

**Joint submission by  
Japan Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination  
Related to Japan for the consideration of the List of Issues  
By the Committee on Racial Discrimination**

26<sup>th</sup> August 2009

**【Definition of Minority (Article 1)】**

1. Recognition of Minority Communities covered by the Convention

**Q: The present periodic report of the Government (covering for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>) does not include information of those people who belong to the communities subject to discrimination defined under Article 1 of the Convention, namely Buraku people, Ryukyu/Okinawan people, returnees from China, and etc. Will the Government provide the information on these people before the consideration at the CERD begins?**

Background: Ainu people and migrants/non-Japanese citizens are the only oppressed minority groups that the periodic report of Japan touches upon. While there are other minority groups that are subject to racial discrimination as defined in Article 1, the Government has refused to officially acknowledge them. The report does not touch upon Buraku people, Ryukyu-Okinawan people, Japanese returnees from China and those ethnic minorities who have their roots outside Japan (for example, those who have acquired a Japanese nationality and their descendants, and those children born between Japanese and non-Japanese parents), despite the fact that it was pointed out by the Committee during the consideration of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> periodic reports.

Suggested by <IMADR-JC>

2. Definition of Discrimination based on ‘Descent’

**Q: Please indicate how the Government views the recommendation made under paragraph 8 of the Concluding Observations of CERD made in the consideration of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> periodic report of Japan, as well as the definition of “descent” made in General Comment XXIX.**

Background: The Japanese Government held the view that Buraku problem was not covered by the Convention. However, CERD, in contrast, has taken the view that the term "descent" has its own meaning and is not to be confused with race or ethnic or national origin, and recommended that the State party ensure that all groups, including the Buraku community, are protected against discrimination and afforded full enjoyment of the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights contained in article 5 of the Convention. Also, the Committee adopted General Comment XXIX in August 2002. Having strongly reaffirmed that discrimination based on "descent" includes discrimination against members of communities based on forms of social stratification such as caste and analogous systems of inherited status which nullify or impair their equal enjoyment of human rights, it recommends a number of measures of a general nature. These recommendations strongly criticize the views expressed by the Government. It is urged that the Government indicate new views taking these recommendations into considerations.

<BLL/BLHRRI>

**【State's Responsibilities for the Elimination of Discrimination  
– Policies and Measures (Article 2)】**

3. Abolition of Discriminatory Legislation

3-1. The Family Registration System

**Q: Under the family registration system, people of Buraku origin are easily identified through their domicile and birthplace, which are recorded in the register. Does the Government have any intention to change or abolish the family registration system? For the immediate future and as a make-shift measure, it is suggested to scrap the current basic rule allowing access to a copy of one's family register upon a request from a third party (legal and administrative professionals such as lawyers, administrative scriveners, etc.), and to introduce a new rule that such access is permitted only when the concerned person in the register allows it. It is also suggested to remove the columns for domicile and children born out of wedlock from the registry, and introduce a new registration system exclusively for the individual, and not a family through generations.**

Background: Discrimination against Buraku people is based on their domicile of origin and birth that are recorded in the family registration. A domicile of origin indicates a block and a house number with a name of Buraku area. With information of domicile of origin and family name, one's ancestral information can be traced back through several generations.

In a legitimate marriage, according to the provision prescribing that a couple shares a same family name, one spouse loses her/his family name to change to the other's family name upon marriage. When a child born out of wedlock is recognized as a child by his/her Japanese father, information about such a recognition is specified somewhere in his/her family registration, whereas no information about his/her Japanese father is recorded when a child is not legally recognized by his/her father, inducing discrimination on birth. In the case of marriage with a non-Japanese, a spouse with no Japanese nationality is not recorded in the family registration, thus the other spouse with a Japanese nationality has to have a new family registration for his/her own. The non-Japanese spouse is recorded separately in his/her alien registration. Family registration is a certificate of one's nationality as well as citizenship. Thus, it excludes those non-Japanese who do not have family registration are not guaranteed civil rights.

<BLL/BLHRR>

3-2: Amended Nationality Law

**Q: Although the Nationality Law has been amended, in the case of children born out of wedlock between Japanese fathers and mothers with foreign nationality, it is obligatory to report the child's acquisition of Japanese nationality to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in addition to the normal process of notifying the local government that the father recognizes the child as his own. Given that such obligation is not applied in cases where the child is recognized before birth, does the Government regard this as a new form of discrimination?**

Background: Japan has maintained a principle of lineage (legal parent-child relationship) on acquisition of nationality. Up to 2008, a child born out of wedlock from a foreign mother would only be able to obtain Japanese nationality if the father recognized him/her before birth; in the case of the child being

recognized after birth, he/she would only obtain Japanese nationality if the parents got married. On June 4, 2008, the Supreme Court made a judgment stating that it is an irrational discrimination to require the parents' marriage only for children recognized after birth. As a result, on December 12, 2008, the Nationality Law was amended, enabling children born between a Japanese parent and a parent with foreign nationality to obtain Japanese nationality upon the Japanese parent's recognition of the child, even if the parents are not legally married.

Despite the fact that this is a due amendment resulting from the fact that Supreme Court ruled that the original legislation was against the Japanese Constitution, right-wing groups, who openly declare that their purpose is "to discriminate the 'foreign bastards'", advertised that "There'll be rampant cases where foreigners take advantage of false recognition aiming for the illicit obtainment of Japanese nationality, and at the end of the day, Japan will be taken over by fake Japanese." The Government did not argue back, and instead confirmed that they would prevent illicit obtainment by imposing reporting obligations and creating criminal punishment for false recognition.

< Association for the Support of Children out of Wedlock >

### 3-3. Alien Registration Act and Immigration Control Act

**Q: The Alien Registration Act and the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act are among those laws that regulate the rights of foreigners. But there are no laws that explicitly stipulate the universal rights of foreigners provided for in the international human rights treaties that Japan has ratified, or those that prohibit unjust discrimination. The Government is required to clarify if it is prepared to legislate such laws.**

Background: There is no clause in the Constitution, which specifically protects the rights of foreigners. The sole purpose of the Alien Registration Act and the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act is to control the stay, immigration and emigration of foreigners. Therefore, although many parts of the legal systems that restrict or deny the rights of foreigners are discrimination based on racism, they are justified as being "distinction based on having or not having Japanese nationality." Yet the number of foreigners living in Japan has increased to more than 2.21 million, from 190 countries. As people of many ethnicities and races are living in Japan, there is a need for a law, which stipulates the universal rights of these people and prohibits unjust racial discrimination.

