

# **The Ministry of Education’s Vision of Attendance Allowances Prior to the New Public Assistance Act: Focusing on the Relationship Between Free Compulsory Education and the Public Assistance System\***

**Akiko KONAGAI**

## **Introduction**

In order to guarantee equal opportunities for education, the government is compelled to provide (1) free compulsory education (Constitution of Japan Article 26-2) and (2) measures to provide financial assistance (new Basic Act on Education Article 4-3, School Education Act Article 19). However, the system concerned with support for the compulsory education costs which are considered individual expenses is complex, involving both attendance allowances and educational assistance, an issue which has been noted as an obstacle to child poverty countermeasures.<sup>1</sup> In order to examine the attendance allowances system guaranteeing education to children in economically disadvantaged households, it is necessary to clarify the principles on which attendance allowances, free compulsory education, and public assistance are founded, and how they have been merged and divided to arrive at the current system.

Prior research on the establishment of the postwar attendance allowances system has focused mainly on the 1950s, when the Ministry of Education (below, MoE) was groping toward a policy expanding free education while

---

\* This paper was originally published in Bulletin No. 44 of JEAS.

attempting to retrieve attendance allowances from the new Public Assistance Act, which had newly established educational assistance. For example, Nakajima Tetsuhiko argues that because the Ministry of Health and Welfare (below, MHW) opposed the transfer of educational assistance resources based on the Compulsory Education Attendance allowances Bill (1951), MoE avoided the overlap with educational assistance by removing its targets, establishing the attendance allowances system. Thus, the current system in which education and welfare are split is the result of the rivalry between the two ministries.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere, in his discussion of the changes in the educational finance transfer system, Yotoriyama Yosuke argues that the 1951 Bill was the trigger for the abandonment of a progressive vision of free education, so that “as the ‘opposite interpretation’ of using the educational assistance and attendance allowances systems to cover schooling expenses for poor children with public funds, they were instead established essentially as individual expenses for parents.”<sup>3</sup> However, these studies fail to clarify the content of guaranteed enrollment within public assistance, and therefore lack sufficient examination of the relationship between attendance allowances and public assistance. In addition, they do not show what MoE envisioned as an educational guarantee for households in poverty as of the establishment of the Basic Act on Education and School Education Act, which regulate equal opportunities for education and attendance allowances. The lack of consistency in this vision seems likely to have been a factor controlling the subsequent problems. Here, the purpose of this paper is to clarify the vision of attendance allowances up until the establishment of the new Public Assistance Act, focusing on the relationship of free compulsory education and the public assistance system. The examination from various perspectives of the actual content of the right to education first regulated by the new Constitution promises to contribute to

the clarification of the more universal issue of the principles and reality of social rights in postwar Japan.

Additionally, unless otherwise noted, this paper uses the “Basic Act on Education” to refer to the old Basic Act on Education (No. 25 of 1947) and the “Public Assistance Act” to refer to the old Public Assistance Act (No. 17 of 1946).

## **1. Continuity and discontinuity with prewar attendance allowances**

Let us begin with an overview of prewar attendance allowances, in order to consider its postwar counterpart. In the Taisho period, “enrollment assistance” for children in poverty was considered a social issue by the government; in direct terms, based on the gift of attendance allowances funding for schoolchildren made in commemoration of the Crown Prince’s marriage, the Schoolchildren’s Attendance Allowances Regulations (MoE Directive No. 18 of 1928) were established. Their content was as follows: (1) According to the national budget, the government would provide subsidies to prefectures; (2) prefectures and municipalities would, wherever possible, match the subsidy funds, and (3) pay or supply part or all of the living expenses such as textbooks, school supplies, clothing, food, etc. required as attendance allowances for children struggling to enroll in school due to poverty, including those at schools for the blind or deaf. Given that living expenses, clothing, and food are included in the list of subsidies, it is clear that the starting point for attendance allowances was in livelihood assistance. However, the establishment of the Relief Act a year later, in 1929, created a dual framework in which the system of support for compulsory education expenses was split between attendance allowances

through the Regulations and livelihood assistance for children under 13 through the Relief Act. Here, however, “parallel supply” through both systems was recognized,<sup>4</sup> avoiding the division of supply content and targets that took place after World War II.

In October 1930, it was reported that the Regulations would add the point that “children working to support their families will receive full aid in the amount of their income,” with “a Directive to regional directors at the end of this month,”<sup>5</sup> but this came to nothing. This is thought to be because, as in the following November when living expenses were deleted from the aid content in coordination with the Relief Act,<sup>6</sup> portions regarding earning a living were allocated to the Relief Act’s jurisdiction. However, it is clear that there were opinions within MoE that income aid was required to thoroughly guarantee enrollment, as we see from the statement of Fujino Megumu, Director of the General Education Affairs Bureau of the MoE, at the Education Council meeting of September 21, 1938: because “regardless of how many children requiring immediate enrollment there are, as far as their families are concerned, even if they receive attendance allowances, their enrollment will mean the loss of the income which they had previously provided for their families ... how are we to address these issues overall?”<sup>7</sup> According to the spirit of the law, the attendance allowances in the Regulations were no more than a measure to ensure enrollment as the duty of Imperial subjects, differing fundamentally from the postwar guarantee of compulsory education as a right; this discussion on income aid was, however, to be echoed in postwar attendance allowances.

