

Anti-Americanism in Zengakuren 1957-1960

Zackary Kaplan

University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma

In the first half of 1960 Japan was shaken by the struggle over the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, or *Ampo Toso*. Led by a united leftist front, and met with either support or ambivalence by the general public, the 1960 *Ampo Hantai* movement, or, the anti-Security Treaty revision movement (in full, the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan, henceforth to be referred to simply as “ampo” or “the Security Treaty”) passionately struggled to block Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke’s passage of a revised treaty between the United States and Japan. This united leftist front, known as the People’s Council, was comprised of an unlikely and unstable coalition of unionists (under Sohyo,) socialists (the JSP—Japanese Socialist Party,) communists (the JCP—the Japan Communist Party) and a radical Marxist student organization known as Zengakuren; the movement was also supported and furthered by certain circles of established intellectuals. Among all of the leftist elements, however, Zengakuren gained notoriety around the world for its violent, revolutionary actions, and played a key role in carrying out some of the most dramatic events that would occur during the course of the Security Treaty struggle.

In his comprehensive 1997 text on the history of U.S.-Japan relations, The Clash, Walter LaFeber refers to Zengakuren as an organization that had been steadily embracing international and anti-American causes since the mid 1950’s; indeed, Zengakuren’s fierce opposition to the revision of the Security Treaty in general, and more specifically the mobbing of Press Secretary Hagerty’s car upon his arrival in Japan in June of 1960 and the organization’s successful blocking of president Eisenhower’s visit to Japan later in the same year can be used to paint Zengakuren as a highly anti-American revolutionary group. At the same time, there have been many texts that examine the events of the *Ampo Toso*, explaining the actions and

motivations of Zengakuren as something apart from anti-Americanism. This paper will explore Zengakuren's actions in the context of the *Ampo Toso* leading up to 1960 as the most radical representative of the *Ampo Hantai* movement, in an attempt to determine the essence of Zengakuren in light of anti-Americanism. More specifically, this paper will argue that Zengakuren was a dynamic group with shifting and competing ideologies, whose principal concerns and means during the Security Treaty struggle had little to do with anti-Americanism.

A Note on Anti-Americanism

As this paper explores Zengakuren between 1957-1960 in the context of anti-Americanism, something needs to be said about the definition and significance of anti-Americanism. The discourse on anti-Americanism is both a widespread and controversial one that all too often tends towards demagoguery. While there have been many attempts to rationally and academically define the term, many a brave writer has found himself grasping at straws, only to conclude by parroting Potter Stewart with an admittedly less than satisfying "I know it when I see it." While recognizing both the difficulties inherent in defining the term as well as the prevalence of the discourse on anti-Americanism, I would like to address anti-Americanism in Zengakuren between 1957-1960 as an exercise in judiciously qualifying anti-Americanism. This paper will use the term anti-Americanism in order to identify a bias (and a bias is exactly what anti-Americanism is) against America—its government, its people or its culture. This definition alone, however, does not suffice to clarify the term. It is not enough for a person or a group to be considered anti-American simply because they have interests that are contrary to the interests of the United States, or, on the domestic scene, because they have varying ideals and expectations regarding what America *is*. Nor does being passionately opposed to U.S. policy qualify as anti-Americanism. Anti-Americanism, rather, is a bias that negatively idealizes America. A mild example of anti-Americanism would be a European newspaper consistently condemning the U.S. for its business practices overseas, without ever criticizing nearly identical European practices. In the case of much of the anti-Americanism tied to the philosophy of Communist and Socialist groups from the 1960's and 1970's, anti-Americanism frequently

found substance in criticisms that attributed unrealistic power to the United States. Essentially the U.S. was frequently cited as manipulating conditions over which the U.S. could not reasonably be supposed to have control. It is this kind of bias—and actions taken in accordance with this bias (violent or otherwise) that this paper will explore when considering anti-Americanism.

The Security Treaty in Japan

At the time, the mass movement targeting the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty raised questions in some American minds about whether or not American friendship in the Post War era was being betrayed. However, the assumption that the *Ampo Toso* movement was anti-American, or perhaps even that it was primarily concerned with the U.S.-Japan relationship is a fairly large assumption, if not an egocentric one. While it would be accurate to say that many on the far left were essentially opposed to American politics, understanding and analyzing Zengakuren's actions (or the actions of any in the opposition camp) during the movement against the revision of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty have to be considered in the context of what the treaty—and the struggle against the treaty—meant to the Japanese. Whatever the movement appeared to be at first-glance and from an American perspective, to the Japanese, the struggle against the revision of the Security Treaty was a complicated issue with implications beyond those of the US-Japan relationship. On its most general level the treaty struggle in Japan was defined by the politicization of the debate (largely due to Prime Minister Kishi), and the implications that the treaty had for Japanese identity, neutrality and position in the world.

