

Tel-Aviv's Case Causes Univ. Control Again

May 30, three Japanese terrorists ran into a crowded custom hall at Tel-Aviv's Lod Airport, killed 26 people and wounded 72. Among them was a girl two years old. The three Japanese attackers—two of them committed suicide by their own grenades, another was captured—had been recruited for money by an Arab guerrilla organization. Through interrogation the captured attacker and the two self-murdered men were found to be university students and sympathizers of the Red Army Faction (Sekigun-ha).

This Lod Airport massacre shocked the whole world. In our country the Government sent a special envoy to Tel-Aviv and apologized to Israel's Government and people. At the same time the Education Minister announced that it would need to make a plan for university administration law, because students had played the worst parts in many criminal acts committed by radical groups. As well, the Education Minister warned that every university president should tighten up controls on prolonged absentee students and on discipline among students.

Reportedly, however, the administrator of the university that the only survivor had attended, had checked the student's absence with the student's family and made sure of it. How could the administrator place further controls on the student? The reason why he was involved in mass slaying seems irrelevant to his prolonged absence.

Administration Law

In 1969, the Sato Government's special university administration law was carried in the Diet. The special law said that the Government could make disrupted universities close and suspend to have classes. Before the special law, however, in 1951 the Yoshida Cabinet had prepared a university administration law and three other laws concerned with university education, but none became law.

In 1963, the Ikeda Cabinet prepared similar laws, but these also failed to become law. The outline of these laws was that the Government had its right to participate university administration, and suppress campus dispute by police power.

The other day Education Minister announced that the Government would suggest a university administration law similar to the Yoshida and the Ikeda Cabinets' laws in the Diet, two years after the special university administration law becomes void. It is a well-known fact that the mere administration of law can not solve campus problems. Therefore, neither the Yoshida Cabinet nor the Ikeda could support their plans in the Diet. Such administration laws can not anything but keep short-term campus order.

Fundamental problems of

campus disputes concern education and self-autonomy at university. Traditional university education was that professors were only wrapped up in their own studies and hardly ever paid full attention to teaching. Therefore, talks between students and professors were lost. Self-autonomy meant rule by a board of professors. That is to say, determination by the board was issued as representing all the members at the university. Opinions of students and other staff were not contained in it at all. Students who were undatisfied with these matters, rose to make education real and to replace administration by professors with representation of all the members. Besides, education policies of the Liberal Democratic Party Government have made student movement more tense.

Educ. Policies

Since 1947, there have been many Government policies concerned with university education, whose summing-up is as follows:

(1) Deviding university functions into both study, education and administration, management (regarding campus buildings either as study places, or as public education places).

(2) Separating study from education.

(3) Putting emphasis on practical education (university as supplying for social need).

(4) Showing responsibility of university for people and society, which means that the Government has the right to require university administration, because the administration depends on public finance to a large extent, and the Government is the representative of taxpayers.

(5) Every professors is not merely a scholar but also a member of social organization, so that he is obliged to accept responsibility for the organization. As well, he should cooperate with the policy in calling the riot police to suppress campus dispute.

Since 1960, the Government education polities have put emphasis on (3), (4), (5)—essentially on "university in social system." Neither academic freedom nor self-autonomy at the university can be assured by these education policies. Study which does not have direct relationship with modern society, is ignored.

University administration is carried along the Government policies. University students have necessarily been against the policies. They have turned their movement toward criticizing the Government. The Government has tried to suppress the movement with police power. Oppressed students have used stones, staves, Molotov cocktail and so on. Their movement has become violent. The Government and the police have tightened up controls on the students movement all the

more. Then there happened the hi-jacking of a JAL jetliner to North Korea in 1970 and a series of terrible acts committed by radical students.

The First Goals

Student movement has lost its first goals, and has been far from the general interest of students. In that condition, when a small number of remaining active students try to influence the Government policies, their movement becomes wild and violent.

One reason is that the movement has been suppressed by police power; the other is that with a reduced number of students demonstrators, the student movement has become criminal activities. However fundamental problems lie on frustration of students from education and self-autonomy at the university. The frustration can be solved neither by calling the riot police nor by the criminal activities of radical students. It needs to be discussed inside the university.

