

# The Rethinking of “State Shinto” in Japanese Academia After World War II

QIN Lianxing

Shanxi University, Taiyuan, China

The Shinto Directive, the official source of the term “State Shinto”, on the one hand defines the concept of “State Shinto” in a narrow sense, and on the other hand reveals its profound connotation and generalized extension. In 1945, after the Allied Forces issued the Shinto Directive, Japanese academia carried out in-depth research around “State Shinto”, and gradually formed the “two camps” consisting of scholars who advocated the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” and insisted on the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”. In the process of promoting the democratic reform, the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” gradually developed into the general theory of “State Shinto” after the war; With the continuous advancement of empirical research, the “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” gradually rose. While enriching the post-war research of “State Shinto”, it also provided a theoretical basis for historical revisionists to distort and cover up history. Finally, under the situation that the trend of Japanese political right deviation is increasingly intensified, the limitations of the “broad sense” and “narrow sense” camps are broken, and the study of “State Shinto” has entered a new stage.

*Keywords:* State Shinto, Jinja Shinto, the Shinto Directive, the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”

## Introduction

After the end of World War II in 1945, Japanese academia carried out in-depth research and discussion around “State Shinto”, and gradually formed “two camps” consisting of scholars who advocated the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” and insisted on the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”. Among them, the scholars who advocate the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” believe that “State Shinto” is a religion that combines Royal Shinto and “Jinja Shinto”, which formed the basis of Japan’s national ideology and occupied the status of “State religion” in Japan during the 80 years from the Meiji Restoration to the defeat of Showa. On the basis of this broad definition, the proposal of preventing the revival of “State Shinto” was put forward (Murakami, 1990, pp. 179-180). Scholars who insisted on the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” based on the definition of the concept of “State Shinto” in Shinto Directive, the official source of the term “State Shinto”, advocated that “State Shinto” was “Jinja Shinto” under the state administration before the defeat of the war, which was different from other Shinto according to the provisions of government laws and regulations. On the basis of this narrow definition, some scholars advocated that “State Shinto” during World War II was the object of national administration and could not engage in ideological propaganda (Oohara, 1989, p. 39), trying to get

rid of war responsibility for “State Shinto” with militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideas. Then, why are the differences in the post-war Japanese academia research on “State Shinto” so great? What are the historical backgrounds for the emergence of the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” and the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” proposed by the “two camps”? What specific contents are included respectively? What are the different voices of the Japanese academia in response to the two different views put forward by the “two camps”? In order to solve these questions, this paper focuses on the basic situation of Japan’s post-war “State Shinto” research, combs and summarizes the formation and development of the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” and the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” respectively in chronological order, analyzes and discusses the new situation of the research of “State Shinto” of Japan, hoping to benefit China’s “State Shinto” research. At the same time, under the increasingly serious situation of Japanese political right deviation, we also hope to take this to provide some reference for us to expand the relevant cognition of modern Japan.

### **The Origin of the Formation of the “Two Camps”: The Promulgation of the Shinto Directive**

As many Japanese scholars pointed out, before the war, Japan did not often use the term “State Shinto”. What makes it a familiar fixed term today is the Shinto Directive issued by the Allies in 1945. The Shinto Directive, fully known as “Abolition of Governmental Sponsorship, Support, Perpetuation, Control, and Dissemination of State Shinto (Kokka Shinto, Jinja Shinto)”, was issued with the purpose to separate religion from the state, to prevent misuse of religion for political ends, and to put all religions, faiths, and creeds upon exactly the same legal basis, entitled to precisely the same opportunities and protection. It forbids affiliation with the government and the propagation and dissemination of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology. Among them, for the concept of “State Shinto”, the object of abolition, the following definitions are made in the Directive (the directives appearing below, unless otherwise specified, refer to Shinto Directive):

