Karatoya: NBU J. Hist. Vol. 4 :1-20 (2011) ISSN: 2229-4880

Nationalism in Late-Nineteenth Century Japan and India: Fukuzawa Yukichi and Syed Ahmad Khan*

Marie Hanneman

Late 19th century India and Japan both faced the intrusion of Western imperial power, albeit in differing degrees: India was under British colonial rule while Japan focused its energies on avoiding a similar fate. Two of their nations' leading intellectuals, India's Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898) and Japan's Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), grappled with the challenge their nations faced from the west. Although from very different cultures, the two men developed startingly similar responses to their national situations and arrived at startingly similar conclusions. They were, as Stephen Hay writes in *Asian Ideas of East and West*, among "...the first men...to try to cope with this emergency situation by studying seriously the civilization of the intruding Euroamericans."[1] From their analyses of their countries' challenges to their single-minded determination to strengthen their nations, to the means and methods for doing so, the lives and ideas of these men show amazing parallels. Amid the many parallels however, are also some important differences. An examination of these similarities and differences show in microcosm the different trajectories in the development of nationalism in late 19th century Japan and India.

Both Khan and Fukuzawa wrote and spoke extensively and were leading opinion-makers in their respective countries. Both founded newspapers to help promote their social goals, Syed Ahmad Khan's journal, *Tahzib al-Akhlaq* (*Social Reformer*) and Fukuzawa's newspaper, *Jiji shimpo*. But central to both men's lives and their efforts to effect change in their countries, were the schools they founded, Khan's Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College (later Aligarh University) and Fukuzawa's Keio Gijuku (later Keio University). The colleges they founded taught a Western curriculum, the first in each country to do so, and they particularly emphasized the natural sciences and the English language. Both men promoted education as the primary remedy to social and national decline, a remedy that would create independent, self-reliant individuals who would in turn provide the foundation for modernizing, and thus strengthening, their societies and nations. This in turn, they believed, would lead to the establishment of "civilization" in their respective countries, and the advantages civilization would bring.

---

* The paper is based on a lecture delivered by Professor Hanneman as a Fulbright Nehru Visiting Professor in an International Seminar organised by the Department of History, University of North Bengal and sponsored by the United States - India Educational Foundation (USIEF) held on December 6, 2010 at the University of North Bengal.

Dr. Mary Hanneman is a Professor of Washington University, USA.

e-mail:<hanneman@u.washington.edu>

Despite the many parallels however, key differences existed in the lives and ideas of these two men. One obvious difference was in their national situations. Khan's India was already under Britain's colonial yoke while Fukuzawa's Japan struggled to maintain its independence; Khan supported British rule, Fukuzawa saw India's colonial status as a "'warning to Japan'" of a fate to be avoided at any cost; the Indian people, he wrote, were "slaves of the British government."[2] Khan was a deeply religious and committed Muslim; Fukuzawa was entirely secular, for him, religion had no personal meaning. This religious resulted in the most fundamental difference in the two men, and in their nationalist approaches: even though Khan's primary concern was for his own Muslim community, his vision was a wider one: Khan understood "civilization" as an end in itself, an end which would elevate the condition of the people as a whole. Fukuzawa on the other hand, despite his early liberalism and views of "civilization" as a goal for humanity, ultimately narrowed his focus and came to view "civilization" not as an end in itself, but as a means for strengthening the Japanese nation and state. Thus, while one man responded to the western challenge by developing universalist ideas: India in the world; the other's response was focused on the particular, laying the foundations for a view of Japan against the world.

Why was this the case and more importantly, why does it matter? An examination of the similarities and differences in these two men's thinking and approaches to the late 19th century Western challenge can help explain the vastly divergent trajectories in the development of nationalism in early 20th century India and Japan. India eventually shook off British colonial rule, achieving its independence in a movement that while certainly marked by violence and bloodshed, ultimately coalesced under Gandhi's banner of non-violent and pacifist nationalism. Japan's aggressive efforts to preserve and protect its independence from foreign control on the other hand, developed into a rabid ultra-nationalism, spawning severe political suppression at home and unleashing violence and military aggression abroad. How then can we understand the tremendous differences in the development of nationalism in Japan and India? What can we glean from the lives, thought and activities of these late 19th century figures, Syed Ahmad Khan and Fukuzawa Yukichi, that can shed light on the very different trajectories of nationalism in each of their countries in the first half of the 20th century?

Many factors — social, cultural, economic, intellectual and international — contributed to the different trajectories of nationalism in India and Japan in the early 20th century. I believe, however, that religion and religious belief were the major factors explaining the difference in the development of nationalism in early 20th century India and Japan, and this is demonstrated in the lives and ideas of Khan and Fukuzawa. Khan's Islam was stateless, its geographic, political and historical sweep gave Khan a broad perspective.[3] His was a universe governed by an all-powerful God. Fukuzawa's universe lacked this omnipotent God; instead, his was a nation ruled over by the human god, the Emperor and although Japanese had historically borrowed heavily from China, central to the Japanese ethos was a sense of Japan's cultural uniqueness. Khan's religious beliefs afforded him an objective, transcendent vantage point, "*separate from the state*,"[4] enabling him to see beyond his own concerns and even the concerns of his own Muslim community, and develop a

universalist vision for humanity as a whole. In contrast, Fukuzawa, lacking this transcendent, universalist vantage point, had no position outside of the nation and state from which to observe, critique and assess. Fukuzawa, for all his considerable gifts, accomplishments and legacies, in the final analysis could not see beyond Japan and its imperial tradition. Thus while Fukuzawa's was a subjective vision circumscribed by Japan itself, Khan's was a universalist vision that situated his nation within the larger community of nations. While Khan advocated strengthening the nation in order to civilize it, Fukuzawa advocated civilizing the state in order to strengthen it. In this way, the ideas of these two men represent, in microcosm, the foundations of nationalism's divergent development in late 19th century Japan and India.

This paper will examine the lives and thinking of these two men, in particular examining them in their self-appointed roles as educators and looking at their educational philosophies as windows to their thought. This will highlight the vastly different ideological foundations of nationalism in early 20th century India and Japan showing how these foundations resulted in the different trajectories in the nationalist movement in each country.

