GHQ/SCAP Records(RG 331)
Description of contents

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

(1) Box no. 2137

(2) Folder title/number: (13)
Purge - Miscellaneous

(3) Date: Jan. 1946 - June 1948

(4) Subject:

Classification	Type of record
340	c, d

(5) Item description and comment:

(6) Reproduction: (Yes) No

(7) Film no. Sheet no.

Chick

Purge Background

NOTIFICATION TO SCREENING COMMITTEES

In accordance with the regulations governing the organization of the Public Office Qualifications Examinations Committee, screening committees shall be established in the Central Government, Metropolis and Prefecture, as well as in every city with a population of more than 50,000. The screening activities performed by all committees shall be conducted in accordance with the basic instructions in the annexed papers.

BASIC SCREENING INSTRUCTIONS

1. Standard of Screening

The standard of screening is based on Appendix "A" of the Memorandum (SCAPIN 550) from SCAP, dated 4 January 1946, subject: "Removal and Exclusion of Undesirable Personnel from Public Office", Imperial Ordinances Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 of 1947, and Cabinet and Home Ministry Ordinance No. 1, 1947. These standards must be thoroughly understood, so that the screening activities will be properly conducted ("Established Rules of Screening" will be forwarded under separate cover).

2. Procedures of Screening

The outline of screening procedures contained in annexed Tables 1 and 2 will be followed to insure uniformity of application necessary for proper screening and effective discharge of the responsibilities of the various committees.

3. Processing of Questionnaires

a. A questionnaire, which is the certified statement of a person in question, shall be regarded as the fundamental basis for all screening. Inasmuch as a questionnaire containing omissions or false statements will result in the person in question being removed and excluded from public office, as well as being subject to punishment, the questionnaire shall be handled with special consideration.

b. With regard to filling out the questionnaires, the procedures outlined in annexed Table 3 will be followed. Questionnaires must be reviewed prior to their formal acceptance in order to insure that the questionnaires are complete and legibly made out.

c. Inasmuch as questionnaires will often be submitted for review to higher authorities, it will be necessary to investigate all other matters necessary for proper screening, such as details of companies or organizations, contents of books, synopsis of speeches, etc. At the time of such investigation, all information obtained shall be prepared and filed in such a manner that such information or accurate replies can be submitted promptly to reviewing authorities upon request.

original copies of the questionnaires in Japanese. (1) On cases screened by the Municipal Committees it will, after entering recommended action, send the three copies to the prefectural committee for review and decision. After entering prefectural action thereon, the prefecture will retain two original copies for file and availability for public inspection and will send the other original copy back to the Municipal Committee as an inclosure to the Official Prefectural Bulletin published for the period during which the case was screened; this copy will be placed in the file of the Municipality and will also be made available for public inspection. (2) On cases screened by the Prefectural Committee, it will keep two original copies in its file and available for public inspection and will send the other original copy to the central committee for review if at any time required to do so. (3) On cases screened by the central committee, it will obtain three copies in Japanese and will retain one original copy for file and availability for public inspection and will hold the other original copies available for ready reference. If at any time a questionnaire is required for submission to higher authority, an original copy must be forwarded; and if an extra copy is not then available for file, an additional certified true copy, stamped with the seal of the chairman of the preparing committee, will be made and placed in the file in the place of the original copy forwarded to higher authority. (4) Any committee taking initial action, on a case must keep in its files an original or certified true copy of the questionnaire involved.

e. The retained official copy of each questionnaire processed by a committee will be filed by that committee in a readily accessible manner and will be classified according to registration number. (See par 5 c and annexed Table 9).

f. Questionnaires of Candidates. All candidates for any elective position (including Chokaicho and Burakucho) will prepare one extra copy of the questionnaire. After the questionnaires have

been processed and the action entered thereon, this extra copy will be sent to the Chairman of the Election Administrative Committee in each city, town or village from which the candidate is standing for election. This questionnaire will be available at such office for inspection by the general public. A notice to the effect that the questionnaires of candidates are available for inspection and where they are available, will be prominently posted on the official bulletin board of the respective city, town or village office.

g. Availability of Questionnaires. After action has been published in the official bulletin, the official file copy of any questionnaire shall be immediately available for public inspection upon demand. (See annexed Table 10).

4. Handling of Master Cards and Reports

a. The composition and method of filling out master cards are shown and explained in annexed Table 5.

The master cards will be constituted into a readily accessible file showing the results of screening by the committee and the record of act on taken on any case. For cases screened by them, the municipal and prefectural committees will each prepare three copies of the master card. Municipal committees will forward all three copies to the prefectural committee. Prefectural committees will retain for file one copy of the cards from the municipality and one copy of the cards prepared by the prefecture, and after the results of screening have been formally published, the other copies will be sent to the Cabinet Secretariat for file. For cases screened by it, the central committee will prepare three copies of the master card and will forward them all to the Cabinet Secretariat, who will file one copy and retain the others for reference.

b. Preparation and Submission of Reports:

(1) A weekly screening report will be submitted as prescribed in annexed Table 6.

(2) A report of persons barred or removed will be submitted in duplicate, as prescribed in annexed Table 4 (see also Note, par. 3 d (3) above).

5. Special Records - Each committee will maintain the following records:

a. Statistical record of cases screened (see annexed Table 7).

b. Statistical record of cases barred or removed (see annexed Table 8).

c. Register and reference book (see annexed Table 9)

6. Publication of the Results of Screening.

The results of all screening shall be made public in accordance with the provisions of annexed Table 10.

Explanatory Note

The Appended Tables Numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are preliminary drafts of information to be contained in a form or report under the title indicated.

Annexed Table No. 1

RESPONSIBILITY OF CENTRAL PUBLIC OFFICE QUALIFICATION EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

This committee conducts examinations concerning personal records and other data necessary to determine whether a person should be certified for, or barred or removed from, the following positions:

1. All offices of the National Government including its local branches, bureaus, agencies and offices.
2. Membership in the Imperial Diet.
3. Member or personnel of committees of the national level or level broader than the prefectural, established under law and ordinanc
4. Assembly member of Prefecture, (including To, Do, Fu and Ken).
5. Mayor or assembly member of Kyoto, Osaka, Yokohama, Kobe and Nagoya cities. City, Town, Village or Town and Village Association for the Whole Business or for the Public Office Business.
6. All public offices of organizations such as Special companies, corporations (Eidan), special banks and companies, in which the Government or organizations mentioned above is the largest stockholder.
7. All public offices of organizations to be designated under the Temporary Supply and Adjustment Law.
8. All public offices of organizations of the national level or level broader than the prefectural, established under special legislation; organizations subsidized by the Government and other organizations serving for the public benefit corresponding to the above.
9. All public offices of principal newspaper companies, publishing companies, motion picture and theatre companies, broadcasting corporation and other media of public information.
10. All public offices in the national office and its local branches of the level broader than the prefectural of Political parties, a member or members of which hold a seat or seats in the Imperial Diet, and other organizations which are required to file their declaration under the provisions of Article V, paragraph 1 of the Imperial Ordinance No. 101 of 1946.

11. All public offices of listed influential companies and financial institutions.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PREFECTURAL PUBIIC OFFICE QUALIFICATION EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

This committee conducts examinations concerning personal records and other data necessary to determine whether a person should be certified for, or barred or removed from, the following positions:

1. Members and personnel of committees of the prefectural level established under law and ordinance.
2. All prefectural public offices not screened by Central Committee
3. All other public offices of city, town, village or association not screened by Central Committee.
4. Chief of Chonaikai, Burakukai and its Federation.
5. All public offices of organizations established under special legislation, organizations subsidized by the government and other organizations serving for the public benefit of the prefectural level or below as designated by the Prime Minister.
6. All public offices of local branches of political parties, a member or members of which hold a seat or seats in the Imperial Diet, and other organizations which are required to file their declaration under the provisions of Article V, paragraph 1 of the Imperial Ordinance No. 101 of 1946, of the prefectural level or below.

NOTE: The Prefectural Committee also determines the eligibility of mayors and deputy mayors of cities, headmen of towns, wards or villages, deputy headmen of towns or villages and chiefs of Chonaikai, Burakukai or its federation in regard to the non-succession provisions of Imperial Ordinances No. 3 and 4, 1947.

RESPONSIBILITY OF MUNICIPAL PUBLIC OFFICE QUALIFICATION EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

This committee conducts examinations to determine whether it should be recommended to the Prefectural Committee that a person should be barred or removed from the following positions:

1. Personnel in, or applicants for, the public service of the city where the Committee has been established, other than those screened by the Prefectural Committee.

2. Specific personnel designated as falling under public service in specific organizations of the city level.

3. Chief of Chonaikai, Burakukai and its federation within the city boundary.

NOTE: The Municipal Committee also determines the eligibility of Headmen and deputy headmen of towns or villages, and Chiefs of Chonaikai, Burakukai or its federation under its jurisdiction within the city boundary in regard to the non-succession provisions of Imperial Ordinances No. 3 and 4, 1947.

Annexed Table No. 4

REPORT OF PERSONS BARRED OR REMOVED

1. This weekly report by Prefecture will contain in substance the following information on persons barred or removed:

   a. Prefecture,
   b. Prefectural report number,
   c. Registration number of the case,
   d. Name of the individual,
   e. Whether barred or removed,
   f. Provisions under which person fell,
   g. Specific reasons why person was designated as falling under the provisions of the Memorandum.

2. Report will be submitted in duplicate to Prime Minister.

Annexed Table No. 5

MASTER CARD

1. The master card, which is to be used as the reference file for critical information on each case, contains the following:

a. Name and Date of Birth,

b. Registration No. of Municipality, Prefecture, or Central Government,

c. Position for which screened and whether the person is an incumbent or applicant,

d. Present address,

e. Name of each committee acting on the case, action and date thereof,

f. Date submitted to and received from GHQ and the action taken (passed, barred or removed),

g. Date results were published, publishing authority and the action announced (passed, barred or removed),

h. Disqualifying provisions and positions from which excluded,

i. Dates of: (1) designation, (2) effective date of termination of office and (3) actual date of termination of, or retirement from office,

j. Any special action and date thereof

k. Positions held concurrently at time of screening.

Supplement to Table No. 5

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING OUT MASTER CARD

This card shall be filled out on one side in Japanese.

1. The name and date of birth of the person screened shall be entered in full. The name shall also be entered in Romaji in the following manner: TANAKA, Tare. As each questionnaire is entered in the Registration Book of each committee, a Registration number will be given it which will be entered in the appropriate space on the master card as well as on the questionnaire.

2. Position for which screened. Here shall be entered the position for which a person is being screened and status of person with regard to position (i.e. incumbent or applicant).

3. Present address shall be entered.

4. The committee conducting the initial screening of a person, and the date shall be entered and the action checked. Under Action, either passed, barred or removed will be checked. In addition if the questionnaire is referred to a higher committee, or other action is taken upon it, "other" will be checked and the action explained.

5. If subsequent action is taken, it will be indicated (in the same manner as explained in 5 above) in spaces a, b and c.

6. If the questionnaire is submitted to GHQ, the date of submission and receipt and the action taken by GHQ shall be entered by the Cabinet Secretariat.

7. a. When a person has been screened and action taken by a prefectural governor or the Prime Minister, and the results of screening published, (see annexed Table 10), the date the results are published, and the authority which publishes them will be entered, and the action taken will be checked.

   b. Subsequent change will be filled in only if, at a later date, the published results are changed.

8. The provisions of Imperial or Cabinet Ordinances under which a person was designated as barred or removed and the positions from which excluded will be recorded in detail.

9. a. The "Date of Designation as a Person Falling Under the Memorandum" is the date on which the prefectural governor or Prime Minister designates the person to fall under the Memorandum.

9. b. The effective date of termination of office of persons designated as falling under the Memorandum and subject to removal shall, unless otherwise provided for in Imperial Ordinances 1, 2, 3 or 4 and Cabinet Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, be removed within 20 days (and in exceptional cases 30 days). This date will be entered in Space 9b.

9. c. The date upon which a person designated as falling under the Memorandum and subject to removal actually leaves the office will be entered under 9c.

10. Special action, if any, will be entered and described. Entry will be made here when an application to continue in office, a request for continuance of a pension, etc. are considered.

11. Positions held concurrently at time of screening.

12. When the final decision is made, the card shall be classified with a tab as specifically coloured: Red - barred; Black - removed.

13. Any changes or additions to entries on the master card not covered by other reports or sources of information will be reported to prefecture and the Cabinet Secretariat for entry on filed cards.

The following type form may be used:

Committee's Name

(Name of Person)	(Item No.)
Should read:	(Entry)
Etc.	

Annexed Table No. 6

WEEKLY REPORT OF SCREENING

1. This report will be submitted as of 2400 each Saturday by all screening committees, showing:

a. Total number of questionnaires received.

b. Total number of persons screened.

c. Total number of persons passed.

d. Total number of persons barred.

e. Total number of persons removed.

f. Total number of persons barred or removed, under each provision of the memorandum.

g. Total number of cases pending.

h. Total number of person screened for:

(a) Appointive office

(b) Elective office

(1) Prefectural

(2) Municipal

(3) Party affiliation if pertinent

Annexed Table No. 7

STATISTICAL RECORD OF PERSONS SCREENED

1. This record will be maintained by all committees and will be a weekly accumulative account of:

a. Total number of persons passed.

b. Total number of persons barred.

c. Total number of persons removed.

d. Total number of cases pending.

e. Total number of questionnaires received.

Note: Above entries to be made as of 2400 each saturday.

Annexed Table No. 8

STATISTICAL RECORD OF CASES BARRED OR REMOVED

1. Each committee will prepare weekly accumulative account of the following:

   a. Total number of persons barred or removed under each provision of the memorandum.

   b. Total number of cases falling under a single provision of the memorandum.

   c. Total number of cases found to fall under more than one provision of the memorandum.

   d. The total number of persons barred and removed.

Note: Above entries to be made as of 2400 each Saturday.

Annexed Table No. 9

REGISTER AND REFERENCE BOOK

1. This is a record book maintained by each committee in which each case handled by it will be entered upon receipt, and in which each case will be given a registration number. This book also serves as a log book for cases.

2. The following information will be entered beside the registration numbers, which appear in numerical sequence:

a. Name

b. Date of receipt

c. Position for which screened

d. Actions (such as: Recommended, barred, removed, or passed, forwarded to committee, returned to committee, barred, removed, passed, etc.) and date thereof.

Annexed Table No. 10.

PUBLICITY OF SCREENING RESULTS.

1. The results of screening conducted by the Central Screening Committee shall be publicized by the Chief of the Cabinet Secretariat, and results of screening conducted by each Local Screening Committee, shall be publicized by the Prefectural Governor, governing the area in which the Local Committee is located.

   a. The results will be published in the form of official semi-monthly bulletins, the form of which is shown in paragraph 3 of this Table.

   b. The Prefectural Governor will be responsible for publishing and distributing copies of the bulletins down to and including all subordinate city, town, village, buraku and chonai (wards in the case of the Five Big Cities) administrative offices, where the bulletin will be posted on bulletin boards as a matter of public information. In this connection the Cabinet Secretariat will distribute sufficient copies of its bulletin to each Prefectural Governor to enable him to attach and distribute one copy of the Central Government Bulletin with each copy of the Prefectural Bulletin.

   c. The Cabinet Secretary will also deliver to all national newspaper agencies copies of its bulletins. The Prefectural Governors will deliver to all newspapers in their respective prefectures copies of both the Prefectural and Central Government bulletins.

d. These Bulletins will be published simultaneously by all prefectures on the 22nd of each month for the period 1st through 15th of that month, and on the 7th day of the following month for the period 16th through the last of each month. The Central Government bulletin will be published as near as possible to the 15th and last day of each month, in order to insure delivery of the Central Bulletin to prefectures in sufficient time to enable distribution of Central Government bulletin simultaneously with the Prefectural bulletins.

e. Each Prefecture will submit 5 copies of its bulletin to the Cabinet Secretariat.

2. Prefectural governors will require Municipal committees to submit questionnaires, continuously, in such a manner that the results of all screening conducted by Local committees during any one period can normally be reviewed by the Prefectural Committee prior to the publishing date for that period. Any cases on which such reviewing action has not been taken will be reported as pending.

3. The information reported in the bulletin shall be organized under the title of The Committee initiating action in each particular case and will include a section to show those cases in which prefectural action was reversed by higher authority, with a brief explanation thereof. (See sample form).

The questionnaires from Municipalities for any one period will have the official prefectural action stamped thereon and will be withheld by the Prefecture until the publishing

date for that period, at which time one copy of each questionnaire acted upon will be returned to the municipal committees with copies of the bulletin officially announcing the results entered therein. Upon receipt of the bulletin and accompanying questionnaires, the returned copy of the questionnaire will be filed and made available for public inspection.

Form of Bulletin (Including Sample Results):

(Any Suitable Heading) Office of the (Cabinet Secretary) Governor

Official Bulletin No. 1 5 February 1947

(By Central Govt.)

Results of Screening in _____ Prefecture for the Period 16 January to 31 January 1947.

1. Published herein are the results of the screening of persons under the provisions of Imp. Ords. Nos. 1, 2, 3, & 4 and Cabinet and Home Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947.

2. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS. This bulletin will be given the widest possible publicity. Immediately upon receipt of this bulletin it will be posted on the bulletin boards of the administrative offices of every city, town, village, buraku, chonai and ward (if applicable) administrative office. Each copy will remain posted for a minimum period of one month and until the receipt of the second succeeding new bulletin at which time the old bulletin will not be destroyed, but will be filed in the administrative office for the future reference of any citizen.