The term State Shinto within the meaning of this directive will refer to that branch of Shinto (Kokka Shinto or “Jinja Shinto”) which by official acts of the Japanese Government has been differentiated from the religion of Sect Shinto (Shuha Shinto or Kyoha Shinto) and has been classified a non-religious national cult commonly known as State Shinto, National Shinto, or Shrine Shinto. (Kokugakuindaigakukenkyujō, 2004, p. 137)

The decree here is generally believed to refer to the separation order of priests from teaching posts issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs in January 1882 and Royal Decree No. 163 issued when the Ministry of Home Affairs set up the Bureau of Shrines and Temples in 1900. The former distinguishes “Jinja Shinto” from Kyoha Shinto, strengthens the theory of “the shrine is non-religious”, and makes a step towards the establishment of “State Shinto”. The latter stipulated to abolish the Bureau of Social Temple of the Ministry of Home Affairs and set up the Bureau of Shrines and Temples and the Bureau of Religion, which clearly distinguished “Jinja Shinto” from the Bureau of Shrines and Temples in 1900. The former distinguishes “Jinja Shinto” from Kyoha Shinto in terms of system and administration, indicating the establishment of “State Shinto”. It can be seen from the above definition that the Allies did not strictly distinguish between the concepts of “State Shinto” and “Jinja Shinto” in their instructions, but defined “State Shinto” as the object of state administration and regarded as a non-religious cult and “Jinja Shinto”. However, while defining this concept, the directive clearly pointed out in the specific paragraph of abolishing “State Shinto” that

All propagation and dissemination of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology in Shinto doctrines, practices, rites, ceremonies, or observances, as well as in the doctrines, practices, rites, ceremonies, and observances of any other religion, faith, sect, creed, or philosophy, are prohibited and will cease immediately.

That is to say, in the eyes of the Allies, the “State Shinto” before the war was not a “Jinja Shinto” that was simply the object of national administration, but contained the content of consciousness, which played a role in promoting militarism and ultra-nationalistic and guiding the citizens to participate in the war. Moreover, the directive also mentioned that “Circulation by the government of ‘The Fundamental Principles of the National Structure’ (Kokutai no Hongi), ‘The Way of the Subject’ (Shinmin no Michi), and all similar official volumes, commentaries, interpretations, or instructions on Shinto is prohibited”,

The use in official writings of the terms “Greater East Asia War” (Dai Toa Senso), “The Whole World under One Roof” (Hakko Ichi-u), and all other terms whose connotation in Japanese is inextricably connected with State Shinto, militarism, and ultra-nationalism is prohibited and will cease immediately.

It can be seen from this that, according to the directive, the ways to publicize the ideology of “State Shinto” include official books, Shinto instructions, diction, etc. The publicity subjects include not only the education institutions that receive official support, but also the official institutions such as the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology and the Ministry of Home Affairs, and the publicity content includes the specific content related to the properties of the theory of “National Structure”, such as “The Fundamental Principles of the National Structure” (Kokutai no Hongi), “The Way of the Subject” (Shinmin no Michi). It can be said that the directive side defines the concept of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”, that is, “Jinja Shinto” with non-religious nature as the object of national administration; On the one hand, it leads to the connotation of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, that is, a State religion that includes “Jinja Shinto”, militarism, ultra-nationalistic, and other ideological elements.

After the promulgation of the directive, in the background of the Allied Army’s democratic reform, “State Shinto”, as a “negative legacy” left by modern history, was well known. However, with the further advancement of Shinto research and the increasing right deviation political ecology in Japan, the vague definition of the meaning of “State Shinto” in the directive has gradually become the “fuse” for the chaos of post-war “State Shinto” research and the formation of “two camps”.

