love of peace and respect of international trust, I think, the thoroughness of the purport of this chapter can be realized. What is your opinion on this point?

Mr. KANAMORI: The point just referred to is rather strongly couched in the Preamble in such expressions like "desiring peace for all time", "We have determined to rely for our security and survival upon the justice and good faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world.", etc. In Chapter II, the policy of Japan is expressed in a simple and modest form, but the essence of the chapter is replete with the stern and grave significance. This Constitution of ours is not couched in a strong wording but is written with an intention of expressing a sufficiently stern frame of mind by implication. Therefore, I beg you will please read Art. IX with this point in your mind.

Mr. KURODA: Further, I should like to deal with this Chapter by expressing some of my views and I desire to be favored with the opinion of the Government. In Art. IX. the renunciation of war is stipulated, but I am of the opinion that further as our internal policy we should adopt some measures to prevent the occurrence of war. It is necessary to make a scientific study of why the war like the last one occurred. Instead of thinking abstractly the war in general, I maintain it is necessary to spot out what was the character of the recent war. To my way of thinking the Pacific War was the extension of the China Affair and the

China Affair was the extension of the Manchurian Incident. From that time on the capitalism of Japan allied with the old feudalistic system, resorted to an economic exploitation of the working classes at home. As a consequence, there emerged a paradoxical contrast of the narrow and limitted field of home market with the expansion of capitalistic production. This paradox was tried to be solved by a aggressive expansion to the continent— which proved to be the cause of the last war. Therefore, unless a policy is adopted for eradicating the causes of the war for the future, the impulse for war will occur from within even though a sipulation of renunciation of war is made in the Constitution. Therefore, we have to adopt some definite policy towards monopolistic capital which has naturally a great influence in giving cause to a war. At present, the dissolution of monopolistic capital is ordered and it is in the course of liquidation. In practice, however, it appears that the progress has been slow. So, I think it is necessary to give an unequivocable expression in the Constitution to the principle of prohibition of private monopolistic capital. Unless we adopt a measure to eradicate the impulse for war within the country, we can not make the outlawry of war complete and uphold thorough love of peace, even with the codification of the renunciation of war in the Constitution. This is my view and I should like to be enlightened by the Government whether it has any intention of making a clear provision in the Constitution for the prohibition of private monopolistic capital.

Mr.

Mr. KANAMORI: As I once had an occasion to explain the basic idea for the draft of the Constitution, I consider it appropriate to make a stipulation in the Constitution, if it is an important principle, which has a solid basis and backing among the people and which is suitable for a clear description. It appears to me that it is pretty difficult to put in writing precisely and within appropriate bounds the points suggested without a danger of incurring some misunderstanding. That is the reason why we did not put such ~~to have that~~ stipulation in the draft and I have no intention to have it in even today.

Mr. KURODA: Next, I come to Chapter III. In reading through the draft, I noticed that Chapter III is the most imperfect part of the whole. On the other hand, the same chapter has a very excellent part included in it. In my opinion there are both a good point and a bad. To mention the conclusion first, viewed from the point of the times, this draft has the character of the Nineteenth Century based on the system of individualism, liberalism and capitalism. At present, emerging out of such age, we as the people of a new era, have various new demands. The things which answer such demands are not filled in this draft. It includes many features of the old constitutions which were instituted during the transitional period from feudalism to capitalism. Viewed from the stand-point of the economic and social rights and the guarantee and security of liberty,

I have

this draft is very imperfect. After a reading of this draft, I have got such an impression. With regard to the guarantee of human rights or the so-called basic rights and political and legal rights, the draft has more or less minute stipulations.

The Constitution now in force guarantees us many fundamental rights, all of which however are in reality trampled underfoot by the provisions of law without exception. We Japanese have long been living under such law. As one who have been under this kind of law, I feel keenly about this point. Compared to this, the present Draft Constitution, in my opinion, provides guarantees over a considerably wide range of fundamental rights and freedom, both political and legal. I think this Draft Constitution is fairly comprehensive in vindicating political and legal freedom and in establishing human rights. However, mere guarantee of political and legal freedom and rights will be inadequate to enable peoples of the world to keep a living in these days. Originally, capitalism as it grew, opened a novel way of life different from that under feudalism, and to commemorate its victory the guarantee of the fundamental human rights and freedom both political and legal have come to be stipulated in Constitutions of all countries. As time went on, necessities arose to give protection to those who suffer various economic or social disadvantages emanating from capitalism, viz. a social condition obtained wherein various class struggles arose in the form of social problem, and under this social condition, protection must be extended to laborers, farmers and other workers in general for their living, and there must necessarily appear, as they do actually, such economic stipulations for this purpose as would guarantee the legal and political rights and freedom of these

<u>indestructable</u>

The House of Representatives.

The 90 Session of the Imperial Diet.

No. 1. Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee on the Bill for Revision of the Imperial Constitution.

- - - - - - - - - - -

On Friday, June 28, 1946, members of the Committee were appointed by the Speaker's nomination as follows:-

Messrs.	Hitoshi Ashida,	Matus Eto,
	Takashi Ono,	Tomejiro Okubo,
	Sohei Kato,	Eikichi Kanbayashiyama,
	Hiroshi Kanda,	Yoshio Kijima,
	Kohei Kimura,	Yoshio Kikura,
	Reikichi Kita,	Keitaro Kitaura,
	Tetsuzo Kojima,	Yasuo Takahashi,
	Eikichi Takahashi,	Kiyo Takeda,
	Shinnosuke Takeda,	Juichiro Tsukada,
	Kyo Matsukada,	Eisaku Honda,
	Toranosuke Aoki,	Ken Inukai,
	Kazuhisa Ibaragi,	Saburo Shiikuma,
	Shujiro Suzuki,	Katsutoshi Sekiya,
	Gen Nagai,	Ren Hayashi,
	Kenzaburo Hara,	Ojiro Hara,
	Shigeru Kori,	Hajime Hoshi,

even a word about such amendment yesterday. About this point, the Socialists have always had quite a significant difference of opinions. The most powerful opinion among them was that the Preamble should be as a matter of course amended, and an amendment of Art. 1 is also necessary making a distinct statement as "based on the sovereign will of the people". In fact, they frequently held meetings to discuss the point, sometimes hot discussions lasting for several hours. I am sure that you, gentlemen of the Committee, are acquainted with the fact from newspapers and other sources.

However, those who thought of the subject carefully came to the conclusion that they would be satisfied with making declaration both at home and abroad of the interpretation that sovereignty lies with the people. According to them, it was impossible for the Liberals and the Progressives to make such a joint proposition on the subject, and it was also apprehended that with regard to such important items, their defeat by a minority of votes would create a bad impression both at home and abroad upon the Liberals and the Progressives. If the Liberals, the Progressives and other groups are ready to assume such a clear and bright attitude, the Socialists too are prepared to keep pace with them so as to make a joint proposition at any time. This must be fully known to the gentlemen both of the Liberal and Progressive Parties judging from various circumstances up to the present. Yesterday, we suggested informally to a few people to make a joint proposition. The reason why we did not make a formal overture about the matter was because, as no amendment draft had yet been presented by the Progressives, the Peoples' Cooperatives or Centrals, we thought it was not yet time for making any formal approach about the matter.

The

The Sub-Committee was appointed because we thought it was advisable to bring the matter before the Committee as a joint proposition by unifying the views as far as possible. It is not advisable to give publicity as proposition of a party, without previously making efforts toward such unification. It would be of course different, were it a matter of small details under a separate subject. You may call it a revision of wording, but really it is a serious question to decide the character of the Constitution. It is regrettable that such a course should be taken by an individual party independent of others. As a matter of fact, there was a row in my party this morning over the failure to cooperate with the Liberals and the Progressives, in the face of the Party's stand on this matter and they charged their members on the Constitution Committee with serious negligence. Leaving the question how the Sub-Committee should treat the amendment draft to a later consideration, what I want to emphasize is that it is a matter of great regret that the particulars of the meeting should have been made public in spite of the decision not to publicize the proceedings except through a Communique from the Chairman, until we decide otherwise. Unlike other separate Bills regarding the government measures discussed from time to time, the revision of the Constitution is a most serious question. At the outset when the meeting was opened yesterday it was agreed amongst the committee members that they should work in close cooperation; transcending all the party sentiments. I regret it very much that at the very outset such a breach of arrangement should have taken place. I hope that the Chairman will give warning about this point and that the Committee should reaffirm its decision.

The Chairman: Let me reply to Mr. Suzuki. I highly appreciate the motive of your speech as well as your standpoint. I think the

case is exactly as you have stated. The same accounts are given in different ways in various newspapers. However, let me tell you about the fact as far as I know. It happened in this wise. Yesterday, at the time when a communique was issued in this connection, the press men were here and asked about the amendment proposed by the Liberals. I told them it was as printed in the paper handed to them. They also asked if the Socialists had substantially the same opinion. I told them that there might be slight variations, but the Socialists' views have already appeared in newspapers. However, there were two points left out in the printed copy of the Liberals. The amendments made in two places in the Preamble are not mentioned in the printed matter. They should have been added, but since we were hard pressed for time in printing, we were not able to publish them. I told them verbally and pointed out the two amended places; that was all I did and said: Nothing more was said. Naturally, I never breathed even a word whether the Progressives approved of or opposed to it. The amendment draft of the Liberals published before was partly different from the one given to the pressmen the day before yesterday and I added that two additional amendments were left out in the latter. That was all I said: I could never have said anything about consultation in the Committee, for there was none. I never mentioned that we talked to other parties about the matter. I simply told that the printed matters given to the pressmen had some points different from the proposition made here, and pointed out to them where they differed. Such is all that I know about the fact.

Mr. KITA: I think Mr. Suzuki was quite right in making his statement. I am extremely sorry that the matter has come to such a pass.

I regret it all the more because the Socialists had always asserted more strongly than the Liberals or the Progressives that sovereignty rests with the people, and the whole matter eventuated as though they--- the Liberals and the Progressives--- robbed the Socialists of their assets. A few press men asked me about what was said in the Sub-Committee meeting, and I told them that I could not say anything about it as a pledge was made absolutely to say nothing except the Chairman. They said that it would not do at all, and that they were told that the Progressives had already reported the proceedings of the Sub-Committee to the Diet members meeting, and asked me if they could publish the matter as an announcement of the Progressives. Would it not be awkward, they said, to print that the Liberals had nothing to do with it? Then, they told me in so many words what we have just heard from the Chairman. They said that they heard that the decision was made to the effect that sovereignty rests with the people; they said that they knew that much about it. I simply replied to the effect that no report was made at the meeting of our Diet members, but that a report was made to the meeting of the Diet members belonging to the Progressived Party.

6

ys

Mr. Yoshida [redacted]: I am in full sympathy with Mr. Suzuki. According to the Chairman and Mr. Kita, the newspaper reporters seem to have ever heard the report on the proceedings of yesterday's sub-committee made at our Diet members meeting, but the story is entirely wrong. What really happened was this: As there were many members who wanted to go home on leave, the members meeting was called to remind them to refrain from leaving town, since the matter had gone so far and the time for the meetings of the Sub-committee were drawing near. At the time, the draft amendment of our party was also reported to them, and on that occasion the question of people's sovereignty came to a head. Prior to that, when the Sub-committee was about to sit yesterday, Mr. Ito showed me the draft amendment of the Liberal Party and explained that his party was going to amend a certain part of the Preamble to such and such. Our party had also virtually decided to do the same, so I said we would not oppose to it. This is the talk I had with Mr. Ito. At the Diet members meeting, I only reported that the part of the Preamble in question was going to be amended such and such. I did not state that such matter had been taken up at the Sub-committee. I hope you will understand it.

Mr. KITA: I am satisfied.

The Chairman: The matter stands as was explained. The reason why I mentioned the amendment drafts to press reporters is this: The drafts of various parties which were ready for discussions at this committee had already been published. The Liberal Party had published its draft, and other parties had submitted their tentative amendment proposals. I thought that these drafts which had already been published might rightfully be disclosed as they did not constitute the proceedings of the committee. As to how to revise these amendment plans or what was discussed at the committee meeting con-

stituting

constitute the substance of the committee proceedings and I dare not publish them and I don't think I am entitled to do so. I am sorry that my disclosure to the press reporters of the change in the amendment draft has caused serious embarrassment to some members. But I did not do it with any malicious intent. I simply made the correction in question, because I thought that as the amendments of various parties were not secrets, I might publish it without doing any harm.

Mr. SUZUKI (Y): The circumstances are now clear. I know you did not do it with malicious intent, but I hope you will take care in future.....

The Chairman: I hope we shall all take care to prevent leakage in all matters and not to put ourselves in awkward positions. I have duly noted the purport of your remarks.

Mr. YOSHIDA : The draft amendment of my party has been submitted to the Chairman.

The Chairman: Will you please explain it?

Mr. YOSHIDA: I shall explain it briefly. First I shall take up the Preamble. If I go into details, I shall get reminder about the progress of the proceedings like yesterday. Therefore, I will make it brief.

As to the Preamble, as Mr. Kita explained yesterday, the Liberal and the Progressive Parties made compromise and agreed on a plan, not a final but a tentative one. I reported back the plan to our party, and after many discussions, we found that it could not be adopted without modifications. So we shaped our own plan, which is slightly different from that of the Liberal Party's but follows practically along the same line. You will please understand it..... What

shall

shall I do ? Shall I leave it at that, or shall I proceed ?

Mr. SUZUKI : Will you please explain the Preamble first? We shall later.....

Mr. YOSHIDA: The most important point in the Preamble is the part concerning "Shuken Zaimin" (people's sovereignty) as Mr. Suzuki mentioned yesterday. To clarify this point.....

Mr. HATSUKADE: Frankly speaking, I have repeatedly asked press reporters not to use lightly the term "Shuken Zaimin" in any circumstances. It may sound a little strange, but I think that we had better use the term "Shuken Zaikokumin" (sovereignty of the nation) throughout.

The Chairman: Mr. Hatsukade's opinion sounds reasonable. Influenced by European political thoughts or interpretation of constitutional laws, we have used the word "Min" (people) in the sense it is opposed to the sovereign. In this sense we have always used the terms "Zai Min" and "Zai Kun" (sovereign). But according to the theory of Mr. Kanamori, which is the official interpretation of the present Government, "Min" is construed to include the Emperor. But when we say "Min", the general public are inclined to take it not in the sense used by the Government but in the sense opposed to the sovereign. Therefore, Mr. Hatsukade suggests to use "Zaikokumin", instead of "Zaimin" so as not to give wrong impression to the people. Am I not right?