True, Tel-Aviv's massacre was committed by the three university students, but it is away from the point that the Government attempts to constitute university administration law, in order to keep from similar terrible incidents in the future.

This educational administration policy of the Government does nothing but make student movement more violent. Students need to think again about education, self-autonomy at the university, and their movement. If they do not so, student movement will only repeat a bad cycle, and the university administration law will be accepted.

Come back to university, every student.

Tel-Aviv Event and The Unusual Solatium

Both the Tel-Aviv incident and the Government's solatium were accepted as unusual points of the Japanese. By the solatium, the Government tried to take the responsibility for the crime, and this action seems to have posed the problem of Japan's national responsibility. In the following article, the theme is focused on the pollution victims and those who are still remembering the Japanese militarism in the neighbour countries.

We would like to express our sympathy for those who unfortunately fell victim to the brutal terrorists cruel actions at Lod airport of Israel. Whatever political reasons the three terrorists might have had, such an indiscriminate mass slaying should never be permitted, and there is, of course, no room for defending their bloody terrorism.

Two Unusual Events

After the incident, the Japanese Government dispatched a special envoy in apology to Israel, and it was settled immediately that some 1.5 million dollars would be paid as a solatium to the victims. It seems to be the intention of this action of the Government to take the responsibility for the crime committed by Japanese. Solatium as a means of apology, is reported to be very unusual in the case like this, and if we consider the motive that caused the Government to take such steps, we can not help making the following interpretation. Because

of the terrorist's nationality, the Government was afraid of losing the international reputation Japan has been winning as the Third Big Power, and it tried to keep Japan's dignity out of dishonor.

Who Is Responsible

While Tel-Aviv was in the center of the international sensation, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was under way in Stockholm. Along with the Director-General of the Environment Agency Mr. Oishi, some pollution disease patients attended the conference, and foreign newspaper reporters were all terrified at the first sight of the miserable Minamata disease patients and the victims of Kanemi's PCB rice-oil poisoning. Japan's reputation has deteriorated here, too. Mr. Oishi, as a representative of the Government said in his speech it was the responsibility of the Government that pollution had spread so far in Japan. A few years ago, Prime Minister Sato stated in the Diet that where there was no welfare, there was no economic growth. However contrary to his words, nothing particular has been done to aid the patients who have been sacrificed to the world's highest economic growth rate.

If the Government would like to accept the mass-slaying as a national responsibility of Japan, the pollution which is spreading at an unprecedentedly large scale that has resulted in so many pollution diseases and in many cases, medically untreated patients should also be accounted as a national responsibility. The latter shame had been hidden long and was exposed internationally at the conference for the first time. The Government tried to re-

gain the lost prestige by the special envoy's apology along with so much solatium, while it had been forgotten, from the standpoint of the national shame, that there are hundreds of those who should be given the similar treatment living inside Japan's borders. How can the Government explain the inconsistency between the treatment of the Tel-Aviv case caused by the terrorists and its treatment for the pollution victims for whom it is actually responsible.

If we view the two incidents—the mass slaying and pollution—from the standpoint the Government is taking, it is possible to consider that the Government should pay the same solatium for the pollution victims in order to regain the dignity lost in Stockholm.

Those responsible for the Tel-Aviv incident are the three terrorists, themselves, while those responsible in the case of pollution are the Government officers who, blinded by the power of money and the rapid economic growth, have been turning a blind eye to the outrageous commercialism of the major enterprises.

The word, "mass slaying" reminds us of Japan's atrocity in the bloody Nanking Massacre in which more than 300,000 innocent Chinese people were killed indiscriminately, and in the repeated mistreatment of the Koreans. As far as the case of indiscriminate slaughter of innocent foreigners is concerned. The relationship between leftist terrorism and rightist imperialism is analogous to the difference between the latest Tel-Aviv case and the Nanking Massacre.

Now that Japan has grown into the third big Power with dignity, when we are confronted with these facts, can we find any other national shame bigger than this? Has the Government ever taken any appropriate steps as a compensation countries? Both the Tel-Aviv case and the previous aggressions were staged by Japanese, but in spite of the solatium to the victims of the former case, where the Japanese Government is not responsible at all, the Government is still neglecting to take the responsibility for the latter, where it ought to be responsible.