### **The Gradual Establishment of the Theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”**

After the end of the Allied occupation in 1952, the Japanese academia officially started the relevant research on “State Shinto”. The historian Toshio Fujitani was the first to study “State Shinto”. In the chapter “The Establishment of State Shinto” in the Lecture on “the History of Japanese Religion” (Volume I) published in 1959, Fujitani first used the expression of “State Shinto” to analyze Japan’s Shinto policy before the war. First of all, Fujitani pointed out that “State Shinto” was the sacrificial system that most Japanese shrines adopted before the war, with the ancestors of the Mikado as the center and the Mikado as the sacrificial master. Secondly, Fujitani believed that the idea of “State Shinto”, which regarded the Mikado as an absolute monarch, was something that the Japanese ruling class instilled in the people in the early Meiji era in order to unify the national ideology. Finally, Fujitani advocated that, in addition to “Jinja Shinto”, the royal sacrifices and the corresponding ceremonies held in official halls and schools, the proposition of the theory of “Jinja Shinto is non-religious”, “The Meiji Constitution”, and “The Imperial Rescript on Education” are all elements of “State Shinto”. Among

them, Article 28 of the Meiji Constitution stipulates that Japanese citizens are forced to believe in the State Shinto or the religious beliefs of Mikado, while “The Imperial Rescript on Education” is the “classic” and “holy book” of Mikado, and the state forces people to worship “The Imperial Rescript on Education” (Fujitani, 1959, pp. 257-283). In general, the basic framework of Fujitani’s theory of “State Shinto” is mainly composed of the ideology of shrine system, royal sacrifice, and various Mikado systems. After the Shinto Directive was issued, the Japanese started their initial research on the pre-war “State Shinto” from a critical standpoint. Fujitani’s theory of “State Shinto” laid a solid foundation for the post-war research of “State Shinto” of Japan.

Next, on the basis of Fujitani’s theory of “State Shinto”, religious scientist Shigeyoshi Murakami, in his book *State Shinto* published in 1970, used Marxist theory to make a more detailed analysis and elaboration of the specific structure and formation process of “State Shinto” in modern Japan in the past 80 years, and built a complete system of “State Shinto Theory”. First of all, Murakami maintained that “State Shinto” is a national ideology with dual political and religious characteristics, which, as the State religion of modern Japan, had a profound impact on other religions and citizens. Secondly, Murakami advocated “State Shinto” based on “Jinja Shinto” and the “Royal Shinto”. Among them, “Jinja Shinto” refers to Shinto with religious facilities—Shinto shrines as the center; “Royal Shinto” refers to sacrifices in the palace with the nature of a country. Thirdly, in addition to “Jinja Shinto” and “Royal Shinto”, Murakami took many elements at different levels as the supporting conditions for “State Shinto” and “State Shinto System”, making “State Shinto” an existence with rich connotation and extensive extension. Finally, Murakami clearly pointed out that the reason why Japan recognized “State Shinto” as non-religious before the war was that the pre-war government advocated that “State Shinto” had no religious doctrines. However, in fact, “State Shinto” is a through and through religion that sets up specific gods and propagandizes believers to believe in these gods. It is the State religion of modern Japan. Its doctrine is the “doctrine of the state system”, that is, the concept of the state system of Great Japanese Empire, which is specifically reflected in “The Meiji Constitution” and “The Imperial Rescript on Education”. Moreover, Murakami advocated that in the modern Mikado system country, “State Shinto” achieved the goal of controlling the national ideology through school education with the “The Imperial Rescript on Education” as the core and “Jinja Shinto” with sacrifice as the center. Murakami’s fierce criticism of “State Shinto” before the war was closely related to the political trend at that time. To be specific, after the end of the Allied occupation, with the support of the conservative parties, some right-wing forces began to actively promote the “nationalization movement of the Yasukuni Shrine”. At the same time, the Japanese government resumed the Era Festival in 1967 in the name of the “founding anniversary”, and stipulated it as a statutory holiday. In 1968, the “Meiji Centennial Commemoration” campaign was held, and in 1969, the “Guidelines for Primary School Learning” was revised. Murakami believed that this series of measures actually meant the “revival” of “State Shinto” (Murakami & Nie, 1990, pp. 1-2). Therefore, driven by a strong sense of crisis, Murakami stood in the position of supporting democracy and severely criticized the “State Shinto” before the war.