Fukuzawa Yukichi

Fukuzawa Yukichi was born in 1835, the youngest of five children of a low-ranking samurai of Kyushu's Nakatsu domain. His father died before Fukuzawa's second birthday, leaving the family in straitened economic circumstances and forcing their return to Nakatsu from Osaka, where the elder Fukuzawa had been stationed in service to his *han*. Fukuzawa's formal education began relatively late; as the son of a low-ranking samurai he was not expected to learn much of anything and he was fourteen before he decided to educate himself: "I found that many of the boys of my age were studying these classics; and I became ashamed of myself and willingly started school."[5] Applying himself to his studies, he soon outshone his fellow students but came to hate the stultifying nature of both the Confucian classics and the Nakatsu han. He determined to leave Nakatsu, writing in his *Autobiography* that "...always in my heart I was praying for an opportunity to get away. And I was willing to go anywhere and to go through any hardship if only I could leave this uncomfortable Nakatsu."[6] At nineteen the opportunity came: he left for Nagasaki to study Dutch and "Dutch Learning" as Western knowledge was called at the time. Again he excelled in his studies and in 1858 he was ordered to Edo by the Nakatsu daimyo to open a school for Dutch studies for other young men of the domain. But Dutch studies, he soon realized, were obsolete. Instead, he decided to study English and the world of the West.

In 1860, he took advantage of a chance to travel with a Tokugawa government delegation to the United States, the first of three trips he would make abroad. His second overseas experience took him to Europe in 1862 and in 1867 he travelled again to the United States. Prior to this last overseas trip he began writing what would be his most famous publication, *Conditions in the West*, (*Seio jijo*) published in 1867. The initial printing of the first volume of this three-volume book (combined with pirated copies) immediately sold some 250,000 copies, both satisfying and stimulating the Japanese thirst for knowledge about the west. The phenomenal popularity of this book made him a well-known national

figure. The book's popularity rested in part on its presentation of intricate detail about life in the west, with information on everything from banks, hospitals and schools, to the activities of everyday life, but also on its straightforward and unadorned style, a diversion from the highly elaborate Sinified writing common to the day. (He was so intent on ensuring that his writing was clear and readable that he had his housemaid read the first drafts, and would change any passages she found difficult to understand.)

In April, 1868, just as the last fighting of the brief civil war that accompanied the Meiji Restoration was ending, Fukuzawa opened Keio Gijuku in Tokyo, modeling it after the English public school.[7] His aim for the school was to provide Western-style education to young men and inculcate in them a spirit of independence and self-reliance to prepare them to assume positions as leaders of the new society. (Fukuzawa himself studiously remained aloof from politics his entire life. Calling himself a "political 'teetotaller,'" he wrote that he wanted to "keep neutral and to serve the country in my own independent way."[8]) Some fifteen years after opening Keio, (1882) Fukuzawa founded the newspaper, *Jiji shimpo*, (the forerunner of *Sankei shimbun*, now Japan's third largest daily newspaper) as a way to disseminate even more broadly the ideas and approaches that were at the core of the Keio curriculum. Over the course of these years, Fukuzawa wrote and published numerous books including his 17-part *Gakumon no susume* (*An Encouragement of Learning*) (1872-1876), and *Bunmeiron no gairyaku* (*An Outline Theory of Civilization*) (1875). In 1899 he published his *Autobiography*. Later that same year he suffered a stroke. Although he recovered, he suffered a subsequent stroke several years later and died in1901.[9]

Syed Ahmad Khan

Syed Ahmad Khan was born in 1817 in Delhi, then the capital of Mughal India. His family traced its descent from Imam Husain, grandson of the Prophet Muhammed, as indicated by the honorific title, Syed.[10] Khan's father served as a personal advisor in the court of Akbar Shah II, the nominal head (and second to last emperor) of the declining Mughal Empire. Khan received the traditional, and typical, education of the Muslim elite of that era, focusing his study on the Quran as well as learning Persian, Arabic, and Islamic jurisprudence. His father's death when he was in his early 20s plunged the family into financial difficulties, and although this brought an end to his formal education, he continued to educate himself on his own. Although he was offered a position in the Mughal court, observing the decline of the court he opted instead for a position in the British East India Company civil service in 1837. The Mutiny of 1857, proved to be a crucial turning point in his life. During the Mutiny itself, Sir Syed, then serving the British East India Company in Bijnor, set himself up as guard to an English magistrate and his family, demonstrating his loyalty to the British. A cousin and uncle were killed in the Mutiny, and his mother died shortly after as a result of deprivations suffered during the chaos. In despair, Khan nearly left India, but he remained and it was this "decisive event that transformed him from an ordinary civil servant into an impassioned reformer."[11]

Sir Syed began writing and publishing as a young man, focusing on various religious and cultural issues. He was the first Muslim to write a commentary on the Bible, "apparently

for the purpose of ...creating a greater degree of mutual respect among Muslims and Christians."[12] His most famous work, however, which "brought him into the front rank of the leaders of Indian opinion,"[13] was the 1858 *Causes of the Indian Revolt*, in which he argued that the 1857 Mutiny was not the result of Muslim conspiracy against the English, but rather resulted from British ignorance about Muslim and Indian culture. Sir Syed's support for British rule is a controversial aspect of his record, but most scholars agree that Khan's support for British rule grew out of his belief that it offered the best guarantee of peace and protection for India's Muslim community. This was not an unprecedented intellectual position in 19th century India. As Jawaharlal Nehru commented in his autobiography, *Toward Freedom*, "Sir Syed Ahmad Khan... Like many of his contemporaries, was a great admirer of the British."[14] Earlier, Bengali social reformer, modernizer and advocate of Western style education Ram Mohan Roy had also supported British rule in India. Roy was more definite in his desire for Indian independence, but it should come, he believed, "... only after India was sufficiently developed in modern knowledge and had adequately learned to function as a modern and democratic civil society."[15] Khan himself wrote of his support for British rule: "Our desire to see the British government firmly established in India is based upon our conviction that its strength and continuance are essential to the peace and well-being of the country, and the support which we accord to our present rulers is entirely the outcome of our love for our own fellow-countrymen."[16] There was, moreover, a religious element to Khan's support for British rule: "an old principle of Muslim statecraft ...[based on a]...saying of the Prophet...[called for]...unquestionable obedience to the ruler of the day."[17] "God has made [the British] your rulers," Khan stated in an 1888 speech to the Indian National Congress, "and, in obedience to the will of God you should remain friendly and faithful to them."[18] This did not mean, however, that Khan was a sycophant, blindly faithful to the British. Indeed, Khan, in analyzing the causes of the 1857 Mutiny, roundly criticized the English, writing, "Now the English Government has been in existence upwards of a century, and up to the present hour has not secured the affections of the people."[19] When he disagreed with the British colonial policies, as in the case of educational policy, he stated so plainly: "...if we have still got something of self-respect left in us, we should prove to Government that though Government has indisputable power over the lives of the people, it has no power over their opinions."[20]

In 1869, Khan traveled to England, accompanying his son Mahmood, who had received a scholarship to study there. While in England, Khan explored and examined many aspects of British society and culture, but found himself most interested in British schools and education. Ten years earlier, he had opened a traditional *madrassa* in Muradabad. Though himself the inheritor of a conservative Islamic tradition, Khan advocated an Islam that would be responsive to the new era and his *madrassa*, in addition to teaching the *Quran,* promoted western science education. Now, seeing the state of education in England, he determined to expand his educational efforts in India and in 1875, after his return to India, he opened the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College in Aligarh, modeling it after Cambridge and Oxford. Khan was convinced that a western-style education was necessary to lift the Muslim community out of ignorance and to enable them to compete in the modern world.

