

The **B**ulletin of the  
**I**nstitute of **S**ocial **S**ciences

Meiji University, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1997.

**THE IDEA OF PROGRESS IN THE WEST AND  
THE NON-WESTERN WORLD:  
A COMPARATIVE APPROACH**

*Masaki MIYAKE*  
*Professor of International History*  
*School of Political Science and Economics*  
*Meiji University*

## CONTENTS

I.	The Chapter “Li Yün” in the Chinese Canonical <i>Li Chi</i> .....	1
II.	Western Idea of Progress .....	2
III.	The Idea of Progress in the Non-Western World.....	5
	NOTES .....	8
	ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	10

## I. The Chapter “Li Yün” in the Chinese Canonical *Li Chi*

In one of the Chinese classics, *Li Chi*, the *Records of Rites*, the Chinese saint Confucius is said to have once lamented that the golden age was long gone. In this book he is said to have depicted it in the following way:

“When the great *Tao* (Way) was in practice, the world was common to all; men of talents, virtue and ability were selected; sincerity was emphasized and friendship was cultivated. Therefore, men did not love only their own parents, nor did they treat as children only their sons. A competent provision was secured for the aged till their death, employment was given to the able bodied, and a means was provided for the upbringing of the young. Kindness and compassion were shown to widows, orphans, childless men, and those who were disabled by disease, so that they all had the wherewithall for support. Men had their proper work and women their homes. They hated to see the wealth of natural resources undeveloped, [so they developed it, but this development] was not for their own use. They hated not to exert themselves, [so they worked, but their work] was not for their own profit . . . This was called the great unity.”<sup>(1)</sup>

In this passage contained in the chapter “Li Yün” of the *Records of Rites*, the golden age, the age of *Ta T’ung*, or the age of great unity, is thought to have existed only in a remote past. It is a sad and pessimistic view of history. This view of history is deeply rooted in Confucianism in China. It cannot produce the idea of progress.

According to Laurence G. Thompson, there are four different versions of translation of the canonical *Records of Rites*. In the introduction to his English translation of *Ta t’ung shu*, one of the most important works written by the Chinese thinker K’ang Yu-wei, Thompson gives not only the translation of the chapter “Li Yün” by Derk Bodde, which is quoted above, but also other three versions. The translation by James Legge is as follows:

“When the Grand course was pursued, a public and common opinion ruled all under the sky; they chose men of talents, virtue, and ability; their words were sincere, and what they cultivated was harmony. Thus men did not love their parents only, nor treat as children only their own sons. A competent provision was secured for the aged till their death, employment for the able-bodied and the means of growing up to the young. They showed kindness and compassion to widows, orphans, childless men, and those who were disabled by disease, so that they were all sufficiently maintained. Males had their proper work, and females had thier homes. (They accumulated) articles (of value), disliking that they should be thrown away

upon the ground, but not willing to keep them for their own gratification. (They laboured) with their strength, disliking that it should not be exerted, but not exerting it (only) with a view to their own advantage. In this way (selfish) schemings were repressed and found no development. Robbers, fishers, and rebellious traitors did not show themselves, and hence the outer doors remained open, and were not shut. This was (the period of) what we call the Grand Union.’<sup>(2)</sup>

## II. Western Idea of Progress

The study of the idea of progress achieved up to now for example by J. B. Bury<sup>(3)</sup> and Robert Nisbet,<sup>(4)</sup> to name the most well-known authors, have one thing in common: they concentrate on the study of Western intellectual history. The development of the idea of progress in the non-Western world, China, Japan, India, and Russia, are almost totally neglected.

The idea of progress may be thought to be one type among various concepts of time in history. In my report to the methodological session dealing with the concepts of time in historical writings in Europe and Asia at the 17th International Congress of Historical Sciences (Madrid, 1990), I attempted to classify various concepts of time that appear in historical writings, identifying eight separate types. One of these types is linear time going upward, characterized by eternal betterment and progress. Its metaphor is an indefinite straight line without any end. Its crystallization is the idea of progress.<sup>(5)</sup>