By 1957, or by the time that Prime Minister Kishi took office, far from being highly polarized, there was in fact a national consensus on the need to revisit the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. Packard argues that Japan's returning pride and confidence in the context of great economic success, the recent admission of Japan into the U.N., and the reopening of relations with the U.S.S.R. meant that the popular "mood" in Japan in 1957 was concerned with foreign affairs; irritations over U.S. troops and bases, as well as anxieties over whether or not Japan could truly be an independent nation with foreign troops on its soil, combined with the above to inspire a close reexamination of the Security Treaty and what was known as the

“San Francisco system.”¹ By 1957 a list of formal complaints regarding the Security Treaty had been drawn up in journals and among politicians, public figures, and intellectuals. Pointing to several of the larger grievances, Packard lists six concerns—namely that the treaty was generally unequal; that the treaty did not have a decided date of termination; that it was unbecoming that the U.S. military should be able to quell internal disturbances; that it was unfavorable to the Japanese that Japan-based U.S. troops could be used outside of Japan without prior consultation; that the treaty did not forbid Japan-based troops from being equipped with nuclear weapons; and finally that the treaty did not require that U.S. actions via the Security Treaty abide by the U.N. charter.² That there was a widespread interest in revisiting the terms of the treaty throughout the country should not be a point of debate.

Kishi’s adoption of the cause of treaty revision in 1957, however, saw an aggressive politicization of the Security Treaty issue, steering the entire left towards a policy of absolute opposition. Although the left had clamored for treaty revision for years, it became apparent that they were unwilling to abide either Kishi or his policy goals.³ The reasons for this were manifold, but essentially it came down to the fact that Kishi symbolized what the youth, intellectuals and leftists loathed about prewar and wartime Japan.⁴ A politically powerful figure under General Tojo during the war years, Prime Minister Kishi was a class-A war criminal who had been purged after the war, only to be depurged during GHQ/SCAP’s (General Headquarters/the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers) “Reverse Course” and nimbly return to power in a matter of years. Even worse, during his administration he threatened to revert reverse? Subvert? leftist progress by attempting to change the education system, and strengthen the police, and by showing a

¹ Packard, George R., III. *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1966. (Reprinted. Connecticut: Greenwood, 1978) 15, 40-42.

² *Ibid.*, 47.

³ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 52.

propensity towards altering the Constitution. Combined with Kishi's efforts to revise the Security Treaty, Packard claims that the socialists and other leftists saw Kishi's actions as an attempt to revert/return Japan to prewar totalitarianism.⁵ Furthermore, in the context of recent political trends (in which Prime Ministers were devoting their careers to achieving a single, large political feat) Kishi's decision to dedicate himself to revising the Security Treaty tied his political fate to the issue: success would likely strengthen his political power (and, from the perspective of the leftists, possibly give him the momentum required to amend the constitution and expand police powers), while failure would likely give his opponents the firepower necessary to drive him from office. As a result, any consideration of the left's opposition to the treaty must take into account the treaty's significance to domestic politics, and their dislike of Kishi. The political environment during the struggle was such that the left would have opposed any treaty that Kishi could have produced in an attempt to drive him from office.

The struggle over the revision of the Security Treaty was also partially defined in the minds of the Japanese by the implications that the treaty had for the legal and psychological identity of the nation/people. The nature of the Japanese constitution meant that the old Security Treaty was—and that any likely version of the new security treaty would be—potentially incompatible with Japanese law. The Post War Japanese constitution (often referred to as the “Peace Constitution”) that SCAP passed down to the Japanese was enacted in 1947, and contains the famous article IX—an article in which Japan renounces war as a sovereign right and states that it will not maintain any sort of “war potential.”⁶ Although Japan has historically explained both the American forces in Japan and Japan's own Self-Defense Forces by claiming that the Peace Constitution does not preclude the existence of defensive forces, the constitutionality of the

⁵ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁶ Article IX reads: (1) Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. (2) To accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

first Security Treaty was officially called into question in 1957 (right at the start of the debate) after a series of protests in Sunagawa. The Sunagawa Incident involved a standoff between officials and a group of labor unionists and Zengakuren students, who had traveled to Sunagawa city to disrupt a land survey that was being conducted in order to expand the U.S. air base located there. Although the protests ultimately failed, when seven protest leaders were tried before the Tokyo District Court (charged under the Law for Special Measures Concerning Criminal Cases) the judge acquitted them on the grounds that the Law for Special Measures Concerning Criminal Cases would violate the constitution's "due process" clause. The judge's reasoning was that the presence of U.S. bases in Japan was unconstitutional, and as a result, the Law for Special Measures Concerning Criminal Cases could not apply to the protection of U.S. bases. Ultimately the Japanese Government appealed the case to the Supreme Court, which overturned the Tokyo District Court's ruling.⁷ Although anti-Americanism may have been a motivation for some of the anti-base protestors at Sunagawa, the debate that developed from the Tokyo District Court's ruling was concerned with constitutionality and sovereignty. The debate challenged whether or not the Security Treaty was viable under the purview of the Peace Constitution, which formed the basis for Japanese law—a major element of national identity.