To push the Muslim community away from its insular adherence to tradition and rejection of modern western and scientific knowledge, the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College emphasized a western curriculum.

Although criticized by the Muslim orthodoxy, Khan devoted the rest of his life to developing the college and for the last two decades of his life lived in Aligarh. He died in 1897.

On Education: Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College and Keio Gijuku

Introducing and developing modern education in their countries was a focal point of both men's efforts and both believed that education was a foundation of society and of "civilization." Their schools, Khan's Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College founded in 1875 and Fukuzawa's Keio University founded in 1868, were India's and Japan's earliest institutions of higher learning to offer a curriculum based on western learning, and both continue to be among their nations' top universities even today. Khan's sojourn in England convinced him that, "... Apart from education the attainment to a higher level of civilization was not possible,"[21] and his primary concern was to prepare Muslims and Indians in general, "for that relentless competition through education and social reform, so that they may thus be equipped for the struggle which the introduction of Western civilization had rendered inevitable"[22] Fukuzawa's emphasis on education also grew out of concern over Japan's backwardness and weakness vis-à-vis the West.

While visiting England in 1869, Khan was struck by the nearly universal availability of and access to education and he concluded that education was responsible for England's rise to international power.[23] "Unless the education of the masses is pushed on as it is here [in Britain]," he wrote, "it is impossible for a nation to become civilized and honoured."[24] Khan also emphasized the importance of education to protect and preserve the Muslim community. He decried Muslim "ignorance" and what he saw as the Muslim community's refusal to accept modern thinking and ideas, their propensity instead to cling to a mistaken and hidebound notion of Islam. Islam, he believed, was not incompatible with reform. The Muslim community had fallen behind because their education was backward and they resisted the new learning coming in from the West. This was due in some measure to the prominent role Christian missionaries played in education in India: As Khan explained, because Indian Muslims identified Western knowledge so closely with Christianity, "Their antipathy was carried so far indeed that they began to look upon the study of English as a little less than the embracing of Christianity."[25] They had "refused to move with the times," he said, while the educational standards of Hindu India had already been moving forward under the guidance and leadership of such men as Rammohan Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen.[26] (Both Roy and Sen had in fact embraced Christianity, highlighting Khan's concerns.) Islam too must adapt to the times he argued: religious doctrine was one thing, on religious questions the *Quran* was the bedrock. "Religious and temporal affairs cannot be mixed," he wrote, and traditions and customs not set forth in the *Quran* but rather coming from the Commentaries, should be changed and adapted to fit contemporary society.[27] Thus education, he argued, was the means for saving and strengthening the Muslim community: "All the socio-political diseases of India may be cured by this treatment [educate, educate, educate]. Cure the root and the tree will flourish."[28]

Like Khan, Fukuzawa was acutely attuned to the development and role of education in the West, and wrote extensively on the topic in *Seio jijo*: "In no country in the West is there a place where a school cannot be found – not only in large cities but in country villages and everywhere."[29] And again, like Khan, Fukuzawa believed that education was a primary key to the West's strength. As he often did, Fukuzawa gave a small example to demonstrate a larger point, the individual a metaphor for the nation: "Only those who strive to be educated and are capable of reasoning will earn rank and riches while those without will become poor and lowly."[30]

Given their views on education and its role in society, the similarities in the founding principles of the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College and Keio Gijuku are not surprising. Both schools were modeled after institutions of learning in England and the U.S. Khan envisioned a college "modeled on the lines of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge,"[31] whose "'chief aim and earnest endeavor [was to]... bring up scholars ...[to the same standard]... as Oxford and Cambridge.'"[32] Fukuzawa too modeled Keio "after an English public school."[33] Both Khan and Fukuzawa adhered strictly to a policy of financial self-sufficiency, and neither Mohammed Anglo-Oriental College nor Keio Gijuku accepted financial assistance from the government. An early publication from Keio, *The Keiogijuku University: A Brief Account of its History, Aims and Equipment*, states proudly, "Attention may be called to the fact that the Keiogijuku has never received any assistance, pecuniary or other, from the government. It firmly believes in academic freedom."[34] In *Seio jijo* Fukuzawa had noted the excellence of English education. "...the reason why the English excel over other people in their scholarship and technical skills and other arts ...comes from the leniency of government regulations which do not restrict people but allow them to extend their natural talents freely."[35] This was the atmosphere Fukuzawa wanted to create for his students at Keio. Khan also adhered to a policy of financial independence and maintained his school free of any government control.[36] "I am of the opinion," wrote Khan in 1884, "that no government can take the responsibilities of the education of the whole nation, and I firmly believe that it is not possible for the government to meet [sic.] out fully the educational requirement of its subjects. Even more than this, I strongly hold that the nation [referring to his Muslim nation] wishing for the betterment of the education of its young boys, cannot do so unless it by itself provides for their education."[37]

Financial independence from the government was vital for protecting academic freedom and allowing both schools to offer what was at that time, a radical curriculum: Western-style education. In his 1868 "Keio Inaugural Pronouncement," Fukuzawa stated:

> What places Western learning apart from all other learnings is that it is a true product of nature and it rides with reason; it teaches the ways of humankind and it moderates between an individual and society. It contains all the truths with no vestiges of untruth, it possesses all knowledge, large or small; it is learning that people, as long as they are people, must learn. Therefore, it may well be called a learning of the fundamental truth....To spread this study in our society, the first requisite is a school with rules modeled on those in Western countries to guide the students..."[38]