Mr. HATSUKADE: You are right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KITA: The opinion of Mr. Hatsukade just expressed is a matter of considerable importance. In our popular concept, when we say "people's sovereignty", it signifies the idea which is expounded in le Contrat Social, meaning the sovereignty is vested in the people of a nation, and smacks of a philosophy in social history. Mr. Kanamori's

Kanamori's theory that the sovereignty is vested in the people including the Emperor has a wider meaning such as expressed by the Social Democrats by the term "corporate body of the Emperor and the people." Therefore, if we say "Shuken Zaikokumin" (sovereignty of the nation) we can express the idea more clearly, while if we say "Shuken Zaimin" (people's sovereignty), it gives us an impression that the sovereignty is vested in the individual people. Especially, the Communist Party is using the word "people" in such term as "people's front." According to the old concept, the word is construed to have a meaning opposed to the Emperor, and is used to denote the ruled class as against the ruler, the Government and the ruling class. We fear that the term "Suken Zaimin" will give an impression that the sovereignty is vested in the people in the above sense. Therefore, I think it is more suitable for the purport of our amendment proposal to use the term "Shuken Zaikokumin."

Mr. YOSHIDA: I agree with the opinions of my colleagues that we had better use the term "Shuken Zaikokumin" instead of "Shuken Zaimin." Putting this point aside, let me explain briefly our draft amendment.....

Mr. KITA: Just one moment please... I don't think it has a binding force, although we are not opposed to the idea....

Mr. SUZUKI: We use the term "Shuken Zaimin" (people's sovereignty) quite unintentionally because we are accustomed to it. Therefore, we shall be put into a very awkward position if we are absolutely prohibited to use the term. We shall be very careful, but let me make a suggestion that we shall not be criticised even if we use the term by mistake, if we would at once explain what we mean by

the

the word "people" is such and such.

The Chairman: As all of us are expressing our wish, our opinions are by no means binding.... Mr. Yoshida, as we read through the Preamble yesterday, will you please read out the part which differs from the draft read by the Liberal Party yesterday.....

Mr. YOSHIDA: That was just what I was going to do, Mr. Chairman. This term is the same as "the sovereignty of the nation." "This Constitution, founded upon the ----- principle----- and we reject and revoke constitutions, all laws, ordinances, and reseripts in conflict herewith." I think this part is slightly different from that in the draft of the Liberal Party.

The Chairman: I think the word "all" should be inserted before the word "constitutions." It must be a mistake in printing.

Mr. INUKAI: Any kind of constitutions...?

Mr. HAYASHI (Reims): It doesn't mean any kind of constitutions. It means the present Constitution....

The Chairman: Not only the present Constitution. It means to reject and revoke any future constitutions.

Mr. NISHIO: There are too many words of explanation. Will you please state what words are inserted where and which parts are amended how?

The Chairman: So far as I am aware, two parts are different. The word "Funshoku" (banishment) is changed to "Jokyo" (remove) in the draft of the Liberal Party. And the words "sustain their own sovereignty" in the fourth line from the end are changed to "sustain their own independence." That is all, is it not?

Mr. YOSHIDA: Let us go back to the first line.

Our draft reads: "Kenkyo sareta Nihyaku [illegible] o tsujite kawaru"

/on

(We, through our duly elected representatives), while the Liberal Party's draft reads: "Kokkaigiin wo tsujite kodo shi".(acting through the Members of the Diet.) Again, our draft differs from that of the Liberals in the part which reads: "Warera Jishin to Shison no Tameni." (for ourselves and our posterity.) Ours follows the original draft in this part.

Next, I should like to draw your attention to the part which reads: "We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society designed and dedicated...." You may think there is a comma after the word society, but there is not.

The difference between our draft and the Liberal Party's are as I have stated above. The other parts are entirely the same, and I shall ommit to read them.

The Chairman: I now ask Mr. Heima Hayashi to explain on the draft of the Cooperative Democratic Party.

Mr. HAYASHI: A copy of the Cooperative Democratic Party's draft is placed on your desk which I hope is self-explanatory. The word "sonyu (insertion)" appearing frequently in it is misspelt, and I have to ask you to correct the spelling. As regards the Preamble, it is hoped that it be shaped in such a manner that it would convey a summarized meaning of the Constitution, and that the matters enumerated under items a, b, c, and d be woven into it. In Chapter I, Article 1, "shocho de ari (shall be the symbol)" is followed by a conjunction "oyobi (and)" and is repeated. We think the repetition should be avoided. The phrase "seifi ni kensuru kenno wo yushi nai (shall not have power related to government" in Article 4 should be deleted. Of the two paragraphs in Article 5, the first paragraph should be deleted.

The Chairman: What is you opinion, Mr. Kasai?

Mr. KASAI: The printed copies are not available yet. Let me therefore, explain about our draft. My view is that the two matters in the first line should be make into one. "We, Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives ..... the fruits of peaceful cooperation....", and "the blessings of liberty". In the original, two feets are covered, and we suggest the following reading:" heiwa teki kyoryoku to Nihonkoku zendo ni wotette jiyu no fukushi wo kakuhoshi, seifu no koi ni yotte fukatsui sono no sonka ga hassei shinai koto wo katai shite kokoni kokumin no soi ga,....". Then the word "kokusei" which stands for "government" in English should be rendered "seifu". Instead of "suko na (lofty), etc" we have

"shinsei

"shinsei ne ete." and "sono keni wa kokumin ni yurei shi, ete" is changed to "sono ken-i wa kokumin ni engen shi sono kenryoku wa kokumin no daihyosha ni yotte koshi sarare..... (a sacred trust of the people, the authority for which is derived from people, the powers of which are exercised by the representatives of the people)." Mr. Kita is of the same opinion with us in this repect. The "sono rieki wa kokumin gakyoju suru mono de atte "(and the benefit of which are enjoyed by the people), jinrui fuhen no genri wo kiso to suru kempo wo seitei suru.(This is the universal principle of mankind upon which this Constitution is founded)". We expect copies will be placed in your hand shortly for your consideration.

The Chairman: What shall we do about the proceedings? Mr. Masui's proposed draft is no handed in yet and also that of the Social Democratic Party has not been submitted.....

Mr. Y. SUZUKI: My party hopes to rewrite it in a more sublime and succinct style, as the present one is negative and prolix in style. That means it is to be written independently from the English text, but will that be permitted? We must find it ou out before attempting it. If the English text could not actually be disregarded, we must work out on the drafts drawn up by various parties. The handling of the Preamble will differ according to which of the above method is taken. We would, therefore, ask you to decide on this point.

Mr. R. KITA: I strongly support the proposal of Mr. Suzuki. Indeed, when I talked over with certain members of the House of Peers, I found that they had the same desire. Gentlemen of the Socialist Party too have a similar idea.

The

The Cooperative Democratic Party seems to have a similar view too. We feel sympathetic to that idea to a large measure. Some members of the Social Democratic Party were of the opinion that the renunciation of war would better be stipulated in the Chapter for the people's rights and duties, as it sounds not exactly appropriate where it stands now. We can very well appreciate the contention. Although we can acquiesce in the view that the renunciation of war may be expressed with better appearance by stating in the Preamble our hopes for the building of a peace-loving nation and the world's peace, we fear that we shall find it difficult to agree among ourselves as to the hopes of the various Parties if the Preamble is to be rewritten. The Japanese version is not very well done, but the English one is fairly well written, and I suggest that we render it in the words familiar to our ears and prepare a draft which we might submit under the joint sponsorship.

Mr. KASAI: I second Mr. Kita's proposal. The English text is most elaborately written, and it will be extremely difficult to render it into a language characteristic of the Japanese. As pointed out, it is prolix and sounds sluggish, but we can improve it by changing words in it.

Mr. MORITO: Let me tell you my impression. It appears to me the attitude we are taking toward the amendment of the Preamble is that we translate from the English text and make improvements, amendments and corrections on it. This is more or less at divergence from what was said by the Government, and we wonder whether such an attitude is required of us. Under the existing situation, we may not be allowed to

shape it as we like, but we suppose the attitude of literal translation, word-by-word, verbatim rendering,' will be undesirable. If, however, such is the case, we would rather wish, with the gentlemen of the Communist Party, that the draft be amended according to the English text, as reportedly desired also by the gentlemen of the Liberal and Progressive Parties. If such be the case, I think we would rather go at it in a most thoroughgoing manner and amend not only the Preamble but its entire body in the same way. If the Preamble is not to be changed as we like, another method may be considered whereby we grasp the general meaning and render it in our own language without giving too much heed to each individual word. The Preamble is written in excellent English, and in grand style, but it loses its strength if once translated into Japanese and makes a tedious reading because of the difference in the construction of sentences. I have a great doubt if it might not be rendered more freely without too much heed given to each individual word but in keeping with its meaning, so that a closer affinity may be introduced between the ideas expressed by these two texts. I wonder if we may not relinquish the idea that a faithful verbatim translation is essential.

Mr. HATSUKADE: Analyzing the views expressed by the gentlemen, it seems to me that it is simply because the thing is written in spoken language that it lacks vigor and solemnity of expression. So far as it is in spoken language I do not think we can do any better than this if improvements are attempted, and I support the present draft almost absolutely. But this is a Constitution, and I wonder whether its Preamble, at least, may not be written in literary style, instead of spoken language, and

<u>in such</u>

in such a way as every school boy in the upper grade of the primary school could understand it, so that the highest degree of intelligence may be given the full expression. Sense of stateliness and sublimity much desired by the gentlemen may perhaps be expressed in this way. I am wondering whether this part may not be written in different style. If it be...

The Chairman: To which part are you referring?

Mr. HATSUKADE: I am referring to the Preamble, which I suggest be written in written language or in literary style. Stateliness and sublimity is much desired by gentlemen, and I suppose gentlemen of high intelligence here would not write in this style and naturally find this lacking in direct appeal.

The Chairman: The only trouble is that the Preamble forms a part of the Constitution and is inseperable from its body. I have a doubt about the proposition to write only the first part in written language and others in spoken language.

Mr. HATSUKADE: This is merely a suggestion. If spoken language is to be used in it, I think this is the only way.

The Chairman: I was in the Government when the question of rewritting it in spoken language was discussed. The reason for its adoption was that the people of the present generation to whom Chinese ideographs are familar from their childhood may have an impression that the spoken language is not quite convincing, but probably younger generations will find the conventional literary style not quite appealing. After a couple of decades, Constitution written in conventional way of expression in literary style, is is feared, will most probably come as unappealing as a talk about unfamiler third persons.

Mr

For this reason, the spoken language was given preference. Mr. Matsukade who is of venerable old age may naturally have a feeling, just as I do, perhaps on account of my age, that succinct statement in literary style is much more appealing, but young people seem to have a different sentiment.

Mr. Matsukade: Perusing the drafts sent in by the Parties, we find that curiously enough amendments after all are reverted to the original draft submitted on March 6. We can cite instances if we desire it. The same holds true with the Preamble. After all, we invariably come back to the present one.

The Chairman: As to Mr. Morito's opinion, I should say personally I would like to have it succinctly written in a way most appealing to us Japanese, but if it were to be rewritten by the Japanese in such a way as would be approved by the interested quarters as to the idea involved, it could not be finished in a week or so. It is no easy task, I think, and if I be allowed to be personal, I should say I even do not know to whom to commit this onerous task. If such method were to be taken after all, I hope the Social Democratic Party or the Independent Club will send in a workable draft, as such will furnish a useful basis for the discussion. Otherwise, I do not know to whom we should commit this task or when such draft could ever be drawn up.....

Mr. Y. SUZUKI: Arguments on this point have so far been repeated many times, so I shall hasten to reach a conclusion. The reason why we had not made a draft ourselves was that if we had done this and sent an English translation of it for consent, it would be quite possible that such draft should leave enough room for more or less sharp criticism from practical viewpoints and occasion a fresh trouble. It was thus decided that the drafting be put off till the time when it would have become possible. Now, the time allowed us is short and it would be impossible for us to ignore this draft of the Government. I think there is no alternative but to adopt it, subject to improvement in Japanese phraseology. At any rate, there are two ways of thinking. Which will the Committee choose? Please decide at this meeting. I believe there is no way out else.

Mr. INUKAI: I beg your pardon to interrupt your talks in behalf of our party. Today at 10 a.m., our party leaders some how convened a meeting of their Diet members regarding the revision of the Constitution. It is said the meeting is very stormy and I have just been asked to attend it. May I leave here for a short time and get myself represented at this meeting by Mr. Hara or Mr. Yoshida?

The Chairman: I shall be much pleased, if you can send someone to represent you here.

Mr. KITA: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, I shall have to attend a meeting of the legislative investigation Council of whose sub-committee I am Chairman. On this and a similar occasion, I wish to have in this Committee a proxy who can

freely

freely give expression to our thoughts and ideas. Can we do that?

The Chairman: Can't you name some one among the three members of your Party here?

Mr. KITA: Certainly, I can. But when, the three members are all here, it is all right, but when, they are not, can somebody else take my place?

The Chairman: Then, if a party or group is represented on this Committee by a single member, they will have to send a fresh representative, and in that case, I am afraid, we will be put to a trouble of repeating old arguments and explanations on account of his imperfect knowledge about the preceding circumstances in the Committee. So it seems highly desirable that you will send your proxy to the Legislative Investigation Council instead of leaving this Committee or will choose your proxy temporarily from among the Committeeman present. As the Liberal Party has four representatives this committee, there is no possibility of such inconvenience being occasioned, but there are some groups whose representatives are not present to-day. I am sure your request will be embarrassing to the meeting.

Mr. KITA: When the three members are all here, it is all right, but.....

The Chairman: Let us talk over the matter again when a practical need has arisen.

