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In the development of educational policy in postwar Japan, the significance of the roles of the Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso (Japan Teachers Union) cannot be disputed. Their functions differ, of course, with one representing the government and the other the teachers. The Ministry of Education draws up the national curriculum, approves the textbooks, and recommends teaching methods. The power Japan’s central government thus maintains over teachers, comparable to that of other highly centralized governments, is a legacy from prewar Japan, and shows the influence of French and Prussian practices.

Following World War II, the central government’s influence over education was sharply curtailed as a result of the American Occupation policy, which was designed to decentralize educational administration. After the American interlude, the Ministry of Education recovered much of its prewar control and influence. But the government was confronted with an unprecedented situation brought on by the rise of Nikkyōso, a stronghold of opposition to the government.

Prior to World War II, the majority of teachers were represented by the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai (Great Japan Education Association), a quasi-government organization under strong influence of the Ministry of Education. A dissenting minority of teachers endeavored to organize the teaching body into an opposition force but was quickly suppressed by the government. Shortly after the war, prewar activists were able to reorganize a teachers’ movement that crystallized into Nikkyōso in 1947, when the power of the Ministry of Education was curtailed by the American Occupation.

Nikkyōso, like its prewar predecessors, was initiated as an independent, militant organization. It derived its strength and power from the general political and social upheaval within
the labor movement during the period of democratization after the war. Consequently, even after the Ministry of Education regained much of its prewar influence in the mid-fifties, the union continued as a formidable opposition force. Indeed, the period from 1955 to 1960 was marked by a series of anti-Nikkyōso measures undertaken by the Ministry of Education to restrict that power.

The union may well be considered at the present time to have been forced into a defensive position by the Ministry. Nevertheless, in certain instances such as Nikkyōso’s appeal to the International Labor Organization and several successful legal cases, the Ministry itself seems to be on the defensive. This much is certain: the Ministry of Education can no longer make any decision concerning the educational policy for the nation without taking Nikkyōso’s reaction into consideration.

Nikkyōso is a national federation of prefectural unions of teachers whose members include the large majority of elementary and junior high school teachers, as well as groups of teachers in other sectors. The Ministry refuses to recognize it at the national level, and consequently negotiations occur only between local education authorities and local teachers’ unions. However, the union’s national policy on wages and working conditions influences local negotiations; it also has its effect on the labor movement as a whole. Nikkyōso is, in fact, one of the most powerful labor unions in Sōhyō (General Council of Trade Unions), the largest labor confederation in Japan.

As is the case with most labor organizations in Japan, Nikkyōso is deeply involved in politics. It openly supports the opposition Socialist party, bringing it into confrontation with the ruling conservative party. The platform of Nikkyōso’s annual conventions includes political slogans opposing American involvement in Vietnam and the United States-Japan Security Pact. As a union of teachers, though, the union is deeply concerned with educational problems.

The different aspects of Nikkyōso’s activities, including teacher welfare, politics, and education, have received varying degrees of emphasis during the course of the union’s development. Shifts of emphasis have occurred in parallel with changes in leadership of the union, while changes in leadership can be seen, in turn, as a reflection of the educational, political, economic, and social circumstances surrounding it. It is thus necessary to understand the problems of Nikkyōso within the whole context of Japanese society, and such an understanding requires not only a familiarity with Japanese education itself but
also a knowledge acquired from related disciplines. This makes the study of Nikkyōso a difficult but challenging task, and, accordingly, few serious studies on the topic have ever been made either within Japan or elsewhere.

Professor Duke’s work is an ambitious attempt by a non-Japanese scholar to take the lead in this field. Using the historical approach, he sets out to trace the origin and development of the left-wing teachers’ movement through Nikkyōso’s first twenty years. His work is based on his own first-hand observations in Japan, supplemented by published and unpublished works of Japanese scholars on the subject. Readers will find this a good introduction to, and analysis of, the problems of organized movements of Japanese teachers, as well as Japanese education as a whole.
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Ever since I came to Japan in 1959 to teach in a university in Tōkyō, I have been keenly interested in the activities of the Nihon Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Japan Teachers Union), better known as Nikkyōso. From its inauguration in 1947, climaxing the chaotic movement among rival left-wing teachers’ organizations immediately after the war, Nikkyōso has pursued a highly controversial policy involving strikes, demonstrations, sit-ins, mass vacations, and other forms of physical and verbal militancy, which at times attained violent proportions.

The hostile relationship between the Japanese Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso is reflected in the latter’s militancy. Shortly after I undertook an intensive study of Japanese education, it became manifest to me that this mutual antagonism provides, in fact, the key to an understanding of developments within postwar Japanese education. Consequently, I concluded that without a knowledge of Nikkyōso and its militant policies and programs it is virtually impossible to grasp the significance of postwar educational policies that were carried out by the Japanese government and the Ministry of Education.

Although a knowledge of the role of Nikkyōso is essential for the comprehension of postwar Japanese educational developments, and although this union represents not only the largest union in Japan but also one of the largest unions of teachers in the world, Nikkyōso is virtually unknown outside Japan. A perusal of the literature revealed a dearth of material concerning this union published in languages other than Japanese. Based on this set of circumstances, I rather boldly set out to rectify the situation by undertaking a study of the evolution of the left-wing teachers’ movement in Japan, which culminated in the birth and growth of Nikkyōso in 1947.
As a non-Japanese researcher approaching the extremely bitter controversy between the Japanese government and teachers’ unions, I decided early on that I would make no attempt to judge the propriety of either side. Rather, my object was to analyze the continuing series of disputes by seeking out those individuals from both camps who were directly involved in the disputes. I then proceeded to present both points of view without evaluating either one. Primary sources were utilized to the fullest, since most of the original Japanese participants were living in the greater Tōkyō area when this research was carried out between 1968 and 1970.

In addition to interviewing individuals who were directly involved in the disputes and consequently highly critical of the opposition, I sought out certain informants who were totally familiar with the disputes but who were not directly involved themselves. In this manner additional light was shed on the progression of developments. The gratifying feature of it all was the openness and frankness with which each respondent, without exception, explained his position and attitude. Ironically, perhaps only a non-Japanese could be accepted with such confidence by both camps.

I am indebted to so many people for assisting me in this research that I hesitate to list them. Nevertheless, I would be totally lacking in gratitude if I did not express my appreciation to the following people for their assistance. I am deeply indebted to Ichikawa Shōgo, assistant professor of educational administration, Hokkaidō University, who happened to be studying at the University of London in 1969, when I was writing a doctoral dissertation on Nikkyōsō. He rendered much help by reading each chapter, offering criticisms and advice.

From the union’s side, I am particularly grateful to Nikkyōsō’s historian, Mochizuki Muneaki, who spent many hours with me discussing past events. His incredible memory of details, particularly of Nikkyōsō’s conventions and internal conferences, proved to be invaluable. The leader of the initial postwar movement, the Honorable Iwama Masao, currently Communist representative, clarified from the left-wing position many of the issues of that hectic period. The Honorable Kobayashi Takeshi, formerly Nikkyōsō chairman and currently Socialist party representative, was most helpful with events during his tenure in the decade of the 1950s. And, finally, Chairman Miyanohara Sadamitsu met with me as often as I
needed, to clarify Nikkyōso’s monumental reorientation under his tutelage during the 1960s. I cannot adequately express my appreciation to Nikkyōso leaders for their full cooperation.

From the side of the Ministry of Education, I am most indebted to former Minister of Education, the Honorable Araki Masuo, long-term Liberal-Democrat representative and director of the National Security Agency, for analyzing his position during the violent period when he attempted literally to break Nikkyōso’s power. Two former Vice-Ministers of Education, the Honorable Naitō Takasaburō, currently Liberal-Democrat representative, and Hidaka Daishirō, my former dean and now professor of education at the Gakushūin University, were most helpful in explaining the government’s position during their tenures extending from the 1940s through the 1950s. Sagara Iichi, former ministerial secretary shortly after the war, devoted one whole day to me when I visited him at the Kyōto University campus, where he is dean of the College of Education; he described for me the minister of education’s position between 1946 and 1950 under the American Occupation, when the left-wing teachers’ movement developed so rapidly.

For the American Occupation position, I was most fortunate to have Professor Ronald S. Anderson from the University of Hawaii—and former SCAP Education Officer—as my neighbor in Tōkyō during his sabbatical year at the initial period of this study. His recollections of the years from 1948 to 1951, when he served within SCAP, cogently revealed the attitude of the Occupation during that momentous reorientation of policy commonly referred to as the “reverse course,” when the Americans began to restrict the Communist-influenced labor movement, in which Nikkyōso played an integral role.

At the very beginning of this study, it was necessary to ask some person influential in the Japanese education world to serve as a go-between for me with the many individuals I wanted to interview. Itō Noboru, distinguished education critic and a member of the Tōkyō School Board, served that role by introducing me to most of the informants from both sides to arrange the initial interviews. He played a key role in this research, as expected by Japanese tradition.

I am most grateful to my assistants at the International Christian University who aided in translations, interviews, and various research details during the several years of the study: Tominaga Junichi served at the beginning; Tōyama Mariko and
Yamamura Satoshi, now Mr. and Mrs. Yamamura, served during the middle period; Hayakawa Eiichi, trusted assistant, worked diligently and with great precision throughout the project.

Various people read the entire manuscript or selected chapters and offered suggestions, advice, and encouragement. From the University of London, professors Joseph Lauwerys, Brian Holmes, and Ronald Dore provided invaluable support and advice for the initial version. Dr. Narita Katsuya from the Japanese National Institute of Educational Research reviewed the chapter on the prewar movement. Dr. Kobayashi Tetsuya, my former division chairman at the International Christian University and a distinguished Japanese scholar and authority on Japanese education, now serving in Hamburg, Germany, as director of the UNESCO Institute of Education, graciously read the manuscript and prepared the Foreword. I appreciate his interest in my work. In addition, I am indebted to Dr. Edwin O. Reischauer, former ambassador to Japan, who read the manuscript and encouraged me to seek publication of it.

Finally, I am eternally grateful to my wife, June, who expertly typed the manuscript in two foreign, but most hospitable, lands, a first draft in England and the final version in Japan.

A note about Japanese names used in this book. Japanese names are presented in the order in which Japanese use them, that is, the last name first, simply because it is more natural that way. The title of the book, incidentally, was inspired by a book entitled *Japan’s Militant Buddhists*, written by my colleague, Noah Brannan.

International Christian University
Tōkyō

Benjamin C. Duke
PART I

Origins of the Left-Wing Teachers’ Movement, 1919-1947
The Prewar Movement

The Birth of Left-Wing Traditions

Several weeks after Japan accepted the provisions of the Potsdam Declaration, which terminated the Pacific war in mid-1945, a left-wing teachers’ movement spontaneously emerged through the debris of Japanese cities. Reacting to the strict prewar and wartime government control of the teaching profession and the pitiful economic conditions existent within a defeated land, the movement rapidly gained momentum. By the end of the year, thousands of teachers were organized into a variety of unions and associations, independent of the government, struggling to improve teachers’ livelihood and to construct a new image of the Japanese teacher. A year and a half later, the initial postwar teachers’ movement culminated in the formation of the one great organization, the Nihon Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Japan Teachers Union), better known as Nikkyōso, encompassing nearly a half million teachers and directed by a combination of Socialist and Communist leaders.

Although Nikkyōso was institutionalized after World War II, its roots lie embedded in prewar Japan. A direct relationship can be traced to the decade of the twenties and early thirties, when activist teachers endeavored to unify the teaching corps through left-wing organizations, independent of government control. And even though their fledgling attempts were crushed by the government, the prewar efforts, marked by both individuals and ideology, laid the foundation for the postwar left-wing teachers’ movement and the ultimate formation of the militant, anti-government Nikkyōso.

The struggles to organize teachers in the prewar twenties and the postwar forties were aimed at repudiating the traditional image of the Japanese teacher, which successive governments had so effectively utilized to produce one of the most dedicated and self-sacrificing teaching corps in the world. The ideal image of the Japanese teacher had already been firmly es-
tablished by the time of the Meiji Restoration in 1868. Originating from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—when Buddhist priests preserved the literary arts in their temples during the prolonged period of civil strife—and from the Tokugawa era (1603-1867)—when fief schools and schools for the commoners were taught mostly by individuals from the samurai (warrior) class, which was imbued with education based on “ethical training through study of the Confucian classics,”¹—a unique combination of the two traditions merged into the ideal image of a Japanese teacher. On the one hand, teaching was considered as a holy profession (seishoku), resembling a religious order in which teachers worked with the poor and the illiterate as a mission of love. At the same time, the teacher was regarded as a moral disciplinarian, commanding a formal classroom environment similar to a pious military order. Student-teacher relations were summarized in the adage, “Let not the pupil tread within seven feet of his teacher’s shadow.”²

Inherent in the ideal image of the Japanese teacher was the notion that teachers taught as a service to mankind. The rewards were intrinsic rather than pecuniary. Close but formal personal relationships between the teacher and his small circle of students forged a bond that continued throughout life. The teacher was customarily consulted by his students for advice on life’s important decisions, including career and marriage. The teacher’s prestige was uncommonly high, even though his financial return was exceedingly low; his students, their parents, and the community at large held the teacher in high esteem because he personified the most prestigious calling of learning and because he performed his duties without regard for his personal well-being.

The pre-Meiji relationship is described thus by one historian:

... The relation between pupil and teacher and parent was more than an economic one. Learning was too much respected to be treated simply as a commodity, and the tradition of the scholar who simply fulfilled a duty to mankind by passing on his scholarship was still sufficiently strong, and still played a real part in the motives of a high enough proportion of teachers, to prevent those who did rely on teaching for a living from lowering their dignity to the point of setting too explicit a price on their services.³
As long as the teacher remained a priest or a samurai with altruistic convictions, there was no inconsistency in the life of a venerated but unpretentious teacher. In other words, teaching was viewed as a heavenly mission conducted by special classes of people who assumed the responsibility of teaching through hereditary processes. But such a traditional concept was not to be upheld forever. Even as early as more than one hundred years ago, a transition was taking place from the concept of teaching as a heavenly mission to that of teaching as a regular occupation. The transitional sequence originated with the priestly class dominating the arts in pre-Tokugawa times, followed by the warrior class during the Tokugawa era, and succeeded by the commoner during the Meiji period; the final stage took place after World War II when teachers were organized into unions.

With the inauguration of the Meiji government in 1868, a new era in the history of Japanese teachers was ushered in, the background of which lies in the broad social and political changes that were carried out under the new regime. After the feudal Tokugawa military regime finally disintegrated in the 1860s before the twin threats of superior Western naval forces, which demanded access to the previously isolated nation, and the internal revivification of the then effete imperial institution, Japan experienced a most severe domestic crisis. The feudal clan leaders divided their allegiance, aligning themselves behind either the emperor or the general, thus provoking civil war. The imperial forces ultimately triumphed and were thrust into the unenviable position of ruling a divided and enfeebled nation while confronting the powerful naval forces of the several Western nations that were competing for Asian colonies, trade concessions, and diplomatic privileges.

The new government, in the name of the boy-Emperor Meiji, endeavored to consolidate its position and chart a new course with the proclamation of the famous 1868 Charter Oath to the gods. One of its most important provisions, shortly thereafter to exert an inordinate influence on Japanese education, proclaimed that “knowledge shall be sought from throughout the world so that the welfare of the Empire may be promoted.” Accordingly, emissaries were dispatched to Europe and America to investigate the variety of Western systems of education and government.

In 1871, following the closing of the old Tokugawa schools, all matters concerning education became the responsibility of a Department of Education, which immediately proceeded to for-
mulate the first scheme for a national school system to take effect in 1872. The purpose of this plan was to break the shackles of feudalism; to unite the petty feudal states behind the emperor, following the enervating internal revolution that was reestablishing the emperor’s political authority; and to overtake the West in science and military technology. The school system was to be the means. The goal was an independent Japan under Emperor Meiji.

The new Department of Education launched its program in 1872 by undertaking what must be one of the most daring attempts to apply comparative educational analyses in a cross-cultural situation. The department patterned the nation’s new educational administrative structure after the French design, implanting ultimate control at the central governmental level. The plan, only partially effected because of its enormity, included the districting of the country into eight university regions. Under each university were to be thirty-two middle-school regions, each of which was to include 210 elementary schools, for an immense total of well over 50,000 educational institutions. The system involved an eight-year elementary school, with the lower four years recommended for all, followed by a six-year middle school and a three-year university. The major educational goal of this grandiose scheme was to produce mass literacy and, in the process, mass acceptance of the new government and a carefully selected elite leadership to control the nation’s destiny.

The Meiji government then began the importation and adaptation of many educational practices, including method and content, from the United States, which, ironically, had one of the most decentralized systems of education in the world. The American common school, instrumental in unifying early America and ideally bringing into one classroom all children in the community regardless of their diverse backgrounds, was particularly attractive to the Japanese government endeavoring to unify Japan under Emperor Meiji. To the Japanese, America appeared the most successful nation in the world in solving the problem of universal education at that time.

Of necessity the Meiji government launched Japan’s first national school system on the foundation of Tokugawa education, which had attained a remarkable rate of school attendance: by 1867 more than 40 percent of the boys and 10 percent of the girls were estimated to have had some form of schooling. Oftentimes, the new compulsory common elementary schools for the masses were merely the old Tokugawa schools, that is, primarily
the private terakoya, which was originally a temple school for local children but which later included almost any local school that taught the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Because of the large number of terakoya available in the land, local governments henceforth recognized many of them as state schools, transferring their students and teachers to the new schools as they became available.

In the beginning, the preponderance of teachers for the new state schools had taught in the terakoya schools and had had no formal training. Many carried with them the traditional image of the ascetic but revered teacher. Those teachers from the samurai class, who considered monetary matters distasteful, running counter to the austerity of the warrior code, had, by definition, little interest in financial rewards. This was indeed an auspicious legacy from the feudal past since the burden of financial support for the new schools was placed at the local level where adequate funds for a mandatory school were neither readily available nor forthcoming from many communities. A corps of loyal, dedicated, self-sacrificing, and experienced teachers thus formed an ideal ingredient for the Meiji government’s monumental plan to unify the many feudal states behind the new emperor. The teachers proved to be one of the more stabilizing elements in this transitional society, encountering an experiment in modernization in the 1870s.

Although many of the experienced teachers from the schools of the Tokugawa period were adept at inculcating Confucian teachings of filial piety and loyalty, certainly a requisite of the new government, it was obvious to government officials that these same teachers were ill prepared to teach the imported Western learning to large classes of children, derived from all levels of society, in the new common compulsory elementary schools. Consequently, in 1872, the same year the first national education plan was inaugurated, a normal school was established in Tōkyō whose master teacher was Marion Scott, an American elementary school principal from California. Equipped with textbooks from home and a Japanese translator, Scott taught his pupils to teach a class of Japanese children the way he had taught American children in California.

Graduates of the Tōkyō Normal School were dispersed into the provinces to set up provincial normal schools for the training of a new class of teachers trained in Western methods of teaching using Western textbooks. And so the process went, and with it were planted the seeds for later discord between those teachers and government leaders who considered
teaching as an altruistic, sacred mission and those of the newly trained teachers who considered it as an occupation by which one lived a normal life in the community, supporting a family with an adequate income.

The first normal school graduates were dominated by former samurai and their dependents from the Tokugawa era. Teaching attracted them not only because many were inclined to reject business and commercial work after losing their privileged warrior-class status but also because teaching offered them permanent work and appealed to their sense of duty to serve the government. However, by the end of the Meiji period in 1912, teachers and students at the normal schools originated mostly from non-samurai families. Examples from the Kumamoto Normal School and its training school are indicative of the trend, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

By the 1880s, less than a decade after the establishment of the first normal school, which reflected strong foreign, mostly American, influence, a reactionary movement engulfed Japanese education. Emperor Meiji himself set the stage for a return to more conservative and traditional principles in his 1879 Imperial Instructions on Education; he did so by criticizing those who, “in their eagerness to adopt Western ways make light of the virtues of humanity, justice, loyalty and filial piety.” Education, he proclaimed, must inculcate the true teachings of Confucianism.  

A year later, with the passage of the Assembly Act and the Primary School Teachers’ Regulations, political restrictions enveloped the teachers. Under these provisions, “it
Table 2. Family Background of Teachers at the Training School of the Kumamoto Normal School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878–1887</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888–1897</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898–1907</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908–1917</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Nikkyōso (Japan Teachers Union), Nikk yōso Jūnenshi (Ten-Year History of the Japan Teachers Union) (Tōkyō: Nikkyōso, 1958), p. 432.

became impossible for teachers to talk about political matters or even to listen to political speeches, virtually becoming isolated from social and political controversy.”

An even more conservative leadership gained control of Japan as the emperor came under the increasing influence of Motoda Eifu, a Confucianist who promoted the view that “the Emperor should be the model of virtue for the entire people as the recipient of the ancestral precepts transmitted from the Sun Goddess through the unbroken lineage of the of the Imperial Family.” Motoda endeavored to impose his ideas as a basis of the morals course in schools. His plans were temporarily delayed with the appointment in 1885 of Mori Arinori as the first minister of education.

It was Mori Arinori, who vigorously promoted national education for the development of Japan as an independent nation. Known as the father of Meiji education, Mori, who traveled widely in Europe and represented Japan in Washington for more than a year, believed that the advancement of the State depended upon education whose policies must be firmly established on the policies and purposes of the State.

In 1886 Mori rewrote the educational code into four separate education orders: the Primary School Code, the Secondary School Code, the Imperial University code, and the Normal School Code—all firmly based on the principles of nationalism. These codes continued in essence until 1945. Perhaps the most important of Mori’s ideas, with unusual ramifications
for the later years, was that concerning normal schools (shihan gakkō), for, according to Mori’s first article of the 1886 Normal School Code, “pupils must be trained to cultivate the spirit of Obedience, Sympathy and Dignity. They must be filled with the spirit of loyalty and patriotism and made to realize the grandeur and obligations of loyalty and filial piety, and to be inspired with sentiments proper to our nationality.”¹⁰

The normal schools under Mori’s influence were administered as quasi-military institutions, scrupulously designed to indoctrinate the principles of nationalism through a strict program of physical, moral, and mental training of the future elementary school teachers, who were, in turn, to inculcate these ideals in the young during compulsory school classes. Since all graduates were liable to military service, it was deemed proper that military gymnastics and drill on the German model should be taught for three to six hours a week. A high-ranking military officer was assigned to administer the Tōkyō Higher Normal School.

There were two types of normal schools. One type trained elementary school teachers; there were two such schools in each prefecture, one for men and one for women. The other type, known as the higher normal school, trained secondary school teachers. Both types gained wide recognition. The competition to enter these normal schools intensified when they attracted bright local students who were seeking a means of social mobility since there was only one university, Tōkyō University, at that time. Graduates became statesmen, scholars, poets, and writers, as well as teachers, all gradually replacing the warrior class as a new class of commoners. Offering free room, board, tuition, clothing, and an allowance, plus assurance of a teaching position upon graduation, the normal schools held a unique position in the Japanese educational world in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and produced a confident corps of teachers.

American ideals of education, shaped by Christian traditions and the Western frontier and emphasizing individualism, humanism, and local control, were no longer considered appropriate for an Oriental country experiencing the painful transformation from a feudalistic base of Tokugawa times to a modern state under Emperor Meiji. The Japanese leaders in the late 1880s thus made one of the most crucial decisions in the history of Japan: The model for Japanese education, as well as for many other institutions of the nation, including the 1889 Constitution, would henceforth be German, not American. The Herbartian educational ideal employed in Germany, a nation whose history, lit-
erature, and traditions formed the foundation of the country’s educational curriculum and moral teachings, appealed to the Japanese leaders as an ideal combination of moral training and the acquirement of knowledge.

At the same time, Confucian nationalists, by promoting the mythical origins of Japan and the emperor, exploited the previous efforts of Mori, assassinated in 1889, who had endeavored to unify and strengthen the nation through a strong and unified school system. The culmination of the movement to traditionalize was finally attained in 1890 with the proclamation of the most important educational document in prewar Japan, the Imperial Rescript on Education.

Know ye, Our subjects:

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education. Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore advance public good and promote common interest; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may all thus attain to the same virtue.11

[Imperial Seal]

The Imperial Rescript represented a unique composite of ideals—ideals that are firmly embedded in Japanese tradition—and manifested the restoration of Motoda’s prestige.
At the same time, the Rescript combined filial piety with patriotism and industriousness in the Japanese version of the Protestant ethic. It could aptly be described as the embodiment of a “Japanese ethic,” which provided a major motivating influence underlying Japan’s transformation into one of the world’s leading nations today. Unfortunately, this document was exploited by Japanese militarists in transforming the nation into one of the most aggressive nations in modern times. Therein lies the Rescript’s uniqueness.

From the day of the Imperial Rescript’s issuance until the end of World War II fifty-five years later, Japanese teachers inculcated in their students an awe and reverence for the hallowed proclamation, honored as each school’s sacred treasure, along with the picture of the emperor and the empress. Through the Rescript, the youth underwent indoctrination by a dedicated teaching corps that lived by the simple precept that it was the duty of the individual to perform his role in society, no matter how great or humble, with complete devotion and energy for the welfare of Japan and the Imperial Throne, coeval with heaven and earth.

The Imperial Rescript on Education provided the moral, philosophical, religious, and patriotic foundation of Japanese education; the pattern of education was thus determined until the end of World War II. It was to be a highly centralized system based on the principles of elementary education for all and secondary and higher education for the intellectually able, with technical streams being added later in separate schools as Japanese industry developed. It was to emphasize Western technology and science, and Japanese culture and traditions based on Confucian hierarchal relationships. Its teaching methods were based on the Herbartian five-step process, which appealed to teachers seeking the most efficient means of teaching systematically a great deal of information and factual knowledge in the shortest possible time.

The purpose of prewar Japanese education was to modernize Japan industrially and technologically so that she could attain equality with Western countries, thereby enabling her to remain independent. At the same time, it was to cultivate Japanese culture and traditions in the name of the emperor, who represented the true Japanese spirit from his ancient ancestral lineage, to be taught in the morals course based on the Imperial Rescript which assumed a predominant position in the curriculum. To accomplish these multiple aims less than a
century ago, Japanese education became a tool of nationalism and servant of the State, eventually fulfilling many of the goals originally set for it.

During the entire Meiji period, the government regarded teaching as a duty and service to the State, consistent with the emperor’s appeal for each citizen to perform his role in society selflessly for the welfare of all. Teachers, however, were considered to be in a special category. Even though they were paid from local revenues, they were treated as quasi-national officers, paid not for their labor but for their loyalty to the emperor as his officers. Moreover, as civil servants serving the emperor, their honorable position was of such proportion that to protest the very low financial rewards was considered beneath the dignity of an individual in such a distinguished position.12 This attitude continued into the twentieth century.

Another interesting phenomenon developed during the latter part of the Meiji period. Increasingly, farmers sent their eldest sons to the prefectural normal schools, reasoning that the son could later hold a teaching post, although poorly paid, while continuing to manage the farm. A male normal school graduate often became a local elementary school principal, a prestigious position in the community, which also allowed early retirement at about age fifty. In other words, an elementary school principal, in addition to owning land, retired in the most enviable circumstances, with a double income from his pension and the farm. This type of teacher never had to rely solely on his salary and was satisfied with the conditions of teaching that brought him the all-important prestige within the community.

Following the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars at the turn of the century and upon the death of Emperor Meiji in 1912, which marked the end of the Meiji period, a new era was ushered in. By then the industrial revolution had started. With the new era came the first independent teachers’ organization.

Japanese industry advanced rapidly, profiting considerably when European countries were cut off from their Asian markets during World War I. Without otherwise becoming involved in the fighting, except for minor skirmishes, Japan was able to remain secure from attack while reaping profits because of the war. Income buildup was substantial, leading to unprecedented economic prosperity and concomitant social disruption; spending and imports increased sharply, bringing about a spiraling inflation.
Salaries of teachers, as civil servants with fixed incomes, fell markedly behind industrial and commercial salaries and price increases, which led to a hopeless situation for teachers. For example, to support a family with five members in 1919 required at least 2,000 yen a year, but the average annual salary of teachers was 581 yen. The low teachers’ salaries undermined the social prestige of the teaching profession and the self-respect of teachers. The situation had already been aggravated by the growing unpopularity of the normal schools. Brighter students from the higher economic classes were increasingly attracted to the rapidly expanding middle schools leading to the broadening university system. Normal schools consequently were attracting more students from poorer homes, especially farming families, who were willing to take low-paying teaching positions upon graduation, often on a scale lower than apprenticeships.

By 1920, a fresh wave of liberalism was influencing Japan, affecting the role and image of the teacher. World War I stimulated a humanistic movement in many countries of the world, including Japan. Meiji men were being succeeded by a new class of commoner-bureaucrats during the reign of Emperor Taishō (1912–1926). Government leaders were chosen from the class of commoner-politician, rather than the aristocratic class; and the overestimated phrase Taishō Democracy was coined in response to the victory of Western democracy over German totalitarianism. Hara Takashi became the first commoner premier in 1918, marking the beginning of party government.

Liberalism and euphoria were spreading. Those few who had opposed the traditional heavenly-mission concept of the teacher moved into the forefront of the movement to reform education by establishing progressive schools, including the Jiyūgakuen (Liberty School) founded by Hani Motoko and the Seijō Elementary School by Sawayanagi Masatarō, still famous for their progressive methods of education. John Dewey visited Japan to introduce his philosophy of education. Progressive ideas from America, Pestalozzian theory, and Marxist teachings were all competing with Herbartian theories from Germany now losing popularity in Japan. With Pestalozzian theories as the central force of the new education movement, emphasis was placed on self-activity in contrast to cramming under Herbartian methods. A new era in Japanese education and society appeared imminent.
From 1919 to 1921, the beginning of the so-called proletarian period, the influence of Marx-Leninism within Japan was pronounced. A multitude of Marxist societies, journals, and activities emerged. Student organizations were ventured at Waseda and Tōkyō universities for the study of Marxism. Intellectuals were awakening to the new foreign ideology. A flood of socialist literature circulated throughout the country, mostly in the form of translated Western materials, keeping Japanese readers abreast of the progress of world socialism.

In 1919, in response to the liberal trends of the time and the hardships of the destitute teachers who were left behind in the sudden prosperity, the first independent organization of Japanese teachers was founded. Shimonaka Yasaburō, a teacher at the Saitama Prefectural Normal School, organized a movement called the Nihon Kyōin Kumiai Keimeikai (Japan Teachers Union Enlightenment Association), or Keimeikai. Keimeikai established an office in Tōkyō and held its first official meeting on August 4, 1919, with 200 members, at the Kanda Seinen Hall. They set themselves the following three goals: stabilizing teachers’ livelihood, elevating teachers’ positions, and securing their independence of thought. Their organ was the periodical Keimei (Enlightenment), serving at its peak a membership of 1,500 teachers throughout the nation. Their initial declaration, a curious assortment of moderate ideas, included the following:

Our ideal is to attain a just life based upon human rights. We acknowledge the basic rights of human beings and respect their inalienable social rights.

We are Japanese. We assert our sincerity as Japanese citizens and our desire to be loyal to the just and great principles of Japan. Therefore, we reject all irrational and unnatural laws, conventions and thoughts contrary to these principles.

We are educators. We are conscious of our vocation and will devote ourselves to the education of all people in friendship.14

In 1920 Keimeikai discussed a proposal for public election of school principals, a recurring theme of many of the subsequent teachers’ organizations, which objected to the role of the school principal as a puppet of the government. Saitama Prefectural authorities shortly thereafter dismissed or transferred leaders of Keimeikai within their jurisdiction. The government then banned Keimeikai’s journal after an edition carried an article entitled “Kokka Seikatsu no Gōrika” (Rationalization of Our
National Way of Life), concerning the hardships of life in Japan. A few intrepid members ventured to participate in Japan’s first May Day celebration in 1920, an act totally counter to the traditional image of a Japanese teacher. Pressure by the government was increased until Keimeikai was forced to disband, terminating the first attempt to organize Japanese teachers independently of government control.15

Social unrest and rice riots continued to plague the nation, and the catastrophic Tōkyō earthquake of 1923 added to the misery of the people. In such an environment malcontents were readily attracted to opposition movements. By this time the Soviet Union had indicated an interest in Japan, and a tiny Japan Communist party was organized in 1922 under Soviet aegis. For the next several years, the party faithful worked within the labor movement. Acts of violence broke out, providing the police with a timely reason to crack down on the Communist party and dissolve it. Apparently, very few teachers were directly involved in the Communist movement at this time.

In the late 1920s, disaster again fell upon the nation when the effects of the Great Depression reached Japan, a land depleted of raw materials, totally dependent upon international trade, and faced with prohibitively high import tariffs among its traditional trading countries. Teachers, already poorly paid, suffered further deprivation and denigration. Farmers’ incomes, however, fell below that of teachers, placing the local teacher in the unique position of struggling to maintain a minimum standard of living while witnessing the struggles for survival of his students’ families. Socialist and Communist activities increased in response to these conditions, only to be more vigorously condemned by the government.

In 1929, the Shōgakkō Kyōin Renmei (Primary School Teachers League) was formed in Tōkyō, the first Communist teachers’ association in the nation; it took a leading role in the class struggle by joining an international movement of teachers sponsored by the Soviet Union. In 1930, forty-five members were arrested under the 1925 Law for the Preservation of Public Order, and the organization disbanded.16 In the same year, the Ministry of Education issued instructions for the appointment of active military officers to give military instruction in all public normal schools, middle schools, technical schools, and higher schools. Although Mori’s code of 1886 had stipulated similar regulations, their enforcement had become haphazard during the Taishō Democracy era.
Several of the remaining activist teachers from the dissolved left-wing Shōgakkō Kyōin Renmei, led by Yamashita Tokuji, then formed in 1930 the underground Nihon Kyōiku Rōdō Kumiai (Japan Educational Labor Union), or Kyōrō, which had a distinctly proletarian platform. Kyōrō is considered the prewar spiritual predecessor of the postwar Nikkyōso and the originator of the concept of “educational laborer” (kyōiku rōdōsha), which became a major issue of contention after the war. Kyōrō distributed a publication entitled the Kyōrō Panfuretto (Educational Worker’s Pamphlet) as a struggle guide and established illegal Kyōrō branches in eighteen prefectures. For a short time it joined the Nihon Rōdō Kumiai Zenkoku Kyōgikai (National Council of Japanese Labor Unions) as its educational division. Kyōrō thus came under the direct influence of one of the most active organizations controlled by Communists, which instigated local and national strikes that brought on the wrath of the police and the early disbandment of the parent body.

In the same year that Kyōrō was established, a recognized cultural organization called Shinkō Kyōiku Kenkyūjo (Institute for Proletariat Education), or Shinkyō, was also organized under the leadership of Yamashita Tokuji from Kyōrō. Shinkyō was used by Kyōrō leaders as a legal research body for the dissemination of left-wing literature through a journal called Keimei, which appealed to the young impoverished teachers experiencing the difficulties of teaching in a nearly bankrupt nation. Shinkyō was distinctly leftist, criticizing contemporary bourgeois education while promoting an educational system for the children of the proletariat. Readers of the journal formed a small network of left-wing teacher cells throughout the nation until the group was forced to disband.

Shinkyō never attained a mass base among teachers because of its theoretical and political tendencies. It represented an urban-based, rather sophisticated, ideological group remote from the day-to-day life of the average teacher. The leaders were influenced by international movements and formal theories of which the ordinary teacher working under adverse conditions was unaware. The following excerpts from Shinkyō’s platform illustrate its political and ideological persuasion and reveal its interpretation of the role of the teacher as an educational laborer:
DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

1. To satisfy the desire for basic education to meet the daily needs of laborers, farmers, and other workers
2. To struggle against bourgeois and fascist educational principles
3. To struggle for satisfactory material conditions in order to provide for the full educational desires of proletariat children
4. To struggle against imperialistic education
5. To protect socialist education
6. To train leaders for the proletariat education movement

ACTIVITIES AND PLATFORM

1. Opposition to militaristic and religious education
2. Promotion of general educational activities for the proletariat
3. Opposition to any disciplinary measures against children of the working class
4. Consolidation of technical and professional education on socialist principles for children of the working class
5. Opposition to education emphasizing examination preparation which neglects children of the working class
6. Establishment of night schools and nurseries at factories financed by factory owners but managed by factory committees
7. Opposition to Seinen Gakkō (Youth Schools established by the government)
8. Elimination of school fees and provision of free educational materials for children of the working class
9. Adoption of educational principles and techniques based on a careful interpretation of Marx-Leninism
10. Cooperation with international proletariat movements
11. Promotion of freedom of revolutionary materials and movements
12. Promotion of freedom of speech, press, and association
13. Opposition to imperialistic wars

Shinkyō’s platform, blatantly anticapitalist and antibourgeois, was the overt basis of all left-wing teachers’ organizations in the 1920s and the 1930s. They could operate on this basis usually with impunity, since the government was not much concerned with antibourgeois propaganda. However, any crit-
icism of the emperor, the imperial institution, the national entity of Japan (kokutai), the military, or the government inevitably invited the wrath of the police. Implicit in the proletariat propaganda was a criticism of these sacrosanct institutions, but in order to avoid reprisals the emphasis was placed on opposition to capitalistic bourgeoisie. When the government decided these boundaries were violated, it simply closed down the organization.

During the early 1930s, the Communists and Socialists bickered among themselves for hegemony of the working-class movement, thus further confounding and inhibiting proletarian movements. The Communists, operating under strong influence from the Soviet Union, attacked the role of the emperor in Japanese society, an attack which provoked the full wrath of the police. The Socialists refrained from supporting such a radical position and, conversely, during the darkening thirties assumed a somewhat cooperative policy with the government based on “national socialism,” which brought them into conflict with the Japan Communist party. The prewar split was a major underlying factor in the division between the Communist and Socialist parties after the Pacific war ended in 1945, when their respective leaders resumed the struggle for hegemony of the burgeoning postwar labor movement.

The period of the early 1930s, when the depression took its appalling toll in Japan, was of extreme importance to the postwar teachers’ movement. During these several years of national economic distress, when the military began its inexorable drive to control the State, the teaching corps underwent one of the most excruciating periods in its history. Teachers’ salaries were reduced. In 1931, about a thousand towns and villages were in arrears of teachers’ salaries. The teaching profession had reached its nadir.¹⁹

The critical factor about this period is that every president and nearly every other leader of the postwar Nikkyōso underwent his teacher training in the normal schools of the late 1920s and early 1930s and went out to teach in their first positions during this time of extreme national tribulation. The relationship between normal school training and the teaching experiences of postwar union leaders in the depression years of the early 1930s, especially in impoverished rural Japan, and the left-wing attitudes and positions these leaders assumed after the war in organizing Nikkyōso were of critical significance to the initial postwar attitude assumed by Nikkyōso.
In 1932, as the militarists sought to strengthen their grip on the government, Premier Inukai was assassinated, ending fourteen turbulent years of party government. In the same year the Ministry of Education issued an ordinance on April 8 stipulating that teachers were expected to fulfill their duties as ten-shoku, literally, a heavenly occupation or mission. One of the contemporary normal school textbooks stated that “the goal of education is for others. Therefore true education is attained when the teacher sacrifices himself for his students. Herein lies the reason why teaching is called a holy profession (seishoku).”

The pendulum once again, as in the 1880s, swung back to the traditional image of a Japanese teacher, as progressive ideals in education were branded as foreign inspired and inimical to Japanese traditions.

Under the militarists, Japanese teachers were indoctrinated with nationalistic and quasi-religious concepts through a highly disciplined normal school curriculum, which was oriented toward the martial arts and in which normal school students participated in military maneuvers as part of their preparation for teaching. At the Okayama Prefectural Normal School, for example, there were three army officers on the faculty, who taught three to five class hours a week in weapons firing, marching, and military leadership. Graduates from 1927 on had to serve a five-month tour of duty in one of the military services in order to understand the “military spirit.” Only then were they considered fit to educate young people. After their tour of duty, they were expected to regard the military spirit as the spirit of education.

The moral code in both the normal schools and the imperial forces was founded on loyalty to the emperor and service to the State. The normal schools, once again achieving increased popularity during the mid-thirties as a means of attaining job security during the depression and as an alternative to prolonged compulsory military duty, became so closely aligned with the military that the transition from normal school to the military and on to the teaching post was a natural process. Several basic sectors of the society became inextricably intertwined in the single purpose of accomplishing the mission of the government.

As long as the teacher trainees were protected from the harsh realities of a destitute society while remaining within the confines of the normal schools and the military, where the State provided all amenities including a monthly stipend, the scheme operated efficiently. However, when some of the graduates, upon finally reaching their first teaching assignment,
were sickened by the abject poverty, particularly of their rural students, reaction set in. The inconsistencies of the normal school teachings, where concepts of Japanese superiority and greatness were inculcated, were exposed when the new teachers encountered the actual condition of the poorer masses of Japanese.

Under these conditions, a few teachers influenced by Marxist literature tried to organize a “Pioneer Movement” patterned after the Pioneers in the Soviet Union. Posters ostensibly depicting the life of happy young Pioneers in a Communist land, contrasting sharply with life in Japan at that time, adorned a few classroom bulletin boards, as activist teachers hopelessly endeavored to organize like-minded teachers in a protesting proletariat movement. They were ruthlessly dealt with by the government, which branded all teachers’ protest movements as Communist-inspired. From 1926 to 1935, the government arrested 748 teachers on ideological grounds and punished 649 of them. In Nagano Prefecture in 1933 alone, 131 teachers were arrested, of whom 58 were removed from their teaching posts by dismissal or compulsory early retirement, discouraging a radical teachers’ movement through fear of reprisals and arrest.23

During this period, the one teachers’ movement that persisted with a limited degree of success was the loosely termed Seikatsu Tsuzurikata Undō, which meant the creative-writing association or the life-in-education movement. The form and nature of this protest was such that it was extremely difficult for the authorities to suppress it. Although somewhat formalized in several different sections of the country, the movement was essentially amorphous. Teachers could participate, in most instances, without exposing themselves to any punitive action. In contrast Shinkyō, this movement was simple, devoid of theoretical premises, and based on the native life and daily activities of the ordinary teacher. Accordingly it had a much broader appeal than organizations such as Shinkyō.

The creative-writing or life-in-education movement was conducted mostly by teachers in Japanese language classes who oriented their composition lessons toward the daily life of their students. Since there were no prescribed lessons or teachers’ manuals for composition classes, teachers were free to plan their own lessons. The movement originated when language teachers had their students compose essays on self-reflection, a subject dear to every Japanese. From criticizing one’s own weaknesses, followed by earnest soul-searching to correct one’s
foibles, the next step was to reflect on life in general—that is, on Japanese society—by criticizing the evils and by seeking solutions to correct them. During the years of the depression, it was not a difficult task indeed for students to witness the ills of Japanese society.

Teachers as well as students were affected by the lessons. One teacher, Iwama Masao, who at this time found Marxism attractive and who was ultimately to become the major leader of the early postwar teachers’ union movement, recalls: “My eyes were awakened to the evils of our society through compositions of my pupils in which their sufferings at home were revealed under the pressure of poverty.”

The movement became political when teachers such as Iwama, who were themselves critical of the economic conditions and the harsh political restrictions the government placed upon them and the public at large, led the students to conclude that the Japanese government was the major source of the evils confronting Japan.

The life-in-education movement was less political and more humanitarian as practiced by the Hoppō Kyōikusha Undō (Northern Teachers Movement), founded by Narita Tadahisa, from the northern prefecture of Akita. Since northern Japan was traditionally considered the least developed area of the nation, teachers in this rural movement endeavored to show the rest of Japan that such movements could succeed under the most adverse conditions. Similar groups were begun in other rural areas, such as Shikoku, but most of the formal organizations did not long survive.

In 1934 the government sponsored a national convention of teachers in which it promoted a spiritual enhancement of education, demanding that teachers be purveyors of militaristic education. Shortly thereafter, the Thought Bureau was established. As the government increased its restrictive measures, the leader of the Hoppō Kyōikusha Undō was arrested in 1935. The government charged that teachers involved in this movement were organizing peasants’ children to attack Japanese society in critical essays, and that this was done through proletariat methods to accomplish the purposes of the Comintern and the Japan Communist party. The formal movement then ceased to exist.

The role of the creative-writing movement and the more politically inspired teachers’ organizations must not be overestimated, for the preponderance of teachers, including language teachers, accepted the course toward militarism, using the classroom to support the government’s aims throughout the
war. Most of them did so because they had been thoroughly indoctrinated during their own schooling and thus zealously believed in the cause. Teachers used every course they taught as a means to instill “acceptable” concepts into the young. In particular, history, geography, and morals (shūshin) courses were used for these purposes. Teachers in morals education emphasized the themes of bushidō (the way of the warrior), stressing loyalty, filial piety, bravery, and honor in addition to the general theme of militarism, ultranationalism, and State Shintō.

An example of the role of the teacher in Japanese society during the 1930s can be seen in the prewar career of the fourth president of Nikkyōso, Miyanohara Sadamitsu, who exemplifies the depth of indoctrination of teacher candidates during the normal school training. When interviewed, Miyanohara recalled that upon graduation from the Kagoshima Normal School in southern Japan in the mid-thirties he was a confident young teacher imbued with concepts of Japanese superiority and love of the emperor. After graduation he entered the Japanese imperial navy for five months; upon release, he became an elementary school teacher in rural Kyūshū.

Miyanohara firmly believed in the militaristic education then being promoted by the government, as Japanese armies moved onto the Asian mainland. As a teacher in the upper elementary school, handling boys fourteen to fifteen years of age, he earnestly endeavored to develop among these boys a sense of service to the Japanese empire. In particular, he recruited volunteers for Manchuria in a special organization of young people organized to help develop the newly conquered territory. At that time he took especial pride in being able to persuade many of his rural students to join this governmental undertaking. Unfortunately, fewer than half his students lived to return home from Manchuria at the war’s end, resulting in an ideological reversal within Miyanohara, from the right in the prewar era to the left in the immediate postwar period. This was ultimately to be reflected in his left-wing leadership of Nikkyōso from 1962.

Those teachers who did not believe in the government propaganda were nevertheless compelled to teach the materials prescribed by the Ministry of Education, or lose their jobs or, in extreme cases, face arrest. Certain teachers who sympathized with their poverty-stricken students joined movements to help alleviate these conditions merely on humanitarian grounds. Although the government branded all suspect teachers’ movements as Communist and ruthlessly intervened to stamp them out, there was, nevertheless, a fringe sector of teachers who
were willing to sacrifice themselves for a liberal cause. Sometimes the motives were humanitarian, sometimes, political, and frequently, a blend of the two. Such teachers’ movements were to be totally suppressed during World War II.

After 1935, as far as can be ascertained, no independent teachers’ organization functioned until the formation in 1939 of two groups called the Nihon Seinen Kyōshidan (Japan Young Teachers’ Association) and the Kyōiku Kagaku Kenkyūkai (Association for the Scientific Study of Education), or Kyōkaken. The Nihon Seinen Kyōshidan was a short-lived organization of activist teachers based in Tōkyō. Because of government pressure, it was unable to form a sustaining movement, Kyōkaken originated from the publication in the early 1930s of the most authoritative prewar encyclopedia of education, entitled Kyōikugaku Jiten, published by the Iwanami Company. The editors continued the work by publishing a series of relevant lectures which led to the publication of a journal called Kyōiku (Education). Promoters of the journal, Kido Mantarō, professor of psychology at Hōsei University, and Tomeoka Kiyō, formerly from the same department, decided to form an organization to further their ideals. They based their position on the reform of education through scientific research and study.

Initially, the movement grew out of an interest in psychology as it pertained to education; hence, it was not ideologically oriented. Nevertheless, inherent in this approach was a criticism of contemporary Japanese education as obsolete and inadequate to support a modern nation. There was an implicit criticism of the Ministry of Education that normally would have brought on the wrath of the police. The Ministry of Education did not suppress Kyōkaken for the following reasons: (1) Kyōkaken did not overtly question the war or the military regime, and (2) its leaders promoted the scientific reform of education for the advancement of Japan. Not even the military government could bring itself to ban such an organization that endeavored to improve the quality of Japan’s war machine.

Kyōkaken attacked normal school training, the center of ultranationalism, as antiquated and anachronistic in its pedagogical methods based on the Herbartian five-step process, which encouraged rote memory when applied in the Japanese context. It also established local branches of Kyōkaken consisting of regular teachers. The plan was to reeducate teachers both in training and in service who would reconstruct education scientifically. In turn, the schools were to reform and re-
construct Japanese society, thereby enabling the government to wage modern warfare for the preservation of the Japanese nation.