Khan too, advocated a Western-based curriculum, seeking to "secure high English education," by which he meant the latest curriculum in the sciences, mathematics, economics, history, geography and literature.[39] "Let us add to our knowledge," Khan wrote, "by borrowing and carefully studying the various arts and sciences of other nations."[40]

Both men advocated not only a Western curriculum, but also English language instruction. Keio recognized English as "not only... the best medium of introducing the Western civilization into the country, but also as the most widely used language in political, commercial and other relations between nations."[41] Khan argued that vernacular education, which "is no more regarded as sufficient for our daily affairs of life," should be replaced by "English education which is urgently needed by the country and by the people in their daily life." Even "an ordinary shopkeeper, who is neither himself acquainted with English nor has any English knowing persons in his employment," Khan wrote, "feels it a serious hindrance in the progress of his business [to be ignorant of English]."[42]

Khan's and Fukuzawa's advocacy of a Western curriculum arose from their critique of traditionalism in their societies. Echoing Khan's views on the dampering effect of Muslim traditionalism in India, Fukuzawa too emphasized the importance of education as a means of removing the roadblocks erected by Japan's "antiquated teachings." These must be modified to suit current conditions: "It is fitting," Fukuzawa wrote, "...that moral teachings should be modified from time to time to keep pace with the progress of civilization, and it is but natural that a highly advanced and ever advancing society, such as we find in the world today, should be provided with a system of morals better suited to its needs than the antiquated teachings..."[43]

Although both advocated a Western curriculum, neither called for a complete scuttling of their cultural traditions. Even though Khan criticized Muslims for their rigid observance of obsolete customs, he nevertheless recognized the value in the core teachings of Islam and hoped the best qualities of Muslim tradition could be retained and nurtured: "In the old days our boys of good family used to read at home with a master ...[and]... they received a good general training in character and manners from the society of their parents and the elders of the family, who were patterns of excellence in these manners. ...it was of a very high order and we still honour and ought to honour it. Our difficulty now is this: that the noble class of gentlemen whose virtues we remember and from watching whose character we ourselves learnt good breeding and good morals, has departed from the world."[44] Fukuzawa also had heaped scathing criticisms on Chinese Confucianism, but he nevertheless found value in Japanese tradition and argued that "One must not find too much fault with Confucianism, for, after all, what brought the Japanese people from their absolute ignorance to the civilization of today is the achievement of Buddhism and Confucianism... [Confucianism's]... positive influence must not go unnoticed."[4545]

Fukuzawa Yukichi,

Outline of Civilization, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works*, Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 107.

Thus as he considered what elements constituted a proper education for young Japanese men, he wrote, "Without question, I do not make light of the [core Confucian] teaching[s] of filial piety and brotherly harmony." The ideal teacher, according to Fukuzawa, "would certainly be able to influence his pupils in the ways of filial piety and brotherly harmony."[46]

Those aspects of traditional culture that could be saved and utilized, however, had to be integrated into the context of a modernizing society. Both men held it as axiomatic that in the drive for modernization, their schools should not discriminate or be exclusive, but instead must be open to young men of all walks of life. As Fukuzawa stated at the opening of Keio in April, 1868, prior to the new Meiji government's abolition of the class system, "'We have opened the doors of the school wide to the public to allow all men, regardless of their status as samurai or commoner, to come and participate in our program."[47] Nor was Khan's Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College intended only for Muslim students, despite Khan's galvanizing concerns about the backwardness of the Muslim community. Indeed, Khan encouraged young men of all backgrounds and religions to enroll in his school and he endeavored to maintain a balance in the student body among Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsi and other students. The only injunction he issued was that Shia and Sunni students must not engage in religious debate and argument. "I shall feel sorry," he wrote, "if anybody thinks that this college has been established so as to show discrimination between Hindus and Muslims."[48]

> "...both Hindus and Muslims are provided with facilities to study here. Both of them get the training best suited to the existing norms and needs in India. We may call ourselves Hindus or Muslims here in India, but in foreign countries we are all known as Indian natives. This is why the insult of a Hindu is an insult of the Muslim and the humiliation of a Muslim is a matter of shame for the Hindus. In the circumstances, we can never be held in respect unless both the brothers are bred and brought up together, get the same education together, and are provided with the same means of progress for their future career."[49]

Khan wrote, "There is no distinction between Hindus and Muslims. ... I consider Hindus and Mussulmans as my two eyes. I don't even like to say this because people will generally differentiate one as the right eye and the other as the left. I consider Hindus and Mussulmans both as one and the same eye. If I had only one eye, I could have compared them both with it." [50]

Obviously, both schools were open only to men, but this was due not to Khan's or Fukuzawa's own discrimination against educating girls but rather to the prevailing social norms of the day. Both men, in fact, supported education for girls. Khan wrote, "There is no doubt in it that for the development of national culture and civilization the education of women is essential."[51] Although he supported *purdah* for women in Muslim families, Khan argued that a ..."home in which a woman was given an equal status with men could alone guarantee the well-being of society."[52] Fukuzawa too was adamant about the necessity of educating girls: "To save the women of Japan from servility and slavishness, and to place

them in a position equal to men, schools and education are no doubt necessary.... As for education proper, no distinction should be made between girls and boys."[53]

Khan and Fukuzawa both believed that optimizing their educational endeavors required the environment of a residential college and both Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College and Keio Gijuku provided living quarters for their students. A proper education went beyond mere books, and demanded the kind of student-teacher contact that could only be provided in a residential context, "in which the students might learn the morals and manners of modern society."[54] Prompted by a sense of immediacy in the face of the threats posed by the intrusion of Western imperial power, they opted for a more encompassing style of education, one that would offer maximum benefit to their students. "Boarding house," wrote Khan, "is a machine for making nation a nation in the true sense. If all of its parts operate properly, it will function well, otherwise it is altogether useless."[55] Khan advised his students, "Don't search that book on your shelves or tables or in the College Library. It is with you all the time. What is that book? It is, indeed, nothing but the corporate life of you and your classmates in this College. Thus you have to learn how to study this book and get at its *substance*."[56] Teaching by example was Fukuzawa's policy as well. Not everything, Fukuzawa wrote, could be taught "by formal instruction." Moral education in particular, "has to be transmitted to the pupils informally or unawares through the personality of the teachers. ...There are even examples in which there was not even a book to read and yet good education was provided."[57]

As residents at the college, students would learn not just the western-style curriculum, but could learn by observation and participation about the western life-style. In a departure from the exclusive emphasis on book-learning in both traditional Muslim and traditional Japanese education, and in keeping with their ideals of experiential learning, both men insisted that their students engage in sports, the Keio school rules requiring that after the evening meal, "'all residents shall climb trees, play ball games, or engage in other sports."[58] Likewise, Sir Syed's school rules required students to engage in sports, and he even started a cricket club at Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College.