## **2. Examination of the scope of free compulsory education and attendance allowances after the establishment of the**

## **Japanese Constitution**

With regard to the regulation of free compulsory education, the Legislation Bureau's *Article-by-article guide to the Constitution revision draft* of May 1946 stated "Free education means that there is no tuition charged; expenses for stationery, textbooks, etc. are not a part of free education." In this context, Nagai Kenichi and Muramoto Hiroyuki have shown that while the scope of free compulsory education, including school supplies, was debated during the Constitution draft writing process, the Ministry of Finance at the time was intent on limiting the free scope to tuition.<sup>8</sup> In short, the Constitutional interpretation of this regulation was determined based on the national finance perspective. However, at the Imperial 90<sup>th</sup> Diet session when the Imperial Constitution Revision Bill was debated, in response to the argument of House of Representatives member Oshima Tazo that equal opportunity must be regulated in order to make education available to boys and girls, the economically disadvantaged, and the disabled alike, Minister of Education Tanaka Kotaro stated that "while there are issues such as the free tuition question and the free distribution of textbooks, their scope requires research from the national finance perspective,"<sup>9</sup> leaving open on the part of MoE the possibility of expanding the scope that would be free of charge as legislative policy. Here, this chapter examines the discussion within the Education Reform Committee on the free compulsory education system and the attendance allowances system with regard to the scope of expenditure for each, in order to examine the relationship between the two systems.

### **(1) MoE discussion on expenses for free compulsory education and education promotion**

At the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Special Committee (6 November, 1946), a document on problems with the implementation of the new junior high school system was distributed and discussed. Regarding one of the problems, the cost of attendance allowances, an MoE official (name unclear) spoke as follows.<sup>10</sup>

With regard to 4, attendance allowances expenses, the new Constitution will provide for free compulsory education, which will involve a different age range from its previous form ... . It is thought, at least, that overall auxiliary workers will enter in significant numbers, and so we must consider attendance allowances along with the problem of free compulsory education, researching to what extent the national government must take responsibility, whether it will include tuition, textbooks, school supplies and so on, and as I mentioned previously, what degree of aid for living expenses must be provided in compensation for taking labor away from ordinary households.”

In the “(Ministerial debate) Problems of implementing the elementary [sic] junior high school compulsory system from the following academic year”<sup>11</sup> (5 November 1946), thought to be the same as the document distributed at this meeting, regarding the problem of “[t]he scope of ‘free’ compulsory education,” three sub-items were listed: was tuition alone to be free, or would textbooks and school supplies also be included? Would fee-paying private schools be included as special provisions? What about attendance allowances? Therefore, MoE was obviously debating the scope of free education and of attendance allowances at the same time and in parallel, based around the guarantee of enrollment. Given that when the issue of ensuring enrollment for disadvantaged children arose before the war, its solution got no farther than expanding attendance allowances and did not address the expansion of the scope of free education, the qualitative

shift from the prewar stance deserves attention. The MoE official explained the issue of the scope of free education at this meeting as follows.<sup>12</sup>

As I mentioned, regarding the scope of “free” compulsory education, the new Constitution will make compulsory education free for the first time. The problem is the intent of the Reform Committee in terms of the scope thereof. Conventionally speaking, free compulsory education meant that tuition was free. Will the intent of the new Constitution go further to comprise free textbooks and school supplies, or, as I mentioned previously, will it go as far as improvement of living conditions in order to render education compulsory? And will specially designated fee-paying institutions be accepted?

This statement, while notable for its lack of suitable understanding of the switch from duties to rights, shows that MoE was discussing expanding the scope of free compulsory education to include textbooks, school supplies, and even living expenses. This inclusion of living expenses in the discussions of the expanded scope of free education and attendance allowances is important in the following ways. First, aid for living expenses was a necessary condition for the actual guarantee of the right to education for the people of the time, and simultaneously a necessary measure for MoE to bring about in practical terms the extended length of compulsory education which it was trying to realize against intragovernmental opposition. However, given that income aid was discussed prewar with regard to attendance allowances, the discussion of aid for living expenses was not unique to the postwar period: it was a fact both pre- and postwar that some children would not be able to attend school without economic aid, and the discussion on this point can be positioned as an extension of the prewar debates. Second, in relation to the already established Public

Assistance Act (September 1946), aid for living expenses should have been enacted under the provisions of that law, not within MoE's jurisdiction. Therefore, we may surmise that MoE's discussion at this point of free education and attendance allowances was, as before the war, unstructured, or that MoE was contemplating the absorption of public assistance into attendance allowances.