Mr. KITA: As alluded to by Mr. Morito shortly before, the original tallies exactly with the contents of each article of the Constitution, but some time ago I conceived the idea—— even attempted to revise it—or rewriting it and eliminating

traces

traces of exotic expression, by substiting as purest Japanese idioms as possible for any immature phrasing. For example, the phrase "fruits of peaceful co-operation with all nations" sounded to my ears rather exotic and in my own writing I replaced it with the words "fruits obtainable by peaceful cooperation with all nations", and changed to "blessings of liberty" into the "blessings that liberty will bring". At the same time I felt that such changes would not be easily agreed to by all the parties. So I had decided that the original be maintained intact in the main but some exotic expressions in it must be reduced to the minimum. After hard toil and application, I replaced in my private draft the words "for ourselves and our posterity" with "for the sake of the present and the future"; the words "duly elected", with "rightfully elected" or rather "justly elected". In this way I have worked rather hard and now am almost convenced that at least some improvement may be made in the original. In deference to the opinion of Mr. Morito, I shall be only too glad to adopt the more graceful word "Tosei ni (justly)" or "tekisei ni (properly)" than the adverb "Saito ni" which is somewhat vulgar. My idea is to clothe the Constitution with a pure Japanese garment, while maintaing most faithfully the ideals it aspires to achieve. To be frank, it seems possible to make the draft far more expressive by using our spoken language, only if a style comparetively near to English is adopted. For instance, to make the word "do" in the phrase "do ordain and establish" more expressive, we might use the words "Chikette", or render it "makoto ni (truly)". I hope that the members of the Committee will exchange their views

more

more freely and exhaustively on this phrase of the issue and try and adopt a style nearer to our written language in order to make the wording of the Constitution a little more impressive.

Mr. SUZUKI: Behind Mr. Morito's remark there is this background: When we recently saw the Director of the Legislation Bureau, he recounted a history of the draft of the Constitution. He asserted that the Constitution had been written in Japanese. He said the Government did not believe in the rumor afloat that there was an English version in addition and hoped that the Committee would examine the draft by keeping in mind this official statement. Mr. Morito, therefore, evidently feels that it is acts of imprudence on the part of members of the Committee to criticize the draft as containing mistranslations or talk among themselves as if there were an English text behind the draft or take such an attitude as though would underwrite the story published by an American newspaper to the effect that Japan's new Constitution was a foreign gift. Mr. Morito thus meant to remind us that it was unbecoming of any member of this Committee to drop such words as "so and so is written in English" and the like. Now there is no doubt that the thoughts and other contents of this literature are to be adopted in the end. So it is to be hoped that too much time will not be spent in the criticism of it, but all members unite in efforts to amend, if needs be, the Government's original on the basis of the two proposals mapped out separately by the Liberals and the Progressives.

Mr.

Mr. KASAI: I would be last man to allege that the literature was originally written in English or that the draft before us should be studied according to the English version. I wanted only to point out that our posterity might regard the new Constitution as a slipshod writing because the style of that literature was not quite up to date nor was likely to suit the taste of coming generations. On the other hand, I happened to see at least part of an English version which I thought was a most dignified and perfect literature. So I feared our posterity might wonder why we had not written the new Constitution after the pattern of the said English literature. We are ashamed to leave behind us a Constitution which will not "appeal" to future generations. As Messrs. Morito, Kita and Suzuki have already stated, we do not think the draft before the Committee is written so powerfully as the aforementioned English version is. The Constitution is destined to prove a grand code of laws to be handed down to posterity as an imperishable legacy, and in the light of the existing Constitution which, though fifty or sixty years old, is still readable these days, it appears imperative that the present draft should be so improved as to inspire accurate ideas into our posterity. For this end, I prefer a style of written language to one of a spoken language, although opinion seems divided on this point. If the adoption of a style of written language is not impossible, some word, as Mr. Kita has suggested, ought to be added to emphasize "to ordain and establish" in the present draft written in the

oral

oreal style, among many other modifications. To cite another example, the word "sacred" has a very strong meaning and is more or less different in its import from the word "suko" which means noble or sublime, but the draft uses an adjective popularly considered as an equivalent to "sublime" to qualify the word "trust". It may perhaps be better to replace this adjective with a Japanese phrase which is daily employed in this land as the quivalent of "sacred" in English. In a nutshell, we Japanese wish that the draft will be thoroughly examined and, where possible, revised with a view eradicating the least traces, if any, of an exotic style in its wording.

The Chairman: Do you mean to say, Mr. Kasai, that we ought to wait until your draft is ready?

Mr. KASAI: No, our draft will be submitted this afternoon.

Mr. SUZUKI: Then arguments seems nearly exhausted on the question of amendment-- of course to the Preamble alone. What would you think of setting up a small committee to study and report back on the amendment problem?

The Chairman: Have you no objection to Mr. Suzuki's suggestion?

Mr. OSHIMA: Although many an argument has so far been set forth, I on my part believe that after all there will be no choice but to go on with the original and ardently hope that the problem will be solved as quickly as possible on the basis of both plans of the Progressives and the Liberals. In saying this, I do not of course have any intention to treat the question lightly.

The Chairman: Shall we then take a short recess now and ask any three members of the Committee to prepare some fit draft by 1 p.m. and return here with it for submission to the session to be resumed in the afternoon?

Mr. HAYASHI: From every party?

The Chairman: No, about three from among us.

Mr. OSHIMA: Is it not better to have all of us? To appoint another sub-committee is something like building a roof over a roof. I don't think the present members are too many to settle matters.

Mr. KITA: What do you think, Mr. Suzuki? As far as the Preamble is concerned shall we settle it among ourselves? Or, each party may want to be represented, so we might have one each from the three minor parties, one Socialist, one Progressive and one Liberal, six in all.

Mr. SUZUKI: That is an idea.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: That would be better.

Mr. SUZUKI: But, if you want to make it so big, why not carry on among ourselves?

Mr. KITA: I have no objection to that.

The Chairman: It is a bit awkward because no Progressive member is here.

Mr. KITA: How does it suit you to get one from every party, making six in all?

Mr. SUZUKI: As there is no Progressive member here, we cannot go on.

The Chairman: Shall we wait till afternoon, taking a recess? Even if we go on, there are only thirty minutes.

Mr. SUZUKI: But the Progressives may change again in the afternoon.

The Chairman: Yes, they may. But there is nothing for it but

but to wait until about half-past one.

Mr. SUZUKI: Returning to the question of people's sovereignty, let us talk among ourselves and when we arrive at an agreement, let us make it our proposal. When you speak about it to the press-people or others, please be careful about this point.

The Chairman: There is a rough draft, I will read it. We may add the point which was suggested just now. "The subcommittee on the Revision of the Constitution held an informal meeting from 10:30 a.m. July 26 and heard explanations on amendments by the Progressive Party the Cooperative-Democratic Party and the Independent Club. Then amendments of the Preamble to the revised Constitution Bill were debated. There was exchange of views as to whether the Government draft should be drastically amended or be left with minimum amendments, but it was decided on the whole to adopt the latter policy. It was further decided that an amendment of the part in the Preamble concerning the people's sovereighty should be reported to the full Committee as a joint proposal of all parties."

Mr. HAYASHI: We have not decided that much.

Mr. KITA: It would be correct to say that the sub-committee has come to that opinion.

Mr. HAYASHI: I have no objection before we come to "It was further decided etc."

Mr. KITA: I mean that the sub-committee agreed at the point that sovereign power resides with the people.

Mr. HAYASHI: There we are not yet agreed. There is difficulty on that point in our party. For our part, we would rather have on the third line "resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war" as proposed by the Liberals and I see no impropriety in immediately putting " establish the Constitution".

I don't see any necessity of clearly expressing by words that sovereign power resides with the people.

Mr. KITA: Do you mean to strike out also the declaration that the will of the people is supreme (Shiko)?

Mr. HAYASHI: "resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war, do ordain and establish this Constitution".

The Chairman: Stop shorthand for a minute. (Shorthand was suspended.)

Mr. KITA: Mr. Hayashi, if the matters are laid open, it is not proper. From international considerations, it is inappropriate not to give out clearly the expression of the sovereign power of the people. Can't you get the understanding of your fellow party members by reporting that all parties have the same idea?

Mr. HAYASHI: Not impossible. I will try, though it is a difficult point.

Mr. KASAI: That is the most fundamental point. It is fundamental to them as it is to us.

Mr. HAYASHI: According to the Chairman's idea, the government draft is also difficult (to be accepted).

The Chairman

The Chairman: The talk has gone astray. How shall we express the idea to the press?

Mr. SUZUKI: The matter is not handled by the Liberals alone. We intend to make a proposal supported by as many members as possible. We are now on that stage.

Mr. HAYASHI: There is no knowing how the Progressives are going to change.

Mr. SUZUKI, Y: Better not touch on that now.

Mr. NISHIO: Better not read the latter part.

Mr. SUZUKI Y: Leave it at "We have reached the stage".

Mr. KITA, N: This may cause a big sensation.

The Chairman: Then let us strike out the last paragraph, and make it like this:" "Then amendments of the Preamble to the revised Constitution Bill were debated. There was exchange of views as to whether the Government draft should be drastically amended or be left with minimum amendments, but it was decided on the whole to adopt the latter policy, and the meeting went into recess at noon." Will this do?

Mr. SUZUKI, Y: I am afraid, we take recess too often and are proceeding very slow. If the Progressives are not here, we may go on talking without short-hand and make some improvement on the Preamble. When the Progressive members turn up, we may have a regular sitting, and hear their opinion and if they agree, we can settle. What do you say to this?

The Chairman: Will this suggestion do?

Mr. SUZUKI

Mr. SUZUKI: If the Progressive Party's draft were not in, we would stop, but as it is in .....

Mr. HAYASHI: If the Preamble becomes so definite, the desire of our party will be put aside, as it is a party opinion to have its idea in the Preamble. If our desire is rejected, we wish to strike our "renunciation of war" from here. Because, to put the renunciation of war under Article 9, would be treating the matter too lightly. We wish to deal with it as a big matter. Abandonment of war may be called the cause of the New Constitution and it ought to be given a prominent place. Thus it is our party's desire to strike it out from the article and declare it conspicuously in the Preamble. As matter stands, our desire is entirely ignored.

The Chairman: Let me say a word. There is a very difficult reason. Stop short-hand, ...

(Shorthand writing is stopped.)

The Chairman: Start shorthand writing ....

Mr. HAYASHI: We want to have it in the Preamble because it is very important. But if things are so ....

Mr. KITA, R: The Socialist member has presented a draft like that and my party, the Liberals, had a desire to set it forth in the Preamble but as that will complicated, the matter we have decided to go on with this Preamble. If we adopt your idea, the matter will be turned over again. So I hope you will go back and appease your fellow party members. When we had a talk with the members of the House of Peers, they were of

opinion

opinion that the thing may better be declared in the peace treaty. To speak of abandonment of war where we are disarmed after the defeat is like a talk of a beggar about giving up collection of money. It is a thing to be declared by a power which has excessive armament .....

The Chairman: As the Progressive members are not here, let us exchange opinions on the Preamble without taking shorthand. Let us take a short recess.

(The sitting went into a recess at 11: 43 a.m.)

(Opened at 1:55 p.m.)

The Chairman: Now, let us resume the meeting. I see that Mr. Kozai is not here yet. But let us exchange our views about the preamble. This morning, there were two different opinions among the members, either to discuss the question of amendment among all the members or to ask two or three members to work out an amendment draft. But I think the majority was in favour of handling the matter in this committee, as we are not a large body. Now, which way shall we follow? Shall we go ahead with our work here as it lies before us? I see the Progressive members just arriving. The first part of the Progressive Party's draft is a little different from that of the Liberal Party. Which shall we take? It may be an idea to have a new one, aside from these two.

Mr. SUZUKI: We might take up the draft of the Liberals as a basis and amend it freely.

The Chairman: Well, then, the first thing we have to decide is whether we shall have in the first line, "through our duly elected members of the National Diet" or make it "through the representatives." Which do you think is better? I wish to hear the opinion of the Liberal Party members. In my opinion there is no substantial difference of meaning between those two expressions. To use the word "representative" may be more suitable. If we use the definite expression as, let,.....

Mr. HATTORI: Same as in the English text?

The Chairman: Yes. The word "representatives" may be interpreted as "Deputies." But, when we say "House of

Representatives

Representatives" we understand that they indicate the first House, or House of Commons. At least such has been the usage of those words. Therefore, there is no reason why we must use the word "daihyo".

Mr. SUZUKI: But, we are not the only representatives. The Diet includes the House of Peers as well and it is so in future too, so long as we adopt bicameral system. It seems to me, therefore, that the original wording is better.

The Chairman: Do you think the original is better? Mr. Takahashi, let me hear your opinion.

Mr. Takahashi(Tai): I think that, if we are to use the word "representatives," we had better retain the words"in the National Diet" as in the original.

Mr. MORITO: It may be mistaken as if they were elected in the National Diet..... I think, therefore, that the words "duly elected representatives" without accompanied by the words "in the National Diet" are more accurate. Isn't it?

Mr. HARA (Ju): The words "representatives of the National Diet" sound a little strange, I fear.

Mr. OCHIAI: How do you think of such wording "through our representatives in the National Diet who have been duly elected." My suggestion is that the words "duly elected" may be inserted directly after the words "Japanese people".....

Mr. SUZUKI: The trouble lies in the possible misunderstanding as if they were representatives elected by the National Diet. We may say, therefore, "through our representatives duly elected for the National Diet."

The Chairman: Then, we might say "our representatives in the Diet" instead of "our representatives of the Diet."

Mr.

Mr. MORITO: That leaves no room for any misunderstanding.

Mr. HAYASHI: After all, the idea of the Liberal Party is better, isn't it?

Mr. INUKAI: Mr. Takahashi, is that all right for you?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: The Chairman has just expressed the same view as ours. We think that if the word "representatives" must be retained, the words "in the National Diet" must also be retained.

Mr. HATSUKADE: If so, I am afraid, it may be mistaken as if the representatives" are selected by the National Diet.

The Chairman: How about "acting through"? We have a lot of trouble about the wording in our Party.....

Mr. MORITO: "Acting through" does not put any particular stress on the action, I think.

The Chairman: The expression indicates "the Japanese people who are acting through." These words signify the action of the "Japanese people."

Mr. MORITO: Do you think so? It seems to me that the expression seems to say "they are acting through the National Diet in the work of making the Constitution." Am I wrong?

The Chairman: Shall we drop the word "acting"? Or shall we retain it?

Mr. OSHIMA: I think we had better drop it.

The Chairman: I see that the majority want to discard this word.....

Mr. HATSUKADE: I heard that Mr. Ito would soon be here... say about 2.30 this afternoon. So I think we had better put off our discussion about the word "acting" until then.

Mr.