The residential college experience was designed to "modernize" their students and to make them independent and self-respecting. Both Khan and Fukuzawa were advocates of the self-help message of Samuel Smiles, believing the strength of the nation rested upon the strength of the individual. "The spirit of self-help is the root of all genuine growth in the individual; and exhibited in the lives of many, it constitutes the true source of national vigor and strength," Khan wrote.[59]

> "Self-help is the best help—is a well-tried and excellent maxim. This aphorism contains a vast store-house of worldly experience acquired by humanity at large and by generations belonging to different nations. Enthusiasm for self-help in a human being is the real bed-rock on which his progress depends. And when this enthusiasm is found in a number of people, it becomes a guarantee for national progress, strength and stability."[60]

At Keio Gijuku Fukuzawa emphasized "the inculcation in the students of the principles of Independence and Self-Respect..." "The true source of independence of life is to eat

one's bread in the sweat of one's brow," Fukuzawa wrote. A man of independence and self-respect should be a self-helping and self-supporting man..."[61]

The Meaning and Goals of Civilization

Khan's and Fukuzawa's educational efforts were aimed at modernizing and strengthening their nations, at achieving "civilization." The convergence of individual and nation was real for both men, and just as they urged independence and self-reliance for their students, Khan and Fukuzawa also applied these to their own national situations. As we have seen, Khan did not advocate immediate independence for India, but accepted and even embraced England's colonial rule over India — India in the late 19th century was not yet ready for democracy, he believed. It was still, in his estimation, "too divided by race, religion, caste and lack of education" to be equipped for democracy.[62] More importantly, British rule in India provided for communal peace: "It is," he wrote in 1885, "necessary that for the peace of India and for the progress of everything in India the English Government should remain for many years – in fact, for ever!"[63] Nevertheless, Khan did not rule out independence for India, acknowledging that "A desire for self-rule... was natural for all respectable people. This desire could even be their final goal."[64] Khan argued that education was the sure – and only — path to democracy and ultimately perhaps, independence. Without education, "political freedom, even if obtained, could not be retained; but education could be instrumental in winning back the lost political power and prestige."[65] For Fukuzawa, national independence was the essential goal of education and he energetically applied himself to defending Japan's independence. In fact, one might say that Fukuzawa's emphasis on and advocacy for education all focused on one essential point: save the nation and preserve its independence.

The schools Khan and Fukuzawa founded and the educational philosophies they developed shared much in common, yet despite this shared vision, as we shall see, critical differences arose in their understanding of the nature of the "civilization" such education would help build in their nations. These differences arose primarily in the religious outlooks of each man, and the fundamental differences in their religious outlooks can shed light on the vastly different pathways of the subsequent nationalist movements in each of their countries.

Khan's understanding of the world was founded on his deeply religious outlook. His was a transcendent view firmly grounded in his belief in an omnipotent God ruling over all of humanity. In Khan's belief, "The different categories of mankind are the variations of the same civilization whose root is common to all."[66] "Liberty, " Khan wrote, [is] a natural right of the individual... God may be said to be the author of the right." [67] Khan's was a transcendent moral position that enabled him to value human beings as human beings, bound together in a common humanity. These were individuals, to be valued as individuals, not merely as cogs in the machine of national strength. Fukuzawa's view, in contrast, was ultimately much narrower, circumscribed by Japan and the Japanese emperor. Thus one might say that Khan's goals were goals for humanity; Fukuzawa's goals were goals for Japan itself. It is in these critical differences that we can identify the seeds of the different trajectories nationalism took in India and Japan in the early 20th century.

Khan and Fukuzawa both believed that in the late 19th century, civilization was best represented by the civilization of the West. As Fukuzawa wrote, "'Those who would plan for their country's progress toward civilization must take European civilization as their goal and use it as the standard for judging all matters.'"[68] In Khan's view, Europe had advanced beyond Asia and Britain, in particular, served as a model of civilization: "England... now leads the van of civilization," he wrote in 1863.[69] Neither man advocated wholesale Westernization or an unthinking aping of the West. Fukuzawa championed Western civilization not because it was Western, but because it possessed what he believed were the qualities of civilization; it was the "'civilization that had first appeared in the West,'" and not "'Western civilization'" that he aspired to for Japan.[70] Khan upheld the British model, of which he wrote in 1875: "'I assert with the firmest belief, that there can be no better principles of government than those on which the British government is based. The rights of the subjects, their wealth, their liberty are not so safe anywhere in the world as they are under the British government.'" [71] "'Whatsoever nation is the master and possessor of the wealth of knowledge, we should extend our hand toward it,'" wrote Khan.[72] For Fukuzawa, science, commerce and law were the "three pillars" of civilization; echoing this, Khan wrote that civilization possessed "modern science... modern industries, modern commercial methods [...and the...] social customs and polite manners of the West."[73] Khan, however, included an element of civilization that Fukuzawa did not, that is, religion, because, as he wrote, "religion exercises great influence on the culture and civilization of a people."[74]

Despite their common understanding of what constituted the most advanced civilization, the ultimate goal of civilization was different for each man. For Khan, the goal of "civilization" was to provide for the welfare and happiness of the people, creating a system of government that would protect their rights, property and liberty.[75] Thus civilization was a goal in and of itself: "The only advantage of a good government is that under it the individual can freely develop themselves," Khan wrote.[76] It was up to the Indians themselves to accomplish this: "'...our liberty and industry depend upon us... if we carry on our work with enthusiasm, patience and courage... our position, like that of other progressive nations, will be one of comfort, happiness, and freedom." This in itself, Khan asserted, was a worthy goal.[77] The role and function of the state was to protect against "internal disorder and foreign invasion." Having accomplished this, its main function was to "maintain peace and protect the lives, property and rights of the people and provide them with all sorts of freedom."[78] Thus, individual rights, individual property and individual liberty, beyond national liberty, were the true goals and the raison d'etre of "civilization."