## **(2) The ideal of the expanded scope of free education and attendance allowances as a supplement thereto**

Although, as seen above, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Special Committee of the Education Reform Committee was informed by an MoE official of the need to discuss the scope of free education and attendance allowances, no discussion actually took place. However, the 11<sup>th</sup> General Meeting (November 16, 1946) heard an argument from Kawamoto Unosuke, principal of the Tokyo School for Deaf-Mutes (not a member of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Special Committee at the time), on the expansion of free education, in the form of a criticism of the regulations on waiving tuition in the Draft for the Basic Act on Education. According to Kawamoto, because students had to use public transportation to attend public schools in remote mountainous areas, "if transportation expenses are not supplied in a suitable fashion, the real meaning of free education will not be realized throughout ... As well, in general terms, the question of how far to go with textbooks and school supplies, whether to provide the actual items or the funds required for them, can be thought to be part of free education depending on how you approach it. Did no one consider this at all?"<sup>13</sup> Kawamoto thus called once again for a review of the scope of free education. Similarly, Tajima Michiji, chairman of the Greater Japan Scholarship Foundation, pointed out that the regulations on waiving tuition "conversely regulate the fact that the national government, while it

waives tuition, is not prepared to guarantee other school supplies, textbooks and so on,"<sup>14</sup> criticizing the fact that the regulations covered only the waiving of tuition.

In response, Sekiguchi Takakatsu, Director of the Minister of Education's Cabinet Planning Office, stated that MoE was "currently coming to interpret" the Constitution's regulations on free compulsory education as waiving tuition, but "had not decided" what degree of expenses should be made free and whether the affluent should be targeted along with those struggling to enroll. He added that therefore "it is certain that tuition will be waived, and as for the rest we hope to consider it as a research issue from here on, organizing materials." In addition, if each Special Committee were to determine the expenses and their targets, "we believe that some change may be possible."<sup>15</sup> In short, as far as the Planning Office was concerned, (1) they were aware of the scope of free expenses and the question of whether their targets should be universal or only the economically disadvantaged as issues for examination, and (2) MoE was interpreting the regulations on free compulsory education as waiving of tuition, but open to change in scope in future as a legislative measure.

The discussion continued at the 12<sup>th</sup> General Meeting (November 22, 1946), where Kawamoto, who had argued for an expansion of the scope of free education at the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting, pressed his point with the following example of a limited range of targets.<sup>16</sup>

Of course they are not going to hand out transportation fees, or school supplies, or expenses for those who need to use school dormitories and so on, to everyone in the country. Regarding those, I hope very much that suitable phrasing will be used along the lines that these expenses will be supplied when needed in the articles as regulated, making them free of charge as well.

In this way, Kawamoto called for the provision of expenses for school supplies, transportation, and dormitories “when needed.” The chairman, Abe Yoshishige, interpreted this statement as a call for economic aid for disadvantaged children rather than for expansion of the scope of free education for all children, taking it as an opinion on the article on equal opportunity. As Kawamoto stated that “this could be either in compulsory education or in equal opportunities for education”<sup>17</sup> in response, the discussion moved on to equal opportunity, without touching further on the scope of free education.

As above, Kawamoto’s initial argument that this scope should include textbooks, school supplies, and transportation expenses to school was, as Kono Hiroaki puts it, “one of the problems that the ERC ought to research and debate thoroughly ... no less than an important point on the actual content of guaranteeing the right to receive education.”<sup>18</sup> In response to Kawamoto’s statement, an MoE official stated that the scope and target of free education were issues; as if to respond, Kawamoto suggested limiting the targets. Therefore, the point of discussion ultimately moved on to equal opportunity, without sufficient discussion of the free scope. At the 1<sup>st</sup> Special Committee, tasked with debating the Basic Act on Education vision, as well as the General Meeting, the lead investigator, Hatani Ryotai, stated that “our Committee did not consider the issue of free education all that much, so we did not interpret it all that broadly,”<sup>19</sup> indicating that discussion on the scope of free education remained cursory.

MoE’s calculation of the costs of providing ten textbooks to junior high school students entirely on the government’s dime shows us that discussion of free textbook provision took place within the Ministry.<sup>20</sup> However, the Basic Bill on Education submitted at the 92<sup>nd</sup> Imperial Diet involved no changes to the scope of free education. At this session, Minister

of Education Takahashi Seiichiro responded that “while we would have liked to waive not just tuition but all other expenses, in particular providing all required school supplies from public funds, based on the opinion that this will not be possible in the current economic situation, here we have simply regulated tuition fees,”<sup>21</sup> leaving open the possibility that the scope of free education could be expanded later. In regard thereto, we have the *Commentary on the School Education Act* of Naito Takasaburo, head of the MoE School Education Bureau General Affairs Division (Hikari Shuppansha, 1947, p. 50).

This compulsory education, according to the regulations of Article 26-2 (latter section), of the Constitution, must be free, that is tuition must be waived. However, given Japan's current financial situation, the meaning of ‘free’ in Article 26, while it ought to extend to children's school supplies, is currently only that tuition is waived; for parents who cannot afford school supplies and thus cannot provide compulsory education to their children, according to the regulations of Article 25 of the School Education Act, municipalities must provide the required aid.