How to Apologize

The nation's hatred has been concentrated on the United Red Army's inhumanity and the national sentiment of the Japanese will never allow the mad terrorists to be considered as the representatives of Japan. However, the solatium paid by the Government representing our nation seems to suggest that the whole nation is actually responsible for the outrageous terrorism. We would like the Government to remember that a mere apology can not settle everything. Also, an apology can be accepted and interpreted in different ways according to the situation and the time.



Japanese Ambassador Attending the Victim's Funeral

The special envoy Mr. Tokura (the second person from the left) is watching the coffin of Professor Katzir, one of the victims of Tel Aviv incident, in deep grief, accompanied by his wife. Mr. Tokura attended the professor's funeral after he has visited other victims in hospital in Tel Aviv city. He was sent to Israel immediately after the incident in apology to the victims.

UPI

Education Forum

—The History of Authorization of Schoolbooks—

What Is a Schoolbook

In September 1872 not long after Yukichi Fukuzawa's "Recommendation of Study" was issued for the first time, schooling system was established by the Education Ministry in Japan. The history of school books since then can be divided into the following five periods.

The first period came immediately after the nation's education system was announced. The second was the period around 1886 when authorization of school textbooks started. The third period, during which all the school textbooks were published by the nation, came after 1903. The year that followed Japan's defeat in the war belongs to the fourth, when the authorization began again, and the present age is the last fifth period.

Free publication of school books was carried out for a while after the announcement of the education system. Each school was free to choose any textbook out of the list of books recommended by the Education Ministry, and it was greatly expected that good translation and works would become available by many private authorities. The Japanese education directed by the Education Ministry was going on its way energetically during this period, which was the beginning of the education system. However, a list of school books whose use was forbidden was announced hardly 10 years after the establishment of the education system, and the oppressive tendency, through many twists and turns, after all resulted in the textbooks which were put completely under the state's authorization in 1886. The reinforcement of the control on schoolbooks by the state had continued until all the primary school books were published under the national au-

thorization system. At the same time the democratic movement, along with the Government's policy for the development of the domestic industry and for the reinforcement of the military power, began to rise.

Editors and authors could afford to give reign to their originality even in the authorized schoolbooks of those days, but critical descriptions on the government policies for the public safety could not avoid the Education Ministry's check. The primary education was proposed to make pupils appreciate the value of morals and to strengthen each individual's basis of Confucianism from the time he is still at primary school.

While the debate on the problems of authorized school books being hotly discussed among the educational authorities, an incident happened, which intensified the critical tendencies toward the school books. The incident, caused by bribery between school book publishers and the educational circle, developed into the general public's criticism of the authorization itself. Before this incident came to light, the Education Ministry had been preparing for the establishment of a new system by which all the publication of school books would be under the Government's control. The famous Kyoiku Chokugo (the Imperial Rescript on Education) issued in 1890, which was used as a textbook to teach children the meaning of loyalty to the State and Emperor, was intended to be more effective through compilation of new textbooks on morality laying more emphasis on the loyalty to those in power.

The Education Ministry, in consideration of the undesirable influence on society by the bribery affairs, made a decision

to give up the authorization on school books. Its authorization was immediately replaced by the State's control over the school books, which was exemplified in the textbooks on the ancient mythologies. Therefore there was no room for archaeological study on the descriptions of historical fact in such textbooks.

The educational tendency that appeared in the period between the two World Wars was comparatively free, which afforded even composition training at school. However in the days when the state's power was all turned to the preparation for the coming war, the education partly inspired with the liberal tendencies could not avoid the tragic fate of being washed away by the torrents of militarism. Knowledge in science textbooks was taught to be helpful to the construction of the militarism and the theory of our country's history was far from what we believe as a scientific commonsense.

Textbooks with such contents which could no longer be able to keep up with the democratic tendencies after the defeat, should have been excluded from the Japanese education. However it was impossible to abolish the pre-war educational system immediately, and even such textbooks as were published before the war continued to be used with the inappropriate descriptions blotted out in black ink. We wonder how abnormal it seemed for school boys to blot out by themselves the letters and characters which ought to be the origin of the pupils' knowledge.