<RAIK/SMJ>

### 4. Creation of Domestic Law that Prohibits Racial Discrimination

**Q: Are there any future prospects of adopting a law to prohibit discrimination? If so, please specify.**

Background: Japan acceded to CERD in 1995, which charged it with the responsibility of prohibiting and ending racial discrimination by private individuals and organizations, yet nothing has been done to equip domestic law to make this possible. There is still no comprehensive law that prohibits discrimination between private individuals, and this has resulted in it being very easy to discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, descent and so on, in spheres such as employment, housing, customer service and marriage. There are precedents where the court has judged an individual's discriminatory

actions as wrongful conduct and ordered the payment of damages, but this is ultimately relief after the fact. Further, because there is no law specifically prohibiting discrimination, such court precedent is a weak measure in preventing potential discrimination. Even if the victim approaches the courts seeking remedy, many give up because of the time and money it takes. There is also no quick and simple remedial body, such as a national human rights institution, to deal with this type of discrimination.

<IMADR-JC>

#### 5. Creation of an Independent National Human Rights Institute

**Q: Does the Government intend to establish a national human rights institution that is independent from the government and works with complaints in regard to discrimination stated in the Convention? If so, please specify when and how.**

Background: In spite of recommendations from numerous international human rights bodies, including that from CERD in 2001, there is still no human rights institution working to protect victims from discrimination and provide them with remedies. The Government's repetitive response to this is that the Human Rights Protection Bill, which was scrapped in the Diet in 2003, is being considered for resubmission, but the Government has not presented any concrete actions for its realization.

Under the current situation, in most cases, discrimination is left uncontrolled, as there are no effective institutions to which the victims can make complaints. The Government should establish a national human rights body in accordance with the Articles 2.1 and 6 of the Convention and General Recommendation 17 by the Committee. The institution to be established, moreover, should be an independent, effective and plural body in accordance to the Paris Principles, in order to function adequately towards the prohibition of discrimination and the restoration of the human rights of victims.

<IMADR-JC>

#### 6. Survey to Find Out Actual Conditions of Minority Groups

*The present report of the Government does not include specific information on the composition of the population and on economic and social indicators reflecting the situation of all minorities covered by the Convention (as per para 7 of the CERD Concluding Observations of 2001). Also, the report fails to include socio-economic data disaggregated by gender and ethnic group and information on measures taken to prevent gender-related racial discrimination, including sexual exploitation and violence. In this context, the following two questions are raised:*

##### 6-1: No National Survey on Buraku Problem since 1993

**Q: In the report submitted to the CERD in August 2007 informing how the Government had responded to recommendations made in the CERD Concluding Observations, it was stated: "Gaps that existed in various aspects between Dowa districts and society in general have been greatly improved, and it is observed that the public discriminatory attitude has certainly been diminished." Which survey and findings did the Government rely on when making this judgment? Meanwhile, a full-scale survey to ascertain the actual conditions of Buraku, to compare with those found in the last survey in 1993, is very much needed. How does the Government feel about this?**

Background: As mentioned above, the Government reported that measures were taken for the solution of the Dowa problem by both the national and local governments for the past many years, and these efforts have resulted in the sharp improvement of living conditions and infrastructures in Dowa areas

and solved gaps that existed in different aspects. It is also reported that various initiatives had successfully been taken in education and awareness-raising towards the elimination of the public discriminatory attitude. Since the Government has not conducted a national survey to ascertain the actual conditions of Dowa areas since the last survey made in 1993, it is questioned what facts or data the Government has relied on when making such a subjective observation. (\*\* Dowa means Buraku, and is the terminology used by the administration)

<BLL/BLHRR>

#### 6-2. People from the former colonies of Japan

**Q: Many of the people from the former colonial territories and their descendants, including resident Koreans, are second, third and fourth generation residents. Please clarify their employment rates, and forms of employment.**

Background: The Government's response (July 2001) to the Committee's Concluding Observations (para. 7) (April 2001) was that it would consider what information could be provided on economic and social indicators of resident Koreans. However, the current Report includes no mention of such indicators.

<RAIK>

#### 6-3: Migrant Workers

**Q: There has been a rapid increase in migrant workers and marriage migrants from China, Brazil, and the Philippines among others. Please clarify the enrolment rates in compulsory education, rates of children advancing to senior high school education, enrolment rates in universities, employment rates and forms of employment of their children.**

Background:

Over 7% of children of migrant workers and other migrants, who are of compulsory education age do not go to Japanese schools or schools for foreign children. Their enrolment rates in senior high schools and universities are also exceedingly low. Many of the children, who cannot receive higher education, end up in the lowest level of the labor market as non-regular workers. This situation must first be clarified.

<RAIK/ SMJ>

#### 6-4: Children of Foreign Residents

**Q: Children of resident Koreans, migrant workers and other migrants, face various difficulties in Japanese society, including discrimination in employment, promotion, and in the occasion of trying to rent a residence. Please clarify whether the Government and the local governments are carrying out any research of such serious racial discrimination that affects all aspects of living. Please also clarify what kind of measures are taken to redress such discrimination, and upon which laws these measures are based.**

Background: The State report (para. 71) states the number of human rights violation cases against foreign nationals, and some examples of such cases. However, no analysis has been given about them. This demonstrates that the Government and the local governments have no will to grasp the actual situation and establish education/ enlightenment programs or to take concrete measures to redress the situation.

6-5: Minority Women

**Q: The Government is required to give information about the economic and social conditions of minority women belonging to the communities that the Convention covers. Also, it is required to give information about measures that it has taken to prevent gender-related racial discrimination including sexual exploitation and sexual violence against minority women.**

<IMADR-JC>

7: Implementation of the recommendations by the Special Rapporteur on Racism

**Q: To what extent has the Government implemented the recommendations by the Special Rapporteur on Racism (E/CN.4/2006/16/Add.2, E/CN.4/2006/16/Add.2/Corr.1) up to this point, and how does the Government intend to implement them in the future?**

Background: All the issues in regards to which the UN Special Rapporteur on Racism, Racial Discrimination and Related Intolerance made recommendations in his report are closely related with the implementation of the Convention within Japan. The Japanese Government submitted a Note verbale dated 30 May 2006 from the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights on June 2006. This document does not respond to the most crucial point of the Special Rapporteur's report that "there exists racial discrimination and xenophobia in Japan." Furthermore, it does not show basic reaffirmation or positive attitude towards the fulfillment of the recommendations in the report. Most of it consists of the enumeration of existing laws and policies, and it shows the government's lack of willingness to grasp the actual situation on the ground where discrimination is happening, and argue on the basis of such reality.