Finally, revising the Security Treaty would have many implications for Japanese neutrality. After the war, the Japanese experienced a sharp shift in national character; nationalism died out and was replaced with pacifism, interest in the United Nations, and a popular dream of neutrality. As one article from the era claimed, "Today, antiwar and peace are the subjects that move the Japanese the most."⁸ Nonetheless, Japan was closely tied to the United States via a treaty with no determined end date. The global shift in power away from the U.S. that had occurred in the mid-1950's (largely symbolized by the 1957 launching of Sputnik) stoked Japanese

⁷ Details taken from: Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 131-134.

⁸ Takeyama, "Tradition and Japanese Youth," 277; Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 29.

anxieties about being dragged into a new conflict so soon after the Pacific War.⁹ Ultimately, U.S. brinkmanship and increasing friction between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. meant that, in Packard's words, many saw the Security Treaty as a guarantee of *insecurity*, and questioned whether or not Japan was right in its alliance with America.¹⁰ Despite this interest in peace and Japanese anxieties about being dragged into a war, a cold / an abrupt termination of the treaty while America remained a crucial trading partner and continued to hold the Okinawan islands would have been very difficult, if not undesirable to many outside of the older leftist circles.¹¹ However, aiming at long-term progress by seeking to revisit the treaty (and thereby intentionally entering into a new treaty) would complicate Japanese relations with the Communist Bloc, and invite aggression.¹² The Japanese were between a rock and a hard place. However impractical the desire for neutrality was, it was also plain to see that the renewal of an alliance with America would unquestionably damage relations with the Soviet Bloc. An aversion to these complications, as well as the widespread feeling that even without a treaty America would protect Japan, made it easy for many Japanese to object to the treaty on grounds unrelated to personal biases, either towards or against America.

While it's important to admit that elements within Japanese society opposed the maintenance of a treaty with America for anti-American reasons, the popular movement against the Security Treaty had very little to do with anti-Americanism, or even with America directly. Rather, concerns focused on the side effects, as it were, that the treaty would have on Japan. This point has been emphasized by scholars of Japanese culture since the time of the dispute, and can be evidenced by the letters that many Japanese people wrote to American friends in hopes of explaining the true nature of the

⁹ Ibid., 59

¹⁰ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 60.

¹¹ U.S. forces occupied Okinawa until 1972.

¹² Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 15.

situation as it unfolded.¹³ To the Japanese, the revision of the Security Treaty was a topic that had great significance for domestic politics, as well as great implications for Japanese identity—both in terms of the Japanese desire for neutrality and in terms of how the Japanese would come to interpret the meaning of the Peace Constitution—and for their relationship with the Soviet Bloc. Although the societal context in which Zengakuren members opposed the Security Treaty was one of popular opposition, the primary motivations or concerns of the movement at large was defined by considerations other than Japanese aversion to, or aggression towards, America.

The Zengakuren and Bunto

Having clarified that the movement against the revision of the Security Treaty was not an anti-American movement despite the fact that it targeted the Security Treaty, it is time to shift attention specifically to Zengakuren's role in the movement. Referred to both as a highly anti-American, internationally focused group and also as a group unconcerned with anti-Americanism, if anything, Zengakuren is a group that has been misunderstood or selectively interpreted by many over time. Upon close examination of Zengakuren during the first struggle over the revision of the Security Treaty, it becomes apparent both that there was considerable variation of ideology and beliefs within Zengakuren, and also that (much like many involved in the popular movement itself) Zengakuren's active core was predominantly unconcerned with anti-American causes.