The Chairman: Well, we shall put off our decision on the word "acting" until he comes back. Now, let us hear your views about the words "the present and the future." In the draft of the Proggressive Party, the original words "for ourselves and our posterity." are retained. Which do you like better of the two expressions "for the present and the future" and "for ourselves and our posterity"?

Mr. MORITO: I prefer the expression in the original draft, though I think that we may omit the word "ourselves" and say "for us and our posterity." We do not generally use "selves" in Japanese wording. I think "for us and our posterity" will do much better.

The Chairman: Do you mean to say "for us and our posterity"?

Mr. MORITO: I think that will do.

The Chairman: If we make it simply "wareare", we must have "wareare no" (Our) before "posterity".

Mr. MORITO: I think it is all right in Japanese. It may be different in foreign languages.....

Mr. MIRA: The reason why I support the original wording is this, that if we adopt such wording as "our people at present and in the future," the meaning of the word "people" becomes very broad, even to include future naturalized Japanese. The object of our Constitution is, I think, to provide for the happiness of the posterity of the Japanese race, or the Yamato race. This point is very important. Therefore, I have arrived at the conclusion that we had better retain the original expression as it is.

The Chairman

The Chairman: Mr. Keto, what do think about this? Shall we put this off as well until Mr. Kita's return?

Mr. KETO: Yes.

The Chairman: Then, let us go ahead, for Mr. Kita will be back here presently. Now, the draft of both the Liberal Party and the Progressive Party discards "aidani" in "Shokokumin tono aidani". Do you think we had better drop this word "aidani"?

Mr. HATSUKADE: If we adopt the word "seika" (fruits) which follows, we may drop the word "aidani". But, when we consider the wording of the original draft carefully, it should be "shokokumin tono aidani.....seiritsu sase".

(The Chairman retires, and Mr. Takahashi (Tai) takes the Chair.)

Mr. MORITO: I fear that does not fit in very well. We might use such a brief expression as "the fruits of cooperation with all nations". The only drawback with this expression is that there is no place wherein we may properly insert the word "kokumin." Speaking generally, however, we may use a brief expression like this. As I have just mentioned, we cannot have the word "kokumin" in it.

Mr. HARA: The reason for amendment is this: In the original draft we have "heiwateki kyoryoku wo seiritsu sase", but then we seem to make mutual effort for peaceful cooperation the expression".....seiritsu sase" does not quite fit in. Therefore, we thought it better to use such wording as "the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations" adding "(secure) blessings of liberty....." For, these words are far more intelligible than the original. Such was the reason why

an amendment in this respect has been proposed.

Mr. HATSUKADE: Supposing we use a clearer expression than "the fruits of peaceful cooperation"? I think it means a good result.

Mr. HARA: Yes, that is right.

Mr. HATSUKADE: If we can find more appropriate words to embrace the good result and blessings or benefits of liberty, so much the better.

Mr. KETO: I understand that the word "fruits" has been selected in order to express the various benefits we may expect after the establishment of peaceful cooperation with all nations, such as the supply of coffee from Brazils, wheat from Canada, and various other things through resumption of foreign trade. So your opinion is that "to secure the fruits" is clearer and more accurate than "spiritual ends," isn't that so?

Mr. HARA: That is our idea.

su.

Mr. HAYASHI: It was suggested to use the term "Hampo Kyowa" (peaceful cooperation with all nations.) I think the word "Kyowa" (peaceful cooperation) is excellent. It is very concise, shortning the words "Heiwateki Kyoryoku" (Peaceful cooperation). But, how about to adopt the wording "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika" (the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations.) Of course, the phrase "Hampo Kyowa no Seika" will do, but I think the term "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika" is the best.

Mr. HARA: Is the letter "Kyo" of the word "Kyowa" derived from the letter "Kyo" of the word "Kyoryoku" (cooperation)?

Mr. HAYASHI: The letter "Kyo" of "Kyoryoku" and the letter "wa" of "Heiwa" (peace) -----

Mr. HARA: I think the word is not quite up to the marks ...

Mr. HAYASHI: The term "Heiwateki Kyoryoku" is too long, I think.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Do you mean to shorten the term "Heiwateki Kyoryoku" to the word "Kyowa"?

Mr. ETO: The term "Shokokumin tono Heiwateki Kyoryoku" can be reduced to the words "Hampo Kyowa". I think the words are excellent.

Mr. HATSUKADE: After all, if we make it short, Hampo Kyowa ----

Mr. ETO: I think the term "Hampo Kyowa no Seika" is better.

Mr. HORIUCHI: In making amendment, we had better avoid words which smack of translation and try to express the meaning in Japanese. I think we can proceed more smoothly in this way.

This

This is a suggestion, and I don't mean to force it, but I think it is worth your consideration.

Mr. HARA: What do you mean by the word "Bampo"(ten thousand nations)? Do you mean the world?

Mr. MORITO: Yes. The word "Banmin"(all the people) suggests the term "Ikkun Banmin"(one ruler and all the people) and denotes the Japanese people. The word does not contain the meaning of "Ko"(nations), therefore, it can not be used.

Mr. HAYASHI: "Shokokumin tono Kyowa" (peaceful cooperation with all the nations) ------

Mr. INUKAI: I think the words "Bampo Kyowa" come rather pat to the meaning of the English version. But we have to remember that these words are rather high-toned Chinese words, while the rest of the sentence concerned is written in spoken Japanese. If we can use the words without compromising the rest of the sentence, I think they sound excellent.

Mr. HARA: It means the countries which have brought the World War II into peaceful conclusion. Therefore, I don't think we can use the word "Bampo." (all nations) here.

Mr. INUKAI: The English version reads "with all nations", meaning any nations. Therefore it is in line with the meaning of "Bampo"

Mr. OSHIMA: It seems that both the Liberals and the Progressives are agreed on this part. I think their drafts are better. "Shokokumin tono Heiwateki Kyoryoku no Seika to Nihonkoku Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Kotaku ---- " (the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations and the blessings of

liberty

liberty throughout this land)

Mr. HAYASHI: This part is very hard to manage because of too many Chinese characters.

The Acting Chairman: I think the term "Bampo Kyowa no Seika to, Nihonkoku Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku" sounds better.

Mr. OSHIMA: I think that is too complicated as compared with the other part of the document.

Mr. HAYASHI: Let me suggest to use only the word "Kyowa" and make the sentence read like this: "Shokokumin tono Kyowa." I think the word "Kyowa" is much better. "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika to, Nihonkoku Zendo --- "

Mr. HARA: As this part refers to the war ---

The Acting Chairman: Does the original text reads "all nations:"?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): It reads "cooperation with all nations."

For your reference, may I point out that "with all nations" in the English text implies, in short, that Japan is the subject, that the matter is considered from the standpoint of Japan, and that it indicates the relation between Japan and the rest of nations. If we translate this into "Bampo" I think the word may not denote the position of Japan vis-a-vis other nations in clear light.

Mr. HAYASHI: If we put it as "Shokokumin tono Kyowa," that will be all right, won't it?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): If you have that implication in mind, the aim of the English text may be expressed.

Mr. INUKAI: In your opinion, the word 'Bempo' means "of all nations." Your observation is very pertinent.

Mr. MORITO: According to the meaning of the original text which reads "secure" ----

Mr. INUKAI: Mr. Morito is of the opinion that we need not be bothered too much by the English version. In that case, "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika" is all right.

Mr. HATSUKADE: Yes it is.

Mr. HAYASHI: I think that is the best.

Mr. INUKAI: This is a matter of euphony. What troubles me is that high-toned Chinese words are used only in this part, and the rest of the sentence follows with the words "Seito ni Senkyo sareta Kokkai ni okeru Daihyosha", disharmonizing the whole structure. I think the words are excellent, but look like a sort of a Triton among the minnows.

Mr. HATSUKADE: This part gave rise to discussions the other day. The preposition "aidani" (between, among) is used here, but the original text uses the preposition "with", not "among". I was told by an American that if we put it as "Bempo Kyowa", it gives one an impression to mean among all nations.

Mr. INUKAI: He was right. So we go too far apart from the English text if we put it as "Takokumin (other nations) tono Kyoryoku no Seika"?

Mr. HATSUKADE: That will be all right.

Mr. OSHIMA: If we put it as "Shokokumin" (all nations) it will be all right. Let us put it as "Shokokumin tono Kyowa."

The Acting Chairman: In that case, Mr. Hayashi is in favor of "Shokokumin tono Heiwateki --- "

Mr. HAYASHI: No. "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika --- "

Mr. INUKAI: The word "Heiwateki" is contracted to the word "Wa".

The Acting Chairman: "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika to, Nihonkoku Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku to wo."
(the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations and the blessings of liberty throughout this land.)
------- Have we agreed to leave intact the word "Jishin" (selves) appearing before this sentence?

Mr. HAYASHI: No, we have not come to a conclusion.

The Acting Chairman: Let us make it final for this part.

Mr. HARA: What has become of it?

The Acting Chairman: "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika to, Nihonkoku Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku to wo Kakuhoshi" (secure the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations and the blessings of liberty throughout this land) -----

Mr. MORITA: In the draft, it is stated as "Zendo ni wat\tte" while the amendment draft puts it as "Nihon koku Zendo niwataru" (throughout the land of Japan). It has a double meaning. We can take it to mean that we secure both the fruits of peaceful cooperation and the blessings of liberty throughout the land of Japan. I think it is rather far-fetched to construe that the words "throughout this land" qualifies only "blessings of liberty". We can take it to mean that we secure throughout the territory of Japan the fruits of peaceful cooperation and the

blessing of liberty. I understand the wording of the draft is so constructed as to mean "secure ---- throughout this land." But in the amendment draft, the words throughout the land do not qualify both, but only the blessings of liberty. I think we need to reconsider the point. In relation with the preceding sentence --- I am not quite sure ---- the words qualify both. That means throughout the land of Japan, or if not Japan, throughout the whole country ----

Mr. ETO: In that case the words "Nihon Zendo ni wattate" should be placed after the words "Jiyu no Keitaku" ----

Mr. INUKAI: How about to put it like this: "Kyowa no Seika to Jiyu no Keitaku to wo Zendo ni watatte Kakuho suru."

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): Indeed we may take it to mean like that, but we were occupied with the idea that if we made an antithesis with foreign relations and domestic affairs, we could put it very smoothly and beautifully. May be, we have construed this part to suit ourselves.

Mr. MORITO: As to the words "Nihon Zenkoku Zendo" (throughout the land of Japan), we need not especially ----

Mr. INUKAI: I think the words "With all nations" are made an antithesis of the words "throughout this land."

Mr. MORITO: Therefore, we can do without the word "Nihonkoku". "Jiyu no Fukushi wo Zendo ni watatte Kakuho suru." This will do.

Mr. INUKAI: What do you think Mr. Eto? I think they make an antithesis.

Mr. ETO: If we amend this part as Mr. Morito suggested it, the

the words "Bampo Kyowa" can be used to very much improve the Japanese text. "Bampo Kyowa to Jiyu no Keitaku to we Nihon Zendo ni watatte Kakuho suru." (secure the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations and the blessings of liberty throughout the land of Japan.) I mean apart from the original text.

Mr. HAYASHI: I think so too.

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): I think we had better take it that the fruits of peaceful cooperation are shared by all nations, and that we are not selfish --- if we connect the words in question with the words throughout the land of Japan, I feel they smack of somewhat selfishness.

Mr. INUKAI: Do the words "Kokunai Zendo" (throughout the land) sound bad?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): When we drew up the outline of the Constitution, we tried to put it as "Kono kuni no" (of this country) or something like that. It might have been "Kono Kuni Zendo ni Oyobu" (throughout the land of this country.)

Mr. ITO: From the meaning of the original text, I think we can express it more clearly if we put it as Mr. Morito mentioned just now. The whole of Japan wishes peace, and as the result of such wish, the fruits of peace are brought to the whole land of Japan, therefore, ---

Mr. INUKAI: The whole of Japan is permeated with the desire for peaceful cooperation with all nations. --- We can take it to mean like this. What is your opinion, Mr. Hayashi?

Mr. HAYASHI: We can take it either way. We may have to decide it by our intuition. We may as well adopt the one which sounds better. I think either will do.

su.

Mr. HARA: They are related to the following, "resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government".

"The fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nation" is one factor and "the blessings of liberty throughout this land" is another, to secure which we are resolved that never again shall we, be visited with the horrors of war etc.

Is it not better to put all these together according to the order of sentences in the original? It may have somewhat different meaning, if the expression "the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nation" is to be qualified by the words "throughout this land".

Mr. MORITO: I think it proper that the fruits of peaceful cooperation should so construed as to be secured throughout this land.

Mr. HARA: Then, the words "seifitsu sase" seem not to be adequate.

Mr. MORITO: It is your amendment. I think the word "seika" as proposed by the Progressive and Liberal Parties, is better. There are two things "fruits" and "blessings" which shall be secured throughout the land.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Mr. Hara, have you no objection to the original?

Mr. HARA: No. I have no objection to it as far as the sentence ending in the word "seika" is concerned.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): The text is, then, approved as amended up to that word. Well, and the following?

Mr. HARA: The rest is all right as in the original, except that the word "Fukushi" should be changed to "Keitaku"

Mr. HAYASHI: Can't we change "Nihonkoku Kendo ni wataru" into "Kokumin no Jiyu no Keitaku"? I think "Zen Kokumin no Jiyu no Keitaku" is better.

Mr. HARA: We must have some adjectives .....

Mr. OSHIMA: Is it generally settled that the word "Fukushi" should be changed to "Keitaku"?

Mr. HARA: Because it is "blessings" .....

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Is there no objection to the change?

Mr. OSHIMA: I am in favor of it.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Let us decide to retain the expression in the original "Kyows no Seika to Nihon Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku towo kakuhoshi" and go ahead.

Mr. MORITO: "Wataru" is not good. If it is to qualify "Jiyu" only it must be "Watatte", but if it is to qualify the whole, it should be put back.

Mr. OSHIMA: Let us leave it at that, "Nihonkoku Zendo ni watatte Jiyu no Keitaku wo Kakuho shi" .....

Mr. SATO (Government delegate): Is it not "Watatte no"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): The substance comes to that.

Mr. INUKAI: Mr. Sato is right, I think.

