

DISCUSSION ARTICLES
FROM JAPAN

TWO CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR DISCUSSION FROM ZENSHIN

I The Present Situation of the Class Struggle
in Japan

II The Vietnam War and the World Today

AND THE ESSAY --

"Marx's Humanism Today" -- by Raya Dunayevskaya

NEWS & LETTERS PRE-CONVENTION BULLETIN No. 5

August, 1966

9855

THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN JAPAN

Since the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty last December, the aggression of Japanese imperialism has reached a new stage both at home and overseas, in launching outer expansion and strengthening political reaction. Planned resumption of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in 1970 will inevitably occupy the essential position for future development of the class struggle in Japan, and the Japanese working class will undergo a serious trial at that time.

Japanese imperialism, defeated in World War II, experienced a grave crisis, faced as it was with a tremendous upheaval of workers' struggles in the midst of a political and economic catastrophe. It had lost its colonial territory completely and its imperialist army had been disbanded.

The elements that helped Japanese capitalism survive were the U.S. army of occupation and U.S. economic assistance, and the Japanese Communist Party, which defined the U.S. troops as a liberation army and, because they were in the leadership of the workers' movement at that time, were able to suppress the resistance of the Japanese people.

The facts are, however, not peculiar to Japan. They are, in fact, a Japanese edition of the Stalinist policy that divided the post-war world between the world imperialists headed by U.S. capitalism and the Stalinists represented by the U.S.S.R. ruling class. This occurred at the Yalta talks.

The U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. coalition turned into the cold war through the division of Germany, and was finally broken by the Chinese Revolution and the Korean War. All these facts gave the American imperialists an impetus for securing domination over the Far East.

Japanese imperialism was thus given the necessary conditions for a revival. U.S. imperialism now expected Japanese imperialism to undertake the task of being the anti-revolutionary stronghold in Asia. However, the Japanese ruling class still needed U.S. assistance. After the defeat of the workers' struggle in 1947-49, Japanese imperialism was able to reestablish itself through the Dodge Line (reduced and balanced budgeting) and by the special procurements boom caused by the Korean War.

Thus the post war development of Japanese imperialism, from the period of U.S. occupation till the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the U.S.A.- Japan Mutual Security Treaty of 1952, was possible only in the contemporary world in which the ruling classes of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. shared domination over the people of the whole world.

The U.S.A.- Japan Mutual Security Treaty was aimed at re-establishing Japanese imperialism as the strongest reactionary partner of U.S. imperialism in the Asian world. It is an anti-revolutionary coalition of the U.S. and Japanese ruling classes.

This treaty has given the Japanese ruling class enough military, political and economic aid to confront civil disorder. It has exempted Japanese capitalism from contributing to the military expenditures in the budget and has allowed it to accumulate capital very rapidly.

The aim of the Japanese ruling class in amending the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty in 1960 was to raise its position in U.S.-Japan relations as well as in Asian relations. It was the result of the development of Japanese capitalism which had succeeded in restoring a financial monopoly system stronger than that of the pre-war period. And it had equipped itself with "Self-Defense-Troops" (that is, an unofficial, unauthorized army.)

Today, the U.S.-Japan Treaty is functioning as "the alliance of robbers" which allows the U.S. and Japanese imperialists to rely on each other in realizing their aggressive policy in the Far East. It is accelerated by the following elements:

First, the escalation of U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam. American imperialism, challenged by the development of both the EEC (European Economic Community) countries and Japan and afraid of losing its dominating power over the politics and economy of the world, is at present putting its full power into the Vietnamese war to secure U.S. control over Asia.

U.S. aggression in Vietnam would not be possible without the support of Japanese imperialism. The Japanese ruling class is in fact a most desirable co-thinker and co-operator of the U.S. government in carrying out a reactionary policy against the Asian people. The U.S.-Japan Treaty is nothing but a legislative pretense for it.

Second, Japanese imperialism has begun expansion through the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty. Japanese capitalism has been undergoing depression. This has been caused by over production in the course of rapid development since 1955. Now the outbreak of the inner conflict in the Japanese economy cannot be avoided without establishing its own economic territory overseas through exporting surplus capital. The Japanese ruling class feels it is imperative for them to build up their own military power in order to defend their interests already gained and now being developed in South Korea, Indonesia and other Asian countries. At the same time, they feel themselves closely tied to U.S. imperialism and its destiny -- that is, that retreat and decline of U.S. imperialist power in the world will inevitably be a terrible blow to Japanese imperialism.