From this, we gather that (1) the Constitutional interpretation is that the scope of free compulsory education includes waiving tuition, (2) while it really ought to include school supplies as well, financial restrictions required limitations at the time, and therefore (3) attendance allowances are adopted as a measure of reducing economic burdens. In this way, attendance allowances were a supplement to the scope of free education limited by the external factor of national finance, but given that MoE hoped to enlarge this scope through legislative policy, it was possible that if allowed by the situation, attendance allowances expenses would come to fall therein. However, although the *Commentary on the Basic Act on Education* states

that a promotion system established by regional municipalities “should be thoroughly encouraged,”<sup>22</sup> budget measures under the Schoolchildren’s Attendance Allowances Regulations did not take place after 1947, being effectively abolished.<sup>23</sup> Remnants of this national subsidy can be seen in the “Bill on Regional Educational Administration”<sup>24</sup> proposed at the time, but the bill did not bear fruit. As seen in the next section, because the Regulations were “absorbed into public assistance expenses via the Public Assistance Act,”<sup>25</sup> the national government of the early postwar era no longer had a fiscal system inducing regional municipalities to implement attendance allowances.

### **3. Internal and external factors in the creation of a separate framework for school education expenses in public assistance**

The separate framework for school education expenses created in the 8<sup>th</sup> revision of public assistance standards in August 1948 was assessed as “development into education aid in the new [Public Assistance] law,”<sup>26</sup> constituting a development of enrollment guarantees in public assistance. This section notes that MoE’s vision of attendance allowances was an external factor in the creation of this separate framework. It also shows that because the aid provided by the Public Assistance Act, regardless of the separate framework, was insufficient, aid for educational expenses for the economically disadvantaged was thereafter supplemented by regional municipalities and PTAs.

#### **(1) Internal factors in the creation of a separate framework for school education expenses in public assistance: Revision of the standards**

### **calculation method**

The Public Assistance Act, like the Relief Act, described compulsory education expenses as included in livelihood assistance.<sup>27</sup> However, the standard calculation based on the standard cost of living by household members as regulated by the Headquarters for Economic Stabilization allowed for household size and location alone, without consideration for the presence of school-age children in the household. Therefore, the consideration provided for compulsory education expenses was extremely insufficient, as explained thus during the 8<sup>th</sup> revision thereafter: “In the balance with households without children attending school, extremely low expenses tend to be figured in, leading to a failure to ensure the education expenses for children actually attending school; likewise, the contradiction which tends to arise is that households without school-age children receive high living expenses for no especial reason.”<sup>28</sup>

Within MHW, work on the revision of assistance standards leading to the 8<sup>th</sup> revision had been in progress from January 1948 on.<sup>29</sup> The public assistance standards at the time were “criticized as murderous or unconstitutional, with critical opinions even submitted to the Supreme Court,”<sup>30</sup> and their revisions had hardly achieved more than calibration to changing prices; the 8<sup>th</sup> revision, however, adopted the objective standards calculation method (distinct from the subjective views of the officials in charge) of totalling the purchases of the essential items required for a minimum level of living, thus calculating minimum living expenses with the market basket method. This was to result in “guaranteeing life as a human being, beyond the bare minimum of maintaining existence,” and to that end the interpretation was that expenses “for school-age children to attend school and receive compulsory education” must be included.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, for example, educational expenses in the “Standards calculation

method for livelihood assistance expenses” (July 28, 1947)<sup>32</sup> ran to “school supplies and so on, ... three times the conventional price based on an estimate of the minimum limit required for elementary schools,” while the 8<sup>th</sup> revision created a calculation basis from MoE survey materials which included textbooks and commuting items as well as school supplies. At the same time, the prospect of separate supply—the separate framework—from the school education expenses included in the public assistance standard amount was created, enabling consideration for the sufficient guarantee of compulsory education expenses.

## **(2) External factors in the creation of a separate framework for school education expenses in public assistance: Development of the attendance allowances vision**

The 1947 *Commentary on the School Education Act* states that attendance allowances “mean aid exceeding that regulated in the Public Assistance Act,”<sup>33</sup> referring to it as a policy issue for MoE beyond the area of legal interpretation. In this way, the MoE internal attendance allowances vision, under consideration in advance of the 8<sup>th</sup> revision, seems to have been an external factor in the creation of a separate framework for education expenses in public assistance. With regard to the content of this vision, let us confirm (1) expenses and aid amounts, (2) rate of national subsidies, (3) targets. (1) In the “Attendance allowances expenses aid calculation table”<sup>34</sup> thought to date from fiscal 1946, the basic supply price of attendance allowances for new-style junior high school students was the same as the scholarships given by the Greater Japan Scholarship Foundation to students at old-style junior high schools; in the “Aid for student attendance allowances expenses”<sup>35</sup> document prepared in March 1948, however, the calculation was based on textbooks, school supplies, and commuting items

as expenses for attendance allowances, constituting a budget using an objective basis. (2) Regarding the rate of national subsidies, the “Bill on Local Educational Administration”<sup>36</sup> set it at 1/2. In prewar attendance allowances, because the national government did not set a supply price and national subsidies were essentially at a fixed rate, it was pointed out at the Education Council noted above that national subsidies for attendance allowances expenses were far too low;<sup>37</sup> in comparison, national subsidies as conceived here were apparently expected to increase in accordance with fluctuations in the number of target households and in supply prices. Elsewhere, regarding (3) target students, MoE had no way to identify economically disadvantaged households, the way public assistance targets were identified based on assistance standards. Therefore, for instance, the “Matters for consideration regarding the enactment of the Basic Act on Education”<sup>38</sup> prepared by the MoE Planning Office in September 1946 defined its targets as “those in need of public assistance, those with income below a certain level,” while in the fiscal 1948 budget calculation of attendance allowances expenses in requests to revive budget items, the calculation used was the number of disadvantaged persons as calculated by MHW times the number of students divided by the total population;<sup>39</sup> this suggests that targets were estimated based on public assistance.