Kyōkaken’s recommendations for educational reform were originated mostly by Professor Abe Shigetaka of Tōkyō University, who was influenced by his lengthy visit to the United States in 1925, and after his death in 1939 were promoted by his student Munakata Seiya, who exerted considerable influence on the postwar teachers’ movement. Among the recommendations were the following: decentralization of educational control, a 6–3–3–5 articulated system, curriculum reforms, teaching-methods reform, an extension of compulsory education from six to eight or nine years, and the integration of the various secondary schools into a unified or comprehensive school. The significance of these prewar progressive ideas lies in the fact that nearly all of them were included in the American Occupation’s reforms of Japanese education after World War II.

Presided over by Kido Mantarō and Tomeoka Kiyō, Kyōkaken attracted a number of scholars who joined the movement because its scientific approach to education appealed to them intellectually. It also attracted a number of dissidents from the several left-wing organizations disbanded by the government who had no other formal organization to join. As a result, there was within the organization a mixture of conservatives, moderates, and leftists, all criticizing contemporary education while promoting a new education for Japan.

Kyōkaken had no direct relationship with the military government or the Ministry of Education. However, its contacts with Prince Konoe, who became prime minister in 1938, afforded it security. Prince Konoe financed a brain trust called the Shōwa Kenkyūkai (Shōwa Research Association), which included distinguished progressive scholars, several of whom belonged to another private organization called the Kyōiku Kaikaku Dōshikai (Educational Reform Society), which also included educationists and politicians of progressive leanings interested in promoting education. Among the members of the Kyōiku Kaikaku Dōshikai were Abe, Kido, and Tomeoka from Kyōkaken. Through this network of contacts and the meetings of the Kyōiku Kaikaku Dōshikai and the Kenkyūkai, the theories formulated by Kyōkaken were made known to politicians and to Prince Konoe himself.

Kyōkaken served a unique blend of purposes by providing the military regime with ideas for educational reform and new teaching methods to improve the manpower quality of the war
machine, a continuing demand the military government placed on the Ministry of Education. At the same time Kyōkaken provided a base for left-wing activists to continue their antigovernment activities during the war in the guise of improving education, under the protection of their indirect association with Prince Konoe, who was related to the imperial family. Kyōkaken was finally dissolved by the government in 1944, when the military regime, facing continual battlefield reversals, dissolved any organization under the slightest pretext. With the arrest of Kido and Tomeoka, the government ended all movements having any semblance of a teachers’ movement.27

Activist teachers in prewar Japan never posed a real threat to the military regime. They were merely annoying. Their activities, however, sustained the tiny ray of protest throughout the dark thirties and early forties. When the American Occupation authorities were seeking a liberal Japanese element in the aftermath of the war, they found it in these leftist teachers who had unsuccessfully attempted to organize prewar associations. The Americans and the Japanese left wing thus aligned themselves in their opposition to the military regime, initially by having the protesting teachers of the thirties forming the nucleus of the teachers’ movement and later by having Nikkyōso as the nucleus.

The lone teachers’ association recognized throughout the prewar and wartime periods was the Teikoku Kyōikukai (Imperial Education Association) founded in 1883 to unite teachers for the improvement of national education in support of the government’s educational policy. The fortunes of this association were curious. Basically, they followed the alternations of the government. During the Meiji period, the Teikoku Kyōikukai was theoretically a federation of autonomous local and prefectural educational and cultural associations. Governmental influence was strong. During the period of the Taishō Democracy (around 1920), however, it transformed its image under the presidency of the educational reformer, Sawayanagi Masatarō, founder of the progressive school Seijō Gakuen. During this period the Teikoku Kyōikukai not only sent Japanese teachers to the West to study Western philosophies of education and modern teaching methods, but it also invited progressive educators of the West to come to Japan. In addition, it labored for increased national expenditures on elementary education and the payment in full of teachers’ salaries that were in arrears because of the depression.
When the military embarked upon its aggressive expansionist campaign, the Teikoku Kyōikukai, along with all other cultural and social organizations, became submerged in the quagmire of ultranationalism and militarism. In 1944 it changed its name to Dai Nippon Kyōikukai (Great Japan Education Association). All teachers were asked to join the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai, thereby eliminating the autonomy enjoyed by local and prefectural associations. Nearly all teachers joined because to do otherwise stigmatized one as unpatriotic during the most dangerous period of the war, when the government was facing continual military reverses.28

Tanaka Kōtarō, a distinguished postwar minister of education and later chief justice of the Supreme Court, described the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai as obviously nationalistic, functioning as virtual agent of the Ministry of Education, which appointed the association’s president and vice-president, who, in turn, chose the director and counselors. Many of the association’s staff were ultranationalists and retired high officials of the Ministry of Education. As an official teachers’ organization, its purposes were “to promote the educational ideal of the Japanese people on the fundamental principle of the national policy, encourage the indefatigable assiduity of its members, and render loyal service to national education. The government considered the association all the more worthy of its subsidy of a million yen per year because of its nationalistic tendency.”29

During the later war years, no teachers’ organization of consequence was recognized except this association. The others had already been either disbanded or effectively suppressed by the government through arrests and intimidation. Teachers lost their political rights, their freedom of thought, and their freedom of association, in common with the rest of the populace. However, teachers, as promoters of militaristic education and leaders of a new Japan, were viewed in a special way by the government. Their whole life was imbued with ultranationalistic militarism from their elementary schooling, their normal school training, and their mandatory period of military duty. Under these circumstances, the Japanese teaching corps became one of the most militaristic groups of people in Japanese society, perhaps next only to the military itself, perpetuating ultranationalism by faithfully sending forth their students to the battlefields for the Japanese Empire and the emperor. When the war finally ended in 1945, a regenerated teachers’ movement was, to a substantial degree, a spontaneous reaction to these prewar circumstances.
The Postwar Rebirth (1945)

Freedom of Association

On July 26, 1945, eleven days before the atom bomb obliterated a major part of Hiroshima, the Allied Powers issued the Potsdam Declaration, demanding that Japan either surrender unconditionally or face the “utter devastation of the Japanese homeland.” The terms of the Potsdam Declaration read in part as follows: “The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights, shall be established. The occupying forces of the Allies shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as these objectives have been accomplished and there has been established in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government.”

On August 14, Emperor Hirohito announced acceptance of the terms of the Potsdam Declaration. Acknowledging the threat of annihilation by further use of the new bomb and the rapidly deteriorating war situation, the emperor surrendered his nation to the Allied Powers. The final paragraph of the Potsdam Declaration paved the way for the cooperative attitude on the part of the Japanese toward the occupying forces, a monumental reversal that mystified many of the foreigners who participated in the comprehensive project. There is no doubt that Emperor Hirohito was instrumental in this regard since he declared, in a decree reminiscent of the 1890 Imperial Rescript: “Beware most strictly lest any outbursts of emotion, which may engender needless complication ... lead you astray.... Devote your united strength to construction of the future ... work with resolution so that you may enhance the innate glory of the Imperial state and keep pace with the progress of the world.”
At the end of hostilities on August 15, 1945, teachers in Japan were exhausted, sick, hungry, and demoralized. Many had lost their homes in the relentless bombings of the cities, which had destroyed over four thousand schools. Those who had moved to the suburbs spent hours each day commuting because of the unreliable transportation system. Married teachers were compelled to forage for food through the countryside in order to keep their families from starving. Blackmarkets proliferated overnight. Clothes, valuables, and personal belongings were bartered for rice, the most important commodity. Teachers parted with their few remaining precious books to obtain food and shelter.

Records of teachers’ activities during these days of confusion immediately following the war’s end are sketchy, to say the least. Personal accounts are somewhat conflicting. What can be concluded is that, sporadically, bewildered teachers found themselves returning to those schools that had escaped the bombings to meet with their colleagues. At these impromptu sessions, surviving teachers who had participated in prewar movements spoke more frequently than the others, consequently being looked upon more and more as leaders in a leadership vacuum. The teachers who had, so to speak, pursued the wrong cause during the war constituted a disenchanted silent majority. Leadership at many such school gatherings fell naturally to the more liberal element of the faculty. The one overwhelming problem confronting all teachers concerned rice. There simply was not much available food of any nature in Japan. Conversation invariably turned to the subject of food shortage and the lack of money, fundamental issues underlying the teachers’ movement from the very beginning in the immediate postwar period.

On August 26, General MacArthur arrived in Japan with a skeleton force to sign the instruments of surrender on September 2 on board the U.S.S. Missouri in Tōkyō Bay. He received his orders for the conduct of the military occupation of Japan in the Initial Post-Surrender Policy of Japan, radioed to him from Washington on August 29 and announced in Japan on November 8. Under the provisions of this document, General MacArthur was appointed Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) with full authority to effectuate the provisions of the Potsdam Declaration. He did, in fact, assume the position of commander of American occupying forces with token rep-
representation from the other Allied Powers. For all intents and purposes, it was an American occupation of Japan, and will be considered as such in this study.

General MacArthur was instructed not to establish direct military government but to exercise his powers through the emperor of Japan or the Japanese governmental machinery, national and local. The policy was to use the existing form of government, not to support it. The supreme commander was entrusted with the broad mandate to foster conditions for the greatest possible assurance that Japan would never again become a menace to world peace. This was to be accomplished by abolishing militarism and ultranationalism, by strengthening democratic tendencies, and by encouraging liberal political inclinations. Finally, in a notably brief section on education, General MacArthur received instructions to reopen the schools as soon as possible, replace teachers who were active exponents of militant nationalism, abolish military training in the schools, and ensure that curricula acceptable to him would be followed in all schools.¹

As it became evident that the conquering soldiers did not intend to pillage the land, tensions among the Japanese people were somewhat alleviated. Activist teachers gained new courage. Schools, closed since April, were reopened in the cities in mid-September; even though many of the students were still in the mountains—students who had been evacuated there during the war because of the city bombing raids. Gradually, an emerging leadership, replacing the discredited principals at various schools, organized teachers into small study groups. Activist teachers got in touch with like-minded friends or fellow graduates of a particular normal school on teaching staffs of other schools. In a few cases, local prewar educational associations or societies regrouped. Unplanned, unauthorized, and uncoordinated, teachers began slowly banding together to cope with the exigencies of a defeated nation occupied by foreign soldiers.

On October 2, the official organization of General Headquarters, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (GHQ, SCAP), was created by General MacArthur’s General Orders, thereby abolishing the interim military government. One of the special staff sections within SCAP—the Civil Information and Education Section (CI & E)—included the Education Division which alone had direct jurisdiction over educational matters dealing with the Japanese Ministry of Education. Its primary duty was to advise the supreme commander about “policies
relating to public information, education, religion and other sociological problems ... to effect the accomplishment of the information and education objectives."\(^5\) The Education Division was responsible for removing militarism and ultranationalism from the schools and for developing patterns of democratic education.

On October 4, SCAP dispatched the Directive to the Japanese Government for the Removal of Restrictions on Political, Civil, and Religious Liberties, abolishing the detested Preservation of Public Order Laws. On October 11, General MacArthur forwarded a letter to Prime Minister Shidehara, ordering that policies be carried out which would open the schools to more liberal education and that unionization of labor be encouraged. With the restrictions on political liberties abolished and with the subsequent release of Communist political prisoners, some incarcerated for many years for their implacable opposition to the wartime military government, a new factor was introduced. The long-suffering Communists suddenly acquired respectability, admired by many for their courage during the war in upholding their beliefs. The Americans welcomed them back into the mainstream of Japanese social and political life as allies in the cause of demilitarizing Japan. The American Occupation and the Japan Communist party thus realized an initial affinity in their common purpose to eradicate ultranationalism and militarism from Japanese education and society.

With the legalization of the Japan Communist party and the encouragement of the unionization of labor, the Communists energetically focused their limited resources on the organization of a united labor movement under their aegis. A few Communist organizers were sent out to the local schools where teachers were meeting in support of the new liberal leaders. Marginal contacts were established between emerging leaders at individual schools and the resurgent Communist party, which was striving to establish a coordinated movement. The Communists, however, were still regarded with suspicion by the average teacher as revolutionaries opposed to the emperor, though they were accepted by many left-wing liberals because of their wartime antigovernment activities.

The first stage of the basic policy of the Occupation designed to demilitarize education was begun during the last two months of 1945 and completed within the first four months of the Occupation. On October 30, SCAP ordered the removal of all teachers "known to be militaristic, ultranationalistic, or antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the Occupation."\(^6\) On De-
December 15, a directive was issued separating religion and the State by abolishing State Shintō and all religious acts in the schools, in addition to the doctrines that taught the superiority of the Japanese people and the Japanese emperor. Finally, on December 31, 1945, the concluding directive in this troika of denial suspended the courses in morals (shū- shin), history, and geography.

One particular group of individuals meeting informally in Tōkyō within weeks after the war played a special role in the birth of the postwar teachers’ movement. It all began at the Tōkyō home of Ono Shunichi, son of a former president of the Bank of Japan. Ono, who had reluctantly accepted the chairmanship of the board of the wartime Japan Children’s Cultural Association, an organ of the military government, had been active in the late thirties in organizing left-wing teachers, many of whom had belonged formerly to such organizations as Kyōrō, Shinkyō, Seikatzu Tsuzurikata Undō, and Nihon Seinen Kyōshidan, which no longer existed. In 1939 Ono attended a special meeting planned and sponsored by some of these young teachers of Tōkyō. Deeply impressed by the sincerity and beliefs of these teachers in their fight for democratic education, he made a substantial financial contribution to help their cause, although these teachers could not organize themselves officially for fear of punishment by the militarists who were then in control of Japan. Be that as it may, the point is that Ono, through such teachers’ activities, had made prewar contacts with a number of individuals such as Hasegawa Shōzō, a progressive elementary school teacher from the Nihon Seinen Kyōshidan, who, after the war, became chairman of the central executive committee of the Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union.

Several weeks after the war ended, Ono and a few of his friends sent letters to several other prewar activists they had known during the late thirties, inviting them to come to Ono’s home in Tōkyō to discuss the plight of the teacher amidst the postwar chaos. At the first informal meeting, this coterie of prewar activists considered the problems of reconstructing Japanese education. Included in the initial group, most of whom eventually became leaders either within the teachers’ movement or the Socialist and Communist parties, or both, were Kitamura Magomori, a member of the radical Kyōrō of 1930, and Inagaki Masanobu and Irie Michio, both prewar Communists. At a subsequent meeting, these men named their group the Kyōiku Saiken Renmei (Education Reconstruction League), proclaiming their commitment to revolutionizing
Japanese education by awakening a new educational consciousness within the school, home, and society for the construction of a peace-loving Japan.

During the first several meetings at Ono’s home in September 1945, the discussions centered around the need for educational reform through research activities independent of the government. The participants concluded that the foundation for a peaceful Japan must be rooted in education. By the end of October, however, the general attitude began to change. Workers were organizing unions after political restrictions were lifted by the SCAP directive. In witnessing these activities and in the hope of revolutionizing education in Japan, the participants in the discussions at Ono’s home concluded that teachers must be organized into a union that would strive to alleviate the terrible living conditions then being experienced by teachers.

The meetings in Ono’s home rapidly expanded as word about the plan spread among like-minded friends and acquaintances of the original group, some of whom had only recently returned to Tōkyō after being evacuated because of bombing raids during the war. To accommodate the growing attendance, the meeting place was moved to an elementary school in Kanda, Tōkyō, where, on November 18, 1945, it was unanimously agreed that the formation of a teachers’ union was the next step to be taken. Having the participation of former members of Kyōrō, Shinkyō, Kyōkaken, Nihon Seinen Kyōshidan, and other organizations from the prewar teachers’ movement, this group of teachers represented a broad spectrum of beliefs and political inclinations.9

Included in the group by now were two figures to become prominent in the teachers’ movement, Hani Gorō and Iwama Masao. Hani, a left-wing historian, had been recuperating from his most recent wartime prison sentence for having spoken out against the war at the Tōkyō YWCA in early 1945, when several of the original organizers, including Inagaki, prevailed upon him to join their group.10 Hani was to become one of the early theoreticians within the movement. The other individual, Iwama Masao, who had been a protagonist at the progressive Seijō School in the thirties, found a natural attraction to the movement.11 He soon became the leader of the radical wing of the teachers’ movement.

Some of the original organizers, it should be noted, were no longer regular school teachers; others, having been associated with universities or professions such as journalism, never were regular school teachers; still others had been dismissed
from their teaching positions during the war. Certain leaders strongly advocated support of political movements, which to most of the people in attendance meant communism since the Communist party was actively interested in the group through its participant members. Others, mostly regular teacher-participants who leaned toward the Socialist party, warned against becoming associated with any political party, especially the Japan Communist party. The extreme leftists and the moderates were thus quickly making known their divergent political positions within the same group.

Simultaneously, a plan was afoot in Tōkyō for organizing another group of teachers. This group, which also played a significant role in the postwar teachers’ movement, was organized by Kagawa Toyohiko, a famous Christian Socialist in Japan. On December 2, 1945, Kagawa invited thirty members from among his friends in Tōkyō and seventy-five volunteers from other prefectures to an inaugural meeting of what became known later as the Nihon Kyōikusha Kumiai (Japan Educators Union), or Nikkyō, at the Kuramae Industrial Hall, Shimbashi, Tōkyō. Kagawa’s purpose in calling this meeting, according to his secretary, was to initiate an organization to “accomplish educational reform without violating the cultural pattern of Japan.”  

Nikkyō included some well-known progressives of a moderate political nature including Ouchi Hyōe, a distinguished economist; Kawasaki Natsu, well-known champion of women’s rights; and Hani Setsuko, wife of Hani Gorō, from the distinguished Christian family that founded the prewar Jiyūgakuen (Liberty School) in Tōkyō. Nikkyō exhibited more of the characteristics of a cultural society than those of a labor union. Although membership was open to all, most of the officers of Nikkyō were affiliated with, or sympathetic to, the Socialist party and were elected by the initial committee members appointed by Kagawa, who was immediately elected president of the group.

The two main objectives of Nikkyō concerned salary increases and security of position for teachers. The day after Nikkyō was founded, its representatives handed a resolution to Minister of Education Maeda Tamon, with the following demands: the immediate reappointment of teachers illegally dismissed during the war, the public election of educational administrators and school principals, and the establishment of autonomous rights of schools. Shortly thereafter, Nikkyō placed before the Tokyō municipal education authorities two demands: a 600-yen monthly salary increase to offset inflation and the
abolition of the plan to dismiss redundant primary school teachers. A Nikkyō spokesman also made known Nikkyō’s decision to join the Nihon Rōdō Kumiai Sōdōmei (Japan Federation of Labor Unions), or Sōdōmei, a council of moderate labor unions endorsed by the Socialist party.13

Learning that Kagawa’s Nikkyō had set December 2 as its inaugural meeting, the rival group of prewar activists, mentioned earlier, hurriedly agreed to organize formally on December 1 at the Kanda Education Hall under the name of Zen Nihon Kyōin Kumiai (All Japan Teachers Union), or Zenkyō.14 The promoters of this group energetically circulated throughout Tōkyō and nearby prefectures seeking members sympathetic to their union. Since many of the evacuated students had not yet returned to their reopened schools in Tōkyō, there were a number of teachers who had time to proselytize for the movement.

Zenkyō, at its inaugural meeting on December 1, 1945, issued to teachers throughout the nation the following appeal embodying its fundamental purpose of uniting the nation’s teachers into an antigovernment union:

The war which has been fought over these many years since the Manchurian incident by our misguided leaders has come to a terrible end. Our cities and towns are in ruin and we face severe food and housing shortages. What is the teacher’s role in this situation?

Each one of us entered the teaching profession with high ideals and a love for young people. And then this catastrophe took place. We must not allow it to happen again. We are not afraid of poverty, but if we suffer from hunger and our children are left without shelter, we cannot fulfill our educational ideal. Our feudalistic leaders filled us with fear, placed us in straitjackets, forced militarism upon us, and drove us and our students into this most unhappy state of affairs.

Never again will we be misled by the deception of our government leaders. We must accomplish our educational ideal and love of children regardless of authority from above. In order to accomplish this goal, we must unite. By forming a united front we can protect our livelihood, educational administration can be reconstructed, our social positions can be heightened, and we can attain our high educational ideals. If we do not unite now, government affiliated unions will be organized to suppress our free movement. They are even now spreading an administrative network of a police nature to locate teachers responsible for the war. This is to avoid the Ministry of Education’s
Responsibility for its wartime activities. Therefore we must unite and welcome anyone from any political party or ideological disposition. Then the union can accommodate all of the 400,000 teachers throughout the country.\textsuperscript{15}

Zenkyō promoted the following demands, combining economics, politics, and ideology: increase teachers’ pay by five times, establish the right of collective bargaining, establish union control of school administration, eliminate school inspectors to free the teachers from feudalistic control, abolish textbook approval by the Ministry of Education, establish a system to publicly elect school principals, abolish the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai, punish those educators responsible for the war, eliminate militaristic and nationalistic teachers, reappoint progressive teachers who were dismissed illegally during the war, establish a single union for all teachers, and form a common front with the workers of Japan.\textsuperscript{16}

The first two independent teachers’ organizations founded after the war in late 1945, Zenkyō and Nikkyō, were based on platforms with fundamental differences of extreme importance. Essentially, Nikkyō was a moderate Socialist organization while Zenkyō was a left-wing group which was under Communist influence and assumed a militant stance. Precisely in this difference was the underlying antagonism that existed between the moderates and the radicals in the teachers’ movement from 1945 onwards. According to Hani Gorō, individuals of all political persuasions from ultranationalists to communists were welcomed into Zenkyō, which was then seeking members on an individual basis.\textsuperscript{17} Apparently, no nationalists joined this obviously left-wing group supported by the Communist party, while many leftist teachers who had been discharged by the government during and prior to the war found an ideological home in Zenkyō. Nikkyō, on the other hand, mainly encouraged membership of moderate socialists sympathetic to Kagawa’s principles of cooperatives, receiving tacit Socialist party support, in part from an anti-Communist position.

Another crucial difference between the two organizations involved the role of the emperor, an issue reflecting a deep ideological divergence. Zenkyō leadership in a manner similar to that taken by the Japan Communist party, adamantly opposed the imperial institution. Kagawa, the founder of Nikkyō, who was a leader of the Christian Socialist movement from the early twenties, would not consider a united front with Zenkyō because of Zenkyō’s implacable stand against the continuation
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of the emperor system. The conflict over this issue between the Socialist and Communist parties was exacerbated when the Socialist party included the emperor, albeit powerless, in its January 1946 proposals for a revised constitution. Kagawa’s attitude toward Zenkyō also perhaps reflected his opposition as a Christian to atheistic communism operating within Zenkyō leadership. Kagawa’s unyielding position on this issue of the emperor eventually led to the loss of some of Nikkyō’s leading members.

Zenkyō and Nikkyō differed in other ways as well. Zenkyō, in the first edition of its weekly journal, Nippon Kyōiku Shimbun (Japan Education Newspaper), on December 1, 1945, attacked Emperor Hirohito for his failure to acknowledge war guilt. The article was written by Hani Gorō, who had become influential in developing Zenkyō’s ideological position. Nikkyō, in contrast, prepared a publication on democratic education centering around the emperor system. Zenkyō promoted a common front with workers to democratize Japan against the present government and against the alleged despotic and corrupt Ministry of Education. Nikkyō aimed at democratizing education by erecting a cooperative form of society based on the teaching of love and of a forever peaceful world. Zenkyō did not reject strike action by teachers, while Kagawa denounced it.

Despite these differences, the two organizations had some basic similarities. Both were organized at the top administrative level first, followed by appeals for rank-and-file support. Both championed democratic education and opposed militarism in the school; both demanded the discharge of ultranationalist teachers and favored the reinstatement of liberal teachers dismissed during and prior to the war; both attacked the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai as a reactionary organization and called for the public election of local school administrators. Above all, the major immediate concern of both groups, regardless of their political dissimilarities, was the economic conditions of the teacher in the period immediately following the war.

The teachers’ plight in postwar Japan of 1945 was most acute. A study of teachers’ salaries and expenses undertaken by SCAP in December 1945 produced the results shown in Table 3.

By comparison, according to the Mainichi Shimbun, in 1945 an office boy made 250 yen a month, and a taxi driver earned as high as 1,500 yen a month. In another daily paper, it was reported that an elementary school teacher’s monthly salary of 93 yen (the year-end bonus was not calculated in this figure) could purchase only two large cans of sweet potatoes on the
Table 3. Average Income and Expenses of Teachers, December 1945 (in yen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income and Expenses</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly bonus</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly expenditure</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly deficit</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, A History of Teachers’ Unions in Japan, Tōkyō, March, 1948, p. 58.

black market. A SCAP officer reported that a waitress in an officers’ mess could earn a salary of 250 to 900 yen a month, a place to sleep, and two meals a day, while the monthly salary of a university professor was equal to the black-market price of a carton of cigarettes.  

Meanwhile, the cost of living soared. Using June 1937 as a base index of 100 for the average retail price of food in Tōkyō, the index that stood at 241 in September 1945 jumped to 1,897 by June 1946. In the same period, clothing prices rose from a base of 192 in September 1945 to 1,528 in June 1946. SCAP’s surveys showed that the ordinary working man was unable to provide himself and his family with the necessities of life out of his current earnings. Ministry of Education officials asserted that earnings of teachers, ranging from the elementary school level to the university level, barely could pay for one-third of their need.

In order to survive under these circumstances, teachers resorted to unusual means for supporting themselves and their families. Absenteeism was rampant as teachers who were heads of households literally foraged for food in the countryside. Many took on extra jobs. Some shined shoes in distant wards so that their students would not witness their destitution. Others became seriously ill with diseases such as tuberculosis aggravated by malnutrition, and were permanently disabled. A newspaper reported that the daily caloric intake of a Tōkyōite averaged a disabling low of 881. These were the reasons why
Zenkyō and Nikkyō, as newly formed teachers’ organizations, had as their major demand a basic living wage of 600 yen a month for all teachers, with higher salaries according to rank.

Two additional organizational developments taking place at this time compounded the overall confusion of the teachers’ movement. On October 16, 1945, in the city of Musashino at the edge of Tōkyō, a group of local teachers who had been holding meetings to discuss their problems organized the Musashino Kyōshidan (Musashino Teachers Group), led by Jitsukawa Hiroshi, who was experienced in the left-wing prewar teachers’ movement. This organization was the first group of teachers to be formed at the grass-roots level to become prominent eventually in the overall teachers’ movement. On November 18 this group, whose membership had grown to about one thousand, changed its name to Kitatama Kyōin Kumiai (Kitatama Teachers Union), representing a larger district in the northwestern part of Tōkyō.  

Teachers in other areas of Tōkyō were also organizing themselves. On December 17, 1945, two hundred teachers in Toshima-Ku of Tōkyō formed the Toshima-Ku Kyōin Kumiai (Toshima Teachers Union). Finally, on December 23, with the two organizations from Kitatama and Toshima as its nucleus, a new union was created called Tōkyō-To Kyōin Kumiai (Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union) or Tokyō.  

The demands of the newly formed Tokyō were almost identical with those of the leftist Zenkyō, consistent with the similar backgrounds of the leaders of both organizations during the prewar movement. From the moment of its formation, Tokyō began coordinating its activities with Zenkyō. Within a very short time, Tokyō, serving as the Tōkyō municipal branch of Zenkyō, was powerful enough to act as an independent organization in its struggles with the Tōkyō municipal authorities, while uniting with Zenkyō in their common struggles against the Ministry of Education and the national government.

The fourth and final group of importance during the last four and one-half months of 1945 after the war’s end was the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai, (Great Japan Education Association) re-organized on November 14, 1945. Taking the position that labor unions work purely for the improvement of economic conditions, the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai strove for the spiritual improvement of teachers, maintaining that strong cooperation with the government was essential for raising the level of cul-
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tural life in Japan. Its initial demand was a 500-percent increase in a teacher’s monthly salary. As in the past, this association received a subsidy from the Ministry of Education. The other three teachers’ organizations were opposed to the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai on ideological and historical grounds from the date of its postwar reorganization until its near demise in August of 1947, when the Ministry withdrew its subsidy at the urging of SCAP.

Thus, by January 1, 1946, the framework for a much larger and lasting postwar teacher’s movement was constructed. It included, on the one hand, the left-wing organization Zenkyō and its subordinate, Tokyō, both led by prewar activists who opposed the government with the support of the Japan Communist party. Their ideological stand placed them in the mainstream of the class struggle of the proletariat movement wherein teachers and workers labored together for a new democratic Japan. The workers’ methods became the teachers’ methods. Collective bargaining and the right to strike were fundamental to the cause. On the other hand, there was Nikkyō, consisting of teachers of a moderate persuasion opposed to Zenkyō’s ideological proclivities. Nikkyō was supported by the Socialist party, which aimed at achieving harmony through cooperatives and peaceful negotiations with the Ministry of Education. Conservatives and apolitical teachers could return to the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai.

During this unprecedented four-month period immediately after the war, when Japanese teachers originated their initial postwar organizations, the American Occupation authorities and the Japanese Ministry of Education had remarkably little direct contact with the various teachers’ organizations. The major contributions of the American Occupation to the teachers’ movements at this time were the decrees of October 4 and October 11, which authorized the unionization of labor, the renewal of civil liberties, and the release of political prisoners, in addition to the proclamations to demilitarize and democratize Japanese education. A highly significant deduction that can be made about this crucial period, then, is that prewar Japanese activists spontaneously grouped themselves into teachers’ organizations without directive, without guidance, and without direct participation of American Occupation authorities.

Why were the American Occupation authorities not participating actively in the fledgling teachers’ movement during the first several months after the war? One major reason is that they were preoccupied with their own peculiar problems.
They were still maneuvering through the complex web of the Japanese social, political, and cultural institutions, striving to understand their intricacies. Concurrently, they were undergoing the process of organizing themselves administratively to carry out their broad mandates. The direct influence exerted by SCAP on the postwar teachers’ movement came after the beginning of 1946. By that time, the fundamental attitudes of the teachers’ organizations were already firmly established.

The Japanese Ministry of Education at this time was likewise in no position to intervene actively in teachers’ organizations because it, too, was undergoing the trauma of adjustment to the new situation. The Ministry, months later, in April 1946, made an attempt to organize all teachers’ organizations into a new union led by Ministry officials called the Zenkoku Kyōiku Shokuin Kyōgikai (National Council of Educational Personnel Unions), but this council failed at its first meeting, when it encountered strong opposition from left-wing representatives from Zenkyō.27

What happened, in short, was that an independent teachers’ movement, which began in private homes and teachers’ rooms, evolved, for the most part indigenously and undisturbed by the Ministry of Education and the American Occupation. It can be said, in retrospect, that the undercurrent of resistance found in prewar and wartime Japan could not be destroyed despite the harsh social, political, and cultural restrictions exercised by the military government. The prewar resistance was strong enough so that at war’s end it was able within several weeks to generate a surprisingly effective movement. The Americans played the role of catalyst.

Several important conclusions can be made concerning this brief but momentous period between mid-August and December of 1945, and how it affected the entire postwar teachers’ movement. First, the movement developed in direct response to the conditions that existed in Japan before 1945 and to the economic chaos of a defeated and destitute nation immediately after the war. Second, the movement was originated by the Japanese for the Japanese, with almost no direct involvement by the American Occupation. The Americans, so to speak, had removed the lid of suppression, thus enabling those prewar activists to emerge and resume independently their movement in the new environment of postwar Japan. Third, the movement was initiated at the top administrative level primarily by prewar left-wing activists because the average teacher, confronted with the enormous problems of obtaining food and shelter, was in
no position to consider the problems of uniting teachers, and because there was a leadership vacuum created when educational administrators were discredited for their role during the war. Finally, the Ministry of Education, historically the major influencer of Japanese teachers’ organizations, was itself under criticism by both the teachers’ organizations themselves and the American Occupation, rendering the Ministry powerless to intervene in the movement. Consequently, at the end of 1945, for the first time in the history of Japan, the welfare of the classroom teacher became of paramount concern to several independent teachers’ organizations vying for his allegiance.
Struggles for Economic Survival (1946–1947)

Champions of Democratic Education

On January 1, 1946, when Emperor Hirohito made his famous declaration of mortality—that “the ties between us and our people ... are not predicated on the false assumption that the Emperor is divine”1—the several teachers’ organizations faced the new year with two immediate goals. One concerned the improvement of the livelihood of the destitute teachers, and the other, the organization of the teaching corps throughout the nation. The two were inseparably linked since the organization capable of improving the plight of teachers could attract the rank and file into its membership.

Competition began immediately among the radical Zenkyō (All Japan Teachers Union) with its affiliate Tokyō (Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union), the moderate Nikkyō (Japan Educators Union), and the conservative Dai Nippon Kyōikukai (Great Japan Education Association). The major goal for all was to improve teachers’ living wages. Table 4 reveals the magnitude of the problem of price increases the Japanese people faced in 1946.

Zenkyō sponsored its first national convention in Tōkyō on January 19 to deliberate the formation of a united front with Kagawa’s Nikkyō group. Its demands were as follows: (1) a 500-percent increase in salary to keep up with the rampant inflation; (2) the abolition of the plan to dismiss as redundant 30 percent, or 9,600, of Tōkyō municipal teachers; and (3) the reinstatement of 800 surplus teachers already dismissed.2 On January 23 Zenkyō held a demonstration at the Imperial Palace Plaza, the first of its kind, to send off a petition containing the demands to the Ministry of Education. The reply from the Ministry, representing a government with limited resources, was far from satisfactory to Zenkyō, although teachers’ salaries were slightly increased in January and the plan to dismiss redundant teachers was shelved shortly thereafter under union pressure.
Table 4. Tōkyō Price Index for Wholesale and Retail Items for Selected Periods (in yen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Wholesale Average</th>
<th>Retail Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1937</td>
<td>Sept. 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All items</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>228.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>241.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>260.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>192.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>294.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, A History of Teachers' Unions in Japan, Tōkyō, March, 1948, p. 62.

Tokyō, with Zenkyō support, held a mass meeting of teachers on January 28 at Hibiya Park to publicize and promote its local demands. About three thousand teachers participated in the meeting and later marched through the streets to the municipal office of education to present a petition; this march was the first of a series of teachers’ street demonstrations in postwar Japan.

In response to the ideological controversies engulfing the Japanese teachers at this time, less than six months after the war, the minister of education clarified his position concerning what he called “the present period of confusion.” He stated during a press conference that teachers as individuals had the right to join the political party of their choice, including the Japan Communist party, according to their political beliefs; but that, once the teacher entered the classroom, he must maintain political neutrality in his teachings. This declaration was of vital significance, for it not only granted official approval to Communist teachers within the radical Zenkyō but also pleased the non-Communist teachers sympathetic to the Communist
cause. It was also consequential because the press conference called attention to the Japan Communist party, which had by then become the most active political party; as a result, it received more press coverage than did all other parties combined.

In reaction to the public demonstrations sponsored by the Zenkyō-Tokyo combine of left-wing unions, two major developments were taking place within the overall teachers’ movement in the first several months of 1946. Within Zenkyō a more moderate element of teachers was beginning to make itself heard against Communist influence among the leaders and against the rather unfavorable image of teachers being spread by the noisy street demonstrations. Many teachers in this opposition group sincerely believed that the teachers’ plight could be mitigated only through a united teachers’ movement, and they recognized that Zenkyō represented by far the major organization in the movement. But they could not go along with Zenkyō’s militant action. Although the Zenkyō-Tokyo combine continued under an increasingly radical leadership, it is notable that within the organization there was an early split between the radical and moderate factions, with the Socialist party providing support for the latter.

At the same time, several new organizations of moderate teachers were in the making within Tokyo in reaction to Zenkyō’s militancy and its close association with the Communist party. In March and April, the Tokyo-To Seinen Gakkō Kyōin Kumiai (Tokyo Municipal Youth School Teachers Union), the Tokyo-To Chūtō Gakkō Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Tokyo Municipal Middle School Educational Personnel Union), and the Tokyo-To Kukumin Gakkō Kyōin Kumiai (Tokyo Municipal People’s Primary School Teachers Union) were formed. Having similar objectives, the three groups united into a new, moderate, non-political organization on April 26, 1946, called the Tokyo-To Kyōshokuin Kumiai Kyōgikai (Council of Tokyo Municipal Educational Personnel Unions), referred to as Tokyo-kyō.4

Tokyo-kyō attracted many of the moderate and conservative teachers in the Tokyo area who were either anti-Communist or simply apolitical but who believed that the only path to higher salaries was through the organization of teachers. In addition, many of the teachers who had become disenchanted with Kagawa’s Nikkyō, which clung to pro-imperial principles and whose leadership remained distant and somewhat closed, dropped out and joined the new Tokyo-kyō. This shift from one moderate organization to another was a natural development because the average teacher found a more hospitable atmos-
phere in Tokyōkyō, an amalgamation of teacher-led unions. Kagawa’s Nikkyō, which had served as a moderate alternative to the radical Zenkyō from the very beginning of the postwar teachers’ movement and which had reached a peak of five thousand members by mid-1946, dwindled rapidly and was no longer functioning actively by the end of 1946. Its centrist role was assumed by Tokyōkyō.

The arrival of the First United States Education Mission (USEM) to Japan in March 1946 signaled the direction in which the American Occupation was planning to move with respect to the democratization of Japanese education. Shortly after the declaration of the Imperial Rescript on January 1, 1946, General MacArthur initiated step two of the Occupation—the formulation of the policy of educational reforms to democratize Japanese education and, in turn, Japanese society. The supreme commander asked the United States government to send to Japan an education mission of distinguished American educators, to be given the challenging task of recommending basic reforms of Japanese education so that never again would it contribute to a military imperialistic regime. At the same time, he requested the Japanese government to appoint a committee of qualified Japanese educators, which became the Japan Education Reconstruction Committee (JERC), to work with the United States Education Mission. Specifically, the Mission was assigned the four following tasks:

1. To study how education for democracy may be best achieved in Japan and to make recommendations regarding content of courses and curriculum
2. To make a study of psychology in the reeducation of Japan and to advise on educational methodology, language training, timing and priority of educational reforms, development of student initiative and critical analysis, and the reorientation of teachers
3. To study the administrative reorganization of the educational system, including the reorganization of the Ministry of Education and the problems of centralization
4. To survey higher education and to advise on methods of obtaining more active participation in the life of the community and nation by the students

The teachers’ unions welcomed the Mission’s arrival since fundamental reforms of a positive nature had not yet been effected because of SCAP’s initial negative phase during the last four months of 1945. Indeed, teachers who had been strongly
identified with the wartime militarists were legally untouched, although many had already voluntarily resigned in fear of reprisals in addition to those who left the teaching profession out of a sense of guilt for their wartime activities. Moreover, the Ministry of Education was still staffed with many of the same bureaucrats from the war period. This situation was deplorable to the teachers’ unions, particularly when the Ministry initially approved a subsidy for the reorganized Dai Nippon Kyōikukai, which promptly elected Minister of Education Abe as president; he declined the post.6

The Mission immediately began working with the special committee of Japanese educators, JERC, appointed by the minister of education at the request of SCAP. In effect, the Mission was working through the Ministry of Education, the object of criticism by the left-wing Zenkyō-Tokyō unions, and, ironically, the object of reform by SCAP. In other words, the Ministry of Education was to be inextricably involved in drastically curtailing its own power. The minister of education made no provision for appointing any teachers’ union representative to JERC until more than a year after the Mission returned home.

The United States Education Mission, which played a central role in the reformation of Japanese education, had very little contact with organized teachers’ associations. Zenkyō sent a message prepared by Hani Gorō attacking Ministry of Education personnel and offering to send a committee of teachers to advise and assist the Mission. The offer was not accepted. Hani met briefly with the Mission and explained in characteristic terms that success in democratization of Japanese education depended not on the Ministry of Education but on the activities of the teachers’ union.7

Subsequently, the Mission met with many individual classroom teachers on school tours during its four-week investigation. Apparently, the Mission members were deeply impressed with the teachers’ opinions, for the Mission’s final report concerning teachers read in part as follows:

Mistrust engenders mistrust. The Ministry of Education through its apparent lack of confidence in the intelligence of teachers at all levels has succeeded in producing a lack of confidence on the part of teachers in its power for leadership. The teachers of Japan, in so far as their views have been represented to the Mission, are critical and restless and are looking for leadership outside the Ministry of Education. This unrest among teachers is not wholly due to their pitiable economic status. It arises out of a genuine
desire for guidance and for the opportunity to help in building the new Japan. Despite control and repression, there are teachers who are thinking for themselves and who are growingly aware of the direction that Japanese education must take. Such teachers are waiting expectantly for the stimulus and encouragement of the right kind of leadership.\textsuperscript{8}

The Mission gave its stamp of approval to the organizing teachers without referring to unions per se. They felt that teachers should “organize into voluntary associations on local, prefectural, and national levels”; and that “teachers’ organizations must be free to act with initiative and vigor and to work closely with other organizations.”\textsuperscript{9} The teachers’ unions welcomed the Mission’s recommendations.

The United States Education Mission, in addition to the suggestions concerning the organization of teachers, made major recommendations to General MacArthur for a fundamental reformation of Japanese education, summarized as follows:

1. The Ministry of Education should “not prescribe content, methods of instruction, or textbooks, but should limit its authority in this area to the publication of outlines, suggestions, and teaching guides.” Curricula and course of studies “would thus result from the cooperative action of the central authority and the teachers.” “It is essential that teachers, school principals, and local heads of schools be free from domination and control by higher-ranking school officials.” School inspectors, who compelled regimentation, “should be replaced by a system of consultants.”

2. A coeducational articulated system, including a six-year elementary school, a three-year lower secondary school, and a three-year upper secondary school, should replace the old 6–5–3 system.

3. The multiplicity of secondary schools should be united into comprehensive schools.

4. Prefectures, cities, and other subdivisions “should establish an elected education commission,” which “should have general charge of public schools” within its jurisdiction.

5. Ethics should become a “part of the social studies course.” Moral behavior and ethical attitudes can also be developed in other school institutions such as drama clubs, sports, and musical organizations.
6. Normal schools should become colleges.
7. General education “must be integrated into the regular curriculum” of the universities.\textsuperscript{10}

The report of the United States Education Mission, following very closely the educational system of the United States, proposed a revolutionary reform of Japanese education. As a result there was enormous significance in the report for the teachers’ unions. They, too, were demanding a complete reformation of Japanese education. And even with little direct contact between the unions and the Mission, by the very nature of the situation, the unions got the support they wanted. The Japanese teachers’ unions, and particularly the radical Zenkyō, supported by the Communist party, fully endorsed the Mission’s recommendations for the reform of Japanese education and carried them out enthusiastically a year later when their implementation became official. The unions believed that a new era in Japanese education had finally arrived.

The United States Education Mission’s recommendations for reform elicited varying degrees of enthusiasm from the three powers that played an important role in their implementation. The teachers’ unions accepted the reforms as their very own because the reforms coincided with their overall demands and because these reforms could only strengthen the positions of teachers and unions. SCAP, the originator of the reform proposals through the United States Education Mission, committed itself to their implementation. General MacArthur described the report as a “document of ideals high in the democratic tradition.”\textsuperscript{11} The Ministry of Education accepted the reforms in general but showed reservations about the feasibility of some of them, and particularly about the speed with which they were to be effected. SCAP and the unions thus had more in common at this time than did SCAP and the Ministry, although SCAP carried out the reforms through the Ministry of Education. When the Ministry, which was responsible for carrying out the drastic measures in a bankrupt and defeated nation, balked at certain reforms, the unions attacked the Ministry as reactionary. SCAP agreed on occasion. The reforms nevertheless brought together the teachers’ unions and the Ministry of Education, for the first time in the postwar period, to work together for the common goal of carrying out the United States Education Mission’s recommendations.
Throughout 1946 the living conditions of teachers deteriorated as did the general economic conditions within Japan. The SCAP education officer who claimed shortly after the war that a black-market carton of cigarettes cost the equivalent of a university professor’s monthly salary reported six months later that a carton cost five months’ salary for the same professor.\textsuperscript{12} The threat of rice riots prompted warnings against demonstrations from both the emperor and General MacArthur. Unemployment reached 4.5 million. SCAP reported that 2 million people were destitute.\textsuperscript{13}

Circumstances led the Ministry of Education to issue the following warning to the nation’s educational administrators in April 1946.

\begin{quote}
We hear that consequent to the worsening of the food situation, some teachers and officials of schools have recently been demanding foodstuffs from the pupils or their parents. It is a matter of deep regret since it will become a menace to the home life of children who are under the same ration system as everyone else, including teachers. You are therefore requested to take the measures necessary immediately to prohibit strictly such illicit activities on the part of teachers of the schools.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Teachers’ salaries were increased several times during the year, but inflation absorbed the increases. Even within the civil service, a typical government employee earned about 80 percent more than a teacher of the same age. Employees of private industry earned from three to five times more. In addition, because the national treasury was bankrupt, it could not pay teachers’ salaries on time after June 1946. Teachers received their July and August pay in September.\textsuperscript{15}

With the continuing economic crisis, the first half of 1946 in Japan was marked by the unprecedented proliferation of labor unions with concomitant labor disputes. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the increase in number of Japanese trade unions, including the teachers’ unions, during this period.

In anticipation of the first free May Day celebrations since the war’s end, scheduled for 1946, Zenkyō held a mass meeting of teachers in April to plan for the event. The meeting also considered teachers’ grievances, which led to the inevitable dispatch of a delegation to the Ministry of Education on April 26 to submit complaints to the minister. Union representatives forced their way into the minister’s office, where a boisterous meeting took place when they demanded that May Day be de-
Table 5. Spread of Unionization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of Unions</th>
<th>Union Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1945</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>379,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1946</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>901,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1946</td>
<td>3,242</td>
<td>1,536,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1946</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>2,567,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1946</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>3,002,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1946</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>3,413,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1946</td>
<td>12,006</td>
<td>3,677,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6. Labor Disputes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month (1946)</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>83,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>58,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


cleared a a holiday and that teachers control the schools. The vice-minister, who met the representatives, was forced to flee the building. This incident was the first of a series of unconventional meetings between Zenkyō and the Ministry of Education.
May Day celebrations took place in an orderly manner. Approximately one million people throughout the nation participated. Among them were five thousand teachers from both Zenkyō and its Tokyō affiliate, carrying red flags and placards bearing slogans such as, “Prevent Teachers from Starving—Establish a Salary Based on the Cost of Living.”

Children carrying red flags also paraded despite the Ministry’s disapproval of the participation of school children in the event. As far as can be determined, the moderate Tokyōkyō was not officially represented.

SCAP’s attitude toward Japan’s first postwar May Day of 1946 is important because it is indicative not only of SCAP’s overall favorable attitude toward the union movement but also of a very serious difference of opinion between SCAP and the Japanese government concerning teachers’ unions. For example, the minister of education most reluctantly approved teachers’ participation in the May Day demonstrations while rejecting student involvement on grounds that May Day was not a school holiday. In contrast, SCAP’s records of the event exude pride, reporting that “May Day celebrations were unprecedented. They demonstrated the new freedom which the Occupation has given to the Japanese people and the political vitality of the working class which, when properly guided, can be a potent force in the democratic reconstruction of Japan.”

Only three weeks later, General MacArthur issued a stern warning against mass violence led by Communists, as the number of public disturbances increased in protest over the shortage of rice and the general living conditions. The immediate provocation was the so-called Food May Day of May 19, when 150,000 people paraded through Tōkyō.

A member of SCAP’s Labor Division summed up the Occupation’s policy toward the labor movement as follows:

Labor policy, like so many others, had first to be improvised. After some confusion a fairly clear and consistent policy was eventually formulated in Tōkyō.... This was based on a working philosophy evolved by Labor Division which assumed that the working classes constitute, potentially, the strongest if not the only reliable base for a democratic regime in Japan. Democracy must, therefore, offer to Japanese workers freedom of expression and action.... Japanese labor holds the key to success or failure in the attempt to convert Japan from a dangerous enemy into a good neighbor.
This attitude revealed sharp differences between the Occupation’s approach to the democratization of Japanese education and society and that of many officials within the Ministry of Education and the Japanese government in general during 1946 and much of 1947. From late 1947 onward, the two powers converged, paradoxically, not because SCAP had reformed the Ministry’s attitude but because SCAP had realigned itself more closely with the Ministry’s original position vis-à-vis the teachers’ unions. There can be no doubt, however, that in 1946 SCAP was encouraging labor unions.

In mid-1946 the chief of SCAP’s Labor Division supported labor leaders, when he told them during a convention, “The response of the Japanese workers to the opportunities opened to them by SCAP ... has exceeded my most optimistic expectations.” During informal contacts between SCAP officials and individual labor unions, encouragement was continually given to the labor leaders. For example, Iwama Masao, chairman of the communist-influenced Tokyō, by this time the one most active group within the radical Zenkyō leading the teachers’ left-wing movement, stated unequivocally that SCAP officials from the Civil Information and Education Section urged him and his group to unionize all teachers.

In contrast, Education Minister Abe met with fifty Zenkyō representatives on May 4, 1946, and questioned the right of school teachers to unionize, rejecting all of their demands. Later, he issued a statement confirming teachers’ right to organize into unions but restricting their activities to matters concerning wages, work hours, and working conditions; teachers were forbidden to participate in political activities or to interfere with school management and educational policy. The unionists countered with a sit-down demonstration in the Ministry hallway.