Subsequently, Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto” was widely spread in the Japanese academia, and gradually became the “general theory” of the post-war “State Shinto” in Japan. He was also regarded as the “first person” in the post-war study of “State Shinto” (Sakamoto, 1994, p. 2). In addition, Murakami’s “State Shinto”, once published, has also become a classic work on the issue of “State Shinto” at home and abroad. It is worth mentioning that in 1990, Murakami’s “State Shinto” was translated and published in China, which immediately became an important reference for Chinese scholars to study the Japanese “State Shinto”.

In 1971, Toshiyoshi Miyazawa, who studied from Tatsukichi Minobe and was known as the highest authority in the Japanese constitutional community, made the following interpretation of the Meiji Constitution in the new version of the Constitution II, taking Murakami’s State Shinto as an important reference:

The Meiji Constitution takes the Mikado theocracy as its fundamental spirit, and the result is naturally that it does not want to treat the religion that regards the ancestors of the Mikado as gods –shrine or Missionary work of Shinto - equally with other religions. In particular, in order to stabilize the spiritual foundation of the Mikado worship as the basic concept of the Meiji Constitution, it is necessary to endow the shrine that proves that the Mikado has a divine personality with the character of State religion, so the State Shinto was established. (the middle part is omitted) In addition, the state forces ordinary citizens to visit the shrine, and state officials are obliged to participate in the official ceremony of the shrine.

The Meiji Constitution stipulates freedom of religious belief, which is obviously contradictory to the belief that the shrine is a State religion. How to explain this? At that time, the government eliminated the contradiction between them with the interpretation of “The shrine is non-religious”. (Miyazawa, 1997, pp. 347-352)

From the above explanation of Miyazawa, it can be seen that, like Murakami’s main point of view, Miyazawa also regarded the shrine as the State religion of modern Japan, and believed that the Meiji government made use of the official view of the theory of “Jinja Shinto is non-religious” to make the “freedom of religious belief” stipulated in the Constitution coexist with the State religion. As Japanese scholar Hiroshi Suga said, this is the first time that the constitutional circle has used the term “State Shinto” to describe the relationship between politics and religion under the Meiji Constitution and the nature of the state religion of the shrine (Yamaguchi, 2008, p. 113). It can be seen that Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto” has great influence on Miyazawa. As an authority in the constitutional circle, Miyazawa’s “State Shinto Theory” has strong influence and penetration, and has been widely incorporated into textbooks related to the Constitution once published. It has gradually become the basic understanding of “State Shinto” in the constitutional circle. Later, with the publicity of Miyazawa’s “State Shinto” in constitutional textbooks and commentaries, and the adoption of “State Shinto” in textbooks by relevant cases, Murakami’s “State Shinto” gradually developed into the basic understanding of “State Shinto” by ordinary people before the war. As Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto” was formed on the basis of the concept of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” in Shinto Directive, it can be said that with the efforts of historian Toshio Fujitani, religious scientist Shigeyoshi Murakami, constitutional scientist Toshiyoshi Miyazawa, and other post-war “large camps” in the study of “State Shinto”, the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” gradually developed and was finally established as a common theory of “State Shinto” for people at home and abroad.