In order to realize this vision, MoE planned to unify educational expenses aid to economically disadvantaged households under attendance allowances, via separation of educational expenses from public assistance in the fiscal 1948 budget.<sup>40</sup> However, this was not approved, and although revival in the budget was called for,<sup>41</sup> at the Cabinet Meeting on April 10, 1948, as recorded by Secretary to the Minister of Education Arimitsu Jiro to the effect of “Considering implementation via the Public Assistance Act,”<sup>42</sup> the decision was made to unify expenses under public assistance. Possible

contexts for this include, first, the limits of the national budget, second, the governmental policy as already decided to unify national institutions for the economically disadvantaged, and third, the fact that MoE had no way of identifying target students and had to rely on the public assistance system. Immediately afterward, the creation of a separate framework for school education expenses in the 8<sup>th</sup> revision of the Public Assistance Act, in August of the same year, seems to have been indirectly affected by the absorption of attendance allowances into public assistance, as we see from the facts that school lunch costs had been calculated separately from before this revision and that the adoption of a more scientific calculation method had still left open the option of avoiding a separate framework from that of living expenses aid. Therefore, the development of attendance allowances in public assistance was stimulated to some extent by the MoE attendance allowances vision.

However, while the “Aid for student attendance allowances expenses” created by MoE calculated commuting expenses to include bags, student caps, cap badges, shoes, handkerchiefs, and umbrellas, the public assistance expenses calculation included only geta sandals and umbrellas, constituting expenses unlikely to be sufficient to guarantee enrollment.<sup>43</sup> In addition, the Public Assistance Act contained a so-called disqualification clause in Article 2, which regulated that assistance would not be provided to “those who are capable but unwilling to work, those who make no efforts to maintain a living such as those too lazy to work,” and “those of bad character,” distancing its actual provisions from the general assistance stance which would protect “those requiring livelihood assistance” equally and without discrimination.

Therefore, in November 1948, MoE stated that aid for educational expenses via the Public Assistance Act “was not necessarily inclined to

achieve its goals when viewed from its implementation,” while also demanding the following. “Given the status quo of today, school-age children recognized as struggling to enroll in compulsory education include not only the children of households requiring assistance from now on [sic], but also many others in almost identical situations,” so “it is absolutely necessary, given the principle of compulsory enrollment, to provide these children with the necessary aid,” demanding of the prefectural governor that they “investigate students in need of enrollment aid.”<sup>44</sup> That is, MoE considered the Public Assistance Act's guarantee of enrollment insufficient, and was making its move, immediately after unification under public assistance, to restart attendance allowances.<sup>45</sup>

### **(3) Supplementation of public assistance through regional municipalities and PTAs**

As noted above, because national subsidies for attendance allowances were abolished as of fiscal 1946, many prefectures phased out budget measures for attendance allowances from 1947 on.<sup>46</sup> However, some municipalities conducted attendance allowances without this subsidy.<sup>47</sup> The existence of attendance allowances on the part of municipalities, based on Article 25 (now Article 19) of the School Education Act, amid the struggling regional finances of the immediate postwar, is to be lauded. At the same time, we may assume that there were far more municipalities which were unable to conduct attendance allowances, having had national and prefectural subsidies cut off, thus further reinforcing inequity between regions in terms of guaranteeing enrollment.

PTAs also engaged in attendance allowances for economically disadvantaged households.<sup>48</sup> The background thereto may be estimated to include, first, the likelihood that the prewar supply of school supplies via

parents' associations, etc., was still continued after the war,<sup>49</sup> and second, MoE's promotion of aid for poor children's educational expenses through PTAs.<sup>50</sup> In this way, while MoE recognized private aid on the part of PTAs, it was to state in 1952 that "these private forms of relief exist because the Public Assistance Act does not cover aid in the first place; further, if children newly in need of assistance are not to receive relief based on the law, their percentage will undoubtedly increase willy-nilly,"<sup>51</sup> notably pointing out once again the insufficiency of the public assistance system.

## **Summary**

This paper has focused on the relationship between free compulsory education and the public assistance system in order to clarify the vision of attendance allowances before the enactment of the new Public Assistance Act. The following three points of knowledge have been made clear.

First, a comparison of attendance allowances before and after the war finds that while there was continuity on the point of discussion of the expansion of aid based on an awareness of the need for aid of economically disadvantaged households, it was only at the postwar stage that this was discussed in relation to free compulsory education, representing a discontinuity. To be sure, as in Yotoriyama's comment that the establishment of the attendance allowances system led to the discarding of the pioneering vision of free education, even in the era in which the Basic Act on Education was enacted, financial restrictions prevented the expansion of the scope of free education, and attendance allowances were positioned as a supplement to education which was free in the sense that tuition fees were waived. However, as in the possibility demonstrated of changing attendance allowances expenses to those of free compulsory

education, the distinction between the two was not, immediately after the war, considered unshakeable.