To establish the idea of progress, it is indispensable to overcome the pessimistic view of history, which insists that the present age is always inferior to the golden age in the past. In the Western world, an attempt to overcome such pessimism was made by the “Moderns” in the “Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns”, which was fought mainly in France in the second half of the seventeenth century. The “Ancients,” represented by the famous poet Boileau was defeated by the “Moderns” represented by Charles Perrault and Fontenelle. In this quarrel, Fontenelle is especially important as the proponent of the “Moderns” and deserves, according to J. B. Bury, the honor of being “the first to formulate the idea of the progress of knowledge as a complete doctrine.”<sup>(6)</sup>

In his famous book *Meaning in History*, the German philosopher Karl Löwith suggests, after analyzing the idea of progress expressed by Turgot, Condorcet, Comte, and Proudon, that the idea of progress in the West is a secularised version of the Judeo-Christian concept of time, namely a linear and eschatological concept of time.<sup>(7)</sup> He seems not to have fully estimated the

overwhelming importance of the “Scientific Revolution” achieved by Newton, Boyle, Huygens, and other Western scientists in the second half of the seventeenth century. It is almost certain that these great discoveries supported the conviction of the “Moderns” in the dispute between the “Ancients” and the “Moderns.” Even the meaning of the English word “progress” acquired beside the original meaning of march through space a new meaning of “betterment” in the second half of the seventeenth century, as Samuel L. Macey, former president of the International Society for the Study of Time, points out in his essay: “Literary Image of Progress.” He refers to the title of John Bunyan’s work *Pilgrim’s Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come*, published in 1678.<sup>(8)</sup> This title does not have the meaning that the quality of the pilgrim is gradually becoming better from year to year.

Concerning the interpretation of Löwith on the idea of progress, Georg G. Iggers points out in his highly illuminative article in the *American Historical Review*, “The Idea of Progress: A Critical Reassessment”:

“The idea of progress in its classical form was born in the confidence of the Enlightenment that through the systematic application of reason to society, rational conditions of human life could be created. Certain critics, such as Karl Löwith, have therefore interpreted the idea of progress as a secularized form of the Judeo-Christian conception of Prudence. It is true only to the extent that the theorists of progress of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries viewed history as a unilinear process toward a meaningful end. But not only did most theorists of progress see the fulfilment of this end in worldly terms, but, as in the case of Condorcet and John Stuart Mill (in sharp contrast to the Augustinian view), they emphasized the active role that men played in the historical process through the application of reason and science to society.”<sup>(9)</sup>

In another article in *The Journal of Modern History*, “The Idea of Progress in Recent Philosophies of History,” Iggers says summarizing the development of the idea of progress in the West up to Condorcet:

“Philosophy of history in the past few decades has undergone a profound crisis in methodology and in its conception of the meaning of history.

Since the Enlightenment, historical thought has been marked by two generally accepted assumptions. First, that the history of man could be understood by an empirico-rational method. Second, that the study of history demonstrated the continuity of man’s progressive development. For the past few decades both of these assumptions have been increasingly questioned.

These two assumptions, the idea of progress and the empirico-rational

method, while not logically connected, have related origins in time. To be sure, the linear conception of history, a basic component of the doctrine of progress, has its roots in Judeo-Christian messianic thought, which, in contrast to Greek cyclical theories, saw all of human history as one tremendous teleological drama. But the Christian conceptions of history, except perhaps in the case of the Joachites, could hardly be considered philosophic doctrine of progress insofar as within mundane history any qualitative development of sinful mankind was precluded. The idea of progress as well as the empirico-rational approach to history became dominant only with the secularization of the Western intellect in the seventeenth century and the rise of modern science.

Philosophies of history, while differing vastly in their definitions of the scope, nature, and end of progress, and of the way in which it comes about, have agreed that the passage of time was generally positively related to qualitative growth and that modern civilization was the highest point of human existence yet attained in a direct development which could be traced back by scientific means - never rigorously applied to be sure - to primitive man. As defined by the Enlightenment philosophers from the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns in the late seventeenth century to Condorcet, the perfectibility of man was viewed as primarily intellectual in nature and the result of conscious intellectual rather than purely immanent social causation. An earthly utopia was possible, not as the inevitable outcome of historical forces, but as the conscious work of rational individuals who, because of man's increasing enlightenment, were able to base society on the foundations of natural law revealed by human reason. Romantic theorists, while rejecting the effectiveness of deliberate action derived from abstract principles, did not, except in a few extreme cases, reject the reality of progressive social change. Writers like Burke, Herder, or Savigny viewed social change rather in terms of organic growth, the outcome of immanent causation. The intellect, instead of being the prime mover of the historical process, was merely one aspect of a total society. Yet even if the proper unit of historical study became a society rather than the totality of mankind, the possibility of a continuity of human history as a meaningful whole was not necessarily denied, as we see in Hegel.<sup>(10)</sup>