<IMADR-JC>

8: National Plan of Durban Declaration and Plan of Action

**Q: The Durban Declaration and Plan of Action (DDPA) adopted by the World Conference Against Racism (2001) recommends the development of a national plan of action accordingly (para 99). Such a plan of action has not yet been developed in Japan. When does the Government plan to do so?**

Background: The Durban Review Conference of April 2009 reviewed the past seven years' implementation of DDPA at the national level. What was the basis for the Government in reviewing national implementation? The outcome document of the DRC recommends an immediate development of such a national plan in consultation with relevant stake-holders, including civil society, for those countries which have not yet done so (para 114). It is the obligation of the Government to take necessary measures to implement the DDPA, as well as the Convention, at the national level.

<IMADR-JC>

**【Sanction to Racial Incitement (Article 4)】**

## 9: Reservation regarding Article 4(a) and (b) in Japan's Ratification of the Convention

### 9-1: Intention for the Withdrawal of Reservation

**Q: Please clarify the prospects for including Article 4(a) and (b) in Japan's ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in relation to the concerns raised by the Committee.**

Background: In recent years, Japan has seen a rapid increase in racist incidents. In particular, groups have called for the expulsion of foreigners and ethnic minorities from Japan. For example, groups have defiled the dignity of war victims who were forced to be "comfort women" by repeatedly referring to them as "war prostitutes." Groups have also called for the expulsion of foreign junior high students with special residency status and have harassed these students in their neighborhoods.

This harassment has been recorded and posted on Internet sites. With footage of their harassment publicly available, even the victims' privacy is unprotected. Moreover, there are politicians who openly support such groups.

Currently, there is not a single organization or specific Japanese law that exists to enable victims to seek aid against this type of racist abuse, and thus, most victims have no choice but to stay silent. Accordingly, there is a need to include Article 4(a) and (b) in Japan's ratification of the Convention, and to develop Japanese laws to accommodate this as soon as possible.

<KEY>

### 9-2: Discrimination on the Internet

**Q: What measures has the Government taken against incitement to discriminate on the Internet? Is the Government considering using anti-discrimination laws to suppress acts of identifying communities or individual homes, or exposing private information using search functions, leading to concentrated discrimination and human rights violations, or incitement to discriminate?**

Background: It is possible to identify the names of areas and individuals of discriminated Buraku origin on the Internet, or to produce images of Buraku areas and individual homes by adding street views, maps or historical maps using additional search functions to identify individuals. There is now a greater danger of concentrated personal attacks. Since discrimination and incitement to discriminate appear endlessly on the Internet, deletion of the offensive information will not provide a fundamental solution to the problem.

Discriminatory propaganda and incitement to discriminate have increased on the Internet in recent years. Although measures exist, such as guidelines for internet providers, the Act Concerning the Limits of Liability for Damages of Specified Telecommunications Service Providers and the Right to Request Disclosure of Identification Information of the Senders, as well as the procedures for requesting deletion of information by the Ministry of Justice, they depend in large part on the voluntary cooperation of providers. These measures also may be effective against personal defamation but not in responding to discrimination against particular groups as a whole, such as in Buraku discrimination. Even in courts, such cases will be examined as defamation of individuals, and the discriminatory act itself would not be punished.

A restraining effect may be expected from an adoption of an anti-discrimination law and creation of a social understanding that discrimination and human rights violation are social evils that should be eliminated. Since the Ministry of Justice cannot take prompt measures to prohibit such acts, and merely issues warnings, society has not been able to change its extremely tolerant attitude towards discrimination and human rights violations.

<BLL, BLHRRI, Network against Discrimination and for Research on Human Rights>

9-3: Discriminatory Comments of High-Ranking Officer

**Q: The Committee in its previous Concluding Observations (para. 13) expressed its concern on “statements of a discriminatory character” made by Shintaro Ishihara, the Tokyo Governor, and “the lack of administrative or legal action taken by the authorities.” Governor Ishihara, however, has repeatedly made discriminatory comments since then. Please clarify what measures has the Government taken in response.**

Background: On May 8, 2001, Governor Ishihara wrote in the Sankei Newspaper, raising unsubstantiated figures, that there were annually around 10,000 illegal immigrants in Japan, of which Chinese comprised a little below 40%. He continued that these people were unable to find regular employment, as they were illegal residents, and they would be criminals as a matter of course. In August 4, 2003, he wrote in the same newspaper, that “the very pragmatic DNA of Chinese ... [makes them] steal without hesitation in order to satisfy their desire.” On September 15, 2006, he again spoke at a symposium supported by government organizations, using the word *Sangokujin*, which is considered to be a derogatory term, to refer to people from the former colonial territories, to say that there were no measures, including immigration control, to respond to the illegal immigrants, in particular from China. (the Asahi Newspaper, September 16, 2006) The Government took the view that seen from the context of the statement as a whole, the statements were not discriminatory (Comments on the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mr. Doudou Diène, June 2006) and has not taken any counter-measures.

<RAIK/SMJ>

9-4: Violence against Korean Students

**Q: Concerning to the issue of violence and harassment against Korean school children, the Committee recommended in paragraph 14 of its concluding observation, “The Committee is concerned about reports of violent actions against Koreans mainly children and students, and about inadequate reaction on the part of the authorities in this regard and recommends that the Government take more resolute measures to prevent and counter such acts.” Nevertheless, verbal and physical assaults against Korean students repeatedly occurred in 2002 and 2006. The Government stated in paragraph 26 of the present periodic report that “it has taken appropriate measures.” If so, why doesn’t violence against Korean students stop? Why isn’t it eradicated? The Government is required to make a clear statement.**

Background: Oral and physical abuses against Korean school children are repeatedly committed whenever the relation between the DPRK and Japan becomes tense. The following numbers show how frequently it has been committed; 321 cases for six months from September 2002 to March 2003, 122 cases for a month of July 2006, and 55 cases for a month of October 2006. In the present periodic report, the Government made the same statement as before that it had taken appropriate measures by displaying posters for human rights promotion and distributing pamphlets and articles for human rights promotion.” It did not include more specific information on where and how such measures were taken. As pointed out by the Committee during the consideration of the previous report of Japan in 2002, it is very difficult to eradicate violence based on racial discrimination only by displaying posters or distributing pamphlets.