Second, the postwar principle of equal educational opportunity could not be made concrete without the guarantee of welfare. Therefore, MoE, which felt that public assistance was required in order to guarantee the right to education, envisioned an attendance allowances system. This vision of attendance allowances, while pointing out the insufficiency of aid for school education based in the Public Assistance Act, was focused around its enhancement and thus also involved the unification of aid for compulsory education expenses under attendance allowances. In this way, MoE's image of the guarantee of rights was in the process of changing and developing. However, in practical terms, due to the lack of a specific educational administration framework for identifying household incomes and selecting target students, and more essentially due to the restrictions of national finance and the unification of the social security system, the vision failed. These problems are thought to have been passed on thereafter to MoE's continuing attempts to institutionalize educational promotion.

Third, the creation of a separate framework for educational expenses as a preliminary to new educational assistance took place not only as the application of science to the method of calculating public assistance standards but also as the absorption of attendance allowances into public assistance. This separate framework apparently enabled the attendance allowances vision to reinforce aid on the educational side of public assistance, given the stable level of aid content. However, because of the insufficient public assistance calculation basic items and the restrictions on assistance targets through the disqualification clause, enrollment guarantees through public assistance were extremely limited. If this proved a factor in MoE's intent to restructure the system, we may say that the seeds were

already planted at this time for the split of educational administration and welfare administration in attendance allowances thereafter. Given this limited public assistance, when national subsidies for attendance allowances ran out and the financial basis for enforcing compulsory education as in the former Article 25 of the School Education Act was lost, municipalities and PTAs played supplementary roles to some extent. However, their efforts were restricted, and we cannot overlook the many children who were forced into long-term non-attendance because of a lack of aid. This likewise became a background factor in MoE's intent to restructure attendance allowances.

This paper was unable to examine in full the trends of welfare assistance, involving MHW's view of MoE's actions, or the influences of the Occupation military, regional municipalities, and PTAs on the MoE vision of attendance allowances. These issues remain to be addressed in the future.

(Graduate student, Nagoya University)

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Nakajima Tetsuhiko, "Kodomo no hinkon sakugen no sogoteki shisaku: Kyoiku to fukushi no bunretsu ni chakumoku shite [Overall measures for reducing child poverty: Focusing on the split between education and welfare]," in Japan Educational Administration Society Research Promotion Committee ed. *Kyoiku kikai kakusa to kyoiku gyosei: Tenkanki no kyoiku hosho wo tenbo suru [Unequal educational opportunities and educational administration: Prospects for guaranteeing education in a transitional period]*, Fukumura Shuppan, 2013, pp. 75-76.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 75-88.

<sup>3</sup> Yotoriyama Yosuke, "Kyoiku joken seibi kijun rippo naki kyoiku zaisei iten hosei: Seiritsu, tenkai, soshite shukusho to saihei [Legislative system for transferring educational finance without legislation on educational condition standards: Establishment, development, contraction and reorganization]," in Yotoriyama Yosuke & the Research Society for a Welfare State Plan eds. *Kokyoiku no mushosei wo jitsugen suru: Kyoiku zaisei ho no saikochiku [Realizing free public education: Reconstructing educational finance laws]*, Otsuki Shoten, 2012, pp. 30-128.

<sup>4</sup> "Kyugoho jissai ni tomonai gakurei jido shugaku shorei jo no gigi [Questions about school-age children's attendance allowances in accordance with the enactment of the Relief Act]," Vol. 6, February 16, 1932, Notice from the General Education Affairs Bureau to regional agencies. In the case of parallel supply, the supply of items required for everyday life would be omitted from attendance allowances; likewise, under the Relief Act, children receiving public attendance allowances would receive living expenses with educational expenses subtracted from livelihood aid.

<sup>5</sup> Also reported in "Kasegu dake no kane wo ataete shugaku sasu [Giving children as much as they would earn to have them enroll]," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, October 2, 1930, morning edition, p. 7, and "Fushugaku jido no shugaku shorei: Monbusho, chikaku kitei wo kaisei shi, chiho chokan ni kunrei [Attendance allowances for children not enrolled in school: MoE to revise regulations and direct regional leaders]," *Asahi Shimbun*, October 11, 1930, morning edition, p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> "Gakurei jido shugaku shorei kitei chu kaisei [Intermediate revisions to the Schoolchildren's Attendance Allowances Regulations]," MoE Directive 16, November 27, 1930, to Hokkaido Agency and other prefectures.

<sup>7</sup> Education Council ed. *Kyoiku Shingikai shimon dai-1-go: Tokubetsu iinkai seiri iinkai kaigiroku [Education Council questions Vol. 1: Minutes of the*

---

*Special Committees and Organizational Committee*], Vol. 6 (parts 3, 4), Senbudo Shoten, 1970, p. 123.

<sup>8</sup> Nagai Kenichi & Muramoto Hiroyuki, “Kenpo 26-jo no seitei katei: Irie bunsho, Sato bunsho nado wo sozai to suru saikento [The process of establishing Article 26 of the Constitution: Reconsideration using the Irie and Sato documents],” in *Hogaku shirin* [Review of law and political sciences] Vol. 97 No. 3, 2000, pp. 21-22.