For Fukuzawa, as his writings clearly emphasize, the true, underlying goal of civilization was not the protection and promotion of people's life, liberty and property. While those were worthy goals, they were but side-benefits. The ultimate aim and goal was national independence. In his mid-1870s *Encouragement of Learning*, Fukuzawa had written about the need for a vigorous and independent citizenry in the progress toward civilization, people who were "...true citizens of Japan, citizens who will not be playthings but stimulating agents of the government... their own true masters. This will balance the powers of the government and the powers of the people, and *thus the true independence*

of the country will be assured [italics added]."[79] In later years Fukuzawa further narrowed his focus, writing an urgent message about the goal of national independence as the primary goal of achieving "civilization":

> When we look at Japan's situation at present, we are struck by its urgency and we find no leeway for other concerns. We must first ensure the continuing existence of Japan and of its people and afterwards talk of civilization. If there is no country and no people, one cannot speak of Japanese civilization. This is why I narrow my argument and proclaim our country's independence as the sole goal of civilization.[80]

Thus while Khan saw civilization as a path to improving and enhancing the lives of the people, a goal in and of itself, for Fukuzawa the underlying goal of "civilization" in Japan was the protection and preservation of Japan's national independence. Khan saw civilization as serving the people, for Fukuzawa civilization was to serve the state. I believe this fundamental difference can help explain the divergent directions taken by the mainstream of Indian and Japanese nationalism in the early part of the 20th century.

What then, were the intellectual foundations that led each man to his understanding of the meaning and goals of "civilization" and how can we explain these differing intellectual positions? Why was Khan able to develop a broader understanding, a conception of civilization that would serve all while Fukuzawa's understanding of civilization's goal was narrowly focused on Japan? More importantly, how can these intellectual positions shed light on the later divergence in the developments of nationalism in both India and Japan?

An array of factors can account for the two men's different understandings of "civilization" and its goals and usages. I would like to focus on one major difference in particular, which is their very different religious perspectives and standpoints. Khan's Islamic belief situated him in a broad historical, political, geographic and religious context and his belief in a transcendent, omnipotent God gave him a vantage point that encompassed all humankind. Fukuzawa's vantage point, on the other hand, was ultimately only as broad as Japan itself. Khan's broader vision, for example, prompted him to make the case for international harmony by citing the New Testament, and what he held as its universal truths.[81] Also citing the Quran and the Torah, Khan wrote, "...one is asked to love not only his neighbors and those of his nation but all, to the extent that even for his enemies one is asked to have true love."[82] Seeking a universal basis for international harmony, Khan quoted the Gospel, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."[83] Fukuzawa also argued for international peace and justice, but writing in 1881, he rejected the idea of universal love as a "'just and beautiful... fiction,'" one that is "'espoused mainly by Western Christian ministers or by persons who are enamored of that religion.'"[84] Instead, Fukuzawa put forth a logical argument:

> "A country is a gathering of people. Japan is a gathering of Japanese and England is a gathering of Englishmen. Japanese and Englishmen alike are members of a common humanity; they must respect each others' rights. If one individual may not injure another, then two may not join to injure two others. And the same logic applies to a million or ten million: The principles of things do not change according to the numbers involved."[85]

This is a solid logical argument, but it does not draw him out of the exclusivism and subjectivity of Japan. Rather than grounding his arguments for universal peace, harmony, justice on the basis of universal values or a transcendent foundation, Fukuzawa harked back to the state itself as a basis for morality and ethics.

If the fundamental goal of civilization was the protection of the individual, where did individual rights, the "rights of subjects" come from, according to Khan? Individual rights were not granted by the state, they came from God, "who," as Khan wrote, "is the real king."[86] "God is the creator of all things," Khan wrote, "as He is the Creator of heaven and earth and what is in them, and of all creatures, so is He also the Creator of nature.'"[87] Khan asserted that as God was Creator of all, he was also the grantor of the rights of the individual: "Liberty... is a natural right of the individual... God may be said to be the author of the right."[88] For Khan, each individual had a moral sense and a conscience, providing them with a moral compass enabling them to function harmoniously in society. "True social life required every individual not to suppress the call of his conscience..."[89] Morality and ethics were, in Khan's understanding, a matter between the individual and his god, thus they were established on a universal foundation.

What then was the moral and ethical basis for Japan? Where, according to Fukuzawa, did the rights of man originate? Fukuzawa writes, "'Seeking a teaching that can be made the ethical standard for our Japanese samurai, I find that the most appropriate is 'repaying the country with loyalty.'" [90] Fukuzawa thus identified loyalty to the leader as the Japanese moral and ethical standard. What the leader said was thus by definition right and true, leaving the individual had no place in that determination. As early as the 1870s, Fukuzawa had moved away from an earlier acceptance of certain universal values in human civilization, for example, the idea of the existence of natural rights. "'...it is simply useless,'" he wrote, "'to speak of popular rights based on nature; they are not worth discussing.'" [91]As Craig points out, "In a brutal world where principles are created only by men and guns, it is necessary to rely on one's own strength. This view of the world led Fukuzawa away from general theories about civilization to a more specific concern for Japan's immediate national needs.." [92] Fukuzawa's own view of religion led him to the conclusion that:

> "'It is extremely difficult, to maintain morality without religion. The great scholars of the west constantly struggle with this problem. Yet, accidentally, in Japan during the hundreds of years since medieval times our samurai have been able to maintain a high personal morality while ignoring religion... One reason they were able to maintain high standards of virtue apart from religion was that they were aided by Confucianism. But a still more potent factor was the feudal system itself: from the government of the Tokugawa down to the smallest han, each had his place as lord or vassal, as superior or inferior, and a clear social order was formed. The spiritual character of samurai raised in our feudal period derives fundamentally from the single fact of their unswerving loyalty to their lord. [93]

Thus morality, according to Fukuzawa's analysis here, was not independent of the state, but in fact, depended upon state authority itself. The samurai of old relied not on their own

consciences, not on any independent moral sense derived from belief in a transcendent higher power, but on their loyalty to their lords, their loyalty to a temporal authority. Following this line of reasoning then, with the end of feudal power and the Meiji period restoration of direct imperial rule, the focus of loyalty must turn to the emperor and thus the emperor became the locus of morality. As Albert Craig has pointed out, Fukuzawa "state[d] that Japan must depend on the imperial house to uphold morality." [94] Reflecting again on the meaning and the goals of "civilization," Fukuzawa wrote, "At this time the duty of the Japanese is solely the preservation of their national polity. ... Western civilization will enable us to consolidate our polity and at the same time increase the luster of our imperial line."[95]