The escalation of the aggressive war in Vietnam, as well as Chinese nuclear armament, both of which are carried out beyond the expectation or anticipation of the Japanese ruling class, exercise a grave influence over it.

These factors make the Japanese ruling class realize its reactionary role in Asia and force it to prepare for the re-establishment of an imperialist army and to strengthen their ruling system at home.

Thus far, we have analyzed the background of the imperialist aggression of the Japanese bourgeoisie, which took a new direction after the conclusion of the Japan-Korea Treaty.

The current policy of the Sato government against the Japanese people may be summarized as follows:

- 1) to reinforce the competitive power of Japanese capital through rationalization and the end of wage increases at home, and to establish a powerful influence over the other Asian countries both economically and politically, e.g. South East Asian Conference of Economic Development.
- 2) to develop the current Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty into a Japan-U.S.A. Nuclear Treaty in order to give aid to the U.S. for the Vietnamese War and to cope with the Chinese nuclear armament, and, at the same time to establish their own military power strong enough to carry out limited war as a military ally of the U.S. army through a Third Defense Plan and Secret Strategic Plan in Asia.
- 3) to launch a complete reform of the post-war system of political construction, which allowed the Japanese people a certain degree of democratic rights, and to amend the Constitution (including section 9, the Peace Article), the election system, and the penalty code in order to establish state-power on an overwhelming scale.
- 4) to embrace the ideology of imperialism and chauvinistic national unity in order to persuade the people to accept future imperialist wars abroad and a suppressive regime at home.

The planned re-amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in 1970 will be the culmination of the aggression of Japanese imperialism, mentioned above. The present Sato government is determined to carry out these plans until 1970 despite all the opposition of the Japanese people.

The response of the present leadership of the workers' movement, the Socialist and Communist Parties, to such a situation has deteriorated badly. It seems that the more critical the situation becomes, the less militant they are.

The main concern of the Socialist Party is to attain a majority in the parliament and to form a 'socialist' cabinet. For this reason, it is trying to make its policy more 'realistic' (e.g., to transform the existing Self-Defense Troops into some kind of Peace Corps) and has become more and more tied to the present social system. The JSP does not recognize the reactionary intentions of the Sato government and Japan's development toward imperialism.

On the other hand, the Japanese Communist Party is also rapidly turning reformistic. The JCP has a platform of 'independent, peaceful, democratic, neutral Japan; self-dependent development of the Japanese economy'. Needless to say, it is based on a two-step strategy and parliamentarianism, and is nothing but a reformist idea to find some solution to the fundamental problems of Japan without overthrowing Japanese capitalism.

In spite of its emphasis on the anti-U.S.A. struggle, such a policy as the JCP's can never bring about the overthrow of U.S. imperialism, either.

The reformistic essence of the JCP platform has been exposed in the course of the intensification of imperialistic aggression. When the JCP opposed the general strike of April 17, 1964, the excuse was "to retain the power of the Party and the people for the '1970' revolution." In May of this year, however, it was reported that a central committee member of the JCP criticised their former policy, saying that they now must expand the Party and prepare for the coming election, since the revolutionary situation is not coming. Some articles of the JCP publication have begun to refer even to the strategy of "Peaceful Transition into Socialism", which had been repeatedly attacked as the reformist view of Khrushchev and his followers.

Recently, the JCP professed a "self-dependent" line instead of its former subordination to the Chinese CP's line, as a result of the intensification of the Russian-Chinese conflict and the outburst of inner conflict in the Chinese Stalinist regime.

The "self-dependent" line of the JCP never means creative development of the movement in Japan. On the contrary, it is a very "pragmatic" response to the international crisis of Stalinism, designed to maintain the position of the party bureaucrats within and outside the JCP. Now there remains very little to distinguish the JCP from the JSP, at least in its political line, since the essence of the CP line is reformist even though expressed by the "left wing" jargon. Actually, coalition with the SP is now seriously being discussed in the CP. Moreover, the recent Peace Conference in Hiroshima, sponsored by the CP, excluded the pro-China foreign delegates in order to accept the representatives of the World Democratic Youth, which is controlled by the CP of the USSR.