Control on the school books was more intensified by the U.S. Occupation Army from 1946, and all the publication of school books was carried out through the permission and authorization by the U.S. forces

headquarters. It meant the approval of the new trend for the democratization of the Japanese education, by which the color of militarism and ultranationalism was intended to be excluded from school books.

Criticism of the pre-war education and expectations of the post-war education are expressed in the Fundamental Law of Education, School Education Law and the Program of Study and Teaching announced in March 1947, all of which are based on the spirit of the newly established Japanese Constitution. Education was finally released from the State's control, but the optimistic expectation of future education was soon smashed down by another trend which approved the revival of the school book authorization on the grounds that it was too early to resume the free publication and choice of schoolbooks.

It was from April in 1949 that partly authorized textbooks began to be used in practice. The Education Ministry had continued to carry out the compilation and publication of the States authorized textbooks up to that time. However many of textbooks published under the new authorization system were edited by the Education Ministry. On top of that, textbooks of the time were poor in variety, and teachers, though entitled with the right of choice, could not necessarily afford to choose whatever textbooks they liked.

In 1951 the Education Ministry made up a plan to publish standard textbooks which were rich in variety, in order to make the contents suitable for the rapidly changing world. Nevertheless, the plan was not put in practice because of the supposition that the Education Ministry intended to return to the State authorization system. The last period was finally added to the long history of the Education Ministry issued school books.

The system of authorization had been continued from that time and in 1953 as a result of the reformation of School Education Law and the Board of Education, the Education Minister was endowed with the right to authorize schoolbooks. In 1956 the authorization system was reinforced by increased members of the Textbook Authorization and Research Council (from sixteen to eighty). The expansion of authorization, promoted by the revision of the Program of Study and Teaching in 1958, and the reformation of the standard of authorization, resulted in an increase of textbooks with a stamp of rejection on their covers.

The present authorization system, which went through so many changes in its history from the time of Japan's defeat, seems full of defects compared to the authorization system established shortly after the end of the war. The opposition to the system from the general public which has been intensified since the Ienaga Case was posed as a serious problem of the Japanese education. This trend has been accompanied by the campaign for obtaining the general public's recognition of the real meaning of the incident.

One of the peculiarities of the Japanese view about school books would be well indicated by the fact that we tend to accept schoolbooks as if they

The Mita Campus

'calamus gladio fortior'

Honorary President: Prof. Noritake Kobayashi
Adviser: Prof. Mikio Hiramatsu

Editor-in-Chief N. Miura Business Mgr. T. Ohashi
News Editor K. Kunimoto Advertising Mgr. H. Ito
Feature Editor S. Watanabe Student Editor F. Ando
Culture Editor H. Taketani Reporters J. Orban
Managing Editor T. Ohashi E. Yamazaki
Circulation Mgr. H. Ishimori K. Miyamoto

OFFICE

THE MITA CAMPUS, Keio University; Student Hall Room No. 33 Mita Shiba, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan. Mita Office Tel. (453) 0216
THE MITA CAMPUS is published every month during the academic year, and policies of THE MITA CAMPUS are responsibility of the student editors. Statements published here do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the school authorities or any department of the University. Single copy: Price ¥20. Annual subscription rate: ¥250.

Political Apathy

Mass slaying by the Japanese guerrillas in Tel-Aviv gave terrible shock to the Japanese. A Japanese weekly magazine pointed out that the Japanese are regarded as depolitical and tend to commit crimes more easily abroad. We can hardly deny that the criminals of the bloody Tel-Aviv incident were greatly disappointed at the Japanese politics, and we can easily surmise that they were not depolitical types but antipolitical.

Therefore it seems necessary for all the Japanese to consider whether or not we are really depolitical and indifferent to the politics. Our political attitude can be classified into the following three types: the active attitude to show loyalty and support to the political power and its symbol (such as the national flag and national anthem); the attitude to oppose and deny the political power and symbol actively; indifference to politics in general.