It was natural for Ministry officials to be chary of the radical wing of the teachers’ movement. On a number of occasions, Zenkyō-Tokyō delegations had invaded the Ministry’s offices, demanding interviews with the minister and staging sit-down strikes inside the building which at times extended for several days and nights. The unions also scurrilously attacked the Ministry in print and in public speeches. Hidaka Daishirō, a division chief of the Ministry at that time and later permanent vice-minister of education, charged that SCAP not only encouraged the radical teachers’ unions but also prevented the Ministry from taking action to curtail what the Ministry considered as obvious excesses. The Ministry, he recalled, did everything
in its power to encourage the moderate Tokyōkyō group while SCAP secretly brought pressure on the Japanese government in certain cases to modify its resistance to union demands.  

A peculiar development, in fact, was underway within SCAP and the Ministry of Education: both were divided internally in their attitudes toward the left-wing teachers’ unions. Many of the bureaucrats within the Ministry who had continued in their positions since prewar days, along with some of the new appointees who were responsible for carrying out SCAP’s extensive reforms without the necessary resources, were aghast at the militancy of the Zenkyō-Tokyō combine. Others among the new appointees, however, who were of the liberalist tradition of prewar Japan, were more in sympathy with the teachers’ movement. Such a divided attitude was understandable since some of the ministers of education themselves during the period from 1945 to 1951 were liberal while others were more conservative, though all were from the academic world. Within SCAP were also two factions. There were, on the one hand, the American officials, including many civilians thrust into the military government, plus some of the officers, who were imbued with progressive ideas and committed to the task of reforming Japanese society through freedom. There were others, on the other hand, mostly career military officers, who found it naturally difficult to allow unbridled freedom to the Japanese so soon after the Pacific war. This ambivalence within both governing bodies, particularly SCAP, made it difficult at times for leaders of the teachers’ movement to determine the extent of official approval of their policies. For all intents and purposes, throughout 1946 the left-wing union leaders operated on the assumption that SCAP approved of their activities and that the Japanese Ministry of Education was hostile toward them.  

To fulfill SCAP’s original mandate for the demilitarization of Japanese education, Imperial Ordinance Number 263 of May 6, 1946, was issued for the removal, exclusion, and reinstatement of teachers and educational officials. Under the provisions of this edict, all 400,000 teachers were to be examined to “eliminate militarists, ultranationalists, and individuals hostile to Occupation policy, and to provide for the preferential treatment of persons previously dismissed for anti-militarism or similar reasons.” The plan for carrying out the purge was devised by the Ministry of Education with SCAP approval. Minister of Education Tanaka Kōtarō, who was the official responsible for devising the machinery, assumed a favorable attitude toward
the purge, but some Ministry officials opposed it in fear of being purged themselves.\textsuperscript{27} The teachers’ organizations, notably Zenkyō, led by leftists, enthusiastically approved the long-awaited purge of right-wing teachers.

The Ministry of Education, responsible for carrying out the purge, had a committee created in each prefecture, consisting of a teacher, a school principal, a representative from the educational staff, and two members from outside the education sector.\textsuperscript{28} All but the teacher were appointed by the prefectural governor, who was a government appointee himself. The teacher was selected, moreover, by the reorganized Dai Nippon Kyōikukai of prewar fame, provoking the charge by the teachers’ unions that the Ministry was continuing a reactionary policy by favoring this organization. Zenkyō took strong issue, claiming that it was not appropriate for this association to have a hand in purging undemocratic elements.\textsuperscript{29}

Every Japanese teacher completed a questionnaire in private concerning his prewar and wartime publications, speeches, memberships, and other activities related to militarism and ultranationalism. These questionnaires were then screened by the appropriate prefectural committee. Membership in certain wartime organizations meant automatic expulsion. Only teachers whose credentials were in doubt appeared in person before the committee. At the next level, each university set up its own purge committee, appointed by the university president, to examine the faculty. At the top level, officials of the Ministry of Education themselves underwent examination by a special committee of seven members from various areas of public life appointed by the minister of education. This committee also served as a committee of appeal for those teachers who objected to the prefectural committee’s decision. Although the final court of appeal for all cases was ostensibly the Ministry of Education, in reality, it was SCAP.

The purge of ultranationalist teachers was particularly important to the teachers’ movement because in effect it could remove the hard-core rightists who would have been in natural conflict with the unions. Accordingly, the unions cooperated to the fullest possible extent with the examining committees. Wherever possible the unions submitted evidence against certain teachers, creating sensitive situations among the local teaching body. Anonymous letters were used on occasion to submit evidence with incriminating charges. Admittedly, injustices by both sides were committed.\textsuperscript{30}
In addition, some of the prefectural purge committees were attacked as unrepresentative of the public at large on the charge that they were dominated by the old conservative establishment of landowners and businessmen. The unions and even members of SCAP complained that certain committees were investigating teacher’s questionnaires perfunctorily, paying little heed to suspect activities of the more conservative teachers. SCAP headquarters apparently agreed, because orders were sent out to include representatives of labor and women on the committees to attain a better cross-section of society.31

The results of the right-wing purge were impressive, not because of the number of teachers removed by the committees—only about 1 percent of all teachers—but because of the total number of teachers who voluntarily resigned from the teaching profession because of the purge threat. By May 1947, when the purge was completed, 120,000 teachers or 22 percent of the entire teaching corps had been removed, most of them choosing the path of voluntary early retirement rather than subjecting themselves to the purge.32 What could have been a competitive force, or at least a hindrance to the teachers’ unions, was effectively removed as right-wing elements withdrew, leaving the field in the hands of left-wing activists. Surprisingly, very few progressive or leftist teachers dismissed prior to 1945 applied for reinstatement.

While the purge was underway, an attempt to unite the major teachers’ unions was initiated once again. In May 1946 the moderate Tokyōkyō and the radical Zenkyō, the latter having changed its name on May 3 to Zen Nihon Kyōiku Rōdō Kumiai (All Japan Educational Labor Union), known as Zenkyōrō, agreed to cooperate in demanding a basic monthly salary of at least 600 yen. The first joint mass meeting was scheduled for June 1 at the broad Imperial Palace Plaza. Thousands attended. The understanding on the part of the moderate Tokyōkyō was that no Japan Communist party officials would be invited. For some as yet unexplained reason, however, Nosaka Sanzō, head of the Japan Communist party, was invited by the militant Zenkyōrō to address the convention. As he spoke, Tokyōkyō representatives shouted criticisms and walked out, throwing the meeting into general confusion. The Communist leader finally completed his speech in which he pledged the support of the Japan Communist party for the teachers’ struggles.33
Although reports of the ensuing events differed considerably, it is clear that the departing moderates sent a delegation to the minister of education, claiming that the tumultuous meeting was not representative of teachers’ unions. Following Nosaka’s speech, Zenkyōrō, led by Iwama Masao, also sent a delegation to the Ministry and demanded a 600-yen monthly salary and the abolition of the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai. The minister of education set a thirty-minute time limit on the clamorous meeting, which was abruptly cut off. The delegation left embittered.  

The breach between the moderate and radical streams of the organized teachers’ movement was deepened when the radical Zenkyōrō, hoping for wider support, once again changed its name, on June 26, to Nihon Kyōiku Rōdō Kumiai (Japan Educational Labor Union), or Nikkyōrō, deriving its name from a radical prewar teachers’ organization. Nikkyōrō launched a nationwide campaign for membership from the growing ranks of independent prefectural unions, which were springing up throughout the country. In addition, the newly named Nikkyōrō decided to join the labor council Sanbetsu, distinguished for its close ties with the Japan Communist party. (Sanbetsu is the short form for Zen Nihon Sangyōbetsu Rōdō Kaigi [Congress of Industrial Unions of Japan].) Sanbetsu had been established specifically to counter mass dismissals of redundant government employees in a general reorganization of government-run industries such as the railroads, where reduction of workers by 130,000 men was planned. Nikkyōrō, by declaring for Sanbetsu, made no secret of its extreme left-wing ideological proclivities.

The moderate Tokyōkyō, up to now appealing primarily to teachers in the Tōkyō area, also decided to broaden its foundation of nonradical unions on a nationwide basis. Accordingly, on July 21, 1946, Tokyōkyō changed its name to Kyōin Kumiai Zenkoku Renmei (National Federation of Teachers Unions), known as Kyōzenren. Kyōzenren promptly announced its decision to join the moderate labor council Sōdōmei, a smaller rival of Sanbetsu organized by the Socialist party.

Once again the hiatus between the moderate and radical streams of the teachers’ movement was brought sharply into focus. Until mid-1946 the movement within both streams was centered primarily in Tōkyō, the seat of the national government. Because of the large number of teachers in the capital city, Tōkyō provided a natural arena for the teachers’ unions to confront the Ministry of Education directly. By the latter half
of 1946, new prefectural unions of teachers were forming in various areas of the country, though most groups calling themselves prefectural unions had little support outside the major cities. In other words, activist teachers within major cities who were aware of the movements in Tōkyō formed the driving force behind the formation of prefectural or local teachers’ organizations.

One reason that the rural areas lagged far behind the urban centers in organizing the teaching profession was that teaching was the only avenue open to a commoner in the rural areas who wanted to elevate his social status, for teachers were regarded as members of the rural elite that included priests and landowners. Those teachers from families without privileged status who entered the rural elite were initially reluctant to join a common labor union because to do so was tantamount to forfeiting their preferential status. Prefectural cities thus had to lead the way. The competing national unions encountered the problem of gathering the many small local unions into the fold, then broadening their memberships.

Along with the kaleidoscopic revision of names of the two rival Tōkyō-based unions, the competition between them spread throughout the nation for the membership of the growing prefectural unions. Since affiliation with a national teachers’ organization meant an automatic relationship with either the Communist-dominated Sanbetsu or the Socialist-dominated Sōdōmei, the decision of each local union clearly reflected the ideological persuasion of its leadership. In some prefectures teachers were divided in their support, splitting the local movement in a manner similar to that at the national level.

The popularity of the rapidly expanding teachers’ unions at this time stemmed not only from the economic conditions of the time, but also from the status held by the unions under the Occupation. Teachers’ unions attained more importance than teachers’ associations because unions were endorsed by the new labor-union laws and by SCAP. Education associations, especially the discredited Dai Nippon Kyōikukai, whose assets were systematically taken over by local militant unions and which did not have union status, received only tacit approval of the Ministry of Education. Thus many of the proliferating teachers’ organizations preferred the title of union, associating their memberships en bloc by uniting with a national teachers’ union at the expense of the education associations.
Another important development during the American Occupation had its beginning also in the last half of 1946: the militant campaign to increase salaries of government employees, which led to the first direct confrontation between Japanese labor and SCAP. The struggle was conducted mainly in Tōkyō by the Zenkoku Kankō Shokuin Kumiai (National Public Employees Union), or Zenkankō, through the Communist-dominated Sanbetsu, whose membership of more than 2.6 million civil servants was fighting the Japanese government for higher salaries and opposing the dismissal of redundant railroad workers. The radical Nikkyōrō, whose demands were generally ignored by the government, led the struggle for teachers’ salaries in conjunction with the campaign for increased salaries for all civil servants.

On October 18 the militant Nikkyōrō held a national conference to plan the “struggle campaign.” It was decided to suspend temporarily all activities of Nikkyōrō and its Tōkyō municipal subordinate, Tokyō, and to elect a special committee called the Struggle Committee (Tōsō inkai) to lead the entire teachers’ movement for a 600-yen basic monthly salary. Katō Masao was elected chairman; Iwama Masao, then chairman of Tokyō, secretary general; and Higashitani Toshio, Ogasawara Fumio, and Akiyama Tadao, committee members. The Struggle Committee immediately proceeded to take its demands to Minister of Education Tanaka Kōtarō, at both his office and his private residence. Minister Tanaka declared that he would not meet with the teacher representatives because of their violent methods, and that a union of teachers should not be controlled by any political ideology. It should be noted that Tanaka was a devout Catholic, fundamentally opposed to the Communists within the teachers’ unions.

The Struggle Committee retorted that their demands pertained to economic issues, not political issues, and that Tanaka’s illegal refusal to meet with teachers revealed his insincerity in his relations with teachers. According to Iwama, the Struggle Committee was infuriated at Tanaka’s refusal to grant legitimate teachers’ representatives an interview. On October 22 Tanaka was forced to use police protection to escape the Struggle Committee’s insistent representatives. The government then, on November 1, announced a pay raise for teachers, raising, for example, the basic monthly salary for teachers with three years’ experience to 460 yen. This was still well below the 600 yen demanded by Nikkyōrō.
On November 6 the Struggle Committee met again, changed its name to Zenkoku Kyōin Kumiai Saitei Seikatsuken Kakutoku Kyōgikai (Council of All Japan Teachers Unions to Secure a Minimum Standard of Living), or Zenkyōso, and elected Iwama Masao chairman. Zenkyōso proceeded to the office of the minister of education, who had finally agreed to meet them; they threatened him with a resolution to call a general teachers’ strike, a tactic yet to be employed, if the government did not grant the full pay increases as demanded. The reply came from the Ministry of Finance, explaining that a 600-yen basic salary for all teachers would require a general tax increase, something that simply could not be carried out then. It might be added here for comparative purposes that, according to the figures published by Asahi Shimbun, the average monthly salary of coal miners in 1946 was 900 yen.

The moderate Kyōzenren, which had decided in mid-October to base its demands on a 600-yen net monthly income, in contrast with the radical Nikkyōrō’s demand for a 600-yen basic income plus allowances, could not approve of the threatened teachers’ strike being planned by Nikkyōrō’s Struggle Committee, Zenkyōso. The moderate council of unions, Sōdōmei, of which Kyōzenren was an affiliate member, supported the government workers’ struggles but rejected the planned general strike as politically motivated. The two organizations, Nikkyōrō and Kyōzenren, characteristically promoted similar economic demands but employed dissimilar tactics to achieve them, being unable to form a joint struggle movement.

By November, Zenkyōso, assuming complete leadership of the radical teachers’ movement, claimed a membership of 200,000 teachers in twenty-nine district affiliates. The moderate Kyōzenren listed 130,000 members from thirty-one districts. As charges and countercharges between Zenkyōso and the Ministry of Education were exchanged, maximum efforts were expended to increase Zenkyōso’s membership for the inevitable showdown with the government. Zenkyōso dispatched speakers to local meetings of teachers and PTAs, seeking their understanding and support against the Ministry. Once again, on December 22, the radical stream changed its name, from Zenkyōso to Zen Nihon Kyōin Kumiai Kyōgikai (Council of All Japan Teachers Union), better known as Zenkyōkyō.

At nearly every national conference, the radical stream changed its name when it formally accepted more prefectural units into the fold. In one sense, it meant a new beginning with a new membership each time. It also indicated an attempt to
win new members or to placate the less radical teachers by encouraging them to remain within the union. Their numbers were essential. However, as the left-wing union increased its membership, it was, in the process, enlarging the moderate wing of the union since leftists were already members and only moderate teachers were left to be recruited. (See Figure 1, which shows the evolution and relationship of the variously named teachers’ unions.)

During the conference on December 22, Zenkyōkyō reported that 320,000 members were on the rolls. At this conference, those who were opposed to the extreme radical leadership and the plans to carry out a general strike united to elect as chairman a moderate, Araki Shōzaburō, a Socialist from Osaka, along with a slate of moderates from the Socialist party. All of the candidates from the so-called Leftist League (Saha Rengō) from the Communist party were defeated. By this time, the Socialist party was placing increasing support behind the Araki wing of Zenkyōkyō in an effort to offset the Communist wing behind Iwama.

The election results threw the conference into an uproar when the Communist group that supported Iwama refused to accept the verdict. After much confusion, the conference finally decided that the election results would be respected but that the new executive would not function until the old Struggle Committee under Iwama completed its campaign for higher salaries. In effect, the old Struggle Committee was temporarily revived to resume its leadership of the campaign for a living wage. Iwama’s Struggle Committee immediately decided to cooperate with the Struggle Committee of the Public Employees Union under Yashiro Ii from the Japan National Railways, which had decided on December 18 to conduct a nationwide strike against the Yoshida cabinet. This pact marked the first national struggle in which a teachers’ union cooperated with other unions in a joint campaign.

On December 23 Zenkyōkyō held a national meeting of twenty thousand teachers at the Imperial Palace Plaza. Once again, the members voted to send a delegation led by Iwama to the Ministry of Education with twelve demands along their previous line. A time limit was set for the minister’s reply, and the Ministry was threatened with a possible nationwide teachers’ strike if the reply came late or proved unsatisfactory. The plan for the strike, of course, had been in the making throughout December. It is unclear who provoked whom, but the delegation clashed with police at the Ministry of Education, and Iwama and
seven other leaders were arrested. Although they were released after lengthy questioning while their delegation demonstrated in front of the police station, the incident was the first serious clash between the radical teachers’ union and the police. Ironically, the moderate Kyōzenren met quietly with Minister Tanaka on the very same day and won a signed agreement from him to have the teachers’ salaries increased to 600 yen as soon as possible. When Zenkyōkyō learned about this agreement between Kyōzenren and Tanaka, it charged that Tanaka was showing favoritism toward Kyōzenren.

The newly named Zenkyōkyō, under instructions from Iwama’s Struggle Committee, transmitted orders on December 29 to all prefectural branches to prepare for a general strike since their demands were not met. The plan was as follows: On the first day the strike would be declared and classes would be held for only two hours; on the second day classes would be held for only one hour; and on the third day no classes would be held. The moderate Kyōzenren decided not to participate in the strike but to continue in an orderly manner its demands on the Ministry of Education for the early attainment of the agreed-upon salary increase.

As the nation entered its second new year after the war—the target date of the planned general strike—Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, renowned for his Meiji-like determination, in
a radio address to the nation on New Year’s Day branded those who were planning the strike as outlaws (futei no yakara).\textsuperscript{46} Enraged, the labor leaders intensified their determination to carry out the strike plans. On January 11, the National Public Employees Union, including the Union of National Railways, the Postal Union, the teachers’ union of Zenkyōkyō, the tobacco and mining unions, and the union of workers for the Occupation Army met and set the date of the nationwide strike for February 1, with the express purpose of toppling the Yoshida government.

On January 15 some concessions were granted, and the prime minister apologized. On January 22 a salary increase of 150 yen was granted government employees on the advice of SCAP, which had been working quietly behind the scenes but taking no public role in the crisis developing between organized labor and the Japanese government. According to a labor spokesman, union leaders did not anticipate action by SCAP since they were operating within the legal framework established by SCAP, empowering unions with the right to strike. Moreover, their object of protest was not SCAP but the Japanese government.\textsuperscript{47} Hence, when General Marquat from SCAP’s Economic and Scientific Section summoned labor leaders to his office on January 22 and advised them not to strike, warning them that SCAP would intervene if they did, he was not taken seriously.\textsuperscript{48}

Activist teachers within Zenkyōkyō feverishly prepared their students for the strike, explaining that because the Yoshida government had failed to bring prosperity to the Japanese people the teachers could not fulfill their duty to their students. Teachers seeking parental support visited students’ homes to explain their position. As February drew near, last-minute mediatory attempts between the National Public Employees Union and the government failed. Finally, on January 31, 1947, General MacArthur dramatically intervened with the following famous statement:

Under the authority vested in me as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, I have informed the labor leaders, whose unions had federated for the purpose of conducting a general strike, that I will not permit the use of so deadly a social weapon in the present impoverished and emaciated condition of Japan, and have accordingly directed them to desist from the furtherance of such action.
It is with greatest reluctance that I have deemed it necessary to intervene to this extent in the issues now pending. I have done so only to forestall the fatal impact upon an already gravely threatened public welfare. Japanese society today operates under the limitations of war, defeat, and allied occupation. Its cities are laid waste, its industries are almost at a standstill, and the great masses of its people are on little more than a starvation diet.

A general strike, crippling transportation and communications, would prevent the movement of food to feed the people and of coal to sustain essential utilities, and would stop such industry as is still functioning. The paralysis which inevitably would result might reduce large masses of the Japanese people to the point of actual starvation, and would produce dreadful consequences upon every Japanese home regardless of social strata or direct interest in the basic issue. Even now, to prevent actual starvation in Japan, the people of the United States are releasing to them quantities of their own scarce food resources.

The persons involved in the threatened general strike are but a small minority of the Japanese people. Yet this minority might well plunge the great masses into a disaster not unlike that produced in the immediate past by the minority which led Japan into the destruction of war. This in turn would impose upon the Allied Powers the unhappy decision of whether to leave the Japanese people to the fate thus recklessly imposed by a minority, or to cover the consequences by pouring into Japan, at the expense of their own meager resources, infinitely greater quantities of food and other supplies to sustain life than otherwise would be required. In the circumstances, I could hardly request the Allied peoples to assume this additional burden.

While I have taken this measure as one of dire emergency, I do not intend otherwise to restrict the freedom of action heretofore given labor in the achievement of legitimate objectives. Nor do I intend in any way to compromise or influence the basic social issues involved. These are matters of evolution which time and circumstance may well orient without disaster as Japan gradually emerges from its present distress.19

On the evening of January 31, Yashiro Ii, over a nationwide radio broadcast, instructed local union officials to call off the strike. In tears, he made his famous statement about taking one step backward, then two steps forward. Iwama, as chairman of the teachers’ Struggle Committee involved in the strike, hesitated until the early morning of February 1 before canceling the teachers’ strike amidst general confusion.
General MacArthur’s proclamation caught the restless labor movement by surprise. Labor leaders were aware of SCAP’s regulation that “strikes which are inimical to objectives of the military occupation were prohibited,” but SCAP had also maintained an attitude of encouragement toward Japanese labor, then laissez-faire. Hence the new policy of direct negative intervention by SCAP bewildered labor leaders. To the average laborer, SCAP was their liberator from the oppressive wartime military government. The restrictions on their right to strike by the American military were reminiscent of suppression by the Japanese military.

The radical Tokyō, the Tōkyō branch of Zenkyōkyō under the chairmanship of Iwama, which served as the core of the Struggle Committee’s campaign, then took up the challenge by circulating a document which charged that the proclamation of February 1 was oppressive, undemocratic, and discriminatory against labor. It intimated that American policy in Japan was a form of economic invasion by American imperialism, a charge later to be hurled over and over again as the Occupation wore on. In this instance, the charge was presented in guarded terms, because of Occupation censorship, by suggesting that General MacArthur, technically carrying out the Far Eastern Commission’s policy in Japan, perhaps did not represent only the United States. Moreover, the charge ultimately was focused on the Yoshida government as the real oppressor of Japanese labor.

The immediate effect of the Occupation’s ban on the general strike was to quiet the labor unions as General MacArthur, only a week after the incident, called for general elections. Conditions within the land were still deplorable in the continuing aftereffects of the war. The food situation had deteriorated so badly that General MacArthur had to appeal to the United States Congress for emergency food shipments. Even the empress began raising chickens within the palace grounds to provide food and to save on the limited imperial household budget. A famine holiday was declared at Kyōto University to avert a food crisis.

The unions experienced a period of self-reflection after the debacle of February 1, unable to judge the extent of freedom of action that was allowed them. Within the unions there was a general reaction against the radical leadership that had led them to the brink of direct confrontation with the Occupation forces. Moderates within Zenkyōkyō shortly thereafter quietly moved Iwama and his group out of their all-powerful positions,
with a word of gratitude for their efforts. Several unions within Sanbetsu withdrew from the organization amidst criticism of its Communist leadership and its emphasis on strike tactics. Nevertheless, the leadership of Sanbetsu remained firmly under Communist control.

Rather curiously, the traumatic effect of the incident of February 1 prompted a more ameliorative attitude on the part of the Ministry of Education. Takahashi Seichirō, the new minister of education appointed on January 31, was a long-time teacher himself. Unexpectedly, he agreed to a salary increase and to negotiations with Zenkyōkyō over a labor contract for teachers. According to a high Ministry official, the major reason for the minister’s abrupt modification of the government’s position was directly related to the appraisal of the balance of power within the radical union. Ministry officials presumed that the moderate wing of Zenkyōkyō was in the ascendancy following reaction to the strike episode. The Ministry consequently wanted to strengthen that position vis-à-vis the rank-and-file membership.53

The first teachers’ union contract, signed by Minister Takahashi and Zenkyōkyō President Araki on March 8, 1947, recognized the left-wing Zenkyōkyō as the official bargaining agency for its members with the Ministry of Education. The following provisions were included: a forty-two-hour work week; specified holidays; twenty free study days a year; establishment of a Personnel Affairs Committee, with members from both sides to consider the appointment, discharge, transfer, and punishment of teachers; sickness and maternity provisions; security for teachers to participate in the union movement; the right of a specified number of union officials to work full time for the union while holding a teaching post; the use of school buildings for union activities; agreement of the Ministry not to apply the Administrative Order if a dispute should arise between the two parties; that the Ministry would not interfere with the political interests of union members; that the Ministry would make efforts to unite all teachers in the country into one single agency, namely, Zenkyōkyō; and that the duration of the agreement would be six months.54

The negotiated contract between Zenkyōkyō and the Ministry of Education appeared as a great victory for the union after the crisis of February 1. The Japan Education Reconstruction Committee (JERC) immediately criticized the agreement as violating the principles the Committee had developed for the reform of Japanese education, and it recommended the estab-
lishment of a teachers’ association along the lines of the Nihon Kyōikukai (Japan Education Association), which was the old Dai Nippon Kyōikukai under a revised name.

Ironically, after a year of protest demonstrations, Zenkyōkyō had obtained the bulk of its demands without demonstrating. Kyōzenren, the moderate union, immediately negotiated a similar contract for its members, bringing the majority of all teachers in the country under a labor agreement that granted teachers’ unions the right to bargain collectively and an implied right to strike. And, of extreme importance, the contracts provided for an agreement to unite all teachers into one union, hastening the efforts already underway to find a common ground for uniting the two major unions.

Several weeks after the signing of the extraordinary contracts between the unions and the Ministry of Education, the basic education reforms recommended by the United States Education Mission a year previously were finally ready for implementation. During that intervening year, the Japan Education Reconstruction Committee (JERC) had diligently and in good faith carried the reform work forward after the United States Education Mission had left, laboring between the Japanese Ministry of Education and SCAP’s Civil Information and Education Section officials in an effort to carry out the recommendations of the Mission to the mutual satisfaction of both sides. The final results were the School Education Law, March 29, 1947, and the Fundamental Law of Education, March 31, 1947. Significantly, the new Japanese Constitution, which proscribed the emperor from assuming any political role, became effective shortly thereafter on May 3, 1947.

The two education laws together were designed to replace finally the 1890 Imperial Rescript on Education as the legal and philosophical basis of Japanese postwar education and to carry out the recommendations of the United States Education Mission. Obviously American inspired, both in content and tone, with strong similarities to the American version of The Revision of the Japanese Education System released earlier the same week, the purposes of the new education emphasized democratic education for world peace and individual dignity for the welfare of the country and mankind. Academic freedom, the development of personality, equal educational opportunities, and the separation of State and Church were the pillars upon which the new education was being established.
The critical passages from these documents, which ever since have been the center of the political and ideological controversies over postwar education and the teachers’ movement, include the following:

THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF EDUCATION

Article 6 (School Teachers)
Teachers of the schools prescribed by law shall be servants of the whole community. They shall be conscious of their mission and endeavor to discharge their duties. For this purpose, the status of teachers shall be respected and their fair and appropriate treatment shall be secured.

Article 8 (Political Education)
The political knowledge necessary for intelligent citizenship shall be valued in education. The schools prescribed by law shall refrain from political education or other political activities for or against any specific political party.

Article 10 (School Administration)
Education shall not be subject to improper control, but it shall be directly responsible to the whole people.55

THE CONSTITUTION

Article 9. Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce as a sovereign right of the nation the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes. In order to accomplish the aim, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

Article 19. Freedom of thought and conscience shall not be violated.

Article 21. Freedom of assembly and association as well as speech, press, and all other forms of expression are guaranteed.

Article 23. Academic freedom is guaranteed.
Article 26. All people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability.

Article 28. The right of workers to organize and to bargain and act collectively is guaranteed.56

As a result of the two laws of March 1947, essentially following the United States Education Mission’s recommendations, Japanese education finally entered the period of the new education, nearly two years after the end of the war. The following basic reforms were initiated: a coeducational articulated system including a six-year elementary school; a three-year lower secondary school; a three-year comprehensive upper secondary school, amalgamating the various types of schools into one as soon as possible; and a four-year university system. Compulsory education was extended to nine years, scheduled for full implementation by 1949. A separate course in morals education was proscribed from the curriculum.

Meanwhile, the political parties were preparing for general elections, called by General MacArthur following the strike incident of February 1, “to obtain another democratic expression of the people’s will on the fundamental issues with which Japanese society is now confronted.”57 The strike ban became a central issue in the election. Labor unions, which had given up their plans to strike because of General MacArthur’s intervention, seized upon the elections as an opportunity to attain through the ballot box what they had hoped to gain by the strike. Switching their primary tactics from demonstrations and strikes to the political processes approved by SCAP, they threw themselves into the election campaign.

On March 26, 1947, the Ministry of Education published a directive that clarified the political rights of teachers. Teachers were declared free to run in the forthcoming general elections but were not allowed to retain their teaching positions if they entered the Diet (Parliament). Teachers were free to run for local assemblies and could retain their teaching posts if elected. Teachers elected as prefectural governor or local mayor could not concurrently continue teaching. Teachers’ unions were declared free to carry on an election campaign so long as its goals did not deviate from the essential aims and status of a labor union.58

The election of April 1947 brought the first postwar nationwide victory, although a qualified one, for the Socialist party. Socialists gained 143 seats in the Lower House, to become
the largest single party. However, the two major conservative parties, the Liberals and the Democrats, polled 131 and 121 votes respectively, continuing the conservative political hegemony. Winning only four seats, the Communist party fared badly during the Socialist swing. A similar result obtained in the Upper House election, with the Socialist party winning forty-seven seats.

The teachers' unions moved into national politics for the first time in the April elections. Iwama Masao, a Communist sympathizer running independently, receiving both criticism from union moderates and praise from the leftists for his role in the February 1 strike campaign, was selected to run for a seat in the Diet as a way of moving him out of union leadership while rewarding him for his indefatigable efforts. Zenkyōkyō won three other seats, in addition to Iwama's, in the Upper House and five in the Lower House on the Socialist ticket. Sympathetic Hani Gorō also won election to the Upper House, supported by a quasi-independent educational organization. The moderate Kyōzenren ran three successful Socialist party candidates in the Upper House, including their chairman, Kōno Masao.

This election marked a turning point both in national elections and in the teachers' movement. A coalition government was formed by Katayama Tetsu, the first postwar Socialist prime minister, who selected Morito Tatsuo, a Socialist scholar, as minister of education. At the same time, Zenkyōkyō, the radical teachers' union, turned from the primary tactics of street demonstrations and protest movements to those of parliamentary processes, launching a two-pronged movement to attain its demands, with the threat of strikes and demonstrations supported by political power in the Diet.

During April and May 1947, the rival unions Zenkyōkyō, now under the more moderate leadership of Socialist Araki Shōzaburō, and the smaller, moderate Kyōzenren, with strong Socialist party ties, held a series of meetings to discuss merger of the two groups. There were several compelling reasons for uniting the two that finally made their alliance inevitable. First, their basic aims—to improve teachers' welfare, to democratize Japanese education, and to unionize all teachers—were similar, although their tactics to attain them were dissimilar. Second, by this time, the issue concerning the role of the emperor, a stumbling block for unity in the earlier period, had been eliminated as a source of contention since the emperor was declared a symbol of the State in the new Constitution. Third, the two
groups were also convinced that they could never overcome the power of the Ministry of Education, then threatening them with a new teachers’ association, backed by the American Occupation, as long as teachers were divided. Unity was essential.

Unity was also necessary for the successful implementation of the new education plan and the 6-3 system legislated weeks previously, both of which each union supported avidly. In addition, their combined power was needed to confront a threat to the twenty-eight thousand teachers who had been hastily recruited during the war and who had no teacher certification, thus failing to meet the minimum qualifications for teachers as stipulated in the pending revision of the licensing of teachers. And finally, Socialist party members were now leading both unions, so that a rapprochement was not only possible but inevitable.

An agreement reached by a joint committee on May 8, 1947, concluded the plan to form a merger of Zenkyōkyō, the militant Council of All Japan Teachers Union, and Kyōzenren, the moderate National Confederation of Teacher Unions. At the last minute, another organization of teachers, the small Daigaku Kōsen Kyōso (Teachers Union of Universities and Specialized Colleges), agreed to join the merger of the larger unions. An inaugural convention was scheduled for June 8, 1947, at Nara, ancient capital of Japan, unscathed during the war because of its irreplaceable historical treasures; in fact, Nara was one of the very few cities in Japan in 1947 that could accommodate a large conference. The name of the organization was decided upon simply as the Japan Teachers Union (Nihon Kyōshokuin Kumiai), better known today as Nikkyōso.
PART II

The Japan Teachers Union: Twenty Years of Militancy, 1947–1967
SCAP’s Reverse Course

On June 8, 1947, in the outer gardens of the Kashihara Shrine near Nara, where the legendary Jimmu was crowned the first emperor of Japan in 660 B.C., 900 delegates purporting to represent 500,000 teachers approved the formation of Nikkyōso, the Japan Teachers Union. SCAP reported that Nikkyōso embraced nearly all of the 400,000 teachers in the country, with 278,500 members from the more militant Zenkyōkyō and 98,500 from the moderate Kyōzenren.¹ Daigaku Kōsen Kyōso (Teachers Union of Universities and Specialized Colleges), the union unaffiliated with either Zenkyōkyō or Kyōzenren, accounted for the remainder. The following officers, all from or sympathetic with, the Socialist party were elected: Chairman: Araki Shōzaburō (former chairman, Zenkyōkyō); Vice-Chairmen: Iwasaki Kyūzō (vice-chairman, Kyōzenren), and Tsuruoka Shinzō (chairman, Daigaku Kōsen Kyōso); Secretary General: Ogasawara Fumio (vice-chairman, Zenkyōkyō); Vice-Secretaries General: Narita Yoshihide (vice-chairman, Kyōzenren), and Konami Kintarō (secretary general, Zenkyōkyō).²

The first convention of Nikkyōso adopted the following slogans as the union’s goals:

1. Reconstruct education and build a new Japan.
2. Implement the new 6–3 education system (elementary and lower secondary schools) with national funds.
3. Assure the freedom and democratization of research activities.
4. Establish a living wage.
5. Stabilize the cost of living.
6. Promote nursery schools with national funds.
7. Liberate women and youth.
8. Promote the nationwide unification of teachers.
9. Strengthen the unity of the working class by cooperating with labor groups and peoples’ organizations.
10. Destroy fascism by expelling war criminals from education.

The major structural decisions approved at the inaugural meeting included the following: (1) Nikkyōso will be organized as a federation of prefectural unions; (2) the body that has the final approval over policy matters will be called the Central Committee, whose delegates will each represent 4,000 members; (3) the Central Executive Committee, made up of members from the Central Committee, will formulate policy.

The final ceremony of the opening convention of Nikkyōso concluded with the following oath:

We have now formed the Japan Teachers Union through the combined will of 500,000 teachers with great expectations. We will endeavor to establish a new democratic order for the creation of a new Japanese society. We hereby swear that we will promote the social and economic status of teachers through the united power of our 500,000 members. We will earnestly struggle against the poor conditions experienced by our teachers. And we will cooperate with workers and farmers not only in Japan but throughout the world.³

Nikkyōso’s initial policy reflected the moderate socialist leadership that had gained supremacy over the two former unions by the time of their merger. Only two members of Nikkyōso’s first Central Executive Committee were members of the Communist party. The remaining sixty members were considered Socialist.⁴ A variety of factors explain this imbalance. There were strong latent feelings against the Communist faction which had become influential under Iwama Masao during the strike fiasco of February 1. Many local teachers were still opposed to Communists as revolutionaries. The Socialist party remained opposed to communism, refusing to cooperate with the Japan Communist party in the formation of a united labor front. Furthermore, the leader of the radical left within Nikkyōso, Iwama Masao, who had entered the Upper House of the Diet after the April general elections, was no longer available in the day-to-day union activities. The fact that Nikkyōso, although recognizing organized strikes as a weapon
for labor unions, nevertheless assumed the position that its use was to be avoided as far as possible was considered a victory for the moderates.

Regardless of the moderate persuasion of the national leaders of Nikkyōso at the time of its formation, the union’s historian estimates today that in 1947 the ratio of the influence of the non-Communist faction to that of the Communist faction was about 6 to 4.\footnote{No exact figures are available, but this rough estimate is revealing. The Communist strength lay in the influence of a small number of activists who had been instrumental in organizing the early locals. Thus they occupied positions of power at the branch level far out of proportion to their actual numbers. Within a year, the Communist faction was able to project itself into the dominant position of influence within Nikkyōso.}

The dominance of moderates within the top leadership was particularly evident in the designation of labor union (kyōin kumiai) was omitted from the official union name and the concept of teachers as educational laborers (kyōiku rōdōsha) was avoided in the declarations. Both issues were fundamental to the Communist movement. Moreover, the left-wing faction was confronted with the generally prevailing attitude that teachers were different from ordinary laborers. Public sentiment would neither approve nor support the concept of teachers as laborers. But of perhaps even greater importance was the fact that the average teacher did not consider himself a common laborer. The rank and file thought of themselves simply as members of a mass movement of teachers attempting to improve their livelihood—not as educational laborers.

During the summer of 1947, following the formation of Nikkyōso, feelings of accomplishment and anticipation permeated the teachers’ movement. The vast majority of teachers were united in one organization. Their union was recognized as the bargaining agent for the average teacher. Their rights were embodied in a legal contract with the government. Prime Minister Katayama, although heading a coalition cabinet, was a Socialist whose minister of education, Morito Tatsuo, was a Socialist sympathetic to Nikkyōso’s program. And the new 6–3 system supported by the union had recently gone into effect with the opening of the school year in April.

The exigencies of the day, however, proved to be overwhelming. The Japanese government was not only depleted of financial resources but also diminished in authority since it was
functioning under the rule of an occupying army. For example, there simply were not enough funds for extending compulsory education to the seventh year—the first year of the new lower secondary school—or for raising teachers’ salaries. In addition, the minister of education, whose office traditionally holds a lesser position in the cabinet, witnessed the budget for the new school system being sharply curtailed. In short, Prime Minister Katayama governed from a position of weakness, at the mercy both of the conservative members in his coalition cabinet and of SCAP, the ultimate authority in Japan.

This combination of frustrating circumstances provoked the labor unions, including Nikkyōso, to oppose the Socialist prime minister and his minister of education within a relatively short time. The government was incapable of alleviating, the terrible conditions of the working classes since an annual three-fold increase in the cost of living in Tōkyō was reaping its toll. When a completely inadequate budget, though a budget nonetheless, to carry out plans for the new lower secondary schools received reluctant approval by the minister of education—while many children attended the compulsory lower secondary schools in warehouses, barracks, temples, and even in the open air—Nikkyōso unreservedly criticized the Socialist government. In total disarray, the Katayama cabinet resigned on February 9, 1948, ending more than eight months of disastrous Socialist leadership of the Japanese government, the only period since the war when a Socialist served as prime minister.

The year 1948 was a milestone in the history of the American Occupation of Japan, with repercussions greatly affecting Nikkyōso. Internationally, Soviet-United States relations were rapidly deteriorating—this was the time of the Berlin Blockade. The American-supported government of Chiang Kai-shek was retreating across the Chinese mainland, pursued by a Communist army under Mao Tse-tung. Communist plots were being discovered within the United States government. Throughout the world, American policy toward the Communist block hardened. Accordingly, the policy of the American Occupation of Japan entered a period of transition greatly influenced by the increasingly tense international atmosphere between Communist and non-Communist blocs.

Internally in Japan, the first half of 1948 witnessed growing discontent among labor unions as critical economic conditions continued. In February 1948 the postal workers’ union planned a strike, which was banned by SCAP in March. The Osaka Teachers Union, a local branch of Nikkyōso, went on strike
for higher wages. Teachers from Gumma Prefectural Union planned a fifteen-day strike. Shortly thereafter, Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education negotiated a settlement whereby Nikkyōso won an average monthly salary of 2,920 yen, in common with other government employees, on the condition that further strike plans be suspended. Thus labor unrest was calmed for the moment.

Within a few weeks, however, certain local unions became dissatisfied with the salary-increase agreement. In May teachers in Kyōto and Hyōgo prefectures struck for twenty-four and forty-eight hours, respectively, for higher salaries. Other nationwide strikes planned by unions of government employees threatened the nation once again. Indicative of the trend were statistics from December 1947 which showed that, of the 1,794,000 workers involved in disputes, 1,670,000 were government employees, who had fared the most poorly during the period of ceaseless price rises and growing inflation. A SCAP official estimated that salaries of government employees had increased 20 to 80 percent since the end of the war while wages in private industry had gone up 200 to 400 percent and in commerce, 400 to 800 percent.

Faced with numerous strikes, General MacArthur once again dramatically intervened. On July 22, 1948, he sent a letter to Prime Minister Ashida, informing him that his government should revise the National Public Service Law so that:

No person holding a position by appointment or employment in the public service of Japan or in any instrumentality thereof should resort to strike or engage in delaying or other dispute tactics which tend to impair the efficiency of governmental operations,... all government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service.

This famous letter, instigating what Nikkyōso considers the most restrictive legislation for teachers in the entire postwar period, was based on the American pattern of civil service regulations. General MacArthur borrowed freely from President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s rationale for the prevention of strikes and collective bargaining by American civil servants—ironically, in his support of the 1935 Wagner Act, granting industrial unions broad powers. SCAP reasoned that the purpose of the National Personnel Authority, the quasi-independent governmental agency responsible for the welfare of civil servants, was:
to provide for the installation of a democratic and efficient public service in the government of Japan. The plan envisages a modern type of personnel system which recruits public employees from the entire public by competitive tests and promotes them on the basis of merit, providing scientific supervision over their classification, compensation, training, evaluation, health, safety, welfare, recreation and retirement. The system provides a grievance procedure for the fair and equitable treatment in administration.\(^9\)

SCAP's letter made frequent reference to the differences between the public and private sectors of employment. Arguing that, historically, trade unions have translated their increasing economic power into political power through support of duly constituted political parties, General MacArthur wrote that:

It would be violative of the democratic concept for the trade union movement to usurp the function of the duly elected representatives of the people as a whole by superimposing union judgment upon legislation and administration.... There is a sharp distinction between those who have dedicated their energies to the public service and those engaged in private enterprise. The former are the very instruments used for the exercise by government of the people’s sovereign power ... for upon them rests ... the obligation to serve the whole people.... A strike of public employees manifests nothing less than intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operations of government until their demands are satisfied. Such action, looking toward the paralysis of government by those who have sworn to support it, is unthinkable and intolerable.\(^{10}\)

With the “paramountcy of the public interest as the foremost consideration,” the intent of the letter from General MacArthur to Prime Minister Ashida was carried out through Cabinet Order 201 on July 31, 1948, and legislated in an amendment to the National Public Service Law, December 1948. In one stroke, the new law superseded the right to strike and bargain collectively that had been granted by the Ministry of Education to the two competing teachers’ unions in early 1947, prior to the formation of Nikkyōso. These formal contracts of 1947, applicable to Nikkyōso, had remained in force without modification until the spring of 1948, when the Ministry of Education and the union expressed a desire for a new agreement. Failure to reach an accord resulted in the union’s decision in July to ask for mediation by the Labor Relations Board. General MacArthur’s letter was written before the Board acted. Without
prior consultation or the right of appeal, the Ministry of Education notified Nikkyōso that the agreement was unilaterally repealed, transforming Nikkyōso into a union of teachers devoid of the usual instruments of unionism.

As a result of having teachers teach under the provisions of the regular national civil servant regulations rather than under those of the former contracts, all teachers were now bound by strict laws concerning political activities. According to the 1947 National Civil Service Law, Article 102, employees of the national government were restricted from participating in any political activities except that of voting. Teachers, who had enjoyed broad political rights under their former contracts, came under these new restrictive regulations because of the letter written by General MacArthur.

Once again, as in the abortive strike of February 1947, teachers as civil servants were affected by a government act overtly designed to curtail the strength of other government unions, primarily in transportation and communications, whose strikes were threatening to disable the country. In both instances, the crisis faced by the country was not brought on by teachers, but it can be assumed that the Ministry of Education welcomed the restrictive provisions affecting the hostile Nikkyōso as well. But to Nikkyōso, in which by now one-fourth of the Central Executive Committee members were Communists or fellow travelers, this was naked oppression by the American Occupation, violating the fundamental rights of Article 26 of the Constitution, which granted workers the right to bargain collectively.

Both sides were hardening their positions. An officer of the Government Section of SCAP revealed the occupying army’s changing attitude toward union leaders based on the new law. The chief of the Government Section explained as follows:

Leadership of certain organizations has been taken over by men who have not been devoted to the welfare of Japan and her people and a situation has been created dangerous to the future of the nation. Despite the critical need for national recovery, this pattern of labor relations recently on several occasions has led Japan to the brink of a general strike of government services. A national disaster has only been prevented by the decisive action on the part of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.
Within SCAP, however, there was a sharp division of opinion toward the conflict created by the new law. The Government Section viewed it simply as a problem in creating an efficient, modern, civil service system. The Labor Division regarded it as part of the larger problem of labor relations. When the Government Section prevailed, James Killen, chief of the Labor Division and a vice-president of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, resigned in protest. The American Federation of Labor promptly criticized SCAP on the grounds that by denying collective bargaining rights to government employees, SCAP was not weakening communism but was driving Japanese workers into its arms.\textsuperscript{14}

The unions of Japanese government employees reacted bitterly toward their new status under the National Public Service Law. Communist influence, gradually intensifying within the hierarchy of public service unions, was strengthened when the Communists led a determined resistance against the newly imposed strike ban. Acts of violence broke out throughout the land. There were many arrests and convictions of militant unionists within the public service sector.

Shortly after this frustrating episode for government employee unions, in which their political activities and labor rights were sharply curtailed, preparations for the first elections of the new school boards got underway, causing further deterioration of the already strained relationship between SCAP and Nikkyōso. The principle of a locally elected school-board system was based on the recommendations of the United States Education Mission made two years previously that “each prefecture should establish an elected educational committee to take general charge of public schools within the prefecture”; that “in each city or other prefectural subdivision, there should be a lay educational agency elected by the people to administer the local education program.”\textsuperscript{15} SCAP’s purpose in supporting the school boards was quite clear. A spokesman declared at a press conference that “the schools of Japan, long under the domination of the Ministry of Education, are being placed in the hands of the people themselves.”\textsuperscript{16}

A disagreement developed among SCAP, the Japanese Ministry of Education, and the Japan Education Reconstruction Committee (JERC) over the school-board system itself and over the question of the lowest feasible administrative level suitable for having the new boards. SCAP at first proposed that they extend down to the grass-roots level (the town and village), whereas the Japanese government recommended having them
only at the prefectural and large-city level. JERC had misgivings about direct public election and proposed an indirect system of selection.\textsuperscript{17} SCAP finally agreed to a compromise restricting the first school-board elections to the prefectural level and the five largest cities, thus postponing school-board elections at the smaller-city and town and village levels until 1950 because of budgetary difficulties. In addition it was agreed that six members would be elected at large and one appointed by the local assembly to the prefectural school boards; and four members would be elected and one appointed to the municipal school boards.\textsuperscript{18}

Nikkyōso, completely ignoring the new political restrictions placed upon teachers as a result of General MacArthur’s letter, heartily approved of school boards and set out vigorously to have their representatives elected to the boards by following the democratic procedure prescribed by the American Occupation. At first, the union supported school boards down to the local level. However, as the election drew near and the “true nature of the powers of the boards were fully understood in that local laymen could restrict teachers’ activities,” Nikkyōso altered its position and supported only the prefectural boards. Nikkyōso’s policy was based on the concern that local conservative landowners and politicians would dominate the elections by assuming a hard line against the leftist teachers’ union.\textsuperscript{19}

SCAP took a personal interest in the school-board elections, perhaps because the boards were considered a traditional American institution and because SCAP placed an abiding faith in them to accomplish a truly democratic reform of Japanese education. Consequently, the school boards were to be run as the American officers knew them in America. But Nikkyōso leaders had their own ideas about the boards, considerably different from those of SCAP and contrary to SCAP’s plan. The confrontation between SCAP and Nikkyōso on the school-board issue was most pronounced in Tōkyō where SCAP’s Tōkyō Military Government Team challenged the Tōkyō branch of the teachers’ union. SCAP’s officers showed films and spoke in every ward of the city, explaining the American tradition of having laymen—not educators—control educational policy through the school boards. The antagonism between SCAP and Nikkyōso was publicly exposed when Colonel Hollingshed, commander of the Tōkyō Military Government Team, addressed a meeting of Tōkyō teachers in these words:
On September 10, we requested that you submit a statement about whether or not you would endorse as candidates any members of your union. Statements were requested from each chapter. To date only one has declared endorsing Narita. Yet we know that the Itabashi Chapter is endorsing Kaneko, and others are planning to back candidates. It is high time you realize that your union is being severely criticized in opposing and obstructing every measure to improve education in Tōkyō. Now is the time to redeem yourself in the eyes of the public by issuing a clear-cut statement that the Tōkyō Federation of Teachers Union and its chapters will neither select nor sponsor any teacher or members of the union as a candidate for the board of education. Such a statement should result in the immediate withdrawal of those candidates whom you have already selected. Public school teachers in the United States which had experience with boards for 150 years are never permitted to serve on boards because it is an accepted principle that no one in public service should determine policies under which he works.