Mr. HATSUKADE: It sounds best if we say "Nihonkoku Zendo ni oyobu"

Mr. OSHIMA: I think "Watatte" is all right. The word is used to qualify the the word "Kakuho".

Mr. INUKAI: Mr. Oshima's opinion is the same as Mr. Morito's.

It

It will come to "Seika to Keitaku towo Nihonkoku Zendo ni watatte"

Mr. HAYASHI: Does the word "Kakuho" govern both "Seika" and "Keitaku"?

Mr. ETO: I think so.

Mr. HAYASHI: Then, the word "to" in "Keitaku towo" is superfluous, is it not?

Mr. SATO (Government delegate): Are you referring to the word "to" in "Keitaku to"?

Mr. HAYASHI: Yes.

Mr. SATO: It is what I was going to explain. In case more than two nouns or pronouns are connected with a conjunction "to" (and), there are usually two way of expressing it in Japanese; for example, we say "Kore to Are" (this and that) or "Kore to Are to" (repeating the word "to" after the following noun of pronoun.)

Both ways seem to be maintained with equal force. But, we have omitted the second "to" throughout the draft, so far as there is no particular need to use it. This is just for your information.

Mr. INUKAI: Is it so? It is better to have a uniform style.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Is the expression "Nihonkoku Mendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku" not good?

Mr. OSHIMA: I prefer to leave the words as they are in the original, it is difficult to reach an agreement.

Mr. TAKAHASHI

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Can we not amend again what is not fit after we have got it through?

Mr. OSHIMA: We better go ahead.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): I shall read the text as amended, "Shokokumin tono Kyowa no Seika to Nihonkoku Zendo ni wataru Jiyu no Keitaku towo Kakuhoshi, Seifu no Kodo ni yotte futatabi Senso no Sanka ga Nassei shinaiyo ni suru Koto wo Ketsui shi" Is there no objection to it?

Mr. HAYASHI: How about "sasemai"?

Mr. HATSUKADE: I will withdraw it.

Mr. ETO: With regard to the word "Sataru", we might reserve the point for further study.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): The word "Koi" (Action) in the original is changed to "Kodo" (conduct) in the draft both of the Liberal and the Progressive Parties. What is your opinion Mr. Hayashi?

Mr. HAYASHI: I think the word "Kodo" sounds stronger and I prefer it to "Koi".

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): "Seifu wa Kodo ni yotte futatabi Senso no Sanka ga Nassei shinaiyo ni suru koto wo Ketsui shi" .....

Mr. MORITO: It seems to me that the expressures are in a tone of literal translation. It might be better to put it"Senso no Sanka wo kurikaesanu koto wo Ketsui shi". I do not stick to the exact wording, but yours sounds somewhat sluggish .....

Mr. YOSHIDA: The text was originally written so as to read, "Sanka wo Nassei sasemai to Ketsui shi". It is much simpler. I think that either this or Mr. Morito's amendment is better.

Mr. MORITO

Mr. MORITO: If we say "Senso no Sanka wo kurikaesanu koto wo Ketsui shi", we may omit the word "futatabi" and we better say "Sanka wo" instead of "Sankaga". At any rate, we should make it simpler.

Mr. HARA: Mr. Morito, may I get your opinion? Does not the word "futatabi" with the word "Kurikaesu" (repeat)? make it sufficiently clear without substituting it.

Mr. INUKAI: It is a question of tone rather than meaning.

Mr. YOSHIDA: I agree to Mr. Morito's views. Was it "Saku wo kurikaesanu koto wo Ketsuishi"?

Mr. MORITO: Yes.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Shall we amend as proposed by Mr. Morito, namely "Seifu no Kodo ni yotte Senso no Sanka no kurikaesanu koto wo Ketsui shi"?

Mr. HAYASHI: I agree to Mr. Morito's views, provided, however, that the word "kurikaesanu" should be "kurikaesanai".

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Shall it read "Senso no Sanka wo kurikaesanai Koto wo Ketsui shi"?

Mr. ETO: Yes.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman). Mr. Matsukade, what is your opinion?

Mr. MATSUKADE: I have no objection to it.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: Then we come to "do proclaim the sovereignty of the people's will and do ordain and establish this Constitution", ---- what do you think about it?

Mr. HAYASHI: I think the original text which is expressed more implicitly is better, so I wish to hear explanations again why it should be amended.

Mr. INUKAI

47

Mr. INUKAI: It is not up to me to explain it, but allow me to say that the wording was decided upon a few days ago after negotiations with the Authorities concerned.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Which is correct, "sonsuru" or "ni aru"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): Which is the proposal of the Liberal Party?

Mr. YOSHIDA: We put the word "sonsuru" at first, but amended it as "aru" later, as it seems to be better.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): What do you think, Mr. Hatsukade?

Mr. HATSUKADE: I am in favor of "aru".

Mr. HAYASHI: I quite understand the provision from a viewpoint of international relations. I think that the word "people" means, as explained by Mr. Kanamori at the full Committee the people including the Emperor. Am I right?

Mr. ETO: According to my information obtained at the meeting of the Liberal Party during the discussion of the amendment, it is clearly said that the people includes therein the Emperor.

Mr. YOSHIDA: The Progressive Party has the same views as to its interpretation.

Mr. HAYASHI: I understand. Then I am in favor of the text, in view of the present international position of Japan position.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): If it is all right, we go to the next. The text reads "founded upon the universal principle that government is a sacred trust, the authority for which is derived from the people, the powers of which are exercised by the representatives

representatives of the people, and the benefits of which are enjoyed by the people, and we reject and revoke all constitutions, laws, ordinances, and rescripts in conflict herewith". Up to this point.

Mr. SUZUKI: Is the letter "Hai" (廃) is changed to ~~Shi~~ 排 (hai)?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: Yes, 排.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Should it read "Koshi shite" instead of "Koshi shi" in "Kokumin no Daihyosha ga Kore wo Koshi shi"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Acting Chairman): No. In the draft proposed by the Liberal Party, the text is written as "Koshi shi", while in the draft of the Progressive Party, it is "Kore wo okonai"

Mr. YOSHIDA: I do not insist on "okonai"; "koshi shi" might well be adopted. Shall the letter "te" be inserted?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: No, without it.

gu.

Mr. ETO: Mr. Matsukaide, who I find is not present now, is of the opinion that "Kokusei" should be changed, to "Seifu". I think we had better ask for his opinion once more in this point.

Mr. YOSHIDA: This matter has been the object of discussion. The Progressive Party favors it in its original form, but what is the opinion of the Social Democratic Party? I. myself prefer "Kokusai" .....

The Acting-Chairman (Mr. TAKAHASHI): Mr. Suzuki, have you any opinion?

Mr. SUZUKI: I prefer "Kokusai". As Mr. Kasai has come back, we better ask for his opinion .....

Mr. KASAI: I suggest that this be amended as "Seifu". The reason is that the preceding word "government" is translated as "Seifu"; therefore the following one should also be translated "Seifu".

Mr. SUZUKI: Then it would read "Seifu wa Kokumin no Suko naru Shintaku niyoru monodeari". Is it all right?

Mr. KASAI: Yes, that is it.

Mr. SUZUKI: I think we ought to change the word in some way.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Isn't "Kokusaiｷ preferable?

Mr. KASAI: I think that "Kokusai" is not appropriate. The often quoted English phrase "government of the people" means "Kokumin no Seifu" in Japanese, not "Kokumin no Kokusai". Therefore this word "government" means "Seifu".

Mr. OSHIMA: You mean to translate as "Jinmin niyoru Seifu", not "Seiji"?

Mr. KASAI

Mr. KASAI: Some times, we say "Seiji", but here .....

Mr. SUZUKI: If translated as "Seiji", it is understandable. And then, "Kokusei" is all right.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Yes.

Mr. KASAI: Mr. Kita, before leaving, said that the favored "Seifu". I think that the word "Seifu" is stronger.

Mr. SUZUKI: Apart from the English version, the expression "Kokusei wa Kokumin no Suko na Shintaku niyoru monode" is fine. Isn't it all right?

Mr. YOSHIDA: I feel the same way as Mr. Suzuki.

Mr. HATSUKAIDE: We too, consider that's all right.

Mr. KASAI: I hope you defer the decision to some time later. I have some matters to consider in this connection.

Mr. HARA: This is preferable.

Mr. OSHIMA: After all, government here means "Seiji".

Mr. TAKAHASHI (The Acting Chairman): Then, what shall we do?

Mr. OSHIMA: I think what we entrust is "Seiji".

Mr. YOSHIDA: The trust of "Seiji" is the same as the trust of "Kokusei" ....

Mr. ITO: Those who favor "Seifu" seem to theorize that "Kokusei" includes judicial and other powers. And I think they want to use a word of narrower meaning.

Mr. KASAI: Exactly so. As the following sentence "a sacred trust, the authority for which is derived from the people, the powers of which are exercised by the representatives of the

the people, and the benefits of which are enjoyed by the people," is the explanation of government, I consider that this English word has such a meaning as has just been pointed out by Mr. Ito. "Seiji" will include judicial and all other general matters; therefore, "Seifu" is preferable.

The Acting Chairman: What do you say Mr. Hayashi?

Mr. HAYASHI: I think that this should read "somo somo kuni no Seiji wa Kokumin no Suko na Shintaku ni yoru (period) sono Keni wa Kokumin ni yurai suru, sono Kenryoku wa Kokumin no Daihyosha ga okonau". In that case, "Kokusei" makes smooth reading. This is reasonable, I consider.

Mr. KASAI: In the Japanese version, a new sentence is begun with the words "somo somo". In the English version, they are all included in one sentence. Therefore, I think that the preceding "government" and the following "government" are the same thing. In this sense I prefer "Seifu".

The Acting Chairman: Opinions are divided into two. The matter may be left for future study. Is there any point to be revised in the following sentence down to the end of the paragraph?

Mr. MORITO: I think that the phrase "Kyoju suru monode arukotowa " be amended as "Kyoju suru [illegible] or "Kyoju suru kotowa". The shorter the better.

Mr. YOSHIDA: I did not catch Mr. Morito's words .....

Mr. MORITO: Prior to that, we have "Kokusei wa Kokumin no Suko na Shintaku niyoru mono dearu" ..., then I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. KASAI

Mr. KASAI: I think Mr. Morito is right. The Japanese version of the English phrase " the benefits of which are enjoyed by the people" should be rendered shorter, as it explains the preceding term "the universal principle". In my view it should read "Kokumin ni yotte Kyoju serarubeki Jinrui Fuhen no Genri wo Kiso tosuru kono Kempo wo Kakuritu suru."

The Acting Chairman: Mr. Kasai, isn't the print ready yet?

Mr. KASAI: It is now under printing.

The Acting Chairman: Then will you please say it again?

Mr. KASAI: It would read "Koko ni Kokumin Soi no Shuken wo Sengen shi, Seifu wa Shinsei naru Shintaku nishite, sono Keni wa Kokumin ni Engen shi, sono Kenryoku wa Kokumin no Daihyosha ni yotte Koshi serare, sono Keifuku wa Kokumin ni yotte Kyoju serarubeki Jinrui Fuhen no Genri wo Kiso to suru kono Kempo wo Kakuritsu suru." The following sentence is "Warera wa kono Kempo ni hansuru Issai no Kempo to Horei, Shochoku wo Haishi suru mondo aru."

Mr. MORITO: I suggest that "yorumonodesari" be amended as "Yori" and "Kotowa" as "nowa" .....

Mr. YOSHIDA: I think Mr. Morito's suggestion just now made is simple and good. But I am afraid there is some discrepancy between the word used by the Chairman and that used by Mr. Morito. Does the word "Rieki" mean "Ben-eki" (benefit) or "Fukuri" (well-being)?

The Acting Chairman: It is "Ben-eki".

Mr. Y. Suzuki: In the original draft, it is "Ben-eki". How to change it is a different question. Is your "Kei" of "Keifuku" the "Kei" of "Keio"?

Mr. KASAI: Yes. That word was used by Mr. Kita here yesterday, and I agree with him. This is said to have been used by Emperor Meiji when the Meiji Constitution was drawn up. I think it carries somewhat nobler idea than "Rieki".

Mr. YOSHIDA: "Fukuri" and "Ben-eki" are both all right, but "Keifuku" is also good. Let us decide on "Keifuku".

Mr. HARA: Will "Fukuri" not do? Words "Keitaku" and "Keifuku" come in succession. Why not use "Fukuri" simply?

Mr. YOSHIDA: I think "Fukuri" will do. But when placed side by side, "Keifuku" is better. Mr. Hara says words come in succession. But how?

Mr. HARA: If we say "Keitaku to shite Keifuku", there is alliteration of "Kei". Is not "Fukuri" better expressing the idea most properly? This is a problem that does not matter very much.....

Mr. MATSUDAIRA: The benefit of Government is not that of material only but spiritual one is included. From that point of view "Keifuku" has a deeper meaning and I am in favor of "Keifuku".

Mr. SUZUKI: That word is good for man of learning. But it is a little difficult. The English version has "benefits". The meaning

is

is "by such and such, the people get "Onkei" (good) " ---. This is the original meaning. So the word "Onkei", though a common word, carries the idea more thoroughly.

Mr. YOSHIDA: I think what Mr. Suzuki says stands to reason, but if we use "Keifuku" for "Onkei".....

Mr. SUZUKI: Yes, only the word is a little difficult. In the light of permanent nature of the people's culture, I should like to have words that make themselves understood at instant hearing.

Mr. MORITO: It makes one feel a little at variance with the democratic principles.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Then what do you say to change it to "Fukuri".... What do you think, Mr. Morita?

Mr. KASAI: Why not make it "Keifuku"?

Mr. SUZUKI: I agree, but.....,

Mr. KASAI: Can't you agree to "Keifuku"? It is a little difficult, but "Kei" of "Keiga" is a word of everyday use to Japanese and "Fuku" of "Keifuku" is "Fuku" of "Fukuri". What is your opinion?

Mr. YOSHIDA: Mr. Eto and Mr. Hara. Let us here your opinion.

Mr. ETO: I agree to "Keifuku".

Mr. YOSHIDA: Then let it be so.

The Acting Chairman: Now let us see how it reads. Government is a sacred trust.....? yorunonodesu" (a thing to lie) is corrected to "yori" (lies). "Sono Ken-i wa Kokumin ni Yorai shi sono Kenryoku wa Kokumin no Daihyosha ga Koshi shi sono Keifuku wa Kokumin ga koree Kyoju suruuma Jinrui Fuhen no Gensi de aru". Is this all right?