3. The questionnaires on which the action in each case of the persons listed herein was based are available for public inspection in both the office of the Public Office Qualification Examination Committee of the municipality under which they are listed and of this prefecture. (In the office of the Cabinet Secretariat in the case of those screened by the Central Committee). Any person may upon demand have unrestricted

access, for the purpose of inspection, to any of the questionnaire of persons listed herein.

4. Results:

a._____Prefecture_____
Address of Committee

Number of Persons screened_____.

Number Persons passed_____.

List of Names thereof indicating positions for which screened.

Number of Persons barred_____.

Names thereof with position for which screened.

Number of Persons removed_____.

Names thereof and titles of positions from which removed.

Cases Pending

Names thereof.

b._____Municipality_____
Address of Committee

Ditto

c._____Municipality

Ditto (Seal and Signature)

d. etc.

3137

THE PURGE

BASIS FOR THE PURGE
- Potsdam Declaration — Page 1
- Occupation Directives — 1
- The 4 January 1946 Directive — 2
- Purge Categories — 2

INITIAL ACTION OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTING THE PURGE DIRECTIVE
- Ordinances Issued — 3
- Initial Operation and Effect of the Purge — 4
- Statistical Summary — 5

EXTENSION OF PURGE PROGRAM
- Preliminary Steps — 6
- The Extension Plan — 6
- The Extension Ordinances — 6
- Criteria for Screening — 6
- Criteria for Purging — 7
- Injunctions — 8
- Non-Succession Provisions — 8
- Administration — 9
- Publicity — 9
- Schedule of Screening — 9
- Activities Prior to Elections — 10
- Activities Subsequent to Elections — 10
- Economic Phase — 10
- Public Information Media Purge — 11
- Provisional Designation — 11
- Special Examining Bureau — 12
- Public Office Qualifications Advisory Agency — 12
- First Appeal Board — 12
- Second Appeal Board — 13

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PURGE STATISTICS — (Appended)

1-2

THE PURGE

On 4 January 1946 the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers issued a directive requiring a purge of all persons who shared responsibility for Japan's program of aggression. This directive was designed to remove undesirable persons from positions of influence in the political, economic and social life of Japan. For the fields of education and police, separate similar programs had been initiated as early as October 1945.

The removal and exclusion program has never been either in concept or administration a punitive measure but rather a technique designed to eliminate the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons whose past careers showed them to be undesirable leaders for a nation dedicated to democracy and the cause of world peace.

BASIS FOR THE PURGE

Potsdam Declaration

The basis for the purge program is found in that part of the Potsdam Declaration which states, "There must be removed for all time the authority and influence of those who deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world".

Occupation Directives

In accordance with initial U.S. Post-Surrender Policy for Japan SCAP was directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that no persons be "allowed to hold public office or any other positions of responsibility or influence in public or important private enterprise who have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression, who have been influential members of any Japanese ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic society"..... who have been influential in the activities of Imperial Rule Assistance Organizations, "or who manifest hostility to the objectives of the Occupation".

SCAP was further directed to prohibit the retention in, or selection for, positions of important responsibility in industry, finance, commerce, agriculture, or public or private financial institutions, agencies or organizations, of any persons who have been active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, and of all those who do not direct future Japanese economic effort solely toward peaceful ends.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, SCAP was directed to assume that persons who held key positions of high responsibility since 1937 in any of the fields enumerated above have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression.

The 4 January 1946 Directive

SCAPIN 550, the "4 January Directive", is SCAP's implementation of the instructions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Purge Categories

This basic directive ordered the Japanese Government to remove from public office and to exclude from government service exponents of militant nationalism and aggression falling within the following defined categories:

Category A. War Criminals

Category B. Career Military and Naval Personnel: Special Police and Officers of the War Ministries.

This category included members of the Board of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshals, the Supreme Military Council, the Imperial General Headquarters, the Army and Navy General Staffs, and the Supreme Council for direction of the war; all career commissioned officers and enlisted personnel who served in or with the military or naval police or other special or secret intelligence police organizations; and all persons who served as higher officials in the Ministry of War or Ministry of Navy.

Category C. Influential Members of Ultranationalistic, Terroristic or Secret Patriotic Societies.

Founders, officers, directors and other important officials, large financial contributors to, or editor of any publication or organ of such societies.

Category D. Persons Influential in the Activities of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society, and the Political Association of Great Japan.

National officers, leading officials in Prefectural or Metropolitan subdivisions, editor of any publication or organ of the above or agencies or affiliates of the above organizations.

Category E. Officers of Financial and Development Organizations Involved in Japanese Expansion

Persons who between 7 July 1937 and 2 September 1945 were directors, presidents, vice presidents, advisors, auditors or controlling branch managers in Japanese occupied territory of above institutions.

Category F. Governors of Occupied Territories

Certain specified higher officials such as governor general, civil administrator, and military administrator in Japan's wartime colonial empire.

Category G. Additional Militarists and Ultranationalists.

These broad provisions bring under the terms of the directive:

1. Any person who has denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the militaristic regime.

2. Any person who has instigated or perpetuated an act of violence against opponents of the militaristic regime.

3. Any person who has played an active and predominant governmental part in the Japanese program of aggression or who by speech, writing or action has shown himself to be an active exponent of militant nationalism and aggression.

INITIAL ACTION OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTING THE PURGE DIRECTIVE

Ordinances Issued

On 27 February 1946 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 109 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1946 which established the machinery for applying the Directive. These ordinances determined, first, who should be screened, second, who should be classified as undesirable in light of the Directive and third, how the removal of undesirables should be accomplished.

By the terms of these ordinances all incumbent officials of the then first three civil service grades, and those who held positions of comparable authority, all staff officers of 114 listed corporations, associations and other organizations under the special control of the government, and all applicants for future elective or appointive posts in the national government were subject to screening to determine their eligibility.

The seven categories of undesirables outlined by the Directive were defined in greater detail by the ordinances as follows:

1. No change was made in the category applying to war criminals (Category A).

2. The one affecting career military and naval personnel (Category B) remained substantially the same.

3. The provisions of Category C were defined as applying to influential members of 123 listed ultranationalistic or secret patriotic societies.

4. The many agencies and affiliates of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations (Category D) were enumerated and the influential positions in each duly listed.

5. The number of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion (Category E), as listed in the original directive, was increased.

6. The exact titles and positions of high Japanese officials in occupied territories (Category E) were defined.

7. The broad provisions of Category G were extensively interpreted by a special cabinet announcement appearing shortly after the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance 109.

It brought under the purge memorandum all persons who had occupied certain policy-forming positions on the highest government level between the outbreak of "The China Incident" and the Surrender.

It listed other high government positions of somewhat lesser importance and provided for the purge of individuals who had occupied them providing there was conspicious evidence that these individuals have played an important part: (a) in the conclusion of alliances with the Axis or with puppet nations in preparation for the Greater East Asia War, (b) in the suppression of opponents of militarism, (c) in concluding economic agreements with occupied countries, (d) in the financial or production program for Japanese military activities.

The interpretation of Category G also brought under the purge: (a) those officials who had over a long period of time engaged in the suppression of civil liberties, (b) other officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had participated in activities prescribed under Category G, (c) officials of companies that had produced the weapons and sinews of war, (d) highest officers of patriotic societies not listed under Category C and (e) any person who was recommended as a candidate by the TOJO Government in 1942.

The ordinances provided for a screening committee to examine questionnaires and to decide upon individual eligibility. In the event that the individual was found to fall under the criteria as defined in the ordinance, the Prime Minister was to designate him as an undesirable person, and to order his removal and exclusion from office. The ordinances also provided for the collection of questionnaires and contained a penalty clause designed to insure that such questionnaires would be filled out truthfully and completely.

Initial Operation and Effect of the Purge

The impact of the Purge Directive was immediate and profound. On 13 January 1946, only 9 days after the Directive was issued, the Cabinet of Baron

Kijuro Shidehara underwent extensive re-organization. Three ministers and six cabinet executives and many other high government officials resigned. In view of the imminence of the approaching April elections the Government released the criteria as soon as they had been determined in the form of Cabinet announcements, without waiting until the entire bill had been written. Thus, by the end of February when Imperial Ordinance No. 109 was officially promulgated, action had already been taken to bring under the purge (a) persons who had been influential in patriotic and secret societies, (b) influential members of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations, and (c) career naval and military personnel, of whom approximately 183,000 were barred from the public service.

On 10 March 1946, the day of the Cabinet announcement interpreting Category G, the Shidehara Cabinet sustained a second wave of resignations; five ministers retired. Many members of the House of Peers followed suit. Within the month 30 new appointees, duly screened under the new ordinances, were appointed to fill the vacancies thus created.

That part of the 10 March interpretation which rendered ineligible for public service all members of the Lower House who had been recommended by the Tojo Government greatly altered the political scene. Leadership of political parties changed, political allegiances shifted and new candidates were sought to replace those previously scheduled to run in the April elections. Of the 3,384 candidates for the Lower House, 252 were barred. Of the 252 barred, 113 were candidates recommended by Prime Minister Tojo in the 1942 elections. Another 268 "recommended candidates" did not file.

When the Diet convened on 20 June 1946 all successful candidates to the Lower House were re-screened and their cases reviewed. As a result ten more were removed, nine of these by Japanese Government order and one, Ichiro Hatoyama, leader of the Liberal Party, by SCAP directive.

On 16 May 1946 the Japanese Government prepared a still more comprehensive and detailed interpretation of those paragraphs of Category G relating to other government officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had engaged in activities proscribed under the Directive. These extended criteria were not publicly announced at the time lest such an announcement interfere with the completion of screening by the scheduled deadline. Nevertheless, this document represented an early extension of the purge program into industry and the field of public information, an extension to be perfected and completed the following year.

Statistical Summary

By August 1946 the Japanese Government announced the substantial completion of the initial phase of the purge program. The Privy Council, the Diet, the Cabinet, Prefectural Governors, all officials of the then first three ranks, judges of higher courts, officials of government controlled companies, procurators of certain higher courts, and officials of higher educational institutions directly under the Ministry of Education had all been screened. These totalled 5,520 persons, of which 814 were barred or removed, and 4,706 were passed. This figure was subsequently increased by 4 January 1947 to 8,899 persons

screened, of which 7,832 had been passed and 1,067 barred or removed. In addition 183,000 career officers of the army and navy, members of the gendarmerie and former intelligence agents had been categorically barred. The way was now clear for the anticipated extension of the program to local government, to industry and to the field of public information.

EXTENSION OF PURGE PROGRAM

reliminary Steps

In August 1946 a statement of SCAP policy was issued requiring the Japanese Government to prepare a comprehensive plan for: (a) the exclusion from prefectural and municipal assemblies and from appointive posts of all personnel deemed undesirable under the provisions of SCAPIN 550; (b) the application of that directive to all elections of members of both Houses of the Diet; (c) the exclusion of all purged personnel from any influential political or economic posts. This statement also provided that the Japanese Government should publish the full text of the plan simultaneously with its submission to SCAP.

The Extension Plan

On 22 October the Government submitted to SCAP and simultaneously released to the public a plan which comprehensively implemented the 4 January Directive.

In the ensuing two months the essential features of this plan were incorporated into definitive and appropriate form for issuance as law.

The Extension Ordinances

On 4 January 1947, one year from issuance of the original directive, the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of 1947 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, thus implementing all the features of the approved plan. These ordinances contained provisions which were designed to reach into all fields.

Criteria for Screening

The screenable positions were extended to include all elective and appointive posts in the national and local governments and specified positions in certain companies, associations, mass communication media and other organizations. These latter were defined to be positions in: companies in which the government had special interests; organizations subsidized by the government or serving for the public benefit; principle newspaper companies, news agencies, publishing companies, motion picture and theatrical companies, broadcasting corporations and other media of mass communication; political parties, their branches and similar organizations; and influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations. The specific offices considered to be policy-making positions and approximately 470 such companies, organizations, etc., were specifically listed.

Criteria for Purging

In a manner similar to that in which definition of screenable positions was enlarged, the purge criteria were also more specifically defined.

No changes were made in the definition of the categories applicable to war criminals (Category A) career military and naval personnel, etc. (Category B), officials of financial and development companies involved in Japanese expansion (Category E) and officials in occupied territories (Category F). With regard to the influential members of ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic societies (Category C) the criteria were specifically defined to include those persons in local branches thereof who had held positions comparable to those previously defined as applying only to the national level. The criteria applicable to persons influential in the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, (Category D) were further defined in the case of parent organizations and major affiliates to include officials of all local subdivisions thereof, down to and including chiefs of town and village branches.

The category in which the most far-reaching and comprehensive definitions were made was that applying to additional militarists and ultranationalists (Category G).

The provision in this category, implemented by Cabinet announcement of 10 March 1946 described heretofore, which applied to government officials and professional men who had participated in activities such as mentioned in this category was defined more clearly. Those falling under the provisions of the ordinance were government officials who took part in the planning or execution of propaganda or dissemination of news for the purpose of (1) instigating war; (2) suppressing opponents of jingoism; (3) advocating dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, and militarism or ultranationalism; (4) guiding or controlling thought or speech for the same purpose; (5) political direction or economic exploitation of Japanese occupied territories; (6) furthering important plans for wartime general mobilization or economic control, and other plans for the direction of war.

Diet members in or outside the Diet who had in writing, speech or action been conspicuously active in instigating or directing war, suppressing opponents of jingoism or inspiring dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, militarism or ultranationalism were considered undesirable within the purview of the provision.

Men of letters and artists who by their works had advocated aggression or militant nationalism, actively contributed to such propaganda, or who through their political or philosophic doctrine laid down and ideological basis for the policies for the Greater East Asia, or New Order in the East Asia or policies of a similar nature, or the China Incident or the Pacific War; who had advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation to be a leader of other nations or who cooperated actively with propaganda of the above effect; who persecuted or denounced liberals or anti-militarists for their liberal or antimilitaristic ideologies; or who in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism were by this provision brought under the terms of the Directive.

This added definition made it possible to measure by a clearer standard the writings, speeches, articles, news reports, etc. of this group of people.

Closely associated with the above was the more elaborate interpretation of the criteria as applied to the principal officials and editorial personnel of organizations in the information media field. As published in the Cabinet Ordinance certain officials of newspaper companies, magazine or book publishing companies, broadcasting corporations, companies producing motion pictures or theatrical presentations and any other media of mass communication in or outside Japan who held office during the period between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 and whose companies engaged in the activities listed in the preceding paragraph as criteria for judging men of letters and artists were brought under the Directive. These listed officials were the Chairman, Vice-chairman, President, Vice-president, Managing Director, Standing Director, Chief of Compilation Bureau, Chief of Research Bureau, Editor-in-Chief, Managing Editor, Chief of Editorial Staff, or any other official who exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above positions. Previously the criteria as it applied to the information media field had been so vaguely defined as to be difficult of application; this had largely been remedied.

Perhaps the most sweeping extension of the provisions of this broad category, was in the interpretations as they applied to certain top officials of what had previously been referred to as "influential companies or national policy companies manufacturing finished aircraft or arms or producing iron or steel." This category had now been broadened to include all policy-making officials down to but not including ordinary directors, but including all other officials, regardless of title, who in fact exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above in any company which was conspicuously influential in the manufacture of strategic or critical material of war, conspicuously monopolistic in the production of basic productive materials or business of communications or transportation, or domestic or foreign trade; holding companies or influential companies closely associated thereto; and companies capitalized in excess of one hundred million yen or which had commanded excessive economic power. Two hundred and forty-six such companies were listed in the ordinance.

Injunctions

Contained in Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 are four injunctions designed to prevent the continuity of influence and power by purgees in those positions and organizations in the public service from which they had been removed. Penalty clauses are included which make violators of the above injunctions liable to confinement for not more than three years or to a fine not exceeding 15,000 yen.

Non-Succession Provisions

A feature designed to allow new leadership to come to the front in municipal governments was incorporated in Imperial Ordinances Nos. 3 and 4 of 1947, also issued on 4 January 1947. These ordinances provided that mayors, deputy-mayors, headmen of wards in Tokyo, headmen and deputy-headmen of towns and villages and headmen of federations of neighborhood associations (CHONAI KAI CHO and BURAKU

KAI CHO), who had held such positions consecutively from 1 September 1945 until 1 September 1946, even though they did not fall under the provisions of the purge ordinance, were to be barred from filing as candidates for those respective positions for a period of four years. So much of this as it applied to the headmen of federations of neighborhood associations was revoked when, on 3 March 1947, these federations were abolished.

Administration

Because of the increased amount of screening anticipated at all levels, estimated by the government at between 500,000 and 700,000 cases, reorganization of the screening system was effected by the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance No. 2 of 1947.

This ordinance provided for one Central Public Office Qualifications Examination Committee, forty-six Prefectural Committees (including 5 major cities) and 118 Municipal Committees (cities with population of 50,000 or more).

The Central Committee was made responsible to the Prime Minister who makes final decision on all cases screened by that committee. The local committees make recommendations to their respective prefectural governors who give final decision thereon.

The Central Committee's authority was limited to positions in the national government, positions in organizations comparable thereto, and the top elective posts of the prefectures and 5 principal cities. All other posts in local government and those in local branches of screenable organizations were within the screening authority of the local committees.