In spite of SCAP’s demands, Nikkyōso members, including Kaneko Reigaku, supported by the Communist party, and Narita Yoshihide, vice-secretary general of Nikkyōso, who was affiliated with the extreme left-wing faction of the union, ran for the Tōkyō school board. Throughout the country, more than one hundred candidates from Nikkyōso entered the race for the 296 seats in Japan’s first postwar attempt to democratize education through popularly elected school boards.

The first school-board election on October 5, 1948, resulted in a conservative victory, according to the Nippon Times, with 72 percent (213) of the winners considered conservative, 26 percent (76) progressive, and 2 percent (7) radical. Although both Narita and Kaneko lost in the Tōkyō election, Nikkyōso claimed that out of the 95 seats won by active teachers, 54 had been endorsed by the union. In addition 23 others had been sponsored jointly by Nikkyōso and by various local organizations. Regardless of the exact number of teachers elected to the boards, the results indicated that a significant number of Japanese voters did not view Nikkyōso negatively.

From the vantage of hindsight, it can be concluded that the elective school-board system did not place education in the hands of the people nor did it render the Ministry of Education simply an advisory agency, as originally intended by the United States Education Mission. Certain conditions precluded such a radical decentralization: (1) SCAP held ultimate authority.
(2) The Ministry of Education was the agency responsible for carrying out the new 6–3–3 educational system. (3) The Ministry of Education set teachers’ minimum qualifications. (4) Fifty percent of teachers’ salaries were subsidized by the Ministry, enabling the government to determine the number of teachers who could qualify for the subsidy—in effect, setting a quota. Prefectural superintendents of education frequently traveled to Tōkyō to appeal for funds to build the new schools required for the extension of compulsory education. The optional courses of study formulated by the Ministry of Education were considered mandatory by many teachers because of the long tradition of local subservience to the Ministry. Consequently, the schools still looked to Tōkyō for direction, where the all-powerful SCAP continued to operate through the Ministry of Education.

The Ministry of Education in 1948 thus maintained a considerable amount of influence over Japanese education, augmented by the conservative dominance of the new school boards. Predictably, many Nikkyōso affiliates launched a general campaign of a hostile nature to bring pressure on the school boards to meet the aggressive demands of the union for higher salaries and for greater control of educational affairs by teachers. On many occasions, Nikkyōso militants disrupted school-board meetings when their demands were not met. In the face of strong teacher opposition, some boards yielded, in particular where former teachers were serving as board members.

American Occupation officials, reacting to both the international climate and internal developments in Japan, finally reached, by late 1948, the stage of a full “reverse course” policy for Japan from the initial “heady” period of democratization. Japan was considered ripe for communism, with a high unemployment rate, runaway inflation, low production, chronic food shortages, and general labor unrest plaguing the land. With worldwide communism posing what was interpreted as an international threat to the non-Communist world, Japan was thought to be similarly threatened. The American government then made the important decision that Communist advances in Japan, as well as throughout the world, must be repulsed. Concurrently, it was decided that the Japanese economy must be placed posthaste on a viable basis, regardless of the consequences to the original Occupation policy of strengthening the democratic institutions related to the labor movement.

The American Occupation moved forcibly to counter the internal Communist threat and to place the stagnant Japanese economy on a viable basis. Industrial production was still at
a standstill with a production rate in 1949 only 60 percent of that during the years between 1930 and 1934. A radically new approach to the chronic economic problem, announced in December 1948, was to have serious repercussions on Japanese education and Nikkyōso policies. General MacArthur, on December 20, declared that one of the primary goals of the Occupation was the prompt economic stabilization of Japan.

An American banker named Joseph Dodge, who had played an important role in German currency reform, was brought to Japan in February 1949 to plan the financial rehabilitation of Japan. The Dodge Plan, a nine-point program, involved drastic measures to balance the budget, reduce inflation, and stabilize prices. An immediate curtailment was imposed on government expenditures and subsidies; printing of new money was sharply reduced; and a program to rationalize labor was instituted to unravel a “rigged economy,” perpetuated, Dodge believed, on the twin stilts of American aid and large Japanese government subsidies.

The effects of the Dodge Plan were dramatic. On February 20, 1949, a law concerning the rationalization of government employment was passed by the Diet, and 258,543 civil servants were dismissed. The unions of government employees, particularly those most affected—the national railroads and the post office—were thrown into confusion. Violence broke out. The president of the Japan National Railways, who had dismissed 95,000 employees, was found dead on the railroad tracks near Sendai on July 6. An empty train, released from its moorings in Mitaka, Tokyo, on July 14, crashed into crowded steps, killing eight persons. Many Communists were arrested and charged in connection with the violence.

The Dodge Plan perforce had a severe impact on the school-expansion program legislated in 1947, which was to complete by 1949 the extension of compulsory education through grade nine. National funds allocated for this project were reduced in the general retrenchment of government spending, exacerbating the already severe shortage of school buildings for the new junior high schools. Under the Dodge Plan, the educational share of the national budget was reduced from 8.1 percent for the 1948–1949 academic year to 6.3 percent for the following year. This contrasted with 9 percent in the early 1930s.

Chairman Araki of Nikkyōso testified forcefully before a Diet Committee, charging that since there was already a shortage of 52,416 classrooms, an increase in the education budget to sustain the new 6–3–3 educational system was mandatory.
He was referring to conditions that prompted the resignation of 683 village heads, several of whom committed suicide because of their failure to fulfill promises to build lower secondary schools. At that time more than 350 lower secondary schools were conducting classes in barns and other buildings with similar poor facilities.30

The initial effects of the Dodge Plan played into the hands of the growing number of Communist teachers who were appealing to the disillusioned non-Communist teachers for support against the policies of the Japanese government and the American Occupation. SCAP became deeply concerned about the steadily increasing number of Communists; party membership had grown from 1,000 in 1945 to 70,000 by 1947.31 The general public, experiencing the third straight year of impoverishment following the bombing holocausts of the last years of the war, looked with more favor than at any other time in Japan’s history on the Communist plan to reform Japanese industry and society in 1948 and 1949. The Communists had also effectively capitalized on the American Occupation’s more conservative policies from 1948 by appealing to the liberal inclinations of students, intellectuals, labor leaders, and others who had become disenchanted with the Socialist party after its misadventure at running the government. Liberals disappointed with the Socialist party had little choice but to turn to the Communist party.

By election time in 1949, the Socialists had lost much of their previous popularity, receiving only 13 percent of the votes for 49 seats. It was during this election that the Japan Communist party made its strongest bid for political power in the postwar period, polling 9.6 percent of the votes (2,900,000) for 35 seats, up from 3.7 percent, or 4 seats, in the previous general elections in 1947. The conservatives, with 264 seats, however, gave Prime Minister Yoshida his first majority government.32 That the Communist party and the Conservative party won great numbers of votes was an indication of the public’s general dissatisfaction with the centrist Socialist party.

Within Nikkyōso a similar trend was underway. Teachers were extremely dissatisfied with their deplorable living conditions. SCAP reported that by April 1948, out of the average monthly salary of 2,156 yen of an unmarried teacher living alone in a single room in Tōkyō, 1,500 to 2,000 yen was used for room and board.33 Communist influence within Nikkyōso had
consequently been gaining strength throughout 1948 until it had finally attained dominance among the leadership by the beginning of 1949.

At the fourth national convention of Nikkyōso, convened in the southern resort city of Beppu in February 1949, the internal struggle between the Communists and Socialists disrupted the proceedings as a reaction to Communist domination emerged. A non-confidence motion was submitted by the moderate wing, charging that the Central Executive Committee had “followed a mistaken wage policy and had cooperated with the wrong political party,” referring to the committee’s efforts on behalf of the Communist party. A bitter floor debate ensued. As an open attack on Communist supremacy within the union, the motion finally lost by a vote of 465 to 425, revealing the relative strengths of the two factions. This vote was the first open break between the Communists and Socialists, turning the tide against Communist dominance of Nikkyōso, which was not to be equalled for a decade.

The convention at Beppu also attained notoriety for the Communist declaration of a bloc of Nikkyōso’s members. Iwama Masao, left-wing leader of the teachers’ movement through 1946 and 1947 and Independent representative in the Diet since 1947, representing the union’s interests, declared his allegiance to, and membership in, the Japan Communist party. Seventy other members of Nikkyōso, mostly Iwama’s colleagues from the old radical Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union, stood with him in the joint declaration, giving substance to the public’s general impression that Nikkyōso was dominated by Communists. Because of the rapid increase of Communist influence both within labor unions and at the polls in 1948 and 1949, Iwama and his followers had the feeling that the Communist revolution was at hand.

Following the dramatic confrontation at Beppu, the moderates redoubled their efforts to unify their ranks against Communist control of Nikkyōso. The significance of Communist control of the union’s Central Executive Committee and other administrative positions was not underestimated in the antagonism between the two factions. The Japan Communist party held direct control over the Communists within Nikkyōso through its Education and Culture Department (Kyōiku Bunka-Bu) and its Labor Department (Rōdō-Bu). The Communist faction was in constant touch with the Communist party headquarters in Yoyogi, Tōkyō, for instructions.
Amidst such Communist advances, SCAP finally moved directly against the Japan Communist party in 1949 by systematically carrying out a program to discharge active Communists from government, politics, labor, and industry in what became known as the Red Purge. As an integral part of a general suppression of left-wing activists, the education sector, too, underwent its own Red Purge. On July 19, 1949, Dr. Walter Eells, SCAP’s advisor on higher education in the Civil Information and Education Section, spearheaded the attack on Communist teachers with one of the most famous speeches in postwar Japan. Although he referred specifically to university teachers, the effect of his speech permeated the entire school system. Dr. Eells, speaking at the opening ceremony of Niigata University, declared that:

Freedom of teaching and freedom of research are the most widely held and jealously guarded functions of a university. In our country, the American Association of University Professors has published carefully prepared and widely influential statements of principles to assure academic freedom.... One sentence from one of its statements reads as follows: “No teacher may claim as his right the privilege of discussing in his classroom controversial topics outside his own field of study.” ... This means that a mathematics teacher, for example, has complete academic freedom to study or teach his own field of mathematics but does not have freedom to teach such a subject as communism.

In the past few years the question has come up in the United States, as it has recently in Japan and in other countries, whether in a democracy a member of the Communist Party should be discharged from his position as a university professor because he is a communist.... Communism is a dangerous and destructive doctrine since it advocates the overthrow of established democratic governments by force. Must those who may believe in this dangerous doctrine be allowed to teach such doctrine to the youth of the country?

In the United States we have an important organization known as the Educational Policies Commission, composed of the leading scholars of the country.... The Commission only a few weeks ago issued a document which advocates and defends the discharge of proved communists from the schools of America. Do the recommendations of this document violate the long and jealously guarded academic freedom of the university? By no means. The basic reason for advising exclusion of communist professors is that they are not free. Their thoughts, their beliefs, their
teachings are controlled from the outside. Communists are told from headquarters what to think and what to teach. In the very name of academic freedom, therefore, the most important right and duty of a university, we dare not have known communists as university professors because they are then no longer really free to teach or carry on research.... Therefore they cannot be allowed to be university professors in a democracy.\textsuperscript{38}

Predictably, Dr. Eells’ speech set off a storm of protest. When he further expounded his thesis at other universities, students heckled his speeches, forcing him off the stage at Tōhoku and Hokkaidō universities. His name became synonymous with anticommunism. His position on communism became SCAP’s basis for purging Communist teachers from the entire school system in one of the most controversial acts of the American Occupation of Japan.

On September 7, 1949, prefectural superintendents of education were summoned to Tōkyō by the minister of education for a secret meeting. The superintendents were notified that the purge of Communist teachers was ordered by SCAP and must be complied with. However, the minister explained that, since this action could possibly violate the constitutional rights of teachers, the official reason for dismissing such teachers must not be membership in the Japan Communist party.\textsuperscript{39}

The superintendents returned to their prefectures and began the systematic dismissal of the most active left-wing teachers within their jurisdictions. Personnel officers had dossiers on all local activists. It was not difficult for the superintendents to select the activist teachers and prosecute their cases before the prefectural school boards, usually on the legal grounds that these teachers were obstructing the normal operations of the school system or that they were redundant over and above the quota set by the Dodge Plan. The school board alone voted for their dismissal; the Red Purge of teachers was thus accomplished. In certain cases it is known that the list of teachers to be purged submitted by the prefectural SCAP education officer to the school board usually coincided with the list drawn up by the superintendent’s office.

Teachers implicated in the Red Purge were not cross-examined, were not present for any of the deliberations, and had no right of appeal except through the civil court, where decades later several cases remained in litigation. They merely received their notice of dismissal. An American researcher, evaluating the Occupation in process, concluded that “there is evidence
that proper safeguards have not been observed by the Japanese authorities in some areas and that a considerable number of teachers not proved communists have been dismissed. "

The Red Purge of teachers was a direct attack on Nikkyōso, which by this time, in common with many labor unions, had come under the dominant influence of Communists, particularly at the prefectural and the large-city administrative levels. The Communists were filling the vacuum created by the waning Socialist influence, following the disastrous attempt at Socialist government between 1947 and 1948. At the prefectural and local levels, these Communist leaders were carrying out frequent demonstrations and acts of intimidation against the local school boards—activities that were indeed legal grounds for dismissal. Some school boards were forced to relocate repeatedly and secretly the site of their meetings to elude picketing and general harassment.

The school boards themselves were most reluctant to punish left-wing leaders of teachers, because they realized that such action would result in widespread reprisals by teachers and in further deterioration of relations between teachers and the school boards. In addition, the school boards, in operation for only a year, were theoretically models of democracy. To discharge leaders of their teachers was felt to be an undemocratic act by a democratic institution. Under these circumstances, it can be assumed that many school-board members approved the Red Purge, since they had no recourse but to follow SCAP’s desires, but they placed the responsibility for the purge primarily at SCAP’s doorstep.

The effect of the Red Purge on Nikkyōso was serious. First of all, 1,010 teachers were fired, many of them prefectural and local leaders of Nikkyōso. They were among the 20,997 Communists and fellow travelers who lost their jobs in government, information media, and industry. In Tōkyō alone, 246 Communist or allegedly Communist teachers were purged. Consequently, although the national leadership of the union was not directly affected since the purge of teachers was carried out by prefectural authorities at the local level and not at the national level by the Ministry of Education, the ranks of Nikkyōso at the local level were severely depleted of the left-wing activists.

Nikkyōso protested the purge when representatives met with the minister of education during the dismissals, charging that it was illegal to dismiss teachers simply on the basis of their personal ideological beliefs. However, the union was not able to organize coordinated nationwide protests because the
purge took effect rapidly throughout the nation, especially after the Korean War broke out in 1950. At that time SCAP had Communist leaders arrested on a number of occasions and banned their newspaper, the Akahata. Nikkyōso itself, moreover, was in a weakened condition due to internal instability because of the Communist-Socialist confrontations. As a result of the purge, Communist influence within the union dropped from a high in 1949 to its lowest level ever in the years 1950 and 1951. This was, of course, the very result SCAP had desired.

The second highly significant result was that the moderate element within Nikkyōso, gaining strength thanks to the Red Purge, began to exert increasing influence against Communist domination. This movement was first seen in the non-confidence motion against the Communist-dominated Central Executive Committee during the February convention in Beppu. It won the day when Nikkyōso’s President Araki, during the sixth national convention in November 1949 at Shiobara, recognized the problem and declared in his address that the union “has shifted between right and left wings during the past two and a half years of struggles, leading to much misunderstanding of us. Now, the 500,000 members of the union must reunite, eliminate leftist unionism in order to strengthen the union, and establish policies to protect the actual interests of all our members.”

The Red Purge of leftist teachers in the 1949–1950 period contrasted sharply with the purge of right-wing teachers during 1946 and 1947, illustrating the “reverse course” of the American Occupation between 1947 and 1949. And when the “depurge” of thousands of individuals convicted during the right-wing purge was carried out concurrently with the Red Purge, the timing made the public feel that the American Occupation was no longer concerned about the democratic process in Japan but thought only of the international cold war.

The Red Purge also illustrated the peculiar predicament into which the Occupation had worked itself by infringing upon legally instituted democratic rights, promulgated by SCAP, in the name of academic freedom. The inconsistency was evident in the fact that certified teachers who were card-carrying Japan Communist party members, such as Iwama, were eligible to become members of the Diet, representing hundreds of thousands of constituents, but were ineligible to teach in the schools within their constituencies. Dr. Eells himself recognized this paradox when he later wrote that the “situation admittedly had some elements of difficulty since the Communist Party is le-
galized in Japan and has elected many members to the Diet, and academic freedom is guaranteed in the Constitution of the country."  

Under these conditions, even Minister of Education Takase, according to his secretary, had reservations about carrying out the wishes of SCAP. Takase felt that relations between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education were not particularly bad at this time, calling it the honeymoon period, as the Ministry and the union were both striving to realize the reforms of Japanese education legislated in 1947. He also felt that there was no legal basis for dismissing Communist teachers. Takase’s position was explained to the Government Section of SCAP by the Secretariat, but the decision to purge Communists from all sectors of Japanese society had apparently already been made somewhere within SCAP and in Washington. No compromise was permitted.

Nikkyōso’s convention at Shiobara on November 11, 1949, after the Red Purge had been initiated, marks the official turning point of the leadership away from Communist dominance toward a more moderate Socialist position. Communist influence within the entire union movement waned during late 1949 and 1950, with the emergence of an anti-Communist movement called Mindō (Democratic League) within union affiliates of the Communist-dominated Sanbetsu (council of unions). Sanbetsu membership declined from a high of 5 million in the 1947-1948 period to 1.5 million by the end of 1949, as the Red Purge took its toll.

Simultaneously, Nikkyōso was playing a major role in organizing unions of government employees into a united association of unions. At that time, Nikkyōso’s president was also president of Kankōrō, a council of civil servant unions, known officially as Nihon Kankōchō Rōdō Kumiai Kyōgikai (Japan Council of National and Local Government Workers’ Union). Because the railway and postal unions were split over the Red Purge, Nikkyōso, which remained intact, became by far the largest union in Kankōrō, taking a leading role in unifying the moderate factions from other unions into a movement to organize a new council of unions. SCAP worked behind the scenes to promote such a development.

The result was the formation in July 1950 of Sōhyō, known officially as Nihon Rōdō Kumiai Sōhyōgikai (General Council of Trade Unions in Japan). Consisting of three million members, Sōhyō, an amalgamation of moderate, mostly civil servant unions, supported the Socialist party from an essentially anti-
Communist position.\textsuperscript{49} Sōhyō was shortly to become the most powerful federation of unions in postwar Japan. Nikkyōso voted to join Sōhyō at its seventh national convention in May 1950. The vote was 321 in favor to 130 opposed,\textsuperscript{50} indicating the relative strengths of the Socialist and Communist factions within the union leadership at that time.

During the Red Purge and during the realignment of labor unions leading to the birth of Sōhyō, the second of the two most important postwar legislative acts relating to teachers was passed. The first one, discussed above, was the 1948 act which brought teachers under national civil servants’ regulations, resulting in the forfeiture of the teachers’ rights to strike, to bargain collectively, and to participate in any political activities except voting. The second, a combination of two laws planned for later enactment at the time the 1948 act was hastily passed, included the Special Law for Public Service Education Personnel (Kyōiku Kōmuin Tokurei Hō) of 1949 and the Local Public Service Law (Chihō Kōmuin Hō) of 1950.

The Special Law for Public Service Education Personnel stipulated in Article 3 that henceforth teachers in national schools would be classified as national public servants and those in locally maintained schools would be classified as local civil servants. This differentiation of teachers, the vast majority of whom were in public schools and only a minority in the several national schools, required a new law for local civil servants, which followed in 1950. However, Article 21 of the 1949 Special Law stipulated specifically that, for the time being, that is, until a local civil service act could be prepared, teachers who were newly classified as local civil servants were still bound by Article 102 of the National Public Service Law, which prohibited all political activities except voting.\textsuperscript{51}

In 1950 the Local Public Service Law was passed consisting of regulations for local public servants, with minor exceptions written into the Special Law to provide for matters unique to the teaching profession. The following crucially significant clauses were included in the bill for all local government employees, including teachers:

\textbf{ARTICLE 36 (Political activities)}

1. Local public service personnel may not contribute to the formation of political parties or become officers in them. They also may not induce others to become members of any political party.
2. Local public service personnel may not participate in any of the following activities in support of, or opposition to, a particular political party, person, or event in a public election: (a) engage in soliciting votes, (b) participate in a signature campaign, (c) engage in fund raising campaigns, (d) use or allow others to use public funds or public buildings.

**ARTICLE 37 (Dispute tactics)**

Local public servants may not resort to strikes, slowdown, or other acts of dispute against their employer, who is the local people as represented by the agencies of the local public body, or to conduct such idling tactics as will deteriorate the functional efficiency of the local public body, or to instigate others to do so.

**ARTICLE 52 (Organization)**

Public servants’ organizations whose purpose is to promote the improvement of working conditions will be recognized. Local public servants may join such an organization.

**ARTICLE 55 (Negotiations)**

Local public servants’ organizations may negotiate with the local public body concerned with regard to compensation, work hours, and other working conditions of their personnel. However, such negotiations do not include the right of collective agreement with the authorities of the local public body.

Nikkyōso made a determined effort through nationwide meetings to block passage of this bill, claiming that the basic rights of workers set forth in Article 26 of the Constitution—“the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively is guaranteed”—would be violated. After a short postponement of the deliberations, a compromise clause pertaining to the matter of political activities contained in Article 36, was added by the government because of Nikkyōso’s opposition. In the revised version, political restrictions were to be enforced only in the district in which the local civil servant was employed.

As a result of these laws, in which teachers were classified as local civil servants, Nikkyōso lost its official status as a national union. Thus it became virtually a voluntary organization in the eyes of the law since teachers are hired by the prefectoral school boards rather than by the Ministry of Education. In other words, whereas to Nikkyōso, the prefectural teachers’ organizations recognized by the prefectural government under Article 52 continued as federated members of Nikkyōso, to the
prefectural governments, the teachers’ organizations were not recognized as Nikkyōso affiliates. In a sense, the prefectural teachers’ organizations were operating simultaneously in two capacities, depending on whom they were dealing with. In practice, they functioned as prefectural units of the national union Nikkyōso, regardless of what the prefectural governments called them.

The effect of the new laws was the elimination of all legal basis for Nikkyōso’s claim to negotiating rights with the Ministry of Education on behalf of the vast majority of teachers in the country. There seems little doubt that such an anticipated outcome was one of the major purposes behind the formulation of the laws in the first place. What the laws failed to do, however, was to restrict the political activities of Nikkyōso’s national leadership, which, after all, was directing the union’s political program. Since members of the national executive were working at the Tōkyō headquarters away from the local districts, where each was technically employed on the teaching staff but on leave at the national office, they were not affected by the political restrictions on teachers in the district of employment.

For the next decade, the Ministry of Education refused any formal negotiations with Nikkyōso on grounds that teachers’ organizations are recognized only at the prefectural and local levels where teachers are employed, and that only at that level can teachers and their employers negotiate under the law. Representatives of Nikkyōso, however, continued to meet with those ministers of education who were receptive to their incessant demands for consultation until later ministers finally ceased all contact between the Ministry and the national executive of Nikkyōso. At this point their relationship deteriorated to abysmal depths.

The Local Public Service Law also established a quasi-independent local organ similar to the National Personnel Authority, whose purpose it is to make recommendations to the local public body concerning compensation, working conditions, and welfare of the local public servants. Nevertheless, because the salaries of local public servants are based on the standards recommended by the National Personnel Authority for national civil servants, for all intents and purposes, the major target of pressure for Nikkyōso in raising teachers’ salaries remained the national government.
The year 1950, in addition to being the year when the Local Public Service Law was passed, also was the beginning of a monumental transition period in the postwar history of Japan. The focal point was the outbreak of the Korean War. Communist armies by 1950 had sent the U.S.-supported Nationalist Chinese fleeing to the island of Formosa. The new Communist People’s Republic of China entered into a thirty-year alliance with the Soviet Union on February 14, and Communist North Korean troops moved south on June 25 and took the South Korean capital of Seoul. On June 27 the Security Council of the United Nations asked member nations to aid South Korea. By July, General MacArthur, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan, was commanding the United Nations forces sent to aid South Korea. Commuting between Korea and Japan, MacArthur used Japan as a forward supply base for military operations on the Korean Peninsula.

With Communist armies controlling the whole of China and sweeping south with Soviet support through Japan’s nearest neighbor only tens of miles away, the earlier Occupation policy of Japan became anachronistic to the American government. Article 9 of the postwar Constitution, proscribing a Japanese army, rendered Japan a military vacuum, precisely as originally intended. The international situation prompted the American government to seek a new policy for Japan.

During January of the same year, the Cominform under the influence of the Soviet Union issued its famous rebuke to the Japan Communist party and its leader Nosaka Sanzō, attacking the moderate policies followed by the party in its relationship with SCAP. The Japan Communist party hesitantly accepted the criticism as valid and initiated a militant policy of internal violence, training cadres of young Communists that attacked police stations with bombs. SCAP retaliated by cracking down on the Japan Communist party, forcing it underground. At a time when South Korea was nearly overrun with North Korean Communist armies, SCAP found itself harassed by Communist militants within Japan, the forward supply and marshaling base for the Korean War.

The American Occupation and the Japanese government then resorted to a unique measure to meet the internal Communist threat by approving a new National Police Reserve of 75,000 men to maintain peace and order and to guarantee public welfare. Heavily financed and technically advised by SCAP, the National Police Reserve called upon 800 experienced World War II officers of the Japanese imperial army to fill the of-
ficers’ ranks and train the new recruits. The initial recruitment produced 203,000 applicants.\textsuperscript{54} Leftists considered the National Police Reserve to be the first step toward the rearmament of Japan.

Then, in September 1950, the Second United States Education Mission to Japan arrived to evaluate the results of the first mission’s recommendations made in 1946. Five members who had served on the first mission returned. The second mission’s report had little impact on Japanese education since it merely praised the steady progress made by the earlier American reforms, though calling for more funds for education. Its notch in history, however, was achieved through a simple statement deep within the text of its report: “One of the greatest weapons against communism in the Far East is an enlightened electorate in Japan.”\textsuperscript{55}

Opposition forces branded SCAP’s policy for Japan as imperialistic exploitation of the nation asserting that Japan was being used as an Asian bulwark against communism, thus providing America with its farthest Pacific outpost in the struggle against international communism. Nikkyōso interpreted the Second United States Education Mission’s controversial statement concerning an enlightened electorate as an attempt by the Americans to mold the Japanese people to serve America’s interests.\textsuperscript{56} When the initial negotiations began for a treaty to terminate the American Occupation of Japan, leftists became alarmed that SCAP would harness Japan with a treaty that would bind the nation to America militarily.

At its seventh national convention, convened in May 1950, Nikkyōso reflected the national and international political currents, indicating that a new direction was imminent. Oka Saburō, a Socialist from Osaka, succeeded the first Nikkyōso president, Araki Shōzaburō, who was elected in 1950 to the Upper House, along with Secretary General Ogasawara Fumio and six other Nikkyōso candidates.\textsuperscript{57} Under the military threat prevailing in 1950, with the Korean War at Japan’s southern doorstep, and the probability of a peace treaty in which American military forces would remain on Japanese soil after independence, the issue of peace became for the first time a major concern of Nikkyōso.\textsuperscript{58}

The convention of 1950 thus marks an important turning point in the development of the left-wing Japanese teachers’ movement. Since the end of the war, Nikkyōso’s struggles had been focused on teachers’ salaries and teachers’ rights and on the reform of Japanese education through the implementation
of the School Education Law and the Fundamental Law of Education. Moreover, the major emphasis of the organized teachers’ movement until then had been primarily on national affairs. But as Japan became deeply enmeshed in the international currents of the cold war, the teachers’ movement rearranged its priorities accordingly. In response to the concern for peace in 1950, the union expanded its activities into the international realm as well. A new era in the development of Nikkyōso was imminent.
The priorities of Nikkyōso were undergoing a definite transition by late 1950 and early 1951. In addition to the international influences, several crucial domestic factors also influenced the union to move in a new direction. First of all, the terrible depression years were finally over. The Japanese economy was gaining momentum. The war in neighboring Korea brought in substantial sums of foreign currency for military spending in support of American forces engaged in the conflict. Factories were beginning to hum again, supplied with new equipment through American aid, replacing that destroyed during the Pacific war. A boom was expected. Labor strikes were no longer a constant national concern. Food shortages were over. A new atmosphere was replacing that of a defeated nation. Japan was moving forward again.

Teachers' salaries, although still low, no longer constituted the overriding concern of the individual teacher, for they had been increased to a level comparable to those of other government employees and thus were now tolerable. The Asahi Shimbun reported in March 1951 that the average monthly salary of elementary school teachers was 7,027 yen; that of high school teachers, 9,160 yen; and that of industrial workers, 9,133 yen.¹

The postwar educational reforms were essentially in effect by 1951. The new educational system, including the six-year elementary school, the three-year lower secondary school, and the three-year upper secondary school, followed by a four-year university, was in operation. Elected school boards at the prefectural level and in the five large cities, to be automatically extended to the remaining cities, towns, and villages in 1952,
were making certain educational decisions, a function that was previously the prerogative of the Ministry of Education. Morals education was proscribed from the curriculum. The struggles concerning the implementation of the initial postwar educational reforms were almost at an end, as were the struggles for a living wage.

Nikkyōso, by early 1951, had substantially realigned its priorities away from the original ones of economics and education to meet the exigencies of the rapidly changing conditions. For example, at the beginning of January, U. S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles arrived in Japan to discuss a peace treaty with the Japanese government. He offered Japan a military defense alliance with the United States. More than six thousand teachers purged as rightists in 1946 and 1947 were “depurged” in May 1951. More than 20,000 former military men were also “depurged” shortly thereafter; from these 20,000 men were recruited 800 former military officers to become officers in the new 75,000-man police reserve. Simultaneously, at the fifth national party conference of the Japan Communist party, a decision was made to follow a militant policy, sparking acts of violence and government suppression, as the Japan Communist party was once again purged of all its leaders by SCAP. Police entered university campuses and sought Communist student instigators threatening university autonomy.

It is within this context that Nikkyōso shifted its emphasis from economics and education to politics and education. Faced with the threat of rearmament of Japan and with the conservative policies of the Japanese government, as the ruling party inevitably reacted to the sweeping educational reforms enacted during the American Occupation, Nikkyōso leaders became obsessed with a movement for peace and peace education. Nikkyōso’s new orientation became official policy at its national convention held in May 1951, which adopted the following Four Principles of Peace as the union’s fundamental platform: (1) total peace—Nikkyōso objected to the San Francisco Peace Treaty Conference, scheduled for September and boycotted by the Soviet Union, China, and North Korea; (2) complete neutrality of Japan—Japan should have no special relationship with any country; (3) opposition to military bases in Japan, referring to the planned continuation of American military bases on Japanese soil after the signing of the peace treaty; (4) opposition to rearmament—Nikkyōso reacted to the new police
reserve force of 75,000 men and to a threat to revise the Constitution to permit Japan to have an army. The Four Principles of Peace were to be reaffirmed at each successive convention.

At the same convention, Nikkyōso adopted a slogan that has been repeated at each successive convention. “Never send our students to the battlefield again” perpetually reminded delegates of the role of wartime teachers who zealously prepared their students to fight courageously and die for the honor of the Japanese empire. Since a significant number of teachers who had been involved in this indoctrination process had latent feelings of guilt, Nikkyōso’s peace movement during the Korean War appealed to many, especially those who were becoming less interested in economic issues than in the political issues of the day. In the process, the foundation was being laid for a long series of events that took place between 1951 and 1956, during which time Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education gradually polarized their positions until they reached an inevitable confrontation.

The strained relationship between the Ministry and Nikkyōso worsened with the signing of the San Francisco Peace Treaty on September 8, 1951; this treaty set the terminating date of the American Occupation of Japan for April 28, 1952. The Americans had carried out their mandate to demilitarize and democratize Japanese society and education to the best of their ability and were ready to withdraw the machinery of the Occupation government. However, because the Korean War was still being fought and because the Chinese Communists were supporting North Korean Communists with massive ground forces, the Americans qualified their withdrawal from Japan: they positioned a string of military bases throughout the land to defend Japan against external aggression—that is, the threat of communism—as provided in the United States-Japan Security Pact, which took effect the same day as the Peace Treaty.

With the near termination of the American Occupation in 1951, the Japanese government under conservative Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, a stout anti-Communist, began to originate policies for Japan independently of foreign control. The initiative came from the successor to General MacArthur, General Matthew Ridgeway, the new Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. He suggested on May 1 that the Japanese government should officially evaluate American Occupation reforms. SCAP felt that the time had arrived for the Japanese to determine for themselves which Occupation reforms were essential and which ones should be revised, in an atmosphere free
from the fear of censorship should there be criticism of the Occupation. This was the first time since the end of the war that the Japanese enjoyed this immunity. The purpose of the suggestion was to smooth the transition from occupation to independence.

Responding to General Ridgeway’s invitation, the Japanese government, in mid-May 1951, appointed the Committee for the Examination of Occupation Reform Policy (Seirei Kaisei Shimon Iinkai) to evaluate the American Occupation reforms in all sectors of society, including education. The committee consisted of Ishizaka Taizō, president of Tōshiba Electrical Manufacturing Company and the most influential businessman in postwar Japan; Itakura Takuzō, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Jiji Shimpō Newspaper Company; Obama Ritoku, adviser to the Nihon Keizai Shimbun (Japan Economic Newspaper); Hara Yasaburō, president of Nihon Kayaku Company (Japan Chemicals); Kimura Atsutarō, former minister of justice; Maeda Tamon, former minister of education; and Nakayama Ichirō, president of Hitotsubashi University.5

A statement in the introduction to the committee’s report of July 1951, concerning the revision of the education system, laid the framework for ensuing Japanese reforms of the American Occupation education reforms:

The reforms of education after World War II significantly revised the old education system and promoted a democratic system. These revisions, however, were patterned after foreign systems of education, disregarding differences in fundamental characteristics among countries. Accordingly, the occupation reforms must be examined in order to establish a rational education system which meets the prevailing needs of Japan based upon present conditions and characteristics of the nation.6

The report made the following recommendations:

1. The 6–3–3–4 system should be maintained in principle but more flexibility must be provided to meet the needs of the country. Increased provisions for vocational education should be introduced by dividing each level of schooling at the lower and upper secondary schools and the universities into two separate types of institutions, general and vocational.
2. A five-year vocational secondary school should be established including three years of lower secondary and two years of upper secondary school, and/or a five-or six-year vocational college of three years upper secondary school and a two-or three-year college course.
3. The course of study should not be uniform but must be revised for general schools and technical schools.
4. The government should prepare the textbooks.
5. Every prefecture and each city with a population over 150,000 should maintain a school board of three members to supervise local education, appointed by the head of the local government with consent of the assembly.
6. The Minister of Education should be made responsible for educational matters.
7. A Central Advisory Council should be appointed to advise the Minister of Education in the conduct of Japanese education.\(^7\)

The recommendations were accepted by the government as recommendations only. They were important because they represented the first official recommendations by the Japanese government to reform the American Occupation reforms of Japanese education. Throughout the decade of the 1950s, the Japanese government carried out nearly every one of the committee’s proposals, a policy that became a major factor underlying the growing antagonism between the Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso. To the Japanese left wing, it symbolized the “reverse course” of the Japanese government.

While the special committee was making its recommendations to reform the American Occupation reforms, the last of the postwar scholar-ministers of education, Amano Teiyū, became the center of a very serious controversy concerning morals education. Amano, a distinguished Kantian scholar, was attacked for having recommended the reintroduction of morals education into the curriculum, with the emperor as the “center,” setting off a major reaction throughout the leftist camp. In personal correspondence, Amano explained the controversy as follows:

It is true that I favored the reintroduction of morals education. My position was based on the understanding that the purpose of education is to develop human beings. The core of humanity is morality. So it goes without saying that morals education is es-
sential. And in Japan, in particular, where most people are atheistic, morals education is even more important. That is why I urged the reintroduction of morals education into the curriculum.

But it is not true that I advocated the Emperor as the center of morals. This misunderstanding was caused when I replied to the question, “Is there any center for the Japanese people?” (Nihon kokumin ni chūshin ga aru kā?) at a plenary session of the House of Councillors. I answered that the Emperor was an integral part of morals (dōtokuteki chūshin) meaning that he was no longer the political or authoritative center. The reporters wrote that I said the Emperor should be the center of morals (dōtoku no chūshin). I never said that.8

The semantic problem did not blur the fact that the government was contemplating the reintroduction of morals education which had been banned by the American Occupation in 1945 as a course that could be used to inculcate militaristic and ultranationalistic ideology. In reaction to Minister Amano’s policy on morals education and to the special report by the government’s select committee to reform the Occupation reforms, Nikkyōso countered with the following position paper entitled Principles for Japanese Education:

1. The present 6–3–3–4 system should be maintained.
2. The revival of morals education should be opposed.
3. A common curriculum should be continued through the elementary and lower secondary school. Vocational education should be strengthened in regular upper secondary schools only to meet the needs of nonmilitary industry.
4. Members of a Central Advisory Council on Education should be elected at large to reflect the will of the public.
5. Elected boards of education should be established only at the prefectural level and in the five largest cities.
6. Admission tests to upper secondary schools should be abolished and all who desire to enter must be accepted.
7. Textbook screening should be entrusted to the prefectural boards of education, not the Ministry of Education.
8. Eighty percent of compulsory school education expenses and 100 percent of kindergarten and upper secondary school expenses should be borne by the national treasury.9
As it became manifest by 1951 that the government was planning significant changes in educational policy, even though the outburst of criticism against Amano’s plan to reintroduce morals education forced the Ministry of Education to delay action, the extreme left-wing faction within Nikkyōso, which had been sharply reduced but not eliminated during the Red Purge of 1949-1950, reasserted itself. Its first opportunity came unexpectedly when Nikkyōso, at its convention at Kinosaki in May 1951, decided to join the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP). Shortly thereafter, WCOTP invited its member organizations to prepare a teacher’s code of ethics for consideration at its 1951 convention, to be held on Malta. Nikkyōso accepted the invitation and asked four scholars sympathetic to the union’s activities to prepare an initial draft of the code. The four chosen were Miyahara Seiichi, associate professor at Tōkyō University, and Katsuta Morikazu, professor at Gakushūin University, both left-wing activists in the prewar Kyōkaken movement; Sugo Hiroshi, professor at Ochanomizu University; and Yanagida Kenjūrō, formerly from Kyōto University. Several others were consulted later.10

According to Miyahara, this group of scholars accepted Nikkyōso’s request on the condition that the code would be used not merely for the WCOTP Convention but would also be presented to Nikkyōso’s next national convention as the way of life for the Japanese teacher. Upon Nikkyōso’s acceptance of these terms, the scholars devoted their attention primarily to two problems: the “increasingly reactionary policies of the government since the beginning of the Korean War, and the gap between the ideological position of Nikkyōso leaders and [that of] the rank-and-file membership.11

The problem of the hiatus in the political sentiment between Nikkyōso’s leaders and its rank and file had plagued the union executive ever since the founding of Nikkyōso. Miyahara commented on this rift as follows:

One of the major defects of the Union at the beginning was that it was organized primarily at the top by individuals who were politically oriented, rather than from below by the rank and file. Before the Union leaders could instill into the membership the necessary political awareness, that is, that they are educational laborers (kyōiku rōdōsha), the government conducted the Red Purge of local leaders and initiated its reactionary policies. Consequently, the politically aware Union leaders decided to utilize
this opportunity in preparing a code of ethics to promulgate the concept that teachers are laborers throughout the entire teaching corps. This was the background of the Code of Ethics.\textsuperscript{12}

The Code of Ethics drawn up by the four scholars contained a short introduction and ten brief articles with explanations. Nikkyōso declared in a lengthy foreword to the code that:

Conservatives and reactionaries are discussing the reform of the present system of education. Needless to say, the Union and working people are opposed to such a reactionary tendency. It becomes necessary to suppress the teachers if the reactionary forces want to enforce their plans. Nevertheless, we must defend freedom of learning, thought, and education against this dishonest tendency and secure peace and prosperity for our younger generation by guarding the nation against the risk of war. For this we need to have a definite outlook on life and on scientific views of society, and a righteous moral doctrine.... Such terms as “holy profession” ... impede our progress as modern citizens. An outmoded Confucian creed of life still remains as a motto observed by teachers. So long as we adhere consciously or unconsciously to the old morality and ways of thought, we cannot “revolutionize ourselves” if we wish to fulfill our mission. Therefore, we have drawn up this Code of Ethics to lay the foundation for teachers’ actions.\textsuperscript{13}

The code’s ten articles are:

1. Teachers shall work with the youth of the country in fulfilling the tasks of society.
2. Teachers shall fight for equal opportunities in education.
3. Teachers shall protect peace.
4. Teachers shall act on behalf of scientific truth.
5. Teachers shall allow no infringement on freedom in education.
6. Teachers shall seek after proper government.
7. Teachers shall fight side by side with parents against corruption in society and shall create a new culture.
8. Teachers are laborers.
9. Teachers shall defend their right to maintain a minimum standard of living.
10. Teachers shall unite.\textsuperscript{14}
The article that received major attention was the eighth, which stated that teachers are laborers or educational workers (*kyōiku rōdōsha*). The history of this concept in Japan is interesting. It extends back to the proletariat organization of the thirties called the Nihon Kyōiku Rōdō Kumiai (Japan Educational Laborers Union), an illegal left-wing group under Communist influence. After the war, when the organizing unions were seeking rank-and-file support, even the most radical Zenkyō hesitated to use the term *educational laborer* or *labor union* (*rōdōkumiai*) as part of its name, although the leaders employed the concept in their speeches *ad infinitum*, because of the feeling that the average teacher did not yet approve of the political implications.

The first time that the leadership of a teachers’ union felt secure enough to include in its name the term *labor union* was in May 1946, when the radical Zenkyō changed its name to Zen Nihon Kyōiku Rōdō Kumiai (All Japan Educational Labor Union), better known as Zenkyōrō. As the left-wing Zenkyōrō attempted to broaden its membership in order to appeal to a wider clientele, it changed its name again—to Zenkyōso, omitting the word *labor* (*rōdō*). Finally, in June 1947, the several unions merged into the one great union, and the omission of the term *labor union* from the name was conspicuous when the simple designation Nihon Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Japan Teachers Union) was selected by the moderate faction then in control.

Four years later, when Nikkyōso’s famous Code of Ethics for teachers was prepared, the leadership capitalized on the opportunity to declare officially that teachers are educational laborers, in contrast to the prewar ideal concept of teaching as a heavenly mission. Leaders of the union had been proclaiming this ideologically left-wing concept for years, but the specific clause had never been included in any of its declarations. Hence, Nikkyōso’s open identification with it in the Code of Ethics did not come as a surprise to pro-Nikkyōso people. But those opposed to the union pounced upon it as indicative of the unprofessional persuasion of Nikkyōso and of the ideological proclivities of its leaders. Article 8 thus became a symbol of the dispute between the union and the Ministry of Education, which claimed that teaching was a “profession” and that teachers must act accordingly.

During the code-of-ethics controversy, Nikkyōso held its first annual National Education Research Convention (Kyōiku Kenkyū Zenkoku Taikai), in November 1951 at Nikkō. The
theme of the meeting was education for peace under the slogan, “Never send our students to the battlefield again,” consistent with the union’s major emphasis at that time. This convention, with three thousand teachers in attendance, many of whom presented papers before section meetings, resembled a labor union convention rather than an educators’ convention, because regular activists present dwelt on topics remote from the day-to-day activities of the classroom teachers.

The research meetings were developed by the union into annual events, eventually attended by about ten thousand teachers, where full emphasis was placed on topics directly related to education. The regular Nikkyōso convention was then free to give full attention to union matters, which happened to be concentrated on political issues of the day. In effect, the union was sustaining interest on two fronts. The union also established the tradition of inviting a group of twenty to thirty scholars sympathetic to Nikkyōso, called Kōshidan, to serve in an advisory capacity for the education research conventions. This lent a certain degree of academic respectability to Nikkyōso’s entire movement.  

At the regular national convention at Niigata City, in June 1952, Nikkyōso approved the Code of Ethics and firmly established its new orientation, moving more to the left under the slogan, “Fighting Nikkyōso.” It was at this convention that the union adopted its inflexible attitude against a revision of the Constitution to permit rearmament, the presence of any American military bases in Japan, extension of school boards below the prefectural level, and revision of the school-board law. A program of demonstrations, hunger strikes, and sit-ins was planned to support the campaign. By advocating the overthrow of the Japanese government’s dictatorship and the establishment of a government for the workers, this convention got Nikkyōso more deeply involved in political controversy.

The American Occupation of Japan came to an end on April 28, 1952, after a total of six years, eight months, and fourteen days. The victorious American army had entered Japan in 1945 amidst a calm but tense atmosphere following the collapse of the Japanese military government. They departed more than six years later, leaving a nation run by a democratically elected government but in the throes of internal agitation and violence. The degree of violence and the number of strikes and demonstrations had turned upward beginning in 1951, ironically coinciding with general economic improvements. The culmination came on Bloody May Day, in 1952, four days after the Oc-
cupation ended. Nevertheless, the Americans considered their interlude in Japan successful, trusting that democratic roots had been planted sufficiently deep so that dissent could be expressed without destroying the democratic forms of society and government.

One of the very first episodes between the government and Japanese labor during the transition period from Occupation to independence concerned the Subversives Activities Prevention Law (Hakai Katsudō Bōshi Hō), a bill to replace the American Occupation’s Organizations Control Ordinance, originally aimed at controlling Communist violence. Sōhyō, the new moderate General Council of Trade Unions, which was originated in 1950 to offset Communist hegemony of the labor union movement, led the opposition to this bill. The government claimed that the purpose of the bill was to “prescribe necessary actions to control organizations which shall have carried on any terrorist subversive activities, thereby contributing to the securing of public safety.” Sōhyō, heavily influenced by Nikkyōso, interpreted the bill as an attempt to “revive the old detested Peace Preservation Laws which suppressed all democratic activities in prewar Japan.”

Two people were killed and dozens wounded in the Bloody May Day demonstrations of 1952, as police fired on thousands of angry demonstrators surging around the Imperial Palace Plaza in Tōkyō, overturning and burning cars. Coming only several days after Japan achieved independence, this incident prompted the government to press for the bill’s enactment. At the very time of the debate, there were riots all over the country, led by left-wing protestors against the United States-Japan Security Pact and the American military bases in Japan. Police were entering university campuses, searching for leaders of Zengakuren, the left-wing student association, thus thrusting campus autonomy as an additional issue into the controversy over the bill. Nevertheless, the Subversive Activities Prevention Law was finally pushed through the Upper House on July 3, 1952.

Hostility between the government and the labor movement over this episode resulted in a hardening of attitudes by Sōhyō and its intellectual leaders from Nikkyōso, quickly turning Sōhyō’s orientation from an anti-Communist organization, its original purpose, into a left-wing antigovernment labor council. At the same time, the government called for the first general elections since independence for October; three months after the controversial Subversive Activities Prevention Law was
passed. The two conservative parties won a resounding victory, with a combined total of nearly 70 percent of the seats, while the Communist party, which was generally blamed for the violence, lost all of the 22 seats it previously had held in the Diet.\footnote{The first major direct confrontation between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education after independence involved the 1952 school-board elections. The original plan in 1948 was to extend gradually the school-board system from the level of prefectures and large cities down to the village level; such an extension meant an increase of nearly ten thousand boards. Nikkyōso, which initially supported this plan in 1948, opposed it just prior to the school-board elections in 1952 because the leaders concluded that the local conservative establishment would monopolize the boards. The Ministry of Education had opposed the extension in 1948 as representing a much too rapid decentralization of education.}

The school-board extension to the local level had developed into a highly controversial issue by 1951. Nikkyōso, supported by the Socialist party, much of the press, and even some government officials, opposed the plan, which was scheduled to go into effect automatically based on previous legislation. During the union’s ninth national convention in May 1952, at Niigata, a resolution was passed opposing school boards below the prefectural level.