<Zainichi Korean Human Rights Association/RAIK>

9-5: Discrimination against foreign children at school

**Q: Many of the children with foreign nationality, including the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> generation of Koreans and children of migrant workers and migrants with various nationalities, go to Japanese schools. There is a range of discrimination cases against these children with foreign nationality. Please clarify how the Government recognizes such situation, and whether there are any systems to redress discrimination in schools.**

Background: Discrimination cases against children with foreign nationality hardly appear to the surface, because it is difficult for children faced with discrimination and their parents to access third-party institutions in order to make complaints. In reality, more than 80% of children of resident Koreans in Japan use “Japanese names” in daily life instead of their original “Korean names,” and many of the children who transfer from Japanese schools to schools for foreign children do so because of the bullying in Japanese schools. The Government states in its report (para.20) that it “expands and strengthens their promotion activities to disseminate and enhance the idea of respect for human rights,” but on the contrary, no specific program to overcome racism is carried out within Japan’s school education. Also, studying about the reality of racially based discrimination and its origins in history, methods to overcome discrimination is not a compulsory subject in teacher-training courses at universities etc, resulting in many of the teachers facing the children with foreign origin, despite being ignorant of their situations.

<RAIK/SMJ/Osaka *Mintoren*>

**[Elimination of Racial Discrimination in Civil and Economic Rights and Equality Before the Law (Article 5)]**

10. Education of Children of Foreign Nationality

10-1: Foreign Children at Public Schools

**Q: There has been a rapid increase in children of migrant workers and other migrants in recent years, as well as an increase in children, whose native language is not Japanese. The Government states that it gives “maximum attention” in accepting these children in Japanese public schools (para. 24). Please clarify the reason why almost 20% of such children go to schools for foreign children, such as Brazilian schools, and almost 7% do not go to any schools.**

Background: The reality indicated in the above paragraph is that institutional and financial measures to provide “guidance in learning Japanese” and support “by their regular teachers as well as by others who can speak their native language” is far too insufficient, and the Japanese public education system is not yet prepared to receive children, whose native language is not Japanese.

<RAIK/SMJ>

#### 10-2: Education in their Own Languages

**Q: The Committee in its previous Concluding Observations recommended that the Government take measures “to ensure access to education in minority languages in public Japanese schools.” (para. 16) The Government in the latest Report explains that “a school subject called “sogo-gakushu” (general learning), ...allows conversational foreign language classes and opportunities to study traditional cultures, to be provided as part of the education for cultivating international understanding.” (para. 24) Please clarify how such education is put into practice, and what financial measures national and local governments have taken for the education of national languages and culture.**

Background: The Report indicates that, formally it is possible to conduct education of native languages and culture in public schools, but in reality, it is conducted as “pre-school” or “international class” in a number of schools in areas, in which foreign residents are concentrated. Minority language education in public schools is conducted in “ethnic classes,” held in schools in areas such as Osaka Prefecture and Kyoto City. These are organized for Korean children in public schools, and teach Korean language and culture in extra-curricular classes. The costs for teachers in these ethnic classes are borne by local governments. Apart from these, there are only a handful of schools providing native language education in support classes for Chinese and Brazilian children.

<RAIK/SMJ>

#### 10-3: Cultural and Ethnical Identity

**Q: The Committee in the previous Concluding Observations explicitly states that “the name of an individual is a fundamental aspect of the cultural and ethnic identity.” (para. 18) The Government is required to clarify how the names of foreign children are treated in Japanese school education.**

Background: As mentioned above, over 80% of resident Korean children are obliged to use “Japanese names.” Also, the names of many children of migrant workers and marriage migrants, particularly Brazilian, Peruvian and Philippine children, are written in *Katakana* letters, in the Japanese form of placing the surname before the given name. This would not lead to “tolerance towards and respect for diverse cultures, religions, lifestyles and customs that people of different origins practice.” (para. 20 of the Government Report)

<RAIK/SMJ>

### 11. Ethnic Schools in Japan

#### 11-1: Financial Assistance to Ethnic Schools

**Q: There are about 100 ethnic schools (North and South Korean schools, Chinese schools etc) and**

**international schools in Japan, most of which are authorized from local governments as “miscellaneous schools” under the School Education Act. In addition, around 100 schools such as Brazilian schools, Peruvian schools and Filipino schools have been newly established after the 90’s, parallel to the vast increase of migrants. Most of these new schools are not authorized even as “miscellaneous schools,” and are treated as private cram schools, thus forcing the children even more burden. Please clarify the reason why the Government does not provide any financial support to these 200 schools for children with foreign origin.**

Background: Foreign residents in Japan including the resident Koreans fulfill the same tax obligations as the Japanese nationals. However, the Government takes no financial measures to support education in minority language in schools for children with foreign origin. As for schools with “miscellaneous school” status such as North Korean schools, South Korean schools and Chinese schools, they are only provided small financial support from local governments.

<RAIK/Osaka *Mintoren*>

**11-2 Q: While the Japanese Government revised the system concerning qualifications for admission to university in 2003, Korean school graduates still have to pass “individual examination” to be given by individual university. Does the Government intend to improve the system by accepting a graduation certificate of Korean school as qualification for admission to university?**

Background: With the revision of the Ordinance for Enforcement of School Education Act in 2003, the scope of qualification for admission to university has expanded to include those who have completed a 12 year-course at schools for foreign children authorized by international rating systems such as WASC, ACSI and ECIS; and those who have completed the course at those schools for foreign children that are accredited by their relevant home governments such as South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil. But, it did not include graduates of other schools (including Korean schools) in the scope of qualification, leaving the discretion on permission with each individual university, or requiring these students to pass the high school equivalence test.

<Zainichi Korean Human Rights Association /RAIK/Osaka *Mintoren*>

**11-3 Q: Donations for international schools (mainly for European children) are subject to tax exemption, while those for Korean and Chinese schools are not. Please explain the reasons why.**

Background: Under the School Education Act, Korean and Chinese schools are placed in the miscellaneous category which also includes driving schools. Legally, those schools for foreign children that are categorized in the miscellaneous schools are eligible to tax exemption for donations. In fact, “for the sake of promotion of investment in Japan,” the Government admits the tax exemption for donations to international schools and German schools having many students (more than half of all) whose families stay in Japan for business purposes. Meanwhile, Korean schools and Chinese schools are not admitted. In March 2008, the Japan Bar Association made a recommendation to the Government urging to revise the system on the grounds that such a discriminatory tax treatment constitutes an infringement of right to learning of children of these schools.

## 12. Social Security

**Q: Some members of the foreign resident community, mainly elderly resident Koreans and persons with disabilities, have been affected by the age requirement under the National Pension Act and are unable to receive pensions. Is the Government prepared to take measures to provide remedies for such people?**

Background: The National Pension Act had a nationality clause when it was legislated in 1959, and foreign residents were able to join only since 1982, when the requirement was deleted. But because there were no interim measures, which should have been put in place at the time of the amendment, elderly people born on or before April 1, 1926 and persons with disabilities who were above 20 years of age on January 1, 1982 and were already with the disability, are still unable to receive any pension to this day. The living conditions of the elderly foreign residents and those with disabilities are extremely difficult, and prompt remedies are necessary.