<sup>9</sup> “Dai-90-kai Teikoku Gikai Shugiin Teikoku Kenpo Kaiseian Iinkai giroku (sokki) dai-4-kai [Minutes of the Committee on Revising the Imperial Constitution at the 90<sup>th</sup> Imperial Diet, House of Representatives (shorthand), No. 4],” July 3, 1946, p. 55. Note that this paper used the National Diet Library Imperial Diet Minutes Search System (<http://teikokugikai-i.ndl.go.jp>).

<sup>10</sup> Japan Modern Educational Historical Materials Research Association ed. *Kyoiku sasshin iinkai/Kyoiku sasshin shingikai kaigiroku* [Minutes of the Education Reform Committee/Education Reform Council] (below, *Education Reform Committee Minutes*) Vol. 6, Iwanami Shoten, 1997, p. 333.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* VII-11.

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* Vol. 6, p. 335.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* Vol. 1, Iwanami Shoten, 1995, p. 247.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, p. 248.

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*, p. 271.

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.* Kawamoto’s opinion on the regulation of equal opportunity was that Article 3-2 of the Draft of the Basic Act on Education “take measures to provide scholarship [*ikuei*]”; he argued that “the word *ikuei* is used for secondary education and above, and is not often in use within the scope of compulsory education,” feeling that this article did not target the compulsory

education stage (ibid., p. 272). Thereafter, *ikuei* was revised to *shogaku* (financial assistance), but the vagueness of this regulation was also probably a factor in rendering Kawamoto's opinion unclear.

<sup>18</sup> Kono Hiroaki, *Showa 21 (1946)-nen 11-gatsu – 12-gatsu gejun no kyoiku kihon ho rippo katei [The legislation of the Basic Act on Education from November through late December 1946]*, Hokkaido University of Education Asahikawa Campus Department of Education, 1987, p. 65.

<sup>19</sup> op. cit, *Education Reform Committee Minutes*, Vol. 1, p. 247.

<sup>20</sup> “Kyokasho daibenhi sanshutsuhyo [Calculation table for textbook expenses],” Tsujita Chikara Documents 8-23-8. The use of the term “primary junior high school” here suggests that this document was created in 1946.

<sup>21</sup> “Dai 92-kai Teikoku Gikai Kizokuin kyoiku kihon hoan tokubetsu iinkai giji sokkiroku dai-3-go [Shorthand records of the 92nd Imperial Diet House of Peers Special Committee on the Basic Bill on Education, No. 3],” March 22, 1947, p. 7.

<sup>22</sup> Educational Legislation Research Society, *Commentary on the Basic Act on Education*, Kokuritsu Shoin, 1947, p. 80.

<sup>23</sup> Budgetary subsidies for schools for the blind and the deaf, which had had independent budgets in the Schoolchildren's Attendance Allowances Regulations since fiscal 1940, was continued as a budget item even after the Regulations were abolished.

<sup>24</sup> Stated in the “Division of Educational Cost Burdens” (Tanaka Jiro Education Documents I-182-1) thought to have been created during the process of drafting the Bill on Regional Educational Administration of January 15, 1947, as the national subsidies for expenses required for regional municipalities' educational administration as regulated in Article 96 of the Bill, was “for municipalities, half the costs required to promote the enrollment of school-age children for whom enrollment is difficult because

---

of poverty.”

<sup>25</sup> MoE ed. *Gakusei hyakunen shi [A Century of the School System]*, Teikoku Chiho Gyosei Gakkai, 1972, p. 867.

<sup>26</sup> Koyama Shinjiro, *Kaitei zoho Seikatsu hogo ho no kaishaku to unyo [Revised and Expanded Version: Interpreting and Implementing the Public Assistance Act]*, National Council of Social Welfare, 1976, p. 35.

<sup>27</sup> MHW Bureau of Society “Seikatsu hogo ho chikujo setsumeii [Explaining the Public Assistance Act article by article],” in Terawaki Takao ed. *Sengo sosetsuki/shakai fukushi seido/engo seido shi shiryō shusei [Collection of historical documents on the postwar early days of the social welfare and aid systems]* (Part I), Kashiwa Shobo, 2012, 010102-0801.

<sup>28</sup> MHW Bureau of Society Public Assistance Division ed. *Kijungaku no naiyo to sono unyo [Content and implementation of standard amounts]*, Japan Social Affairs Council, 1948, p. 44.

<sup>29</sup> Suganuma Takashi, *Hisenryōki shakai fukushi bunseki [Analysis of social welfare under the Occupation]*, Minerva Shobo, 2005, p. 209.

<sup>30</sup> op. cit., *Content and implementation of standard amounts*, p. 29.

<sup>31</sup> ibid., p. 35.

<sup>32</sup> op. cit., Terawaki, 010104-0401.

<sup>33</sup> Naito Takasaburo, *Gakko kyoiku ho kaisetsu [Commentary on the School Education Act]*, Hikari Shuppansha, 1947, p. 50.

<sup>34</sup> Tsujita Chikara Documents 8-23-7. Because the purpose of this was to calculate the increased expenses required for the extension of the years of compulsory education, it was probably created in 1946.