The recent situation of the Japanese opposition forces may be summarized as follows:

The Democratic Socialist Party (right-wing social democrats) approaches the government party, the Liberal Democratic Party.

The Sohyo (General Council of Japan Trade Unions) turns towards the Trade Union League (directed by the right-wing social democrats).

The JSP loses its militancy as left-wing social democrats.

With such a general trend toward the right-wing, the SP-CP alliance would play a very reactionary role.

The alternative has now become very clear: opposition to Japanese imperialism, or surrender to it.

Every aggression of the Japanese government against the people is not accidental, but shows the needs of a revived Japanese imperialism. One who cannot see the roots of the current policy of the Japanese ruling class will inevitably be beaten violently by the intensified attack.

Now that the entire established leadership of the workers' movement is impotent to carry out the struggle against imperialist aggression, we, the revolutionary left-wing, must assume the very heavy task of making real the workers' own struggle.

The following two points should be taken into consideration:

The SP as well as the CP has stopped referring to the coming struggle in 1970 against the re-amendment of the Japan-U.S. Mutual Security Treaty. Now

the year 1970 only means, for them, general elections which might, in their optimistic expectation, bring forth ' socialist' government.

If we let things go in the SP and CP direction, the struggles of 1970 would not be a revival of the heroic struggle of 1960. On the contrary, the more the SP-CP coalition proceeds, the more severe will the suppression by the state power be. The ruling class is now earnestly preparing for such a thing.

It is the urgent task for the revolutionary left-wing to present a clear policy for the 1970 struggle -- a policy of opposition to the re-amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty, and of appeal to the workers and Japanese people to prepare for the struggle.

Second, it follows from this point that it is necessary to draw lessons from the 1960 struggle against the first amendment of the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in order to revive the power of the workers and students which was then vigorously exerted.

In fact, it was the struggle of the revolutionary left-wing that brought forth the struggle of 1960 on a scale that had never been seen in the history of the Japanese class struggle, and which saw the development of militant mass power by the workers and students.

In the development of the 1960 struggle, a harsh battle against the CP and SP was carried out in order to realize the mass militant action of the workers and students. Without such a struggle, initiated by the revolutionary left-wing, the 1960 struggle would have taken quite a different form. The struggle was based on the firm belief that the victory of the Japanese workers is impossible without criticising and overcoming the SP and CP.

For the first time in the history of the Japanese class struggle, tremendous mass action, completely independent of the CP and SP, was undertaken by ZENKAKUREN, through the leadership of the revolutionary left-wing. We were not afraid of being accused and attacked by the traditional left-wingers.

In preparing for the 1970 struggle, we have the advantage of the experiences since the 1960 struggle -- the struggle for the workers' own revolutionary party against imperialism and Stalinism, instead of the JCP and the JSP. Our present abilities, however, are quite insufficient for the task we face now.

We must point out that even among the militant left wingers who cooperate with us, there are some groups that undermine the importance of building up an independent party of workers, and hesitate to criticise the CP and SP, which are compromising with Japanese imperialism. It is therefore urgent for us to strengthen theoretical discussion among the militant left wing to overcome this tendency in the course of the struggle.

The years from now to 1970 will put us -- the revolutionary left-wing -- to a severe test.

-- JRCL-NC
ZENSHIN

9860

Contribution to our Discussion from the JRCL-NC, ZENSHIN

THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE WORLD TODAY

I

The U.S. aggression in Vietnam has entered a new and decisive stage by the bombardment of Hanoi. The battle is still going to be developed by U.S. imperialism. Complete destruction of the industrial area in North Vietnam, demolition of dams, landing (of troops) in North Vietnam, and the blockade of Halphong harbor are planned.

Russian as well as Chinese Stalinists, on the other hand, have been deepening their degeneration. In Japan, the anti-war struggle has almost been abandoned due to the actions of the Japanese Socialist Party and the Japanese Communist Party.

In this situation some groups, even among the militant left wing in Japan, oppose open criticism of the existing leadership. They are not ashamed of their inactivity during the struggle against the anchoring of U.S. nuclear submarines in Japan last June or against the Hanoi bombings.

Here we have to clarify some point of the anti-Vietnam War struggle in order to overcome the difficult situation before us.

II

The aggressive war in Vietnam is an inevitable outburst of the inner contradiction of world imperialism long developed in the post-war system of world domination. The present crisis of imperialism is clearly expressed in the Vietnamese war. And the war is being accelerated by the imperialist world system.