When faced with (from an English perspective) the inscrutable term "Zengakuren," it is easy to find oneself at a loss about what kind of group Zengakuren might be, and when reading about Zengakuren's activities during the 1950's it is easy to assume that it is a monolithic (or at least coherent), ideologically based group. To a degree, this is also the case in the original Japanese, as during the peak of activity the group's name had begun to appear in newspapers and journals not in the Chinese characters that would typically be used to write the word, but instead in katakana characters (a syllabary that informs pronunciation, not meaning, and is often used to interpret foreign words into Japanese) so that the word became almost a special term. The proper noun "Zengakuren," in

¹³ Ibid., 288.

fact, is a shortening of “Zen-Nihon Gakusei Jichikai Sorengo,” which translates as “All-Japan Federation of Student Self-Government Associations.” As a large collection of self-governing student associations, Zengakuren was not and is not (it continues to exist today) an ideologically based group. Nonetheless, by some odd twist of fate, the leftist students that stepped forth to represent their student bodies and direct the associations were almost exclusively voted in and supported by their peers so that there was no intra-party competition with rightist students (which were admittedly in the minority on college campuses in the 1950’s) in the struggle over control of Zengakuren.¹⁴ As a result, Zengakuren was directed by an entirely leftist leadership. However, the significance of the fact that Zengakuren was not an ideological organization has important implications for how power shifts over time. Primarily it means that multiple groups can claim powerful positions within the organization, which is exactly what happened during the second half of the 1950’s. In consideration of this, it is not enough to consider what *Zengakuren* did during the Security Treaty struggle, but rather to ask what group *within* Zengakuren did what. When examining what events are accredited to Zengakuren’s name throughout the movement, one is faced with a slew of protests, two infiltrations into the Diet complex, an assault on the Prime Minister’s residence, the first Haneda incident, the mobbing of Press Secretary Hagerty’s car outside of the Haneda airport, and the blocking of President Eisenhower’s visit to Japan. But without a proper understanding of the ideologies within Zengakuren, which group did what, and who they did it with, their motivations and intent cannot be determined; more specifically, without such analysis, determining whether or not Zengakuren actions reflected anti-Americanism is impossible.

The differences between the Zengakuren mainstream and anti-mainstream is a result of events relating to the group’s formation and early history. Zengakuren was founded by SCAP during the Occupation before the start of the Korean War led to the Red Scare and the Reverse Course. Essentially, Zengakuren was created as one organization to help promote the democratization of Japan. The group was immediately taken in by the Japanese Communist Party

¹⁴ Sunada, “The Thought and Behavior of Zengakuren: Trends in the Japanese Student Movement,” 458-9.

(JCP), and followed the party into radical militancy after the Reverse Course and the signing of the San Francisco Treaty. Following orders from the Soviet Bloc, the JCP and some Zengakuren members engaged in Molotov bombings and other violent demonstrations in the early 1950's.¹⁵ The result was the JCP's complete loss of public support, as well as the loss of all 35 of their seats in the Diet. The public response shocked the JCP out of their recently adopted tactics, and they reverted to trying to create a friendlier, more respectable image.¹⁶ In the meantime, the JCP kept Zengakuren on the backburner, seeing little use for the intellectual elites in the struggle to awaken the proletariat and incite revolution.¹⁷ Over the next several years, there were a number of changes, both within Zengakuren, and on the international stage that would lead to the formation of Zengakuren as it was during the anti-Security Treaty revision movement.

The first of these changes was an increase in student interest in radical/transformational politics. One can think of at least three explanations for this trend. First, the sense of betrayal that accompanied the JCP's sudden change in course to a more moderate mass line motivated some students to deeply question both what they had already done in the name of the cause, and what they were doing now that it had abruptly changed course, leaving them behind.¹⁸ Other students were aware of a revolutionary legacy and a duty as a highly educated elite who had faced some of the fiercest competition in the world and succeeded in entering the Japanese university system. Reviving pre-war study circles, students emphasized the

¹⁵ Kim, Hong N. "Deradicalization of the Japanese Communist Party Under Kenji Miyamoto." *World Politics* (1976): 275.

¹⁶ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 25.

¹⁷ Tomono, Junichi. 全学連と全共闘.[All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle]. Tokyo: Heibon 平凡, 2010. 20.

¹⁸ For reference see Tomono's book (footnote 17).

application of transformative theories.¹⁹ Finally, many students were poor and had no guarantee of employment in the highly competitive job market—it is not unreasonable to argue that they were cornered and had no choice but to pay attention to politics.²⁰ Despite the various motivations, however, the result was that Zengakuren surprised everyone in the 1950's by choosing to pursue largely ideologically motivated politics, and paid only peripheral attention to personal interest issues such as struggles over tuition fees, academic freedom and the democratization of campuses.

The other major changes that determined Zengakuren's direction were inspired by events overseas. Khrushchev's 1956 denouncement of Stalin and the U.S.S.R.'s response to the revolution in Hungary in the same year led to a general shift in Zengakuren away from the Soviet Union internationally and the JCP domestically, who continued to both support and accept instruction from the Soviet Union, despite the fact that recent events illustrated what Zengakuren considered to be Soviet hypocrisy and a general continued adherence to mistaken policies and assumptions left over from Stalin's leadership.²¹ Leading up to what is known as the June 1st Incident in 1958, Zengakuren leaders steadily became more critical, allowing their highly valued involvement in international student groups (largely based on the borderless appeal of their anti-war, anti-atomic/hydrogen bomb emphasis) sponsored by the U.S.S.R. to grind to a halt.²² Zengakuren leaders judged both the Soviet Union and Japan as imperial nations, and came to harshly criticize the JCP's

¹⁹ Ibid., 71; Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 95; Nikkan Rodo Tsushin Sha, 全学連の実態—その派閥を中心として [The State of Zengakuren: Focusing on Intra-party Factions]. Tokyo: 1960. 13

²⁰ Ibid., 10-11.