Mr. YOSHIDA: Which is better "Kokumin ga kore o Kyoju suruma" or "Kyoju surukotoma"?

Is not the latter do?

Mr. MORITO: Either will do for me.

Mr. SATO

56

Mr. SATO (Government delegate): Let me say a word regarding the point of "Kyoju suru". According to the original way of expression, "koso" is considered rather too colloquial and "Koto wa" is used in other parts. Another point, please. This is also only a matter of nuance. "Kokumi ga Kokumin no Suko na Shintaku ni yoru" (Government is a sacred trust) was specially made "yorunenodeari" (a thing to be a sacred trust) and thus trust is somewhat stressed and the authority for which is derived from the people.... the power..... and the benefits..... are jointed in counterpart. Such was the trend of idea in writing the draft. This is only for your reference.

Mr. KASAI: Before the word "Shintaku", the word "Suko" is used. But I think something higher than "Suko" is meant here. It means "Shisei" (sacred) and includes people's free-will, people's rights and is the most important and comprehensive word. So I hope "Suko" be replaced by "Shinsei". People's rights which nothing can violate are really secred. As the English version uses sacred instead of noble, I think "Shinsei" is better.

Mr. SATO (Government delegate): Let me say a word for your reference. When we were drawing up the draft, the word "Shinsei", was suggested. The word "Shinsei", when read in relation to the present Constitution, savours of mysticism, and on that account though the word was a desirable word in itself, we contented ourselves with the word "Shiko" (sublime). This is the reason why "Shiko" was adopted.

Mr. KASAI: This mysticism is different from the mystic idea of the Emperor's being a living god, so we can use the word "Shinsei" here boldly, I think.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Is this not good enough, Mr. Kasai, as the Government delegate says, though I see well what you mean.

Mr. HATSUKADE

Mr. HATOYAMA: On this question, I heard Mr. Kasai's question and Mr. Kanamori's reply. I think Mr. Kanamori carried the day. I am still in favor of the original draft.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Mr. Kasai, let us go on with this. Mr. Morito, shall we go on with "Suko na Shintaku ni yori" (a sacred trust) suggested by Mr. Morito? Mr. Suzuki's suggestion of saying, "Shintaku ni yorumonode ari" is anyhow settled and we can take the sense in that way from the context. Mr. Morito, can't you accept "yorumonode ari" and settle the passage as you suggested?

Mr. ETO: I well understand the point, "yorumonode ari" by the drafters' explanation. I prefer the strong expression "yorumono de ari." As to the word "Suko" (sublime), I like "Shinsei" (sacred) better. This word is found in the present Constitution indeed, but as Mr. Kasai explains, the meaning is different. We should not dislike the word, only because it is used in the present Constitution. I don't think it advisable to select "Suko" (sublime) with a predisposition that the word is in the present Constitution.

Mr. T. OSHIMA: The word sacred means "shinsei". I think this translation is right.

Mr. MORITO: I agree to make it to "Shintaku ni yorumonode ari."

The Acting Chairman: I ask Mr. Morito. Is the last part "monode ari"? How about "sono Kenpo no Kokumin ni Yurai shi sono Kenryoku no Kokumin no Daihyosha ga Kore wo Koshi shi sono Keifuku no Kokumin ga Kore wo Kyoju suru koto wo"?

This does not make smooth connection.

Mr. MORITO: There comes "mmode ari." A line after next comes "motomu mmode aru." I am inclined to think there is room for further consideration from a rhetorical point.

Mr. YOSHIDA

Mr. YOSHIDA : There are "monode ari" and "monode ari", two many "monode ari" are "mono-mono-shii" (Awful).

Mr. MORITO: "Genri ni motozuku monode ari" based on principles) is better by saying "monode aru".

Mr. KASAI: As Mr. Kita will be present to-morrow, I hope you will defer the last decision on the word "Shinsei" (sacred) till to-morrow.

The Acting Chairman: Please consider the last part I have asked.

Mr. KASAI: Let me ask again. As benefits are enjoyed by the people and the Constitution is based on principles of universal human benefits enjoyed, I should like to have "geki Jinrui Fuhen" instead of "monode atte", though the former is rather descriptive. The four things come one after another: "Kokumin no Shinsei naru Shintaku de atte Ken-i wa Kokumin ni Yurai shi Kenryoku wa Kokumin no Daihyosha ni yotte Koshi sarare Soshite Keifuku wa Kokumin ni yotte Syoju serarubeki Jinrui Fuhen no Genri".....

The Acting Chairman: Then, some rewriting must be done before and after. The connection of phrases is not quite well.

Mr. KASAI: Mr. Suzuki spoke about it yesterday. I hope Ministers would be a little more broad-minded and a satisfactory style would be worked out.

Mr. MORITO: Concerning the point "monode aru", please let me consider a little more. I hope to change to a better expression if I can find one.

The Acting Chairman: In the meantime, asking for your further consideration on the point, let us go ahead. Now, we shall take up as the next paragraph beginning with "We, the Japanese people,

desiring

desiring peace for all time" down to the end. As far as this clause is concerned, there is little difference in phraseology between the original draft of the "overnment and that of the Liberal and the Progressive Nation.

Mr. ETO: How about the passage.?..... tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance".

Mr. OSHIMA: Before coming there, we have the words",,,,, are deeply conscious of the high ideals...". Is that all right?

Mr. ETO: That is quite all right, isn't it?

Mr. OSHIMA: If that is all right, I leave it.

The Acting Chairman: As has been advanced by Mr. Eto, do you not think it all right?"..... are deeply conscious of the high ideals"...

Mr. MURTO: Here we have another "nmode otte". It appears that these words are repeated too many times.

The Acting Chairman: Oh, I have misread. I think the term "Ke[illegible] kyo" appearing in the middle of the clause under review has already been changed to " Hanshitsu" at the suggestion of Mr. Oshima.

Mr. ETO: No, I do not think that the point has been decided upon yet. Only suggested.

The Acting Chairman: Then, will you please express your opinion, Mr. Oshima?

Mr. OSHIMA: In the morning session, I said in regard to the term "Henkyo" that, whereas the three linking words immediately preceding it, namely, "Tensei" "Haiji" and "Appaku" all are nouns, this term alone is essentially ~~are~~ adjectival noun, so that quite an unbalanced impression may be gained therefrom, so I suggested to change "Henkyo" to "Hanshitsu", so that ~~it~~ can agree with the remainder grammatically. How is that?

The

The Acting Chairman: What do you think about Mr. Oshima's view?

Mr. MATSUKADE: I second his view.

The Acting Chairman: Any other opinions?

Mr. MORITO: While I have little objection to the word "Henshitsu", I desire to see the words " Kyubo" and "Sakushu" added immediately after "Appaku" and "Henshitsu". You see, the words "Sensei" and "Reiju" have a political implication, the word "Appaku" may sound political but has essentially a social implication with a spiritual background,--- particularly, religious and educational. As another social aspect, we must know there is economic oppression. It includes "Kyubo" and "Sakushu", or "Hinkon" and "Sakushu" or "Hinkon" and "Kokushi". Therefore, I earnestly hope that these copulative words are inserted here. Without them, I feel that the style of sentence is incomplete. As you will find later, the words "Kyufu" and "Ketsubo", appearing two lines downward, also denote social problems. Therefore, I am anxious to have the words "Kyubo" and "Sakushu" inserted here.

The Acting Chairman: Then, do you wish to see the phrase in question read like this?

"Appaku to Henshitsu Kyubo to Sakushu wo Chijo kara Riyen ni Fusshoku shiyo".

Mr. MORITO: Yes.

The Acting Chairman: Is there any objection to the change as suggested?

Mr. KASAI: Before inserting the words "Kyubo" and "Sakushu", let us consider whether it is better to change "Hankyo" to "Henshitsu".

We may also consider such words as "Kyogo" and "Gammai". If "Hankyo" is not good, what word is to be substituted here? Let us

consider

consider that point. What do you say to using the word "Gammei"?

The Acting Chairman: Then, do you mean "Appaku to Gammei"?

Mr. KASAI: Yes, "Kyoryo" and "Gammei" are translated into "intolerance" in dictionaries. So, it is desirable to use some stronger word. Are there any suggestions?

Mr. ITO: "Sensei" and "Reiju".....

Mr. KASAI: They make an antithesis.

Mr. ITO: Then come "Appaku" and "Henshitsu". There must be found a suitable vocabulary, to make an antithesis with "Appaku".

Mr. SUZUKI: "Henshitsu" differs from "Henkyo" in meaning.

Mr. KASAI: What do you say to changing it to "Gammei".... "Fukanyo" (不寛容) in place of "Henkyo".....?

Mr. SUZUKI: "Fukanyo" might sound all right, but because it consists of three letters..... And as regards "Henkyo", although it has been argued that it is an adjectival noun, I think that there is nothing objectionable in using it. That may be interpreted in the same sense as "Fukanyo". But "Henshitsu" sounds somewhat stiff. In fact, that deviates a little.

Mr. INUKAI: I quite agree with Mr. Suzuki that "Henkyo" and "Henshitsu" are different in meaning.

The Acting Chairman: What do you say, Mr. Hatsukade?

Mr. HATSUKADE: Speaking of "Henshitsu", I may say that "Hen" means prejudice and "shitsu" means persistence. So "Henshitsu" means a state of narrow-mindedness. As regards "Henkyo", "kyo" means "narrow-mindedness", and I think it is all right. If viewed grammatically, I hold that to use "shitsu" is also unobjectionable. But "kyo" might be better. I hope you will bear this in mind. I also hope that due credit will be given to Mr. Oshima's view.

Mr. HAYASHI: Turning to "Henkyo", though it means prejudiced obstinacy, it comes, in the final analysis, to "Dokuzen" or "self-complacency". Being a familiar and plain word, will it not be all right to use "Dokuzen"?

Mr. SUZUKI, Y: Still I think that "Henkyo" is better.

Mr. KASAI: "Henshitsu" might not be bad, but "Henkyo" is far better and more easily understood by the public. We are just trying to find out a better word, if any, than "Henkyo" or "Henshitsu".

Mr. ETO: Intolerance invites oppression, so the word "Henshitsu" would seem somewhat out of place here.

Mr. OSHIMA: The words "oppression" and "intolerance" make an antithesis, don't they? Therefore, to try to arrange an antithesis in Japanese would be unreasonable. Unlike a fine combination of such words as "tyranny" and "slavery", which form a good antithesis, the fault here is rather with the

unsuitableness

unsuitableness of the original language "oppression" and "intolerance".

Mr. ETO: I am not familiar with the original language ----- Turning to Mr. Horito's opinion, I also maintain that an antithesis should be composed of "Kyubo" and "Sakushu", because the former is closely related with the latter. About a combination of such words as "Appaku" and "Henkyo", "Henkyo" might be tolerated, but "Henshitsu" is too obscure in meaning. So I take it that it has been asked to find out a better word. In this connection, I quite agree with the suggestion of Mr. Kasai to use "Gammei", for it seems to me the most fitting word here.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Well, how about my suggestion? That is, since it would not be so easy to find out for application a really appropriate and right word, let us be contented with "Henkyo", because its meaning seems to be quite plainly understood as was advanced by Mr. Suzuki. Anyhow, leaving it like that let us go ahead, otherwise we can never finish.

(The Acting Chairman, Mr. TAKAHASHI, Y retires, and the Chairman takes the Chair.)

The Chairman: So, what are we going to do after "Appaku" and "Henshitsu"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI, Y: Final decision has not as yet been made on "Henshitsu". We have been tackling with the wording.

The Chairman: How about dropping the word at all?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: Not decided yet. The question of changing "Henkyo" to "Henshitsu" is not settled yet.

The Chairman: But isn't it a little funny to let the word "Henkyo" remain, if we clearly know it is an adjective?

Mr. SUZUKI: I do not think it is objectionable in any way whatsoever, even if it were an adjective. Since "Appaku" and "Reiju" both express an abstract idea, I think "Henkyo" is the best word to fit in here. "Henshitsu" has a different meaning.

The Chairman: I have no particular opinion myself.

Mr. SUZUKI: "Gammei" stands against "Chisei" or intelligence. So "Gammei" is just not the right word.

Mr. YOSHIDA: As a steering committee, I suggest that we proceed further, without obstinately roaming around here. Mr. Kasai?

Mr. KASAI: As for me, I have no objection. I want to assure Mr. Yoshida that I do not object to "Henkyo". But since "Henshitsu" has been brought out ....

The Chairman: Then, shall we leave "Henkyo" as it is?

Mr. ETO: I think "Henkyo" is better.

The Chairman: What do you say to leaving "Henkyo" intact?

(Some call "Ayes")

The Chairman: How about the word "Fusekaku" (banishment) appearing after them?

Mr. KOMITO: Before that, I should like to have the words "Kyobo to Sakushu" (poverty and exploitation) added.

The Chairman: But the word "Hotsubo" (want) is appearing a few lines below.

Mr. KOMITO: That is a little bit different.

The Chairman

The Chairman: The same meaning appears later, although not in the same line.

Mr. MORITO: The international relations ----

The Chairman: The words "We recognize and acknowledge that all peoples ---" include ourselves, don't they?

Mr. MORITO: Because of these words, I think we had better insert the words I mentioned in the foregoing part.

The Chairman: Frankly speaking, as the English text was written with a view to polishing up the style, these four words (tyranny, slavery, oppression and intolerance) were put side by side. As I am a poor English scholar, I am not in a position to judge such matter, but, do you think it proper to add two more similar words here?

Mr. MORITO: As these two words have a very serious social significance, we may add them, even if they may spoil the style. I think this is a very important matter in its substance.

The Chairman: As our aim is to improve the world, we have many things which we would like to bring in ----

Mr. MORITO: If you think there are too many antithesis, I think we should insert these two words even at the risk of breaking up the antithesis.

The Chairman: There is already a word "Appaku" (oppression) here. Your "Sakushu" (exploitation) ----

Mr. MORITO: It may look redundant, but, according to my impression of the whole sentence, "tyranny and slavery" are a political expression, while "oppression and intolerance" are a

<u>spiritual</u>

spiritual or mental expression. My "poverty and exploitation" are an expression of "economical sociality." Without these three, the sentence is unbalanced. This corresponds to our desire to add something substantial to the rights of the people under Chapter 3. Therefore, I should very much like to have these words inserted here. If necessary, the antitheses may be broken up or reduced to "oppression and intorelance" and "poverty and exploitation". This is not a matter of words, but of substance. This has an important bearing upon the whole structure of the Constitution. This point is deemed very important by the members of my party.