Meanwhile, the Yoshida government pressed forward with the original plan, presumably, according to Permanent Vice-Minister of Education Hidaka Daishirō, “as a countermove against the Japan Teachers Union, believing that conservatives would dominate the new local boards and thus check the influence of the Union in the prefectural boards of education.”\footnote{The Ministry of Education was particularly anxious to have local conservative forces control local appointments of teachers, thereby reducing the power of prefectural boards of education where Nikkyōso was notably successful in the 1950 school-board elections. The union assessed the extension of school boards to the local level in exactly the same way as did the government, that is, as a means to restrict union influence, much to the consternation of the Americans who had placed great faith in the boards to democratize Japanese education.}

Nikkyōso conducted daily demonstrations in front of the Diet building when a bill to postpone the school-board expansion was under consideration. But the government elected to delay the vote until the next session of the Diet. During the interval, Minister of Education Amano Teiyū resigned on
August 12, 1952, terminating the postwar tradition of having a succession of scholar-ministers. His successor, Okano Kiyotake, former president of Sanwa Bank, was appointed on August 26, just two days before Prime Minister Yoshida dissolved the Diet for new elections. The bill to postpone the extension of school boards to the local level was consequently not brought before the Diet. This turn of events opened the way for earlier legislation authorizing local school boards to take effect automatically. The nationwide school-board elections, involving 80 additional cities and 9,600 towns and villages, was set for October 5, 1952.

Let us go back two years to trace the development of the matter of school boards. The government’s favorable attitude toward the principle of local school boards, where conservative forces could be a dominant factor, can be explained by an overall review of Nikkyōso’s political successes. For example, in the 1950 prefectural school-board elections, Nikkyōso won a total of 66 seats, a rather remarkable feat coming as it did during the Red Purge, when Nikkyōso was under attack for its left-wing activities. In the 1950 House of Councillors election, 8 Nikkyōso members made successful bids. Nikkyōso was also instrumental in electing 10 of the 46 governors and 150 candidates to the assemblies, including 84 union members in the 1951 prefectural elections.

To promote Nikkyōso’s political campaigns and to separate the union legally from a political organization, it formed the Nihon Kyōshokuin Seiji Renmei (Japan Teachers Political League), in April 1951, to manage its political campaigns. In July 1952, the organization was strengthened when the name was changed to Nihon Minshū Seiji Renmei (Japan Democratic Education Political League), known as Nisseiren, and the first Nikkyōso chairman, Araki Shōzaburō, was appointed head of the organization.

Nisseiren, with a branch located at each level of Nikkyōso’s organization, managed the union’s political campaigns from 1952. Its success in the 1952 general elections was pronounced. Eight of 15 candidates for the Upper House and 38 candidates for the Lower House, supported by Nisseiren and others sympathetic to Nikkyōso’s policies, were elected, constituting a bloc of 46 representatives, all related to Nikkyōso in the nation’s supreme legislative organ. From the very beginning, only Socialists were endorsed. The growing success of the union at the polls, in part as a result of the zealous efforts by activist
teachers to win the votes of parents of their students, caused much anguish in the ranks of the ruling conservative party of the government.

The school-board controversy was intensified when the government appointed Okano to replace Amano on August 12, 1952; Okano was the first postwar politician to assume the position of minister of education, breaking the tradition of having scholars as ministers of education. The contention between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education over this appointment became a major issue in the Japanese educational world for the next decade.

The government’s position concerning Okano’s controversial appointment was summed up years later by the then permanent vice-minister of education, the Honorable Naitō Takasaburō. He explained that, since education is part of the ruling party’s overall responsibility to the nation, it was essential that a party man be responsible for carrying out the party’s educational policy—not a scholar-minister who was unrelated to political parties—and that the minister should also be influential within the party in order to win approval of his policies. In addition, he should be capable of presenting effectively and forcefully the party’s policies to the public. To support his point, Naitō mentioned Prime Minister Yoshida, who at first approved of scholar-ministers but very shortly came to realize that without a political base they were powerless within the party as well as before the public. For this reason, all ministers of education from Minister Okano on were selected from the ranks of party politicians.24

Such justifications notwithstanding, Nikkyōso escalated its campaign against the government, charging the conservative party with subverting education into the arena of partisan politics. The Communist group within Nikkyōso capitalized on these developments to exert gradually increasing influence. Even though Nikkyōso was administered during the transition from Occupation to independence by a moderate chairman, Oka Saburō, who, in his own words, “constantly strove to keep our movement away from Communist influence,”25 the extreme left-wing faction strengthened its position within the union as the government escalated its opposition to Nikkyōso.

Minister Okano, the first minister of education to brand Nikkyōso as an enemy of the Ministry of Education, immediately plunged into the conflict by supporting the expansion of school boards to the local level and by proposing a plan in September 1952 to differentiate teachers’ salaries according to three levels
of schooling. Salaries of compulsory school teachers, that is, teachers of students up to and including the ninth grade, were to be set at a lower level than salaries of teachers of upper secondary school students. University teachers were to be paid at the highest level.

The announcement about salaries exacerbated a smoldering antagonism within Nikkyōso between the vast majority of compulsory school teachers and the minority of upper secondary school teachers, which had its beginning in August 1950 when the upper secondary school teachers from Hokkaidō, Akita, Yamanashi, and Iwate prefectures formed a splinter group in March 1951—the moderate Zen Nihon Kōtōgakkō Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Japan High School Teachers Union) called Zenkōkyō. The issue first revolved around the priorities of Nikkyōso, which emphasized economic demands primarily of compulsory school teachers to the neglect of those of the upper secondary school teachers, who came from the old prestigious upper middle schools. Nikkyōso’s policy to unify all teachers into one body failed to distinguish the special role the old upper secondary schools and their teachers had played in prewar Japan.

Despite ill feelings, Zenkōkyō maintained formal contact with Nikkyōso through its left-wing faction. But the ministry’s plan to differentiate teachers’ salaries struck a sensitive chord in the already deteriorating relationship between Zenkōkyō and Nikkyōso. A moderate faction within Zenkōkyō shortly thereafter opposed maintaining any contacts with Nikkyōso, eventually splitting it into two separate hostile divisions. In 1952 Zenkōkyō approved Minister Okano’s plan to establish a graduated salary system while Nikkyōso vehemently opposed it. Nikkyōso charged that the government was implementing a new salary scheme to divide the teachers’ movement by appealing to Zenkōkyō and unaligned upper secondary school teachers in order to weaken Nikkyōso. When the new salary system went into effect in 1953, a total of twenty-five prefectoral upper secondary school teachers’ organizations, comprising a membership of about one-third of all the teachers at that level in Nikkyōso, split off from Nikkyōso to join Zenkōkyō. These teachers claimed that since their work was more specialized and they had more educational preparation than did the elementary and lower secondary school teachers, their salaries should be higher.26

Nikkyōso, finally accepting the inevitability of the schoolboard expansion, scheduled for October 1952, decided to coordinate sympathetic PTAs and other related organizations into a
campaign to capture as many seats as possible in the elections so that “reactionaries cannot control the new boards.” Based on their success in the 1950 elections, the leaders realized that their best chance remained with prefectural boards of education. It was in the 1950 election that Nikkyōso candidates had won about one-third of the seats, provoking the Yoshida government to extend the school boards to the local level in the hope of curtailing Nikkyōso’s strength at the prefectural level.

Nikkyōso’s aim in 1952 was to gain as many seats as possible at the local level in an attempt to influence local school boards and local heads of government to entrust educational matters to the prefectural school boards where the union had significant representation and influence. The results of the 1952 school-board election further annoyed the government. Nikkyōso candidates won approximately 35 percent of the prefectural school-board seats, including one seat out of five in Tōkyō, and an estimated 30 percent at the local level.

During the school-board controversy, the government was charged with a major revision of the Ministry of Education Establishment Law. Article 4 of the original law of 1949 stipulated that the Ministry of Education should be the administrative agency for providing professional and technical advice to boards of education, that it should prepare drafts of laws concerning minimum standards of education, and that it should prepare the budget for national funds for education. On August 30, 1952, in addition to several internal administrative adjustments, Article 4 was changed to read that “the Ministry has the duty to promote school education, social education (adult), and culture, and assumes responsibility to carry out the administrative business concerning the above.”

Nikkyōso attacked this revision as reactionary and reminiscent of prewar Japanese education. The revision in fact did not change the relationship between the Ministry of Education and the school boards, which could, and often did, ignore the wishes of the Ministry. In other words, the 1952 revision did not give the Ministry new compulsory powers as charged by Nikkyōso.

The years 1953 and 1954 can be looked upon as a period of rapid escalation in the struggles between the Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso, culminating in 1954 in the twin laws on the political neutrality of teachers. This controversy began with the appointment of the first Central Advisory Council on Education in January 1953, as provided for in the revision of the Ministry of Education Establishment Law of 1952. Nikkyōso took strong issue with several of the fifteen appointments, in-
cluding Ishikawa Ichirō, president of the powerful Federation of Economic Organizations; Fujiyama Aichirō, president of the Japan Chamber of Commerce; and Moroi Kanichi, head of the Kantō Employers’ Association. The union claimed that the Central Advisory Council was biased, favoring Japanese capitalism. Nikkyōso also opposed the appointment to the council of Amano Teiyū, former minister of education, who was embroiled in the controversy over the return of morals education. The government argued that it had balanced the composition of the council with men like Dr. Yanaibara, distinguished president of Tōkyō University.

Another matter that did not help the poor relationship between Nikkyōso and the Ministry was the Ministry’s announcement on January 17, 1953, of the government’s plan to alter the system of national subsidies for local teachers’ salaries. At that time, salaries originated equally from the national treasury and the prefectural treasury, although the Ministry of Education provided large subsidies to the prefectures through an equalization grant from the national treasury. Minister Okano drafted a bill providing that all teachers’ salaries be paid from the national treasury, thereby changing the status of local civil servants to national civil servants; in effect, teachers were being returned to the status they had held prior to the 1950 Local Public Service Law. The Ministry of Finance objected to this bill on the grounds that it would place a heavy burden on the national budget. On the other hand, the National Association of Prefectural Governors supported it.

Naitō Takasaburō, then serving in the Ministry of Education as chief of the General Affairs Section, explained the reasoning behind Minister Okano’s controversial proposal. He said that teachers in national schools were considered national public servants. As such, their political rights were severely restricted. In fact, the only political right national public servants enjoyed was the right to vote. The large majority of teachers, however, were local civil servants who could participate in political activities outside the district in which they were employed. Minister Okano’s goal was to render all teachers national public servants (kokka kōmuin) by having their full salaries paid from the national treasury; teachers then would be subject to all political restrictions prescribed for national public servants.

Nikkyōso planned massive demonstrations, including coordinated nationwide leave-taking for March 12, 1953, the final day for deliberating the teachers’ salary bill in the Diet. Several days before that date, Prime Minister Yoshida, in a fit of exas-
operation over an unrelated issue, called a member from the opposition party a “stupid fool” (bakayarō) during a Diet session. A non-confidence motion was passed against Yoshida, then engaged in a struggle to retain the prime ministership; his position was threatened by former conservative leader Hatoyama Ichirō, who had been recently “depurged.” Yoshida dissolved the session and called for new elections, upon which Nikkyōso called off the general strike. Nevertheless, 300 members of Nikkyōso began a hunger strike on March 11, and 15,000 teachers of the Tōkyō branch of the union walked out of their classrooms at 1 P.M. on March 12 to march in front of the Diet building to protest the pending bill.

In the general elections in April, Prime Minister Yoshida’s party was returned to power but with a reduced margin due to the split with Hatoyama, while the number of successful Nikkyōso candidates dropped from 38 to 22. The new cabinet, which decided not to bring the controversial salary plan before the Diet again, was installed on May 19. Among the new cabinet members was Odachi Shigeo, one of the most controversial ministers of education in postwar Japan.

Odachi, a former official of the prewar Ministry of Home Affairs (Naimushō), the most powerful segment of bureaucracy in pre-1945 Japan, controlling as it did local government, local education, and the national police, immediately came under attack for his wartime actions as mayor of Singapore during the infamous Japanese occupation of that city. Odachi was also accused of replacing with prewar Ministry of Home Affairs officials many Ministry of Education officials, who had been employed during the American Occupation to replace purged officials. In fact, it has been established that a number of officials resigned from the Ministry of Education around this period partly as a result of the moves to bring the Ministry under the control of the political party in power. But, according to the then chief of the General Affairs Section of the Ministry of Education, who also resigned in 1953, only two former Ministry of Home Affairs officials were brought in at this time, including Odachi’s former assistant in Singapore and his permanent vice-minister of education. Most of the other replacements were former Ministry of Education officials who had been purged between 1946 and 1947 and “depurged” between 1950 and 1951.

Odachi was now confronted with Kobayashi Takeshi, a quiet Socialist of moderate political persuasion, who was elected Nikkyōso chairman at the tenth national convention in Ujiyamada City. Kobayashi succeeded Oka Saburō, who was
elected to the House of Councillors in the general elections of April 1953, in the tradition of the first Nikkyōso chairman, Araki Shōzaburō. In that election, Nikkyōso’s candidates won a total of 9 seats in the Lower House and 13 in the Upper House, a marked reduction from the total of 46 in the previous election.39

The Nikkyōso convention at Ujiyamada revealed an open conflict between the left-wing and moderate factions within Nikkyōso. The radicals submitted several motions against the more moderate policies of the outgoing executive—Oka Saburō, chairman, and Miyanohara Sadamitsu, secretary general—protesting the moderates’ relatively mild opposition to the Ministry of Education in recent campaigns. All non-confidence motions were defeated. However, the moderates’ narrow margin of victory, less than two-thirds of the votes cast, provided new evidence that left-wing influence was growing, particularly as its leader, Hiragaki Miyoji, replaced Miyanohara as secretary general, balancing the moderate president, Kobayashi. The rivalry between Hiragaki and Miyanohara, which eventually shook Nikkyōso to its foundations, had its beginning in this election at Ujiyamada.

During the beginning of the new school year in April 1953, two events occurred which further revealed the growing strength of the leftist group within Nikkyōso in reaction to the government’s attempt to curtail left-wing activities of teachers. Nikkyōso distributed a pamphlet at the beginning of the new semester in April entitled To the New Teachers (Atarashii Kyōin ni Natta Hitobito ni), in which the statement was made that 10 percent of the Japanese people were capitalists and that the remainder were poor. The imbalance was attributed to the prevailing social system. Nikkyōso then went on record as opposing Japanese capitalists and the ruling conservative party:

Because of the subservient relationship between the United States Government and the Japanese Government during the Occupation, the Japanese Government finds itself unable to break this dependency even after independence. A good example of this relationship is manifest in our government’s agreement to produce military goods for the American-Korean War. The Japanese Government has become a death merchant. This policy is extremely dangerous.

In order to accomplish its policy, the government is attempting to restrict the freedom of the people by resorting to police force to suppress meetings, speeches and thought of those who understand the evils of the government’s policies. Our gov-
ernment is deceiving the common people through newspapers and the mass media. In addition, the government is exploiting education to conceal this dangerous policy. We teachers who are members of the Union do not think the same way as Japanese capitalists. Accordingly we oppose the government from the standpoint of a class struggle.\textsuperscript{40}

The government naturally took strong issue with the pamphlet. Shortly thereafter in 1953, before this controversy subsided, the \textit{Yamaguchi Diary} case captured the nation’s attention. The Yamaguchi Prefectural Teachers Union, a branch of Nikkyōso, had compiled and edited excerpts from students’ summer compositions related to the union’s peace education, a plank in the policy adopted at the Nikkyōso convention in 1952 in Niigata. The publications were in the form of workbooks with commentaries passed out to each elementary and secondary school student in Yamaguchi Prefecture at the beginning of the school year in April.

Several of the provocative passages from the workbooks are given in the following:

Some Japanese compare the Soviet Union with a thief claiming that we must fasten our doors securely locking that country out in order to keep the thief away from the house. They argue that securing our doors is the same as rearmament. Is this really true? These people then spend more and more money buying a large lock on the front door but the burglars haven’t yet come. While we concentrate on making the lock on the front door bigger and more secure, we left the back door wide open and a decent gentleman (the United States) came in wearing muddy shoes and took 806 valuables (American military installations in Japan) out of the house. But the Japanese people didn’t even notice it. Now, who is really the thief?\textsuperscript{41}

North Korea and South Korea both wanted to unite their divided land into a unified Korean nation. Both governments wanted to become the head of the new government. Most people thought the workers’ country, North Korea, was the better of the two but Syngman Rhee of South Korea did not agree. With American help, South Korea attacked North Korea several times but was beaten back on each occasion. Finally, on June 25, 1950,
North Korea chased South Korea deep into her own territory after the South had attacked the North. This is how the Korean War began.42

The first aim of socialism is to attain the happiness of laborers and farmers. It is diametrically opposite to capitalism. Capitalists who own the factories make their profits through exploiting laborers by paying them low salaries and paying low prices to farmers for their rice. Now, what is the difference between Russia, a socialist country, and Japan and the United States, capitalist countries?43

In June 1953, the Iwakuni Municipal Board of Education in Yamaguchi Prefecture banned the publications as “undesirable” on grounds that they were politically biased. The Yamaguchi Prefectural Board of Education supported the local board’s decision and banned the publications throughout the prefecture. The Iwakuni Teachers Union immediately attacked the action by the prefectural board as suppression of Nikkyōso’s peace-education policy. Nikkyōso was then in the midst of its tenth national convention. It was reported that the union’s national leaders were unaware of the publications until the case came under public attack in Iwakuni.44 Nevertheless, a resolution was quickly passed by the convention in support of the Iwakuni chapter. The school board’s decision prevailed.

The tenth national convention revealed the extent to which Nikkyōso had become involved in political issues outside the field of education as the left-wing group inexorably strengthened its position. The convention concentrated on issues of Japanese rearmament, American imperialism, and American military bases in Japan. The Iwakuni incident fit neatly into the picture since Iwakuni was the site of an American air base under the provisions of the Japan-United States Security Pact. In addition to the decision to support the local Iwakuni teachers against the school board in the Diary case, the convention voted to launch a movement against all American bases in Japan and to sponsor the production of a film entitled Hiroshima, which turned out to be a controversial anti-American production.

The emphasis on political and ideological issues epitomized by the Yamaguchi Diary case proved to be costly for Nikkyōso. A large number of members withdrew from the Yamaguchi Prefectural Teachers Union, resulting in a reduction of membership
from 10,000 to only 4,000, including the loss of many principals of elementary and lower secondary schools. A year later, those teachers who had rejected Nikkyōso formed a new union called the Prefectural Federation of Teachers, the first group of teachers to be formed in opposition to Nikkyōso since March 1951, when the upper secondary school teachers split off to form an independent organization. Similarly, smaller groups of teachers who had dropped out from the union, for example the 800 teachers from the Shimonoseki City branch, also formed independent local unions in opposition to the political activities of Nikkyōso.

The government became increasingly alarmed by the activities of left-wing teachers within Nikkyōso. At a press conference on August 30, Minister of Education Odachi expressed official concern, stating that if the government finds that political neutrality of education is being violated by teachers, countermeasures, including legislation, must be taken to maintain that neutrality.45 A week later the government announced the preparation of legislation to prohibit political activities of teachers both in and out of the classroom. The proposed legislation for the preservation of political neutrality of education thus became the next major source of contention between Nikkyōso and the government.

Solidifying the government’s determination to pass special legislation to curb the political activities of teachers was the Asahigaoka case, which received widespread publicity in late 1953 and early 1954.46 On December 15, 1953, a delegation of parents from the Asahigaoka Lower Secondary School, Kyōto, submitted a formal complaint to the superintendent of education, charging that teachers were incorporating Communist-oriented material in their teachings. Specifically, they charged that mathematics and science teachers, during their regular classes, were opposing Japanese rearmament and the presence of American military bases in Japan by attacking the Peace Treaty, the Japan-United States Security Pact, and the Yoshida government. Teachers were accused of reading to their classes long passages from the Akahata (Red Flag), the Japan Communist party newspaper. The parents also charged that propaganda films emphasizing the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were being shown at school. Children, it was claimed, were taught to sing the “Internationale.”

The Asahigaoka area was a new middle-class suburb of Kyōto, where a number of white-collar workers, university professors, and intellectuals lived. Therefore, in the area there was
a high proportion of families with progressive political views, to the extent that one of the local assemblymen had run successfully on the Communist party ticket. Supported by the Kyōto City branch of the Kyōto Prefectural Teachers Union, famous as one of the most militant organizations within the teachers’ movement, the local progressive elite had united to make the Asahigaoka School a center for “peace education.”

The Kyōto School Board of five members included two conservatives from the Yoshida party and two left-wing Socialists supported by Nikkyōso. The fifth member, a conservative, was away on a grant in the United States at the time that the Asahigaoka case was first brought under review. The superintendent, also a conservative, was placed in a unique position since the board was deadlocked. The superintendent had already been involved in endless conflict on other matters with the powerful Kyōto City Teachers Union; the Asahigaoka case compounded his problems.

At the beginning of the new school year in April, the superintendent, acting within his prerogative, ordered that the three teachers who were leading the leftist campaign at the Asahigaoka Lower Secondary School be transferred to three other schools. This method of removing and dividing ringleaders was—and still is—a common method used by local education authorities in dealing with a hard core of leftist teachers in any school. In this case, the three teachers returned their orders to the superintendent’s office and continued teaching at the Asahigaoka School. The superintendent, planning next to dismiss the three teachers, called the fifth school-board member home from America since it was necessary to get the full board’s approval for outright dismissals. The case developed into a nationwide spectacle as both Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education sent their representatives to Kyōto to investigate the case and support their respective sides.

On May 5, the full school board met and, predictably, in a vote of 3 to 2, approved the dismissals, which were in turn immediately rejected by the teachers. The superintendent officially closed the school. The three teachers and their supporters representing the majority of the faculty responded by raising red flags over the school and continuing to conduct classes. They confined the school principal to his office for the next two days amidst general confusion. Finally, at a mass meeting, the principal was forced to resign.
The superintendent then announced that classes would be held at a different location, and on May 11 temporary classes were begun in another building. Local public feelings ran very high as teachers and parents attempted to induce children to attend one of the two schools. On the first day 819 children were transported in twenty buses to the temporary school, while 893 attended the Asahigaoka School under teacher control. On the second day, more than 1,000 students showed up for classes at the officially approved school. As more and more children left the non-official school, the local branch of Nikkyōso finally announced, at the end of a week, that their school was closing.47

The Asahigaoka Lower Secondary School was officially reopened shortly thereafter with an entirely new faculty. The three teachers had been formally dismissed. Nikkyōso appealed their case to the Kyōto District Court on the grounds that the superintendent had failed to give the teachers a full and complete hearing. The District Court upheld the school board’s decision, and the Osaka Higher Court upheld the lower court’s verdict. Nikkyōso then took the case directly to the Supreme Court, which referred it back to the Osaka Higher Court, where it lay pending.48

In the meantime, the government was maneuvering to restrict political activities of teachers. The process proved more difficult than expected. The first step involved an investigation of the political activities of teachers by the Ministry’s Central Advisory Committee. Interpreting this move as another Red Purge, Nikkyōso accused the government of instructing police and superintendents of education to search for cases of politically biased teaching and report them to the government. The committee was divided over its findings. The majority of the committee members, claiming that Nikkyōso functioned like a political party, recommended legislative action; the minority, led by the president of Tōkyō University, Dr. Yanaibara, and by former scholar-minister of education, Maeda Tamon, opposed legislation, arguing that the new Japanese Constitution guaranteed freedom of political expression.49

Minister of Education Odachi approved the committee’s majority opinion. The government subsequently drew up its so-called twin laws on political neutrality, designed to make it illegal to teach or incite to teach in any manner contrary to Article 10 of the Fundamental Law of Education, which states that “education shall not be subject to improper control, but it shall be directly responsible to the whole people.” Support-
ing the government’s position was Tanaka Kōtarō, one of the first postwar ministers of education and later chief justice of the Supreme Court. He reasoned that Article 6 of the same Fundamental Law provided the “legal framework for the ethics of the teaching profession.” This article states that “teachers ... shall be servants of the whole community,” which he interpreted to mean that “the political neutrality of public servants will be maintained.”

One of the twin bills for the political neutrality of education was called The Law to Revise the Special Law for Public Service Education Personnel (Kyōiku Kōmuin Tokurei Hō no Ichibu o Kaisei suru Hōritsu An). The Special Law under revision was originally passed in 1949; it classified teachers as either national or local public servants. Since there was no local civil service law to regulate the newly classified local teachers at that time, Article 21, Clause 3, of the 1949 law stipulated that “local civil servants, for the time being, would continue to be bound by Article 102 of the National Public Service Law,” which restricted the political activities of national public servants to voting only.

When the Local Public Service Law was finally passed in 1950, the clause “for the time being” in the 1949 bill was superseded, and local public servants then came under the provisions of the new law. Article 36 of the 1950 Local Public Service Law also restricted the political activities of local teachers to voting, but only within the district where they were employed. Outside the district of employment, teachers had the same rights to participate fully in all political activities as did the average citizen.

The bill introduced in 1954 was designed to revise Article 21, Clause 3, of the 1949 law to read: “Political activities of teachers in local schools, for the time being, and disregarding Article 36 of the Local Public Service Law, will be bound by the political restrictions of the National Public Service Law.” In other words, teachers of local schools would be subject to the same restrictions as teachers in national schools; that is, they would not be permitted to participate anywhere in political activities, except voting, even outside their districts. Thus, those teachers serving in the national executive of Nikkyōso in Tōkyō, away from their local districts, would no longer be able to participate in any political activities except voting.

The second of the twin bills was called the Law for the Temporary Measures to Preserve Political Neutrality in Compulsory School Education (Gimu Kyōiku Shōgakkō ni okeru Kyōiku no Seijiteki Chūritsu no Kakuho ni Kansuru Rinji Shochi Hō). This
short bill contained five articles. The key clause was found in Article 3, which stipulated that “no one or no organization may instigate or incite teachers or students of compulsory education to support or oppose a political party or political activity.” Article 4 set punishment at one year’s imprisonment or 30,000 yen for violation of this law.

Nikkyōso’s Central Executive Committee met immediately to plan united action against the political neutrality legislation, which could destroy Nikkyōso’s strikingly successful political machinery that functioned on all levels from the village school boards to the Diet. On February 24, the bills were introduced in the Diet and on March 1 the Education Committee began hearings. By this time, considerable interest had been generated over the bills, with a significant number of individuals and national organizations opposing them. For example, Rōyama Masamichi, one of the most respected political scientists in the nation, argued that the laws ignored the concept originally stated in the Fundamental Law of Education that education must be kept free of government control.

The government placed before the Education Committee twenty-four examples of allegedly biased political teachings, including the Yamaguchi and the Asahigaoka cases. A third case involved the submission of a petition from parents at the Daishōgun Elementary School in Kyōto, claiming that teachers taught the students to despise the Japanese flag and the imperial family and advised them not to listen to the Japanese national anthem, which Nikkyōso claimed was a glorification of the emperor. Nikkyōso charged that the evidence was fabricated and that, in certain cases, the schools mentioned in the examples did not even exist.

Nikkyōso then staged a most provocative act to focus nationwide attention on its opposition to the political-neutrality bills. The union decided to hold simultaneous Safeguard Education Rallies of all its members on Monday, March 15, 1954, to defend its peace-education program. In place of regular classes on Monday, Nikkyōso unilaterally declared that the nation’s schools would be open on Sunday, March 14, for students and parents; and Monday would be a school holiday. The Ministry of Education immediately branded the action illegal.

There was great confusion among parents throughout the nation whether children—and parents—should attend school on Sunday. Similar confusion was witnessed among rank-and-file teachers who were forced to decide whether to abide by Nikkyōso’s plan or to heed the Ministry’s warning. The day
passed peacefully. Varying conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the union’s scheme were reported. One newspaper estimated that 70 percent of all classes were called off on Monday, when teachers met to discuss the imbroglio. The union claimed that in 5 of the 46 prefectures more than 50 percent of Nikkyōso members attended the rallies on Monday and held classes on Sunday. In 28 prefectures, more than 38 percent of the membership followed instructions. In the remaining 13 prefectures, Nikkyōso members conducted rallies on Sunday and held regular classes on Monday. The union claimed a great victory in “shocking the authorities, who were trying to control education, by demonstrating that educational initiative lay with the teachers.”

The union’s claim was accurate. The government, incensed with Nikkyōso’s Sunday classes, forced its legislation through the House of Representatives on March 26, by a vote of 256 to 137 amidst fistfighting in the chamber. The opposition was intensified by the United States-Japan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement, which was being reviewed in the Diet at that time. Under this agreement, the United States was to provide significant aid for the purchase of military equipment for the Japanese forces.

The issue of Japanese rearmament had been magnified several months earlier when Richard Nixon as vice-president of the United States visited Japan and made the famous statement that the United States, miscalculating Soviet intentions, had erred in eliminating Japanese military forces after the war. He suggested to the Japanese that they should strengthen their military position. Other bills were under consideration also in the Diet, such as the controversial bill aimed at changing the National Safety Force—the former Police Reserves—into Self-Defense Forces and bills aimed at strengthening the prefectural police system. Consequently, legislation concerning the political activities of teachers became inextricably involved in broader national and international issues.

Attention then turned to the Upper House of Councillors. Nikkyōso was divided in its plans for action because of some unfavorable reaction from among the membership over the Sunday-class episode. The left-wing demanded mass leave-taking while the moderate wing advocated a short hunger strike to publicize Nikkyōso’s protest. The latter prevailed.

There was considerable political jockeying in the Upper House over the twin bills concerning the political neutrality of education. Fortuitously, the chairman of the Education Com-
mittee of the Upper House was a member of the Ryokufūkai, a club whose membership included over forty representatives. Some of them were independent from regular political parties, for example Tanaka Kōtarō and Takase Sōtarō, both former scholar-ministers of education during the American Occupation, and others were in the left wing of the conservative parties. In order to reduce the severity of the penal provisions, the Ryokufūkai, claiming that criminal punishment for teachers who were politically active was entirely too strong, attached an amendment to the bill revising the Special Law for Public Education Personnel. The amendment added a clause to Article 21 stipulating that teachers in public schools who violate the political restrictions listed therein would not be subject to the regular penal provisions of imprisonment of less than three years or a fine of less than 100,000 yen. This critical revision would automatically change criminal punishment (keiji-batsu)—that is, on the initiative of the police—to administrative punishment (gyōseibatsu); and it would thus eliminate police initiative in local educational affairs.

In order to appreciate fully and clearly the simple but enormously significant modifications proposed by the Ryokufūkai to the 1954 legislation, the pertinent clauses of the original and revised versions of the law are juxtaposed in the following:

### SPECIAL LAW FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION PERSONNEL

**Article 21 [The Ministry of Education’s Interpretation of the Original Version, 1949]**

The political activities of teachers in public schools will be governed by the political restrictions contained in the National Public Service Law. [Article 102 of the National Public Service Law restricts political activities of national public servants to voting only, with penal provisions of less than three years’ imprisonment and less than 100,000 yen in violation thereof.]

**Article 21 Section 3, Part 1 [Revision proposed by the Japanese government and adopted in 1954]**

The political activities of teachers in locally maintained schools, for the time being, and disregarding Article 36 of the Local Public Service Law [Restricts political activities of teachers exclusively to voting, within district of employment area]
only] will continue to be governed by the political restrictions contained in the National Public Service Law.\textsuperscript{62}

Article 21 Section 3, Part 2 [Amendment proposed by the Ryokufūkai and adopted in 1954]

The penal provisions in the National Public Service Law will not be applicable to teachers who violate the political restrictions contained in the National Public Service Law.\textsuperscript{63}

A second last-minute revision maneuvered by the Ryokufūkai was to add the words \textit{for the purpose of} in Clause III of the Law for the Temporary Measures to Preserve Political Neutrality in Compulsory School Education. The revised statement read: “No one or no organization may take action for the purpose of instigating or inciting teachers or students at the compulsory education level to support or oppose a political party or political activity.”\textsuperscript{64} Again, the purpose of this amendment was to soften the original provisions of the bill by changing the phrase “instigate and incite to support or oppose a political party or political activity” to “for the purpose of instigating and inciting....”

Although Nikkyōso and the government were opposed to the diluted versions of the bills, both sides eventually accepted both amendments; and the bills became laws at the end of May. The significance of the amendments is crucial, for the revised versions were ineffective from the point of view of the government. In fact, as far as can be determined, the provisions of these two bills have never been applied, even though their restrictions have been clearly violated on many occasions. Proving intent has made it so difficult to prosecute a case that no school board has ever undertaken the effort—the defendant can claim his “purpose” was not political but educational. And removal of the criminal penal provisions has rendered the other bill useless.

The first test of the political-neutrality laws came just over a month after their passage. On July 7, 1954, a journal of the Public Employees Union (Kankōrō), whose nominal publisher was a Nikkyōso teacher from a secondary school in Chiba Prefecture serving in the capacity of secretariat of Kankōrō, published statements such as “Let’s overthrow the scandalous Yoshida cabinet and cause the Diet to dissolve immediately.”\textsuperscript{65} Minister of Education Odachi called the publication to the attention of the Chiba Prefectural Board of Education as a vio-
lation of the new political-neutrality laws. He publicly charged that “some if not all of the 500,000 teachers in the country are deliberately and systematically conducting such a type of education as to help destroy the present social order. Nikkyōso is utilizing every opportunity to conduct an education designed to destroy the existing social order as a necessary step toward an ultimate revolution.”

The Chiba Board of Education undertook an investigation and concluded that there was no justification for prosecuting this case under the political-neutrality laws. Nikkyōso interpreted the board’s conclusion as proper, exemplifying democracy in action: a publicly elected board of education had withstood pressure from the reactionary Ministry of Education. Minister Odachi arrived at a different conclusion. He was angered by the prefectural school board’s conclusion and charged that the case was a naked violation of the law. He complained that under the current administrative system in which there was collusion between leftist teachers and school boards under their influence, the minister of education was rendered helpless to carry out the provisions of the law. He indicated that the educational administrative system must be revised, as in his statement that “the school-board system has many faults and does not suit the conditions of the nation. We cannot abolish the boards of education outright but we must make necessary judgments.” His comments were a portent of the next stage in the escalating struggles between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education.

During the remainder of 1954 the ruling conservative party was beset with internal rivalry and scandal. After six years of one-man rule—from the end of the American Occupation into the period of independence and economic rehabilitation—the seventy-six-year-old Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru finally resigned to be succeeded by Hatoyama Ichirō, who had been purged in 1946 and “depurged” in 1950. Hatoyama appointed a succession of ministers of education, each serving for only a few months as the prime minister periodically reshuffled his cabinet. The first was Andō Masazumi, who had also been purged as a rightist in 1946 and “depurged” in 1950. Andō immediately indicated to the prefectural boards of education, which had the final decision in curriculum matters, that it would be desirable to include ethics as a major subject at the upper secondary school level. It was clear where the new minister stood in the ideological conflict.
General elections for the Lower House were held in February 1955. The Hatoyama party—the Democrats (Minshutō)—were returned as the dominant conservative party with 185 seats, while the Socialist party, by then divided into the right and left Socialist parties, gained 156 seats, giving them about one-third of the total number of seats. The other conservative party, Yoshida’s, captured 112 seats, and the Communists 2. Twenty-four Nikkyōso-supported candidates won in the election, including 19 from the left-wing and 3 from the right-wing Socialist parties plus 2 independents, in spite of the political restrictions the 1954 bills had placed on teachers.

At the same time, the Japan Communist party was experiencing a structural change when the leaders who had been abroad or underground since the Red Purge of 1950 suddenly reappeared. The sixth Communist Party conference, held in July 1955, reflecting U.S.S.R. Prime Minister Khrushchev’s coexistence policy, initiated a realignment of forces within the party; a program of peaceful, parliamentary revolution gained favor. In effect, the Japan Communist party was renouncing violence for moderation, paradoxically, at a time when Communist members within Nikkyōso were pursuing an increasingly militant policy against the government.

During the same year, a realignment of the major political parties took place. In October the left-wing and right-wing Socialists reunited. But perhaps of even greater political importance was the merger in November of the two large conservative parties, the Liberals and the Democrats, into the one overwhelming party, the Liberal Democratic party (Jiyūminshutō), better known as Jimintō. The new party reelected Hatoyama as prime minister; he appointed Kiyose Ichirō, loyal party politician, minister of education.

The succession of conservative governments since independence had been frustrated in their attempts to restrict the political activities of Nikkyōso, which, they felt, were grossly biased to the left, thus corrupting Japanese youth at a time when the nation was making a dramatic economic recovery after the miserable years immediately following the war. The main emphasis of Nikkyōso was no longer economic but political, and the government was frustrated in dealing with the challenge.

The list of government failures in curtailing the left-wing teachers’ movement is impressive. The attempt to bring all teachers under national civil servants’ strict political regulations by paying their full salaries from national funds never got
off the planning boards. The revised Ministry of Education Establishment Law of 1952 gave the Ministry of Education the responsibility for educational matters but not the power to compel boards of education to comply to the wishes of the Ministry. The special laws restricting the political activities of teachers, passed in 1954, were rendered ineffective at the last moment. The school boards, especially at the prefectural level, were heavily influenced by Nikkyōso through its hand-picked candidates, who had gained about one-third of the seats in the public elections. And the Ministry of Education was still operating under the basic guidelines of the Ministry of Education Establishment Law of 1949, drawn up originally during the American Occupation to decentralize educational control, and slightly revised in 1952.

The powerful conservative party, the new united Jimintō decided to undertake the single most important legislative revision following the American Occupation. The government announced a plan to revise the school-board system and the relationship between the boards and the Ministry of Education. This announcement initiated the next stage in the growing hostility between the Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso, engulfing virtually the entire educational arena in the conflict.

The planned school-board revisions embodied in the proposed Law for the Administration of Local Education (Chihō Kyōiku Gyōsei Hō) were relatively simple, though they had enormous consequences. School-board members were no longer to be elected by the public at large. Prefectural school-board members, reduced from 7 to 5 on each board, were to be selected and appointed by the prefectural governor, who was an elected official, with the consent of the prefectural assembly. Local school-board members, reduced from 5 to 3, were to be appointed by the local mayor or village head with the consent of the local assembly. The prefectural superintendents of education were to be appointed by the school board with the approval of the minister of education; this was the first time since the end of the war that the national government held such influence over personnel at the prefectural level.

The permanent vice-minister of education serving at the time explained the government’s purpose in revising the school-board system as follows: The original purpose of the school-board system was to avoid control of prefectural education by national politicians and bureaucrats as well as control of local education by local politicians. However, because candidates for the school boards required substantial funds to mount
a successful electoral campaign, the ordinary citizen could not afford to participate as a candidate. Nikkyōso, having a large treasury, supplied funds to local hand-picked candidates for the campaign. As a result many Nikkyōso-supported candidates were elected to school boards. And, since Nikkyōso itself was supported by the Socialist and Communist parties, the school-board system inevitably became involved in politics. It was for this reason, the vice-minister explained, that the Ministry of Education viewed the school boards as agencies controlled by Nikkyōso and the Socialist and Communist parties. In conclusion he said that the major reason for revising the school-board system was the Ministry’s desire to restore the political neutrality of the boards.73

The minister of education, in testimony before the Diet committee considering the bill, gave the following reasons for proposing the revisions: “... to insure the political neutrality of education and the stability of educational administration; to build a harmonious relationship between educational administration and local government; and to consolidate educational administration into one body consisting of the national, prefec- tural, and local educational agencies for more efficient adminis-

Also included in the proposed Law for the Administration of Local Education was a provision pertaining to the relationship between the Ministry of Education and the school boards. Under the proposed provision, mandatory compliance by the school boards with Ministry directives was to take the place of voluntary compliance. The law raised a semantic issue of crucial importance. Article 52 of the proposed law stated that the minister of education, if he determines that a local school board is not complying with education regulations or is violating the original purposes of education, has the authority to demand (yōkyū) necessary action for the board’s compliance.75 The difficulty in interpretation relates to the meaning of the term yōkyū, which can be defined as demand or request, depending on the context. Naturally, the Ministry of Education considered the meaning to be demand, and the opposition, request. Adding the provision of compulsion would give the Ministry authority to fulfill its responsibility for the conduct of Japanese education which it was granted in the 1952 revision. A bill to revise textbook policies was also under consider-
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prove leftist-oriented books before teachers would recommend purchase for their schools. The textbook bill proposed the following: to reduce sharply the number of textbooks requiring approval by the Ministry’s Textbook Authorization Committee to about three in each subject area for each grade level; to have the prefectoral school board establish selection committees to make the final selections from the approved list; to have one textbook used throughout the prefecture for a given subject for each grade level.\textsuperscript{76}

Nikkyōso interpreted all of these revisions as an assault on the union itself in the Ministry’s attempt to remove the labor movement from the schools. Nikkyōso thus claimed that school boards would become “just a channel through which the directions and orders of the Education Ministry are transmitted.”\textsuperscript{77}

The government claimed there was more than an anti-Nikkyōso motive behind this first major change in the postwar administrative structure of Japanese education since independence. The Honorable Araki Masuo, one of the most powerful politicians of Jimintō involved in the revisions, explained the government’s position as follows:

The new postwar Constitution states in Article 26 that “All people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability, as provided by law.” The Fundamental Law of Education reinforces this right in Article 3 that “The people shall be given equal opportunities of receiving education according to their ability, and they shall not be subject to educational discrimination on account of race, creed, sex, social status, economic position, or family origin.” The Ministry’s position is based on this right which unequivocally states that from Hokkaidō to Kyūshū, in every prefecture, city, town and village, educational opportunities should be equal. But the Ministry and everyone else know that in reality educational opportunities vary greatly from one section of the nation to another, from one village to another, and from one classroom to another. And few will dispute that one of the major reasons for the distortion and imbalance in Japanese education related to the school board system whereby each individual board basically determined the educational opportunities and standards within its own particular area. The result was that every student in Japan did not have an equal opportunity for receiving an education commensurate with his abilities.

Furthermore, Articles 20, 38, and 43 of the School Education Law dealing with elementary, lower secondary, and upper secondary schools, state identically that “Matters concerning school
subjects (kyōka) shall be decided by the competent authorities.” The government considers that the competent authority (kan-tokuchō) is the Minister of Education. Therefore, in order for the competent authorities, i.e., the Minister of Education, to assume responsibility under the Constitution for assuring that each citizen obtains equal opportunities of education, the relationship between the Ministry and the school boards perforce had to be revised to enable the Ministry of Education to acquire the necessary authority to carry out its constitutional mandate.78

Nikkyōso immediately launched a nationwide campaign against the school-board revision. Other organizations and individuals joined the opposition. In particular, Dr. Yanaibara, president of Tōkyō University, and Dr. Nambara, former president of Tōkyō University, declared their objections before the Diet committee which was conducting hearings on the pending legislation. Dr. Yanaibara attacked the Ministry of Education for not consulting its own Central Advisory Committee, of which he was a member, before submitting the board-of-education bill to the Diet, brushing aside the minister’s claim that he did not have sufficient time. Dr. Nambara claimed that the “government bills run counter to what we have been advocating since the war.”79 The Association of Boards of Education also opposed the revisions. Nikkyōso organized meetings throughout the nation to protest the bills.

On April 20, 1956, after reviewing an interim committee report, the House of Representatives passed the school-board bill, by a vote of 220 to 0; the opposition had refused to vote.80 In May the textbook bill also passed the Lower House. All attention and protests then became focused on the House of Councillors. Nikkyōso held its fourteenth national convention in Kōfu on May 10 to plan united action against what it regarded as the intensified reactionary educational policies of the government.

Nikkyōso’s mass demonstration began on May 18: half a million teachers walked out of their classrooms before the school day was over. They were joined in their protest that day by the National Association of Boards of Education, the Japan PTA, and the Federation of Housewives Association. Zen-gakuren, the left-wing student organization, and Sōhyō, the left-wing labor organization, conducted demonstrations around the Diet building, together with Nikkyōso delegations. Their protests were aimed at the deliberations of the Education Committee of the Upper House, for once a bill is reported out of
committee, its passage is virtually certain. Their protests were finally overcome, and the bill was reported out of committee for a floor vote. By this time, the government had abandoned the textbook bill and was concentrating only on the school-board revision bill.

Members of the ruling Jimintō and of the opposition Socialist party with its block of Nikkyōso-supported representatives fought on the House floor on June 1 as tempers flared. Police were called in to restore order. Finally, on June 2, 1956, while five hundred policemen guarded the chambers, the Law for the Organization and Management of Local Education Administration (Chihō Kyōiku Gyōsei no Soshiki o yobi Unei ni Kansuru Hōritsu) was passed by a vote of 143 to 69. The voting brought to a close one of the most important and turbulent sessions of the Diet in postwar Japan and in the process set the stage for the violent confrontation between the Ministry of Education and Nikkyōso that followed.
6

Violent Encounter with the Government (1957–1961)

The Battle for Union Leadership

Nikkyōso’s direct confrontation with the Ministry of Education began in 1957. The struggles in which the two powers had been engaged since the end of the war had finally reached a climax. With the passage of the critical revisions of the school-board system and the modifications in the relationship between the Ministry of Education and the school boards legislated in 1956, the stage was set. The new school boards had more conservative than progressive appointees, precisely as the Ministry of Education had planned. And when Prime Minister Ishibashi resigned because of illness only two months after assuming office, Kishi Nobusuke, one of the most remarkable politicians in postwar Japan, who advanced from a Class A war criminal in 1946 to prime minister on February 25, 1957, became leader of the powerful Jimintō, the Liberal-Democrats.

Minister of Education Nadao Hirokichi, one of the strongest ministers of education in the entire postwar period, assumed a determined attitude against Nikkyōso. Nadao immediately came under attack by the union because of his assignment in the powerful Ministry of Home Affairs prior to 1945. Of all the ministers of education during the nine-year tenure of Nikkyōso Chairman Kobayashi Takeshi, it was Nadao whom Nikkyōso feared most; he was brilliant and implacable.¹

Confronted with a new and threatening situation after the 1956 educational administrative revisions, Nikkyōso published its own program for a democratic educational system. The statement is important as an outline of Nikkyōso’s policies at that time. In the following are given Nikkyōso’s major recommendations for Japanese education in the mid-1950s:
1. Basic Revision of the Education System.
Abolishment of the position of minister of education, appointed by the prime minister representing a political party, and establishment of a Central Education Council whose members will be elected democratically. The Ministry of Education will be revised to become the Secretariat of the Central Education Council. A new board of education law will be enacted under which the board members will be chosen by public election. The board will be granted authority on personnel and financial matters.

2. Equal Opportunity for Education.
The quality of senior high school education must be improved. Entrance will become compulsory. Special senior high schools for night students will also be established.

3. Elimination of Over-crowded Classrooms.
Special emphasis will be given to restricting class size to fifty pupils or less. There should be no merging of schools for financial reasons. In order to lighten the parents’ share of compulsory education expenses, the state treasury should meet 80 percent of compulsory education expenses.

4. Promotion of Science and Technological Education.
The school curriculum will be revised so that pupils are taught to regard production as the basis of human activity. Revision of the school curriculum should be carried out voluntarily by teachers. Industrial training will be stressed and state subsidies will be drastically increased for this purpose. Establishment of senior high schools for vocational training will be opposed.

5. Promotion of Morals Education.
Morals in the new age should be based on an awareness of human rights, love of independence, the education of an individual imbued with the spirit of peace, democracy and international friendship, and on respect for an individual who possesses practical knowledge and techniques and who has awakened to the principles of science. Morals education should be conducted at all times in the entire process of education. Morals education along this line should be conducted constantly at school, in the home, and in society, with full cooperation of teachers, parents, and the general public. Morals education would thus be conducted during the whole course of education. A special ethics course will not be established.

Enactment of a school textbook law will be opposed. Inspection of school textbooks should be democratic. Teachers will be given authority to select textbooks.²

Diametrically opposed to most of the recommendations of the union, the government, with a powerful prime minister, a strong minister of education, and a Ministry of Education having authority over the school boards, felt confident that it was at last in a position to restrict the activities of the left-wing Nikkyōso teachers. The opportunity was quickly seized with the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan (Kinmu Hyōtei), over which the two powers were locked in violent internecine conflict for the next several years.