### **The Gradual Appearance of the Theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”**

With the further development of the study of “State Shinto”, the “single line development history” of “State Shinto” advocated in the above theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, that is, the view that Shinto has been formulated as the State religion of Japan for sustainable development since the Meiji Restoration, and the view that “State Shinto system” completely covers the modern Japanese religious history, have gradually been questioned by scholars. For example, in the book *The Formation of Modern Mikado View*, Japanese scholar Yoshio Yasumaru clearly pointed out that the proposition that originally rich and colorful religious phenomena should be rigidly incorporated into the same framework—the “State Shinto system” is too impatient (Yasumaru, 2010, p. 149). In this case, from the opposite of the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”, which interprets “State Shinto” in a narrow sense, has gradually appeared. Among them, the earliest and most influential is the theory of “State Shinto” put forward by Uzuhiko Ashizu in the book

*What Was the State Shinto* published in 1987. In general, Ashizu’s theory of “State Shinto” mainly includes the following points:

First of all, Ashizu advocates that “State Shinto” should be understood according to the definition of the concept of “State Shinto” in Shinto Directive, that is, “State Shinto” is “a sect of national cult Shinto that is different from the religion of Sect Shinto (Shuha Shinto or Kyoha Shinto) according to government laws and regulations, and has a non-religious nature” (Uzuhiko, 2006, p. 206). In short, it is “Jinja Shinto” under the state administration before the defeat. Secondly, Ashizu pointed out that “the State Shinto is based on the aspiration of sincere Shintoist since Meiji, but because it was strongly blocked by the political rights of non-Shinto and religious forces in the development process, and was ‘neutralized’ by these forces, he said that its spirit is a completely blank non-spiritual essence, ‘powerless and incompetent thing’ under secular rationalism, which is closest to the historical truth”. In addition, Ashizu believes that the “Koutai Shinto” and “doctrine of the state system” that “Broad Sense State Shinto theorists” attach importance to are just the religions that mislead the extremely inflated theocracy ideology of the people in the opposition during wartime into the guidance and creation of the government (Ashizu & Sakamoto, 2006, pp. 203-208). Finally, Ashizu proposed that the following historical facts should be paid attention to when analyzing the development process of the “State Shinto History”: as the theoretical basis of “State Shinto”, the original proponent of the theory of “the shrine is non-religious” was Shimaji Mokurai, a priest of the Jodo Shinshu (the True Pure Land Sect of Buddhism). Moreover, this proposition is a “policy on Shinto” put forward by Buddhists such as Shimaji Mokurai with the purpose of blocking Shinto as a religion (Ashizu & Sakamoto, 2006, p. 41). In this way, as the first study of “State Shinto” to make a positive criticism of Murakami’s “State Shinto”, the “general theory” after the war, Ashizu’s “State Shinto”, based on the concept of “State Shinto” in the “narrow sense”, soon became the representative of the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” opposite to Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”. It provides an important reference direction and angle for the later researchers of “State Shinto”.

Later, Koremaru Sakamoto, who was engaged in the study of Shinto history of Shinto shrines, inherited and developed Ashizu’s theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”, and together with Ashizu, built a “other camp” of post-war Japanese “State Shinto study”. Sakamoto’s “State Shinto Theory” mainly includes the following aspects. First of all, Sakamoto maintained that the study of the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” would neglect to make empirical and historical analysis and discussion on the Shinto system and royal sacrifices, and then arbitrarily explain “State Shinto”, which is dangerous to include Shinto, Mikado system, and all consciousness forms related to nationalism in “State Shinto”. Therefore, we should make a historical analysis of the relationship between modern countries and shrines and the formation of “State Shinto” in modern Japan according to the explicit definition of “State Shinto” in the Shinto Directive (Sakamoto, 1994, p. 7). Secondly, Sakamoto pointed out that “State Shinto”, which was founded on the theoretical basis of the theory of “the shrine is non-religious”, often has unstable “two sides” in itself. The so-called “dual nature” means that most of the shrines contain religious elements in the actual situation, but as the object of state administration, the shrines can only be regarded as “sacrificial execution facilities” without religious elements. Once again, regarding the actual situation of the “State Shinto” in modern Japan, Sakamoto believed that the ideological basis of “State Shinto” was the concept of “the unity of religion and government (saisei itchi)” and “Piety and Ancestor Worship” (Sakamoto, 2007, pp. 367-368). However, although the Bureau of Shrines and Temples, as the “main office of State Shinto”, declared the importance of divine sacrifice, in reality, it not only “ignored” the meaning of sacrifice,

