parental mind (*Toward Supreme Morality* III, p. 511).

By ‘a parental mind’ Hiroike means here the warm and caring attitude with which a parent embraces the wholeness of its offspring’s existence and wishes for its healthy growth, an active care undertaken in a benevolent spirit, and the integration of all of this. Wholeness is probably the best synonym for ‘a parental mind’ here.

Wholeness, then, connects each part with every other so that it exists within the whole. In modern societies, specialization, fragmentation, and the breaking down of communal bonds are accelerating. Wholeness is the exact

opposite of this. In Japan traditional social structures are changing and so the wholeness which embraces human beings in their totality is being lost. But this very movement towards a more specialized society means that we need justice and benevolence even more.

(ii) Care and Wholeness

Unlike some other interactions between people, caring activities are creative and nurturing. Invisible they may be, but their wholeness sustains all the parties involved. Chikuro Hiroike termed such activities 'the spirit of enlightenment.' Educating or influencing others demands not only knowledge and skills but also the broad and generous spirit of parents, one which embraces others and which we can call the 'Great Benevolent Spirit.' Of course specialized knowledge and skills are needed to work in conjunction with, and give effect to this spirit.

What exactly does this 'parental spirit' mean? In the first place, it is something that goes beyond our role as the physical parents of our own children, although that role symbolizes the way we need to nurture and cherish everything. A true 'parental spirit' in fact reveals itself whenever we appear in our wholeness to another person; it is also present in the concept of an ortholinon (this term indicates the succession of pure orthodoxy that creates or develops the physical and spiritual life of humankind). Secondly, in this broader 'parental spirit' both justice (masculinity) and benevolence (femininity) are integrated, each supplementing the other.

The way that modern society functions means that we see human beings only in part, that is, in their specialized roles where their actions are characterized by a narrow and hard form of justice and the use of intellectual and analytical capacities alone. So they lack what is most essential to human existence, the wholeness that embraces everything. Nor does every physical parent possess a real 'parental spirit'. That is just an illusion. When examination results come out, for example, parents care only about their own children, and they can be extremely ungenerous when comparing them with others. Equally, they can also observe their own children with a cold and objective gaze, or refuse to accept the good and bad points about them. So human parents often lack the wholeness of the true 'parental spirit' and cannot accept that there is a spiritual line connecting us all with God and our ortholinons.

(iii) The Principle of Benevolence in the Public World

Finally, then, we need to examine the arguments leveled against the spirit

of benevolence. If we want to apply what Chikuro Hiroke proposed to our present day problems we may well encounter many criticisms like the following.

(a) Only an outstanding leader with a highly developed sense of responsibility can follow the principle of benevolence when dealing with critical situations. In our daily public lives, how we practice ethics is greatly influenced by the particular situation and our relationships with others. Benevolence is only possible in relationships between superiors and inferiors, not those involving equals.

(b) Benevolence works only when relationships with others have been disrupted and there is no hope for recovery, and solely on occasions when communication proceeds from one party alone. Only when we feel isolated do we turn to benevolence as a last resort. So it has no relevance to ordinary life, and we should emphasize the importance of dialogue instead.

(c) Why is benevolence to be imposed externally? It appears quite idealistic for those outside a dispute to insist that the parties involved act in this spirit. Benevolence does not really have the power to resolve troubles. Emphasizing it is just another instance of the weakness of Japanese culture, to be set alongside the dependency theory of Takeo Doi and the mother principle as Japanese illness of Hayao Kawai. Benevolence may be a beautiful idea but it is limited to the realm of Japanese culture.

(d) Benevolence only has meaning when problem solving skills and knowledge are employed as part of a total strategy. Hiroike's idea appears much too spiritual and lacking in concreteness. Benevolence may be part of one's personal ethics but has no place in public ethics, since it is very doubtful if it can resolve disputes between countries or political parties.

(e) Benevolence only has meaning in the minds of leaders who deal with complicated disputes between countries or enterprises. If it became the guiding principle of the Japanese government's diplomatic ethics, other countries would regard Japan as being very weak and exploit this to advance their own interests.

Such criticisms can in fact help us to clarify the characteristics of Hiroike's idea more effectively, and we can respond as follows.

(iv) The Characteristics of Supreme Morality

First, Hiroike's supreme morality is not based on the masculine approach of fighting against evil but on the feminine one of encompassing others gently.