<Hiroshi Tanaka/National Network for the Total Abolition of the Pension Citizenship Clause >

## 13. Rights of Indigenous Peoples

### 13-1. Ainu People

**Q: The Government is due to set up an advisory or consultative body to deliberate Ainu policy following the submission of the final report by the Expert Panel on Ainu Policy. It is desirable that at least one-third to half the members of the deliberative body be Ainu, and that experts who are well versed in the internationally recognized rights of Indigenous Peoples and recent developments in this arena be included as members of the body. Please explain the kind of members the Government plans to appoint, the criteria that will be used for their selection, and the ways the Government plans to ensure the effective participation of Ainu people in this consultative body which will be involved in deliberating matters which directly affect their rights and interests. Moreover, please explain how the Government of Japan plans to secure the Ainu people's rights as an Indigenous People, following the resolution by the Diet and the recommendation by the Expert Panel to respect the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).**

Background: On June 6, 2008, the Diet passed a resolution recognizing the Ainu people as an Indigenous People of Japan. In July 2008, the government announced the establishment of an Expert Panel on Ainu Policy, and the Panel submitted its final report in July 2009. Initially, no Ainu were selected as members of the Panel, but following Ainu protest, one Ainu was ultimately included as a member. However, the participation of the Ainu people in institutions and mechanisms which are relevant to them is not legally or institutionally secured. In fact, Ainu people's demand that at least one-third to half of the Expert Panel be made up of Ainu members was not realized, and no expert on the international standards on the rights of Indigenous Peoples, such as the UNDRIP, was included as a member of the Panel. The Expert Panel's report should be commended for the fact it requests the enactment of legislation on Ainu issues, and the establishment of a deliberative body on Ainu affairs. However, the government is yet to recognize any of the rights of Ainu people. Even after submission of

the Expert Report it remains completely unclear if, by when, how and which rights of the Ainu people the Government plans to secure. As a result, the outlook and future prospects for recognition and guarantee of the rights of Ainu People remains completely unclear.

<Shimin Gaikou Centre>

#### 13-2: Ryukyu/Okinawan People as an Indigenous Peoples

**Q: Please clarify the Government of Japan's definition of the term "Indigenous Peoples" and explain why the Government does not recognize Ryukyu/Okinawan People as an Indigenous People.**

Background: Although there have been recommendations to recognize Ryukyu/Okinawan People as an Indigenous People, the Government does not recognize them as such. On the other hand, regarding the Ainu People, after the resolution by the Diet, the Expert Panel submitted a report recognizing them as an Indigenous People.

<AIPR/OCIC>

#### 14: Buraku Discrimination

**Q: Paragraph 23 (iii) of the Concluding Observations of 2001 recommended that the Government include information on strategies for the elimination of Buraku discrimination it would plan after the termination of "Special Law for the Budgetary Measures Area Improvements" in its next periodic report. Unfortunately, nothing is mentioned in the present report of the Government. Please indicate the Government's views.**

Background: In March 2002, the "Special Measures Law" for Buraku was terminated. But, it did not mean that the problem of Buraku discrimination had been solved. Many factors clearly indicate the persistent existence of Buraku discrimination. These include actual conditions that Buraku people are placed in, the public attitude towards Buraku people, and continued occurrences of discriminatory incidents. Being given the above recommendation by the Committee, the Government expressed its view stating that "gaps have sharply been improved, and discriminatory attitude has certainly been resolved." The view is quite subjective and is not based on any factual data or findings coming out of a survey. Thus, the Government is urged to ascertain the actual situation of Buraku people and develop strategies for the elimination of discrimination. More information about serious outcomes of unresolved Buraku discrimination problem is given in the annex (1).

<BLL/BLHRI>

#### 15: Discrimination against Children born out of wedlock

**Q: Does the Government have the will to eliminate all forms of discrimination against children born out of wedlock, especially legislative discrimination, including discrimination in the legal share of succession within the Civil Code, and to eliminate the concept of "illegitimate child" from legislation and administrative practices? Also, does the Government intend to promote human rights education in regards to social discrimination against children born out of wedlock?**

Background: When a child is born out of wedlock as a result of racial discrimination in marriage, he/she is then subject to discrimination within the current legislation. In 1996, the Legislative Council of the

Ministry of Justice issued a report recommending the amendment of the Civil Code in order to eliminate discrimination in the legal share of succession. However, this amendment was not realized. The Government uses public opinion as a reason not to take action, but it has never made any attempts to enhance public opinion towards the elimination of this form of discrimination. In the past, all recommendations by the Legislative Council have been immediately submitted and adopted at the Diet, except for the three bills that the Japanese Bar Association campaigned strongly against. The Japanese Bar Association has opposed three proposals by the Legislative Council recommending stricter punishment in the Penal Code and the Juvenile Act in view of human rights, and calls for the prompt amendment of the Civil Code.

<Association for the Support of Children out of Wedlock>

16: Cultural Policy towards Ryukyu/Okinawan People.

**Q: Please explain Government policy to protect the culture of Ryukyu/Okinawa. Please explain the role and the function of the official position/office especially established for Ryukyu/Okinawa, such as an Ambassador to Okinawa, if any.**

Background: The Government of Japan stated that the Ryukyu/Okinawan People became Japanese citizens after the Nationality Act was enacted in the Diet, in reply to a question by a Member of Diet from Okinawa. After the Ryukyu Kingdom became Okinawa Prefecture, Ryukyu/Okinawan culture was denied as backward under Japan's control. Moreover, during WWII, those who spoke Ryukyu/Okinawan language were treated as espionage suspects. UNESCO recognizes the Ryukyu language as a distinct language in Japan. However, the Ryukyu language is not taught in public education even in Ryukyu/Okinawa, and is not recognized as an official language.

<AIPR/OCIC>

17: Health and environmental problems caused by U.S. Bases in Okinawa

**Q: Does the Government have any intention to ask the U.S. Government to revise the Japan-U.S. Status-of-Forces Agreement? Also, does the Government have any intention to ask the U. S. Government to pay the compensation money for damage caused by noise of US jet fighters back to Japan?**

Background: Since WWII, 75% of US Armed Forces bases in Japan are situated in Okinawa while it accounts for only 0.7 percent of Japan's total land area. The lands for the US bases were requisitioned from Ryukyu/Okinawan landowners forcefully, without their consent, and the act is illegitimate. Presently, the US Armed Forces bases are located in the center of the urban areas and this is a major factor that prohibits Ryukyu/Okinawans from exercising their rights to self-determination and development.