Publicity

The results obtained by the publicity of the extended purge plan in October 1946 made it desirable that in the future all activities and results in connection with the purge be given wide publicity. This publicity program is accomplished in several ways. The Central Government, through the Prime Minister, the governors, and the mayors of the five principal cities, releases to the press and posts semi-monthly bulletins listing by name all those persons who have been screened during the preceding two weeks, together with results of the screening. The questionnaires of all such persons together with copies of the purge ordinances are made available for public inspection at the offices of the screening committees concerned. A copy of the questionnaire of each candidate is also available for public inspection at the office of the appropriate election administration committee as well as the screening committee's office. News releases and radio broadcasts explain to the people not only the purpose behind the purge but also the important provisions of the purge ordinances.

Schedule of Screening

The order in which various groups would be screened was determined by schedule. Proposed appointees for local committees were screened first. The general elections then impending necessitated screening election officials and

candidates next. Screening of economic entities, principal public offices, political parties and public information media organizations followed.

Activities Prior to Elections

Prior to the General Elections in April 1947 all candidates for the more important elective posts were screened and the following report made by the Japanese Government:

Candidates	Filed	Passed	*Provisionally Passed	Barred
House of Representatives	3,426	3,230	59	137
House of Councillors	1,406	1,365	10	31
Prefectural Governors	451	428	3	20
Mayors of 5 Principal Cities	43	42	-	1

*No final decision could be reached in these cases noted as "provisionally passed" because research in the information media field had not been completed.

During the same period the Local Committees screened an estimated 72,550 candidates for headmen of wards, towns, and villages; 21,126 candidates for deputy-mayors, deputy-headmen and accountants of cities, towns and villages; and about 42,252 members of election administrative committees.

Activities Subsequent to Elections

Subsequent to the elections and prior to assuming office, successful candidates for the important elective posts, screened by the Central Committee were re-examined. Eleven members-elect to the House of Representatives and four members-elect to the House of Councillors were removed. One of those removed was ISHIBASHI, Tanzan, former Finance Minister of the Yoshida Cabinet.

The Central Screening Committee also post-screened 2,803 successful candidates for prefectural assemblies and 284 assemblymen of the five principal cities.

During the same period the Local Committees post-screened 158,757 persons who had been elected to the assemblies of cities, wards, towns and villages.

Economic Phase

This phase began about 15 April 1947, at which time it was estimated that 3,200 persons holding policy positions in approximately 300 companies would require screening.

By the middle of July 1947 approximately 3,150 persons holding leading and influential positions in over 240 companies had been screened and their cases reviewed by SCAP; a total of 292 persons had been removed and/or excluded from public service. There remained the screening of those persons whose questionnaires had not yet been obtained, the seeking out of those whose positions were not

listed in the mandatory provisions of the ordinances but who had, nevertheless, exercised influence and authority commensurate with such listed positions and the formal designation of those who resigned to escape the legal injunctions against purgees.

The economic phase of the purge program was completed on 10 May 1948. A total of 6,951 persons holding or having held screenable positions in 245 listed companies had been screened, of whom 6,312 were passed, 186 were barred from public service, and 453 were removed and excluded. In addition 1,298 persons who had held positions subject to the purge either in Japan itself or in former Japanese-occupied areas were purged through the provisional designation program.

Public Information Media Purge

Paragraph 5 of the "remarks" section of Appendix I, Cabinet and Home Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 constituted the basis of the Public Information Media Purge. This paragraph brings under the provisions of the Directive any scholar, journalist or editor and any principal official of a publishing house, newspaper or magazine, broadcasting corporation, motion picture or theatrical company who between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 advocated aggression, or militant nationalism, espoused totalitarianism or advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation over other nations, denounced liberals and anti-militarists, or in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism.

The just and equitable application of these provisions necessitated extensive research in every field of public information, including not only a study of the media itself but of the organizational structure of public information companies. This program was undertaken in March 1947 by a Cabinet Secretariat sub-committee, which during the ensuing three months compiled a list of 225 newspapers and news agencies, 15 motion picture companies, 5 broadcasting companies and 5 organizations controlling the dissemination of information, deemed to have engaged in activities prescribed under Category G. This list was published as part of an amendment to the "remarks" outlined above. This amendment brought under the provisions of the Directive specified office holders in listed companies but provided an opportunity for any individual or company to produce satisfactory evidence as to why exemption should be granted.

The Japanese Government conducted a review of allegedly ultranationalistic books published during the decade preceding the war in order to determine whether or not the authors fell under the Memorandum.

As of 10 May 1948, 1,328 persons in the public information media field had been screened; 1,104 of such persons were passed, 71 barred, and 153 removed and excluded from office. In addition 857 persons were purged through provisional designation, of whom 286 were the authors of objectionable writings.

Provisional Designation

"Provisional designation" was instituted to prevent persons who had resigned positions to escape purge by avoiding screening from legally

continuing their influence, which they might exercise as long as they did not assume positions legally screenable. These persons also received pensions and other benefits to which, if they had been screened, they would not have been entitled. Therefore, on 2 July 1947, the government issued Cabinet Order No. 119 of 1947 which provided that the Prime Minister could effect the provisional designation of any person concerning whom there was sufficient evidence to indicate that he fell within the purview of the Memorandum. This "provisional designation" was effected by individual notice to the person concerned. A period of thirty days was provided from the date of receipt of such designation during which the person so notified could file a letter of exception. If no such exception was filed within the thirty day period, the provisional designation became final to be publicly announced and made a matter of official record.

Special Examining Bureau

In May 1948, the Special Investigation Bureau of the Attorney General's Office, established by Law No. 15, February 1948, and organizationally complete with local bureaus in the eight regions of Japan, began to function. Action taken in accordance with its mission of observing and investigating compliance with the injunctions against return to public leadership by purgees included the completion of the investigation of violations and referral of the cases to the Public Procurator's Office for prosecution.

Public Office Qualifications Advisory Agency

A Cabinet pronouncement effective 11 May 1948 established an advisory group for Public Office Qualifications Examination within the Prime Minister's Office. This group assists the Prime Minister in the routine check of eligibility of applicants and nominees for public position. Screening 764,019 questionnaires between 11 May 1948 and 1 November 1950, this agency advised the Prime Minister that 5,759 persons were not qualified for public service. It also uncovered 1,522 instances of erroneous designation of individuals as purgees and these individuals were reinstated.

First Appeal Board

On 23 February 1947 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 65 of 1947 setting up an Appeal Board. Prior to this time any person, who felt that a mistake had been made or an injustice committed in his case could appeal to the Prime Minister.

The Government reported 20 May 1948 that of 201,958 purgees, 1,070 submitted appeals and, of these, 14 were reinstated prior to 10 May 1948. On that date the Appeal Board submitted the names of 248 persons to the Prime Minister for reinstatement. The Prime Minister thereafter requested that SCAP authorize the reinstatement of 129. Approval was granted 21 May 1948, and the Government officially announced the reinstatement of these persons on 22 May 1948. Later, on 19 July 1948, five additional persons were reinstated.

Second Appeal Board

On 8 February 1949, by Cabinet Order No. 39, a second appeal board was established to recommend reinstatement of petitioners who could substantiate pleas of gross personal injustice. Thirty-two thousand, eighty-nine applications were received. On the board's recommendation, the Prime Minister submitted names of 10,090 to SCAP for reinstatement. SCAP approved the Prime Minister's recommendation and those persons were reinstated by successive government announcements. In addition, on 30 October, the Japanese Government proposed, and SCAP approved, the reinstatement of 3,250 young ex-officers of the army and navy, none of whom had military service or military schooling prior to 8 December 1941.

Second Appeals Board

On 8 February 1949, by Cabinet Order No. 39, a second appeals boards was established to recommend reinstatement of petitioners who could substantiate pleas of gross personal injustice. Thirty-two thousand, eighty-nine applications were received. On the board's recommendation, the Prime Minister submitted names of 10,090 purgees to SCAP. SCAP approved the Prime Minister's decision. Eight hundred and thirty-eight former reserve officers were reinstated on 27 September 1950, and 9,252 other persons were reinstated on 13 October 1950. In addition, on 30 October, the Japanese Government proposed, and SCAP approved, the reinstatement of 3,250 young ex-officers of the army and navy, none of whom had had any connection with the military service prior to 8 December 1941 and none of whom could be held responsible for leading the Japanese people into World War II.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PURGE STATISTICS
As of 31 October 1950

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Reinstated	Total Remain. Purged
ategory A ("ar Criminal Suspects)	27	4	3	20	1,664	5	1,682
ategory B (Career Military)	6,294	715	3,505	2,074	113,337	7,822	111,094
ategory C (Ultra-nationalistic Societies)	26	0	13	13	3,066	116	2,976
ategory D (Imperial Rule Assitance Association and Affiliates)	83	0	76	7	33,573	2,310	31,346
ategory E (Expansionist Organizations)	53	9	32	12	391	125	310
ategory F (Governors of Occupied Areas)	0	0	0	0	43	12	31
ategory G (Additional Militarists & Ultra-nationalists)	1,472,004	1,464,883	3,524	3,597	42,770	4,620	45,271
Economic	179,404	178,763	188	453	914	554	1,001
Public info media	1,777	1,530	90	157	857	250	854
Ex-servicemen's associations	380	0	356	24	39,744	3,463	36,661
Miscellaneous others (including special higher police, recommended candidates, Butokukai, etc.)	1,290,443	1,284,590	2,890	2,963	1,255	353	6,755
Total	1,478,487	1,465,611	7,153	5,723	194,844	15,010	192,710

Source: Public Office Qualification Section of the Prime Minister's Office

PURGE STATISTICS
BASED UPON REASON FOR PURGING
As of 31 October 1950

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Re-moved	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Rein-stated	Total Remain. Purged
Category A							
Suspected War criminals	27	4	3	20	1,664	5	1,682
	6,294	715	3,505	2,074	113,337	7,822	111,094
Category B							
Career Army Officers	2,521	171	1,086	1,264	48,947	4,266	47,031
Chokunin rank officials--War Ministry	0	0	0	0	48	5	43
Career Navy Officers	1,519	203	539	777	24,119	2,379	23,056
Chokunin rank officials--Navy Ministry	0	0	0	0	103	10	93
Members of Kempei-tai	2,254	341	1,880	33	40,120	1,162	40,871
Category C							
Founders, officers and influential members of secret ultranationalistic societies	26	0	13	13	3,066	116	2,976
Category D							
Founders, officers and influential members of Imperial Rule Assistance association and affiliates	83	0	76	7	33,573	2,310	31,346
Category E							
Financial organizations	53	9	32	12	391	125	310
Development organizations							
Category F							
Governors of Occupied Areas	0	0	0	0	43	12	31
	1,472,004	1,464,883	3,524	3,597	42,770	4,620	45,271
Category G					914	554	1,001
Economic organizations	179,404	178,763	188	453			
Special companies & banks in which the Government is largest stockholder	2,988	2,888	5	95	0	1	99
Companies & organizations designated by Temporary Supply & Demand Adjustment Law	843	802	0	41	0	0	41

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Reinstated	Total Remain. Purged
ategory G con't.							
Organizations established & subsidized by the government	172,730	172,666	6	58	0	3	61
Influential companies, financial institutions & other economic organizations (located in Japan)	2,217	1,875	138	204	666	474	534
Influential companies, financial institutions & other economic organizations (located outside Japan)	139	66	39	34	248	76	245
Other influential companies & financial institutions	487	466	0	21	0	0	21
ublic information media organizations	1,777	1,530	90	157	857	250	854
Government information media control companies	0				59	9	50
Officials of news companies & news agencies	817	672	56	89	256	123	278
Book & magazine publishers	822	753	14	55	213	56	226
Motion picture & theatrical companies	105	82	11	12	28	29	22
Broadcasting corporations	28	23	4	1	15	5	15
Writers	5	0	5	0	286	28	263
Influential members & officials of Butokukai	1,060	626	28	406	791	221	1,004
Others	1,289,763	1,283,964	3,218	2,581	40,208	3,595	42,412
Grand Total	1,478,487	1,465,611	7,153	5,723	194,844	15,010	192,710

PURGE STATISTICS BASED UPON
POSITION FOR WHICH SCREENED
As of 31 October 1950

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Reinstated	Total Remain. Purged
Screened by Central Government							
For appointive office	170,275	162,395	4,198	3,682	123,288	9,227	121,941
Ministries & boards	121,540	119,502	308	1,730	0	0	2,038
Central government Committees	5,231	5,228	3	0	0	0	3
Public office qualification Committees	1,005	1,004	1	0	0	0	1
Members of political parties subject to screening	54	23	4	27	0	0	31
Quasi-governmental Control Organizations	12,894	12,894	0	0	0	0	0
Economic Organizations	7,909	7,269	187	453	914	554	1,000
Special companies & special banks in which the Government is largest stockholder	2,985	2,885	5	95	0	1	99
Companies & organizations designated by the Temporary Supply and Demand Adjustment Law	843	802	0	41	0	0	41
Organizations established & subsidized by the Government	1,226	1,163	5	58	0	3	60
Influential companies, financial institutions & other economic organizations (located in Japan)	2,237	1,895	138	204	666	474	534
Influential companies, financial institutions & other economic organizations (located outside Japan)	139	66	39	34	248	76	245
Other influential companies & financial institutions	479	458	0	21	0	0	21

Statistics Based upon Position for which Screened

	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Reinstated	Total Remain. Purged
ublic information media organizations	1,773	1,531	85	157	857	250	849
Government information media control agencies.	0	0	0	0	59	9	50
Officials of newspaper companies & new agencies	819	675	55	89	256	123	277
Book & magazine publishers	820	751	14	55	213	56	226
Motion picture & theater companies	105	82	11	12	28	29	22
Broadcasting corporations	28	23	4	1	15	5	15
Writers	1	0	1	0	286	28	259
thers	19,869	14,944	3,610	1,315	121,517	8,423	118,019
or elective office	9,198	8,883	267	48	0	0	315
House of Representatives	4,224	4,023	179	22	0	0	201
House of Councillors	1,698	1,640	49	9	0	0	58
Governors	466	428	37	1	0	0	38
Mayor of principal cities	45	44	1	0	0	0	1
Prefectural assemblies	2,500	2,485	1	14	0	0	15
Others	265	263	0	2	0	0	2
Total	179,473	171,278	4,465	3,730	123,288	9,227	122,256
Screened by Local Governments							
or appointive office	879,155	876,372	933	1,850	71,556	5,752	68,587
First-class officials	44	44	0	0	0	0	0
Second-class officials	43,178	42,253	2	923	0	3	922
Third-class officials	252,739	252,667	10	62	0	2	70
Members of political parties	9,196	9,182	7	7	0	0	14
Others	573,998	572,226	914	858	71,556	5,747	67,581
or elective office	419,859	417,961	1,755	143	0	31	1,667
Headmen & assistant headmen	51,106	50,852	218	36	0	13	241
Others	368,753	367,109	1,537	107	0	18	1,626
Total	1,299,014	1,294,333	2,688	1,993	71,556	5,782	70,454
GRAND TOTAL	1,478,487	1,465,611	7,153	5,723	194,844	15,010	192,710

PURGE STATISTICS
FOR PROVISIONAL DESIGNATION
As of 31 October 1950

Category	Persons Provisionally Designated	Persons Passed	Persons Finally Designated
ategory A			
Suspected War Criminals	1,668	8	1,664
ategory B	122;445	9;108	113;337
Career Army Officers	54,185	5,238	48,947
Chokunin rank officials--War Ministry	48	0	48
Career Navy Officers	26,982	2,863	24,119
Chokunin rank officials--Navy Ministry	105	2	103
Members of Kempei-tai	40,217	999	39,218
Members of Tokumu Bu	43	0	43
Members of Tokumu Kikan	865	6	859
ategory C			
Founders, officers and influential members of secret patriotic or ultranationalistic societies	3,206	140	3,066
ategory D	34;216	643	33,573
Imperial Rule Assistance Association	16,913	207	16,706
Imperial Rule Assistance Youth Association	16,572	408	16,164
Council for Establishing Imperial Rule Assistance Political Societies	576	13	563
Political Association of Great Japan	14	0	14
Other Affiliates of Imperial Rule Assistance	141	15	126
Category E			
Financial and development organizations involved in Japanese exparsion	401	10	391
Category F			
Governors of occupied territories	44	1	43
ategory G	43,992	1,222	42,770
Economic organizations	936	22	914
Special companies and special banks in which the Government is largest stockholder	0	0	0
Companies and organizations designated by the Temporary Supply and Demand Adjustment Law	0	0	0
Organizations established and subsidized by the Government	0	0	0

Purge Statistics for Provisional Designation

Category	Persons Provisionally Designated	Persons Passed	Persons Finally Designated
Category G cont.			
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations (located in Japan)	681	15	666
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations (located outside Japan)	255	7	248
Other influential companies and financial institutions	0	0	0
Public information media organization	967	110	857
Government information media control agencies	62	3	59
Officials of Newspaper companies & news agencies	276	20	256
Book and magazine publishers	255	42	213
Motion picture and theatrical companies	28	0	28
Broadcasting corporations	15	0	15
Writers	331	45	286
Recommended candidates of 1942 elections	353	0	353
Principal officials of ex-servicemen's associations	40,802	1,058	39,744
Officials of Butokukai	823	32	791
Others	111	0	111
GRAND TOTAL	205,972	11,128	194,844

THE PURGE

On 4 January 1946 the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers issued a directive requiring a purge of all persons who shared responsibility for Japan's program of aggression. This directive was designed to remove undesirable persons from positions of influence in the political, economic and social life of Japan. For the fields of education and police, separate similar programs had been initiated as early as October 1945.