It should also be stressed upon here that Charles Darwin's theory of evolution prompted much the idea of progress, not only in the Victorian England, but also in the West in general, and even in the non-Western world. The most influential among those who simplified, generalized, and popularised Darwin's thought were Thomas Henry Huxley and Herbert Spencer. In China, Yen Fu translated into Chinese Huxley's "Evolution and Ethics," a lecture delivered at Oxford in 1893. Yen Fu was born in 1853 and studied in England. He was strongly influenced by both Huxley and Spencer. As Benjamin Schwartz points out, Huxley and Spencer were not identical in their thoughts, and "Evolution and Ethics" was rather critical toward Spencer.<sup>(11)</sup> It is important, however, to perceive that Yen Fu introduced into China Social Darwinism by introducing

these thinkers and that Social Darwinism influenced the Chinese intellectuals including K'ang Yu-wei school. K'ang Yu-wei himself was less influenced by it, but his followers more.<sup>(12)</sup>

### III. The Idea of Progress in the Non-Western World

Now I would like to treat with the fate of the idea of progress in the non-Western world, taking up China, Japan, and Russia, as three salient examples.

Among the Chinese intellectuals, the attempt to overcome the pessimistic view of history preached by Confucianism was performed by K'ang Yu-wei (1858–1927). He tried to change the interpretation of Chinese classics along the line similar to the theory of evolution. In his annotation to the passage of the *Records of Rites* quoted in the beginning of this report, '*Li Yün' Annotated* (probably written in 1901–02), he insisted that the age of great harmony did not belong to the past, but would be realized in the future. According to his interpretation, history proceeds from the age of Disorder through the age of Approaching Peace, or the age of Small Tranquillity, to the age of Universal Peace, or the age of Great Unity.<sup>(12)</sup> He applied the theory of three periods inherent in the Ku-yang School, a school which interpreted *Spring and Autumn Annals*, assumed to be written by Confucius, as preaching the evolution of history from Disorder through Approaching Peace to Universal Peace. It is very much problematic and therefore very much disputed, however, to interpret the passage, where Confucius says that the age of Great Unity was gone, as his prophecy for the future.<sup>(14)</sup> But to preach to the Chinese intellectuals among whom the teaching of Confucianism was permeating, such device of re-interpretation was presumably necessary and indispensable for K'ang Yu-wei. The version of English translation by the Japanese philosopher Tsuchida Kyoson (1891–1934) may be more in accord with K'ang Yu-wei's interpretation than the versions quoted in the beginning of this essay by Derk Bodde and James Legge. According to Tsuchida's translation, the utopian age, Ta T'ung, is expected to come in the future. It must be repeated again, however, that it is problematic to translate the passage in the future tense.<sup>(15)</sup> Tsuchida translates as follows:

“When ever the Great Way is realized, the following will surely take place: all the world will be a common possession; the wise and the able are elected; all people will be bound by equal ties of intimacy so that no man sees only his father as father nor only his son as son; the old keep their ease, the ripened youth has his responsibilities; the boy and the girl are trained up; widows, orphans, the disabled and the like are respectively cared for; men take their respective parts while women respectively marry;

as for property, while one would hate to let it go to waste, he will not wish to have it in private possession; as for man's talents, while he would hate not to have exercised them, he will not necessarily expend them on himself; and thus plots will come to an end, thieves and brawlers will not be seen, so that people will come to leave every door open: such an age should be called *Ta T'ung*.”<sup>(16)</sup>

Another English version by Wu Kuo-cheng translates the passage using the present tense. Therefore it is not clear in this translation whether the words which is supposed to be uttered by Confucius, refer to the past or the future. Wu translates as follows:

“When the great principle prevails, the whole world is bent upon the common good. The virtuous and able are honoured, sincerity is praised, and harmony is cultivated. Hence, the people not only treat their own parents and children as they should be treated, but others' as well. They provide that all the old are given comfort, all the adults are given work, all the young are given development, all the widowed, orphaned, helpless, disabled and defective people are given nourishment. For every mail there is a division of land; for every female there is a home. The people dislike to have wealth wasted; but they do not like to hoard it up for themselves. They dislike to have their strength unemployed; but they do not like to work solely for themselves. Hence, all cunning designs become useless, and theft and banditry do not exist . . . This is called ‘the age of Great Universality.’ ”<sup>(17)</sup>

In Japan, Fukuzawa Yukichi (1834–1901) was the most outstanding personality in so far as the idea of progress was concerned. He eagerly studied Confucian classics when he was young, and then criticized them as hinderance in establishing the idea of progress in Japan. He admired what the West had accomplished in the domain of science and technology. He eagerly urged to learn Western science including, among others, economic science, and set up Keio University putting emphasis on economic science. A British man who was observing Japan of Fukuzawa's days, Basil Hall Chamberlain, once said that “it is no exaggeration to call Fukuzawa the intellectual father of more than half the men who now direct the affairs of the country.”<sup>(18)</sup>

In his autobiography, Fukuzawa wrote:

“From my own observations in both the Occidental and Oriental civilizations, I find that each has certain strong points and weak points bound up in its moral teaching and scientific theory. But when I examine which excels the other as to wealth, armament and general well-being, I have to put the Orient below the Occident. Granting that a nation's destiny depends upon the education of its people, there must be some fundamental difference in



the education of the Western and Eastern peoples.

In the education of the East, so often saturated with Confucian teaching, I find two points lacking: that is to say, the lack of studies in 'number and reason' in material culture, and the lack of independence in the spiritual culture."<sup>(19)</sup>

Natsume Kinnosuke (1867–1916), mostly known by his pen name Natsume Soseki, or simply Soseki, was one of the most representative intellectuals in the years after Japan's Restoration in 1868. He studied English literature and made a research stay in London in the years 1900–1902. After resigning from Tokyo Imperial University, he became known as a novelist. He also poured much effort for elaborating the manuscript of his speeches. In his speech delivered in 1911, "Civilizing of Modern Japan" (Gendai Nihon no kaika), Soseki expressed his deep concern over the superficial modernization of Japan. According to him, Japan's destiny was either to retain the superficiality of Western civilization or "to face the possibility of nervous prostration."<sup>(20)</sup> In this lecture Soseki said:

"Let us suppose that in forty or fifty years after the Restoration, by the power of education, by really applying ourselves to study, we can move from teaching A to teaching B and even advance to C - without the slightest vulgar fame-seeking, without the slightest sense of vainglory. Let us further suppose that we pass, in a natural orderly fashion, from stage to stage and that we ultimately attain the extreme of differentiation in our internally developed civilization that the West attained after more than a hundred years. If, then, by our physical and mental exertions, and by ignoring the difficulties and suffering involved in our precipitous advance, we end by passing through, in merely one-half the time it took the more prosperous Westerners to reach their stage of specialization, to our stage of internally developed civilization, the consequences will be serious indeed. While on the one hand we will be able to boast of this fantastic acquisition of knowledge, on the other hand the inevitable result will be a nervous collapse from which we will not be able to recover."<sup>(21)</sup>

In Russia, Peter I. Chaadayev (1794–1856) was the first author who vehemently attacked the superficial modernization since the days of Peter the Great and denied any progress in Russia. We can find some similarity between Soseki's lecture and the *Philosophical Letters* of Chaadayev. Soseki criticized Westernization in Japan since the Restoration and Chaadayev Westernization in Russia since Peter the Great. Both had a bitter experience of rapid and superficial Westernization in both non-Western countries, Japan and Russia, where the intellectuals felt that they were menaced by the threat of losing their civilizational identity.<sup>(22)</sup>