The contradiction of the post-war system of world domination by imperialism has its root in the relations that gave birth to the post-war system.

The restoration of world imperialism after World War II was the result of the defeat of international proletarian revolution. This was due to the Stalinist suppression of the workers' uprising, especially in several capitalist countries such as France, Italy, Japan, etc. The world imperialist system which survived had no country other than the USA to rely upon in developing the policy of world domination. Thus the U.S. ruling class set itself in the central position of the imperialist regime. It was a semi-colonial system and the U.S. began to reign over the world as a 'despotic' dominator. Such an imperialist system is essentially unstable and requires a political-military system of suppression as part of its policy. Continuous tension between the Stalinist regime and the imperialist regime was, in fact, an indispensable element in maintaining the post-war system of world domination.

The problem is that the maintenance of world domination in political economic and military fields, in opposition to the Stalinist regime, was destined to put heavy pressure on U.S. capitalism. In this manner serious contradictions accumulated with the system.

The contradictions burst out first in the weak point of U.S. domination--the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries.

The colonial system in its classical form could not survive in the post-war world. The defeat of the proletariat of capitalist countries and the restoration of imperialism prevented the complete destruction of the colonial system itself. A new method of dominating underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries (so-called neo-colonialism) was established. The U.S. was its main bearer, with France and Britain its subordinate force.

The U.S. domination which developed over the Asian, African and Latin American countries had a very peculiar character. It lacked the usual relationship between the imperialist and colonial countries that marked the pre-war classical system of domination. Its character is mainly military, especially in the Asian countries. In South Vietnam, South Korea and Formosa, which are the unhappy products of the division of one nation between the imperialist and Stalinist powers, the contradiction of the world domination system was culminated.

Crisis burst out in South Korea and South Vietnam. The aggressive war in Vietnam is therefore very closely connected with maintaining the post-war system of dominating the semi-colonial countries.

On the other hand, ironically enough, the more the economy of the capitalist countries develops, supported by the overwhelming power of U.S. imperialism, the more the American superiority is lost, and the more the contradictions are accumulated within the U.S. economy.

Miraculously high development of the EEC and Japanese economy can be contrasted to the stagnation of American capitalism. This has resulted in a U.S. retreat in competition for the world market.

Added to this is the fact that the tremendous expansion of the military expenditures, which the U.S. economy undertook as world dominator for the rest of the capitalist countries in order to maintain the existing system, has exercised enormous pressure upon the U.S. economy.

It is dramatically exposed in the so-called crisis of the dollar, the aggravation of the international balance of the U.S. finance in recent years. Moreover, the dollar crisis was accelerated by the outflow of American surplus capital into other capitalist countries which were superior to the U.S. in their rate of growth. The only 'solution' to the present crisis of the American economy is to regain overwhelming superiority in the level of production power by giving a stimulus to economic development. The Kennedy-Johnson administration tried to respond to such a demand of the American economy through an 'expansion' policy instead of the 'stabilizing' policy of the Eisenhower era. This policy of Kennedy-Johnson brought forth so-called prolonged prosperity & set the cycle of the U.S. economy which was going into the period of installment investment for the second time in the post-war development.

But the prosperity was accompanied with the development of a serious contradiction. In the first place, the economic development at home

gave no solution to the improvement in the balance of international payments. This, in spite of the fact that the outflow of capital was prevented to a certain degree by the expanded inner market for surplus capital. Prosperity, prolonged through several artificial measures had caused a tremendous growth in import and this counter-balanced the expanded inner market for surplus capital. Secondly, as the boom of installment investment was coming to an end, the U.S. administration became dependent on the inflationary policy.

The important thing is that the expenditure for the Vietnamese War has come to occupy the greater part of U.S. finances year by year, and has become almost indispensable for the maintenance of the American economy.

Thus the economy of the U.S. has gotten into a kind of vicious circle. In order to avoid a big recession (this would inevitably lead to a social crisis) it is bound to continue the inflationary policy and the Vietnamese War. On the other hand, the inflationary policy and the Vietnamese war cause a tremendous expansion of imports and endanger the balance of international payments. A drastic change in the international payments gives a blow to the American as well as the world economy.

More important, is that in the EEC countries, and especially in Japan, the post-war prosperity is coming to a standstill and is threatened by crisis. The Japanese economy is on the brink of bankruptcy, scarcely helped by deficit-covering bonds and American prosperity.