The last type can be further classified into three more detailed types according to the U.S. political scientist Dr. H.D. Lasswell. The depolitical, the apolitical, and the antipolitical. For the depolitical, mere use and participation in power is not satisfactory to them. The power seems so valueless to them that they retire from it. The apolitical avoid politics by indulging in another value, for example study or art. The antipolitical are mostly individualistic anarchist and religious mystics. In principle their values collide with the essence of politics.

In addition to the classified three political types by Dr. Lasswell, we would like to mention the fourth political indifference, which is outstanding, especially in Japan. Those who belong to the fourth political indifference seem to be deeply interested in politics, but their interest is turned to the gossips about politicians, the by-product of politics, rather than to the politics itself. For example in case of L.D.P.'s (Conservative Party) Presidential Election, the candidate's policies are pushed aside by the general public's curiosity on how much money was spent by each candidate for the increase of his votes.

Political indifference of this Japanese type has been helping the conservative power last so long. When we consider the other side of the matter, the indifference can be said to have been serving as a hot bed for the growth of conservative power.

In fact we have been manipulated by the GNP's magic. Sacrificed lives of the nation have been the biggest secret of the world highest economic growth rate, which is widely recognizable by the price hikes and the polluted environment.

When we trace back the history of political defects for their causes, we can come to the conclusion that these defects are after all originated from the people's political indifference. We must admit the fact that the American democracy has not yet taken its root in our country. It is required of everybody to reflect upon his own personal attitude to the politics now for the construction of better democracy.

were something like God's authority. However such a tendency would in a sense be natural with the Japanese who had been educated for 40 years by the State authorized textbooks. People's indifference to the educational problems have been produced by this situation, in which we can detect the fundamental cause of the Nation's obedience to the Government's control on education in general.
Can the freedom in education be guaranteed without freedom in the descriptions of schoolbooks? The question here is, of course, how to compile better textbooks. All the educational system should be for the achievement of this ideal. It is the educational circle itself that must give flexible consideration to the educational problems, and we would like the Japanese people to question by themselves what school books are, and to find what schoolbooks ought to be.

—"Sankaku-Daifuku"—

"Daifuku" is a very popular rice-cake in Japan which contains sweet mashed "azuki" beans called "an" in it. We can get taste of its deliciousness with a cup of green tea especially when we are tired from a hard job and want something sweet.

The more pure the "azuki" beans from which the "an" is made the better its taste is said to become. "Daifuku," which is generally thought ball-shaped, has begun to appear in a triangular shape at a certain sweet shop in Tokyo, and this new sweet rice-cake has come to be called "Sankaku (triangle) daifuku"—a newly coined Japanese word.

The sweet shop making the "Sankaku-daifuku" is in Liberal Democratic Party (The conservative party), where four of its leaders, Takeo Miki, Kakuei Tanaka, Masayoshi Ohira, and Takeo Fukuda are running

their race at full speed for the single seat of the party presidency.

"San" is another pronunciation of the Chinese character "Mi" which stands for the name "Miki." "Kaku" is coming from the name "Kakuei Tanaka." "O," which is the initial of Mr. Ohira, can be pronounced also, "Dai," and "Fuku" is the first Chinese character of the name "Fukuda." These four politicians, the candidates for the next presidential election, are the confectioners of the big "Sankaku Daifuku." Well, then, how does the new "daifuku" taste? It will depend entirely on their policies, whether the "an" in "Sankaku Daifuku" tastes sweet or bitter.

Premier 'Sugar'

We have become weary of the long presidency of Mr. Sato, and what is quite odd with his name is that it can be punned on

another Japanese word "Sato" which means sugar in English. However Mr. Sato's sugar, adulterated with so much saccharine, seems to have affected the people's appetite adversely. Isn't it possible to give an explanation on the people's indifference to the present politics by applying this theory? After Mr. Sato's sweet saccharine pot is put away from the table, the sweet cake called "Sankaku daifuku" is going to be served. Now that we have already had our fill of "Sato," we don't what sweet any more!

The general public's opinion about the presidential race seems to be condensed in this short remark, "Whoever may become the next president, it won't make so much difference," and the difference between Mr. Sato and the next president might be nothing more than that between sugar and a sweet "daifuku" rice cake.