but also restrained the divine burial. Therefore, the “national Shinto” (bureaucratic Shinto), as the object of national administration, did not play a huge role in publicizing the national system ideology and invigorating the national spirit, they did not enjoy the lofty status and privileges granted by the state (Sakamoto, 1994, pp. 329-332). Finally, like Ashizu, Sakamoto also paid attention to the important role played by the Jodo Shinshu (the True Pure Land Sect of Buddhism) in the establishment of “State Shinto” and advocated that the Jodo Shinshu (the True Pure Land Sect of Buddhism) was the father of “State Shinto” (Sakamoto, 2006, p. 143).

It can be seen that the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” mostly restricts the concept of “State Shinto” to “Jinja Shinto”, regards “State Shinto” consciousness prohibited in Shinto Directive as an existence unrelated to “Jinja Shinto”, and regards the Jodo Shinshu (the True Pure Land Sect of Buddhism) as the key to the establishment of “State Shinto”.

In addition, in view of the debate between “broad sense” and “narrow sense” in the current research situation of “State Shinto”, Sakamoto clearly stated that:

“State Shinto” should have its minimum conditions for the establishment of the State Shinto (the middle part is omitted). Even for Holtom, even if the shrine is not the State Shinto itself, it is also an indispensable element. From this point of view, from the ideological level, to explore the status of the Shinto shrine (Jinja Shinto) in the modern Japanese country and the people, whether for the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” or for the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, this is undoubtedly the basic work of research of “State Shinto”, and is the root of research of “State Shinto”. (Sakamoto, 2010, pp. 57-58)

Holtom (1884-1962) was a famous Shinto scholar in the United States. According to Japanese scholars, Holtom’s theory of “State Shinto” played an important role in the compilation of Shinto Directive. For example, Yasuo Oohara pointed out that the definition of the term “State Shinto” in Shinto Directive basically follows Holtom’s concept of Shinto (Oohara, 1989, p. 326). At the same time, Holtom’s book *Japan and the Mikado and Shinto*, published in 1943, was also the basic reading material for Americans to understand Japanese Shinto in the late World War II. That is to say, in Sakamoto’s view, Holtom, who has given significant influence to Shinto Directive and Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, also regards “Jinja Shinto” as an important component of “State Shinto”, indicating that “Jinja Shinto” is an indispensable element in “State Shinto” for the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad sense” and the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad sense”. Therefore, from the perspective of ideology, exploring the reality of “Jinja Shinto” in modern Japan is the basic work of the study of “State Shinto”, and reiterates the necessity of studying “State Shinto” from the perspective of “Jinja Shinto”. Later, under the influence of the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” of Sakamoto, many scholars joined the camp of adhering to the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” from different angles, such as Takachi Miyamoto, Hiroyuki Tonami, Hitashi Nitta, and other scholars. In this way, the scholars who advocate the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” and adhere to the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” jointly formed the “two camps” of research of “State Shinto” after the war, providing different perspectives for the research of “State Shinto”.

### **The New Situation of the Study of “State Shinto”**

However, with the continuous development of the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”, some scholars, on the basis of “narrowing” the concept of “State Shinto” into “Jinja Shinto” on the administrative system level of modern gods, clearly set out from the position of “victims” to “make grievances” for “State Shinto”, claiming that Japanese militarism and supranationalism had nothing to do with “State Shinto” before the war, and that they

were the ideas of the Showa Reform advocated by Kitaiiki, Zaburo Tachibanakou, and others, or the ideology of self-cultivation and national history education promoted by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. It also emphasized that “under the strict supervision of the Ministry of Home Affairs, ‘State Shinto’ cannot carry out ideological propaganda or enlightenment activities of that kind.” (Oohara, 1989, p. 39). Correspondingly, Japan established the Association of “Make a New History Textbook” in 1996, and Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi visited publicly the Yasukuni Shrine in 2001. Under the situation that historical revisionism is rising day by day and the trend of political right deviation is gradually intensifying, the religious scholar who advocates peace and has a strong sense of rejection of “State Shinto”, Susumu Shimazono, launched a counterattack, and published the book *State Shinto and the Japanese* in 2010, which broke the limitations of the “broad” and “narrow” camps and opened a new journey of post-war “State Shinto” research.