²¹ Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 40-44.

²² Nikkan Rodo Tsushin Sha, [The State of Zengakuren: Focusing on Intra-party Factions], 90.

emphasis on a two-stage revolution.²³ Zengakuren leaders declared that this style of revolution—which dictated that Japan must first free itself of U.S. influence by becoming stronger—encouraged a distasteful increase in nationalism and required that Japan aim to become a very powerful capitalist nation before initiating a proletarian revolution.²⁴ Finally spurred in a new direction, Zengakuren's (somewhat) long-fought anti-war movement peaked in 1957, and with the June 1st incident, shifted to focus on bringing about immediate revolution.²⁵ At Zengakuren's 11th assembly, Zengakuren leaders criticized the JCP leaders' 2-stage revolution and their continued support of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, they attacked the JCP for their assumption that by opposing America, Japan's problems would suddenly get better; they demanded that the JCP's leaders step down, and that the party cease its support for the Soviet Union and adopt a policy of one-step immediate revolution.²⁶ In response, the JCP ousted the majority of the Zengakuren leaders—an action that resulted in a final solidification of the Zengakuren mainstream and anti-mainstream.

Although Zengakuren was indeed a radical Marxist group that was raised under the purview of the JCP, the anti-JCP, anti-Soviet, anti-imperialist, anti-war Zengakuren mainstream, who went on to form their own organization (Bunto—taken from the German “Bund”/the Communist League) after the June 1st Incident, controlled Zengakuren for the duration of the struggle, from 1957 to 1960. Bunto was convinced that the time was right for a proletarian revolution in Japan, and that any continuation along the current route would only result in greater evils. Bunto viewed the Security Treaty in the same light, understanding it as the logical next step in the attempt of Japan to project its influence overseas and buy what would be an

²³ Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 50-3.

²⁴ Ibid., 50-1.

²⁵ Ibid., 49.

²⁶ Ibid., 60.

important handhold as an imperial power.²⁷ Kishi was also decidedly an enemy of Bunto-led Zengakuren, and they directed their anger and aggression towards him in a show of youthful resentment against both what was considered a somewhat traitorous older generation, as well as a loathing for a Japan that seemed to be repeating old mistakes.²⁸ As a result, the anti-mainstream, which was made up of students sympathetic to the JCP, found themselves blocked from attendance at Bunto meetings by the mainstream, and even from the Zengakuren assemblies.²⁹ Ultimately, the June 1st Incident and the formation of Bunto led to a complete split in the organization, illustrated not only by ideological differences, but also by the fact that the groups pursued different means, sometimes participating separately in the same protests.³⁰

With the formation of Bunto, the Zengakuren mainstream declared war against imperialism and Kishi, and sought to bring about immediate revolution through domestically oriented public demonstrations. The first challenge to the new organization came right away in October of the same year, when Prime Minister Kishi introduced the Police Bill to the Diet in an attempt to strengthen police law and make it easier to break up protests and sit-ins—undoubtedly a move taken in the face of the opposition that had been mounting against the slowly developing attempt to revise the Security Treaty. In response, the Japanese Socialist Party (JSP) boycotted the Diet, and different leftist groups voiced their opposition. Bunto's protests against the Police Law are recognized by many as the dress rehearsal for the standoff that later occurred in 1960. Beginning with its activities in opposition to the Police Bill, the Bunto-led Zengakuren dedicated itself to the development and expansion of the mass movement. After the left successfully blocked

²⁷ Nikkan Rodo Tsushin Sha, 全学連の実態—その派閥を中心として [The State of Zengakuren: Focusing on Intra-party Factions], 55.

²⁸ Matsumoto, Shigeharu, Ryu Shintaro, Shimada Tatsumi, Matsukata Saburo, Fukui Fumio. "What Happened in Japan: A Symposium." *Japan Quarterly* 7 (1960): 423-4; Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 76.