The removal and exclusion program has never been either in concept or administration a punitive measure but rather a technique designed to eliminate the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons whose past careers showed them to be undesirable leaders for a nation dedicated to democracy and the cause of world peace.

BASIS FOR THE PURGE

Potsdam Declaration

The basis for the purge program is found in that part of the Potsdam Declaration which states, "There must be removed for all time the authority and influence of those who deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world".

Occupation Directives

In accordance with initial U. S. Post-Surrender Policy for Japan SCAP was directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that no persons be "allowed to hold public office or any other positions of responsibility or influence in public or important private enterprise who have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression, who have been influential members of any Japanese ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic society"..... who have been influential in the activities of Imperial Rule Assistance Organizations, "or who manifest hostility to the objectives of the Occupation".

SCAP was further directed to prohibit the retention in, or selection for, positions of important responsibility in industry, finance, commerce, agriculture, or public or private financial institutions, agencies or organizations, of any persons who have been active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, and of all those who do not direct future Japanese economic effort solely toward peaceful ends.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, SCAP was directed to assume that persons who held key positions of high responsibility since 1937 in any of the fields enumerated above have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression.

THE 4 JANUARY 1946 DIRECTIVE

SCAPIN 550, the "4 January Directive", is SCAP's implementation of the instructions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Purge Categories

This basic directive ordered the Japanese Government to remove from public office and to exclude from government service exponents of militant nationalism and aggression falling within the following defined categories:

Category A. War Criminals

Category B. Career Military and Naval Personnel: Special Police and Officers of the War Ministries.

This category included members of the Board of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshals, the Supreme Military Council, the Imperial General Headquarters, the Army and Navy General Staffs, and the Supreme Council for direction of the war; all career

commissioned officers and enlisted personnel who served in or with the military or naval police or other special or secret intelligence police organizations; and all persons who served as higher officials in the Ministry of War or Ministry of Navy.

Category C. Influential Members of Ultranationalistic, Terroristic or Secret Patriotic Societies.

Founders, officers, directors and other important officials, large financial contributors to, or editor of any publication or organ of such societies.

Category D. Persons Influential in the Activities of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society, and the Political Association of Great Japan.

National officers, leading officials in Prefectural or Metropolitan subdivisions, editor of any publication or organ of the above or agencies or affiliates of the above organizations.

Category E. Officers of Financial and Development Organizations involved in Japanese Expansion.

Persons who between 7 July 1937 and 2 September 1945 were directors, presidents, vice presidents, advisors, auditors or controlling branch managers in Japanese occupied territory of above institutions.

Category F. Governors of Occupied Territories.

Certain specified higher officials such as governor general, civil administrator, and military administrator in Japan's wartime colonial empire.

Category G. Additional Militarists and Ultranationalists.

These broad provisions bring under the terms of the directive:

1. Any person who has denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the militaristic regime.

2. Any person who has instigated or perpetuated an act of violence against opponents of the militaristic regime.

3. Any person who has played an active and predominant governmental part in the Japanese program of aggression or who by speech, writing or action has shown himself to be an active exponent of militant nationalism and aggression.

INITIAL ACTION OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTING THE PURGE DIRECTIVE

Ordinances Issued

On 27 February 1946 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 109 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1946 which established the machinery for applying the Directive. These ordinances determined, first, who should be screened, second, who should be classified as undesirable in light of the Directive and third, how the removal of undesirables should be accomplished.

By the terms of these ordinances all incumbent officials of the then first three civil service grades, and those who held positions of comparable authority, all staff officers of 114 listed corporations, associations and other organizations under the special control of the government, and all applicants for future elective or appointive posts in the national government were subject to screening to determine their eligibility.

The seven categories of undesirables outlined by the Directive were defined in greater detail by the ordinances as follows:

1. No change was made in the category applying to war criminals (Category A).

2. The one affecting career military and naval personnel (Category B) remained substantially the same.

3. The provisions of Category C were defined as applying to influential members of 123 listed ultranationalistic or secret patriotic societies.

4. The many agencies and affiliates of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations (Category D) were enumerated and the influential positions in each duly listed.

5. The number of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion (Category E), as listed in the original directive, was increased.

6. The exact titles and positions of high Japanese officials in occupied territories (Category E) were defined.

7. The broad provisions of Category G were extensively interpreted by a special cabinet announcement appearing shortly after the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance 109.

It brought under the purge memorandum all persons who had occupied certain policy-forming positions on the highest government level between the outbreak of "The China Incident" and the Surrender.

It listed other high government positions of somewhat lesser importance and provided for the purge of individuals who had occupied them providing there was conspicious evidence that these individuals have played an important part: (a) in the conclusion of alliances with the Axis or with puppet nations in preparation for the Greater East Asia War, (b) in the suppression of opponents of militarism, (c) in concluding economic agreements with occupied countries, (d) in the financial or production program for Japanese military activities.

The interpretation of Category G also brought under the purge: (a) those officials who had over a long period of time engaged in the suppression of civil liberties, (b) other officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had participated in activities proscribed under Category G, (c) officials of companies that had produced the weapons and sinews of war, (d) highest officers of patriotic societies not listed under Category C and (e) any person who was recommended as a candidate by the TOJO Government in 1942.

The ordinances provided for a screening committee to examine questionnaires and to decide upon individual eligibility. In the event that the individual was found to fall under the criteria as defined in the ordinance, the Prime Minister was to designate him as an undesirable person, and to order his removal and exclusion from office. The ordinances also provided for the collection of questionnaires and contained a penalty clause designed to insure that such questionnaires would be filled out truthfully and completely.

Initial Operation and Effect of the Purge

The impact of the Purge Directive was immediate and profound. On 13 January 1946, only 9 days after the Directive was issued, the Cabinet of Baron Kijuro Shidehara under went extensive re-organization. Three ministers and six cabinet executives and many other high government officials resigned. In view of the imminence of the approaching April elections the Government released the criteria as soon as they had been determined in the form of Cabinet announcements, without waiting until the entire bill had been written. Thus, by the end of February when Imperial Ordinance No. 109 was officially promulgated, action had already been taken to bring under the purge (a) persons who had been influential in patriotic and secret societies, (b) influential members of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations, and (c) career naval and military personnel, of whom approximately 183,000 were barred from the public service.

On 10 March 1946, the day of the Cabinet announcement interpreting Category G, the Shidehara Cabinet sustained a second wave of resignations; five ministers retired. Many members of the House of Peers followed suit. Within the month 30 new appointees, duly screened under the new ordinances, were appointed to fill the vacancies thus created.

That part of the 10 March interpretation which rendered ineligible for public service all members of the Lower House who had been recommended by the Tojo Government greatly altered the political scene. Leadership of political parties changed, political allegiances shifted and new candidates were sought to replace those previously scheduled to run in the April elections. Of the 3,384 candidates for the Lower House, 252 were barred. Of the 252 barred, 113 were candidates recommended by Prime Minister Tojo in the 1942 elections. Another 268 "recommended candidates" did not file.

When the Diet convened on 20 June 1946 all successful candidates to the Lower House were re-screened and their cases reviewed. As a result ten more were removed, nine of these by Japanese Government order and one, Ichiro Hatoyama, leader of the Liberal Party, by SCAP directive.

On 16 May 1946 the Japanese Government prepared a still more comprehensive and detailed interpretation of those paragraphs of Category G relating to other government officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had engaged in activities proscribed under the Directive. These extended criteria were not publicly announced at the time lest such an announcement interfere with the completion of screening by the scheduled deadline. Nevertheless, this document represented an early extension of the purge program into industry and the field of public information, an extension to be perfected and completed the following year.

Statistical Summary

By August 1946 the Japanese Government announced the substantial completion of the initial phase of the purge program. The Privy Council, the Diet, the Cabinet, Prefectural Governors, all officials of the then first three ranks, judges of higher courts, officials of government controlled companies, procurators of certain higher courts, and officials of higher educational institutions directly under the Ministry of Education had all been screened. These totalled 5,520 persons, of which 814 were barred or removed, and 4,706 were passed. This figure was subsequently increased by 4 January 1947 to 8,899 persons screened, of which 7,832 had been passed and 1,067 barred or removed. In addition 183,000 career officers of the army and navy, members of the gendarmerie and former intelligence agents had been categorically barred. The way was now clear for the anticipated extension of the program to local government, to industry and to the field of public information.

EXTENSION OF PURGE PROGRAM

Preliminary Steps

In August 1946 a statement of SCAP policy was issued requiring the Japanese Government to prepare a comprehensive plan for: (a) the exclusion from prefectural and municipal assemblies and from appointive posts of all personnel deemed undesirable under the provisions of SCAPIN 550; (b) the application of that directive to all elections of members of both Houses of the Diet; (c) the exclusion of all purged personnel from any influential political or economic posts. This statement also provided that the Japanese Government should publish the full text of the plan simultaneously with its submission to SCAP.

The Extension Plan

On 22 October the Government submitted to SCAP and simultaneously released to the public a plan which comprehensively implemented the 4 January Directive.

In the ensuing two months the essential features of this plan were incorporated into definitive and appropriate form for issuance as law.

The Extension Ordinances

On 4 January 1947, one year from issuance of the original directive, the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of 1947 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, thus implementing all the features of the approved plan. These ordinances contained provisions which were designed to reach into all fields.

Criteria for Screening

The screenable positions were extended to include all elective and appointive posts in the national and local governments and specified positions in certain companies, associations, mass communication media and other organizations. These latter were defined to be positions in: companies in which the government had special interests; organizations subsidized by the government or serving for the public benefit; principle newspaper companies, news agencies, publishing companies, motion picture and theatrical companies, broadcasting corporations and other media of mass communication; political parties, their branches and similar organizations; and influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations. The specific offices considered to be policy-making positions and approximately 470 such companies, organizations, etc., were specifically listed.

Criteria for Purging

In a manner similar to that in which definition of screenable positions was enlarged, the purge criteria were also more specifically defined.

No changes were made in the definition of the categories applicable to war criminals (Category A) career military and naval personnel, etc. (Category B), officials of financial and development companies involved in Japanese expansion (Category E) and officials in occupied territories (Category F). With regard to the influential members of ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic societies (Category C) the criteria were specifically defined to include those persons in the local branches thereof who had held positions comparable to those previously defined as applying only to the national level. The criteria applicable to persons influential in the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, (Category D) were further defined in the case of parent organizations and major affiliates to include officials of all local subdivisions thereof, down to and including chiefs of town and village branches.

The category in which the most far-reaching and comprehensive definitions were made was that applying to additional militarists and ultranationalists (Category G).

The provision in this category, implemented by Cabinet announcement of 10 March 1946 described heretofore, which applied to government officials and professional men who had participated in activities such as mentioned in this category was defined more clearly. Those falling under the provisions of the ordinance were government officials who took part in the planning or execution of propaganda or dissemination of news for the purpose of (1) instigating war; (2) suppressing opponents of jingoism; (3) advocating dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, and militarism or ultranationalism; (4) guiding or controlling thought or speech for the same purpose; (5) political direction or economic exploitation of Japanese occupied territories; (6) furthering important plans for wartime general mobilization or economic control, and other plans for the direction of war.

Diet members in or outside the Diet who had in writing, speech or action been conspicuously active in instigating or directing war, suppressing opponents of jingoism or inspiring dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, militarism or ultranationalism were considered undesirable within the purview of the provision.

Men of letters and artists who by their works had advocated aggression or militant nationalism, actively contributed to such propaganda, or who through their political or philosophic doctrine laid down an ideological basis for the policies for the Greater East Asia, or New Order in the East Asia or policies of a similar nature, or the China Incident or the Pacific War; who had advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation to be a leader of other nations or who cooperated actively with propaganda of the above effect; who persecuted or denounced liberals or anti-militarists for their liberal or antimilitaristic ideologies; or who in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism were by this provision brought under the terms of the Directive. This added definition made it possible to measure by a clearer standard the writings, speeches, articles, news reports, etc. of this group of people.

Closely associated with the above was the more elaborate interpretation of the criteria as applied to the principal officials and editorial personnel of organizations in the information media field. As published in the Cabinet Ordinance certain officials of newspaper companies, magazine or book publishing companies, broadcasting corporations, companies producing motion pictures or theatrical presentations and any other media of mass communication in or outside Japan who held office during the period between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 and whose companies engaged in the activities listed in the preceding paragraph as criteria for judging men of letters and artists were brought under the Directive. These listed officials were the Chairman, Vice-chairman, President, Vice-president, Managing Director, Standing Director, Chief of Compilation Bureau, Chief of Research Bureau, Editor-in-Chief, Managing Editor, Chief of Editorial Staff, or any other official who exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above positions. Previously the criteria as it applied to the information media field had been so vaguely defined as to be difficult of application; this had largely been remedied.

Perhaps the most sweeping extension of the provisions of this broad category, was in the interpretations as they applied to certain top officials of what had previously been referred to as "influential companies or national policy companies manufacturing finished aircraft or arms or producing iron or steel." This category had now been broadened to include all policy-making officials down to but not including ordinary directors, but including all other officials, regardless of title, who in fact exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above in any company which was conspicuously influential in the manufacture of

strategic or critical material of war, conspicuously monopolistic in the production of basic productive materials or business of communications or transportation, or domestic or foreign trade; holding companies or influential companies closely associated thereto; and companies capitalized in excess of one hundred million yen or which had commanded excessive economic power. Two hundred and forty-six such companies were listed in the ordinance.

Injunctions

Contained in Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 are four injunctions designed to prevent the continuity of influence and power by purgees in those positions and organizations in the public service from which they had been removed. Penalty clauses are included which make violators of the above injunctions liable to confinement for not more than three years or to a fine not exceeding 15,000 yen.

Non-Succession Provisions

A feature designed to allow new leadership to come to the front in municipal governments was incorporated in Imperial Ordinances Nos. 3 and 4 of 1947, also issued on 4 January 1947. These ordinances provided that mayors, deputy-mayors, headmen of wards in Tokyo, headmen and deputy-headmen of towns and villages and headmen of federations of neighborhood associations (CHONAI KAI CHO and BURAKU KAI CHO), who had held such positions consecutively from 1 September 1945 until 1 September 1946, even though they did not fall under the provisions of the purge ordinance, were to be barred from filing as candidates for those respective positions for a period of four years. So much of this as it applied to the headmen of federations of neighborhood associations was revoked when, on 3 March 1947, these federations were abolished.

Administration

Because of the increased amount of screening anticipated at all levels, estimated by the government at between 500,000 and 700,000 cases, a re-organization of the screening system was effected by the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance No. 2 of 1947.

This ordinance provided for one Central Public Office Qualifications Examination Committee, forty-six Prefectural Committees (including 5 major cities) and 118 Municipal Committees (cities with population of 50,000 or more).

The Central Committee was made responsible to the Prime Minister who makes final decision on all cases screened by that committee. The local committees make recommendations to their respective prefectural governors who give final decision thereon.

The Central Committee's authority was limited to positions in the national government, positions in organizations comparable thereto, and the top elective posts of the prefectures and 5 principal cities. All other posts in local government and those in local branches of screenable organizations were within the screening authority of the local committees.

Publicity

The results obtained by the publicity of the extended purge plan in October 1946 made it desirable that in the future all activities and results in connection with the purge be given wide publicity. This publicity program is accomplished in several ways. The Central Government, through the Prime Minister, the governors, and the mayors of the five principal cities, releases to the press and posts semi-monthly bulletins listing by name all those persons who have been screened during the preceding two weeks, together with results of the screening. The questionnaires of all such persons together with copies of the purge ordinances are made available

for public inspection at the offices of the screening committees concerned. A copy of the questionnaire of each candidate is also available for public inspection at the office of the appropriate election administration committee, as well as the screening committee's office. News releases and radio broadcasts explain to the people not only the purpose behind the purge but also the important provisions of the purge ordinances.

Schedule of Screening

The order in which various groups would be screened was determined by schedule. Proposed appointees for local committees were screened first. The general elections then impending necessitated screening election officials and candidates next. Screening of economic entities, principal public offices, political parties and public information media organizations followed.

Activities Prior to Elections

Prior to the General Elections in April 1947 all candidates for the more important elective posts were screened and the following report made by the Japanese Government:

Candidates	Filed	Passed	*Provisionally Passed	Barred
House of Representatives	3,426	3,230	59	137
House of Councillors	1,406	1,365	10	31
Prefectural Governors	451	428	3	20
Mayors of 5 Principal Cities	43	42	-	1

*No final decision could be reached in these cases noted as "provisionally passed" because research in the information media field had not been completed.

During the same period the Local Committees screened an estimated 72,550 candidates for headmen of wards, towns, and villages; 21,126 candidates for deputy-mayors, deputy-headmen and accountants of cities, towns and villages; and about 42,252 members of election administrative committees.

Activities Subsequent to Elections

Subsequent to the elections and prior to assuming office, successful candidates for the important elective posts, screened by the Central Committee were re-examined. Eleven members-elect to the House of Representatives and four members-elect to the House of Councillors were removed. One of those removed was ISHIBASHI, Tanzan, former Finance Minister of the Yoshida Cabinet.

The Central Screening Committee also post-screened 2,803 successful candidates for prefectural assemblies and 284 assemblymen of the five principal cities.