Shimazono advocates that the term “State Shinto” refers to a form of Shinto closely integrated with the country and developed after the Meiji Restoration. It is a combination of royal sacrifice, Emperor-worship system, and “Jinja Shinto”, which has had a significant impact on the spiritual life of most Japanese people in modern times. Shimazono summarized his theory as the theory of “State Shinto” aiming at comprehensive understanding of royal sacrifice, the theory of “National Structure”, and “Jinja Shinto”. Among them, royal sacrifice and “Jinja” are the ceremonies, facilities, and organizations aspect of “State Shinto”; The theory of “National Structure” is the ideological aspect of “State Shinto”, and is the key to “State Shinto”. Obviously, there is an essential difference between the theory of “State Shinto” of Shimazono and the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”. Moreover, Shimazono pointed out clearly that although the government institutionally established “Jinja Shinto” as the organ of national cult, and took royal sacrifice as its core, making it gradually become an important undertaker of “State Shinto”, there are still many contents unrelated to royal sacrifice in the belief and activities of “Jinja Shinto”. Therefore, it is also inappropriate for the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” to regard “Jinja Shinto” as “State Shinto”. In contrast, “The Meiji Constitution” and “The Imperial Rescript on Education” are regarded as the institutional basis of “State Shinto”, which make the royal sacrifice and Emperor-worship a powerful national system. On the other hand, in response to Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, Shimazono also put forward the following two criticisms: First, Murakami’s theory of “State Shinto” is a “State Shinto” based on the “State Shinto” during the war (after the 1930s), which cannot represent the “State Shinto” of the whole modern Japan; Secondly, Murakami took “Jinja Shinto” as the basis of “State Shinto”, and scholars “cater” this view, which is an important reason for the current abnormal confusion of the theory of “State Shinto”. On the second point, Shimazono explained that “Jinja Shinto” was an organization formed by the national legal system after the Meiji Restoration. It was an organization gradually endowed with substantive content during the establishment of “State Shinto”, not a specific form of expression of “national religion” that Murakami said existed since ancient times. Therefore, it is not advisable to take it as the foundation for the establishment of “State Shinto” (Shimazono, 2010, pp. 57-98). In addition, unlike the theory of “State Shinto” in broad and narrow sense, Shimazono emphasizes the continuity of “State Shinto” before and after the defeat, and regards the continued existence of royal sacrifices and the Emperor-worship movement of the “Jinjohoncho”, a civil society group, as the basis for the existence of “State Shinto” after the defeat. Shimazono believes that although GHQ has issued Shinto Directive, because the directive defines “State Shinto” as “Jinja Shinto as the national sacrificial organs”, what the directive disintegrates is only the combination between the state and “Jinja Shinto”, and royal sacrifices still exist. Moreover, after the directive is issued, the movement aimed at restoring



the relationship between royal sacrifices and “Jinja Shinto” and strengthening the national ceremonies of Shinto continues to be active. Therefore, the “State Shinto” still exists today (Shimazono, 2010, pp. 4-5).