Thus the contradiction of the post war system of imperialist world domination is concentrated within the U.S. economy and the Vietnamese War is its inevitable product. Moreover, the Vietnamese War is now accelerating the contradiction.

In a word, the destiny of the U.S. and of world imperialism has become closely connected with the war in Vietnam, and the war has occupied the main position in the political, military and economic moves of today's world.

III

We have already mentioned the Japanese commitment in the Vietnamese War. Here we summarize it:

First, the general basis of the Japan-USA coalition is that the post-war imperialism of Japan has been unable to develop itself except through an alliance with the U.S.A.

Second, maintenance of not only American but also other world imperialism and the domination over the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries depends upon what occurs in the Vietnam War. This is also the case with Japanese imperialism.

Third, stabilization of the Asian situation by U.S. power is a necessary condition for Japanese imperialism to form its own Asian economic base. It is through formation of this base that Japan can cope with the European capitalist powers in the world market.

Thus the commitment of the Japanese ruling class to the war in Vietnam is to defend the interest of Japanese imperialism.

Fourth, the Japanese ruling class is intending to make the Japanese people accustomed to imperialist war through the opportunity presented by the Vietnamese War. The reason for the government's willing acceptance of U.S. nuclear submarines in Japanese harbors lies here. Through strengthening military cooperation with U.S. power the Japanese ruling class is trying to reinforce Japanese imperialist military power.

For American imperialism, Japanese cooperation in the Vietnamese War not only means military assistance, but also the political importance of gathering Asian reactionaries around U.S. policy.

IV

Thus far we have analyzed the imperialist character of the war in Vietnam. For total clarification of the imperialist aggression in Vietnam, we have to refer to the Stalinist role.

The criminal role of the world Stalinists, an alienated form of the international Communist movement, has been shown in the torture and massacre of the Vietnamese people by U.S. imperialism in spite of the so-called 'socialist' superiority in the world situation.

In the first place, it should be noted that the so-called 'socialist' camp has gone into serious crisis of disruption and confusion through the outburst of the inner contradiction of Stalinism itself. The ruling classes in the Stalinist countries have been thoroughly occupied in a bureaucratic attempt to overcome the crises of their respective countries (it is, of course, an inevitable product of the 'construction of socialism in one single country'). They can not even prevent the imperialist aggression.

The imperialists are taking full advantage of this situation. More than that.

Through escalating aggression deeper and deeper into North Vietnam they are trying to include so-called 'socialist' countries as targets of aggression.

If the imperialist aggression in North Vietnam is not defeated by the people of the world, then the U.S. invasion might succeed in its contention that it stopped the "aggression from the North".

The imperialist knows this very well. The Stalinists now allow the imperialist invasion into a part of their 'camps' and leave the people living there to be wounded and killed. Thus they are helping the imperialist conceal the true character of the aggressive war.

The next thing to be pointed out is that the Stalinist policy in world politics has become more and more anti-proletarian during the course of the Vietnamese War. It is well known that Moscow and Washington are connected by a 'hotline' and that the U.S.S.R. government is on its way to a coalition with U.S. imperialism.

On the other hand, the Chinese government declared, in the midst of the Hanoi bombing, that the oppressed nations should fight against imperialism by themselves. It clearly shows that the Chinese Stalinists are going to let the imperialist attack the Vietnamese people in isolation. They try to justify this by employing the words of Mao Tse-tung, and by applying the policy of self-dependence.

The Chinese line has nothing to do with the fundamental principle of the international struggle of workers against war and colonialism.

The Chinese bureaucrats know only military counter-attack against imperialist aggression instead of peoples' own mass action.

Here lies the anti-proletarian essence of the Chinese line.

v

It should be noted very seriously that the U.S. aggressive war in Vietnam is expanding more and more, helped by the Stalinist betrayal, into a colonial war. And at the same time it is becoming a war against the Stalinist countries themselves. The point is, escalation of the war doesn't automatically lead to the growth of the anti-war movement.

In the aggravation of the situation, a clearer standpoint and attitude is required than ever toward both imperialism and Stalinism. Any other position than that of anti-Stalinism and anti-imperialism would be broken and destroyed in the midst of the conflict between imperialism and Stalinism.

Shameless surrender of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party to the imperialist aggression in Japan has its root in this point.