The Japan-U.S. Status-of-Forces Agreement, which puts priority on security, threatens the daily lives of the Ryukyu/Okinawan people. The noise pollution caused by the US jet fighters in early morning and midnight take-off and landing training has not improved yet, though midnight landings and early morning practice are prohibited. Moreover, there is fear of military plane crashes and parts of aircrafts falling from the sky. Military aircraft flights continue even during the Ryukyu/Okinawan holidays,

threatening neighboring people's lives day and night. A case of the noise pollution caused by US jet fighters was brought to court and judgment was made in favor of the plaintiffs. However, the Government of Japan, whose public purse is supported by the citizens of Japan, pays the compensation.

There are frequent cases of robbery, murder and rape committed by the military personnel and Armed Forces civilian employees, and such cases are reported almost every day in local newspapers such as Ryukyu Shimpo and Okinawa Times.

<AIPR/OCIC>

### 18: Discrimination in employment

**18-1 Q: Inappropriate questions by interviewers at job interviews are still rampant both in public and private sectors. What measures will the Government take to put a stop to this practice? Could the Government clarify the measures taken to provide remedies to the victims?**

Background: The Government's response in the Diet on November 8, 1988 to a question put to it made it clear that discriminatory questions, such as those listed below, were being asked even in job interviews for national public servants.

1. The interviewee's beliefs, the political party he/she supports, the person he/she respects
2. Home environment, such as family assets, housing, family business, or income
3. Whether interviewee is born in/out of wedlock, place of family registration

Asking such questions is still not prohibited. Only in rare cases, when it became public that such inappropriate questions have been asked, did the authorities issue guideline not to ask such questions in the future.

<Association for the Support of Children out of Wedlock>

**18-2 Q: Please explain what is the present situation of the "Buraku List Scandal," and how the Government has so far dealt with it?**

Background: "Buraku List Scandal" was revealed in November 1975 discovering several facts: it was bought by more than 200 clients including private companies; they bought it for the purpose of checking if a person was a Buraku origin at the time of employment or marriage; and there were eight different versions of "Buraku List" on the market. After the investigation, the Human Rights Bureau of the Ministry of Justice announced the de-facto termination of the case on July 28 1989, while Buraku Liberation League (BLL) argued that there still remained many copies of "Buraku List" to be retrieved. In 2005, the Osaka Prefectural Association of BLL discovered three different versions of "Buraku List" from a private detective agency in Osaka. Two of the three were new versions, suggesting that there have been so far ten different versions published. In September 2006, the BLL Osaka discovered a floppy disk containing "Buraku List" again from a private detective agency. Despite the continued discovery of "Buraku List," the Government has taken quite unsatisfactory steps. There is no law prohibiting publication/sales of "Buraku List" or personal background investigation to find out one's Buraku origin. It is only controlled at the local government level in a form of code as issued by Osaka, Kumamoto, Fukuoka, Tokushima, and Kagawa prefectures. (Only Osaka prohibits both publication and personal background investigation, other prefectures above prohibit only personal background investigation.)

<BLL/BLHRR>

#### 19: Discrimination in the Judiciary

**Q: What actions does the Government take in accordance with the CERD general recommendation XXXI on the prevention of racial discrimination in the administration and functioning of the criminal justice system?**

Background: The recommendation prescribes that it is necessary to gauge the existence and extent of racial discrimination in the administration and functioning of the criminal justice system through the search for indicators attesting to such discrimination. To be specific, the governments are urged to pay the greatest attention to the indicators of racial discrimination including victims of violence and other crimes especially committed by the police and other law enforcement officers, complaints brought by such victims, and the number of prosecution and conviction cases of crimes committed based on racial discrimination. Indeed, the Government is urged to take concrete measures according to the recommendation.

. <IMADR-JC>

#### 20. Dialogue with Civil Society upon Drafting the Government Report and Implementation of the Convention

**Q: Please provide information on what kind of consultation the Government has held with civil society regarding the implementation of human rights obligations as stated in the Convention. Please also explain how the outcome is reflected in the Government report.**

Background: For the past few years, the consultation process between the government and civil society on the domestic implementation of the international human rights system is proving to be a failure. At information exchange sessions held as part of the process of creating reports due under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), the government has been unable to respond to groups opposing the conventions, thus preventing effective participation in the consultation process. At the August 2007 information exchange session, for example, which was held in preparation for the government report due under CERD, slanderous and discriminatory statements were made to several speakers who related their experiences as victims of discrimination, resulting in the discontinuation of the meeting, thus losing the precious chance of exchange of views<sup>1</sup>. Instead of seeking an effective national consultation in order to implement conventions and UN Human Rights systems, the government is shifting towards the abandonment of the national consultation process, such as not holding a meeting to prepare the government report for the Universal Periodic Review. Such attitude poses a serious concern on the Government's basic position in implementing the Convention. Also, because there is no opportunity for NGOs and minority groups to participate in policy evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs<sup>2</sup>, including human rights policies, there is doubt as to how evaluations about the protection and promotion of human rights can be based on reality.

<IMADR-JC>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex (2)

<sup>2</sup> Efforts to gather opinion regarding policy evaluations are made after they are issued, but it is not clear how these will be made use of for the next policy evaluation.

21: Promotion of Acceptance of the Principles of the Convention to Those Involved in the Judicial System

**Q: Please clarify how the Government has established human rights education based on the principles of the Convention for those involved in the judicial system, especially judges, and how it intends to enhance it in the future.**

Background: Japan has not, in many cases, reflected the provisions of conventions in its court decisions. Human Rights education for judges and law-enforcers and their training on the provisions of the Covenant and the General Comments are insufficient, resulting in international human rights norms being ignored by law-enforcing bodies<sup>3</sup>.

<IMADR-JC>

22: Reference to the History of Minorities in School Textbooks

**Q: What kind of historic references are made in school textbooks to Ryukyu/Okinawa, according to the understanding of the Government? Also, how does Government deal with the fact that references to military crimes during the WWII, such as “Comfort Women” and forced recruitment from the Korean Peninsula, are decreasing in the textbooks? Moreover, please clarify whether the membership of the Official Commission on Textbooks and the process of the textbook authorization system are made public.**

Background: Within the process of textbook authorization, authors and publishers are repeatedly recommended by the Commission to amend the statements about the war in Okinawa during World War II. Historical revisionists have made lawsuits against authors and publishers of school textbooks. The people of Ryukyu/ Okinawa demand that the truth be stated in the textbooks, including how the Japanese military carried out strategies that discriminated the local Okinawans, and how they forced “mass suicide” to the Okinawans.