²⁹ Ibid., 81.

the Police Bill, Zengakuren's attention focused intensively on the Security Treaty issue, recognizing the struggle as not only a fight that must be fought in order to quell the progression of Japan's imperialism, but also as a sensitive event that could be honed in the hopes of shocking the nation through violent protest in order to politically awaken the workers.³¹ Bunto's first chance finally came in 1959, almost a month after the draft of the new Security Treaty was presented to the nation. On November 27th (the November 27th Incident) mainstream leaders used the occasion of a mass strike outside of the Diet in order to charge the police line, and break into the Diet compound. Although Zengakuren's actions did more to arouse leftist criticism (the sudden display of violence had negative repercussions for the other members of the People's Council, which was first organized as a united leftist front after the Police Bill affair) than it did to convince the proletariat to rise up, the victory nevertheless spurred on activity within Bunto.³² This success was followed by the First Haneda Incident in January 1960, when the Zengakuren mainstream members barricaded themselves in the Haneda International Airport in order to try and block Prime Minister Kishi's trip to America to sign the new treaty, which had finally been written up after three years of internal debate amongst the LDP and negotiations with America. The Zengakuren members were confronted by police, carried bodily out of the compound, and saw their leaders arrested before Kishi arrived at the airport, but the display increased the sense of urgency in the movement. In the months that followed, Tokyo saw a massive number of public protests, with interested parties cranking out a total of 223 demonstrations between April 1959 and July 1960.³³ After Kishi submitted the new treaty to the Diet for approval in February 1960 and the LDP finally forced it through the lower house, it was only a matter of time before the treaty would be automatically ratified. The

³¹ Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 81.

³² Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 167-70.

³³ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 262.

press and the People's Council decried Kishi's act as undemocratic, and until the treaty's ratification on June 19th the opposition desperately involved itself in protests, with the Zengakuren mainstream initiating a second invasion into the diet compound during a mass demonstration on June 15th. With the ratification of the treaty and Kishi's retirement (intra-party competition, criticism from the left, and the cancellation of Eisenhower's trip drove the Prime Minister from office) the movement quickly deflated. But from the rise of Bunto to the end of the movement Zengakuren passionately pursued their agenda of domestically oriented demonstrations.

During the early months of 1960, the Zengakuren mainstream was not involved in any explicitly anti-American causes, nor did it focus on American targets as it pursued its agenda of domestically oriented demonstrations. Bunto's attention to the National Diet building (as opposed to the U.S. consulate) as the site of protest clearly demonstrates Bunto's focus on Japan and the Japanese Government as the primary opponent and source of power during this movement. There are also many stories of Americans watching and taking part in zigzag or "snake dance" demonstrations alongside students during the peak of the movement, while enjoying full respect from the protestors.³⁴ It is apparent—from Bunto's declared mission, criticisms of the JCP, choice of demonstration location, and attitude towards American citizens—that at least through the early months of 1960, the term "anti-American" should not be a primary descriptor for Bunto. The only element in the movement that seems to defy this trend is the declared mission to block President Eisenhower's visit to Japan. As early as late April of 1960, Bunto had decided on a slogan "Smash Eisenhower's Visit to Japan; Bring Down Kishi's LDP Cabinet; Abolish the New Security Treaty" while the anti-mainstream continued to act in accordance with its Soviet ideology.³⁵ In the end, this goal was successfully achieved as a result of Bunto protests and rioting.

³⁴ Ibid., 269.

³⁵ Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 122.

However, even in their opposition to Eisenhower's visit to Japan, the Zengakuren mainstream placed emphasis on the domestic implications of the visit; their involvement in the affair was a result of the timing with which events played out. After Kishi's trip to America to sign the treaty at the start of the year, it was decided that in the spirit of the new relationship between Japan and America, the emperor would visit President Eisenhower, who would then travel to Japan. By so doing, Eisenhower (who was widely popular in Japan at this time) would become the first incumbent US president to ever visit Japan; the occasion was significant for the largely pro-American Japanese. Kishi, who was faced with both intra-party factional resistance and resistance from without in the form of the People's Council, decided to use Eisenhower's visit to bolster his cause.³⁶ The visit, scheduled for June 19th, would coincide with the date of the treaty's ratification. Aware of the danger this decision posed to their movement (as the country would be first and foremost concerned with welcoming president Eisenhower), the People's Council appealed to the U.S. consulate, saying that Eisenhower's visit should be postponed so as not to be misconstrued as a move of support for Prime Minister Kishi. However, the administration responded that the trip would go ahead as planned. While it must be accepted as a factor, Bunto's addition of the "Smash Eisenhower's Visit" slogan is best understood not in a context of opposition to Eisenhower or the United States, but rather as the continued pursuit of their domestic agenda (outlined above). Although Zengakuren ultimately brought about the cancellation of Eisenhower's trip to Japan, it was Bunto's protest at the Diet—not actions aimed directly at the prevention of Eisenhower's trip—that led to the cancellation. Bunto, which did not take part in the June 10th, 1960 harassment of Press Secretary Hagerty's car (an event that evoked harsh criticism from the press and the public at large, and thus did little to help the leftist cause—in fact it even instilled new confidence in both the U.S. and Japanese governments³⁷) inspired the cancellation of the trip through their