<sup>35</sup> Morito Tatsuo Documents (below, Morito Documents), MO02070200904.

<sup>36</sup> op. cit., “Division of Educational Cost Burdens.”

<sup>37</sup> Statements to that effect by committee members Tanaka Hozumi, Tadokoro Yoshiharu, Shimomura Juichi et al. (Education Council ed., op. cit.,

p. 129).

<sup>38</sup> Tsujita Chikara Documents 2-5, 15-35, Tanaka Jiro Education Documents I-43.

<sup>39</sup> "Aid for student attendance allowances expenses," Morito Documents MO02070200904.

<sup>40</sup> In School Education Bureau "Showa 23-nendo yosan yokyu jiko gaikyo [Overview of fiscal 1948 budget demand items]," Morito documents MO02070400400, the budget for attendance allowances expenses is followed by a handwritten note: "Separate from public assistance."

<sup>41</sup> "Showa 23-nendo yosan satei ni taisuru fukkatsu yokyu [Demands for revival regarding fiscal 1948 budget review]," in "Aid for student attendance allowances expenses," op. cit.

<sup>42</sup> Kusuyama Mikao ed. *Arimitsu Jiro nikki Showa 2-nen – 23-nen [Diary of Arimitsu Jiro, 1927-1948]*, Daiichi Hoki Shuppan, 1989, p. 1,171.

<sup>43</sup> op. cit., *Content and implementation of standard amounts*, pp. 108-109. Given MHW's statement (ibid.) that "goods like shoes and slippers are also thought to be required, but as is known, bags can be replaced by furoshiki wrappers and slippers by handmade straw sandals. In some cases, students can even get by without them," they were aware of the insufficiency.

<sup>44</sup> "Shugakujo enjo wo hitsuyo to suru jido seito no chosa ni tsuite [Survey of students requiring enrollment aid]," Fukushima Prefectural Education Center ed. *Kyoiku kankei reiki [Examples of educational regulations]* (Fukushima Prefectural Education Center Editions Vol. 6), Fukushima Prefecture Board of Education, 1973, pp. 428-430. The MoE Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau/Prime Minister's Central Council on Youth Problems, *6-3 sei shugaku mondai to sono taisaku [Problems and countermeasures regarding enrollment under the 6-3 system]*, 1952, p. 38, explains that "a sampling survey was conducted of a total of 30 schools, 10

---

each in cities, towns, and villages, in the prefectures.”

<sup>45</sup> In fact, these survey results were part of the basis on which MoE tried to reclaim attendance allowances in the 1950s (ibid., pp. 38-39).

<sup>46</sup> Kumamoto Prefecture continued to include a budget line as a special accounting item (Kumamoto Prefectural Assembly Secretariat ed. *Kumamoto Kengikai shi [History of Kumamoto Prefectural Assembly]* Vol. 5, Kumamoto Prefectural Assembly, 1979, pp. 303-711).

<sup>47</sup> Nishinomiya City began providing aid in 1950 and Kobe City in 1951 (Continued History of Postwar Education in Nishinomiya City Editorial Committee ed. *Zoku Nishinomiya-shi sengo kyoiku shi [Continued History of Postwar Education in Nishinomiya City]*, Nishinomiya City Board of Education, 1994, p. 141; History of Education in Kobe City Editorial Committee ed. *Kobe-shi kyoiku shi [History of education in Kobe City]* Vol. 2, History of Education in Kobe City Publication Committee, 1964, pp. 255-256).

<sup>48</sup> For example, Toyama Prefecture cited “aid for poor children” as a PTA activity (History of Education in Toyama Prefecture Editorial Committee ed. *Toyama-ken kyoiku shi [History of education in Toyama Prefecture]* Vol. 2, Toyama Prefecture Board of Education, 1971, p. 962), while Nara Prefecture held that “for so-called borderline parents who could not afford textbooks, etc., municipalities and PTAs frequently provided aid” (Nara Prefectural Board of Education ed. *Nara-ken kyoiku hyakunenshi [A Century of History of Education in Nara Prefecture]*, Nara Prefectural Board of Education, 1974, p. 316).

<sup>49</sup> For example, the Nerima Ward Kaishin No. 2 Elementary School PTA provided aid for school supplies to children (History of Education in Nerima Ward Editorial Committee ed. *Nerima-ku kyoiku shi [History of Education in Nerima Ward]*, Vol. 1, Tokyo Metropolitan Nerima Ward Board of Education,

1975, p. 1273).

<sup>50</sup> The MoE PTA Committee ed. *PTA shitsugi oto shu [Questions and answers on the PTA]*, Printing Agency, 1949, p. 125, contains the following question: "Does the PTA need to take measures of some kind for those unable to attend compulsory education due to economic reasons?" with replies including "If PTA finances permit, they may create a scholarship system and provide aid for school expenses." This is probably the result of consideration for the guarantee of education for poor families on the part of MoE, which had not been able to create an attendance allowances system, but it is clearly problematic that the enrollment aid to be supplied by municipalities based on Article 25 of the School Education Act was being covered by private funds provided by parents through the PTA.

<sup>51</sup> *op. cit.*, *Problems and countermeasures regarding enrollment under the 6-3 system*, p. 72.