Let's fight for the international anti-war movement, basing ourselves on the struggle of rank and file workers.

JRCL-NC
ZENSHIN

A REPORT ON THE WASEDA STRUGGLE

Introduction

The WASEDA University is one of the biggest and most famous of the private universities in Japan, paralleled with the KEIO University. Thirty five thousand students of WASEDA waged a campus strike for 150 days in the first half of this year against the rise of the university fee and for the self-governing of the newly-built student center. In all the schools (Political-Economic Dept., Literature, Law, Education, Science-Technology, Commerce) the mass of students stood up for the struggle against the university administration.

Everyone's attention was focussed on the students in revolt, who resisted police intervention and the arrest of 203 activists. Even though obliged to accept a slight concession from the administration after the great struggle, the resistance still continues in many ways, and many students have been actively involved in the anti-Vietnam War movement.

The WASEDA struggle has marked a new page in the history of the Japanese student movement in its depth and range, and has shown very clearly the urgent necessity of fighting against the imperialistic aggression of the Japanese ruling class on education.

* * *

1. Development of the Struggle

- Dec. 20 : The University Council decided to raise the fee. The decision (1965) was declared during the winter vacation.
- Jan. 20 : Repeated requests from the students to have a talk on the raise (1966) in fee was flatly refused by the administration. Students of all the schools launched a campus strike for an indefinite period under the direction of the All Universities Co-ordinating Conference.
- Jan. 24 : Closing examinations² were boycotted. 8000 students demonstrated on the campus. The university administration postponed the exam. until Jan. 27, when it was boycotted again. Classrooms and lecture halls were closed and barricaded by the students.
- Jan. 29 : The graduation examination, which was going to be held in the adjoining building of the university, was suspended by 6000 picketing students. In the all-university rally, 7000 students reaffirmed their intention to continue the struggle until the increase in fee was withdrawn.
- Feb. 4 : : The president of the university finally agreed to "give an explanation about the fee-raising" directly to the massed students and appeared before 15,000 students who filled the huge Memorial Hall.

He said, "You students have nothing to do with fee raising. It is we who decide it... If the poor people can't come to Waseda as a result of the increase it doesn't matter at all." All the students were so furious at his words that he was forced to leave the hall halfway through his speech.

- Feb. 10 : Students began blockading the main administration building, and several hundred stayed inside.
- Feb. 12 : Early in the morning, the students of the athletic clubs attacked the students occupying the main building. They were armed with helmets and clubs and burned the striking students' flags, placards, sleeping mats, and lynched several of them. Thousands of students, informed of the attack, gathered around the 250 violent athletes and forced them to disband.
- Feb. 21 : At a rainy dawn 3000 police invaded the campus and made an assault on 1500 students in the administration building. They broke the barricades, pushed the students out, and set up barbed wire and iron pipes around the university site. In the afternoon, after a momentary withdrawal of the police, a large number of students, watching the police attack on TV, gathered in front of the university buildings and began shattering the wires and pipes to show their anger at the occupation of the university by the police. Finally, they shook down the barricade made by the police and rushed onto the campus to take it over once more. At that moment, 1500 students who had been driven far from the campus by the police, came back and joined the other students to hold a mass rally of almost 10,000 students.
- Feb. 22 : Police attacked the 800 students occupying the university building at six in the morning, this time headed by armored cars. They ran after the students chasing them from the campus to the street, and violently arrested 203. From this day to the sixth of March, the police remained on the campus. During this period, entrance examinations were carried out, guarded by the police, for the first time in the history of the universities.
- March 6-28: Students were on vacation. A struggle for the resumption of the strike was made.
- March 24 : The university administration gave up the planned graduation ceremony, fearing that the students would revolt there. Instead, the expected graduates held their own graduation ceremony. The 2000 new graduates, who participated in this "independent graduation ceremony" made a fare-well demonstration in front of the administration building, encouraging the younger students.
- March 28 : The strike was resumed in every school in order to re-boycott the postponed examination. A barricade was set up once again by the students.