³⁶ Shigeharu, "What Happened in Japan: A Symposium." *Japan Quarterly* 7 (1960): 402-4

³⁷ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 285-291.

second invasion of the Diet compound on June 15th, in protest at what would be the default ratification of the Security Treaty in the Diet. The dramatic protest that occurred on June 15th, which resulted in bloodshed and the death of a female student led the police to voice a strong concern about whether they would be able to sufficiently protect Eisenhower's car on the stretch from the airport to the imperial grounds. The demonstration was the almighty final stroke, delivered after several months of resistance from the People's Council and threats by some Zengakuren leaders (on April 26th Hayama Takeo suggested that Zengakuren should stone Eisenhower, in imitation of what had happened to Nixon in Venezuela).³⁸ All said and done, even in their opposition to Eisenhower's visit Bunto aggressively pursued an agenda of domestically oriented public demonstrations and remained unconcerned with anti-American causes throughout the movement.

The Zengakuren Anti-Mainstream

In the article "The Thought and Behavior of Zengakuren: Trends in the Japanese Student Movement," Sunada claims that the Zengakuren anti-mainstream group had no effect on the anti-treaty revision movement, as they had been expelled from Zengakuren.³⁹ While it's true that Bunto blocked the anti-mainstream from attending meetings, it is important to remember that Zengakuren leaders were elected by the student bodies of their own universities. In effect, although Bunto had excluded them, the anti-mainstream leaders were never expelled from Zengakuren, and actually experienced an increase in influence throughout the movement, drawing large numbers of students to their protests and petitions. As Packard points out, the competition between the two groups remained fierce throughout the struggle, hovering around a 60 to 40 ratio in favor of Bunto.⁴⁰ If the anti-mainstream members had in fact been expelled from Zengakuren, then it would be easy to qualify Zengakuren as a group unconcerned with anti-Americanism. Not

³⁸ Ibid., 286.

³⁹ 459.

⁴⁰ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 98.

only did the anti-mainstream contribute to the movement by participating in the dramatic Hagerty Incident, but they also spread propaganda and drew students into the movement where Bunto failed in their appeals.

The JCP-sympathetic Zengakuren anti-mainstream was composed of a number of factions. Sympathetic to the communists, the anti-mainstream generally adhered to what Bunto criticized as out-dated Stalinist thinking, and emphasized America's role in oppressing Japan. The anti-mainstream also differed from Bunto in its adherence to the newer JCP policy of pursuing a more moderate mass line with wider social appeal—the great exception to this policy being the mobbing of Press Secretary Hagerty's car after his arrival in Japan in June of 1960. Hagerty, who departed Haneda airport by car, despite Ambassador MacArthur II's suggestion that they should take a helicopter, found himself surrounded by an angry mob on the road just outside of Haneda. Upon leaving the airport, Hagerty's car had practically driven into a crowd of JCP- sympathetic Zengakuren anti-mainstreamers and JCP-sympathetic unionists. The details of what the leftists were doing out on the road are disputed. But whatever the case, the car was surrounded by a group of 200 protestors, which quickly grew to a crowd of 3,000.⁴¹ Although a helicopter and the police came to the rescue, Hagerty's car was subject to shaking and beating for almost two hours before its passengers were rescued. The mobbing of Hagerty's car, in which Hagerty was subjected to violence and fierce hostility as a representative of the United States betrays the unrealistic expectations of the protestors, who after their failed attempt to appeal their own government, identified the U.S. government as both the problem and the source of power. Essentially, the Hagerty Incident should be classified as anti-Americanism not only because the violence directed at Hagerty involved robbing him of his own identity and recreating him as an idea, or a faceless representative of both American citizens and the U.S. government, but also because of the unrealistic expectations for, and accusations towards, America that were implicit in the mobbing.

⁴¹ Tomono, 全学連と全共闘 [All-Japan Federation of Student Self-government Associations (Zengakuren) and All-Campus Joint Struggle], 121.