From the above statement, we can see that the theory of “State Shinto” of Shimazono contains many elements related to “Jinja Shinto”, royal sacrifices, and the theory of “the National Structure”, which is essentially different from the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”. At the same time, the theory of “State Shinto” of Shimazono is different from other theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”. It is no longer confined to the “Jinja Shinto” as the basis for the establishment of the “State Shinto”, but places the royal sacrifice and Emperor-worship at its core. By defining the “State Shinto” as “a form of Shinto combined with the state”, the meaning of the “State Shinto” is further expanded. As Hiromasa Fudita, a Japanese scholar, pointed out, although Shimazono’s theory of “State Shinto” recognized “Jinja Shinto” as a constituent element of the “State Shinto”, it always regarded the elements of the ideological level centered on the “The Imperial Rescript on Education” as the key to the “State Shinto”, covering various elements related to the theory of “The National Structure” (Fudita, 2010).

### Conclusion

To sum up, as a part of the Allied forces’ democratic reform against Japan, the relevant disposition of “State Shinto” in the Shinto Directive has prompted the historian Toshio Fujitani, the religious scientist Shigeyoshi Murakami, and the constitutional scientist Toshiyoshi Miyazawa to gradually establish the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense”, which has become the general theory of “State Shinto” after the war. On the contrary, the definition of the concept of “State Shinto” in Shinto Directives led the researchers of “Jinja Shinto”, such as Uzuhiko Ashizu and Koremaru Sakamoto, to narrow “State Shinto” into “Jinja Shinto” at the institutional level in the administrative history of modern Shinto, thus building the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense”, which not only enriched the post-war research of “State Shinto” of Japan but also provided a basis for historical revisionists to distort and cover up history. In recent years, under the situation that the trend of political right deviation in Japan is increasingly strengthening, Shimazono, who advocates critically inheriting the theory of “State Shinto” of Murakami’s, clearly points out the shortcomings of the theory of “State Shinto in a Narrow Sense” centered on “Jinja Shinto”, and further expands and deepens the connotation of the theory of “State Shinto in a Broad Sense” by defining “State Shinto” as “a form of Shinto combined with the state”. It broke through the shackles of the “two camps”, launched a counterattack against historical revisionists, and opened a new situation of post-war research of “State Shinto”.

### References

- Ashizu, U. H., & Sakamoto, K. M. (2006). *What was the state Shinto* (New Edition). Tokyo: JinJashi-npousya.
- Fudita, H. M. (2010.11). A study on the validity of the concept of State Shinto—A review of Susumu Shimazono, state Shinto and Japanese. *Meizishotokukinengakkaikyou*, 48, 291-302.
- Fujitani, T. O. (1959). *Lectures on the history of Japanese religion* (Vol. 1). Tokyo: San-IchiShobo.
- Kokugakuindaigakukenkyujō. (2004). *The encyclopedia of state Shinto*. Tokyo: Kobundou.
- Miyazawa, T. Y. (1997). *Constitution II: Basic human rights* (New Edition). Tokyo: Yuhikaku.
- Murakami, S. Y. (1990). *State Shinto*. (C. Z. Nie, Trans.). Beijing: ShangWuChuBanShe.
- Murakami, S. Y., & Nie, C. Z. (1990). *State Shinto*. Beijing: ShangWuChuBanShe.
- Oohara, Y. O. (1989). *Between the state and religion—The ideal and reality of the separation of politics and religion*. Tokyo: Nihonkyobunsha.
- Sakamoto, K. M. (1994). *Research on the formation process of state Shinto*. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

- Sakamoto, K. M. (2006). *Jinja Shinto in modern times and kinsei*. Tokyo: Koubundou.
- Sakamoto, K. M. (2007). *A study of state Shinto in modern times*. Tokyo: Kobundou.
- Sakamoto, K. M. (2010). *Forty years of the study of State Shinto*. Tokyo: Nihonshisousigaku.
- Shimazono, S. M. (2010). *State Shinto and Japanese*. Tokyo: IwanamiShoten.
- Yamaguchi, T. O. (2008). *State Shinto in postwar history*. Tokyo: Yamakawashuppansya.
- Yasumaru, Y. O. (2010). *The formation of the modern concept of Mikado*. (J. C. Liu, Trans.). Beijing: Peking University Press.