Hiroike's life story may not appear to have many feminine aspects because he pursued his goals so vigorously. But when he experienced a life threatening illness, he had to understand his weakness and throw himself upon God's benevolence. He could not preserve himself by the exercise of his strong will or ego. Experiencing the limitation of his strengths, he opened his mind to others and started to care for the weak in life, to see the weakness in others, and to care for the sick. Before, his life had been one of solitude conducted by a strong will; now it became one of togetherness and empathy. The axis of his life changed, we can say, from strength to weakness, and so he was awakened to the importance of prioritizing concern for others.

Secondly, Hiroke did not discover this tender feminine ethics entirely through his illness. He had in fact already found it in a story in *The Record of Ancient Matters* (A.D. 712) where benevolence is highlighted; the story is retold in *The Chronicles of Japan* (A.D. 720), where the emphasis is placed on justice (see *The Life of Chikuro Hiroike*, p. 323). In the former version, which provides the first archetypal exposition of feminine ethics, the goddess Amaterasu acted in a spirit of "benevolence, tolerance, and self-examination" in response to her brother's unkind deeds. Hiroike divined how this revealed our need to turn from the principle of strength to that of weakness, which is the essential characteristic of Japanese ethics. No one before Hiroike expounded the principle of benevolence, tolerance, and self-examination and tried to apply it to politics, the economy, diplomacy, and the foundations of national education.

Third, benevolence is the principle of resolving an issue by conceding, not competing. As Hiroke wrote "With the spirit of benevolence, we can forgive our enemies and love those who oppose us. In all cases examine yourself and take all the responsibility upon yourself. In good or bad circumstances one should examine oneself so that one can enhance one's character. Temperance and modesty will allow one to lead a life with gratitude....With such humble modesty, with a tender benevolent spirit like soft water, like a perfectly rounded crystal, like the huge and wide warm ocean or a spring day, politicians will come to have an ever more sincere concern for people and the nation and will stop their ugly political struggles. With this spirit capitalists will become more benevolent and will be able to work for mutual prosperity and joy together with ordinary people. We will have fewer cases of litigation if we stop claiming our rights except where circumstances compel us to, and make concessions in most circumstances. If we make a few more concessions at home, in the community, and in the country, every family will know peace and we can govern our families and communities better. Disputes will become less

frequent, we will happier, and so our country will be more prosperous. In this way the principle of benevolence will become the best path towards attaining happiness and prosperity” (*The Ise Grand Shine and National Polity*, pp. 61-62). In short Hiroike advised that we should resolve every dispute in the spirit of benevolence, tolerance, and self-examination.

Furthermore, in relation to diplomacy, the burning issue of his day, Hiroike wrote, “In the writings of the founders of Japan we cannot find Machiavellian tactics such as resorting to trickery and maneuvering, or threats of the use of force in diplomacy...in general, taking a stand on a position with an impartial and benevolent attitude will gain Japan allies for the realization of world peace” (*ibid*, pp. 63-64).

Even if only a small part of the Japanese population comes to understand and adopt such a high-minded ethical principle, its influence will not be insignificant. Hiroike’s idea echoes Gandhi’s belief in nonviolence. Only the principle of benevolence (i.e. a benevolent attitude toward others) and self-examination can make the coexistence of multiple political organizations and civilizations possible. At the risk of sounding parochial, I cannot help pointing out that it was in Asia that the principle of benevolence as the supreme element in public ethics and spiritual life originated.

References

- Hamazu, Shinji (ed.) *Kea no Ningengaku Nyumon* (Care and Human Studies), Chisenshokan, 2005.
- Noddings, Nel. *Caring: A Feminine Approach in Ethics and Moral Education*, University of California, 1985.
- Mizuno, Jitaro. *Kea no Ningengaku: Seijuku Shakai ga Hiraku Chihei* (Care and Human Studies: Opening the Horizon in the Maturing Age), Yurumi shuppan, 1997.
- Mizuno, Jitaro. *Keikoku Saimin no Gaku: Nihon Moral Science Note* (A Study of Administration and Governing: A Japan Moral Science Note, Reitaku University, 2008. See especially chapter two of this work, ‘Caring for Others as Public Ethics’).

(Translator: Shujiro Mizuno)