In Russia, Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* lit the candle of the burning dispute about the identity of Russia. After the publication of his "First Letter" in the Journal *The Telescope* in 1836, the dispute of the Russian intellectuals between the Slavophiles and Westerners began. Chaadaev pointed out that in Russia there was neither internal development nor natural progress and that this situation was the necessary result of the civilization of import and imitation.<sup>(23)</sup> In *A History of Russian Philosophy*, V. Zenkovsky says that this letter "created an impression like an exploding bomb. Chaadaev's harsh, relentless judgment of Russia and the dark pessimism of his appraisal of her historical fate astonished everyone."<sup>(24)</sup> Alexander Herzen wrote in *My Past and Thoughts* that it was "a shot ringing out in the dark."<sup>(25)</sup> And, to borrow the phrases Samuel P. Huntington used in his article "The Clash of Civilizations?," Russians once again face the historic and recurring debate over "Westernization versus Russification" after the collapse of communism.<sup>(26)</sup>

The destiny of the idea of progress in the non-Western world in the past and in the coming future will have to do with the fate of the respective regions within it, such as China, Japan, and Russia.<sup>(27)(28)</sup>

## NOTES

- (1) Fung Yu-lang, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, Translated and edited by Derk Bodde, (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 202–203.; quoted by Laurence G. Thompson, *Ta T'ung Shu: The One-World Philosophy of K'ang Yu-wei*, Translated from the Chinese with Introduction and Notes (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958), p. 29.
- (2) James Legge, *The Li Ki. Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxvii (Oxford: 1885); quoted by Laurence G. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 27–28.
- (3) J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Growth and Origin* (New York: Dover Publications, 1955, first published by Macmillan Company in 1932).
- (4) Robert Nisbet, *History of the Idea of Progress* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).
- (5) Masaki Miyake, "General Comments on the Concepts of Historical Time," 17th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Methodology 1, Concepts of Time in Historical Writings in Europe and Asia, *Grands Thèmes, Méthodologie, Section Chronologique 1, Rapports et abrégés*, (Madrid: Comité Español de Ciencias Históricas, 1990), pp. 134ff.
- (6) Bury, op. cit., p. 110.
- (7) Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 103. Cf. Werner Berthold, "Grundformen der Geschichtsauffassungen unter dem Aspekt der Zeit: Kreislauf, Rückschritt und Fortschritt," in *Nachdenken über Geschichte: Beiträge aus der Ökumene der Historiker in memoriam Karl Dietrich Erdmann*, Herausgegeben von Hartmut Boockmann

- und Karl Jürgensen (Karl Wacholtz Verlag, Neumünster, Germany, 1991).
- (8) Samuel L. Macey, "Literary Images of Progress: The Fate of an Idea," in *Time, Science, and Society in China and the West*, ed. J. T. Fraser, N. Lawrence, and F. C. Haber (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), p. 98.
  - (9) Georg G. Iggers, "The Idea of Progress: A Critical Reassessment," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. LXXI, No. 1, October 1965, pp. 2-3.
  - (10) Georg G. Iggers, "The Idea of Progress in Recent Philosophies of History," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. XXX, No. 3, September 1958, pp. 215-216.
  - (11) Bunjamin I. Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), chapter 4.
  - (12) Onogawa, Hidemi, *Shin matsu seiji shiso kenkyu* (Study of Political Thoughts in the later Ch'in Period) (Tokyo: Misuzu-shobo, 1969), pp. 257-261. Cf. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 50-51 (Evolution of civilization: K'ang and 'Darwinism').
  - (13) Onogawa, *ibid.*, pp. 94-96. Cf. Fung Yu-lan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, Vol. 2: *The Period of Classical Learning* (from the Second Century B.C. to the Twentieth Century), Translated by Derk Bodde (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1953), p. 680. It is difficult to translate into English the Chinese word "Ta T'ung." Laurence G. Thompson shows thirteen different translations such as: The Great Unity, Grand Union, Grand Course, Cosmopolitan society, The Great Similarity, The age of Great Universality, etc. (Thompson, op. cit., pp. 29-30.). Thompson himself chooses the expression "One World" (*ibid.*, p. 30.).
  - (14) Onogawa, op. cit., p. 97.
  - (15) Cf. Shimomi, Takao, *Reiki* (Li Chi), (Tokyo: Meitoku-shuppan-sha, 1973), pp. 116-118.; Sakade, Yoshinobu, *Daido-sho* (Ta T'ung Shu), (Tokyo: Meitoku-shuppan-sha, 1976), pp. 25-26.; Kojima, Sukema, *Chugoku no kakumei shiso* (Revolutionary Thought of China), (Tokyo; Chikuma-shobo, 1967), p. 88.
  - (16) Tsuchida, Kyoson, *Contemporary Thoughts of Japan and China* (Library of Contemporary Thought, General Editor: W. Tudor Jones), (London, Williams and Norgate, 1927), pp. 194-195; quoted by Laurence G. Thompson, op. cit., p. 28.
  - (17) Wu Kuo-cheng, *Ancient Chinese Political Theories* (Shanghai, 1933), pp. 299-300; quoted by Laurence G. Thompson, op. cit., pp. 28-29. This work was originally a doctoral dissertation (Princeton University). (Laurence G. Thompson, *ibid.*, p. 287.)
  - (18) Basil Hall Chamberlain, *Japanese Things* (Originally entitled: *Things Japanese*) (Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1971), p. 367.
  - (19) Fukuzawa, Yukichi, *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, Translated by Eiichi Kiyooka, Third and Revised Edition, (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1940), p. 229.
  - (20) *Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era*, Edited by Kosaka Masaaki, Translated and adapted by David Abosch (Tokyo: Pan Pacific Press, 1958), p. 448.
  - (21) *Ibid.*, pp. 447-448. In quoting this passage, a minimum grammatical amendment was added by Miyake.
  - (22) Yamamoto, Shin, "Ohka no sotai-teki hansei: Chaadayev to Soseki" (Total Reflections on Westernization: Chaadayev and Soseki), *Bulletin of the Institute*