By 1997, descriptions of the system appeared in all seven textbooks used in junior high schools (the last stage of compulsory education), but gradually decreased. In February 2004, the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology stated that “It is wonderful that words like ‘military comfort women’ and ‘forced recruitment’ no longer appear in most textbooks” , revealing the attitude of the Japanese Government. In textbooks published in Fiscal Year 2006, the phrase “Comfort Women” was erased, and related descriptions remained with weaker tone in only two textbooks. This means that only 17.3% of junior high school students in Japan have the chance to learn about the reality of the “Comfort women” system.

<AIPR/OCIC/WAM>

---

<sup>3</sup> As a recent example, in December 2007, the Supreme Court dismissed an appeal by foreign residents (mainly Koreans descendants of the former Japanese territory) with disabilities, who claim that their exclusion from the national pension plan is a violation by the Japanese Government of international human rights treaties (in particular, ICCPR articles 2 and 26). Also, there is the negative example of a person becoming a judge despite publishing a thesis denying that the Convention on the Rights of the Child prohibits discrimination on the share in succession of children born out of wedlock, which demonstrates that he considers the range of application of international human rights conventions extremely narrowly..

<Abbreviations>

IMADR-JC	The International Movement Against all forms of Discrimination and Racism
BLL	Buraku Liberation League
BLHRI	Buraku Liberation and Human Rights Research Institute
RAIK	Research-Action Institute for the Koreans in Japan
SMJ	Solidarity Network with Migrants Japan
KEY	Organization of United Korean Youth in Japan
Osaka <i>Mintoren</i>	Osaka Council For Combating Discrimination Against Ethnic People in Japan
AIPR	The Association of Indigenous Peoples in the Ryukyus
OCIC	Okinawa Citizens' Information Center
WAM	Women's Active Museum on War and Peace

## **Annex (1) – Buraku Discrimination**

### **☆ No national survey to find out the present situation of Buraku problem:**

After the termination of “Special Measures Law” (March 2002), several local governments have conducted to find out actual conditions of Buraku community or public attitude towards Buraku problem. For example Tottori prefecture conducted the survey and found the increase in the numbers of households receiving public assistance, the unemployed and lower income earners in the Buraku districts in Tottori. Similarly, the survey conducted by Osaka prefecture in 2005 revealed that the public attitude towards Buraku problem have stepped back. Also, Buraku discriminatory incidents have continued to take place since March 2003, as seen in many cases of illegal acquisition of copy of one’s family register by administrative or judicial scrivener, discovery of a data version of “Buraku List” in floppy disc, and propaganda or agitation inciting Buraku discrimination on the Internet.

### **☆ Abuse of official power and Buraku discrimination:**

After 2003, the illicit acquisition of a copy of one’s family registration by judicial or administrative scriveners have continually been discovered in Kyoto, Hyogo, Osaka, Aichi, Tokyo and Mie prefectures. For this, the Government revised the laws concerning the inhabitant basic records and family registration, taking certain measures to prevent such abusive acquisitions. However, based on the principles of personal information protection, procedures to “give a notice to the one whose family registration is taken by the third party” have not yet been introduced. It is urgently required to implement the procedures.

### **☆ Intimidation and harassment on Buraku people:**

In recent years, discriminatory incidents against Buraku have increased such as scribbles on the wall, black-mailing and crank calls. For instance, a man in Tokyo sent out more than 400 postcards intimidating members of Buraku Liberation League between May 2003 and October 2004. He was finally arrested on October 19 2004, and convicted on July 1 2005 at the Tokyo District Court with two years’ sentence for the charges of defamation, assault and forgery of personal seal. But, he was not sanctioned for his acts based on Buraku discrimination. To prevent these discriminatory incidents from occurring, the Government is required to implement the recommendation made in the paragraph 12 of the concluding observations made by the CERD for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> periodic reports of Japan.

### **☆ Attempts to identify Buraku areas:**

In recent years, Buraku discriminatory incidents occur around the occasion of property sales. To be specific, an individual wishing to buy a house makes a telephone inquiry to a relevant city hall where the property is located to ask if the property is in a Buraku district, a real estate business makes a phone call to a relevant city hall to make the same inquiry as mentioned above, or an advertisement agency makes the same inquiry to give information to a construction company of apartment house as its client. While these acts indeed encourage Buraku discrimination, the Government takes passive reaction against it. It is required to educate those involved as well as to introduce a new law prohibiting such acts in accordance with the paragraph 12 of the concluding observations of the CERD.

## **Annex (2): National consultation process in Japan: incidents at the “Meeting with NGO and Citizens regarding the Japanese Government’s Report on International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination” (August 31, 2007)**

During the making process of Japan’s latest report concerning the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), The Japan NGO Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ERD-Net) has taken action to seek effective discussion processes between the government and the minorities concerned to shape the making of the government’s ICERD report.

On August 31, 2007, the second “meeting regarding the government’s ICERD report” between the Japanese Government, NGOs and citizens was held. (This meeting was open to public. The first meeting was held on July 28, 2006.) This meeting was hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, and representatives from other ministries such as the Ministry of Justice (the administration responsible for observance of the convention) also participated.

Recently in Japan, there is great concern over the state of meetings between the Government and civil society on human rights treaties, because NGOs who deny the international human rights standards represented by the UN human rights system have begun to participate in such meetings. They deny or seek removal of legislations such as those on human rights and gender equality, campaign for withdrawal from human rights treaties, and organize themselves to systematically participate and voice their opinions in government hosted meetings. With this in mind, at the beginning of the meeting on ICERD, which was hosted with intentions for striving to implement international human rights standards in Japan, members of the ERD-Net requested that the host and chair of this meeting take measures so that participants would refrain from voicing discriminatory comments that violate the convention. However, comments of slander, discrimination and defamation were voiced repeatedly, and those who participated with expectation for the convention were hurt deeply. (Please see “1” and “2” below for the specific incident. There are three speakers: A, B and C.)

### 1) Discrimination against Koreans residing in Japan

A, an ethnic Korean resident in Japan, introduced an incident where her daughter experienced discrimination on employment; During job interview for two companies, interviewers had asked her; “Won’t your nationality be a problem in working here?” and said; “You must be able to use a Japanese name (instead of her Korean name).” Her daughter wasn’t hired, and A said that discrimination against nationality on employment exists in Japan.

To counter A’s comment, B, another participant from the civil society, commented, “it is natural to be “differentiated” if you do not have a Japanese nationality. It is “differentiation” and not “discrimination.” The reason your daughter wasn’t hired was not because of her nationality, but because she had no ability.” This comment defames A and her daughter, and supports discrimination based on nationality.