The controversy over the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan began in Ehime Prefecture, a small, rather obscure rural prefecture located on Shikoku, one of the least developed of the four main islands of Japan. Ehime was incurring a huge financial deficit—460 million yen ($1,275,000)—for 1955, a common situation among the poorer prefectures.³ The prefectural education office of Ehime requested the Ministry of Education to suggest possible ways to reduce the prefecture’s increasing educational costs. The Ministry recommended that the prefectural education office reduce the teachers’ annual salary increments, half the cost of which was being borne by the prefecture. The method suggested by the Ministry involved a plan to rate the efficiency of teachers and award annual increments only to those who were accorded a good rating.⁴ The plan was based on enforcement of Article 40 of the Local Public Service Law passed in 1950, which in theory applied to all regular employees of local governments, but which had not previously been applied to teachers. This article, on efficiency rating, read as follows: “The appointment officer of local public servants must conduct periodic efficiency ratings of all employees under his responsibility and must act according to the results.”⁵

In August 1956 the Ehime Prefecture government issued directives for all school principals to conduct ratings of their teachers for purposes of awarding salary increments to two-thirds of them. A form was circulated which included nineteen items for evaluation, including cooperative attitude, planning ability, diligence, and the like.⁶ In general, the school principals, most of them members of Nikkyōso at that time, objected to the plan partly because they were union members themselves
and partly because some thought it was impossible to evaluate teaching in that manner. Since the new system for appointing school-board members had not yet gone into effect, the prefectural government withdrew the directive.

In October, however, the new appointive system became effective, and board members were from then on to be appointed by the prefectural governor or the local mayor. Accordingly, all of the Ehime Prefectural School Board members except one woman member were promptly replaced by the governor. New directives were issued for evaluating teachers. They were to be given grades (A to D) on each of eleven rating items, including responsibility, teaching knowledge and technique, discipline, and reliability. The Ehime Prefectural Teachers Union, an affiliate of Nikkyōso, opposed the scheme, claiming that it could not work because of the nature of the teaching profession. The national union headquarters supported that opinion. The prefectural union held a general meeting of teachers in mid-October while seven officers began a seventy-hour hunger strike. After a mass negotiation session between teachers and education officials, it was agreed that the rating plan would not be carried out in 1956.

After Prime Minister Kishi and Minister of Education Nadao took office in February 1957, Saga Prefecture, a small prefecture on the southern island of Kyūshū, dismissed 259 teachers as a way of reducing educational expenditures, upon which the Saga Prefectural Teachers Union, an affiliate of Nikkyōso, called a three-day mass leave-taking; 30 percent of the members stayed away from school on the first day, 30 percent the next, and 30 percent on the final day. The prefectural union ultimately refused to recognize the dismissals and the Saga authorities promptly dismissed eleven union leaders on April 2, 1957. Nikkyōso took the case to court.\(^7\)

At Nikkyōso’s fifteenth national convention in Wakayama, in June 1957, commemorating the tenth year since the birth of the union, the executive apparently remained unaware of the significance of the controversies going on in Saga and Ehime prefectures, especially that in Ehime. Only one statement opposing the rating plan was approved at the convention. Instead, emphasis was placed on a nationwide appeal for more funds at the local, prefectural, and national levels for the enrichment of education, the raising of educational standards, and an increase in teachers’ salaries. Nikkyōso established, moreover, the Peoples Education Research Institute (Kokumin Kyōiku Kenkyūjo),
whose objective was to formulate, on the basis of scientific research, policies for the protection of democratic education from governmental influence.

Meanwhile, the rating plan had been enforced in Ehime Prefecture early in 1957, much to the indignation of the local branch of the union. Opposition was steadily increasing. The Ehime Prefectural Teachers Union pitched a tent in front of the prefectural education office. Alongside the tent was a lantern on which were the words, “For the complete fulfillment of our goals”; the union members were determined that the light would not be extinguished until victory. Union leaders conducted daily negotiations with prefectural authorities. Two thousand protesting teachers took leave en masse. In anticipation of a nationwide fight against the rating plan, Nikkyōso sent nearly three thousand members into Ehime from all over the country in support of the local branch.

In July 1957, the government made known its intention to enforce the rating plan throughout the nation, beginning later in the year, in conformity with Article 40 of the Local Public Service Law. Ehime was, in a sense, a test case. Nikkyōso, interpreting the plan as a threat to its very existence, quickly held a series of meetings all over the country, endeavoring to build a unified front against the government’s plan. The breakaway Upper Secondary School Teachers Union, recently reorganized into the Nihon Kōtōgakkō Kyōshokuin Kumiai (Nikkōkyō), pledged itself to cooperate with Nikkyōso’s struggles against the rating plan.

Nikkyōso’s national executive protested to Ministry officials concerning the rating plan. In one incident, during a sit-in of five hundred members at the Ministry, the rivals, Hiragaki and Miyanohara, were both arrested. At the same time, the Ehime prefectural authorities, facing increased resistance by teachers, postponed until December 10 the deadline for submitting to the school boards the first teacher evaluation reports; by that date 434 of 767 principals had complied. Some were forcibly prevented by Nikkyōso teachers from turning in the reports.

Finally, on December 15, a compromise was reached between Nikkyōso and the Ministry when the prefectural board of education agreed that the board would draw up a new rating form based on a broad range of opinions, including those from teachers, and that the protestors would not be punished. The first stage of the controversy over the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan thus came to an inconclusive end in late 1957.
The next stage developed quickly when the National Conference of Superintendents on December 20 drew up a draft of a rating form and announced its nationwide enforcement from the beginning of the next school year in April 1958. Since the appointments of prefectural superintendents required Ministry approval under the 1956 administrative revisions, it can be assumed that this conference of superintendents was carrying out the wishes of the Ministry of Education. Two days later Nikkyōso convened an extraordinary national convention in Tōkyō to draw up a “Declaration of the State of Emergency” in which the union vowed not to compromise until the rating plan was abolished. Union leaders felt that up to the time of the rating-plan controversy, the government had been attacking them only indirectly by suppressing Nikkyōso’s influence on the school boards. The rating plan, however, was interpreted as a direct attack on the union, since the fear of being rated poorly would discourage the average teacher from participating in Nikkyōso’s movement.11

Nikkyōso Chairman Kobayashi Takeshi explained the union’s opposition to the rating system as follows:

Our major concern is that the implementation of the rating plan will result in subservience to authority, characteristic of prewar Japan, thereby distorting education. Under the new system the local school principal must evaluate the teacher’s performance. In this role the principal will become merely a representative of the controlling powers, that is, the boards of education and the Ministry of Education. The resulting disastrous effect will be an emotional struggle between the principal, representing the entrenched power structure, and his teachers. The principal will then be able to coerce his teachers through the implementation of the rating system. In addition, teachers will lose their identity as educators responsible to their students and to the country as a whole. Therefore we are resolutely committed to resisting all efforts to effect the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan which would sacrifice the students for the benefit of the ruling powers.12

A sample rating form was drawn up by the superintendents of education in consultation with the Ministry of Education; from it each prefectural school board was to draw up its own form. The following excerpts are taken from the sample:

A. Performance of Duties.
   1. Management of class.
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a. Is the management of the classroom in conformity with the basic principles of school management?
b. Does the class act harmoniously as a group, and is order established?

2. Lesson guidance.
a. Are methods worked out to see that the guidance plans of the school are put into effective operation?
b. Are steps taken to handle the difference in ability of the students?

a. Is guidance in living and morals education carried out with enthusiasm?

4. Rating.
a. Are the students graded properly?

5. Research and training.
a. Is research carried out regularly?
b. Are research results properly applied to guidance?

6. Disposition of school duties.
a. Are allocated duties carried out correctly?
b. Is work carried out according to regulations?

B. Special Capabilities.

1. Love of education.
a. Is love for the students manifested?
b. Is the teacher liked by the students?

2. Knowledge, ability, and skills.
a. Has the teacher acquired the knowledge and skills of a specialist?
b. Can the teacher devise original ideas?

a. Is the teacher honest and fair?
b. Do the teacher’s actions conform with his statements?

4. Sense of responsibility.
a. Does the teacher realize his responsibility to his work and his mission as an educator?
b. Does the teacher carry out matters in line of duty on his own free will and responsibility?

5. Impartiality.
a. Does the teacher show partiality?
b. Does the teacher have the courage to say or do what he believes is right?
6. Dignity.
   a. Is he well mannered and clean in body and dress?
   b. Does he have a healthy attitude toward life?\textsuperscript{13}

Each teacher was to be graded (from A to E) on these and other questions. A section for special notations and general comments followed. The evaluation report was to serve as a basis for determining whether the teacher deserved a salary increase; it was also to be used in determining the teacher’s general career pattern. Each prefecture had to prepare its own form by April 1, 1958, and the first evaluation report was to be submitted to the boards of education by September.

Prior to April, the prefectural union affiliates of Nikkyōso campaigned against the rating plan on a prefectural basis, employing violent tactics in some instances. Because of the local nature of these campaigns, both the national union and the Ministry supported from a distance their respective sides in each prefecture. Moreover, because each prefecture campaigning against the rating plan was faced with conditions peculiar to its own location, different prefectures campaigned at different times. Consequently, Nikkyōso was unable to bring about a united, nationwide demonstration of force. A single target was needed to unify the movement.

From among all the districts campaigning, Nikkyōso chose Tōkyō as the rallying point for all prefectures; it then called upon its local affiliates for nationwide support in April, the beginning of the 1958 school year. The Tōkyō affiliate of Nikkyōso, Tokyōso, traditionally a strong, militant organization, decided on a policy of force by staging mass holidays. The plan called for all teachers to take a leave day en masse on the first day of the new school term in April if the local authorities enforced the rating plan. Daily mass negotiations with Tōkyō education authorities led to a postponement of the deadline for submitting evaluation reports from April 1 to April 23.

On April 23, 35,000 of Tokyōso’s 37,000 members carried out a mass leave. Sōhyō, the largest council of labor unions in Japan, advised its members to keep their children home that day in sympathy with Nikkyōso’s actions. About 80 percent of Tōkyō schools were disrupted.\textsuperscript{14} Under the provisions of the Local Public Service Laws, Tōkyō police arrested nearly all of the union leaders, including Chairman Hasegawa Shōzō, who
was one of the founding fathers of Nikkyōso. The case was taken to court. The rating system was officially adopted in Tōkyō on April 23 in spite of the strike.

The government instructed prefessional boards of education to carry out the rating program during April 1958. In reaction, Nikkyōso’s prefectural affiliates in Fukuoka, Wakayama, and Kōchi followed Tōkyō’s example and conducted strikes which resulted in police action and court cases. In spite of such protests, the rating program was put into effect in twenty-three prefectures during April. The opposing forces were strong in prefectures like Kōchi and Wakayama, but weak in others. The form of penalty placed upon protesting teachers varied as well from district to district. The mass daily newspaper, Asahi Shim bun, reported that, according to Nikkyōso, eighty thousand teachers had been transferred at the beginning of the school year because of their opposition to the rating plan. Parents’ organizations took sides.

In the midst of the growing turmoil, a general election for the Lower House was called in May, during which the new unified conservative party, Jimintō, campaigned as a united party for the first time. The conservative majority won 61.5 percent (287) of the seats, slightly less than the 63.6 percent it had won earlier; the reunified Socialist party gained 35.5 percent (166); and the Communist party won 1 seat.

Also coming during the middle of the rating-plan conflict was the announcement by the Ministry of Education that the entire curriculum for compulsory education was being revised for compulsory implementation. This revision was another of the critically important revisions of Japanese education since the American Occupation. Until 1958 the Ministry of Education published periodically the Course of Study Guides, which gave teaching guides but did not prescribe the course content, thus leaving the individual teacher a degree of latitude in developing course content independently. In fact, teaching was most heavily influenced, not by the Course of Study Guides, but by the examination preparation that any student wishing to enter the next higher level had to go through and by teachers’ guides prepared by commercial publishers to accompany each textbook.

The last time the school curriculum had been revised was 1951. Since that time the Ministry of Education had become increasingly aware of the need for updated course content. Around 1954, during Minister of Education Odachi’s term of office, there was a movement within the government and the
Ministry of Education to have a mandatory school curriculum. But the government and the Ministry did not come forth with such a curriculum because they felt that the Ministry was powerless to enforce it under the prevailing laws.\textsuperscript{17} When the relationship between the school board and the Ministry changed through the 1956 revisions, the Ministry finally gained the power to revise and standardize the curriculum. The Ministry justified the revision as a move in the direction of providing equal educational opportunities for all students. Few would deny, however, that what the Ministry hoped to accomplish by having a prescribed curriculum was to curtail the left-wing teachers’ influence in the classrooms. Needless to say, Nikkyōso was not consulted in the planning of the new curriculum.

The Ministry of Education implemented the Revised Course of Study on August 28, 1958. The fundamental principle of the revision was “to strengthen morals education” by providing “an assigned weekly school hour in each grade for an organized program of morals education”; a curriculum embracing this principle was to become effective by September 1959.\textsuperscript{18} To Nikkyōso, which had defended the educational reforms enacted during the American Occupation proscribing a mandatory curriculum and abolishing the morals course, the new measures were clearly reactionary. Coming as it did in the middle of the efficiency-rating controversy, Nikkyōso charged that the government was scheming to usurp total control over education through the revised mandatory curriculum that specified course content and through the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan, which ensured adherence to the prescribed course content. To Nikkyōso, the revision thus meant a reversion to the conditions existing prior to 1945.

Those teachers protesting the mandatory revised curriculum, particularly the newly required course in morals, perforce merged forces with those involved in the rating-program fight already underway. Amid the voices of protest, the Ministry, during the later part of 1958 and early 1959, sponsored for teachers special courses and lectures concerning the new curriculum and the new morals course. Nikkyōso not only boycotted these courses and lectures but also attempted to block physically the scheduled events wherever possible. On a number of occasions, protesting teachers clashed with police, forcing the sponsors to cancel the meeting or change the meeting place secretly. With many districts already in near chaos over the rating program, the revised mandatory cur-
riculum and the series of incidents involving the boycotting of the Ministry’s special lectures only intensified the strain between the Ministry and Nikkyōso.

Organizations other than Nikkyōso that were concerned over the controversies were also involved in the turmoil. Parent-teacher associations loyal to Nikkyōso were opposing parents who protested the union’s activities. Schools were being closed for a day or more throughout the country when teachers walked out en masse. Police raided many of Nikkyōso’s local offices. The left-wing student organization, Zengakuren, joined local demonstrations. Fierce fighting broke out between police and demonstrators in several prefectures. The situation worsened rapidly.

Nikkyōso convened its seventeenth national convention at Kaminoyama City, in June 1958. It proved to be one of the most crucial meetings in the entire history of the union. It was at this meeting that the two major factions of Nikkyōso, the radical left behind Hiragaki Miyoji, supported by the Communist party, and the moderates behind Miyanohara Sadamitsu, supported by the Socialist party, clashed for hegemony of the union. The victor was destined finally to assume prolonged leadership of the union.

When the Kaminoyama convention convened on June 1, Nikkyōso was engaged in the most severe conflict in its history. Many prefectural affiliates of the union were locked in local pitched battles with the school boards. The Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan was in operation in thirty-five prefectures in the nation, including the city prefecture of Tōkyō. Nikkyōso was totally preoccupied with its fight against the Ministry—an involvement having deep political implications which annoyed some of the apolitical rank and file. Critical opinions were expressed during this convention against the union’s militancy.

Nevertheless, the major discord during the convention concerned the method of opposing the rating program as advanced by Hiragaki and Miyanohara; the discord caused the union to be divided in the election contest of the two men for the position of general secretary, then held by Hiragaki. The basic issue at the root of the split had to do with one of the trade-union tactics employed by Sōhyō. During the phenomenal growth of the trade-union movement during 1946 and 1947, Japanese labor developed two kinds of struggle tactics. One was called the unified or vertical union struggle (sangyō ōbetsu t ōitsu t ōsō), and the other, the regional peoples’ struggle (chiiki jinmin t ōsō). Under the first approach, union members throughout
the country joined in unified national action to achieve their goals even if a particular struggle concerned only one section or region. Under the second approach, maximum force was shown only in the region where there was a specific dispute.

The former secretary general of Sōhyō, Takano Minoru, leader of the radical left-wing and antimainstream faction within Sōhyō, adhered to the regional-struggle tactic, as did the Japan Communist party. Takano planned joint struggles with the Communist party because of their methodological propinquity. Hiragaki, a close personal friend of Takano, also favored the regional-struggle concept. Consequently, Hiragaki, as Nikkyōso’s general secretary, adopted the Takano-Japan Communist party approach of regional struggles for Nikkyōso.19

The Communist group within Nikkyōso threw its full support behind Hiragaki, who became known as the leader of the Communists within the teachers’ movement, although to this day he vehemently denies ever having been a Communist himself. He recognizes that he had a reputation as a radical leader of the Communist faction, but he feels that that was the result of his “uncompromising attitude toward the government’s educational policy.”20 His obdurate position against the efficiency-rating system also attracted many non-Communist teachers who were equally opposed to the program and who voted for Communists in the Hiragaki faction. They believed that the hard-line posture of the Communists was the most effective one for them to take in their fight against the Ministry of Education.

The position of secretary general is the most powerful position in Nikkyōso when the chairman is a nonaggressive person. In 1958 the chairmanship was held by Kobayashi Takeshi, who was not an aggressive leader but a good mediator; the position of secretary general was held by Hiragaki, who was leader of Nikkyōso’s Communist faction. Consequently, in 1958 Nikkyōso leadership once again came under the control of the union’s Communist faction. This reemergence of Communist hegemony was the first since 1950, when the Red Purge decimated Communist ranks. What, in fact, had been developing since 1953, when Hiragaki first replaced Miyanohara as secretary general, was that, as Hiragaki moved more to the left in reaction to the government’s restrictive policy toward Nikkyōso, the Communists were gradually gaining momentum by uniting with Hiragaki’s forces to attain their objectives. As Hiragaki strengthened his influence, so did the Communists. The coalition gained strength through the control of powerful positions. For example, according to the estimates of the
union’s historian, the Communist group supporting Hiragaki controlled about 80 percent of the members on Nikkyōso’s Central Executive Committee by 1958, attaining its pinnacle of power.21

Miyanohara followed the unified approach to labor struggles as practiced by Sōhyō Chairman Ota Kaoru, claiming, for example, that all teachers throughout the nation should have struck in protest when the rating program was first introduced in Ehime Prefecture. His reason was that local teachers in Ehime were too weak to oppose the entrenched conservatives alone and that an isolated protest movement would result in heavier punishment than would a mass protest movement. The moderates within Nikkyōso supported Miyanohara’s position, while the extreme leftists pitted their support behind Hiragaki, crystallizing the intraunion disharmony into a contest between the Communist and the non-Communist factions.

Hiragaki was Nikkyōso’s secretary general at the start of the Ehime case in 1956. He immediately went to Ehime to lead a concerted attack on the local prefectural government. His plan was to crush the rating program in Ehime before it could be introduced into other prefectures by bringing into Ehime nearly three thousand Nikkyōso members from all over the country. In other words, Hiragaki wanted to let the education authorities of the rest of the prefectures know through the Ehime example that enforcing the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan would invite disaster. When the Ehime Prefecture School Board enforced the rating plan in spite of Hiragaki’s efforts, his tactics came under increasing criticism from union rank and file.

Nikkyōso’s struggle tactics and strategy thus were of major importance and closely related to the intraunion rivalry between the Hiragaki and Miyanohara factions. As the union continually failed to block enforcement of the rating plan from prefecture to prefecture, the leadership in the person of Hiragaki, who was in charge of the union’s campaign, turned defensive. The internal discord finally came to a head at the famous Kaminoyama convention, when Miyanohara opposed Hiragaki for the secretary generalship.

Meanwhile, certain Socialist party representatives in the Diet, reacting to growing public concern over the interminable disruptions at schools, began to exert pressure on Nikkyōso to modify its firm opposition to the rating plan. Despite rumors that both Sōhyō and the Socialist party were maneuvering to remove Hiragaki from the position of secretary general, Hi-
ragaki continued adamantly to oppose both the rating plan and the Japan Socialist party executives’ intervention in Nikkyōso’s leadership affairs.  

The crucial voting for the position of secretary general at the Kaminoyama convention took place amid great confusion. The announcement was made on the floor that Miyanohara had won by a single vote and that Makieda Motofumi, in the Miyanohara faction, was elected vice-secretary general. The Hiragaki faction promptly walked out of the meeting, throwing the hall into confusion. The convention was abruptly adjourned. At an extraordinary national convention hastily convened a month later, a second vote was taken. This time Miyanohara won by an official vote of 261 to 226. Makieda’s margin of victory was 19 votes. However, even though the moderates had overturned the radicals on the convention floor, the Central Executive Committee remained in the hands of the Communists, which restricted the alternatives open to the new secretary general.

On June 20, 1958, Minister of Education Nadao reaffirmed the government’s decision to enforce the rating plan throughout the nation. By that time, thirty-eight of forty-eight prefectures had already adopted it. On July 4, the government passed an education bill, after violent struggles on the Diet floor, granting special allowances of 2,500 yen a month to school principals, who were thrust into the middle of the rating-plan controversy since nearly 80 percent of them were Nikkyōso members at that time. Those opposing the bill declared that the purpose of the special allowance was to induce school principals to leave the union and enforce the rating plan. Concern was expressed that the government would ultimately introduce a bill prohibiting principals from joining Nikkyōso. Sōhyō threatened a national strike if such action were taken.

While Nikkyōso remained divided at the national executive level by interfactional disputes, its local affiliates fought against the rating system. The situation in Wakayama and Kōchi prefectures became particularly severe when nearly all schools were shut down on several occasions as teachers walked out of their classrooms in protest, paralyzing the school system and inviting recriminations and further closing of schools. Sōhyō and the left-wing university student organization, Zengakuren, joined the daily demonstrations. The students became known as Nikkyōso’s “shock troops” when they repeatedly clashed with police in street demonstrations against the rating plan. Vio-
lence broke out in Wakayama City in mid-August, when Sōhyō sponsored a rally of tens of thousands of workers and students against the rating plan. Many arrests were made.

Zengakuren gained notoriety in 1958 through its attempts to block the extension of runways into Sunagawa village from the huge American military air base at Tachikawa, on the edge of Tōkyō, to accommodate jet aircrafts. The Sunagawa incident, which led to a district court decision in 1959 that American forces in Japan violated the no-war-potential clause of the Constitution, shocked the nation, but it was only a prelude to the major battles of 1960 against the United States-Japan Security Pact. To the students, the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan was merely one in a succession of pernicious measures undertaken by the government to suppress democratic forces.

Chairman Kobayashi of Nikkyōso, during the rating plan struggles, unequivocally refuted the charge that Nikkyōso exploited students by enlisting their support in the union’s campaign against the government. He explained that the students automatically participated in any antigovernment movement whether they were invited or not, Kobayashi did seem to feel, however, that in areas where the union was weak and the local government strong, there could be little doubt that certain Nikkyōso officers welcomed the participation of Zengakuren students and coordinated the students’ efforts with those of the union against the Kishi government.25

Nikkyōso’s immediate goal was to stop the school principals from submitting to the school boards the rating forms due in September 1958. Making manifest Miyanohara’s ascendency in power, Nikkyōso decided to employ the unified-struggle tactic; the plan was to have all union teachers boycott classes on the afternoon of September 15. In a notice of September 4, the government declared such action illegal.26 Police warned that rightist groups, arch enemies of Nikkyōso, were planning to disrupt the boycott. Sōhyō appealed to its several million members not to send their children to school that afternoon. Shortly before September 15, Nikkyōso Chairman Kobayashi was arrested for having led a previous strike. To the great disappointment of the union, its first attempt at a nationwide unified strike against the rating plan resulted in compliance in only seventeen prefectures.27 Few schools had to close. Nikkyōso was not yet capable of using effectively Miyanohara’s tactic of unified struggle.
Prime Minister Kishi, in his policy speech before the Diet shortly after the strike fiasco, placed his government unequivocally behind enforcement of the rating plan when he said:

"The efficiency rating plan is indispensable to ensuring a fair and just personnel administration. It is a system already in force for public service personnel in general. There is no reason why teachers should be excepted. It is in the belief that the plan will serve to maintain fairness in personnel administration of teachers, and the government is determined to enforce it, as has long been decided, with the cooperation of all circles concerned."

Nikkyōso convened its second consecutive extraordinary national convention in Tōkyō on October 14, 1958, to reconsider the dismal results of the September strike and to plan a renewed unified struggle. The convention voted to suspend classes at 2 P.M. on October 28 in conjunction with Sōhyō’s national unified action day, in protest against the rating plan and the government’s attempt to revise and strengthen the police laws. Thirty prefectures complied with short walkouts, and in two, Kōchi and Gumma prefectures, the membership took mass leaves. On November 26 and December 10, further unified action was conducted, though with decreasing degrees of success.

Violent clashes with police were erupting throughout the nation. Local left-and right-wing forces confronted each other in pitched battles, resulting in bloodshed and recriminations. Teachers and administrators were dismissed or suspended from their positions by the hundreds. As a result, defections of teachers and school principals from Nikkyōso became commonplace, running into the thousands as the intensity of the conflict increased. New organizations of local teachers were launched in many sections of the country in a negative reaction to Nikkyōso’s militant actions. In the history of postwar Japanese education, there was never such chaos affecting the schools as that which took place during this direct confrontation between the union and the Ministry of Education for the control of schools.

The viciousness of the conflict was demonstrated, for example, on December 15, 1958, when Nikkyōso Chairman Kobayashi attended a rally in Kōchi Prefecture. He later described the incident as follows. While he was making a speech to parents in a local school assembly hall, a gang of local ruffians entered the hall from the back entrance. They switched
off the lights and began throwing loose objects at the stage. Kobayashi was hit on the shoulder by a small stove (hibachi) used to heat the hall. He was knocked to the floor and lost consciousness. The intruders then apparently kicked his face because, when he regained consciousness in a local hospital hours later, he discovered that his front teeth were missing and his face was badly cut, requiring an emergency operation. When asked who, he thought, was behind the attack, he felt certain that the local boss, who was a conservative party leader, had hired thugs to break up the protest rally. The *Asahi Shim bun* reported that Kobayashi was attacked by about two hundred angry parents who were opposed to Nikkyōso’s activities. On the same day, fifteen other union members were assaulted and hospitalized in Kōchi City.

The first sign of an end to the seemingly interminable conflict was seen in the so-called Kanagawa Formula, proposed in early 1959. The Kanagawa Prefectural School Board had been negotiating with the prefectural branch of the teachers union in an attempt to devise a plan whereby the board could comply with the Ministerial demand to enforce the rating plan without alienating the teachers. During the last six months of 1958, the board and the union in Kanagawa met a total of thirty-nine times, or more than once a week, trying to find a solution to the rating-plan controversy.

According to the Kanagawa Formula, each teacher was to evaluate himself by maintaining a Record of Educational Activities, which was to be submitted to the school principal. The principal, in turn, was to add his own comments to the report in consultation with the teacher and then submit the report to the school board, which theoretically was to use the results for the improvement of local education. When Nikkyōso’s national executive considered the virtues and defects of this compromise plan in January 1959, the two rival factions once again disagreed with each other. Miyanohara cautiously approved the formula while Hiragaki adamantly opposed it. The Central Executive Committee voted in favor of Hiragaki’s position by a vote of 32 to 27, indicating the relative strength of the Communist and non-Communist blocs, in spite of the fact that Miyanohara was now secretary general.

Miyanohara, with Chairman Kobayashi placing his support with the moderates, immediately called for a third consecutive extraordinary national convention to be held in mid-February 1959, in Tōkyō. At this convention, a local delegate from Iwate Prefecture criticized the uncompromising attitude of the union
executive, opining that such an attitude if continued much longer would destroy what energy remained at the local level; and that such a consequence would drive a wedge between the national executive and the local unions. A vote was taken on the “Iwate Resolution,” which advocated that each prefectural branch of the union should adapt the Kanagawa Formula to meet the conditions peculiar to that prefecture and then negotiate a rating plan with the school board. In a secret vote 241 ballots were cast in favor of the compromise and 218 against it.\textsuperscript{32}

Secretary General Miyanohara had narrowly won the day. This victory signified the beginning of another historic transition for Nikkyōso. Gradually, the union turned away from the intractable, hard line of the Communist-supported Hiragaki faction, which had dominated Nikkyōso’s activities from about 1955. The rank and file had become disillusioned with the hard-line tactic, holding Hiragaki responsible for the unsuccessful struggles. By the time of the next regular convention in June 1959, Miyanohara was returned to the position of secretary general by a vote of 264 to 219, while the Hiragaki faction remained barely in control of the Central Executive Committee by a count of 33 to 31.\textsuperscript{33}

In 1959 Miyanohara began his move to purge Communist opposition on the Central Executive Committee and replace it with men aligned with his more moderate views. The process was to take him until 1962, when his faction finally gained indisputable control of the Central Executive Committee and elected him chairman of Nikkyōso. But between 1959 and 1962 many events deterred his plan.

Nikkyōso continued its opposition to the rating plan although in greatly modified form. The new policy was to negotiate locally a plan that would, in effect, be the least disadvantageous to the average teacher and, if possible, render it useless. The controversy over the rating plan in late 1959 became submerged in the greatest unified movement of left-wing forces in Japan during the entire postwar period—the opposition to the renewal of the United States-Japan Security Pact, which overshadowed all other movements for a year. But before we leave the discussion of the rating-plan conflict, an analysis of the effects of the controversy upon Nikkyōso and the rating plan itself is essential for an understanding of the subsequent period.

First of all, the rating plan had gone into effect in one way or another in all prefectures except Hokkaidō and Kyōto. School principals dutifully completed the evaluation reports and sub-
mitted them to the school boards. But because of the intensity of teacher opposition to the plan, the boards of education were reluctant to employ the results for determining salary increases as originally planned. In other words, although the rating plan was carried out widely, its prime objective remained unattained. An example is the Tōkyō School Board, which, to this day, has conducted the annual teacher’s efficiency evaluation as demanded by the Ministry of Education but has never related the results to wages.\textsuperscript{34} The relative impotence of the rating plan stemmed from the school boards’ concern that the majority of teachers, both nonunion and union members, did not approve of the plan. Hence, to enforce the results of the evaluation would invite total opposition by the teaching corps; the results that could be obtained from the ratings did not seem worth the trouble that was sure to come. Moreover, many school-board members themselves were not convinced of the validity of the evaluation forms used as the basis in determining teachers’ pay increases. Hence, because of Nikkyōso’s efforts to undermine the plan, in addition to the inherent difficulties of evaluating teaching, the rating plan quickly turned ineffective.

The cost of the battle to Nikkyōso was extremely high. The three-year struggle from 1957 to 1959 debilitated the union, depleting its membership through arrests and withdrawals. For example, the Ehime Prefectural Union lost the majority of its members, at the rate of about two thousand a year, between 1957 and 1960.\textsuperscript{35} The government estimated that eighty thousand teachers withdrew from Nikkyōso between 1957 and 1960, including fifteen thousand school principals.\textsuperscript{36} The entire episode was one prolonged nightmare of internal and external struggles that threatened the very existence of the union.

Statistics shown in Tables 7 and 8 reveal the magnitude of the effects of the rating-plan struggles on the union treasury and on the membership. The rating-plan conflict took a heavy toll in other ways as well. Administrative punishment was carried out by local education authorities without litigation. Criminal punishment was carried out under the provisions of the following articles of the Local Public Service Law:
Table 7. Expenditure by Nikkyōso for the Campaign against the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan, 1957–1959 (in yen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Union Dues</th>
<th>% of Dues Spent on Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>10,531,965</td>
<td>191,231,762</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>118,841,196</td>
<td>400,497,617</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>172,345,119</td>
<td>489,803,390</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Nikkyōso, Report to the International Labor Office in Geneva, Tōkyō, November 9, 1960, p. 9.

Table 8. Punishment of Teachers during the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Struggles, 1956–1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Punishment</th>
<th>Type of Punishment</th>
<th>No. of Teachers Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demotion</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary reduction</td>
<td>52,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Indictment</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subpoena</td>
<td>4,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Nikkyōso, Report to the International Labor Office in Geneva, Tōkyō, November 9, 1960, p. 37.

Article 37, Clause 1

Local public servants may not resort to strike, slowdown, or other acts of dispute against their employer, who is the local people as represented by the agencies of the local public body, or to
conduct such idling tactics as will deteriorate the functional efficiency of the local public body, or to instigate others to do so.

Article 61, Clause 4
Violation of Article 37, Clause 1, is subject to punishment of imprisonment of less than three years or a fine of less than 100,000 yen.\textsuperscript{37}

Recalling the thoughts he had during those chaotic years, Miyanohara commented that he could feel that Nikkyōso was losing its foundation because of its own intransigent policy that failed to recognize the strength of the opposition and the weakness of Nikkyōso. As chaos continued year after year, the union’s image had become disastrously tarnished both to the public and to the rank and file, who, having had enough of turmoil, were willing to accept a compromise simply to end the conflict. With the union executive assiduously dispatching orders to continue the struggle, Miyanohara finally concluded that a policy change was necessary to salvage the teachers’ union, which had taken so many years to develop.\textsuperscript{38}

While the opposition to the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan was weakening, the most spectacular movement of left-wing opposition to the government in the postwar era was taking place against the extension in 1960 of the United States-Japan Security Pact, providing for the continuation of American military bases in Japan for another ten years. Nikkyōso, however, was just concluding a three-year period of the most enervating struggles in its history. Consequently, when the labor movement, the student movement, and other left-wing forces were reaching new heights in their unified struggle against the government, Nikkyōso was experiencing new lows in morale, unity, and energy.

When the People’s Council for Preventing Revision of the Security Pact (Anpo Kaiteisoshi Kokumin Kaigi) was formed in March 1959, although Nikkyōso extended unqualified support, it was in no condition to mount another offensive, regardless of the urgency of the issues. Several prefectural affiliates of the union staged local demonstrations, and many teachers participated as individuals in the daily mass street demonstrations around the Diet building. A certain amount of doubling-up occurred when one teacher took charge of two classes to free a colleague to participate in the demonstrations. The one unified effort by Nikkyōso was the mass walkout against the Teacher’s
Efficiency-rating Plan, scheduled for 2 P.M. on September 8, 1959, to coincide with the day of unified action scheduled by the People’s Council against the Security Pact. But this action was one of the dying gasps of Nikkyōso’s struggles against the rating plan. The major action in 1960 against the Security Pact was led by Sōhyō, the Socialist party, the Communist party and the Zengakuren; Nikkyōso played only a small role.

Upon passage of the Security Pact after months of turmoil in and around the Diet building, Prime Minister Kishi on June 23 announced his decision to resign. On July 19 Ikeda Hayato from Kishi’s Jimintō assumed the prime ministership. Ikeda’s policy was essentially based on an economic concept of doubling the income in ten years, to be carried out in a “low-keyed” manner, that is, quietly and without causing antagonism. Ironically, Ikeda appointed Araki Masuo, one of the most provocative politicians in Jimintō, as minister of education.

Minister of Education Araki, who had never concealed his contempt for Nikkyōso, launched a concerted attack on the union and its proclivities for politics. Shortly after taking office, he declared unequivocally that he would not meet with any representatives of Nikkyōso because it functioned under the remote control of the Japan Communist party, which is related to a foreign Communist government. Araki particularly attacked the union’s Code of Ethics, claiming that teachers influenced by the union’s philosophy were brainwashing the students to believe in leftist ideology under the assumption that teachers are laborers. This concept, to Minister Araki, violated the Fundamental Law of Education, guaranteeing the political neutrality of education, because it pointed toward a social revolution based on left-wing ideology. Until Nikkyōso reoriented its policies, he would have absolutely no contact with its representatives.

Minister Araki’s charges struck a sensitive spot, as was demonstrated at the union’s 1961 national convention at Miyazaki City. At this meeting, Nikkyōso became deadlocked over the issue of politics. The question basically revolved around the union’s policies since the early 1950s, which emphasized politics and education to the neglect of the economic welfare of teachers. The point was made that the function of labor unions such as Nikkyōso was to strive for the improvement of the economic welfare of the union members, and therefore that labor unions should let political parties handle political issues. In order for both the labor unions and the political parties to succeed, it was considered necessary that there
be a formal working relationship between the two so that they might mutually reinforce their efforts to obtain their respective goals.

There was a degree of ambiguity in Nikkyōso’s actions during this convention, as witnessed by the general public. If the union wanted to endorse a new policy that gave priority to economic issues, why did it consider formalizing a relationship with a particular political party? The answer lay behind the scenes in the internal maneuvering for union leadership. The moderates behind Miyanohara believed that they had the majority of the rank-and-file convention delegates behind them. They also realized that the powerful Central Executive Committee was still under the influence of the Communist faction led by Hiragaki. Although Hiragaki was no longer an executive of the committee, he remained on it representing Osaka Prefecture.

Miyanohara consequently found himself hampered by the Communist group at the policy-forming level (the Central Executive Committee), while holding strength at the policy-approving level, the convention floor representing the rank and file. In order to move Nikkyōso in the moderate direction away from the recent debilitating political struggles, he had somehow to curtail the Communist strength on the Central Committee in order to present his proposals to the whole union. His solution was to try to associate the union officially with the moderate Socialist party by going directly to the convention floor, over the heads of the Communist group on the Central Executive Committee.

The significance of having a formal relationship with the Socialist party lay in the fact that Nikkyōso up until then had overtly supported both progressive parties—the Socialist and the Communist—since each was an antigovernment organization. The Japan Communist party had traditionally exerted significant influence on the union through its activist members in the Nikkyōso hierarchy. In fact, the Communist party had played an integral role in Nikkyōso from the beginning even though the very top union executives and the rank and file traditionally aligned themselves with the Socialist party. A motion to support only the Socialist party obviously represented an important step, inviting strong reaction from the Communist faction. This maneuver was only one part of Miyanohara’s grand scheme to salvage the union following its enervating confrontation with the government over the rating system.
The other part of Miyanohara’s plan was to deemphasize political struggles to reduce their disastrous effects on Nikkyōso, dividing the membership between the moderate or apolitical rank and file and the minority of extreme left-wing political activists, who had worked themselves into influential positions on the local level. Political struggles had not only polarized the factions within the union but had also brought on fragmentation, resulting in the splintering off of large groups of disaffected members.

Miyanohara realized that the one concern that all members had in common, regardless of their political inclinations or disinclinations, was economics. Few could oppose a platform based primarily on the objective of improving teachers’ salaries. On this assumption, Miyanohara set himself the task of reuniting Nikkyōso’s membership by reorienting the platform away from the divisive policy of politics to the uniting policy of economics. To accomplish these long-range goals, his first task was to circumvent the power of the Communist bloc on the Central Executive Committee, which opposed his plan, by having Nikkyōso align itself with only one political party, the Socialist party.41

The proposals to promote economic issues through deemphasis of political issues and to support only the Socialist party threw the 1961 convention into an uproar. The Communist bloc was fighting to retrieve its influence, which had been slowly eroded with the growth of the Miyanohara faction. Amid shouting, filibustering, and general confusion, a vote was taken; an undetermined majority supported the motion for a new economic orientation. When the vote was about to be taken on the matter concerning association only with the Socialist party, opposition radicals surrounded the chairman of the subcommittee, thrusting the convention into total chaos as fighting broke out. The convention was abruptly adjourned. The spectacle was given much publicity.

A month later the convention reconvened in Tōkyō, and a second vote was taken. Amid maximum opposition from the Communist bloc, the two original proposals were finally approved by a majority of the convention.42 Even though Secretary General Miyanohara had won his battle on the floor of the convention, the policies he advocated had one final hurdle to cross—the nationwide achievement tests (gakuryoku tesuto).

The Ministry of Education had announced that it would conduct a battery of achievement tests in mathematics, social studies, science, English, and Japanese for all second-and third-year lower secondary school students throughout the nation on
October 4, 1961. Achievement tests had been given annually for the previous six years, but only at selected schools. Minister of Education Araki Masuo later explained the purpose of the new compulsory-test plan:

Based on Article 26 of the Constitution, which states that “all people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability” and the Ministry of Education’s interpretation of Articles 20, 38, and 43 of the School Education Law, stating that “matters concerning school subjects shall be decided by the competent authorities,” that is, the Minister, it became necessary for me as Minister to measure the effects of the curriculum for which I was responsible. In order to assure that every student from Hokkaidō to Kyūshū was receiving an equal educational opportunity, it was essential that the Ministry conduct nationwide achievement tests to obtain national standards for comparisons. Only by such a procedure could we determine exactly where students were not achieving at the national standard, enabling the government to undertake corrective measures to guarantee equal educational opportunities throughout the nation, according to the Constitution.43

Nikkyōso interpreted the achievement-test plan from a different point of view. It charged that the government was striving to grasp total control of the classroom by first standardizing the curriculum in 1958 and then conducting national achievement tests in 1961 to ascertain whether teachers were following the prescribed curriculum. The union considered the test plan as a direct intervention into the classroom by the government.

Nikkyōso’s opposition to the achievement-test plan was the union’s last stand against what it concluded were the government’s reactionary education policies, completely reversing the earlier postwar democratic education reforms. Since the end of American Occupation in 1952, Nikkyōso had already experienced two defeats: (1) its endeavor to preserve the independence of the school boards and also the union’s influence on them, and (2) its endeavor to preserve the autonomy of the school from the school board after the appointive system became effective in 1956, through sympathetic school principals who were mostly Nikkyōso members. The union’s sphere of influence had been narrowing—at first from the school board to the school, and finally down to the classroom itself—as a result of government policies.
The last preserve of the union seemed to be the classroom where the government still could not supervise effectively, even with its mandatory curriculum. The achievement tests were thus viewed by Nikkyōso as a postwar surrogate for the prewar school inspector. Nikkyōso considered that the government’s purpose in employing the achievement tests was to ascertain whether teachers were actually teaching in their classrooms the mandatory curriculum prescribed by the government. It was the teacher who was going to be tested, not the students.  

Nikkyōso objected to the tests for another reason—that they were means to exploit labor to develop Japan’s economy, as part of Prime Minister Ikeda’s economic policy. The union argued that the government’s purpose was to encourage students to work for high grades in paper-pencil tests in certain subjects so that they could be classified later into such vocational categories as managerial or clerical, in a process similar to that used for sorting animals. Nikkyōso predicted that the test plan would reduce Japanese education to just a preparation-for-examination mill.

The Central Executive Committee, still under the influence of the Communist faction, proposed a nationwide strike for October 26, 1961, the first day of the examinations. Nikkyōso informed Minister of Education Araki that teachers are entrusted to test their students for educational purposes, not for administrative purposes to suit the government, and therefore that they do not have to cooperate with the government in conjunction with the achievement-test plan.

Minister Araki replied that teachers must indeed comply with the directives of the Ministry of Education, designed to enhance Japanese education. Araki claimed that under the 1956 revision of the relationship between the Ministry of Education and school boards, the minister acquired the power to conduct investigations such as the achievement examinations. He pointed out that under Article 54 of the Law for the Administration of Local Education, the Minister of Education had the power to demand school boards to conduct necessary investigations and to submit their results to the Ministry. Again, the word demand (motomeru), which can also be interpreted as request, became a major point of contention.

Minister Araki accepted the union’s challenge by going on a speaking tour of the country, urging parents and educators to oppose Nikkyōso because he alone could not dissolve the union, a voluntary body of federated prefectural associations, although he would have liked to. He estimated that during his
lecture tour he publicly branded Nikkyōso activists as fools and outlaws approximately 150 times on the grounds that they tried to brainwash their students with leftist propaganda. At a meeting before a group of national education administrators, Araki made one of his most famous speeches during his term of office when he told the administrators to “shut out” Nikkyōso because it aimed at a Communist revolution. To support his claim, he cited statistics published by the Public Safety Investigation Agency, which reported that 3,000 of the 500,000 union members belonged to the Japan Communist party. He charged that “these communist members are trying to work up a revolution by brainwashing the good teachers and children. Rascals as members of the Union could not be trusted to educate Japanese youth. There is no choice but to get rid of the Union in order to pass on to the generations to come our culture and virtues built up by the efforts of our forefathers.”

In light of Minister Araki’s threat of harsh punishment if teachers went on strike, Nikkyōso altered its tactics against the achievement-test plan. The revised tactics called for teachers in those grades where the tests were to be given to teach their classes as usual and ignore the tests completely; strike action was not to be taken. Workshops for all teachers were scheduled during the first period of the day to achieve a united front and to negotiate with the school principals.

Nikkyōso claimed that on October 26, 1961, the tests were not given in 90 percent of the schools in Iwate Prefecture and 60 percent in Fukuoka, Hokkaidō, and Kōchi prefectures. Disruption of some schools in the majority of the remaining prefectures gave the union the small satisfaction that, contrary to the Ministry’s plan, the achievement tests were not administered simultaneously in every school. It was a shallow feeling of satisfaction because the Ministry of Education was successful in administering the examination in a large majority of the schools in spite of Nikkyōso’s determination to block it. In some districts, compromises were negotiated whereby the local administration agreed not to reveal scores for later employment purposes. Apparently the average teacher did not view the examination as constituting a serious threat to his independence; hence the teachers did not take mass action to block it.

Prompt measures were taken against activist teachers who either refused to give the tests or physically blocked test administrators. Sixty-one teachers were arrested and taken into custody; 15 of them were prosecuted in court for resorting to physical force. Twenty teachers were dismissed, 63 suspended,
reduced in salary, and 1,189 given official warnings.\textsuperscript{49} The achievement-test controversy generated bad feelings not only between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education, but also between teachers and school principals, and among teachers themselves.

The achievement test was the major source of contention between the Minister of Education and Nikkyōso in 1961. Minister Araki was determined that the tests be given the following year, scheduled for July 11 and 12, 1962, at the lower secondary and elementary school levels. As the date for the second national achievement tests neared, Nikkyōso again modified its position to that of “prior struggles,” that is, negotiating with school boards before the day of examinations in order to gain concessions in the hope of rendering the examination process ineffective. The examinations were carried out with minor concessions and difficulties.

Nikkyōso’s decision in 1962 against striking, euphemistically referred to as mass leave-taking or mass holidays, was a momentous pronouncement. What it signified was that Miyanohara had finally gained control of the Central Executive Committee, which he had set out to do in 1958. It had taken him nearly four years of slow but determined effort to gain supremacy over the radicals in the national executive. He was at last ready to make his ultimate move.

Nikkyōso’s twenty-fourth national convention was convened at Toyama City on July 23, 1962. Kobayashi Takeshi, chairman of the union since 1953, had won election to the House of Councillors several weeks prior to this convention in the tradition of former Nikkyōso chairmen, and therefore he was not running for reelection. Miyanohara Sadamitsu, former elementary school teacher from the southernmost island of Kyūshū, was elected chairman without difficulty. Once again, Nikkyōso was embarking on a new course under new leadership.
The newly elected chairman of Nikkyōso, Miyanohara Sadamitsu, faced with the major problems of reorienting the union’s policies and of reversing the alarming rate of membership withdrawals, unveiled his program at the 1962 national convention at Toyama City. The new orientation focused on teachers’ salaries and teachers’ rights,1 which had been the fundamental issues in the teachers’ movement from 1945 to 1950. But from 1951 to 1961, Nikkyōso was preoccupied with national and international political controversies as they related directly, and frequently indirectly, to education. After a decade of ideological struggles that had destroyed the unity and drained the energy of the left-wing teachers’ movement, thus reducing the union membership by about 20 percent, the cycle was now nearing completion with Nikkyōso’s return to the original goals with which it had so rapidly organized the preponderant number of teachers into the fold shortly after World War II.

Miyanohara set himself the goal of reconstructing the divided union into a strong, reunified organization. The strategy, centered around struggles for increasing teachers’ salaries and for regaining recognition of the right of collective bargaining with the Ministry of Education, perforce had to employ tactics other than strike action since the union was too weak to carry out nationwide unified strikes. This factor was only too clearly evidenced during the campaign against the achievement tests, when the plans of Nikkyōso’s Central Executive Committee could not be carried out at the local level. Miyanohara was particularly sensitive to the hiatus between Nikkyōso’s national leadership and the rank-and-file membership, which had widened as the union became increasingly militant during the 1950s. He set about correcting that situation by promoting a no-
strike policy, appealing for public support both nationally and internationally, and by having the many pending cases prosecuted through the courts.\(^2\)

Chairman Miyanohara was also confronted with a new set of circumstances unprecedented in the left-wing teachers’ movement. First, the number of female teachers in the elementary schools, traditionally the preserve of the male teacher in Japan, had reached nearly the 50-percent level by 1960. Since Nikkyōso’s membership consisted primarily of elementary and lower secondary school teachers, the increase in the number of female teachers introduced a new constituency causing new complications for the union leadership. Second, union members who were graduates of the prewar three-year teacher training schools (shihan gakkō) were being superseded in dominance by those who were graduates of the new postwar university system, in which teacher training was incorporated into the four-year university education. The postwar university graduates who entered teaching reflected the new educational philosophy, introducing another element of friction into the union. Thus it became even more difficult to formulate a nationwide policy which could meet the needs and demands of an ever diversifying membership. Consequently, Miyanohara turned to the issue of teachers’ salaries and rights as a way of unifying Nikkyōso members.