Conclusion

In *Asian Ideas of East and West*, Stephen N. Hay records the observation of an Indian writer who wrote, "'India has absorbed most of the theoretical knowledge and the philosophical ideas of the West but did not to that extent imbibe the techniques and know-how of the West. Japan in contrast took on most of the latter.'"[1] This insight is borne out in the ideas and approaches of Khan and Fukuzawa. While both claimed "civilization" was "universal," Khan's understanding of civilization was deeper – he grasped the "soul of the machine," while Fukuzawa on the other hand, understood the machine, a machine which would best be used, he felt, to advance national strength. Khan's Islam provided him with an objective vantage point, a scaffolding from which he could develop a universalist assessment and understanding of "civilization" and its role in human society as a means of protecting and promoting the rights, property and liberty of the individual. While this paper does not argue that Syed Ahmad Khan's views created the foundation for the development of pacifistic nationalism in early 20th century India, his views do give an example of the cultural and ideological structures in place that supported the eventual emergence of this pacifist strain as it ultimately would take shape under Gandhi. Fukuzawa, on the other hand, lacking a transcendent religious position, developed an understanding that was confined and circumscribed by a subjective, chauvinistic Japanese viewpoint. Similarly, this exemplifies the cultural and ideological underpinnings that ultimately paved the way for chauvinistic military aggression and violence in Japan's effort to protect and solidify its national standing and independence by expanding its empire. One might even say that if Fukuzawa, the quintessential Meiji liberal misapprehended liberalism in such a way, who could be expected to do better? Thus nationalism was planted and nurtured in different soil in India and Japan. The result was the growth of different plants, the nationalism displayed in India's generally pacifistic struggle to gain its independence and the chauvinistic nationalism of Japan's effort to preserve its independence. The lives and thinking of Syed Ahmad Khan and Fukuzawa Yukichi give us windows onto the different trajectories of nationalism in early 20th century India and Japan.**(Endnotes)**

References

1 Stephen N. Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China and India,* (Harvard, 1970) 314.

2 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, (Harvard, 2009) 137; Fukuzawa Yukichi, *An Encouragement of Learning,* David Dilsworth and Umeyo Hirano, trans., (Sophia University, Tokyo, 1969), 79.

3 Seem for example, Faisal Devji, "Apologetic Modernity," in *Modern Intellectual History,* 4:1 (2007) 73.

4 Hay, *Asian Ideas*, 123.

5 Fukuzawa Yukichi, *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, Kiyooka Eiichi, trans., (Columbia University, 1966, 2007) 7.

6 Fukuzawa in *Autobiography*, 20.

7 Helen Hopper, *Fukuzawa Yukichi: From Samurai to Capitalist*, (Pearson Longman, 2005) Hopper, 52.

8 Fukuzawa, *Autobiography*, 311; 307.

9 Fukuzawa biographical material from Fukuzawa Yukichi, *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa* Yukichi, Kiyooka Eiichi, translator, (Columbia University, 1966; 2007); Helen Hopper, *Fukuzawa Yukichi* , Carmen Blacker, *The Japanese Enlightenment: A Study of the Writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, (Cambridge University Press, 1964), and Albert Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, (Harvard, 2009).

10 M. Ikram Chagatai, "Sir Syed Ahmad Khan: A Prominent Muslim Politician and Educationist," in Chagatai, ed., *Syed Ahmad Khan*, (Lahore: Sang-e-meel Publications, 2005) 13.

11 Sheila McDonough, *The Authority of the Past: A Study of Three Muslim Modernists, American Academy of Religion*, 1970, no. 1, 8.

12 Sheila McDonough, *The Authority of the Past:*, 5..

13 Altaf Husayn Kali, "Hayat-i-Jaivid," quoted in Shelia McDonough, *The Authority of the Past*, 5.

14 Jawaharlal Nehru, *Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru*, (New York, John Day Company, 1941) 289.

15 Jaweed Ashraf, introduction to *Causes of Indian Rebellion, 1857*, (Asha Jyoti Booksellers, 2007) 78.

16 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Shan Mohammed, "Syed Alhmad Khan's Political Ideas," in Chagatai, ed., 267.

17 Ashraf, 44.

18 Syed Ahmad Khan, "The Indian National Congress," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, (Nachiketa Publications, 1972) 194.

19 Khan, *Causes of the Indian Revolt,* quoted in Shan Mohammed, 31.

20 Syed Ahmad Khan, "The Would-be University of Allahabad," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* (Nachiketa Publications, 1972) 101.

21 Bannerjea, 106; Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Bannerjea, 108.

22 D.N. Bannerjea, *India's Nation Builders* (Brentano's New York, no date) 95-6.

23 H.G. Rawlinson, "Sir Syed Ahmad Khan," In Chagatai, ed., 113; Shan Mohammed, "Sir Syed," in Chagatai, ed., 291.

24 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Bannerjea, 108.

25 Syed Ahmad Khan, "Sir Syed and the Education Commission," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* (Nachiketa Publications, 1972) 92.

26 Chagatai, "Sir Syed," in Chagatai, ed., 44.

27 Syed Ahmad Khan, "Religious and Temporal Affairs Cannot Be Mixed!" in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You,* (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 33.

28 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in G.F.I. Graham, *The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* (Karachi, Oxford University Press, 1974) 48.

29 Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Seio jijo* in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works,* Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985) 4.

30 Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Encouragement of Learning* I, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works,* Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 66.

31 Syed Ahmad Khan, "So I Dreamt about Residential Life at Aligarh!" in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You,* (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 13.

32 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Chagatai, ed., 52.

33 Hopper, *Fukuzawa Yukichi: From Samurai to Capitalist,* 52.

34 *The Keiogijuku University: A Brief Account of its History, Aims and Equipment,* (Keiogijuku, Tokyo, 1917) 23.

35 Fukuzawa, *Seio jijo,* in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works,* Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 12.

36 Khan in Chagatai, 50.

37 Syed Ahmad Khan, "On Self-Reliance in Education," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* (Nachiketa Publications, 1972), 172.

38 Fukuzawa Yukichi, "Keio Inaugural Pronouncement," in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works,* Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 17-8.

39 Syed Ahmad Khan, he Would-Be University of Allahabad," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan,* (Nachiketa Publications, 1972) 101.

40 Khan, "Address to the Natives of Hindoostan on Education," (1863) Nizami, ed., 43.

41 *The Keiogijuku,* 23.

42 Syed Ahmad Khan, in "Sir Syed and the Education Commission," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, (Nachiketa Publications, 1972) 88.

43 *The Keiogijuku University: A Brief Account of Its History, Aims, and Equipment*, (Keiogijuku, Tokyo, 1917) 15.