### 2) Discrimination against Out-of-wedlock Children

C commented that the discriminatory nature of the Japanese legal system against children born out of

wedlock is leading the Japanese society to enhance social discrimination, and that the government has never taken any measures to enlighten people to eliminate discrimination against them.

To counter C, B commented, “Out-of-wedlock children are a result of adultery. It is natural for children born from adultery to be discriminated.” When voices were raised for B to apologize, he refused and added, “I will not apologize, and I will repeat. It is natural for children born from adultery to be discriminated.” This comment defames C, and also discriminates all people who are out-of-wedlock children.

### 3) Responsibility of Management and Human Rights Protection

Participants including members of ERD-Net regarded the comments made above as discrimination itself, the very issue that the meeting was supposed to address. Thus, members of ERD-NET requested that the meeting should only proceed after B apologized to A and C. However, the representatives of the government, especially the representative of the Ministry of Justice, which is responsible for protecting domestic human rights, did not take any measures to settle the situation. The representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only said, “Do not raise comments against individuals,” did not take any action to deter the discriminator or to provide protection for the ones discriminated, and attempted to simply proceed with the meeting. As a result, the “meeting” was discontinued.

Concerned members among the participants of the “meeting” submitted a letter to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Ministry of Justice on September 14, 2007, asking how each of the ministries viewed what happened and what counter measures they would take. As of 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2007, no response has been made by the Japanese Government.

ERD-Net has so far sincerely cooperated the Government in its process of making the ICERD report, providing comments and participating in the “meetings” hosted by the government. The ERD-Net has also made propositions on how to better conduct dialogue between the government, NGOs and minorities concerned, for the realization of human rights standards and implementation of the convention in Japan. However, the “meeting” hosted by the government fails to enable the government and minorities concerned to discuss with each other on an equal basis, due to its form which did not allow for proper interactive dialogue, and the government’s disregard to minorities as counterparts to combat racism. Moreover, this second “meeting” was held without the government providing proper response for issues and opinions that were raised at the first “information exchange meeting.”

It is an extreme disappointment that a constructive and fruitful discussion has not yet been realized between the government and the minorities concerned. No meeting with the Civil Society about this Convention has been held since.

### **Annex (3): List of 83 organizations belonging to the Japan Network for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination**

Asia-Japan Women's Resource Center  
Center for Prisoners' Rights  
Network for the Education and Human Rights of Foreign Children  
KOREA NGO CENTER  
Rights of Immigrants Network in Kansai  
Citizen's Network for the Redress of WW Victims by Japan  
Solidarity Network with Migrants Japan  
Forum for Peace, Human Rights and Environment  
The Association of Indigenous Peoples in the Ryukyus (AIPR)  
Association for Returnees from China  
Japan Women's Council I  
Association to Protect Utoro  
International Movement against Discrimination on the Internet (INDI)  
The Ainu Association of Hokkaido  
Multi-Ethnic' Human Right's Education Center for the Pro-existence  
Support Network for State Redress Lawsuits  
Ainu Association of RERA  
Kanagawa Human Rights Center  
Release Education Laboratory  
Kanagawa Council For Combating Discrimination Against Ethnic People in Japan  
Human Rights Research Institute against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism- MIE  
Network in Support of the Edagawa Trial  
National Christian Council of Japan Human Rights Committee of Foreigners Living in Japan  
The Japan Citizens' Coalition for the UN International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples  
Asian Women's Empowerment Project  
The Kyoto Korean Community Center - LFA  
Women's Active Museum on War and Peace (WAM)  
Network for Human Rights Legislation for Foreigners and Ethnic Minorities (FR-Net)  
Korean Women Residents in Japan, MIRINE  
Peace Boat  
Okinawa Citizens' Information Center  
The National Research Association for Dowa Education  
Ainu Women's Association  
Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Shimin Gaikou Centre)  
Research-Action Institute for the Koreans in Japan (RAIK)  
Shin Professional Studio (Human-Resource Development Institute)  
Organization of United Korean Youth in Japan  
KALAKASAN Migrant Women Empowerment Center  
Buraku Liberation League Central Headquarters  
Amnesty International Japan  
Buraku Liberation and Human Rights Research Institute  
Osaka Liaison Conference for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Network against Discrimination for Research on Human Rights  
 Human Rights Center in Tochigi  
 Network of Religious Organizations Addressing "Dowa Issues"  
 Kyojukon  
 APEURO Women's Self-investigation and Analysis Project  
 Council of Democratic Resident Korean Women in Japan  
 A R C (Action for the Rights of Children)  
 Ainu Resource Centre  
 Yay Yukar no Mori  
 Japan Catholic Council for Justice and Peace  
 Committee for BURAKU Issues Catholic Bishops' Conference of Japan  
 Catholic Commission of Japan for Migrants, Refugees and People on the Move  
 Association for the Support of Children out of Wedlock  
 Aomori Residents Concerned about the Sayama Case  
 Club of Children and Students working together formulticultural society  
 Edogawa Union Japanese Language Class  
 Ebina Liberation Educators Association  
 The National Research Association for University Dowa Education  
 The Wakayama City Children's Network  
 Network for the rights of Indigenous People  
 National Committee for the Support of Elderly Residents from Japan's Former Colonies in their  
 Lawsuit against the Government for Non-inclusion in the National Pension Plan  
 Osaka Council For Combating Discrimination Against Ethnic People in Japan  
 National Network for the Total Abolition of the Pension Citizenship Clause  
 Supporters of the Suit for a Pension System for Disabled Foreign Residents in Japan  
 Kyoto Supporters of the Case for a Pension System for Elderly Korean Residents in Japan  
 National Christian Liaison Conference to struggle with Issues of Alien Registration Law  
 people for social change  
 Japanese Association for Human Rights of Koreans  
 Association for the Abolishment of the Nationality Clause in Disability Pension  
 Association for Elimination of Pension Discrimination against Korean Residents  
 Network Addressing the Problem of Non-Inclusion in the National Pension Plan  
 Bunny Knights SC  
 Rera-Cise  
 The Investigation Team on the Truth about Forced Korean Laborers in Japan  
 The International Movement Against all forms of Discrimination and Racism  
 The International Movement Against all forms of Discrimination and Racism - Japan Committee  
 Yuimaaru Ryukyu's selfgovernance-Peoples' Moai  
 Korea Toraijin Kyoukai  
 Kansai Okinawa Bunko  
 Ryukyu center dotouch  
 Zainichi Korean Human Rights Association