During the same period the Local Committees post-screened 158,757 persons who had been elected to the assemblies of cities, wards, towns and villages.

Economic Phase

This phase began about 15 April 1947, at which time it was estimated that 3,200 persons holding policy positions in approximately 300 companies would require screening.

By the middle of July 1947 approximately 3,150 persons holding leading and influential positions in over 240 companies had been screened and their cases reviewed by SCAP; a total of 292 persons had been removed and/or excluded from public service. There remained the screening of those persons whose questionnaires had not yet been obtained, the seeking out of those whose positions were not listed in the mandatory provisions of the ordinances but who had, nevertheless, exercised influence and authority commensurate with such listed positions and the formal designation of those who had resigned to escape the legal injunctions against purgees.

The economic phase of the purge program was completed on 10 May 1948. A total of 6,951 persons holding or having held screenable positions in 245 listed companies had been screened, of whom 6,312 were passed, 186 were barred from public service, and 453 were removed and excluded. In addition 1,298 persons who had held positions subject to the purge either in Japan itself or in former Japanese-occupied areas were purged thru the provisional designation program.

Public Information Media Purge

Paragraph 5 of the "remarks" section of Appendix I, Cabinet and Home Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 constituted the basis of the Public Information Media Purge. This paragraph brings under the provisions of the Directive any scholar, journalist or editor and any principal official of a publishing house, newspaper or magazine, broadcasting corporation, motion picture or theatrical company who between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 advocated aggression, or militant nationalism, espoused totalitarianism or advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation over other nations, denounced liberals and anti-militarists, or in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism.

The just and equitable application of these provisions necessitated extensive research in every field of public information, including not only a study of the media itself but of the organizational structure of public information companies. This program was undertaken in March 1947 by a Cabinet Secretariat sub-committee, which during the ensuing three months compiled a list of 225 newspapers and news agencies, 15 motion picture companies, 5 broadcasting companies and 5 organizations controlling the dissemination of information, deemed to have engaged in activities proscribed under Category G. This list was published as part of an amendment to the "remarks" outlined above. This amendment brought under the provisions of the Directive specified office holders in listed companies but provided an opportunity for any individual or company to produce satisfactory evidence as to why exemption should be granted.

The Japanese Government conducted a review of allegedly ultranationalistic books published during the decade preceding the war in order to determine whether or not the authors fell under the Memorandum.

As of 10 May 1948, 1,328 persons in the public information media field had been screened; 1,104 of such persons were passed, 71 barred, and 153 removed and excluded from office. In addition 857 persons were purged thru provisional designation, of whom 286 were the authors of objectionable writings.

PROVISIONAL DESIGNATION

This term grew out of the need to prevent persons who had resigned to escape being purged from legally continuing their influence, which they might have exercised as long as they did not publicly commit actions or assume positions legally screenable. They also received pensions and other benefits to which, if they had been purged, they would not be entitled.

On 12 March 1947 the government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 77, which is primarily directed against those potential or "invisible"

purgees who engage in political activity, and as such cannot effectively be applied to all "invisible purgees".

On 2 July 1947, the government issued Cabinet Order No. 119 of 1947 which provides that the Prime Minister can effect the provisional designation of any person concerning whom there is sufficient evidence to indicate that he falls within the purview of the Memorandum. This designation is effected by individually notifying the persons concerned. A period of thirty days is provided from the date of receipt of such designation during which the person so notified can, if he so desires, file a letter of exemption with a questionnaire which is examined and processed in the normal manner. If no such exception is filed within the thirty day period, the designation becomes effective under the provisions of the basic ordinance, and is publicly announced and made a matter of official record.

APPEAL BOARD

On 23 February 1947 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 65 of 1947 setting up a Board of Appeal. Prior to this time any person, who felt that a mistake had been made or an injustice committed in his case could appeal to the Prime Minister. However, relatively few such appeals had been received. But with the greatly enlarged amount of screening conducted, appeals increased until by July 1947 a total of 99 was listed with the Appeal Board. Of these, 36 were rejected or recommended for rejection, 9 recommended for reinstatement, while 54 were undergoing either examination or deliberation. Initially Ordinance No. 65 provided that before an appeal could be submitted an appellant must have vacated his position; however, in July 1947, this provision of the Ordinance was revoked and appeal became possible immediately upon designation. At first the Appeal Board was handicapped by lack of a sufficient secretariat but later a Cabinet Order was issued which provided a secretariat sufficiently large to enable the Board to investigate and prepare cases more promptly.

SUMMARY

From its inception the Purge has remained preventative. Although SCAP was authorized to intern active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, the desire to preserve the preventative nature of the program restricted the use of this authority to suspected war criminals only.

Except for the initial Purge Directive issued to the Japanese Government on 4 January 1946 and certain memoranda issued after post-review of the government's action directing the removal of specific individuals, SCAP has insisted that the Japanese Government itself implement and administer the purge program, subject to the right reserved by SCAP to review any action of the Japanese Government to insure compliance with the word and spirit of SCAPIN 550.

The Public Office Qualifications Committee and the Public Office Qualifications Appeal Board concluded their work 10 May and were dissolved in accordance with provisions of Cabinet Order No. 62 of 1948.

In the program which began 4 January 1946, 717,415 persons were screened and 8,781 were barred or removed from public service. The Central Committee screened 66,015 of whom 3,681 were removed from public office and 1,019 were barred. Local committees screened 651,400 of whom 1,907 were removed and 2,174 barred.

Provisional designation of undesirable individuals on the basis of official records and documentary evidence, concluded 10 May, affected 204,304 persons of whom 15,699 submitted petitions for exception accompanied by questionnaires and counter evidence, on the basis of which 11,124 were cleared. The number finally designated in this phase

of the program was 193,180, making a total of 201,961 persons removed or excluded from public service. Three of these persons, purged in 1946, were reinstated as a result of rescreening in 1947.

The Government reported 20 May that of the 201,958 persons remaining purged 1,070 had submitted appeals and, of these, 14 were reinstated before 10 May when the Appeals Board submitted the names of 248 persons to the Prime Minister with recommendations for their reinstatement. The Prime Minister subsequently requested that SCAP authorize the reinstatement of 129. Approval for this action was granted 21 May and the Government officially announced the reinstatement of these persons 22 May, reducing the number of those purged to 201,815.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF PURGE STATISTICS

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Purged by Prov. Desig.	Reinstated	Total Remain. Purged
Category A (war criminal suspects)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category B (career military)	2,097	16	39	2,042	113,337	2	115,416
Category C (ultra-nationalistic societies)	0	0	0	0	3,066	4	3,062
Category D (Imperial Rule Assistance Assoc. and affiliates	0	0	0	0	33,573	1	33,572
Category E (Expansionist organizations)	51	8	31	12	391	3	431
Category F (Governors of occupied areas)	0	0	0	0	43	0	43
Category G (Additional militarists and ultranationalists)	715,267	708,610	3,123	3,534	42,770	136	49,291
Economic	6,951	6,312	186	453	914	18	1,535
Public Info Media	1,328	1,104	71	153	857	25	1,056
Ex-Servicemen's Assoc.	0	0	0	0	39,732	0	39,732
Misc. others (including special higher police, recommended candidates, Butokukai, etc.)	706,988	701,194	2,866	2,928	1,267	93	6,968
TOTAL	717,415	708,634	3,193	5,588	193,180	146 a/	201,815

a/ Of these, three were purged in 1946 and were reinstated as a result of rescreening in 1947.

SOURCE: Secretariat of the Central Screening Committee.

PURGE STATISTICS BASED UPON REASON FOR PURGING

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Reinstated	Total Remaining Purged
Category A Suspected war criminals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category B Career army officers	2,097 1,287	16 4	39 22	2,042 1,261	0 0	2,081 1,283
Chokunin rank officials--War Ministry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Career navy officers	804	12	17	775	0	792
Chokunin rank officials--Navy Ministry	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Kempei-tai	6	0	0	6	0	6
Category C Founders, officers and influential members of secret ultranationalistic societies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category D Founders, officers and influential members of Imperial Rule Assistance Assoc. and affiliates	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category E	51	8	31	12	1	42
Financial organizations	34	8	14	12	1	25
Development organizations	17	0	17	0	0	17
Category F Governors of occupied territories	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category G	715,267	708,610	3,123	3,534	107	6,550
Economic organizations	6,951	6,312	186	453	13	626
Special companies and special banks in which the Government is largest stockholder	2,855	2,755	5	95	1	99
Companies and organizations designated by Temp. Supply & Demand Adjustment Law	843	802	0	41	0	41
Organizations established and subsidized by the Government	911	848	5	58	3	60

PURGE STATISTICS BASED UPON REASON FOR PURGING

Category	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Reinstated	Total Remaining Purged
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic institutions (located in Japan)	1,770	1,429	137	204	9	332
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations (located outside Japan)	136	63	39	34	0	73
Other influential companies and financial institutions	436	415	0	21	0	21
Public Inf. Media organizations	1,328	1,104	71	153	15	209
Government Info. media control companies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Officials of news companies and news agencies	595	468	42	85	7	120
Book and mag. publishers	640	571	14	55	7	62
Motion picture and theatrical companies	73	50	11	12	1	22
Broadcasting corporations	20	15	4	1	0	5
Writers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Influential members and officials of Butokukai	1,058	625	27	406	0	433
Others	705,930	700,569	2,839	2,522	79	5,282
GRAND TOTAL	717,415	708,634	3,193	5,588	108	8,673

SOURCE: Secretariat of the Central Screening Committee.

PURGE STATISTICS BASED UPON POSITION FOR WHICH SCREENED

Screened by Central Govt.	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Reinstated	Total Remaining Purged
For appointive office	57,388	53,001	753	3,634	54	4,333
Ministries and boards	42,404	40,386	307	1,711	8	2,010
Central Govt. Committees	1,345	1,342	3	0	0	3
Public Office Qualification Committees	1,005	1,004	1	0	0	1
Members of political parties subject to screening	21	15	4	2	0	6
Quasi-governmental control orgns.	434	434	0	0	0	0
Economic orgns.	6,951	6,312	186	453	13	626
Special companies and special banks in which the Govt. is largest stockholder	2,855	2,755	5	95	1	99
Companies and orgns. desig. by Temp. Supply & Demand Adjustment Law	843	802	0	41	0	41
Orgns. established and subsidized by Govt.	911	848	5	58	3	60
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic orgns. (located in Japan)	1,770	1,429	137	204	9	332
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic orgns. (located outside Japan)	136	63	39	34	0	73
Other influential companies and financial institutions	436	415	0	21	0	21
Public Info. Media organizations	1,328	1,104	71	153	15	209
Govt. info. media control agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0
Officials of newspaper companies and news agencies	595	468	42	85	7	120
Book and mag. publishers	640	571	14	55	7	62
Motion picture and theater companies	73	50	11	12	1	22
Broadcasting corporations	20	15	4	1	0	5
Writers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	3,900	2,404	181	1,315	18	1,478

PURGE STATISTICS BASED UPON POSITION FOR WHICH SCREENED

Screened by Central Govt.	Screened	Passed	Barred	Removed	Reinstated	Total Remaining Purged
For elective office	8,627	8,314	266	47	18	295
House of Representatives	3,931	3,731	178	22	13	187
House of Councillors	1,439	1,381	49	9	3	55
Governors	450	412	37	1	1	37
Mayors of principal cities	43	42	1	0	0	1
Prefectural assemblies	2,499	2,485	1	13	1	13
Others	265	263	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	66,015	61,315	1,019	3,681	72	4,628
Screened by Local Govts.						
For appointive office	351,971	349,736	462	1,773	31	2,204
First-class officials	16	16	0	0	0	0
Second-class officials	4,301	3,380	0	921	0	921
Third-class officials	19,921	19,875	0	46	0	46
Members of political parties	8,034	8,021	6	7	0	13
Others	319,699	318,444	456	799	31	1,224
For elective office	299,429	297,583	1,712	134	5	1,841
Headmen and assistant headmen	44,187	43,947	206	34	0	240
Others	255,242	253,636	1,506	100	5	1,601
Total screened by Local Government	651,400	647,319	2,174	1,907	36	4,045
GRAND TOTAL	717,415	708,634	3,193	5,588	108	8,673

SOURCE: Secretariat of the Central Screening Committee.

PURGE STATISTICS FOR PROVISIONAL DESIGNATION

Category	Persons Provisionally Designated	Persons Passed	Persons Finally Designated
Category A			
Suspected war criminals	0	0	0
Category B	122,445	9,108	113,337
Career army officers	54,185	5,238	48,947
Chokunin rank officials--War Ministry	48	0	48
Career navy officers	26,982	2,863	24,119
Chokunin rank officials--Navy Ministry	105	2	103
Members of Kempei-tai	40,217	999	39,218
Members of Tokumu-bu	43	0	43
Members of Tokumu Kikan	865	6	859
Category C			
Founders, officers and influential members of secret patriotic or ultra-nationalistic societies	3,206	140	3,066
Category D	34,216	643	33,573
Imperial Rule Assistance Association	16,913	207	16,706
Imperial Rule Assistance Youth Association	16,572	408	16,164
Council for Establishing Imperial Rule Assistance Political Societies	576	13	563
Political Association of Great Japan	14	0	14
Other affiliates of Imperial Rule Assistance Association	141	15	126
Category E			
Financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion	401	10	391
Category F			
Governors of occupied territories	44	1	43
Category G	43,992	1,222	42,770
Economic organizations	936	22	914
Special companies and special banks in which the Government is largest stockholder	0	0	0
Companies and organizations designated by the Temporary Supply and Demand Adjustment Law	0	0	0
Organizations established and subsidized by the Government	0	0	0

PURGE STATISTICS FOR PROVISIONAL DESIGNATION

	Persons Provisionally Designated	Persons Passed	Persons Finally Designated
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations (located in Japan)	681	15	666
Influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations (located outside Japan)	255	7	248
Other influential companies and financial institutions	0	0	0
Public Information Media Organizations	967	110	857
Government Information Media Control Agencies	62	3	59
Officials of newspaper companies and news agencies	276	20	256
Book and magazine publishers	255	42	213
Motion picture and theatrical companies	28	0	28
Broadcasting corporations	15	0	15
Writers	331	45	286
Recommended candidates of 1942 elections	353	0	353
Principal officials of Ex-Servicemen's Associations	40,802	1,058	39,744
Officials of Butokukai	823	32	791
Others	111	0	111
GRAND TOTAL	204,304	11,124	193,180

SOURCE: Secretariat of the Central Screening Committee.

As a final action of this phase of the purge program five additional persons were reinstated upon recommendation of the Prime Minister on 19 July. These changes in status are not reflected in the foregoing summaries.

A cabinet pronouncement effective 11 May established an advisory group for Public Office Qualifications Examination within the Prime Minister's Office. It will assist the Prime Minister in the routine checking of the eligibility of applicants and nominees for positions in the public service.

In May the Investigation Bureau of the Attorney General's Office, established by law 15 February and now organizationally complete with local bureaus in the eight regions of Japan, began to function. Action taken in accordance with its mission of observing and investigating compliance with the injunctions against return to public leadership by purgees included the completion of the investigation of violations and referral of the cases to the Public Procurator's Office for prosecution. The Bureau is continuing investigation and surveillance of purged organizations and individuals.

Purge Background

Hans Baerwald

THE PURGE

Joint Press Conference of Civil Information & Education Section and Government Section. Statement made at 1000 on 26 February 1947.

The enforcement of the new Constitution on the third of May inaugurates perhaps the most significant period in Japan's history, a period which will provide one of the most important chapters of contemporary history, a period marked by the concerted effort of its people through the machinery of a democratic government to reform, peacefully and through non-violent means, its political, social and economic structure on a scale and on a time-schedule unprecedented to date.

Success or failure in carrying out these reforms will determine the degree to which the present and future generations of Japan will benefit from the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by their new Constitution. This vast reform program, however, requires the full cooperation of every citizen of Japan.

Specifically, the responsibility for this program is shared by the Government, private economic enterprise and the cultural institutions. All of these groups are charged with full responsibility - and are mutually inter-dependent.

The elections scheduled during the month of April constitute a challenge to the Japanese people which will test their capacity to choose a government capable of leading them to a full realization of the benefits inherent in a democratic state.

Two conditions, however, limit the full and effective exercise of power by the people. These conditions are:

a. The degree of knowledge possessed by the people concerning basic issues and the methods to be used in dealing with them.

b. The continued exercise or acquisition of influence and power in Government and in social, political and economic institutions by persons who were responsible for the suppression, excessive regimentation or exploitation of the people, and who developed and executed a series of wars, the full consequence of which you are well aware.

This latter condition can seriously retard the achievement of reforms which the citizens desire and toward which the Government is working.

You are also acquainted with the fact that the Government last year on the 4th of January undertook a systematic program for the detection and elimination of these undesirable persons from public life, and that on 4 January of this year the Government promulgated Imperial and cabinet ordinances extending this program to local government and to influential political and economic posts.

The Government, however, cannot be charged with sole responsibility for the successful accomplishment of the purge program. All private citizens share this responsibility. The Government can successfully administer this program only with the full and intelligent cooperation of the people.

The people can cooperate effectively only if they possess the necessary information.

The transmission of necessary information to the citizens of Japan is the moral, if not the technical, responsibility of the press and other public information media. To date the press has not fully discharged this responsibility.

You are urged, therefore, to make the utmost effort to inform every responsible citizen in Japan of his responsibility in this matter and of the manner in which he can effectively assist his Government.