- April 17 : The university administration employed 130 guardsmen to "get rid of" the barricade. Their attempt, however, was crushed by the students.
- April 23 : The president of the university resigned. Many freshmen joined the struggle.
- April 28 : The administration published the punishment of 40 students (including 9 expulsions and 21 suspensions).
- May 10 : The new president showed up in front of the students. He talked to them, all smiles in pretense of a "peaceful solution". A slight concession on the fee increase (20,000 yen's reduction)* was proposed, while the punishment of the students was not withdrawn in spite of the mass opposition.
- May 22 : The Commerce students voted for the removal of the barricade. Some of the other students followed this several days later.
- June 22 : The students of the Literature school finally decided to dissolve the strike, putting an end to the 150 day old strike.

2. The Background of the Struggle

The immediate issues at hand were the rise in the fee and the management of the newly-built student hall. The university administration's paper stated that the fee for the whole four years of school was to be raised from 280,000 yen to 440,000 yen for the Literature students, and from 530,000 yen to 740,000 yen for the Science-Technology students. Added to this, the students were requested to pay money also for the expansion of the equipment and for admission or entrance.

The students all know that the money squeezed from the students in this way is not used to improve student life. On the contrary, those departments which the students sell well to the industrial world are the ones which become expanded and better equipped very rapidly. The buildings of the Science-Technology School are newly constructed every year, while the student dormitories remain very small for many years (only 150 out of 35,000 students can be accommodated in the dormitories).

The student hall used to be run by the students themselves and offered rooms and services for the autonomous activities of the university students (e.g. a social science study circle, a mountaineering club, chorus group, etc.) When the new student hall was built, however, at the end of last year, to be added to the old one, the administration declared it was to be governed by the university instead of by the students.

* Editor's Note: We have been told that \$1 equals 360 yen, in exchange currency. However, since there is a great difference in the cost of living in U.S. and Japan \$1 actually equals more nearly only 100 yen in real terms. The reader can calculate these tuition figures for himself, therefore.

It was during the dispute over this issue that the increase in fees was announced quite one-sidedly. In the course of the strike, these immediate issues led the students to deepen their view of their university life and the present situation of the university. Their long-accumulated dissatisfactions with the university's current policies and method of education burst out. The students' anger was directed at the educational policy of the university -- the line of Industry-University Cooperation. The students also expressed their indignation against the bureaucratic method by which the university was administered.

The slogans of the struggle became:

UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF THE FEE-RAISING !!
STUDENT MANAGEMENT OF THE STUDENT HALL !

The aggression on the part of the ruling class toward public education was launched several years ago, and the primary schools, junior high schools, and high schools have to a certain degree already been incorporated into the framework of the existing society (state control over the teachers, direction of text-books, etc.) Now the universities have become the target of the Japanese imperialists. (e.g. Immediately after the struggle against the Japan-U.S.A. Mutual Security Treaty in 1960, the prime minister had said, "We can no more let the universities be the training ground for the revolution." Here the movement of the ZENKAKUREN and the existence of many Marxist professors are implied.)

The aim of the aggression against university education is three-fold:

- 1- to turn the university into the place for reactionary education, and to transform the content of education into a reactionary one.
- 2- to bring labor power obediently to the capitalist, instead of to train creative brains capable of making independent scientific research.
- 3- to get rid of the independent activity of students in any form, whether that be in their studies or in freedom on their campus. In a word, to transform the university into a prison without bars.

The attack on the university is one of the reactionary aggressions of the ruling class which has now invaded every field of Japanese society -- politics, economy, press, broadcasting, civil life, etc. The WASEDA struggle, in its essence, was the fight between two ideas: "to live as human beings" or "to surrender to the state power and capitalist domination" for the students. And the Waseda students, in revolt, have come to the realization that their struggle is not only that of Waseda, but also of all Japanese students, and that they are fighting the same struggle as the students in Berkeley, the Sorbonne, etc.

3. Leadership and Organizations

The Waseda struggle revealed the total bankruptcy of the existing leadership of the traditional left wings of Japan before the eyes of the mass of students. The students of the Japanese Communist Party, for example, opposed the blockade of the administration building and insisted on

going to the Parliament House to make a petition. Rejected by the mass of students, they became very isolated and fell considerably. As a result, the JCP in Waseda, who once had 200 members, could get only 50 students to their own rally. The organizations which led the struggle were those of the independent revolutionary left wing. They were NC-JRCL, RMF-JRCL, and the Socialist Youth League.⁴

These organizations have split from the traditional left wings that constitute the current leadership of the workers movement in Japan, and have been engaged in waging revolutionary mass struggles in the students and workers movement. The three organizations, even though they hold different positions on several points, aim at a fundamental transformation of the contemporary world. Armed with revolutionary Marxism and determined to fight against the state power as well as the bureaucratic leadership of the Japanese "left wing", several hundred advanced activists, who were involved in the student movement in the trying period after the Amp-Struggle⁵ in 1960, stood at the head of the 35000 fighting students of Waseda and called forth the militant spirit of the masses of students. Through this struggle, the TOGAKUREN (Tokyo Student Federation)⁶ became strengthened and many students of Waseda came to join the united action on the political issues such as Japan-Korea Talk, the Vietnam War, etc., with the students organized by the Togakuren on other university campuses in Tokyo.