- of Humanities*, No. 8, August 1974, published by the Institute of Humanities, Kanagawa University, Yokohama, Japanese with English summary. This essay is now included in Yamamoto's posthumous work: Yamamoto, Shin, *Shuhen bunmei ron: Ohka to dochaku* (On Peripheral Civilizations: Westernization and the Indogenous), (Tokyo: Tosui-shobo, 1985), chapter 3. •
- (23) Togawa, Tsuguo, "P. Ia. Chaadaev, *Philosophical Letters* (Translation with Comments), 1," *Slavic Studies, Journal of the Slavic Institute of Hokkaido University*, Vol. 6 (in Japanese), (Hokkaido: Hokkaido University, 1962).
- (24) V. V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy*, Authorized translation from the Russian by George L. Kline, Volume One (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953), p. 150.
- (25) Ibid.
- (26) Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3, Summer 1992, p. 43.
- (27) On the issue treated in this essay, cf. Masaki Miyake, "The Idea of Progress: Modernization and Westernization in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries and a Comparison with Russia's Case," *The Bulletin of the Institute of Social Sciences, Meiji University*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 1993; Masaki Miyake, "Some Perspectives on the Idea of Progress as a Problem in the Study of Time: The Cases in China, Japan, and Russia in Comparison to Modern Europe," in *Dimensions of Time and Life: The Study of Time VIII*, Edited by J. T. Fraser and M. P. Soulsby (Madison, Connecticut: International Universities Press, 1996); Masaki Miyake, "Europe and the Non-Western World: The Idea of Progress, Modernization and Westernization in Japan and China in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries - A Comparison with Russia's Case," *Die Kontinentwerdung Europas: Festschrift für Helmut Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag*, Herausgegeben von Heiner Timmermann (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1966); Masaki Miyake, "Concepts of Time in Historical Consciousness in Europe and Asia," *The Bulletin of the Institute of Social Sciences, Meiji University*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1996.
- (28) For Japanese names I follow the Japanese practice of writing the family names first, and, in the notes, I write the Japanese family names first and put a comma before the first names. The signs for the long vowel, such as ō, are omitted.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This article is the revised and enlarged version of my oral presentation in the 124th session of the American Historical Association's One-Hundred Eleventh Annual Meeting in 1997: "The Idea of Progress in Western and Non-Western Civilizations: A Comparative Approach" held on 5 January 1997 in New York. This session was chaired by Professor Gabrielle Spiegel of the Johns Hopkins University. Professor San-pao Li of California State University at Long Beach joined the session and made his oral presentation on "Progress, Evolution, and Utopia in K'ang Yu-wei's Thought". Professor Georg G. Iggers of State University of New York at Buffalo joined the session as the commentator.

I would like to express my hearty gratitude to all of them, especially to Professor Iggers, who tried his best to organize this session.