All of you know the provisions of the so-called Purge ordinances of 1946 and 1947. It is not necessary to review them. However, certain recent press and editorial comments and requests for information which have been received by the Government and SCAP indicate a certain lack of understanding concerning certain provisions of the ordinances, the general method by which the Purge program is being administered by the Government, and the manner in which the public may participate. Some of the most significant questions and matters requiring clarification are:

1. What is the legal basis of the Purge?

The Program for the removal and exclusion of undesirable personnel from public office is based upon SCAPIN 550 of 4 January 1946, as implemented by Imperial and cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinances.

2. How is the Purge program administered and who is responsible?

The Government is responsible for the administration of the Purge program in accordance with the provisions of Imperial ordinances Nos. 1 and 2 of 1947, and cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, and such amendments and interpretations as may be subsequently issued.

The mechanics of administration are based upon a public office qualifications screening system consisting

of a central screening committee responsible to the Prime Minister and 46 prefectural committees including the methropolis of Tokyo and the five principal cities of Osaka, Kobe, Yokohama, Kyoto and Nagoya. The committees of the 41 prefectures, including the metropolis of Tokyo, are responsible to their respective governors, and the committees of the five principal cities are responsible to their respective mayors. Furthermore, there are 118 municipal committees in cities with a population of 50,000 or more who are responsible under their respective mayors to the governors of the prefectures in which they are located.

The Prime Minister makes the final decisions on cases screened by the central committee. The governors and the mayors of the 5 principal cities make all final decisions on cases screened by the committees under their jurisdiction. The mayors of the 118 cities having municipal committees recommend action on cases screened by their respective committees to the governor of the prefecture or metropolis of Tokyo or the mayor of any of the five principal cities in which they are located.

3. What is the definition and scope of public service?

The term public service includes:

a. National, prefectural, city, town and village governments.

b. The Imperial Diet, commissions or committees at the prefectural level or above, provided by law and ordinance, and in the case of land committees includes those of cities, towns or villages.

c. Organizations, etc. listed under the following categories in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 1947:

(1) Special companies, corporations (Hidans) special banks and other companies in which the government or listed organizations of this type, are the largest stockholders.

(2) Companies or other corporations designated under the temporary supply and demand adjustment law.

(3) Organizations established under special legislation, organizations subsidized by the government or corresponding organizations serving the public.

(4) Principal newspaper companies, news agencies, publishing companies, motion picture and theater companies, broadcasting corporations and other media of mass communication.

d. Political parties represented in the Diet and their branches and other organizations required to file a declaration under the provisions of Imperial Ordinance No. 101 of 1946.

4. What do the terms principal public office and ordinary public office mean?

a. Principal public office in the national government means any position customarily filled by a person with a civil service rank of Chokunin or above, or its equivalent, or any person not a member of the civil service having an equivalent or superior rank.

b. Ordinary public office in the national government means all other positions, including the

lowest civil service rank or its equivalent.

c. Principal public office in the prefectural, city, town or village government and in the organizations listed or referred to in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 means only those positions specifically designated by title under the appropriate provisions of the ordinances.

d. Ordinary public office in the case of prefectural, town, city, or village governments means all positions other than those designated as principal public office.

e. Ordinary public office in organizations listed under the various categories enumerated in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 means only those persons specifically designated as such by title. It does not include undesignated positions of lesser importance.

5. Who is subject to screening?

All persons occupying positions designated as principal public office and all candidates for appointment or election to a principal or ordinary public office in the public service who have not previously been screened under the provisions of the Imperial and Cabinet Ordinances of 1947 previously referred to.

6. Who is subject to designation as an undesirable person and subject to removal or exclusion from the public service?

The following types of persons, as specifically defined in Appendix I of Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 are subject to disqualification:

a. War Criminals.

b. Career military and naval personnel, members of special police and officials of war ministries.

c. Influential members of ultra nationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic societies.

d. Persons influential in the activities of IRAA, IRAPS and the Political Association of Great Japan.

e. Officers of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion.

f. Additional militarists and ultra-nationalists. This category is specifically elaborated in an interpretation of Category "G" of SCAPIN 550 by the Japanese Government, which is appended to and forms an integral part of the Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947.

7. What are the non-succession provisions of the Purge Ordinances?

The so-called non-succession provisions refer to a provision in two different Imperial Ordinances, namely, Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, to the effect that any person who is a relative within the third degree of relationship by blood, marriage or adoption of any person designated as a purgee shall be ineligible for a period of ten years from the date of designation to succeed or be appointed to any position or positions in the public service from which the latter has been removed or specifically barred,

or to exercise any of the powers of the latter. A person affected by this provision is not, however, designated as a purgee or prohibited from being appointed to any other position in the public service, or from being a candidate for election to any public office, unless he is disqualified by some other provision of the ordinances. The second non-succession provision refers to the provision of Imperial Ordinance No. 3 of 1947 to the effect that persons who have held the position of mayor or deputy mayor, headman of a ward in Tokyo metropolis, headman or deputy headman of town or village, consecutively from the day of or prior to 1 September 1945, shall be barred, even though they do not fall under the pertinent provisions of Imperial and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Purge Ordinances. Persons affected under this provision are likewise not barred from appointment or election to any other position in the public service unless they fall under other disqualifying provisions of pertinent purge ordinances

8. Do the Ordinances provide penalty provisions?

Yes. Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 contains a clause providing for a maximum penalty of three years' imprisonment or a 15,000 yen fine for persons convicted of falsifying entries or of omitting information from their questionnaires on relevant and material matters or who otherwise fail to comply with official instructions concerning the screening procedure to which they are subject. The penalty provision is also applicable to persons violating various injunctions, of which the following are of particular significance:

1. Prohibition against any purgee maintaining the continuity of his influence or power through any person in the public service or in specified organizations;

2. Prohibition against any person in the public service seeking or accepting advice or guidance from a purgee;

3. Prohibition against any purgee occupying a position in a newspaper, magazine or other publishing company, broadcasting corporation, companies producing motion pictures or theatrical presentations, or companies controlling any other media of mass communication;

4. Prohibition against any purgee entering the premises of the governmental entity or other organization from which he has been removed or specifically barred.

9. Can persons designated as purgees and removed or barred from public service appeal for reconsideration, and if so, to whom do they appeal?

Yes. Any person who has been affected by the provisions of the so-called Purge Ordinances may appeal to the Prime Minister directly or through the prefectural governor if the prefectural governor was responsible for his designation.

10. Will all candidates for elective public office be screened before the election?

All candidates for membership in the House of Councillors and the House of Representatives, Governors of Prefectures, including Tokyo-to, mayors of cities and headmen of towns and villages will be screened before they are allowed to campaign for election. An exception, however, is made in the case of candidates for a prefectural, city, town or village assembly, in view of the tremendous number of applicants and of the limited time available before the elections. All candidates for these positions, however,

Must file a questionnaire in accordance with the regular procedure and such questionnaires will be made immediately available for public inspection and their names listed on special bulletins which are posted for public inspection.

11. How can the public obtain information concerning the screening program?

The Government, through the Prime Minister, the Governors and Mayors of the five principal cities, will release to the press, and post every two weeks, bulletins for public inspection listing the names of all persons whose cases have been reviewed by Screening Committees and on whom final action has been taken. These bulletins will indicate whether the persons have been passed, removed or barred from the Public Service, as well as the availability and location of questionnaires of the persons listed thereon for public inspection. The questionnaires of the persons whose names appear on the bulletin will be available for public inspection together with copies of the purge ordinances at the offices of The Screening Committees concerned. The questionnaires of candidates for elective positions will also be available at the office of the Appropriate Election Administration Committee. The public should make full use of their prerogative to examine the questionnaires of candidates for appointive and elective office. It is of particular importance that the public report to their respective Governors or to the Prime Minister any instances of falsification or omission of relevant or material information in the questionnaires which they examine, as well as violations of the injunctions previously referred to and of mal-administration by any official connected with the administration of the Purge.

12. How many candidates for elective public office will be screened before the election?

The Government estimates that there will be a total of 70,000 candidates for Governor, Mayor and Headman, and Member of the House of Councillors and House of Representatives, out of which 10,563 officials will be elected. It also estimates 26,200 Holders of Principal Public Office in Local Government and Organizations listed in the Purge Ordinances who will be screened before the elections are completed. This makes an estimated total of 96,200 persons whose screening will be completed by the 10th of May. The Government also estimates that there will be 1,111,500 candidates for Prefectural, City, Town and Village Assemblymen, of which 222,300 Assemblymen will be elected and post-screened.

13. Is the Purge a form of punishment for people considered undesirable?

No, the Purge Ordinances are not either in conception or in administration considered or used as a punitive measure. The Purge Ordinances and Screening System are a technique designed to eliminate or prevent the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons who are designated as undesirable personnel under their specific provisions and the Government will consider and correct any injustice in an individual case whenever reasonable proof of error or injustice is submitted.

The answers to the above questions represent the minimum amount of information required by any public spirited citizen who desires to share in the administration of his Government and to exercise his prerogatives in the selection of its public officials. It is, therefore, your duty and responsibility to see that this information is transmitted to the public.

THE PURGE

Joint Press Conference of Civil Information & Education Section and Government Section. Statement made at 1000 on 26 February 1947.

The enforcement of the new Constitution on the third of May inaugurates perhaps the most significant period in Japan's history, a period which will provide one of the most important chapters of contemporary history, a period marked by the concerted effort of its people through the machinery of a democratic government to reform, peacefully and through non-violent means, its political, social and economic structure on a scale and on a time-schedule unprecedented to date.

Success or failure in carrying out these reforms will determine the degree to which the present and future generations of Japan will benefit from the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by their new Constitution. This vast reform program, however, requires the full cooperation of every citizen of Japan.

Specifically, the responsibility for this program is shared by the Government, private economic enterprise and the cultural institutions. All of these groups are charged with full responsibility - and are mutually inter-dependent.

The elections scheduled during the month of April constitute a challenge to the Japanese people which will test their capacity to choose a government capable of leading them to a full realization of the benefits inherent in a democratic state.

Two conditions, however, limit the full and effective exercise of power by the people. These conditions are:

a. The degree of knowledge possessed by the people concerning basic issues and the methods to be used in dealing with them.

b. The continued exercise or acquisition of influence and power in Government and in social, political and economic institutions by persons who were responsible for the suppression, excessive regimentation or exploitation of the people, and who developed and executed a series of wars, the full consequence of which you are well aware.

This latter condition can seriously retard the achievement of reforms which the citizens desire and toward which the Government is working.

You are also acquainted with the fact that the Government last year on the 4th of January undertook a systematic program for the detection and elimination of these undesirable persons from public life, and that on 4 January of this year the Government promulgated Imperial and cabinet ordinances extending this program to local government and to influential political and economic posts.

The Government, however, cannot be charged with sole responsibility for the successful accomplishment of the purge program. All private citizens share this responsibility. The Government can successfully administer this program only with the full and intelligent cooperation of the people.

The people can cooperate effectively only if they possess the necessary information.

The transmission of necessary information to the citizens of Japan is the moral, if not the technical, responsibility of the press and other public information media. To date the press has not fully discharged this responsibility.

You are urged, therefore, to make the utmost effort to inform every responsible citizen in Japan of his responsibility in this matter and of the manner in which he can effectively assist his Government.

All of you know the provisions of the so-called Purge ordinances of 1946 and 1947. It is not necessary to review them. However, certain recent press and editorial comments and requests for information which have been received by the Government and SCAP indicate a certain lack of understanding concerning certain provisions of the ordinances, the general method by which the Purge program is being administered by the Government, and the manner in which the public may participate. Some of the most significant questions and matters requiring clarification are:

1. What is the legal basis of the Purge?

The Program for the removal and exclusion of undesirable personnel from public office is based upon SCAPIN 550 of 4 January 1946, as implemented by Imperial and cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinances.

2. How is the Purge program administered and who is responsible?

The Government is responsible for the administration of the Purge program in accordance with the provisions of Imperial ordinances Nos. 1 and 2 of 1947, and cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, and such amendments and interpretations as may be subsequently issued.

The mechanics of administration are based upon a public office qualifications screening system consisting

of a central screening committee responsible to the Prime Minister and 46 prefectural committees including the methropolis of Tokyo and the five principal cities of Osaka, Kobe, Yokohama, Kyoto and Nagoya. The committees of the 41 prefectures, including the metropolis of Tokyo, are responsible to their respective governors, and the committees of the five principal cities are responsible to their respective mayors. Furthermore, there are 118 municipal committees in cities with a population of 50,000 or more who are responsible under their respective mayors to the governors of the prefectures in which they are located.

The Prime Minister makes the final decisions on cases screened by the central committee. The governors and the mayors of the 5 principal cities make all final decisions on cases screened by the committees under their jurisdiction. The mayors of the 118 cities having municipal committees recommend action on cases screened by their respective committees to the governor of the prefecture or metropolis of Tokyo or the mayor of any of the five principal cities in which they are located.

3. What is the definition and scope of public service?

The term public service includes:

a. National, prefectural, city, town and village governments.

b. The Imperial Diet, commissions or committees at the prefectural level or above, provided by law and ordinance, and in the case of land committees includes those of cities, towns or villages.

c. Organizations, etc. listed under the following categories in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 1947:

(1) Special companies, corporations (Zaidans) special banks and other companies in which the government or listed organizations of this type, are the largest stockholders.

(2) Companies or other corporations designated under the temporary supply and demand adjustment law.

(3) Organizations established under special legislation, organizations subsidized by the government or corresponding organizations serving the public.

(4) Principal newspaper companies, news agencies, publishing companies, motion picture and theater companies, broadcasting corporations and other media of mass communication.

d. Political parties represented in the Diet and their branches and other organizations required to file a declaration under the provisions of Imperial Ordinance No. 101 of 1946.

4. What do the terms principal public office and ordinary public office mean?

a. Principal public office in the national government means any position customarily filled by a person with a civil service rank of Chokunin or above, or its equivalent, or any person not a member of the civil service having an equivalent or superior rank.

b. Ordinary public office in the national government means all other positions, including the

lowest civil service rank or its equivalent.

c. Principal public office in the prefectural, city, town or village government and in the organizations listed or referred to in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 means only those positions specifically designated by title under the appropriate provisions of the ordinances.

d. Ordinary public office in the case of prefectural, town, city, or village governments means all positions other than those designated as principal public office.

e. Ordinary public office in organizations listed under the various categories enumerated in Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 means only those persons specifically designated as such by title. It does not include undesignated positions of lesser importance.

5. Who is subject to screening?

All persons occupying positions designated as principal public office and all candidates for appointment or election to a principal or ordinary public office in the public service who have not previously been screened under the provisions of the Imperial and Cabinet Ordinances of 1947 previously referred to.

6. Who is subject to designation as an undesirable person and subject to removal or exclusion from the public service?

The following types of persons, as specifically defined in Appendix I of Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 are subject to disqualification:

a. War Criminals.

b. Career military and naval personnel, members of special police and officials of war ministries.

c. Influential members of ultra nationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic societies.

d. Persons influential in the activities of IRAA, IRAPS and the Political Association of Great Japan.

e. Officers of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion.

f. Additional militarists and ultra-nationalists. This category is specifically elaborated in an interpretation of Category "G" of SCAPIN 550 by the Japanese Government, which is appended to and forms an integral part of the Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947.

7. What are the non-succession provisions of the Purge Ordinances?

The so-called non-succession provisions refer to a provision in two different Imperial Ordinances, namely, Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, to the effect that any person who is a relative within the third degree of relationship by blood, marriage or adoption of any person designated as a purgee shall be ineligible for a period of ten years from the date of designation to succeed or be appointed to any position or positions in the public service from which the latter has been removed or specifically barred,

or to exercise any of the powers of the latter. A person affected by this provision is not, however, designated as a purgee or prohibited from being appointed to any other position in the public service, or from being a candidate for election to any public office, unless he is disqualified by some other provision of the ordinances. The second non-succession provision refers to the provision of Imperial Ordinance No. 3 of 1947 to the effect that persons who have held the position of mayor or deputy mayor, headman of a ward in Tokyo metropolis, headman or deputy headman of town or village, consecutively from the day of or prior to 1 September 1945, shall be barred, even though they do not fall under the pertinent provisions of Imperial and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Purge Ordinances. Persons affected under this provision are likewise not barred from appointment or election to any other position in the public service unless they fall under other disqualifying provisions of pertinent purge ordinances

8. Do the Ordinances provide penalty provisions?

Yes. Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 contains a clause providing for a maximum penalty of three years' imprisonment or a 15,000 yen fine for persons convicted of falsifying entries or of omitting information from their questionnaires on relevant and material matters or who otherwise fail to comply with official instructions concerning the screening procedure to which they are subject. The penalty provision is also applicable to persons violating various injunctions, of which the following are of particular significance:

1. Prohibition against any purgee maintaining the continuity of his influence or power through any person in the public service or in specified organizations;

2. Prohibition against any person in the public service seeking or accepting advice or guidance from a purgee;

3. Prohibition against any purgee occupying a position in a newspaper, magazine or other publishing company, broadcasting corporation, companies producing motion pictures or theatrical presentations, or companies controlling any other media of mass communication;

4. Prohibition against any purgee entering the premises of the governmental entity or other organization from which he has been removed or specifically barred.

9. Can persons designated as purgees and removed or barred from public service appeal for reconsideration, and if so, to whom do they appeal?