Simultaneously, the Japan Communist party showed a critical change of attitude through its members in Nikkyōso. Following the decline of Hiragaki’s (and consequently the Communists’) influence after Hiragaki lost his position of secretary general to Miyanohara, and reacting to the adverse criticism of the Communist-promoted teacher-rating struggles, the Japan Communist party notified its followers in Nikkyōso to emphasize henceforth economic struggles.\(^3\) The Communist faction’s reorientation, therefore, coincided with Miyanohara’s, resulting in marked numerical gains for the Communist party where Nikkyōso membership was concerned. For example, the usually reliable National Police Agency reported that, whereas there were 5,000 Communist party members in Nikkyōso when Miyanohara assumed union leadership in 1962, there were 10,000 by 1965. The Japan Communist party had achieved this gain through pursuing a generally unprovocative policy and maintaining a cooperative attitude toward Nikkyōso. During the same three-year period, the total Nikkyōso membership declined from 582,300 to 574,420.\(^4\)
As a result of these factors, Nikkyōso pursued a moderate policy from 1962 to 1965, relatively free from the disruptive tactics pursued with such regularity in the recent past. Miyanohara, facing the realities of an organization weakened from years of internal struggles and of a determined anti-Nikkyōso minister of education in the person of Araki Masuo, viewed the issues of teachers’ salaries and teachers’ rights as a single issue on the basis of a legal interpretation. Salaries of local teachers, although ostensibly determined by the local public bodies by which the teachers are employed, are based on the national salary scale for teachers in national schools, according to Article 25 of the Special Law for Educational Personnel. As a result, the salaries for teachers throughout the nation are similar.

The national salary scale, which sets the standards for local scales, is recommended by the National Personnel Authority (Jinjiin), an organ appointed by the prime minister’s cabinet. It collects data on salary and working conditions in private industry. In order that the government may compete effectively in the labor market, the National Personnel Authority recommends to the cabinet yearly salary increments for national civil servants, taking into account the salaries in private industries; the cabinet in turn determines the national salary scale for public employees for final Diet approval. Local bodies adjust accordingly, and teachers’ salaries are thus uniformly determined throughout the nation.

The two sources of power in the entire procedure are the National Personnel Authority, which utilizes scientific statistical procedures of data analysis, and the cabinet, that is, the ruling party in the government. The government has the right either to accept the full recommendations of the NPA or to adjust them before submitting the budget to the Diet for ultimate approval. The government has traditionally adjusted the NPA’s recommendations, frequently refusing to begin the new pay scales retroactively as the NPA nearly always recommends. In other words, even though teachers are locally hired and locally paid, the power that determines their wage increases lies with the national government and the ruling party.

The problem for Nikkyōso on this matter was that it was not recognized at any level, local or national, for it functioned through its federated prefectural unions of teachers, recognized only as local employees’ organizations (chihō shokuin dantai) by the prefectural governments. Hence, Nikkyōso’s new policy emphasizing economics could not be attained; that is, without
recognition at the national level, Nikkyōso could not negotiate with the national government, which set teachers’ salaries. Obtaining official recognition of Nikkyōso as an organized body to fight for teachers’ rights and improvement of teachers’ economic plight thus became the major concern of the union between 1962 and 1965.6

The tactics used were unique. Confronted by the powerful ruling conservative party, intransigent on this very issue, with Minister Araki resolutely refusing to meet Nikkyōso representatives until the union dropped the Code of Ethics, Miyanohara decided to appeal for international support until the union could become strong enough to reassert itself within Japan once more. The convention in Toyama in 1962 voted to concentrate on the ratification of the International Labor Organization Convention 87. The slogan became “Restore the Fundamental Rights of Laborers” through the abolishment of the law restricting strikes and through government recognition of Nikkyōso as the negotiating body for teachers.7 An analysis of the role played by the International Labor Organization in the disputations between Nikkyōso and the Japanese government is essential.

In November 1951 Japan joined the International Labor Organization, an independent, international organization working closely with the United Nations. The original purpose of the organization was to “inquire into the conditions of employment from the international aspect and to consider international means necessary to secure common action on matters affecting conditions of employment.” As one of the ten “states of chief industrial importance,” Japan has a permanent seat on the Governing Body, and a representative of the Japanese government occupies that seat. (No representative from Japanese workers has served on the Governing Body since 1957.8)

In 1948, ILO adopted a resolution called Convention 87, Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize. Its purpose was to guarantee freedom of association against interference by public authorities. Article 2 reads as follows: “Workers and employers, without distinction whatsoever, shall have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization.” Article 3, Clause 2 reads, “The public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful
exercise thereof.” Finally, Article 8 provides that “the law of the land shall not be such as to impair, nor shall it be so applied as to impair, the guarantees provided for in the Convention.”

One important point in the wording of Article 2 is the phrase “without distinction whatsoever.” The committee that drew up the document stressed in its report that, according to this provision, freedom of association was guaranteed not only to the employers and workers in private industry, but also to public employees, without distinction or discrimination of any kind as to occupation. The only exclusions were the armed forces and the police.

Then, in 1949, ILO adopted the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention 98 to supplement the resolutions stated in Convention 87. Article 4 of this document stipulates that “measures appropriate to national conditions shall be taken, where necessary, to encourage and promote the full development and utilization of machinery for voluntary negotiation between employers or employers’ organizations and workers’ organizations, with a view to the regulation of terms and conditions of employment by means of collective agreements.”

Under the general regulations of ILO, member nations have the right to accept or reject each convention. However, once a nation ratifies a convention, it is then expected to be fully subject to those provisions or risk international pressure and possibly condemnation. Japan, one of the ten members on ILO’s Governing Body, ratified the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention 98 on October 20, 1953. At the time of Miyanohara’s election as Nikkyōso’s chairman in 1962, Convention 87 had not yet been ratified.

Nikkyōso initiated its case with ILO through a lengthy document charging that “the Japanese Government defies the important trade union rights by denying the right to strike to the present Union and interferes with its organization and administration. The root of the problem is Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law which deprives education civil servants of the right to dispute…. We ardently request you to make an appropriate recommendation to the Government of Japan.”

Minister of Education Araki immediately attacked Nikkyōso’s charge, claiming the union had no right to appeal to ILO. Nevertheless, Nikkyōso, in conjunction with Sōhyō, representing all public service unions, painstakingly constructed their case against the government over a period of several years. Finally, in 1964, ILO appointed a Fact-finding Commis-
sion, chaired by Erik Dreyer from Denmark, which embarked on an investigation of the complaints submitted by Nikkyōso and other public service unions. Shortly thereafter, much to the annoyance of the government and delight of the union, the long and bitter struggle between Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education was being aired in public before an international tribunal. The proceedings were given wide publicity in Japan.

The conflicting testimony presented before the Fact-finding Commission by representatives of Nikkyōso and the Ministry of Education summed up their respective positions after nearly two decades of hostility. A summation of the testimony is warranted, juxtaposing the prosecution and the defense, in that order.

First, Nikkyōso contended that the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention 98, to which Japan was a signatory nation, had not been applied to the union on the grounds that teachers were hired and paid at the municipal and prefectural levels. Under Article 53 of the Local Public Service Law, any organization that included more than one local public body could not be recognized by the government and was regarded merely as a voluntary organization. Because of this technicality, Nikkyōso, as a national organization, was not recognized at the bargaining table on the national level. Moreover, since local teachers’ salaries, according to Article 25 of the Special Law for Education Personnel, were based on a national scale determined by the national government, prefectural school boards refused to negotiate salary matters with prefectural teachers’ organizations, claiming that wages were decided on the national level and the prefecture had nothing to do with the wage problem.

Nikkyōso further contended that, when the prefectural organizations of teachers tried to negotiate matters concerning teachers’ working conditions or the number of teachers at each school, the local school boards refused to negotiate on grounds that those matters were fixed by the Ministry of Education. Nikkyōso stated that, since the Ministry of Education does have the power to prepare the educational budget for Diet approval, and since the amount of money spent on education by the government has a direct bearing on the working conditions of teachers, Nikkyōso went to the Ministry of Education but that the minister refused negotiations, claiming that teachers were covered by the Local Public Service Law and the Ministry
of Education had no right to negotiate with teachers. Thus, Nikkyōso’s testimony concluded, under the circumstances described, there was no one with whom the union could negotiate.

The Japanese government’s witness responded by claiming that standards relating to teachers’ salaries in Article 25 of the Special Law for Education Personnel did not have such binding power that local school boards could not determine teachers’ salaries independently. To maintain standards, though, it was necessary for the State “to assume responsibility for teachers’ salaries”; so the standard number of teachers in each prefecture was decided by national law. Members of unions were “free to convey their wishes or express their views to the Minister,” he continued, but they could not negotiate with the minister since he had no authority to act as employer. The witness testified that prefectural teachers’ unions could negotiate with prefectural authorities but that Nikkyōso as a nationwide organization could not. When asked whether the government sought the views of Nikkyōso when formulating the nation’s policies on education and in drawing up the education budget, insofar as these matters had repercussions on the salaries and working conditions of teachers, the government representative replied that the Ministry of Education had not sought Nikkyōso’s opinion.

In hearings related to “Acts of Antiunion Discrimination and Interference,” Nikkyōso’s witness accused the government of sponsoring rival unions, citing as an example the National Federation of Teachers, which had about twelve thousand members and which was, he alleged, organized under the sponsorship of the Ministry of Education and Jimintō. Every year, Nikkyōso charged, the Ministry of Education concentrated its efforts on a different prefecture. Nikkyōso also accused the Ministry of arbitrarily deciding supervisory classifications in an attempt to disrupt the membership by forcing administrative personnel to withdraw from the union.

The Ministry of Education’s defendant countered to the Fact-finding Commission that Nikkyōso’s excessive political inclinations and its attitude totally against the policy of the Ministry of Education were the fundamental reasons why fifteen to twenty thousand members withdrew from the union in each of the past several years. He added that in 1964 only 70 percent of newly employed teachers joined the union, whereas in 1958, 96.5 percent had joined.
Nikkyōso’s witness charged the government with discriminatory treatment of union members in Ehime Prefecture, where the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan originated, citing statistics to show that prefectural union membership of 9,664 in 1957 had fallen to a mere 940 by 1964. The witness testified that the prefectural board of education had organized a rival group, the Ehime Educational Research Conference (E.E.R.C.), whose membership was open only to those teachers who had left or promised to leave Nikkyōso. The charge was made that only E.E.R.C. members were given salary increases and that no union members were promoted to administrative positions without first withdrawing from Nikkyōso and joining the E.E.R.C. In addition, the percentage of Nikkyōso members transferred to isolated rural districts was said to have been two to three times higher than that of E.E.R.C. members. The witness cited other prefectural examples similar to Ehime.

The Ministry of Education’s witness testified that because the Ehime Prefectural Teachers Union had violently opposed the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan, considerate teachers, being aware of their primary mission, seceded from Nikkyōso to form the E.E.R.C. as an organization devoted to educational research. He said there was absolutely no truth in the allegations of discriminatory treatment of selected teachers. He added that, in view of E.E.R.C.’s successful research meetings and research publications, the prefectural and central governmental authorities had given the organization a grant-in-aid of 2,058,000 yen in 1963. The fact that members of Nikkyōso were excluded from the E.E.R.C. had been brought to the attention of the Ministry of Education, but the minister attached no importance to this fact and extended assistance to the new teachers’ association for its worthy research activities. He explained that Nikkyōso could not receive government grants because the union had its own activities.\[13\]

Rebuttal followed allegation, winding through the morass of hostility and vituperation, just as Nikkyōso and the Ministry had been conducting themselves in preceding years; such a hostile relationship bewildered the Fact-finding Commission of international labor experts. The commission finally decided to visit Japan in January 1965 for further hearings and direct investigations. The arguments were merely extended in Japan. The commission, which logged over a month of hearings both in Geneva and in Japan, compiling thousands of pages of written reports, published the following major findings, conclusions, and recommendations:
1. The Commission finds that the kernel of the grievance of certain of the complaining organizations is that the Japan Teachers Union cannot at present negotiate effectively on either a national or a local basis. The Commission therefore recommends the government to decide as a matter of policy whether it prefers central or local negotiations in respect to the employment of teachers. If the government prefers central negotiation, it will be necessary to take appropriate steps to make decisions resulting from such negotiations binding upon the local authorities. If the government prefers local negotiation, it will be necessary for it to give the local authorities real freedom to negotiate. It may well be that the most appropriate solution would be to distinguish from time to time between the matters appropriate for central negotiation and those more appropriate for local negotiations.

2. The Commission notes that the right to strike continues to be the subject of a fundamental divergence of view in Japan. We believe that both the restoration of the unlimited right to strike and the maintenance of the absolute prohibition to strike are unrealistic and that a reasonable compromise is necessary.

3. The Commission has noted the complexities of the regulations concerning labor relations in Japan. We regard excessive legalism as a major obstacle to developing mutual confidence. The government as a whole should have a general labor policy, applicable to all public employees irrespective of the department or local authority by which they are employed. As a minimum this policy should provide immediately for the full application to all public employees of the provisions of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98).

4. The government should develop at all levels the habit of mutual consultation.

5. It has become normally accepted practice in highly industrialized countries for trade unions, including organizations of public employees, to support the programs of democratic political parties which they consider to be in the interests of their members. But Sōhyō, and the Japan Teachers Union in particular, have systematically proceeded far beyond the point justified by economic aims.
and, in doing so, have called upon their local unions to utilize the strike weapon—an economic weapon—in an endeavor to force the Government of Japan to undertake particular policies in political fields which are peculiarly the responsibility of the government.

6. The future now depends on two factors: whether trade unions give the government, on a non-political basis, the measure of cooperation necessary to enable it to make a reality of the new policy; and whether the government then proceeds, on the basis of such cooperation, to resolve the innumerable questions still outstanding.\(^\text{14}\)

Several months after the Fact-finding Commission completed its investigation in Japan, the ruling party finally consented to Convention 87, which received Diet approval on June 14, 1965, effective one year later.\(^\text{15}\) Ratification had been considered repeatedly during earlier sessions of the Diet, only to be tabled when the government could not succeed in persuading the right-wing bloc to recognize Nikkyōso. Following ratification, the Fact-finding Commission concluded as follows:

By virtue of the ratification of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87), teachers are now legally entitled to designate the Japan Teachers Union to represent them in such negotiations as may take place irrespective of whether such negotiations are conducted on a regional or national level. The Commission notes with satisfaction that this was implicitly conceded in the evidence given before them in September 1964, by the representation at the Ministry of Education.\(^\text{16}\)

As we shall see, this was not to be the case.

During the several years when Nikkyōso was appealing its case before the International Labor Organization, Chairman Miyanohara was energetically trying to ameliorate the internal divisions of the union by organizing on the local level groups of people to study wage struggles. These study groups promoted the appeal for unity so that the union could attain its economic objectives. A notable shift in tactics was evinced when Nikkyōso began to attach new importance to the National Personnel Authority by presenting its economic demands to the NPA rather than directly to the government as in the past.
The new tactics, eschewing violence, involved the submission of union demands to the NPA. Peaceful demonstrations and sit-ins were conducted around the NPA building and in front of the Diet building as the process of determining teachers’ salaries proceeded through its course. Peaceful rallies were also held in schools. Once the NPA made its recommendations to the government, Nikkyōso directed its efforts to the government rather than the NPA, demanding total acceptance of the NPA’s recommendations. Because salaries of all public servants were being considered simultaneously, Nikkyōso collaborated with Sōhyō and the Socialist party in the annual wage struggles. Their efforts were not particularly encouraging since ultimate decisions on salary matters were greatly influenced by the intense internal cabinet rivalry between the traditionally powerful minister of finance and his close associates, and the remaining competing cabinet ministers, including the minister of education.

Minister of Education Araki never for a day relented his attack on Nikkyōso. During his speaking tour throughout the nation, he branded Nikkyōso teachers as thieves intent on robbing Japanese children of their spiritual health by using brainwashing techniques. He attacked the union’s annual research conventions (Kyōiku Kenkyū Shūkai), under the influence of left-wing scholars (Kōshidan), for attempting to destroy the mandatory curriculum and turn children into tools of a Communist revolution. After serving exactly three years as minister of education, the longest period any one man has served in that position in the postwar era, Araki was succeeded on July 18, 1963, by Nadao Hirokichi, a strong bureaucrat. Nikkyōso proposed to meet with Nadao, but he saw no reason to alter Araki’s position against official contacts with the union. He felt that talks might create misunderstandings.

During the tenures of Araki and Nadao, Nikkyōso made one of its major educational goals the acceptance of all students from the lower secondary school to the upper secondary school, because any student wishing to enter the upper school after completing the ninth year in the compulsory lower secondary school was required to take an entrance examination. Nikkyōso devoted considerable effort, with some success, to the campaign for the accommodation of more students in the upper secondary schools. At the time the union first considered launching this campaign in 1960, 57.8 percent of the graduates of lower
secondary schools entered the upper secondary school; by 1965, over 72 percent were in the upper school. Nikkyōso took considerable credit for the rapid increase.

The first half of the 1960s was also important in the history of the left-wing teachers’ movement because of a number of court decisions handed down during this period. The union’s Legal Affairs Department had become involved in 137 court suits as a result of the struggles over the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan, during the years 1956 to 1959, and the achievement-test plan, between 1961 and 1962. The judicial decisions were obviously of great importance not only to Nikkyōso, but also to the Ministry of Education.

The major court decisions concerning teachers punished for their actions during the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan struggles, based on Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law, which stipulates that “local public servants may not resort to strikes, slowdown, or other acts of dispute against their employer, or to instigate others to do so,” included the following:

1. The Osaka District Court ruled on February 13, 1959, that teachers who participated in mass paid holidays during the rating struggles were not in violation of the Local Public Service Law. The Prosecutor’s office appealed the verdict to the next higher court where the case lay pending for years.

2. (a) The Fukuoka District Court on December 21, 1962, ruled that mass holidays in April and May, 1958 were, in fact, strikes in violation of the law. Four members of the Fukuoka Prefectural Teachers Union were found guilty of instigating acts of dispute against the local body under Article 37.
   (b) The Fukuoka Higher Court on December 18, 1967, overruled the lower court’s decision.

3. The Saga District Court on August 27, 1962, ruled that strikes by local public service personnel do not violate Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law if the strikes do not affect the welfare of the public. Teachers who went on strike in Saga Prefecture were not violating Article 37 since their activities did not affect the welfare of the general public.

4. The Tōkyō Higher Court in November, 1965, declared that leaders of Tokyōso, the huge affiliate of Nikkyōso in the capital city, were guilty of instigating teachers to strike during a protest demonstration in 1958.
The court cases concerning the achievement-test struggles and arrests revolved primarily around Nikkyōso’s charge that the government had no legal basis for conducting compulsory nationwide achievement examinations. The union charged the government with violating Article 10 of the Fundamental Law of Education, which stipulates that “education shall not be subject to improper control, but it shall be directly responsible to the whole people”; and Article 54, Clause 2 of the Law for the Administration of Local Education, which says that the “Minister of Education can motomeru (request or demand) local school boards to submit statistical and investigative reports concerning education within their jurisdiction.”

The interpretation of motomeru, under the so-called yōkyū (request or demand) clause, became extremely important in these proceedings because the legal basis of the government’s increasing influence over education was the authority of the Ministry of Education to ask school boards to comply with Ministry requests. The fundamental question at stake was whether school boards had the right to refuse Ministerial directives or whether the government had the power to compel local boards to comply. Nikkyōso’s case was aimed at the very heart of the interminable postwar controversy over control of Japanese education. The following verdicts were handed down:

1. (a) The Kumamoto District Court (Kyūshū) on September 14, 1962, concluded that the achievement tests were not a matter of legality or constitutionality and that they did not violate the spirit of the Fundamental Law of Education. Three teachers were given short-term prison sentences for obstructing the performance of a public official, the school principal, in carrying out his duties in administering the tests.
   (b) The Fukuoka Higher Court on May 13, 1964, overruled the Kumamoto District Court’s decision and declared that the tests were illegal on the basis that it was not proper for the Ministry of Education to conduct national achievement tests merely for the purpose of research.

2. (a) The Kōchi District Court (Shikoku) on April 24, 1963, declared that the tests did not fall within the realm of legality as tests per se. They merely represented official government documents which must be executed as instructed. In effect, the tests were legal.
The Takamatsu Higher Court on June 3, 1964, upheld the Kōchi District Court’s decision.

3. (a) The Kokura Branch Court of the Fukuoka District Court (Kyūshū) on March 16, 1964, ruled the tests illegal not on the basis of Article 54 of the Law for the Administration of Local Education but rather on the basis of Article 10 of the Fundamental Law of Education.  
(b) The Fukuoka Higher Court on April 28, 1967, upheld the lower court’s decision, based on Article 54 of the educational administration law, not on Article 10 of the Constitution.

4. The Asahikawa District Court (Hokkaidō) on May 25, 1966, declared the tests illegal based on Article 54 of the Law for the Administration of Local Education.\(^{25}\)

The inconsistencies of the various court decisions concerning the right to strike and the legality of the achievement tests were revealing because the verdicts themselves reflected the polarization taking place in the interpretations of Japanese education laws: antithetical verdicts were given based on the same clauses of the law. Obviously, a conclusive legal decision was essential. Anxious for a hearing by the highest judicial body in the land, Nikkyōso appealed to the Supreme Court.

As a test case for the Supreme Court, Nikkyōso appealed the 1965 verdict by the Tōkyō Higher Court that leaders of Tokyōso (Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union), including its president, Hasegawa Shōzō (one of the founding fathers of the left-wing teachers’ movement after the war), were guilty of violating Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law in instigating teachers to strike in 1958 against the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan. The Tōkyō Higher Court had indicted only the leaders of the union for instigating the strike, but not the thousands of teachers who had participated in the strike. Nikkyōso argued in its résumé before the Supreme Court in November 1965 that Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law, restricting strikes by local civil servants, was unconstitutional in that it violated Article 28 of the Constitution, which states that “the right of workers to organize and to bargain and act collectively is guaranteed.”\(^{26}\)

The Supreme Court delayed its decision for four years; on April 2, 1969, it finally overruled the lower court’s findings. But the final verdict did not answer the question concerning the
constitutionality of Article 37 of the Local Public Service Law, for the decision was based on the argument that the prosecution had not proven beyond a doubt that union leaders had “instigated” the strike. The Supreme Court by a narrow decision wrote that the clause prohibiting individuals or groups from instigating local public servants to strike must be strictly defined. Nikkyōso considered the Supreme Court’s decision the greatest judicial victory for the teachers in the history of the left-wing teachers’ movement. The ultimate results of this landmark decision extend far beyond the period covered in this study.

During the first three years under Miyahara’s leadership, Nikkyōso also continued an attack on what it interpreted as the government’s reactionary educational policies, in addition to the implementation of the required curriculum at the elementary school level from 1961 and at the lower secondary level from 1962. The union charged that the Ministry of Education was distorting the required curriculum and the intent of authorized textbooks by injecting reactionary and nationalistic material, particularly in the history courses. The union demanded that the curriculum be set by teachers and local administrators, that textbooks be selected by the local teaching body, and that the proposed government-sponsored national aptitude examination for university entrance (Nōken Tesuto) be rejected.

There were two developments in 1965 which aroused Nikkyōso leaders to redouble their criticisms of the government’s educational policies. On January 1 the Central Advisory Council on Education, an organ of the Ministry of Education, published a controversial interim report entitled The Ideal Image of Man, an outgrowth of an assignment made by the minister of education in 1963 in preparation for an expansion of secondary school education. He had requested the council to undertake a study of the ideal product of the school system; hence, the words ideal image in the title of the report.

Among other controversial items, the interim report stated, “The Emperor is the symbol of Japan. We have carried the flag, sung the anthem, and loved and revered the Emperor. We must remember that loving and revering our fatherland is identical with loving and revering the Emperor.” Nikkyōso joined the chorus of protests from many sources over the right-wing intent of the report, and prepared materials for local teachers’ discussions. Nikkyōso claimed that it was not a legitimate function of a democratic government to establish a mold into which all students should fit. They argued that the strength of Japan rests
on the diversity of her people. Opposition is essential. The union vowed to oppose in the classrooms the concept expressed in the *ideal-image* document.  

Following this controversy, Nikkyōso plunged into the textbook dispute when, in mid-June 1965, a left-wing scholar, Ienaga Saburō, professor of Japanese history at the University of Education in Tōkyō, sued the Ministry of Education for one million yen. Ienaga had in 1963 submitted to the Ministry for approval the revised draft of his popular textbook entitled *A New History of Japan*, which had gone through four editions since 1947. Objecting to about two hundred passages, the Ministry did not approve the revised draft. After making further revisions in accordance with the Ministry’s demands, Ienaga brought suit charging that the Textbook Authorization Procedure, requiring authors to obtain Ministry authorization for the use of their books as official textbooks, constituted a form of state censorship infringing on freedom of expression guaranteed by the postwar Constitution.

Nikkyōso, which had disputed the textbook-authorization system throughout the postwar period, had already been claiming that the Ministry of Education had increased its surveillance over textbook content from the early 1960s by increasingly demanding revisions of material critical of early Japanese myths, which had been taught as truths prior to World War II, and of Japan’s role in the war. When Professor Ienaga took his case to court citing specific examples of sections labeled unacceptable by the Ministry of Education, Nikkyōso threw its full weight behind Ienaga by organizing study groups of teachers throughout the nation. The case received wide publicity when distinguished scholars, among them former president of Tōkyō University, Nambara Shigeru, testified on behalf of Ienaga. The case developed into a long and tedious litigation.

During the years of relative quietude between 1962 and 1965 while the ILO investigations and the legal proceedings ran their course—costing the union much time, effort, and expense—Chairman Miyanohara, with subdued diplomacy, had been emphasizing wage demands at home. By 1965 he concluded that the unity of Nikkyōso’s rank and file had been sufficiently restored to allow the union to use aggressive tactics to attain its economic goals. After failing to obtain for the union the right of collective bargaining with the government, Miyanohara decided to change his tactics. He planned for a nationwide strike to demand full acceptance by the government of the National Personnel Authority’s recommendation of a 6.4
percent increase in teachers’ salaries, retroactive to May.\textsuperscript{31} The government had announced its acceptance of the salary increase but on the condition that it take effect only from September. Strike action was approved for October 22, 1965, by the twenty-eighth national convention in May.\textsuperscript{32}

Miyano\-hara, being still wary of the gap between national union planning and local implementation, maneuvered carefully for the first unified action since he assumed the chairmanship. He decided that before strike action could be executed, Nikkyōso should conduct an unprecedented nationwide union referendum on the question whether the members would approve of a strike demanding a monthly pay increase of 7,000 yen, to be retroactive to May 1, extra payment for overtime duties, and the abolishment of daytime security duty in the school building. The purpose of the referendum was to instill into each union member a sense of responsibility for the strike action, thus linking the rank and file with the national executive in a truly unified struggle. Miyano\-hara felt that if all members were responsible, all would participate.\textsuperscript{33} The plan was to strike on October 22 with five other public service employees’ unions; the combined forces gave a total of over two million unionists.

Shortly before the scheduled strike, Minister of Education Nakamura Umekichi, appointed by Prime Minister Satō Eisaku (younger brother of former Prime Minister Kishi; he succeeded Ikeda Hayato who resigned from the nation’s supreme office because of failing health in 1964), proposed to meet with Nikkyōso representatives. His decision was based ostensibly on the recommendations of the International Labor Organization’s Fact-finding Commission that the government and unions should hold periodic consultations. The meeting represented the first such direct talks between a minister of education and Nikkyōso representatives in five and a half years, that is, since Araki Masuo became minister in 1960. The union interpreted the meeting as an indication of concern by the minister of education over the well-publicized strike plans. At the highly heralded meeting, Minister Nakamura proposed suspension of the union’s strike plans; he stated that the Ministry of Education, in turn, would carefully consider Nikkyōso’s wage demands. Nikkyōso refused to call off the strike unless the Ministry gave a definite promise that it would meet the union’s demands.

Minister Nakamura, during the hour-and-a-half encounter, laid down three conditions of the government before further talks would be considered. The significance of this famous troika of conditions is that each succeeding minister of edu-
cation referred to them as a necessary basis for talks. They were: the abolishment or fundamental revision of the union’s Code of Ethics, the adoption of a policy of political neutrality, and the discontinuance of force to impede the educational measures taken by the school boards. Nikkyōso rejected the minister’s terms.

The referendum on the strike question was conducted by the union in mid-September. Seventy-five percent of those voting approved the strike plan. Based on the results of the referendum, Nikkyōso, on September 30, held its thirtieth Extraordinary Convention to vote on the motion to take a half-day mass leave on October 22 as part of the unified action by the Public Service Personnel Unified Struggle Committee (Kōmuin Kyōtō). The convention passed the motion to strike by a vote of 427 to 29. The plans had been carefully prepared.

But by October 20 the Unified Struggle Committee began to disintegrate. Certain unions, either under the threat of government censure or reacting to minor government concessions, modified their plans by reducing the length of the strike. When one union deviated from the original unified plan, it set off a ripple that quickly turned into a wave. By late evening of October 20, Nikkyōso was standing alone. Prefectural Nikkyōso officers lost their confidence in the face of mass defections of the other public employees’ unions. At the very last minute, Miyanohara altered the original plan from a half-day strike to a walkout beginning at 3 P.M., just at the end of a regular school day.

The first nationwide strike sponsored by Nikkyōso since the late 1950s thus ended in failure. The government endorsed most of the National Personnel Authority’s wage recommendations but refused to make them retroactive to May. No concessions were granted. Self-reflection was the order of the day. Miyanohara, who had spent several years planning this strike, realized he had overestimated the unity and power of his union. Nikkyōso was still too weak to carry out unified struggles. Nevertheless, he vowed to mount a successful strike campaign for higher wages in 1966.

For the remainder of 1965 and part of 1966, Nikkyōso held innumerable meetings; the 1965 debacle was discussed in an attempt to discern appropriate strike tactics for wage demands in 1966. Leaders on the prefectural level also promoted similar tactics. While the union was busy drawing up preliminary plans for the 1966 strike, the government announced that principals and assistant principals would be classified as supervisors ac-
cording to the National Public Service Law. As a result, they could no longer remain in a union meant for nonsupervisory personnel. It was estimated that about forty thousand reclassified members withdrew from Nikkyōso.36

Then UNESCO, in conjunction with ILO, added a further stimulant to Nikkyōso’s campaign for recognition, when it convened a conference in Paris in October 1966 to consider the status of teachers. The union showed more than a passing interest in the meeting because the government, although having ratified the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention 87 sixteen months earlier, was still refusing to recognize Nikkyōso. Delegates from both the union and the Ministry of Education attended. The conference drew up a document entitled Recommendations Concerning the Status of Teachers. Of the many recommendations listed, the articles most critical for Nikkyōso were the following:

**Article 6.** Teaching should be regarded as a profession. It is a form of public service which requires of teachers expert knowledge and specialized skills, acquired and maintained through rigorous and continued study.

**Article 44.** Promotion of teachers should be based on an objective assessment of the teacher’s qualifications for the new post, by reference to strictly professional criteria laid down in consultation with teacher’s organizations.

**Article 49.** Teachers’ organizations should be consulted when the machinery to deal with disciplinary matters is established.

**Article 62.** Teachers and their organizations should participate in the development of new courses, textbooks, and teaching aids.

**Article 82.** Both salaries and working conditions for teachers should be determined through the process of negotiation between teachers’ organizations and the employers of teachers.
Article 84. Appropriate joint machinery should be set up to deal with the settlement of disputes between the teachers and their employers arising out of terms and conditions of employment. If the means and procedures established for these purposes should be exhausted, or if there should be a breakdown in negotiations between the parties, teachers’ organizations should have the right to take such other steps as are normally open to other organizations in the defense of their legitimate interests.\(^{37}\)

Interpreting the final clause in Article 84—that “teachers’ organizations should have the right to take such steps as are normally open to other organizations” when negotiations break down—to mean the right to strike, Nikkyōso welcomed UNESCO’s report.\(^ {38}\) Since recognized unions have that right in Japan under the Labor Relations Adjustment Law (Rōdō Kankei Chōsei Hō), the union argued that once again an international organization in which Japan holds membership had supported Nikkyōso’s position against the government. The Ministry of Education, through its representative, Sagara Iichi, argued that the government did not interpret this passage as granting Nikkyōso the right to strike. On the contrary, according to the government, the “other organizations,” referred to in Article 84 were those in the same category as Nikkyōso, that is, public service unions. Since other organizations in the public sector do not have the right to strike, neither did Nikkyōso.\(^ {39}\) Nikkyōso would not be recognized. The relationship between the union and the Ministry thus remained as before.

At Nikkyōso’s national convention in September 1966, strike plans nearly identical with those made for 1965 were approved. A unified strike of government employees’ unions was scheduled for October 21, 1966, with similar demands for the full implementation of the National Personnel Authority’s recommendations, including retroactive wage increases. A national union referendum was held between September 25 and October 5 to obtain approval of the half-day walkout. This time 72.2 percent of the membership approved.\(^ {40}\) Treading cautiously, Miyanohara would approve of strike action only in those prefectures where more than 50 percent of union members voted in favor of the strike motion, since the weaker prefectural unions had been the first to capitulate in the 1965 debacle. Twenty-three of forty-six prefectures approved the plan to strike.\(^ {41}\)
An entirely new ingredient was added in the 1966 strike plans. Sōhyō, of which Nikkyōso is a member, decided in August to support unified strike action also on October 21. Sōhyō had two major goals: to launch a campaign protesting American involvement in the Vietnam war, and to obtain a salary hike for public employees, who represented the majority of Sōhyō’s membership. The Vietnam war was being sharply escalated at this time, thrusting the war issue into the center of the Japanese left-wing movement which was aimed directly against American involvement. At a special convention in early October, Sōhyō reaffirmed that one of its major slogans in the strike on October 21 would express opposition to the war.42

Miyano, who had organized a campaign to collect ten million signatures against American bombings of North Vietnam, was willing to place his union behind an anti-American demonstration, but he had not planned to have Nikkyōso’s economic campaign turned into an ideological protest movement. Admittedly, in his speech at the 1966 convention he devoted more time to international political issues than in any of his speeches since he became chairman in 1962. He demanded an end to the American involvement in Vietnam, the return of Okinawa to Japanese control, and the annulment of the United States-Japan Security Pact. Clearly, Nikkyōso was moving cautiously back into the political arena. Be that as it may, Miyano claimed that the 1966 strike plans were focused primarily on economic demands.43

In spite of Miyano’s appeals, anti-Vietnam war preparations dominated the left-wing forces, overshadowing Nikkyōso’s wage campaign. The Japan Communist party joined with the Socialist party and Sōhyō to announce that the anti-Vietnam war issue would take precedence over economic issues in the strike.44 With local Nikkyōso leaders supporting the antiwar demonstrations, it became nebulous where economic demands ended and political issues began. The minister of education warned that the government would deal sternly with teachers who participated in a political strike.45 Miyano’s unified strike plans were once again going astray.

Nikkyōso, on October 9, declared that teachers in over half of all prefectures had voted to participate in the strike action to demand full implementation of the National Personnel Authority’s recommendations for a 6-percent salary increase, retroactive to May 1966. Seventy-two percent of the 549,000 membership had voted approval.46 As the strike deadline approached, various unions began to scale down their plans in re-
sponse to a threat that the minister of labor would punish union members participating in a political strike. Nikkyōso’s strike plans once again remained the boldest.

On October 21, 1966, Sōhyō’s forty-eight member unions carried out a limited strike led by Nikkyōso’s selected prefectoral union affiliates. The strike was only partly successful, but Nikkyōso took immediate comfort in being able to conduct strike action even though only about half of all the prefectures participated; it was the union’s largest unified action since 1958. Approximately 134,000 teachers walked out of their classrooms—two-thirds for half a day and the remainder for two hours. Nikkyōso leadership called the strike a great success because teachers could unite with workers from other unions in unified struggles. Their euphoria was short-lived, however.

The government reacted early the next morning. Throughout the nation, the police took swift action, raiding union-affiliate headquarters in three hundred different locations for evidence related to the conduct of a politically motivated strike. Days later, nearly all the leaders of the Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union were arrested because seventeen thousand teachers in Tōkyō had walked out of their classrooms on October 21. In all, thirty-six Nikkyōso leaders were arrested, including Chairman Miyanohara and Secretary General Makieda, who were arrested in their homes at dawn on December 21 for instigating the strike. A total of twenty thousand teachers were dismissed or suspended for their part in the strike. A number of cases were taken to court, including Miyanohara’s and Makieda’s, as the turbulent year ended.

For Nikkyōso, the year 1967, its twentieth anniversary, began in much the same manner as did the year 1947, when Nikkyōso was inaugurated amidst militant acts of opposition against the government. In action reminiscent of the abortive general strike planned for February 1, 1947, to topple the Yoshida government, the thirty-third national convention in August 1967 voted to conduct a nationwide teachers’ strike on October 26 against the wage policy of the Satō government. The circumstances were nearly identical with those of the previous two years when strikes were planned for the month of October. Minister of Education Kennoki Toshihiro declared the strike illegal. He also announced that he would not meet with union representatives until they renounced their Code of Ethics, practiced political neutrality, and refrained from resorting to force to impede the educational policy of the government.
The Kagoshima Prefectural Board of Education then made public the dismissal of Nikkyōso Chairman Miyanohara Sadamitsu from its local teachers’ register for leading the teachers’ political strike on October 26, 1966; Miyanohara by this dismissal had to forfeit his teaching license.51 At the time of the announcement, Miyanohara was busily engaged in arranging for a nationwide union referendum in the hope of winning approval for the 1967 strike—for “ensuring individual responsibility for unified struggles.”52 Defiantly, he returned the notice of dismissal, two days prior to Nikkyōso’s twentieth-anniversary celebration, a fitting gesture with which to conclude Nikkyōso’s first two decades and to perpetuate the militant antigovernment traditions of the Japanese left-wing teachers’ movement.
PART III
Militancy
This review of the first twenty years of Nikkyōso’s history, and of the left-wing teachers’ movement of the prewar era has made it clear that militancy is one of the union’s most salient characteristics. Nikkyōso has literally been an organization in perpetual opposition. It has opposed, among other things, the Japanese government, the Ministry of Education, Japanese rearmament, American foreign policy, capitalism, and post-Occupation reforms of Japanese education.

Opposition and resistance are inherent in Nikkyōso’s attitudes. For example, when the Nikkyōso-supported Socialist party gained control of the government in 1947, the union actively opposed the Socialist government within a relatively short time, precipitating its collapse, which terminated the only period of Socialist control in postwar Japan. Nikkyōso’s attitude of interminable opposition has developed into a militant tradition expressed in activities ranging from peaceful strikes and sit-ins to violent demonstrations and confrontations with local, prefectural, and national authorities.

Innumerable factors underlie Nikkyōso’s militant policies, but rather than merely itemizing the many causes, I shall focus on one of the most fundamental factors—Nikkyōso’s left-wing leadership. I shall do so by reviewing the careers of several of the union’s leaders.

Iwama Masao, long-time Japan Communist party representative in the Diet, was the first notable leader of the left-wing teachers’ movement to emerge after the war. Coming from a half-farmer, half-merchant family, he entered the Miyagi Normal School in northern Japan in 1921. Even during this period of Taishō Democracy, the militaristic normal school training was characterized by absolute obedience to authority. Bedtime and rising time, for example, were regulated by military bugle calls. Nevertheless, the liberal trends of the day affected a few stu-
dents who began reading socialist publications that were circulating throughout the nation during the 1920s. Iwama was one of those students.

Upon graduation in 1925, Iwama became a teacher in a small agricultural community near Sendai in the northern part of Japan. As a teacher of the Japanese language, he participated informally in the Life in Education Movement (Seikatsu Tsuzurikata Undō) by helping his students develop individuality through writing. Deeply interested in poetry, particularly the *tanka* (the thirty-one syllable Japanese verse), Iwama had his pupils describe their lives in poetry. He was awakened to the evils of society through compositions of his pupils, compositions in which they described the hardships of living in destitute rural Japan.¹

He returned to the normal school for a one-year special postgraduate course, and then, in 1930, found another teaching position, again in an agricultural area in the north. By then the disastrous effects of the Great Depression had reached northern Japan. Farmers could barely afford to eat the rice they themselves produced. Teaching conditions were abominable. Teachers’ salaries were reduced and often delayed. Supplies were scarce. Children were undernourished, poorly clothed, and lacking in incentive. Tuberculosis was endemic.

Under these conditions, Iwama developed within himself a guilt complex about teaching the government-prescribed curriculum, conspicuously remote from and unrelated to the lives of his poverty-stricken students. Day by day he became more critical of the Japanese government and its policies. He began to read, in private, ideologically oriented publications including Marxist literature, and became more and more leftwing in spirit.

In 1932 Iwama moved to Tōkyō and joined the staff of the progressive Seijō Gakuen, which employed the teaching method of the Dalton Plan. A crisis developed within the school in 1933, when its progressiveness came under attack by influential conservative parents. Iwama defended the liberal headmaster, sacrificing his own position in the process. From then on until the end of World War II, he worked on a dictionary and an encyclopedia, wrote poetry, and undertook substitute teaching. Simultaneously, his interest in Socialist and Communist literature increased. However, because he was a known progressive, it ultimately became too dangerous for him to secure the illegal publications. He had, however, no formal contacts with the Japan Communist party prior to the war.

1
Several weeks after the war ended, Iwama attended a small discussion meeting of teachers at the Kyōdō Elementary School near his home in Setagaya Ward in Tōkyō. The discussion focused on the future course for Japanese education now that the war had ended. Iwama described his experiences during the prewar struggles at the Seijō Gakuen and in the process attracted a certain degree of recognition as a prewar activist who lost his position for a progressive cause. He met an "organizer" at the meeting who had probably been sent by the Communist party, although this fact was not made known.

Shortly thereafter, Iwama was invited to attend a preparatory meeting of the left-wing Zenkyō. Because his name was rather well known among prewar activists on account of the Seijō Gakuen incident, Iwama was made welcome and was promptly elected a member of the executive committee. Subsequently he was propelled into the chairmanship of the radical Tōkyō Municipal Teachers Union; eventually he became the leader of the entire teachers' movement in the general strike campaign of February 1, 1947. Two months later he was elected to the Upper House of the Diet as an independent representative. Finally, in 1949, he joined the Japan Communist party, beginning a long and successful career as Communist representative in the Japanese Diet.²

The career of Kobayashi Takeshi, who served as chairman of Nikkyōso longer than any of the other three chairmen during the twenty-year history of the union, also has its roots in the normal school education he received. Kobayashi attended the Sapporo Normal School in Hokkaidō, the northernmost island in Japan. The nationalistic education he acquired there molded Kobayashi into a man deeply imbued with reverence for the emperor and love of Japan.

Upon graduation in 1928, Kobayashi became an elementary school teacher in a small town in Hokkaidō, which was then severely affected by the Great Depression. His school had no electricity and very little oil for heating. Broken windows were replaced with cloth. When the winter darkness settled over that northern territory, schools were closed. Kobayashi felt great sympathy for his students, who were undernourished and poorly clothed. During this time he witnessed governmental suppression of some of his colleagues who participated in activist movements protesting the prevailing social and economic conditions. But Kobayashi did not join any of the prewar left-wing movements, despite the sympathy he felt toward the plight of the students.
Kobayashi attributes his complete loyalty to Japan and its leaders during the prewar and wartime periods to his strict normal school training, which implanted in him an intense love of his homeland and the deepest respect and love for the emperor. He endeavored to pass on these attitudes to his students and, after becoming an elementary school principal, to the teachers who served under him as well.

When the radio and newspapers during the American Occupation brought to light how the Japanese people had been deceived by the wartime leaders, Kobayashi experienced a new consciousness, a feeling of liberation—and mixed feelings of guilt and anger. He felt betrayed and misled. These feelings inevitably led him to seek a new direction for Japanese education. As a small-town higher elementary school principal in faraway Hokkaidō, however, he had little opportunity or courage to become active in the left-wing teachers’ movement converging on Tōkyō.

Prompted, nevertheless, by the poor economic conditions endured by teachers immediately after the war, Kobayashi turned against the Japanese government and its educational policies. Feeling that too many prewar bureaucrats remained in the postwar government and that teachers were politically weak and needed the power of unity to confront the government, Kobayashi, by 1949, or two years after Nikkyōso was formed, was actively participating in the union movement as head of the Hokkaidō branch of Nikkyōso. In 1951 he became chairman of the Hokkaidō Teachers Union, an affiliate of Nikkyōso, and then, from 1953 until 1962, chairman of Nikkyōso itself. He entered the Upper House of Parliament in 1962 on the Socialist party ticket.

Kobayashi, as the newly elected Nikkyōso chairman in 1953, approved the union’s ideological shift to the left in reaction to the government’s shift to the right after the American Occupation ended in 1952. Observing that the ministers of education were being chosen from the ranks of party politicians, especially Minister Odachi who had been associated with the former Ministry of Home Affairs, Nikkyōso, under Kobayashi, hardened its attitude toward the Ministry of Education. Violence, bloodshed, and mass punishment eventually ensued. When the violence in 1958 between union members and the police continued unabated, Kabayashi belatedly threw his support behind the moderates led by his successor, Miyanohara Sadamitsu.3
The third career that will be reviewed is that of Miyanohara Sadamitsu, who has been chairman of Nikkyōso since 1962. Born in the city of Kagoshima in Kyūshū, the southernmost island in Japan, Miyanohara entered the Kagoshima Normal School in 1936, when the militarists were wielding an inordinate amount of influence over the Japanese government. Consequently, Miyanohara immediately found himself immersed in a very tightly controlled life, especially in the dormitory where strict discipline was maintained. He felt that he did not fit into that kind of oppressive atmosphere. Nevertheless, the concepts of Japanese superiority and love for the emperor were ingrained within him during this period. After graduating from the normal school in 1938, he entered the Japanese imperial navy for five months; upon release, he became an elementary school teacher in rural Kyūshū.

Miyanohara firmly believed in the militaristic education then being advanced by the military regime, as Japanese armies launched offensive movements on the Asian mainland. As a teacher in the higher elementary school dealing mainly with boys fourteen to fifteen years old, he took a particularly strong interest in developing among his students a sense of service to the Japanese empire. As mentioned in an earlier chapter, he encouraged volunteers to go to Manchuria to help develop that land under Japanese control; he did so through a special organization of Japanese youth. Miyanohara took considerable pride in being able to persuade many of his rural students to join this governmental project for overseas development of the Japanese empire.

When, at war’s end, at least half of the youth corps which had gone to Manchuria did not return, Miyanohara began to question agonizingly and earnestly his blind acceptance of the Japanese government’s policies—and of the war itself. He came to realize that Japanese education was concerned primarily with the concept of loyalty to the emperor. And because of this blind loyalty, people did not value life and unhesitatingly killed others in the name of the emperor. Miyanohara concluded that Japanese education was fundamentally evil.

In April 1946, Miyanohara had the opportunity to read the First United States Education Mission’s report for the democratization of Japanese education. Comparing the old Japanese forms with the new plan, and reflecting upon his experiences under the old system, he concluded that the new education was
the only hope for the future of Japan. He then and there decided to dedicate himself to the fulfillment of the new democratic education.

How he could best accomplish his ideals became of paramount concern. At first, in 1947, he formed a study group of several of his fellow teachers to discuss the future course of Japanese education and to reflect upon the past. Learning that teachers in Tōkyō, faced with spiraling inflation and low salaries, were already forming unions, his small circle of colleagues concluded that teachers in Kyūshū must also unite in order to promote their economic welfare and help mold the new education.

After Nikkyōso was formed in June 1947, Miyanohara combined his group of teachers with several others in Kagoshima Prefecture to form the Kagoshima Prefectural Teachers Union under his leadership. This union later sent Miyanohara to the national headquarters of Nikkyōso; he was elected national chairman in 1962. As chairman of Nikkyōso, he has insisted at every annual convention that a banner be unfurled over the convention hall bearing the slogan, “Never send our children to the battlefields again.”

The lives of these three Nikkyōso leaders illustrate many of the fundamental factors giving rise to Nikkyōso’s militancy. All three men received normal school education and had teaching experience in rural or small-town elementary schools during the depression of the early 1930s and during the war. This experience was shared by all of the Nikkyōso leaders.

The first two Nikkyōso chairmen, Araki Shōzaburō and Oka Saburō, were also graduates of provincial normal schools. Araki graduated from the Ikeda Normal School near Osaka in 1925 and began teaching in a small elementary school in that area. Oka Saburō graduated from the Yamanashi Normal School in rural Japan in 1933 and became a teacher in a small elementary school in Yamanashi Prefecture during the depression. Oka believes that, as far as teaching technique is concerned, the training given by normal schools in prewar years, was superior to that given by postwar teacher-training institutions. However, the normal school of his day “produced narrow-minded teachers who taught automatically the prescribed curriculum.”