Those involved later experienced harsh criticism from both the press and the public.⁴²

Because the anti-mainstream was not autonomous like Bunto, and took direction from the JCP, who in turn had close ties to the Soviet Union in multiple forms, it is easy to summarize anti-mainstream policy as broadly imitating Soviet ideology. This ideology (largely in accordance with JCP and anti-mainstream desires) principally sought to defame and weaken the United States wherever possible. There is no argument to be made for the anti-mainstream as a group focused on domestic politics; they saw America as the principal power and the root of problems in Japan—freed from America’s strangling influence, they believed, Japan would progress. As a result, the understanding/assessment of Zengakuren as a radical anti-American group can be modified by separating the mainstream from the anti-mainstream. It can’t be denied that there were degrees of gradation throughout Zengakuren, and that both factions were, as radical leftists, essentially opposed to America on an ideological basis. However, the two groups differed in what goals they pursued and how they pursued those goals throughout the movement. As a result, Zengakuren during the *Ampo Toso* should be broadly understood as a group made up of an actively anti-American (pro-Soviet) anti-mainstream, and a mainstream with (at best) dormant anti-Americanism. Whatever Bunto’s core beliefs, however, their actions throughout the course of the *Ampo Toso* should not inspire the use of the term “anti-American” as a primary descriptor for their group or activities. It bears noting, however, that over the course of the struggle the Zengakuren mainstream lost ground to the anti-mainstream, with campuses and students falling into the hands of the anti-mainstream. The relative increase in anti-mainstream strength over the course of the struggle has interesting implications for the possibility of increased popular anti-Americanism leading up to the movement’s climax in 1960.

There are several possible explanations for the power shift between Bunto and the anti-mainstream during the movement. Broadly categorized, there are explanations that attribute the change to anti-Americanism, and those that suggest unrelated factors are responsible. Starting with the latter of these two, the relative increase

⁴² Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 291.

in anti-mainstream power can be at least partially explained by public displeasure with the mainstream's violent tactics, as well as by the fact that towards the end of the movement, most of Bunto's top influential leaders had been arrested. Furthermore, there has been ample observation of both the fact that—to many students in the capital—involvement in the protest movement was not unlike a rite of passage to demonstrate political awareness. The nature of the protests also often resembled Japanese festivals, strongly inviting even those students who weren't directly dedicated to any side of the dispute (but who were as students *de facto* part of the opposition) to participate.⁴³ Furthermore, large showings for the anti-mainstream at protests can be at least partially explained by the accessibility of their activities in comparison to Bunto's, which often involved confronting police. That these factors had an effect on Bunto influence is beyond question; however, it is not conclusive that this was the only cause for the power shift. The final months of the struggle saw an increase in either popular distrust, or at least a lack of confidence in America—a trend that had been growing steadily for years, but made sudden leaps in early 1960. This change was influenced primarily by two series of events. The first was the May 1960 U2 Incident, which raised concerns about U.S. abuse of their bases in Japan, and drew Soviet threats of military retaliation against any countries supporting bases that housed spy planes. The second, a result of the first, was the cancellation of Eisenhower's trip to the Soviet Union, which led to the alteration of the destinations for his upcoming tour. Eisenhower only appeared to be visiting countries that represented important military outposts, and the tour took on a strong militaristic tone, provoking negative responses from the Japanese public. The rise in distrust is evidenced by the popular fiction of 1960, with many stories focusing on U.S. intelligence plots and the effect of secret American atrocities on Japanese history.⁴⁴ How much effect this rise in distrust had on the anti-mainstream's success towards the end of the movement is hard to quantify. However, in tandem with the U2 incident, the change in Eisenhower's tour and the popularity of the conspiracy stories, the shift in power does seem to point to a certain

⁴³ Packard, *Protest in Tokyo*, 263.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 231.

increase in popular anti-Americanism by the climax of the movement. Whatever the case, the anti-mainstream pursued goals separate from the mainstream under the purview of the JCP, and gained influence over the course of the movement.

Conclusion

The Security Treaty conflict cannot be simplistically understood as a sign of widespread anti-Americanism in Japan; the politicized nature of the treaty debate, ideological struggles about the jurisdiction and meaning of the Peace Constitution, as well as the question of neutrality meant that the treaty had domestic and foreign relations implications far beyond the U.S.-Japan relationship. Even amongst the united leftist front, the People's Council, varying priorities meant that with the exception of the Zengakuren anti-mainstream, only the JCP maintained a resolutely anti-American standpoint. Although the Zengakuren mainstream under Bunto would surely have criticized America in the same ways that they would have criticized any other major power of the time, their primary target was Japan, and they focused on domestic issues, targeting the Japanese Government in order to pursue their goals. Bunto's participation in the Security Treaty struggle was not significant in an anti-American context. The intensification of international pressure as a result of the Cold War, and events such as the May 1960 U-2 spy plane incident led to the rise of popular suspicions of America at the peak of the Security Treaty struggle, but they did not distract the Zengakuren mainstream from their goals. The same, however, cannot be said for the Zengakuren anti-mainstream, which grew in relative strength after May 1960, and ultimately realized its most shocking expression of anti-Americanism in the mobbing of Press Secretary Hagerty's car during the peak of the anti-Security Treaty movement.