Yes. Any person who has been affected by the provisions of the so-called Purge Ordinances may appeal to the Prime Minister directly or through the prefectural governor if the prefectural governor was responsible for his designation.

10. Will all candidates for elective public office be screened before the election?

All candidates for membership in the House of Councillors and the House of Representatives, Governors of Prefectures, including Tokyo-to, mayors of cities and headmen of towns and villages will be screened before they are allowed to campaign for election. An exception, however, is made in the case of candidates for a prefectural, city, town or village assembly, in view of the tremendous number of applicants and of the limited time available before the elections. All candidates for these positions, however,

Must file a questionnaire in accordance with the regular procedure and such questionnaires will be made immediately available for public inspection and their names listed on special bulletins which are posted for public inspection.

11. How can the public obtain information concerning the screening program?

The Government, through the Prime Minister, the Governors and Mayors of the five principal cities, will release to the press, and post every two weeks, bulletins for public inspection listing the names of all persons whose cases have been reviewed by Screening Committees and on whom final action has been taken. These bulletins will indicate whether the persons have been passed, removed or barred from the Public Service, as well as the availability and location of questionnaires of the persons listed thereon for public inspection. The questionnaires of the persons whose names appear on the bulletin will be available for public inspection together with copies of the purge ordinances at the offices of The Screening Committees concerned. The questionnaires of candidates for elective positions will also be available at the office of the Appropriate Election Administration Committee. The public should make full use of their prerogative to examine the questionnaires of candidates for appointive and elective office. It is of particular importance that the public report to their respective Governors or to the Prime Minister any instances of falsification or omission of relevant or material information in the questionnaires which they examine, as well as violations of the injunctions previously referred to and of mal-administration by any official connected with the administration of the Purge.

12. How many candidates for elective public office will be screened before the election?

The Government estimates that there will be a total of 70,000 candidates for Governor, Mayor and Headman, and Member of the House of Councillors and House of Representatives, out of which 10,563 officials will be elected. It also estimates 26,200 Holders of Principal Public Office in Local Government and Organizations listed in the Purge Ordinances who will be screened before the elections are completed. This makes an estimated total of 96,200 persons whose screening will be completed by the 10th of May. The Government also estimates that there will be 1,111,500 candidates for Prefectural, City, Town and Village Assemblymen, of which 222,300 Assemblymen will be elected and post-screened.

13. Is the Purge a form of punishment for people considered undesirable?

No, the Purge Ordinances are not either in conception or in administration considered or used as a punitive measure. The Purge Ordinances and Screening System are a technique designed to eliminate or prevent the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons who are designated as undesirable personnel under their specific provisions and the Government will consider and correct any injustice in an individual case whenever reasonable proof of error or injustice is submitted.

The answers to the above questions represent the minimum amount of information required by any public spirited citizen who desires to share in the administration of his Government and to exercise his prerogatives in the selection of its public officials. It is, therefore, your duty and responsibility to see that this information is transmitted to the public.

1 August 1947

THE PURGE

On 4 January 1946 the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers issued a sweeping directive requiring a purge of all persons who shared responsibility for Japan's program of aggression.

This directive, issued as SCAPIN 550, was designed to remove undesirable persons from positions of influence and authority in the political, economic and social life of Japan. For the fields of education and police, separate similar programs had been initiated as early as October 1945.

The removal and exclusion program has never been either in concept or administration a punitive measure but was and is a technique designed to eliminate the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons whose past careers showed them to be undesirable leaders for a nation dedicated to democracy and the cause of world peace.

BASIS FOR THE PURGE

Potsdam Declaration

The international basis for the entire purge program is found in that part of the Potsdam Declaration which states, "There must be removed for all time the authority and influence of those who deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world".

Occupation Directives

In accordance with initial U. S. Post-Surrender Policy for Japan SCAP was directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that no persons be "allowed to hold public office or any other positions of responsibility or influence in public or important private enterprise who have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression, who have been influential members of any Japanese ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic society". . . . . who have been influential in the activities of Imperial Rule Assistance Organizations, "or who manifest hostility to the objectives of the occupation".

SCAP was further directed to prohibit the retention in, or selection for, positions of important responsibility in industry, finance, commerce, agriculture, or public or private financial institutions, agencies or organizations, of any persons who have been active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, and of all those who do not direct future Japanese economic effort solely toward peaceful ends.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, SCAP was directed to assume that persons who held key positions of high responsibility since 1937 in any of the fields enumerated above have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression.

THE 4 JANUARY 1946 DIRECTIVE

SCAPIN 550 which has become famous as the "4 January Directive" is SCAP's implementation of the early instructions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Purge Categories

This basic directive ordered the Japanese Government to remove from public office and to exclude from government service exponents of militant nationalism and aggression falling within the following defined categories:

Category A. War Criminals

Category B. Career Military and Naval Personnel: Special Police and Officers of the War Ministries.

This category included members of the Board of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshals, the Supreme Military Council, the Imperial General Headquarters, the Army and Navy General Staffs, and the Supreme Council for direction of the war; all career commissioned officers and enlisted personnel who served in or with the military or naval police or other special or secret intelligence police organizations; and all persons who served as higher officials in the Ministry of War or Ministry of Navy.

Category C. Influential Members of Ultranationalistic, Terroristic or Secret Patriotic Societies.

Founders, officers, directors and other important officials, large financial contributors to, or editor of any publication or organ of such societies.

Category D. Persons Influential in the Activities of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society, and the Political Association of Great Japan.

National officers, leading officials in Prefectural or Metropolitan subdivisions, editor of any publication or organ of the above or agencies or affiliates of the above organizations.

Category E. Officers of Financial and Development Organizations involved in Japanese Expansion.

Persons who between 7 July 1937 and 2 September 1945 were directors, presidents, vice presidents, advisors, auditors or controlling branch managers in Japanese occupied territory of above institutions.

Category F. Governors of Occupied Territories.

Certain specified higher officials such as governor general, civil administrator, and military administrator in Japan's wartime colonial empire.

Category G. Additional Militarists and Ultranationalists.

These broad provisions bring under the terms of the directive:

1. Any person who has denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the militaristic regime.

2. Any person who has instigated or perpetuated an act of violence against opponents of the militaristic regime.

3. Any person who has played an active and predominant governmental part in the Japanese program of aggression or who by speech, writing or action has shown himself to be an active exponent of militant nationalism and aggression.

INITIAL ACTION OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTING THE PURGE DIRECTIVE

Ordinances Issued

On 27 February 1946 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 109 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1946 which established the machinery for applying the Directive. These ordinances determined, first, who should be screened, second, who should be classified as undesirable in light of the Directive and third, how the removal of undesirables should be accomplished.

By the terms of these ordinances all incumbent officials of the then first three civil service grades, and those who held positions of comparable authority, all staff officers of 114 listed corporations, associations and other organizations under the special control of the government, and all applicants for future elective or appointive posts in the national government were subject to screening to determine their eligibility.

The seven categories of undesirables outlined by the Directive were defined in greater detail by the ordinances as follows:

1. No change was made in the category applying to war criminals (Category A).

2. The one affecting career military and naval personnel (Category B) remained substantially the same.

3. The provisions of Category C were defined as applying to influential members of 123 listed ultranationalistic or secret patriotic societies.

4. The many agencies and affiliates of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations (Category D) were enumerated and the influential positions in each duly listed.

5. The number of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion (Category E), as listed in the original directive, was increased.

6. The exact titles and positions of high Japanese officials in occupied territories (Category E) were defined.

7. The broad provisions of Category G were extensively interpreted by a special cabinet announcement appearing shortly after the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance 109.

It brought under the purge memorandum all persons who had occupied certain policy-forming positions on the highest government level between the outbreak of "The China Incident" and the Surrender.

It listed other high government positions of somewhat lesser importance and provided for the purge of individuals who had occupied them providing there was conspicious evidence that these individuals have played an important part: (a) in the conclusion of alliances with the Axis or with puppet nations in preparation for the Greater East Asia War, (b) in the suppression of opponents of militarism, (c) in concluding economic agreements with occupied countries, (d) in the financial or production program for Japanese military activities.

The interpretation of Category G also brought under the purge: (a) those officials who had over a long period of time engaged in the suppression of civil liberties, (b) other officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had participated in activities proscribed under Category G, (c) officials of companies that had produced the weapons and sinews of war, (d) highest officers of patriotic societies not listed under Category C and (e) any person who was recommended as a candidate by the TOJO Government in 1942.

The ordinances provided for a screening committee to examine questionnaires and to decide upon individual eligibility. In the event that the individual was found to fall under the criteria as defined in the ordinance, the Prime Minister was to designate him as an undesirable person, and to order his removal and exclusion from office. The ordinances also provided for the collection of questionnaires and contained a penalty clause designed to insure that such questionnaires would be filled out truthfully and completely.

Initial Operation and Effect Of The Purge

The impact of the Purge Directive was immediate and profound. On 13 January 1946, only 9 days after the Directive was issued, the Cabinet of Baron Kijuro Shidehara underwent extensive re-organization. Three ministers and six cabinet executives and many other high government officials resigned. In view of the imminence of the approaching April elections the government released the criteria as soon as they had been determined in the form of Cabinet announcements, without waiting until the entire bill had been written. Thus, by the end of February when Imperial Ordinance No. 109 was officially promulgated, action had already been taken to bring under the purge (a) persons who had been influential in patriotic and secret societies, (b) influential members of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations, and (c) career naval and military personnel, of whom approximately 183,000 were barred from the Public Service.

On 10 March 1946, the day of the Cabinet announcement interpreting Category G, the Shidehara Cabinet sustained a second wave of resignations; five ministers retired. Many members of the House of Peers followed suit. Within the month 30 new appointees, duly screened under the new ordinances, were appointed to fill the vacancies thus created.

That part of the 10 March interpretation which rendered ineligible for public service all members of the Lower House who had been recommended by the Tojo Government greatly altered the political scene. Leadership of political parties changed, political allegiances shifted and new candidates were sought to replace those previously scheduled to run in the April

elections. Of the 3,384 candidates for the Lower House, 252 were barred. Of the 252 barred, 113 were candidates recommended by Prime Minister Tojo in the 1942 elections. Another 268 "recommended candidates" did not file.

When the Diet convened on 20 June 1946 all successful candidates to the Lower House were re-screened and their cases reviewed. As a result ten more were removed, nine of these by Japanese Government order and one, Ichiro Hatoyama, leader of the Liberal Party, by SCAP directive.

On 16 May 1946 the Japanese Government prepared a still more comprehensive and detailed interpretation of those paragraphs of Category G relating to other government officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had engaged in activities proscribed under the Directive. These extended criteria were not publicly announced at the time lest such an announcement interfere with the completion of screening by the scheduled deadline. Nevertheless, this document represented an early extension of the purge program into industry and the field of public information, an extension to be perfected and completed the following year.

Statistical Summary

By August 1946 the Japanese Government announced the substantial completion of the initial phase of the purge program. The Privy Council, the Diet, the Cabinet, Prefectural Governors, all officials of the then first three ranks, judges of higher courts, officials of government controlled companies, procurators of certain higher courts, and officials of higher educational institutions directly under the Ministry of Education had all been screened. These totalled 5,520 persons, of which 814 were barred or removed, and 4,706 were passed. This figure was subsequently increased by 4 January 1947 to 8,899 persons screened, of which 7,832 had been passed and 1,067 barred or removed. In addition 183,000 career officers of the army and navy, members of the gendarmerie and former intelligence agents had been categorically barred. The way was now clear for the anticipated extension of the program to local government, to industry and to the field of public information.

EXTENSION OF PURGE PROGRAM

Preliminary Steps

In August 1946 a statement of SCAP policy was issued requiring the Japanese Government to prepare a comprehensive plan for: (a) the exclusion from prefectural and municipal assemblies and from appointive posts of all personnel deemed undesirable under the provisions of SCAPIN 550; (b) the application of that directive to all elections of members of both Houses of the Diet; (c) the exclusion of all purged personnel from any influential political or economic posts. This statement also provided that the Japanese Government should publish the full text of the plan simultaneously with its submission to SCAP.

The Extension Plan

On 22 October the government submitted to SCAP and simultaneously released to the public a plan which comprehensively implemented the 4 January Directive.

In the ensuing two months the essential features of this plan were incorporated into definitive and appropriate form for issuance as law.

The Extension Ordinances

On 4 January 1947, one year from issuance of the original directive, the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of 1947 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947, thus implementing all the features of the approved plan. These ordinances contained provisions which were designed to reach into all fields.

Criteria for Screening

The screenable positions were extended to include all elective and appointive posts in the national and local governments and specified positions in certain companies, associations, mass communication media and other organizations. These latter were defined to be positions in: companies in which the government had special interests; organizations subsidized by the government or serving for the public benefit; principle newspaper companies, news agencies, publishing companies, motion picture and theatrical companies, broadcasting corporations and other media of mass communication; political parties, their branches and similar organizations; and influential companies, financial institutions and other economic organizations. The specific offices considered to be policy-making positions and approximately 470 such companies, organizations, etc., were specifically listed.

Criteria for Purging

In a manner similar to that in which definition of screenable positions was enlarged, the purge criteria were also more specifically defined.

No changes were made in the definition of the categories applicable to war criminals (Category A) career military and naval personnel, etc. (Category B), officials of financial and development companies involved in Japanese expansion (Category E) and officials in occupied territories (Category F). With regard to the influential members of ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic societies (Category C) the criteria were specifically defined to include those persons in the local branches thereof who had held positions comparable to those previously defined as applying only to the national level. The criteria applicable to persons influential in the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, (Category D) were further defined in the case of parent organizations and major affiliates to include officials of all local subdivisions thereof, down to and including chiefs of town and village branches.

The category in which the most far-reaching and comprehensive definitions were made was that applying to additional militarists and ultranationalists (Category G).

The provision in this category, implemented by Cabinet announcement of 10 March 1946 described heretofore, which applied to government officials and professional men who had participated in activities such as mentioned in this category was defined more clearly. Those falling under the provisions of the ordinance were government officials who took part in the planning or execution of propaganda or dissemination of news for the purpose of (1) instigating war; (2) suppressing opponents of jingoism; (3) advocating dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, and militarism or ultranationalism; (4) guiding or controlling thought or speech for the same purpose; (5) political direction or economic exploitation of Japanese occupied territories; (6) furthering

important plans for wartime general mobilization or economic control, and other plans for the direction of war.

Diet members in or outside the Diet who had in writing, speech or action been conspicuously active in instigating or directing war, suppressing opponents of jingoism or inspiring dictatorship, totalitarianism of the Nazi or Fascist pattern, militarism or ultranationalism were considered undesirable within the purview of the provision.

Men of letters and artists who by their works had advocated aggression or militant nationalism, actively contributed to such propaganda, or who through their political or philosophic doctrine laid down an ideological basis for the policies for the Greater East Asia, or New Order in the East Asia or policies of a similar nature, or the China Incident or the Pacific War; who had advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation to be a leader of other nations or who cooperated actively with propaganda of the above effect; who persecuted or denounced liberals or anti-militarists for their liberal or antimilitaristic ideologies; or who in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism were by this provision brought under the terms of the Directive. This added definition made it possible to measure by a clearer standard the writings, speeches, articles, news reports, etc. of this group of people.

Closely associated with the above was the more elaborate interpretation of the criteria as applied to the principal officials and editorial personnel of organizations in the information media field. As published in the Cabinet Ordinance certain officials of newspaper companies, magazine or book publishing companies, broadcasting corporations, companies producing motion pictures or theatrical presentations and any other media of mass communication in or outside Japan who held office during the period between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 and whose companies engaged in the activities listed in the preceding paragraph as criteria for judging men of letters and artists were brought under the Directive. These listed officials were the Chairman, Vice-chairman, President, Vice-president, Managing Director, Standing Director, Chief of Compilation Bureau, Chief of Research Bureau, Editor-in-Chief, Managing Editor, Chief of Editorial Staff, or any other official who exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above positions. Previously the criteria as it applied to the information media field had been so vaguely defined as to be difficult of application; this had largely been remedied.

Perhaps the most sweeping extension of the provisions of this broad category, was in the interpretations as they applied to certain top officials of what had previously been referred to as "influential companies or national policy companies manufacturing finished aircraft or arms or producing iron or steel." This category had now been broadened to include all policy-making officials down to but not including ordinary directors, but including all other officials, regardless of title, who in fact exercised authority or influence commensurate with that of any of the above in any company which was conspicuously influential in the manufacture of strategic or critical material of war, conspicuously monopolistic in the production of basic productive materials or business of communications or transportation, or domestic or foreign trade; holding companies or influential companies closely associated thereto; and companies capitalized in excess of one hundred million yen or which had commanded excessive economic power. Two hundred and forty-six such companies were listed in the ordinance.

Injunctions

Contained in Imperial Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 are four injunctions designed to prevent the continuity of influence and power by purgees in those positions and organizations in the public service from which they had been removed. Penalty clauses are included which make violators of the above injunctions liable to confinement for not more than three years or to a fine not exceeding 15,000 yen.

Non-Succession Provisions

A feature designed to allow new leadership to come to the front in municipal governments was incorporated in Imperial Ordinances Nos. 3 and 4 of 1947, also issued on 4 January 1947. These ordinances provided that mayors, deputy-mayors, headmen of wards in Tokyo, headmen and deputy-headmen of towns and villages and headmen of federations of neighborhood associations (CHONAI KAI CHO and BURAKU KAI CHO), who had held such positions consecutively from 1 September 1945 until 1 September 1946, even though they did not fall under the provisions of the purge ordinance, were to be barred from filing as candidates for those respective positions for a period of four years. So much of this as it applied to the headmen of federations of neighborhood associations was revoked when, on 3 March 1947, these federations were abolished.