4. Cause of the Defeat

Even though the struggle was supported by several hundred activists, there were many weak points the students had to overcome in the struggle. Especially on the matter of blocking the administration building, heated discussion broke out among the students and restlessness prevailed. This lack of confidence in occupying the university building was closely connected with the insufficient grasp of the university's position and the situation today.

As we have already stated, it is of the utmost importance to see the aggression on the university in relation to the imperialistic attack on several other fields of society, in order to find the true meaning of the university problem and finally answer the question: who should be the master of the university theoretically as well as practically. These points were not clearly understood by the mass of students, even by the leaders and activists themselves. Added to this, the frustration and split in the student movement ever since the end of the Ampo struggle has not been completely overcome. The sectarian attitude of the Communist Party and the students of the RMF especially provoked the antipathy of the mass of students on every issue that arose. Both always try to give orders to the students from above and to control them.

Although the struggle was continued for 150 days, it experienced an ebb and flow many times. Many students left the campus during the spring vacation (from the end of Feb. to the beginning of April), and not all the students shared the hard experiences of the whole struggle. It was inevitable that some differences appeared between the activists and the mass of students. In

the last stage of the struggle, the rumor spread through the students that Waseda university was going to be abolished because of the long endurance of the strike and the suspension of lectures.

The leadership, which was also exhausted by the increasing suppression by the police on individual activists, could not fight back against this rumor that had been started by the university administration to threaten and discourage the students.

Finally, replacement of the university staff by less stubborn members gave the students illusions, and persuaded them to end the strike in exchange for a very limited concession by the university.

5. Perspectives

Though the fee-raising problem was "settled", the issue concerning the management of the student hall is still pending. Since the conclusion of the struggle in June, the struggle against the Vietnam War has been organized on the Waseda campus. In the Science-Technology School, which dropped out of the strike first, the left-wing gained a majority in the recent elections of the students, winning over the right-wing people who acted against the strike. Waseda will continue to be a stronghold of the Japanese student movement for years to come. Waseda will never die.

* * *

Footnotes:

- 1- The KEIO university, in which the student movement had not been strong, compared to Waseda, experiences a large student protest action against the raising of fees last year. Now the KEIO students are active in the student movement.
- 2- The school year begins in April and ends in February, in Japan.
- 3- There used to be no walls to divide the university site from the public road, and free entrance was one of the characteristics of Waseda University.
- 4- RMF-JRCL is the "Revolutionary Marxist Fraction" of JRCL, an organization that broke off from the NC-JRCL in 1963. The Socialist Youth League was founded as the youth section of the Japanese Socialist Party and is now taking independent actions, though it is tied to the JSP officially.
- 5- The Ampo-Struggle, is the Japanese abbreviation for the struggle against the Japan-U.S.A Mutual Security Treaty.
- 6- Togakuren (Tokyo Student Federation) is composed of essential student autonomous groups of the universities in Tokyo. Main power of the ZNEGAKUREN, together with the FUGAKUREN (Kyoto Student Federation). After the split of the ZENGAKUREN (All Japan Federation of Student Autonomies) at the end of the Ampo-Struggle, caused partly by the JCP intentionally, and partly as the result of the defeat of the struggle inevitably, the student movement was directed

separately by several political organizations. Recently, however, an earnest search for united action has been made and it has finally led to the re-establishment of the TOGAKUREN, once a local organization of the ZENKAKUREN, last year.

The ZENKAKUREN, as national organization of the student groups, is going to be re-constructed at the end of this year through the cooperation of TOGAKUREN and FUGAKUREN, to put an end to the split of the Japanese student movement -- with the exception of the Japanese Communist Party's student movement, which is now in total confusion as the result of the fact that the JCP has taken an "independent line" from the Chinese Communist Party.