Mr. YOSHIDA: As there are some points reserved for future decision at the previous meeting in this part of the Preamble, if we can not decide this matter right now, we might postpone ---

The Chairman: Then, we shall reserve the decision. As I it is difficult for me to say yes or no definitely without consulting with my party on this matter ----

Mr. YOSHIDA: Let us decide that way.

Mr. MORITO: As to the part which reads: "Warera wa Heiwa wo Iji shi Sensei to Reifoku, Appaku to Monkyo wo Chijo kara Kikyo ni Jokyo shiyo to tsutomete iru Kokusai Shakai ni oshite" (We desire to occupy an honored place in the international society designed and dedicated to the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth.) It looks like, as the part now stands, that a sentence is complete with "Warera wa Heiwa wo Iji su" (We preserve peace.) This is of course not right, is it?

The Chairman

67

The Chairman: The words "the preservation of peace" are related to the international society.

Mr. MORITO: I think we have to be careful for this part. Both the preservation of peace and the banishment of tyranny etc. are related to the international society. Therefore, if we put a comma after the words "Warera wa Heiwa wo Ijishi", we may take the meaning of the sentence correctly, otherwise there may arise misunderstanding as I have mentioned. In order not to give rise to any misunderstanding -----

The Chairman: Can you suggest some way out?

Mr. ITO: I think the original draft is all right. It means to say that we belong to the international society.

Mr. MORITO: We think it is one way of expressing the original meaning. But from the viewpoint of style, the subject and the predicate is too far apart.

Mr. MORITO: Speaking of style, the term "Jokyo shiyo to tsutomete iru Kokusai Shakai ni goshite" may need some polishing up.

Mr. YOSHIDA: I would like to shorten it.

Mr. MORITO: If you have any good idea -----

As to this sentence beginning with the words "Warera wa Heiwa wo Iji shi -- ", it is very difficult for us to perceive the real meaning unless we compare it words by words with the English text.

Mr. KADAI: Let me suggest to alter the word "goshite" to "okeru." The English text reads: "the desire to occupy an honored place in an international society ---." Therefore, the word "goshite" is too strong. Let us change this to lighter word "okeru".

The Chairman Any other suggestions?

Mr. HARA: I think the wording of the original draft is better.

The Chairman: How about the word "Fusshoku" appearing just befpre the word "goshite"? It offends the limitation on Chinese characters for everyday use.

Mr. YOSHIBA: I think the word "Fusshoku" is all right as it is. As to the word "goshite", I think it is clear and plain.

The Chairman: How about the words "hiteshiku Kyofu to Ketsubo kara Kaiho sare" (free from fear and want) appearing in the next sentence? Shall we change them to "Kyofu no Ketsubo no naku" ----

Mr. SUZUKI: I think the wording of the original draft is better. If we use the words "Kyofu no Ketsubo no naku", they sound very weak.

The Chairman: The English words "free from" are, I think, weak. They have not a strong meaning as in the case of beneficiary interest. Therefore, we tried to tone down the Japanese word corresponding to "free from".

Mr. Suzuki: It does not matter whether the words have strong or weak meaning. It is an idiomatic use to say "Ketsubo kara Kaiho sareru."

The Chairman: The use of such words may be common among the people of your class. But for the pupils of primary schools and those who have only elementary education, I think the words are too difficult to understand.

Mr. SUZUKI: If it is written so in the Constitution, the people will gradually become accustomed to them.

Mr. MORITO: Or we may use the word "manukarete".

The Chairman: The word may be understood by every body.

Mr. INUKAI: When we say "Konku no Ketsubo no naku" (literally translated: without want and fear) it means the condition where want and fear have disappeared of themselves. The words "free from" presuppose some media which free them, therefore, we had better use the word "manukareru" here. This is only my personal opinion. What do the gentlemen of the Liberal Party think?

Mr. ITO: I am in favor of it.

The Chairman: I think it is all right.

Mr. MORITO: What does it mean by the word "subetano Kuni no Kokumin ga."

The Chairman: They are the translation of English words "all peoples".

Mr. MORITO: What was the original words used in translating them?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): We first translated them into "Bankokumin", but as the word was considered too colloquel, we changed it.

Mr. MORITO: "Subetano Kokumin". "Bankokumin." Do these words mean "individual persons of a nation" or "nation"?

The Chairman: I think they mean all "nations."

Mr. MORITO: I think so too.

Mr. KASAI: If we put them into "subeteno Kokumin", we will lose their nuance, therefore, I suggest to use either "Shokokumin" or "Sekai Kakukokumin."

The Chairman: In the original translation they were put into something like that.

Mr. SATOH "Bankokumin hitoshiku."

Mr. MORITO: These words may be interpreted to denote domestic affairs. We may interprete them to mean the peoples of all countries. In this form, we are not much impressed that they signify the relation among the nations. What do you feel? If we say "subeteno Kuni no Kokumin ga," we are apt to interpret it to mean "peoples of all countries". There are a great deal of difference in the meaning between these words and "all peoples"

The foregoing part should be construed to mean in general that oppression, slavery, intolerance, etc. shall be removed from human society. The present part should be construed to mean that it is desirable that the relation among all peoples should be peacefully maintained and that they should be placed in a condition where they can enjoy their existence free from the threat of war or economic blocked or any other such troubles. Therefore, the words "Subeteno Kuni no Kokumin ga" does not come pat to the meaning.

The Chairman: The Japanese language does not have any appropriate word which expresses the precise meaning you require. We experienced the same difficulty at the part beginning with the words "Heiwa wo Iji shi ---", as Mr. Morito pointed out. The mode inherent in the Japanese language of constructing

sentance

Sentence is such that we are prevented from placing the phrases exactly where we want and that it is very difficult for us to write a sentence as clearly as in English.

Mr. ETO: As was pointed out by Mr. Morito, if we use the words "subeteno Kuni no Kokumin ga" they might give rise to wrong interpretation, I suggest to put it very clearly in these words: "Sekai no kaku Kokumin ga." (literally translated: every nation of the world.)

Mr. KASAI: I am in favor of Mr. Eto's opinion. As the ground for preference of Mr. Morito is very obvious, we had better avoid the use of such ambiguous words as "subeteno Kuni no Kokumin ga" and, instead, use such words as "Sekai Kakukoku no Kokumin" or "Shokokumin". If the Government originally used the word "Bankokumin", we might as well use some such plain words.

The Chairman: Was Mr. Eto's suggestion "Sekai no Kokumin" (literally translated: nations of the world)?

Mr. ETO: No. "Sekai no Kaku Kokumin ga ---- "

The Chairman: You won't accept "Sekai no Kokumin"

Mr. ETO: If we select some appropriate words which are capable of expressing the exact meaning ---

The Chairman: Shall we choose the words "Sekai no Kokumin ga"?

Mr. ETO: Don't you think it sounds odd without putting the adjective "kaku" before the noun "Kokumin"?

The Chairman: Is it strange? Is there any difference of meaning between "Sekai no Kokumin" and "Sekai no Kakkokumin" ?

Mr. ITO: I don't think they are different in meaning. If the world state does really exist, "Sekai no Kokumin" will be proper, though.

The Chairman: I wonder if they are so distinctly different.

Mr. HARA: In connection with Line 9, as "all peoples" (Subete no kuni no Kokumin) is used following the passages",,,, we have determined to rely for our security and survival upon the justice and good faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world" and " We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society,,,,", expressive of the faith and desire of the Japanese people, I believe it is liable to cause an impression, that Japan is making some theatrical gesture to other nations, to say here "peoples of the world" (Sekai no Kakkokumin). Therefore, I am of the opinion that these words should be left out and the wording in the original be retained. I support the original draft.

Mr. ITO: I think "Sekai no Kakkokumin" will do.

Mr. HAYASHI: If it can not be changed to "Warera wa Zen Jinrui ga", I prefer the wording of the original draft. All peoples of the world substantially mean the entire mankind, but if "Zen Jinrui" cannot be used for some reason, I support the original wording.

The Chairman: These wordings are after all similar in meaning, aren't they?

Mr. YOSHIDA: Then, isn't it same to say "Zensekai no Kokumin"?

Mr. HAYASHI: That's it ! I support it.

Mr. YOSHIDA: "Zen Sekai ga mina hitoshiku"

Mr. ITO: I support it,,,,,,"Zen Sekai no Kokumin".

The Chairman: Well, then, let's settle it as "Zen Sekai". Is it to be followed by "Hitoshiku Kyofu to Kotaube to kore"?

Mr. INUKAI: It is suggested to omit "to".

The Chairman: "to recognize and acknowledge that all peoples have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want....."

Is it all right to change "Tuseboku" (banishment) to "Jokyo"?

Mr. ITO: "Jokyo".

The Chairman: Then, next is....

Mr. HARA: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. "Zen Sekai no Kokumin ga....."

The Chairman: Have you no objection to "Zensekai no Kokumin"? "Senmon" (responsible to itself alone) in the next line..... Is this to be retained as it is in the original draft? Is that right to revert in this way:" no people is responsible to itself alone and allowed to ignore other peoples"? This is Mr. Suzuki's opinion.

Mr. SUZUKI: Although it is not found in the English translation, I think the meaning will be clearer by reverting to the original.

Mr. INUKAI: What were the circumstances where this wording was adopted?

The Chairman: It is not in the English version. And moreover, to be responsible to oneself alone necessarily implies that one should consider others. So, I think it is not necessary to restore.

Mr. INUKAI: But what were the circumstances which adopted this expression.....?

The Chairman: I don't remember. Some one in the Bureau of Legislation may....

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): Mr. Chairman may know it, but so far as I remember, there were no special intentions in adopting this repeating expression, other than to express the meaning as carefully as possible.

Mr. SUZUKI: By striking out that part, I feel something is wanting from the sentence. The Liberal Party omitted that part on the ground that it is the law of political morality and universal. But

the

the political morality ordains that no people should consider their own interests alone, and ignore those of others.

Mr. YOSHIDA: I was absent in the morning, and therefore, I have little to know about the discussions. But is it Mr. Suzuki's opinion to restore the deleted portion?

Mr. SUZUKI: Yes. Chiefly for the reason of euphony and also for the reason that the wording is not sufficient in explaining laws of political morality, I think the revised wording leaves something to be desired. No matter how much we turn it about, we come back to the original wording after all.

Mr. INUKAI: If others have no objection, I support the proposal to restore the deleted portion.

The Chairman: Then, let's put it back. The next sentence reads: "and that obedience to such laws is incumbent upon all peoples who would sustain their own sovereignty and justify their sovereign relationship with other peoples." How about this passage..... Then, I will read the next: "To these high principles and purposes, we, the Japanese people, pledge our national honor, determined will and full resources." What is the idea of changing "Kosa na Shugi" (high principles) to "Kosa na Gensi"?

Mr. HAYASHI: It is strange to say "Gensi [illegible] suru" (to achieve Gensi).

Mr. OSHIMA: "Kaka" in "Pledge our national honor" (Kokyo ni kake) is too difficult a Chinese character to read. I suggest that it be replaced by kana.

Mr. INUKAI: It would be better.

Mr. ZUMOTO: Returning to the passage "no people is responsible to itself alone etc.", how is it if we stop the sentence by putting it

75

it"..... Tokoku wo tsuchi shitewa Naranu"?

The Chairman: That will sufficiently convey the meaning, but as the contents of the passage mean that, that is the political morality.....

Mr. OSHIMA: I suggest that "nu" be changed to "naranai".

Mr. INUKAI: I think "naranai node atte" is much better and tasty.

Mr. KUDO: I prefer "naranai".

The Chairman: Mr. Oshima's opinion seems to be supported by majority. So, it will be changed as proposed by him.

Mr. INUKAI: I think Mr. Horito's opinion is reasonable, but as these two portions of the passage are common in meaning, I think they should not be separated. The first portion will explain the substance of political morality.....

Mr. KASAI: In the English translation, these two portions are connected with "but". Isn't it strange to connect them, each expressing the same idea?

Mr. INUKAI: "But" is often used in a very light sense. To translate it as "shikashi" may sometimes convey a too strong meaning.

Mr. HORITO: The passage "Tokoku wo tsuchi shitewa naranu node atte" seems to be too sluggish in tone.

The Chairman: That is because of the oral style.

Mr. HORITO: But this is the Constitution, and I desire it to be made into a little more compact sentence even in the oral style.

The Chairman: But the sentence starts with "Warera wa" and is closed with "Fukenteki na mondo wa to shimasu". If, therefore, we are to divide it into two sentences, we must delete "Warera wa".

Mr. OSHIMA: Is it not better to bring down the first words

Secret

"Warera wa"to just before "Shinzuru".

Mr. HATSUKADE: I absolutely support the sentence construction in the original draft.

Mr. KORITO: "Warera wa" is not necessarily essential, is it?

The Chairman: As this is the Japanese sentence, it will go without "Warera wa."

Mr. HARA: Regarding the foregoing passage, as "..... desire to occupy an honored place in....." is expressive of the grand aspirations of the Japanese people, I think the subject "wareraf" should stay there.

Mr. KASAI: I am in favor of that.

Mr. YOSHIDA: Then, shall we retain "narumi node atte" without separating the sentence?

The Chairman: If the sentence should be separated, as proposed, into two independent sentences, we must change other parts. Is it agreed to give up "Senmen shite Tekeku wo Shshi shite" and come back to the original? And change "naremu" to "narumi"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: In the latter part of the sentence, we have two "shimzuru" as in "Fubentaki na mono de aru to shimzuru" and "Sekim de aru to shimzuru." But if we put it as "Seijidoteki no Kenchu wo Fubentaki na mono de ari", we can avoid repeating of "shimzuru".

The Chairman: In the English translation text, the clause ending in "Sekim de aru to shimzuru" is directly followed by a line beginning "Nippon Kokumin wa....", although it is divided into two independent sentences in Japanese.

Mr. KASAI: That's wrong. They are separated with a semi-colon.

The Chairman: There is no semi-colon, in my text.

Mr.

Mr. KASAI: They are connected with "omo".

The Chairman: I mean the later part than that.

Mr. KASAI: No, it reads "Fuhenteki na mono de aru to shinzuru"....