44 Khan, "On Education," quoted in Mohammad, ed., *Writings and Speeches*, 200.

45 Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Outline of Civilization*, in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education, Selected Works*, Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 107.

46 Fukuzawa Yukichi, "Letter to Nakamura Ritsuen," quoted in Eiichi Kiyooka, ed., Kazuyoshi Nabeyama, trans., *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education*, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985), 113-4.

47 Fukuzawa quoted in Helen Hopper, *Fukuzawa: From Samurai to Capitalist*, 52.

48 Syed Ahmad Khan, "Speech at Lahore," (Feb. 3, 1884) in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 9.

49 Khan, "Speech at Amritsar," January 26, 1884, in in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 11.

50 Syed Ahmad Khan, "Reply to the Address by the Indian Associate, Lahore," in Shan Mohammed, ed., *Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, (Nachiteka Publications, 1972) 162.

51 Syed Ahmad Khan in "What is Culture?" in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 39.

52 Chagatai, 60. Shan Mohammed argues that Khan believed Islam and the *Quran* actually gave more rights to women than did Christianity, but that in practice, women were treated much better in the West. "The degradation of women in India," he wrote, "is on account of *not* following the orders of Islam." (Khan quoted by Shan Mohammed, in Chagatai, 419.)

53 Fukuzawa Yukichi, "On the Criminal Act of Makita Nobu," 167; "The New Greater Learning for Women," 222, both essays in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Japanese Women, Selected Works*, Kiyooka Eiichi, translator and editor, (University of Tokyo Press, 1968).

54 Rehmani Begum, "Political and Social Aspect of Sir Syed's Ideas," in Chagatai, ed., 468.

55 Khan, "To Boarders!" quoted in Nizami *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, 7.

56 Syed Ahmad Khan, "To Boarders!" in in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997), 5.

57 Fukuzawa, "Letter to Nakamura Ritsuen," quoted in *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education*, 113-4.

58 Keio School rules quoted in Hopper, *Fukuzawa*, 53.

59 Khan quoted in I. Topa in "Sir Syed Ahmed Khan: A Study of Social Thought," in Chagatai, 491.

60 Khan, "Road to Success," in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You*, (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 61.

61 *The Keiogijuku University: A Brief Account of Its History, Aims, and Equipment,* (Keiogijuku, Tokayo, 1917), 19; 16.

62 Rawlinson, "Sir Syed," in Chagatai, ed., 115.

63 Khan, quoted in Mohammed, 186.

64 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Shan Mohammed, "Syed Alhmad Khan's Political Ideas," in Chagatai, ed., 401.

65 K.A. Nizami, *Sayyid Ahmad Khan,* (India: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1966) 129.

66 Khan in I. Topa, "Sir Syed Ahmad Khan: A Study in Social Thought," in Chagatai, 483.

67 Khan quoted in Mohammed, 251.

68 Fukuzawa Yukichi quoted in Albert Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi,* (Harvard, 2009) 103.

69 Shan Mohammed, 256; Syed Ahmad Khan, in "Address to the Natives of Hindoostan on Education, Ghaziapur," (1863) in Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, ed., *Sir Syed Speaks to You,* (Idarah-i Adabiyat-i, Delhi 1968, 1997) 41.

70 Fukuzawa Yukichi quoted in Craig, 101.

71 Shan Mohammed, 400. As noted earlier in the text, critics have accused Khan of being a British sycophant. According to this argument, Khan's words are merely designed to curry favor with the British. While Khan does not reject Christianity, he strongly rejected Christian missionary efforts to convert Indians. Clearly, this was not the position of a mere sycophant. In *Causes of the Indian Rebellion, 1857,* for example, he writes of the Christian missionaries, "In preaching these Missionaries would mention the holy places and persons of other religions in highly derogatory terms and words and proaisde only the Holy Bible... The seed of anger and distrust of our government was thus sown in the hearts of the people." (p. 124) An extended discussion and analysis of this issue is beyond the scope of this paper however.

72 Syed Ahmad Khan quoted in Saeeda Iqbal, *Islamic Rationalism in the Subcontinent,* (Islamic Book Service, 1984) 201.

73 Fukuzawa Yukichi, "Encouragement of Learning IV," quoted in Eiichi Kiyooka, ed., Kazuyoshi Nabeyama, trans., *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education,* (University of Tokyo Press, 1985) 86; Syed Ahmad Khan in Shan Mohammed, "Syed Alhmad Khan's Political Ideas," in Chagatai, ed., 407.

74 Syed Ahmad Khan, "What is Culture?" Nizami, ed., 37.

75 Shan Mohammed, 400.

76 Khan quoted by Shan Mohammed, in Chagatai, ed., 256.

77 Khan, "Self-Help," quoted in Shan Mohammed, 407.

78 Khan, quoted in Mohammed, 255.

79 Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Encouragement of Learning,* essay four in Eiichi Kiyooka, ed., Kazuyoshi Nabeyama, trans., *Fukuzawa Yukichi on Education*, (University of Tokyo Press, 1985) 92.

80 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment*, 131.

81 One could argue that Khan was self-consciously appealing to the British government, which in part must explain his choice of "evidence," but I believe his religious convictions and integrity outweighed any effort to manipulate British sentiments.

82 Khan, *Causes of the Indian Rebellion, 1857*, (Asha Jyoti Booksellers, 2007) 150..

83 Khan, quoted in Mohammed, *Writings and* Speeches, 29.

84 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig afterword in *Autobiography*, 406)

85 Fukuzawa Yukichi, "Men are Equal, Nations are Equal," from *Encouragement of Learning,* quoted in Craig, Afterword, *Autobiography*, 395.

86 Syed Ahmad Khan, *Causes of the Indian Rebellion, 1857*, (Asha Jyoti Booksellers, 2007) 163.

87 Khan quoted in Christian W. Troll, *Sayyid Ahmad Khan, A Reinterpretation of Muslim Theology*, (Vikas Publishing House, 1978) 318.

88 Khan quoted in Mohammed, 251)

89 Chagatai, 60.

90 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, Afterword, *Autobiography,*

91 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, *Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, (Harvard, 2009) 142.

92 Craig, Afterword, *Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka, (Columbia, 1960; 2007) 407.

93 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, Afterword, *Autobiography*, 409.

94 (Craig afterword to *Autobiography*, 428.

95 Fukuzawa quoted in Craig, Afterword, *Autobiography*, 394.

96 N.V. Sovani, "British Impact on India after 1850-1875," in *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, 2:1: 103-104 (1954) quoted in Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West,* 10.