Hiragaki Miyoji, leader of Nikkyōso’s left-wing bloc during the period of violence around 1958, was also a graduate of the Ikeda Normal School and began his teaching career in a nearby rural elementary school in 1937.
One could examine the list of all the officers of Nikkyōso and find that nearly every leader attended a provincial normal school before the war. Upon graduation, all began their teaching careers in elementary schools, frequently in rural Japan, during the periods of the Great Depression and the militaristic regime. The significance of this common background must not be underestimated. The fact that none of the top union leaders had attended a university, the source of the prewar elite, placed them in a lower category, both academically and in prestige, than that enjoyed by university graduates. In addition, because the universities were much more liberal than normal schools, university graduates were more broadly educated and certainly much less restrained and less indoctrinated with ultranationalistic ideas than were normal school graduates, for university students were exposed to the more liberal thought prevailing on university campuses. Indeed, Tōkyō University was alive with Communist cells among the students in the early 1930s.

In contrast, normal schools were highly disciplined, closely regulated, restrictive institutions. Their students received a narrow education and were heavily indoctrinated; they were trained, as it were, to be dogmatists and to perpetuate those concepts and ideals selected by the government as essential for the youth of Japan in the name of the emperor. The leaders of Nikkyōso, almost to a man, were trained in this type of environment; these men showed the same rigidity and intolerance with respect to the development of the union, though in the name of democracy, not of the emperor.

Not only were the postwar leaders of the teachers’ movement trained in second-class prewar institutions, they were elementary school teachers—the least prestigious position in the hierarchy of the teaching profession. Admittedly, rural elementary school teachers from normal schools, particularly those teaching in the upper grades, were held in high esteem in their local communities. Nevertheless, teachers in the middle and upper secondary schools held the truly prestigious teaching positions, next only to those teaching at the university level. Elementary school teachers, moreover, had virtually no freedom in their teaching, whereas secondary school teachers had a certain degree of freedom and independence in the classroom.

In other words, the men who led the postwar teachers’ movement had held positions of inferior status in the prewar years in terms of both their professional training and experience. When they found themselves leading a postwar mass
movement of teachers, it was perhaps inevitable that they would follow an aggressive policy, driven in part perhaps by an inferiority complex, in order to raise the status of union members who were mostly elementary school teachers.

Be that as it may, the postwar leaders of the teachers’ unions not only led a popular movement among teachers, but also occupied influential positions as the intellectual leaders of the entire labor movement. Leaders of the proliferating labor unions were primarily either graduates of secondary technical schools or those who had had no further education beyond the level of compulsory education. Leaders of the teachers’ unions, as graduates of normal schools, thus assumed a special status. As a result, Nikkyōso was often in the forefront of the burgeoning labor movement. At times, labor leaders found themselves moving more to the left in response to the militant demands from the rank and file, notably the railway and postal workers. At other times, Nikkyōso influenced the entire trade-union movement leftward when its leaders were convinced that the Japanese government was becoming reactionary and that the trade unions were not cognizant of the danger. Nikkyōso leaders took it upon themselves to enlighten other labor leaders about the evils of the Japanese government.

The general sentiment of teachers who had been subservient to the ultranationalistic military regime in the prewar and war years also sparked a militant reaction at war’s end. Up until the end of the war, teachers had been compelled to teach certain facts and concepts which many of them knew were untrue. The myths about the sun goddess and the origin of Japan, the subhumanness of Western peoples, and the like, were not believed by a good many of the teachers. But they had to stand before their classes and teach such myths and false ideas as truths, or face the consequences. Most teachers simply complied with the regulations without compunction. Others, however, experienced mental anguish over this unhappy assignment. These latent feelings against the government were carried over into the postwar period.

Also unpleasant, especially to the sensitive teacher, was the task of preparing the finest of Japanese youth to fight and die courageously on the battlefields of Asia and the Pacific. When an appalling number of former students failed to return to their beloved homeland at the end of the war, the teachers ironically were exposed overnight as having been pawns of the wartime machine. The suppressed feelings of guilt among such
teachers turned to anger and exploded through the channels of the teachers’ unions proliferating throughout Japan in 1945 and 1946.

When the Americans arrived, with their idealistic democratic ideals for the reformation of Japanese education, including freedom of teachers from government control, the activist teachers concentrated their energies into a truculent campaign against the government. The purpose of the campaign was to transform the traditional subservient mentality of the average teacher, trained by the normal schools to follow government orders, to one of independence. Ironically, union activists exploited this very habit of subservience in order to induce the average teacher to transfer his allegiance from the government to the union when independent unions joined the larger unions en bloc.

Postwar poverty also caused teachers to feel deeply hostile toward the government. The average union teacher, a married man with a family, was forced to witness his meagre salary being eroded by inflation while his family subsisted on inadequate food rations. The only major avenue by which he might attempt to improve his circumstances existed with the unions. As the months of destitution dragged into years, teachers released their frustrations through strikes and demonstrations. But in 1948 General MacArthur banned strikes and collective bargaining for teachers on the grounds that teachers were civil servants. Thus the means of release of tensions was proscribed while the causes of tension and frustration continued unabated.

The American Occupation struck another blow against the union by conducting the Red Purge, following the ban on teachers’ strikes. The teachers, who in 1946 had given their unqualified support to the United States Education Mission’s recommendations for educational reform in Japan and who had found themselves in harmony with SCAP until then, suddenly found themselves betrayed by their American ally, first by being denied the rights to strike and to bargain collectively, and now by having their leftist union leaders purged. In response, the degree of teachers’ hostility increased.

Nikkyōso lost its last hope of sustaining the American Occupation’s educational reforms for Japan when, shortly after the end of the Occupation, the ruling conservative party of the Japanese government started to change the educational reforms that had been implemented by the Americans. Nikkyōso intensified its militant tactics accordingly. A rash of protest strikes and demonstrations followed, leading to violence in the years
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between 1957 and 1961. By the time the government started to react against Nikkyōso’s violent actions, the union’s militancy had already escalated to a point beyond the possibility of reconciliation.

The period following the end of the American Occupation of Japan, when the Japanese government, under conservative leadership, initiated Japanese revisions of the Occupation reforms to rectify what it considered excesses, produced the most violent acts of resistance in the union’s history. In order to understand those actions, a series of events must be viewed in perspective. During the American Occupation, control of education was theoretically transferred from the Ministry of Education to local school boards. Teachers were granted considerable influence in determining local educational policy. When the school-board law was revised in 1956, much of the real power pertaining to educational decision-making was transferred back to the central government; Nikkyōso considered this a threat to local autonomy and resorted to acts of belligerence. The union lost its case.

The next stage evolved when school principals were forced out of the union and, from the union’s point of view, on to the side of the school boards and the Ministry of Education. Nikkyōso increased its resistance in order to protect school autonomy. Again the union lost. The final stage involved the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan, interpreted by the union as a device to compel teachers to follow the prescribed curriculum. Nikkyōso pursued its most violent protest campaign to defend what it believed to be the teacher’s last preserve—the autonomy of the classroom. In this instance, Nikkyōso won a partial victory but at an extravagantly high price in membership defection and disruptive internal dissension.

Related to this issue is the continuing nonrecognition of Nikkyōso by the Japanese government—a frustration which intensifies the union’s aggressive policy toward the government. After being weaned, during the early heady days of the American Occupation, on Western labor concepts of collective bargaining and the right to strike, Nikkyōso found the conditions set by SCAP after 1948 unreasonable and unacceptable, for it was through these conditions that Nikkyōso, the largest labor union in Japan, not only lost those rights, but also witnessed its contract as the agency representing its members unilaterally nullified by the government: Nikkyōso’s predicament only hardened its militant attitudes. Although the International Labor Organization, of which Japan is a member nation, essen-
tially supported the union’s position, the Japanese government proved to be a formidable enemy, able to thwart all attempts by the union to gain official recognition. Nonrecognition continues as a sword in the side of the union and a major factor underlying its militant antipathy toward the government.

At the local level, Nikkyōso’s frustrations have been magnified by the dearth of institutional avenues available for expressing grievances. In lieu of the right to strike and bargain collectively, each prefecture and major city maintains a local Personnel Authority (Jinjiinkai), patterned after the National Personnel Authority, where grievances from civil servants are handled. Nikkyōso claims that this is a biased body because its three members are appointed by the local administrative head—the governor or the mayor. When the local school board, also appointed by the local administrative head, disciplines teachers or transfers activists from one school to another, complaints taken to the local Personnel Authority are usually rejected. Nikkyōso claims that the Personnel Authority is merely an extension of the school board since both are appointed by the governor or the mayor. The union claims that, because its members have no impartial body to adjudicate grievances, they take to the streets in protest.

The composition of the membership of Nikkyōso has also been a critical factor inducing belligerency. The Japanese elementary school has traditionally been the preserve of the male teacher, whereas in most countries women dominate elementary teaching. In Japan, the number of women elementary school teachers did not approach that of men teachers until after 1965. Hence, when Nikkyōso, consisting preponderantly of elementary teachers, aggressively campaigned for higher salaries in its early history, it was on behalf of male teachers supporting families on inadequate incomes.

The final factor underlying the militant policies of Nikkyōso concerns the highly volatile and controversial issue of Communist influence. The discussion of communism as an ideology has been avoided hitherto in this study because it was not an issue in the prewar normal school; nor was it related to the Great Depression or to the terrible economic conditions and inflation after the war. These conditions did not spawn Communist activity although Communists within Nikkyōso capitalized on the prevailing circumstances to exert an influence, which fluctuated considerably depending on the magnitude of the adverse external factors.
The degree of Communist influence on Nikkyōso can be measured in part by the number of Communist party members holding important administrative positions in the union. Figure 2 shows the percentage of Communist party members on Nikkyōso’s Central Executive Committee from 1947 to 1967.

Table 9 shows the estimated number of Communist party members within Nikkyōso between 1953 and 1967. A comparison of the data in Figure 2 and Table 9 will reveal that there is virtually no correlation between the number of Communists on the Central Executive Committee and that among the rank and file. Indeed, there is no correlation between the degree of Communist power within Nikkyōso and the numerical strength of the union’s Communist teachers. For example, when Communist influence on Nikkyōso was at its peak in 1958, leading the union to pursue violent tactics, less than half of 1 percent of the total union membership were members of the Japan Communist party. Obviously, Communist influence was not dependent upon numbers.

Conversely, after Miyanohara became union chairman in 1962 by purging Communists from the Central Executive Committee in order to pursue a more moderate policy stressing economics rather than ideology, total Communist membership
increased among rank-and-file union members. Again, there was no positive correlation between the degree of militancy pursued by the union and the number of card-carrying Communists within the union. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the number of Communists within Nikkyōso and the degree of Nikkyōso’s increasing moderation, if the years 1958 to 1967 are taken as samples.

What can be said by way of analysis is that Communist influence within Nikkyōso has been significant at selected periods during the union’s twenty-year history, but not because of the appeal of communism itself. Rather, Communist influence within Nikkyōso has been dominant only when the Communist bloc on the Central Executive Committee was capable of leading the union for or against an issue about which the average union member felt strongly.

For example, the Communist members attained their zenith of power during the campaign against the Teacher’s Efficiency-rating Plan between 1957 and 1959 as leaders of an implacable opposition. Teachers throughout the world have opposed
teacher-rating schemes. It can also be assumed that in Japan the vast majority of teachers opposed the government’s plan to evaluate teachers. The result was the rapid growth of the Communist bloc’s influence within Nikkyōso as Nikkyōso’s Communists maneuvered to lead a popular campaign against the rating plan. There is no evidence that Communist influence was increased because of the attraction of communism per se.

When the long and debilitating campaign against the rating plan eventually ran out of steam and lost its appeal to the average union member, Communist prestige within Nikkyōso rapidly declined in proportion. The rank and file supported the Communist bloc as long as Communist interests coincided with those of Nikkyōso’s general membership. When they did not, the Communists lost their power.

In sum, communism as an ideology has not been the determining factor in the degree of influence the Communist bloc has been able to attain in the historical development of Nikkyōso; communism as an ideology has not been one of the major causes underlying the militant policies of the union. Too many other conditions and factors unrelated to communism, as discussed previously, are more directly responsible for the militancy of the union.

Support for this position can be made by a concluding syllogism. If communism had not existed and there had been no Communist bloc within Nikkyōso, it is nevertheless difficult to imagine that the union would have developed its policies much differently in reaction to the prewar and postwar conditions in Japan. However, if the prewar and postwar conditions had been diametrically different; that is, if there had been no nationalistic normal school training, no Great Depression, no postwar poverty, and no conservative reforms of the American Occupation reforms, then the militancy of a teachers’ union in contemporary Japan would have been significantly moderated regardless of the presence of communism. In other words, there is sufficient cause to believe that Nikkyōso, with or without Communist influence, would have pursued a policy of militant resistance to the Japanese government and to the Ministry of Education in reaction to the peculiar set of circumstances prevailing within Japan during the prewar, the American Occupation, and the independence periods.
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General MacArthur’s Letter to Prime Minister Shidehara Kijūrō Concerning the Unionization of Labor. October 11, 1945. (Excerpts)

In the achievement of the Potsdam Declaration, the traditional social order under which the Japanese people for centuries have been subjugated will be corrected. This will unquestionably involve a liberalization of the Constitution.

The people must be freed from all forms of governmental and secret inquisition into their daily lives which holds their minds in virtual slavery and from all forms of control which seek to suppress freedom of thought, freedom of speech or freedom of religion. Reglementation of the masses under the guise or claims of efficiency, under whatever name of government it may be made, must cease.

In the implementation of these requirements and to accomplish the purposes thereby intended, I expect you to institute the following reforms in the social order of Japan as readily as they can be assimilated:

1. The emancipation of the women of Japan through their enfranchisement ...
2. The encouragement of the unionization of Labor ... that it may be clothed with such dignity as will permit it an initial voice in safeguarding the working man from exploitation and abuse and raising his living standard to
a higher level; with the institution of such measures as may be necessary to correct the evils which now exist in child labor practices
3. The opening of the schools to more liberal education that the people may shape their future progress ...
4. The abolition of systems which through secret inquisition and abuse have held the people in constant fear ...
5. The democratization of Japanese economic institutions to the end that monopolistic industrial controls be revised through the development of methods which tend to insure a wide distribution of income and ownership of the means of production and trade
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In order that the newly formed Cabinet of the Imperial Japanese Government shall be fully informed of the objectives and policies of the Occupation with regard to Education, it is hereby directed that:

a. The content of all instructions will be critically examined, revised, and controlled in accordance with the following policies:
   (1) Dissemination of militaristic and ultranationalistic ideology will be prohibited and all military education and drill will be discontinued.
   (2) Inculcation of concepts and establishment of practices in harmony with representative government, international peace, the dignity of the individual, and such fundamental human rights as the freedom of assembly, speech, and religion, will be encouraged.

b. The personnel of all educational institutions will be investigated, approved or removed, reinstated, appointed, reoriented, and supervised in accordance with the following policies:
Teachers and educational officials will be examined as rapidly as possible and all career military personnel, persons who have been active exponents of militarism and ultranationalism, and those actively antagonistic to the policies of the Occupation will be removed.

(2) Teachers and educational officials who have been dismissed, suspended, or forced to resign for liberal or antimilitaristic opinions or activities, will be declared immediately eligible for and if properly qualified will be given preference in reappointment.

(3) Discrimination against any student, teacher, or educational official on grounds of race, nationality, creed, political opinion, or social position will be prohibited, and immediate steps will be taken to correct inequities which have resulted from such discrimination.

(4) Students, teachers, and educational officials will be encouraged to evaluate critically and intelligently the content of instruction and will be permitted to engage in free and unrestricted discussion of issues involving political, civil, and religious liberties.

(5) Students, teachers, educational officials, and the public will be informed of the objectives and policies of the Occupation, of the theory and practices of representative government, and of the part played by militaristic leaders, their active collaborators, and those who by passive acquiescence committed the nation to war with the inevitable result of defeat, distress, and the present deplorable state of the Japanese people.

c. The instrumentalities of educational processes will be critically examined, revised and controlled in accordance with the following policies:

(1) Existing curricula, textbooks, teaching manuals, and instructional materials, the use of which is temporarily permitted on an emergency basis, will be examined as rapidly as possible and those portions designed to promote a militaristic or ultranationalistic ideology will be eliminated.

(2) New curricula, textbooks, teaching manuals, and instructional materials designed to produce an educated, peaceful, and responsible citizenry will be prepared and will be substituted for existing materials as rapidly as possible.
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(3) A normally operating educational system will be reestablished as rapidly as possible, but where limited facilities exist preference will be given to elementary education and teacher training.

d. The Japanese Ministry of Education will establish and maintain adequate liaison with the appropriate staff section of the Office of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers and upon request will submit reports describing in detail all action taken to comply with the provisions of this directive.

e. All officials and subordinates of the Japanese Government affected by the terms of this directive, and all teachers and school officials, both public and private, will be held personally accountable for compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the policies enunciated in this directive.
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Screening of Teachers. General Headquarters, SCAP.
October 30, 1945.

In order to eliminate from the educational system of Japan those militaristic and ultranationalistic influences which in the past have contributed to the defeat, war guilt, suffering, privation, and present deplorable state of the Japanese people; and in order to prevent the teachers and educational officials having military experience or affiliation; it is hereby directed that:

a. All persons who are known to be militaristic, ultranationalistic, or antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the Occupation and who are at this time actively employed in the educational system of Japan, will be removed immediately and will be barred from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan.

b. All other persons now actively employed in the educational system of Japan will be permitted to retain their positions at the discretion of the Ministry of Education until further notice.
c. All persons who are members of or who have been demobilized from the Japanese military forces since the termination of hostilities, and who are not at this time actively employed in the educational system of Japan, will be barred from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan until further notice.

In order to determine which of those persons who are now actively employed in or who may in the future become candidates for employment in the educational system of Japan are unacceptable and must be removed, barred, and prohibited from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan, it is hereby directed that:

a. The Japanese Ministry of Education will establish suitable administrative machinery and procedures for the effective investigation, screening, and certification of all present and prospective teachers and educational officials.

b. The Japanese Ministry of Education will submit to this Headquarters as soon as possible a comprehensive report describing all actions taken to comply with the provisions of this directive. This report will contain in addition the following specific information:

   (1) A precise statement of how acceptability of the individual is to be determined, together with lists of specific standards which will govern the retention, removal, appointment, or reappointment of the individual.

   (2) A precise statement of what administrative procedures and machinery are to be established in order to accomplish the investigation, screening, and certification of personnel, together with a statement of what provisions are to be made for review of appealed decisions and reconsideration of individuals previously refused certification.

All officials and subordinates of the Japanese Government affected by the terms of this directive, and all school officials, both public and private, will be held personally accountable for compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the policies enunciated in this directive.
Suspension of Courses in Morals, History, and Geography.

General Headquarters, SCAP. December 31, 1945.

1. In accordance with the basic directive AG 000.3 (15 Dec. 45) CIE proclaiming the abolition of government sponsorship and support of State Shinto and Doctrine; and inasmuch as the Japanese Government has used education to inculcate militaristic and ultranationalistic ideologies which have been inextricably interwoven in certain textbooks imposed upon students; it is hereby directed that:

   a. All courses in Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History, and Geography in all educational institutions, including government, public, and private schools, for which textbooks and teachers’ manuals have been published or sanctioned by the Ministry of Education shall be suspended immediately and will not be resumed until permission has been given by this Headquarters.

   b. The Ministry of Education shall suspend immediately all ordinances (hōrei), regulations, or instructions directing the manner in which the specific subjects of Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History, and Geography shall be taught.

   c. The Ministry of Education shall collect all textbooks and teachers’ manuals used in every course and educational institution affected by 1, a for disposal in accordance with the procedure outlined in Annex A to this memorandum.

   d. The Ministry of Education shall prepare and submit to this Headquarters a plan for the introduction of substitute programs to take the place of courses affected by this memorandum in accordance with the procedure outlined in Annex B to this memorandum. These substitute programs will continue in force until such time as this Headquarters authorizes the resumption of the courses suspended herein.
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e. The Ministry of Education shall prepare and submit to this Headquarters a plan for revising textbooks to be used in Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History, and Geography in accordance with the procedure outlined in Annex C to this memorandum.

2. All officials, subordinates, and employees of the Japanese Government affected by the terms of this directive, and all school officials and teachers, both public and private, will be held personally accountable for compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the terms of this directive.
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**Political Activities of Teachers and Students.**

Vice-Minister of Education, Ministry of Education. 
January 17, 1946.

Students, teachers, and school officials may enter political activities, and join political organizations. Such political activities, however, must not be allowed to interfere in any way with their normal duties.

Although free discussions on politics will be allowed in schools, political canvassing or recommending of specific political parties or personnel will not be allowed in school time.
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**Concerning Teachers’ Associations (To Educational Administrators).** Ministry of Education April 11, 1946.

Various questions have recently been sent in from different quarters concerning teachers’ associations. Mr. Abe, Minister of Education, spoke of this matter at the recent meeting of prefectural governors as follows:
“Everyone recognizes that measures taken by the government cannot keep pace with the problems which arise from difficulties in our daily life, caused by a shortage of commodities, inflation, etc. It is, therefore, necessary that attempts be made by teachers to help themselves. It is desirable for them to organize some sort of self-aid organizations. They must be careful, however, not to be too radical, or to allow themselves to be taken advantage of by any political parties. It is hoped that these will be developed into a beneficial organization. Therefore, you are requested not to impose too many restrictions on such groups.

“Teachers are at liberty to identify themselves with any of the political parties according to their choice, but they must be very careful not to forget their fundamental mission of education and not to cause any conflict in the schools, thereby disrupting the education of the young people.

“We understand that there are many school farms and other various organizations, supported by parents, which contribute toward the living of elementary school and secondary school teachers. We consider this to be a good thing as it is a sign of appreciation of teachers on the part of parents. But it is requested that you take care not to let the relationship become too personal.”

We desire that you inform all teachers under your supervision concerning the details of this notice.

Source: Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, Education in the New Japan (Tōkyō: SCAP, 1948), 2:162.

Screening of Teachers. Imperial Ordinance No. 263.
May 6, 1946. (Excerpts)

ARTICLE I. A person now holding an educational position and designated by the competent Minister “as falling under the categories of career military personnel, notorious militarist, ultranationalist, or notorious antagonist of the objectives and policies of the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers as specified in the Memorandum of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers dated 22 October 1945” shall be removed and henceforth disqualified. If suitable replacement cannot be found, however, he may be retained for not over six months.
ARTICLE II. A person who may be employed within six months from this date is also subject to Article I above.

ARTICLE III. A person, previously removed from an educational position and now designated by the competent Minister as liberal or anti-militaristic under SCAP directives, will be preferentially reinstated up to six months hence.

ARTICLE IV. Positions included under the term “position in the educational service” shall be designated by the competent minister.

ARTICLE V. Questionnaires necessary for application of Articles I, II, and III above shall be collected by appropriate government agencies.

DISQUALIFICATION BY INQUIRY COMMITTEES
States six categories of those who are to be designated as nonacceptable persons for educational service according to the inquiry and decision of the inquiry committees, as follows:

1. Persons who by lecture, speech, book, essay, or other actions fall in any of the following groups:
   a. Persons who have advocated or actively cooperated in propagating aggressive policy or militant nationalism, and persons who by their doctrines laid an ideological basis for Great Asia Policy, the New-Order-East-Asia or other similar policies, the Manchurian Affair, the Chinese Affair, or the Recent War.
   b. Persons who have advocated dictatorship or Nazi or Fascist totalitarianism.
   c. Persons who have persecuted or expelled others on the grounds of race.
   d. Persons who have propagated Shinto ideology with a view to advocating racial superiority.
   e. Persons who have persecuted or expelled those who have liberal or anti-militaristic opinions, etc., or those who believe in any religion on grounds of their opinions or religions.
   f. Persons who, though they fall under none of the above items, have advocated militarism or ultranationalism or persons who have so ingratiated themselves with these tendencies that they lack ideological integrity as educators.
2. Persons who have been advisors, or nonofficial staff of, or who have had other special connections with the Nazi or Fascist regime or its organs and have cooperated in carrying out its policies.

3. Persons who have publicly stated opinions antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers or who have led others to oppose objectives and policies.

4. Government or public officials who in discharging their duties have persecuted or oppressed religion.

5. Persons who have compiled textbooks or publications concerning education with a militaristic or ultranationalistic intention.

6. Persons who have, under the protection of the Japanese armed forces, directed or taken part in scientific expeditions or excavation works in the territory of the Allied Powers occupied by the Japanese forces since 1 January 1928.
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The Collective Bargaining Contract between the Council of All-Japan Teachers’ Unions (Zenkyōkyō) and the Ministry of Education. March 19, 1947. (Excerpts)

The Ministry of Education, hereinafter referred to as A, and Zen Nihon Kyōin Kumiai Kyōgi Kai (The Council of All-Japan Teachers’ Unions), hereinafter referred to as B, hereby make an agreement for collective bargaining based upon the spirit of the Labor Union Law, as follows:

CHAPTER I. PRINCIPLES

ARTICLE I

A shall recognize B as an agent for collective bargaining. A shall be responsible for the security of the living and the members of B. A and B shall cooperate and be responsible for the enhancement of democratic education.
CHAPTER II. MATTTERS CONCERNING PAY

ARTICLE III
A shall undertake to establish a pay system that will secure for the members of B and their families the standards of wholesome and cultured living. In deciding fundamental principles of pay, the representatives of both parties shall participate.

CHAPTER III. MATTTERS CONCERNING WORKING HOURS AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

ARTICLE V
The working hours of teachers shall be as follows:
1. There shall be 42 working hours a week.
2. The standard daily teaching time shall be 4 hours.
3. As to other working hours, A and B shall decide by mutual agreement within the limits of preceding rules.

ARTICLE VI
Twenty free study days shall be granted every year.

CHAPTER VI. MATTTERS CONCERNING PERSONNEL AFFAIRS

ARTICLE XI
The fundamental standards relative to personnel affairs, including appointment, discharge, transfer, rewards and punishments, shall be considered by the Personnel Affairs Committee composed of members of A and B.

ARTICLE XII
A shall not discharge any of the union members:
1. For participation in the union movement
2. During the period necessary for medical treatment of injuries or sickness contracted while on duty, and for 90 days thereafter
3. During a resting period before and after childbirth, and 90 days thereafter
CHAPTER VII. MATTERS CONCERNING THE UNION MOVEMENT

ARTICLE XIII
A shall allow members of B to engage fully in union affairs while occupying their regular posts. The number of such members shall be decided at a conference of A and B.

ARTICLE XIV
A shall permit members of B to engage in union movement activities. A trip on union business shall be treated as an official trip after the principal has been informed, but no travelling expenses shall be granted.

ARTICLE XV
A shall allow B the use of buildings or facilities under its control for union activities.

ARTICLE XVI
If a dispute, or the threat of one, should arise, A will not take any step against the union by applying the Administrative Order.

ARTICLE XVII
A, when engaged in a dispute with B, will not negotiate with a union or its members who have seceded.

CHAPTER VIII. MATTERS CONCERNING THE COUNCIL OF BUSINESS AFFAIRS

ARTICLE XVIII
A and B shall set up a Council of Business Affairs, based on the aims of this contract. As to the constitution of the Council and the application of its rules, another agreement will be made between the two contracting parties.

ARTICLE XIX
The Council of Business Affairs, based on this contract, will concern itself with the following affairs:

1. Matters concerning pay, injury compensation, personnel, and positions
2. Matters concerning working hours, free days, and vacations
3. Matters concerning the educational budget
4. Matters concerning the handling of business affairs
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5. Matters concerning welfare
6. Matters concerning education and culture
7. Other matters recognized by the Council as necessary

ARTICLE XX
Both parties shall be responsible for the bona fide enforcement of the decisions of the Council of Business Affairs. Any of the preceding items shall be included in a written agreement, if both parties deem it necessary to do so.

CHAPTER IX. MATTERS CONCERNING THE STANDARDS OF PREFECTURAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

ARTICLE XXI
A, considering it proper for the prefectural chapters of B to enter into collective bargaining agreements with the prefectural government, shall encourage the realization of the following:

1. Matters concerning vacations
2. Matters concerning the number of union officials
3. Matters concerning personnel affairs

CHAPTER X. OTHER AFFAIRS

ARTICLE XXII
A shall not interfere with the political interests of the members of B.

ARTICLE XXIII
A shall recognize the freedom of a member of B to hold another public office, insofar as it does not conflict with his regular duties. A shall provide facilities necessary to execute duties of office.

ARTICLE XXIV
The duration of this agreement shall be for six months. A and B may change the effective duration of this agreement before the end of the prescribed period by mutual agreement, if they find that general economic conditions or some other unavoidable situation makes it necessary. If no announcement be made by either of the parties concerned of the invalidation of this agreement
one month before its expiration, it will be effective for six more months. If the intention to invalidate the agreement is announced, the agreement will remain effective until the new one comes into being.

UNDERSTANDING

1. A and B shall make efforts to realize as soon as possible the following:
   (1) The uniting of all the teachers’ unions in the country into one single union, so that it will be the only agent for collective bargaining with A.
   (2) The including of all the teachers, in principle, as members of the union mentioned in the preceding clause.
2. If a union affiliated with B is the only one in a metropolis or prefecture, it will be authorized to make agreements on the basis of the above understanding.

March 3, 1947
Provisionally signed by
Seiichiro Takahashi, Minister of Education
Masao Iwama, Chairman of the Campaign Committee of the Council of All-Japan Teachers’ Unions
Yoshihei Himuro, Superintendent of the Central Labor Committee

A teacher is free to run as a candidate for the Metropolitan, prefectural, municipal, ward, town, or village assembly. When returned, he is authorized by law to be a teacher concurrently. In this case, however, he cannot accept membership, if he is a government official, without approval of the officer in charge. When a local educational official, that is, an educational official at a secondary, youth, or elementary school, is elected a member of a local assembly, he may be given permission for accepting the membership as an additional post, as long as the additional duties do not interfere with his duties as a teacher.

A teacher is free to run as a candidate for a prefectural governor, mayor, or a headman of a ward, town, or village, but in case he is returned, he cannot hold concurrently any of such offices, which are stipulated by law as exclusive offices. If he is a government official, approval of the officer in charge must be obtained before accepting the office. In any case care should be taken that election campaigns do not interfere with teaching as far as possible.

In view of the importance of the coming elections, which will mark a turning-point for a new democratic Japan founded upon the new Constitution, and in view of the fact that the world is deeply interested in the democratization of Japan, it is necessary to carry out impartial and uncorrupted elections. Therefore, it shall be the last thing for a teacher to take advantage of his position in election campaigns.

A teachers’ union is free to carry on an election campaign so long as it does not deviate from its essential aims and status as a labor union or restrain its members from their political liberty.


Having established the Constitution of Japan, we have shown our resolution to contribute to the peace of the world and welfare of humanity by building a democratic and cultural state. The realization of this ideal shall depend fundamentally on the power of education.
We shall esteem individual dignity and endeavor to bring up the people who love truth and peace, while education which aims at the creation of culture, general and rich in individuality, shall be spread far and wide.

We hereby enact this Law, in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of Japan, with a view to clarifying the aim of education and establishing the foundation of education for new Japan.

ARTICLE 1. Aim of Education
Education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving for the rearing of the people, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labor and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent spirit, as builders of the peaceful state and society.

ARTICLE 2. Educational Principle
The aim of education shall be realized on all occasions and in all places. In order to achieve the aim, we shall endeavor to contribute to the creation and development of culture by mutual esteem and cooperation, respecting academic freedom, having a regard for actual life and cultivating a spontaneous spirit.

ARTICLE 3. Equal Opportunity in Education
The people shall be given equal opportunities of receiving education according to their ability, and they shall not be subject to educational discrimination on account of race, creed, sex, social status, economic position, or family origin.

The state and local public bodies shall take measures to give financial assistance to those who have, in spite of their ability, difficulty in receiving education for economic reasons.

ARTICLE 4. Compulsory Education
The people shall be obligated to have boys and girls under their protection receive nine years’ general education.

No tuition fee shall be charged for compulsory education in schools established by the state and local public bodies.

ARTICLE 5. Coeducation
Men and women shall esteem and cooperate with each other. Coeducation, therefore, shall be recognized in education.
ARTICLE 6. School Education

The schools prescribed by law shall be of public nature and, besides the state and local public bodies, only the juridical persons prescribed by law shall be entitled to establish such schools.

Teachers of the schools prescribed by law shall be servants of the whole community. They shall be conscious of their mission and endeavor to discharge their duties. For this purpose, the status of teachers shall be respected and their fair and appropriate treatment shall be secured.

ARTICLE 7. Social Education

The state and local public bodies shall encourage home education and education carried out in places of work or elsewhere in society.

The state and local public bodies shall endeavor to attain the aim of education by the establishment of such institutions as libraries, museums, civic halls, by the utilization of school institutions, and by other appropriate methods.

ARTICLE 8. Political Education

The political knowledge necessary for intelligent citizenship shall be valued in education.

The schools prescribed by law shall refrain from political education or other political activities for or against any specific political party.

ARTICLE 9. Religious Education

The attitude of religious tolerance and the position of religion in social life shall be valued in education.

The schools established by the state and local public bodies shall refrain from religious education or other activities for a specific religion.

ARTICLE 10. School Administration

Education shall not be subject to improper control, but it shall be directly responsible to the whole people.

School administration shall, on the basis of this realization, aim at the adjustment and establishment of the various conditions required for the pursuit of the aim of education.

ARTICLE 11. Additional Rule

In case of necessity, appropriate laws shall be enacted to carry the foregoing stipulations into effect.
The Board of Education Law. July 15, 1948. (Excerpts)

ARTICLE III. Boards of Education shall be established in Tōkyō-to, Hokkaidō, prefectures, cities, towns and villages. “Prefectural Boards of Education” referred to in this law shall be those established in Tōkyō-to, Hokkaidō, and the prefectures, and “local Boards of Education” shall be those established in cities, towns and villages.

ARTICLE IV. Boards of Education shall administer and execute affairs concerning education, science, and culture that have hitherto been under the control of prefectures or prefectural governors or cities, towns, or mayors of cities and towns, and headmen of villages. Universities and private schools shall not be under the jurisdiction of Boards of Education.

ARTICLE VII. A prefectural Board of Education shall consist of seven members, and a local Board of Education shall consist of five members. The Board members shall be elected by the inhabitants of public bodies consisting of citizens of Japan in accordance with the provisions of the Public Service Election Law.

ARTICLE VIII. The term of office of the Board members by popular vote shall be four years.

ARTICLE XLI. The Board of Education shall have a superintendent of education (Kyōikuchō) appointed by the Board of Education. The term of office shall be four years.

ARTICLE XLVIII. Prefectural Boards of Education shall have control over all Schools and other educational institutions established by the prefectures concerned, and local Boards of Education shall have control over all schools and other educational institutions established by the local public bodies concerned.

ARTICLE XLIX. The Board of Education shall take charge of the matters concerning curriculum contents and the appointment, dismissal, and other personnel affairs of the staffs of the Board of Education, schools, and other educational institutions.
ARTICLE LIX. When the budget is approved by the local assembly, the chief of the local public body shall allocate the budget under control of the Board of Education to the Board concerned.


ARTICLE 1
Each Member of the International Labor Organization for which this Convention is in force undertakes to give effect to the following provisions.

ARTICLE 2
Workers and employers, without distinction whatsoever, shall have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization.

ARTICLE 3
1. Workers’ and employers’ organizations shall have the right to draw up their constitutions and rules, to elect their representatives in full freedom, to organize their administration and activities and to formulate their programs.
2. The public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful exercise thereof.

ARTICLE 4
Workers’ and employers’ organizations shall not be liable to be dissolved or suspended by administrative authority.

ARTICLE 5
Workers’ and employers’ organizations shall have the right to establish and join federations and confederations and any such organization, federation or confederation shall have the right to affiliate with international organizations of workers and employers.

ARTICLE 6
The provisions of Articles 2, 3 and 4 hereof apply to federations and confederations of workers’ and employers’ organizations.

ARTICLE 7
The acquisition of legal personality by workers’ and employers’ organizations, federations and confederations shall not be made subject to conditions of such a character as to restrict the application of the provisions of Articles 2, 3 and 4 hereof.

ARTICLE 8
1. In exercising the rights provided for in this Convention workers and employers and their respective organizations, like other persons of organized collectivities, shall respect the law of the land.
2. The law of the land shall not be such as to impair, nor shall it be so applied as to impair, the guarantees provided for in this Convention.

ARTICLE 10
In this Convention the term “organization” means any organization of workers or of employers for furthering and defending the interests of workers or of employers.

ARTICLE 11
Each Member of the International Labor Organization for which this Convention is in force undertakes to take all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that workers and employers may exercise freely the right to organize.


The Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention 1949 (No. 98). International Labor Organization. (Excerpts)

ARTICLE 1
1. Workers shall enjoy adequate protection against acts of antiunion discrimination in respect of their employment.
2. Such protection shall apply more particularly in respect of acts calculated to
   (a) make the employment of a worker subject to the condition that he shall not join a union or shall relinquish trade union membership;
   (b) cause the dismissal of or otherwise prejudice a worker by reason of union membership or because of participation in union activities outside working hours or, with the consent of the employer, within working hours.

ARTICLE 2

1. Workers’ and employers’ organizations shall enjoy adequate protection against any acts of interference by each other or each other’s agents or members in their establishment, functioning or administration.
2. In particular, acts which are designed to promote the establishment of workers’ organizations under the domination of employers or employers’ organizations, or to support workers’ organizations by financial or other means, with the object of placing such organizations under the control of employers or employers’ organizations, shall be deemed to constitute acts of interference within the meaning of this Article.

ARTICLE 4

Measures appropriate to national conditions shall be taken, where necessary, to encourage and promote the full development and utilization of machinery for voluntary negotiation between employers or employers’ organizations and workers’ organizations, with a view to the regulation of terms and conditions of employment by means of collective agreements.

Local Public Service Law. 1950 (With revisions).
(Excerpts)

ARTICLE 1 (Purpose)

1. This law realizes local autonomy by establishing standards for employment, ranking, salary, working conditions, punishment, duties and evaluation of local public servants by the local public body.

ARTICLE 8 (Personnel Committee—Jinjiinkai)

1. Qualified local bodies may establish a local Personnel Committee which studies working conditions, salaries, regulations, collects documents for employment, etc., and submits its findings to the appropriate appointing officer and administrative officer concerning local administration.

2. The Personnel Committee is composed of three members appointed for a four-year term by the head of the local body with the approval of the locally elected governing body. Two members may not belong to the same political party.

ARTICLE 36 (Political Activities)

1. Local public service personnel may not contribute to the formation of political parties or become officers in them. They also may not induce others to become members of any political party.

2. Local public service personnel may not participate in any of the following activities in support of, or opposition to, a particular political party, person, or event in a public election:
   a. engage in soliciting votes
   b. participate in a signature campaign
   c. engage in fund raising campaigns
   d. use or allow others to use public funds or public buildings

ARTICLE 37 (Dispute Tactics)

Local public servants may not resort to strikes, slowdown, or other acts of dispute against their employer, who is the local people as represented by the
agencies of the local public body, or to conduct such idling tactics as will deteriorate the functional efficiency of the local public body, or to instigate others to do so.

**ARTICLE 40 (Efficiency Rating)**

The appointment officer of local public servants must conduct periodic efficiency ratings of all employees under his responsibility and must act appropriately according to the results.

**ARTICLE 52 (Organization)**

Public servants’ organizations whose purpose is to promote the improvement of working conditions will be recognized. Local public servants may join such an organization.

**ARTICLE 55 (Negotiations)**

Local public servants’ organizations may negotiate with the local public body concerned with regard to compensation, work hours, and other working conditions of their personnel. However, such negotiations do not include the right of collective agreement with the authorities of the local public body.

**ARTICLE 61**

Anyone who plans, instigates, or carries out acts prohibited in Article 37 shall be liable for punishment of not more than three years imprisonment, or fined 100,000 yen.
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**A Code of Ethics for Teachers. Nikkyōso. 1952.**

Until the present time the teachers of Japan, under the pressures of a half-feudalistic ultranationalistic system, have been forced into a logic of subservience. Because the Japanese social system today has reached a point where reconstruction from a completely different point of view is necessary, we must cut our ties with past conventions and embrace a new ethic.
A code of ethics is not merely a set of universal and eternal rules, but rather a set of changing principles which must be grasped through a fight to accomplish the historical tasks which have been bestowed upon a people within a specific historical period. Today, however, the workings of our society are causing poverty and unemployment to become more and more universal and are forcing even the independence of the country onto dangerous ground.

The threat of a modern destructive war is distorting our recognition of these historical tasks and deflecting our will to overcome them. In such a state of affairs our earnest desire to seek a peaceful society in which human rights are respected, industrial production is increased, and the exploitation of man by man is no longer permitted cannot be attained without a high degree of autonomous growth toward maturity on the part of the laboring class. Needless to say, teachers are laborers. The more the difficulty of the situation increases, the more the teachers of Japan, along with all laborers, must increase their unity, protect the youth of the country, and face these historical tasks with courage and intelligence. Based on a recognition of the above facts, we hereby establish the following code of ethics:

ARTICLE 1. Teachers Shall Work with the Youth of the Country in Fulfiling the Tasks of Society

Upon our shoulders have been laid the historical tasks of protecting peace, insuring the independence of the country, and realizing a society free from exploitation, poverty and unemployment. Believing in democracy, we are unswerving in our desire to fulfill these tasks.

The youth of the country must be raised and educated to become capable workers who will give themselves, each according to his own abilities, to the accomplishment of these tasks. There is no other road by which the youth of Japan can attain freedom and happiness.

Teachers shall live and work with the youth and shall be the organizers of and counselors in a schooling designed to meet this necessity. Each teacher shall make an intensive critical examination of himself and shall study and make efforts to prepare himself for his new role in education.

ARTICLE 2. Teachers Shall Fight for Equal Opportunity in Education
Equal opportunity in education and respect for the dignity of the individual, as guaranteed by the Constitution, are today still dead letters. The youth of today are severely restricted in their educational opportunities because of the social and economic limitations placed upon the individual. It may be said in particular that no serious consideration has been given to educating either the multitudes of working young people or mentally and physically handicapped children. Children are not being guaranteed equality of conditions for life and growth either within or without the schools. We have reached a point where eighteenth century individualism no longer opens the way to the development of the individual. Today social procedures must be followed in order to create equal opportunities in education.

Teachers shall of themselves be keenly aware of this necessity and shall in all quarters fight for equality in education.

**ARTICLE 3. Teachers Shall Protect Peace**

Peace is the ideal of mankind; war destroys all the hopes of mankind. Without peace the historical tasks facing Japanese society cannot be accomplished. The desire of the people for peace becomes strongest when individual rights are respected and when the people are able to hold hopes for an improvement in social conditions and have strong faith in progress. Discontent and loss of hope on the part of the people may serve to impel a country down the road to war.

Teachers shall be advocators of the brotherhood of man, leaders in the reconstruction of life attitudes, and pioneers in respecting human rights, and as such they shall stand as the most courageous defenders of peace against all those who advocate war.

**ARTICLE 4. Teachers Shall Act on Behalf of Scientific Truth**

Progress takes place within a society when the members of that society, acting on behalf of scientific truth, seek a rational approach to historical tasks. Actions which ignore the fruits of science serve to suppress that in man which makes him seek progress. Teachers shall respect the progress-seeking element in man, shall carry out scientific explorations on nature and society, and shall create a rational environment conducive to the growth and development of young people.
To these ends teachers shall share their experiences and shall work closely with scholars and specialists in all fields.

**ARTICLE 5. Teachers Shall Allow No Infringements on Freedom in Education**

Our freedom of research in education as well as of action is often suppressed by improper forces. Academic freedom as well as freedom of speech, thought and assembly, although guaranteed in the Constitution, are nevertheless actually being restricted severely. Infringements on freedom in education serve to obstruct healthy learning by young people, to hinder intellectual activity, and furthermore to endanger the proper development of the nation. Teachers, being deeply aware of this, shall fight against all improper pressures in education.

**ARTICLE 6. Teachers Shall Seek after Proper Government**

Successive governments, under the pretext of making education politically neutral, have long deprived the teachers of Japan of their freedoms and have forced them to serve in whatever way the government has desired. After the war, having been given the freedom to participate in political activities, teachers banded together and fought for proper government, but now such political freedom is again being taken from them. Government is not something to serve the interests of any one group; it belongs to all the people. It is the means for us to attain our desires in a peaceful manner.

Teachers, together with all working men, shall participate in political activities and shall pool their resources in seeking proper government.

**ARTICLE 7. Teachers Shall Fight Side by Side with Parents against Corruption in Society and Shall Create a New Culture**

In our towns and villages our young people are surrounded day and night by corruption of all kinds which is exerting a degenerative influence on their wholesome minds. Unwholesome amusements are suggested in movies, plays and even in the tales told by the neighborhood children’s storytellers; degenerative tendencies are to be found in newspapers, radio programs, and in books and magazines; the type of atmosphere surrounding bicycle and race tracks and urban amusement districts tends to weaken the soul of the nation. All these exert a particularly strong and poisonous influence on the youth of the country.
Teachers shall combine their efforts with parents in protecting youth from the corrupting influences of society, shall live and work with youth in a proper manner, and shall create a new culture of the working man.

ARTICLE 8. Teachers Are Laborers
Teachers are laborers whose workshops are the schools. Teachers, in the knowledge that labor is the foundation of everything in society, shall be proud of the fact that they themselves are laborers. At the present stage of history, the realization of a new society of mankind which respects fundamental human rights, not only in word but in deed as well, and which utilizes resources, technology, and science for the welfare of all men is possible only through the power of the working masses whose nucleus is the laboring class. Teachers shall be aware of their position as laborers, shall live forcefully believing in the historical progress of man, and shall consider all stagnation and reaction as their enemies.

ARTICLE 9. Teachers Shall Defend Their Right to Maintain a Minimum Standard of Living
Having been forced thus far to live in noble poverty under the proud name of educator, teachers have been ashamed to voice their demands for even the minimum material benefits necessary for their existence. To demand just recompense for their own labors would have been unthinkable to teachers of the past. Because of this situation, teachers have lost all desire and zeal for imparting to their students a proper education, and their lives have come to be ruled by exhaustion, indolence and opportunism.

Teachers shall consider it their right and duty to protect their own right to maintain a minimum standard of living and to fight for optimum conditions under which to live and labor.

ARTICLE 10. Teachers Shall Unite
The obligations which history has given to the teacher can only be fulfilled if teachers unite. The strength of the teacher is exhibited through organization and unity; organization and unity give constant courage and strength to the activities of the teacher. Moreover, there is no other way today in which the teacher can establish himself as an individual except through unity of action. The teachers of Japan, through the labor movement,
shall unite with the teachers of the world and shall join hands with all laborers.
Unity is the highest ethic of the teacher.
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**New Board of Education Law (Law for the Administration of Local Education). June 30, 1956. (Excerpts)**

**ARTICLE 2.** A Board of Education shall be established for each prefecture, city, town and village.

**ARTICLE 3.** The Board will consist of five members, or three at the village level.

**ARTICLE 4.** Each member of the Board will be appointed by the head of the local government with the approval of the local representative body.

**ARTICLE 5.** The term of the Board members shall be four years. Members may be reelected.

**ARTICLE 16.** A Superintendent of Education (Kyōikuchō) will be appointed by the Board of Education. At the prefectural level the Ministry of Education must approve the Board’s recommendation. At the city, town or village level, the Superintendent appointed by the local School Board must be approved by the Prefectural Board of Education.

**ARTICLE 33.** The Board of Education, within the limits of other laws and regulations, shall regulate the management and administration of the schools under its jurisdiction.

**ARTICLE 35.** The Board of Education shall appoint, dismiss and punish educational personnel subject to the provisions of the Local Public Service Law.

**ARTICLE 46.** An efficiency rating of the educational personnel will be undertaken by the appropriate administrative officer under provisions of Article 40 of the Local Public-Service Law.
ARTICLE 52. The Minister of Education, if he determines that the local education body is violating the fundamental laws of education, or is deviating from the original purposes of education, has the right to “motomeru” (request or demand) that measures necessary to correct the situation be taken.

ARTICLE 54. The Minister of Education has the right to “motomeru” (request or demand) local school boards to submit necessary statistics, investigative reports, and other materials to the Ministry of Education.
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Nikkyōso’s Convention Goals. 1966

1. Intensify the joint struggles of all public servants for the early attainment of a large salary increase.
2. Oppose dismissals of teachers, increase the number of teachers over and above the limit set by the government, and increase the education budget for the improvement of education and our working conditions.
3. Intensify our struggles for teachers’ rights and recapture our fundamental labor rights.
4. Oppose education controlled by the central government, promote the independent research and study of education, and abolish the achievement tests and the Nōken Test. Promote the People’s Movement for a New Education in order to provide secondary education for all.
5. Oppose the “invasion” of Vietnam, destroy the United States-Japan Security Treaty, prohibit the nuclear rearmament of Japan, return Okinawa from American control, and intensify the People’s Movement for Peace.
6. Establish our labor union at each workshop (school), intensify the unity and solidarity of our 600,000 members, and expand our organization.
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