Administration

Because of the increased amount of screening anticipated at all levels, estimated by the government at between 500,000 and 700,000 cases, a reorganization of the screening system was effected by the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance No. 2 of 1947.

This ordinance provided for one Central Public Office Qualifications Examination Committee, forty-six Prefectural Committees (including 5 major cities) and 118 Municipal Committees (cities with population of 50,000 or more).

The Central Committee was made responsible to the Prime Minister who makes final decision on all cases screened by that committee. The local committees make recommendations to their respective prefectural governors who give final decision thereon.

The Central Committee's authority was limited to positions in the national government, positions in organizations comparable thereto, and the top elective posts of the prefectures and 5 principal cities. All other posts in local government and those in local branches of screenable organizations were within the screening authority of the local committees.

Publicity

The results obtained by the publicity of the extended purge plan in October 1946 made it desirable that in the future all activities and results in connection with the purge be given wide publicity. This publicity program is accomplished in several ways. The Central Government, through the Prime Minister, the governors, and the mayors of the five principal cities, releases to the press and posts semi-monthly bulletins listing by name all those persons who have been screened during the preceding two weeks, together with results of the screening. The questionnaires of all such persons together with copies of the purge ordinances are made available for public inspection at the offices of the screening committees concerned. A copy of the questionnaire of each candidate is

also available for public inspection at the office of the appropriate election administration committee, as well as the screening committee's office. News releases and radio broadcasts explain to the people not only the purpose behind the purge but also the important provisions of the purge ordinances.

Schedule of Screening

The order in which various groups would be screened was determined by schedule. Proposed appointees for local committees were screened first. The general elections then impending necessitated screening election officials and candidates next. Screening of economic entities, principal public offices, political parties and public information media organizations followed.

Activities Prior to Elections

Prior to the General Elections in April 1947 all candidates for the more important elective posts were screened and the following report made by the Japanese Government:

Candidates	Filed	Passed	*Provisionally Passed	Barred
House of Representatives	3,426	3,230	59	137
House of Councillors	1,406	1,365	10	31
Prefectural Governors	451	428	3	20
Mayors of 5 Principal Cities	43	42	-	1

*No final decision could be reached in these cases noted as "provisionally passed" because research in the information media field had not been completed.

During the same period the Local Committees screened an estimated 72,550 candidates for headmen of wards, towns, and villages; 21,126 candidates for deputy-mayors, deputy-headmen and accountants of cities, towns and villages; and about 42,252 members of election administrative committees.

Activities Subsequent to Elections

Subsequent to the elections and prior to assuming office, successful candidates for the important elective posts, screened by the Central Committee were re-examined. Eleven members-elect to the House of Representatives and four members-elect to the House of Councillors were removed. One of those removed was ISHIBASHI, Tanzan, former Finance Minister of the Yoshida Cabinet.

The Central Screening Committee also post-screened 2,803 successful candidates for prefectural assemblies and 284 assemblymen of the five principal cities.

During the same period the Local Committees post-screened 158,757 persons who had been elected to the assemblies of cities, wards, towns and villages.

Economic Phase

This phase began about 15 April 1947, at which time it was estimated that 3,200 persons holding policy positions in approximately 300 companies would require screening.

By the middle of July 1947 approximately 3,150 persons holding leading and influential positions in over 240 companies had been screened and their cases reviewed by SCAP; a total of 292 persons had been removed and/or excluded from public

service. There remained the screening of those persons whose questionnaires had not yet been obtained, the seeking out of those whose positions were not listed in the mandatory provisions of the ordinances but who had, nevertheless, exercised influence and authority commensurate with such listed positions and the formal designation of those who had resigned to escape the legal injunctions against purgees.

Public Information Media Purge

Paragraph 5 of the "remarks" section of Appendix I, Cabinet and Home Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1947 constituted the basis of the Public Information Media Purge. This paragraph brings under the provisions of the Directive any scholar, journalist or editor and any principal official of a publishing house, newspaper or magazine, broadcasting corporation, motion picture or theatrical company who between 7 July 1937 and 7 December 1941 advocated aggression, or militant nationalism, espoused totalitarianism or advocated the supremacy of the Japanese nation over other nations, denounced liberals and anti-militarists, or in any other way advocated or championed militarism or ultranationalism.

The just and equitable application of these provisions necessitated extensive research in every field of public information, including not only a study of the media itself but of the organizational structure of public information companies. This program was undertaken in March 1947 by a Cabinet Secretariat sub-committee, which during the ensuing three months compiled a list of 225 newspapers and news agencies, 15 motion picture companies, 5 broadcasting companies and 5 organizations controlling the dissemination of information, deemed to have engaged in activities proscribed under Category G. This list was published as part of an amendment to the "remarks" outlined above. This amendment brought under the provisions of the Directive specified officeholders in listed companies but provided an opportunity for any individual or company to produce satisfactory evidence as to why exemption should be granted.

PROVISIONAL DESIGNATION

This term grew out of the need to prevent persons who had resigned to escape being purged from legally continuing their influence, which they might have exercised as long as they did not publicly commit actions or assume positions legally screenable. They also received pensions and other benefits to which, if they had been purged, they would not be entitled.

On 12 March 1947 the government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 77, which is primarily directed against those potential or "invisible" purgees who engage in political activity, and as such cannot effectively be applied to all "invisible purgees".

On 2 July 1947, the government issued Cabinet Order No. 119 of 1947 which provides that the Prime Minister can effect the provisional designation of any person concerning whom there is sufficient evidence to indicate that he falls within the purview of the Memorandum. This designation is effected by individually notifying the persons concerned. A period of thirty days is provided from the date of receipt of such designation during which the person so notified can, if he so desires, file a letter of exemption with a questionnaire which is examined and processed in the normal manner. If no such exception is filed within the thirty day period, the designation becomes effective under the provisions of

the basic Ordinance, and is publicly announced and made a matter of official record.

By the end of July 1947 documentary evidence had been submitted listing substantially all officials who held policy positions in the designated economic companies between 7 July 1937 to 2 September 1945. Of these approximately 800 clearly fell under the provisions of the Memorandum, an additional 200 were deceased, the addresses of some 200 were unknown, and more than 500 will be required to submit questionnaires.

Lists of persons coming within the purview of the categories pertaining to war criminals (Category A) and to career military and naval personnel (Category B) are under preparation.

Preparation commenced on 10 July 1947 of a list of persons who held the policy-making positions in the public information media companies and organizations. It is estimated that this list will be completed as soon after 30 July 1947 as all "evidence to the contrary" can be fully considered.

The collection of documentary evidence insofar as it affects the former officers and persons of authority in secret, patriotic, ultranationalistic and militaristic societies is currently in progress.

APPEAL BOARD

On 23 February 1947 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 65 of 1947 setting up a Board of Appeal. Prior to this time any person, who felt that a mistake had been made or an injustice committed in his case could appeal to the Prime Minister. However, relatively few such appeals had been received. But with the greatly enlarged amount of screening conducted, appeals increased until by July 1947 a total of 99 was listed with the Appeal Board. Of these, 36 were rejected or recommended for rejection, 9 recommended for reinstatement, while 54 were undergoing either examination or deliberation. Initially Ordinance No. 65 provided that before an appeal could be submitted an appellant must have vacated his position; however, in July 1947, this provision of the Ordinance was revoked and appeal is now possible immediately upon designation. At first the Appeal Board was handicapped by lack of a sufficient secretariat but recently a Cabinet Order was issued which provided a secretariat sufficiently large to enable the Board to investigate and prepare cases more promptly.

SUMMARY

From its inception the Purge has remained preventative. Although SCAP was authorized to intern active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, the desire to preserve the preventative nature of the program restricted the use of this authority to suspected war criminals only.

Except for the initial Purge Directive issued to the Japanese Government on 4 January 1946 and certain memoranda issued after post-review of the government's action directing the removal of specific individuals, SCAP has insisted that the Japanese Government itself implement and administer the purge program, subject to the right reserved by SCAP to review any action of the Japanese Government to insure compliance with the word and spirit of SCAPIN 550.

By 4 January 1947 of 8,899 cases acted upon by the Japanese Government 1,770 had been reviewed by SCAP, In 27 instances the actim of the Japanese Government was disapproved.

Between 4 January 1947 and 19 July 1947 the Japanese Gove rnment screened 563,099 cases, removing or barring a total of 1,681 individuals. Of the total number screened during this period SCAP reviewed 16,047 cases, representing persons holding important elective and appointive posts in gove rnment, officials in the major economic and financial concerns, and influential persons in the political and social life of Japan. In 47 instances the action of the Japanese Gove rnment was disapproved.

Further action by SCAP upon post-review of the Japanese Government's action has been to direct the reinstatement of 12 individuals unjustly or mistakenly barred or removed.

Statistics on persons affected by the Purge Program as of mid-July reduce to the following approximate totals:

1. Barred and removed - Initial phase (4 Jan 1946 - 4 Jan 1947)..... 1,067

2. Barred and removed under the Extension (4 Jan 1947 - 15 July 1947)..... 1,681

3. Career officers, gendarmes and intelligence agents barred by original directive..... 183,000

4. Persons who resigned their positions in order to avoid designation..... 20,000

These figures do not, of course, include the tens of thousands of other undesirable leaders who are forever barred from Public Service but who have held no office since the purge became effective and therefore have not yet been designated by name. Nor are nearly 6000 Thought Control and Special Higher Police removed by SCAP's Civil Liberties Directive of October, 1945 included. Because they are barred only from positions in the Justice, Welfare, and Home Ministries and from police work, their status is somewhat different from that of persons purged under SCAPIN 550 who are barred from all Public Service. A similar group, likewise not included in the above, is the approximately 5000 teachers who have been removed from the field of education.

1 August 1947

THE PURGE

On 4 January 1946 the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers issued a sweeping directive requiring a purge of all persons who shared responsibility for Japan's program of aggression.

This directive, issued as SCAPIN 550, was designed to remove undesirable persons from positions of influence and authority in the political, economic and social life of Japan. For the fields of education and police, separate similar programs had been initiated as early as October 1945.

The removal and exclusion program has never been either in concept or administration a punitive measure but was and is a technique designed to eliminate the continuity of influence or exercise of power by persons whose past careers showed them to be undesirable leaders for a nation dedicated to democracy and the cause of world peace.

BASIS FOR THE PURGE

Potsdam Declaration

The international basis for the entire purge program is found in that part of the Potsdam Declaration which states, "There must be removed for all time the authority and influence of those who deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world".

Occupation Directives

In accordance with initial U. S. Post-Surrender Policy for Japan SCAP was directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that no persons be "allowed to hold public office or any other positions of responsibility or influence in public or important private enterprise who have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression, who have been influential members of any Japanese ultranationalistic, terroristic or secret patriotic society". . . . . who have been influential in the activities of Imperial Rule Assistance Organizations, "or who manifest hostility to the objectives of the occupation".

SCAP was further directed to prohibit the retention in, or selection for, positions of important responsibility in industry, finance, commerce, agriculture, or public or private financial institutions, agencies or organizations, of any persons who have been active exponents of militant nationalism or aggression, and of all those who do not direct future Japanese economic effort solely toward peaceful ends.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, SCAP was directed to assume that persons who held key positions of high responsibility since 1937 in any of the fields enumerated above have been active exponents of militant nationalism and aggression.

THE 4 JANUARY 1946 DIRECTIVE

SCAPIN 550 which has become famous as the "4 January Directive" is SCAP's implementation of the early instructions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Purge Categories

This basic directive ordered the Japanese Government to remove from public office and to exclude from government service exponents of militant nationalism and aggression falling within the following defined categories:

Category A. War Criminals

Category B. Career Military and Naval Personnel: Special Police and Officers of the War Ministries.

This category included members of the Board of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshals, the Supreme Military Council, the Imperial General Headquarters, the Army and Navy General Staffs, and the Supreme Council for direction of the war; all career commissioned officers and enlisted personnel who served in or with the military or naval police or other special or secret intelligence police organizations; and all persons who served as higher officials in the Ministry of War or Ministry of Navy.

Category C. Influential Members of Ultranationalistic, Terroristic or Secret Patriotic Societies.

Founders, officers, directors and other important officials, large financial contributors to, or editor of any publication or organ of such societies.

Category D. Persons Influential in the Activities of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society, and the Political Association of Great Japan.

National officers, leading officials in Prefectural or Metropolitan subdivisions, editor of any publication or organ of the above or agencies or affiliates of the above organizations.

Category E. Officers of Financial and Development Organizations involved in Japanese Expansion.

Persons who between 7 July 1937 and 2 September 1945 were directors, presidents, vice presidents, advisors, auditors or controlling branch managers in Japanese occupied territory of above institutions.

Category F. Governors of Occupied Territories.

Certain specified higher officials such as governor general, civil administrator, and military administrator in Japan's wartime colonial empire.

Category G. Additional Militarists and Ultranationalists.

These broad provisions bring under the terms of the directive:

1. Any person who has denounced or contributed to the seizure of opponents of the militaristic regime.

2. Any person who has instigated or perpetuated an act of violence against opponents of the militaristic regime.

3. Any person who has played an active and predominant governmental part in the Japanese program of aggression or who by speech, writing or action has shown himself to be an active exponent of militant nationalism and aggression.

INITIAL ACTION OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTING THE PURGE DIRECTIVE

Ordinances Issued

On 27 February 1946 the Japanese Government promulgated Imperial Ordinance No. 109 and Cabinet and Home Affairs Ministry Ordinance No. 1 of 1946 which established the machinery for applying the Directive. These ordinances determined, first, who should be screened, second, who should be classified as undesirable in light of the Directive and third, how the removal of undesirables should be accomplished.

By the terms of these ordinances all incumbent officials of the then first three civil service grades, and those who held positions of comparable authority, all staff officers of 114 listed corporations, associations and other organizations under the special control of the government, and all applicants for future elective or appointive posts in the national government were subject to screening to determine their eligibility.

The seven categories of undesirables outlined by the Directive were defined in greater detail by the ordinances as follows:

1. No change was made in the category applying to war criminals (Category A).

2. The one affecting career military and naval personnel (Category B) remained substantially the same.

3. The provisions of Category C were defined as applying to influential members of 123 listed ultranationalistic or secret patriotic societies.

4. The many agencies and affiliates of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations (Category D) were enumerated and the influential positions in each duly listed.

5. The number of financial and development organizations involved in Japanese expansion (Category E), as listed in the original directive, was increased.

6. The exact titles and positions of high Japanese officials in occupied territories (Category E) were defined.

7. The broad provisions of Category G were extensively interpreted by a special cabinet announcement appearing shortly after the promulgation of Imperial Ordinance 109.

It brought under the purge memorandum all persons who had occupied certain policy-forming positions on the highest government level between the outbreak of "The China Incident" and the Surrender.

It listed other high government positions of somewhat lesser importance and provided for the purge of individuals who had occupied them providing there was conspicious evidence that these individuals have played an important part: (a) in the conclusion of alliances with the Axis or with puppet nations in preparation for the Greater East Asia War, (b) in the suppression of opponents of militarism, (c) in concluding economic agreements with occupied countries, (d) in the financial or production program for Japanese military activities.

The interpretation of Category G also brought under the purge: (a) those officials who had over a long period of time engaged in the suppression of civil liberties, (b) other officials, members of the Diet, artists, writers, publishers, editors and businessmen who had participated in activities proscribed under Category G, (c) officials of companies that had produced the weapons and sinews of war, (d) highest officers of patriotic societies not listed under Category C and (e) any person who was recommended as a candidate by the TOJO Government in 1942.

The ordinances provided for a screening committee to examine questionnaires and to decide upon individual eligibility. In the event that the individual was found to fall under the criteria as defined in the ordinance, the Prime Minister was to designate him as an undesirable person, and to order his removal and exclusion from office. The ordinances also provided for the collection of questionnaires and contained a penalty clause designed to insure that such questionnaires would be filled out truthfully and completely.

Initial Operation and Effect Of The Purge

The impact of the Purge Directive was immediate and profound. On 13 January 1946, only 9 days after the Directive was issued, the Cabinet of Baron Kijuro Shidehara underwent extensive re-organization. Three ministers and six cabinet executives and many other high government officials resigned. In view of the imminence of the approaching April elections the government released the criteria as soon as they had been determined in the form of Cabinet announcements, without waiting until the entire bill had been written. Thus, by the end of February when Imperial Ordinance No. 109 was officially promulgated, action had already been taken to bring under the purge (a) persons who had been influential in patriotic and secret societies, (b) influential members of the Imperial Rule Assistance organizations, and (c) career naval and military personnel, of whom approximately 183,000 were barred from the Public Service.

On 10 March 1946, the day of the Cabinet announcement interpreting Category G, the Shidehara Cabinet sustained a second wave of resignations; five ministers retired. Many members of the House of Peers followed suit. Within the month 30 new appointees, duly screened under the new ordinances, were appointed to fill the vacancies thus created.

That part of the 10 March interpretation which rendered ineligible for public service all members of the Lower House who had been recommended by the Tojo Government greatly altered the political scene. Leadership of political parties changed, political allegiances shifted and new candidates were sought to replace those previously scheduled to run in the April