The Chairman: "Kono Hoseku ni shitagau koto wa" is included in the same sentence with the clause beginning with "Nippon Kokumin wa".

Mr. YOSHIDA: I think that is all right.

The Chairman: Then, shall we leave this part as it is? It is true that it is no good Japanese sentence to have the repetition of "shinzuru".

Mr. KASAI: Why not group them together?

The Chairman: Mr. Takahashi's proposal is to connect them as "Fuhenteki na mono de ari, kono Hoseku ni shitagau koto wa...." There is something in that.

Mr. HAYASHI: This sentence is too long, and moreover there are too many words "Kerere".

The Chairman: How do you say to change "shinzuru" to "omou" (think)? "Omou" is used somewhat apart from the place where it is found in the earlier part.

Mr. SUZUKI: I think it is all right.

The Chairman: Do you think so?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: There are some more points left to be settled. When Mr. Kita is present here tomorrow, we want to tackle them.

The Chairman: Then, we better make the unsettled points clear.

Mr. HARA: Is "Kami no Chugi" to be changed to "..... gumi"?

The Chairman: Which shall we choose?

Mr. SUZUKI: "Chugi" is better. "Gumi" is an object of consideration, not of will.

Mr. ASHIDA: Shall we come back to "Chugi"?

Mr. HOZUMI

Mr. INUKAI: Yes.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: How shall we do with "For ourselves and our posterity" in the first line?

The Chairman: The question begins with "representatives in the National Diet."

Mr. TAKAHASHI: Whether we shall replace the original word "seitoni Genkyo sareta Kokkai ni okeru Meiboshe's tsujite Kodo shi" by "Gensai oyobi Shorai no tamni" or leave the original as it is, and whether "Kokusai" in the fifth line shall be changed to "Seifu" or not.....

The Chairman: Mr. Kita also is in favor of the change. But I think that the words "government of the people", as expressed by Lincoln, do not mean necessarily "Seifu"; rather they mean "Kokumin no Seiji". He did not mean to leave out the judiciary and the legislature but used the term "government of the people in a broader sense. The word "government" here must be taken to include not only the executive but also the legislature, because the latter is also a sacred trust and its authority is derived from the people. What do you think, Mr. Inuki?

Mr. INUKAI: I still think "Seifu" is better. Because, this sentence beginning with "Some-some" ends here, but in the English text the sentence continues without stopping. Therefore I have made my text read ".....; kengen shi, Seifu wa etc.".....

The Chairman: The word is followed by such expression as "This is a universal principle of mankind" and "reject and revoke all constitutions, laws, ordinances and rescripts in a conflict hereunto". So, I think it is proper in Japanese that the word should be construed as meaning the fundamental principles of government, rather than the organ of government.

Mr. OZAKI: I think also that it should be "Seiji" here.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: This is the point that has been left undecided, and there is another. The suggestion was to change "Suke no Shintaku" to "shinsei no Shintaku".

The Chairman: The word "Shinsei" is singular, and I wonder whether the term "Shinsei no Shinteku" is good Japanese.

Mr. SUZUKI: It does not sound well.

The Chairman: I don't feel happy with "Shinsei no Shinteku". There are/the word "sacred" used here and there, and "Shinsei" is somewhat....

Mr. KASAI: Is not "Shinsei" stronger than "Suko"?

Mr. OSHIMA: Was it not decided to make it "Shinsei" there?

Mr. HATSUKADE: I think we all feel that "Shinsei no Shinteku" sound something like a trust from God. "Suko" will do quite well here, I think.

Mr. INUKAI: I am in favor of "Suko", too.

Mr. YOSHIDA: During Mr. Chairman's absence, Mr. Kasai suggested the word "Shinsei" and insisted on it. But later he conceded and agreed to leave it as "Suko", and the matter was decided tentatively. He seems to have still a lingering affection for the word "Shinsei", but I hope he will give us a trust in a spirit of "Suko". (Laughter.)

Mr. KASAI: What Mr. Yoshida says is not right. What I said was that the decision should be postponed until Mr. Kita is heard tomorrow.

The Chairman: Mr. Kita is in favor of "Suko".

Mr. ITO: I think "Suko" is quite good.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: The word "benefits" appearing a little below was rendered as "Keifuku". Is that settled?

The Chairman: Are there no objection to the word "Keifuku"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: There were several words suggested, like "Keifuku" and "Onkei".

The Chairman: "Ontoku" or "Onkei"..... Has "Keifuku" decided out

Mr. YOSHIDA

Mr. YOSHIDA : I do not mean necessarily to support Mr. Kita but, according to his opinion expressed at the meeting, yesterday, it should be rendered into "Keifuku".

The Chairman: "Keifuku" is the word for "blessings" which is used in the preceding sentence.

Mr. [illegible]: That is "Keitoku".

Mr. INUKAI: Why is the word "Fukuri" objectionable? "Fukuri" sounds natural.....

Mr. HATOYAMA: I am also in favor of "Fukuri".

Mr. MORITO: I think "Fukuri" is better, too. We were in a hurry and did not care whichever be adopted.

Mr. INUKAI: How about deciding the wording in the first line without waiting for Mr. Kita ?

The Chairman: What is the opinion of the Liberal Party?

Mr. INUKAI: It is a debatable point.....

Mr. YOSHIDA: Yes, it is a pretty serious point.

Mr. ITO: Mr. Kita might make it an issue. I think it better to ask his opinion, tomorrow.

Mr. SUZUKI: Mr. Kita occupied whole six hours for this paragraph the other day.

Mr. INUKAI: His opinion has been heard fully enough in this regard.

Mr. TAKAHASHI: With regard to the following sentence "Kokumin ga kore o kyoju suru koto wa Jinrui Fuhen no Gensi de aru" Mr. Morito wanted to make a further study, so it remains unsettled.

The Chairman: We cannot call it a good composition.

Mr. SUZUKI

Mr. SUZUKI: By the way, the phrase "upon which this Constitution is founded".....

The Chairman: I shall confirm the point.

Mr. SUZUKI: You need not do so. In the following sentence "we reject and revoke all constitutions, laws, ordinances, and rescripts in conflict herewith".....

The Chairman: Is "Hai" (廃) to be changed to "Hai (排) ?

Mr. SUZUKI: No, it is the former.

Mr. INUKAI: Does Mr. Suzuki mean to amend it so as to read "we abolish and revoke all constitutions, laws, ordinances, and rescripts in conflict herewith?....

Mr. SUZUKI: No, I intended to do so at first, but considered later that it was not necessary to insert the word "constitution". I think we need not stick too strictly to the original text. It is, of course, understood that the constitutions shall be included, when interpreting the text. It is unlikely that we shall enact in future the constitutions in conflict with it.

The Chairman: What do you say, Mr. Sato? Do the words "laws and ordinances" usually include the constitution therein?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): Let me see. There is no precedent, but I think that laws and ordinances are accepted in a very wide sense, and they might be construed to include constitution.

Mr. SUZUKI: I think that the words all laws used here may well include constitutions.

Mr. INUKAI: The president of my party has his own conviction on the point "herewith". I can not agree to the amendment at once, so I wish to consult once more.....

Mr. SUZUKI: I know that, but I think that he is mistaken.

The

The word "herewith" represents the preceding word "the Constitution" which is written in capital letter C. If it were not so, the text is meaningless. If it means "to revoke all constitutions in conflict with a universal principle".....

Mr. INUKAI: I do not think that the word "Genri" is necessarily bad, but I construe that all constitutions, laws, and ordinances shall be revoked which are contrary to the principle which is laid down as in the preceding. The Minister of Education who is a Catholic, is of the opinion that "herewith" means "natural law."

Mr. SUZUKI: I have been of the same opinion, but I feel that I have been mistaken, after examining the text.

Mr. INUKAI: I understand your idea very well. As the President of my Party has a confidence in interpreting the official documents written in English, I will ask him fully.

The Chairman: Let us think it over again. I will investigate this once more. Mr. Suzuki's interpretation may be right, but let us make an investigation once more;

Mr. OKADA: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask. In the phrase, "Shochoku wo Haijo suru" (reject and revoke prescripts), what character will you use for that "hai"?

Mr. TAKAHASHI: Isn't it the character "hai" (排) (to reject or pump out) of "Haisui" (drainage)?

The Chairman: It is the character "hai" (廃) of "Tsuchuuto Haijo" (the abolition of a successor).

Mr. SUZUKI: Isn't it the character, "hai" (排) of Haiyu (volleyball)?

The Chairman: It is the translation of "Ausscheid". "Hai" (廃) is better.....

Mr. TAKAHASHI: It may not be idiomatic, but I think "hai" (to abolish

abolish or disinherit) is more appropriate for expressing the significance of this case.

Mr. HARA: The "hai" (廃) (to abolish or disinherit) of a successor means removal of a person having a right of inheritance from the order of succession.....

Mr. HATSUKADE: Is the word, "Warera" (we) in the sentence,"Warera wa kono Kempo ni hansuru....." (We..... in conflict herewith) to be corrected throughout?

The Chairman: What is the usage in the Legislative Bureau about the two characters, "Ware"(我) and "Ware" (吾)?

Mr. SATO (Government Delegate): I have already looked into that matter, but I don't see any harm at all to write "Ware" in kana, as "Koreraa" (these) is all written out in kana in other parts.

The Chairman: Shall we write it in kana ?

Mr. HAYASHI: Can't we use "Warera" (吾ら) ?

The Chairman: "Warera" (吾ら) and "Warera" (我ら) have not much difference. If you don't like the Chinese characters, it is much simpler to use kana.

Mr. SUZUKI : I think kana is better.

Mr. ITO: The opinion of the Legislative Bureau being so it is, let's use kana. I notice that the newspapers of late are all using kana.

The Chairman: Mr. Hara, what is your opinion?

Mr. HAYASHI: If you want to have the Chinese character read "Ware", then we have to add the suffix "re".

The Chairman: The question of the suffix in the kana spelling is a question of utmost perplexity, you know.

Mr. HARA

Mr. HARA: Same as we affix "no" to the Chinese character "so" (共).

Mr. INUKAI: Dr. Rintaro Mori was an expert on this line and under such a situation like this he invariably used to spell out "Watakushi" (I) in kana.

The Chairman: Then, shall we decide to write "Mare" in kana?

What would you say?

(Voices of approval)

Mr. SUZUKI: How would you decide the "hai" (to abolish or disinherit) of which we were discussing a short time ago?

The Chairman: Let us decide on "hai" (廃).

Mr. HAYASHI: I should like to refer to the closing words at the end, "Kono Koon na Shugi to Mokuteki wo Tassei suru" (to accomplish these lofty principles and purposes). In the above, "Shugi" (principles) can go nicely with "Tassei" (to accomplish) , I think, but it fails to do so with "koon" (lofty). I wonder if there is such an expression like "Koon na Shugi" (lofty principles).

The Chairman: With regard to "Tassei" (to accomplish) also --- despite the opinion of Mr. Suzuki as already expressed --- I think it rather odd to say "Shugi wo tassei suru" (to accomplish the principles). How about using "jitsugen suru" (to realize)? I doubt the advisability of phrasing "Shugi wo tassei suru" (to accomplish the principles).

Mr. HAYASHI: This being the closing part of the Preamble, I think, we have to make a careful study. Now, what would you say?

who has never heard or does not know the explanation of the Minister of Education, reads this provision, he would naturally construe that schools are prohibited from giving religious education. As I have mentioned before, the letters and word meaning "religion" do exist, while the Bureau of Education and of Religion do exist in the Ministry of Education. Therefore, it will not suffice to explain the literal meaning of the Chinese characters "Shu Kyo" (religion) only. We have to explain the general idea or outline of religion. Therefore, it is meaningless to prohibit religious education. It won't do to say that as it is prohibited by the Constitution I shall not answer queries by school children. In this sense, I don't think there is any hindrance in inserting the words "partial to a sect or denomination" here. Rather, I should think they should be inserted.

88

Mr. INUKAI: That will also do.

Mr. MORITO: I think "Japan as a lover of permanent peace...., nor as a national right... "may be well.

Mr. Y. YOSHIDA: As Mr. Hara said just now, let us read, Japan, as a permanent national principle.... war as a national right..."; as "permanent" stands in the way, it may be struck out and "disapproves" may be put in, reading thus, "Japan, as a permanent national principle disapproves war as a national right and threat by force or use of force, as a means of solution of entanglements with other countries.

Mr. INUKAI: "Abandons" will do just as well.

Mr. H. HARA: Now, it seems high ~~time~~ time for you to decide. Isn't it ?

Mr. INUKAI Let us settle the matter about this point.

The Chairman: Let us consider until next week. There is no reason why we should decide this question to-day.

Mr. MORITO: "Hoki" is a rather difficult word when written in this way (抛棄) but we usually write thus (放棄). Don't people generally write (放) though in the dictionary the other character is used.

Mr. T. TAKAHASHI: This word "Hoki" (抛棄) is used in the Imperial Rescript to this session of the Diet, isn't it ?

The Chairman: Yes, it is. It is also in a certain treaty. In laws, a number of that "Hoki" are found, it is even used in the treaty of 1928.

Mr. T. TAKAHASHI: When we say "Hoki", it will not do to use the character. (放)

Mr. MORITO: You are right, but I mean now that the use of Chinese characters is limited, we may use the easier character. I have said only

for

for consideration and do not adhere to the point.

The Chairman: By the limitation of the use of Chinese characters, "Ho" (放) is to be used in place of "ho"(法).

Mr. T. TAKAHASHI: Does it read thus: "Japan, as a permanent national principle.... war as a national right...." Is the word "permanent" to be struck out ?

The Chairman: On that point let every party further consider until to-morrow and let us meet again bringing what is considered the best. Thus let us agree not to decide this passage to-day.

Mr. T. TAKAHASHI: Then let us decide in that way.

The Chairman: Let us have a talk on to-day's communique: "The Sub-committee was reopened at 1:30 p.m. An agreement was arrived at on the amendment of words in the Preamble of the Revised Constitution Bill. Then opinions were exchanged on the amendment of Chapter I and II but no conclusion was arrived at. The discussion was held over until the 29th. The sitting broke up at 4 p.m." Will this do ?

(There was a voice "No objection ! ").

The Chairman: If you have no objection, let us decide that. Now we break up for the day.

(The sitting broke up at 4:17 p.m.)