

March 18, 2012

About the February 27, 2012 Letter of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan

Religious Juridical Person, “Seicho-No-Ie”
Nippon Kyobunsha, Co. Ltd.

- I. In response to our opinion of February 17, 2012, Jigyodan sent a letter “Important Notice” dated February 27, 2012 to the officers of the Missionary Areas. We present our opinion concerning that letter.
 1. About the Handling of the Royalties for the Reprinted Edition of the First Edition of the Leather Cover *Seimei no Jisso*

The letter by Jigyodan says: “the handling of the royalties of the *Seimei no Jisso* is stated as being ‘the instructions of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi’ and attempts to place the responsibility on Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi, but during the trial it was ascertained that there is completely no concrete proof to support this, and from the impartial judgment of the court, this was totally negated and determined to be a false assertion.”

Nevertheless, this is an attempt to distort the facts. It is clear by reading the judgment document that the court did not deny this fact, let alone is it written anywhere in that document that the court determined it to be a “false assertion.” In our opinion of February 17, 2012, we wrote about the circumstances for the handling of the royalties for the reprinted edition for the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso*. In the lawsuit the payment for the royalties was made to Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi and it is supported by objective proof such as the ledger, which is the main account book for Nippon Kyobunsha’s bookkeeping, that indicates the receipt of payment.

The above proof clearly indicates that the matters transpired during the lifetime of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi, and that Rev. Taniguchi himself determined and directed to whom and what amount of royalties of his works should be paid. From the above state of affairs for the handling of the

royalties for the reprinted edition of the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso*, it is clear that for Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi the reprinted edition of the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso*, which was a special edition for the fiftieth anniversary of the publishing of the *Seimei no Jisso*, was a separate work of the *Seimei no Jisso*, and therefore its royalties were to be received by himself. Nonetheless, Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi considered the financial circumstances of Jigyodan at the time, and from the start he donated about half of the royalties to Jigyodan, but in the course of the printings the financial circumstances of Jigyodan considerably improved, and from that time on, he felt assured and received the total amount for himself. The above are the facts as they are for the handling of the royalties. How could this be called an attempt to place responsibility on Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi?

2. The Judgment Document of the Intellectual Property High Court Clearly States “It Was Not An Illegal Act”

The public statement of January 31 of this year by Jigyodan, under the caption “The Wrongdoings of Nippon Kyobunsha, Which Published the *Seimei no Jisso* by Illegal Means, Has Been Exposed,” makes the assertion that “there was also the erasure of the seal of the chairman of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan from the colophon,” which is different from the facts.

Accordingly, for the sake of its honor, in the opinion of February 17, 2012, Nippon Kyobunsha argued that in spite of the fact that it is clearly stated in the judgment document that the court determined “the actions of the appellant of the appeal, Nippon Kyobunsha, that had printed the ‘author’s seal omitted’ do not amount to an illegal act,” “how could it be concluded that ‘Nippon Kyobunsha, which published the *Seimei no Jisso* through improper means, had engaged in wrongdoing’ from the fact that ‘there was also the eraser of the seal of the chairman of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan from the colophon’?”

Jigyodan has written variously about this matter in its letter but that is no more than a distortion of the points in question and does not provide answers. It is our supposition that in its rush to send out a public statement Jigyodan might not have read the clear decision in the judgment document of the intellectual property high court that overturned the decision

of the first trial and definitely determined that the “printing of the ‘author’s seal omitted’ was not an illegal act,” or perhaps it overlooked this, and because of it that public statement presents “an erroneous account.”

3. The Purpose and Role of Jigyodan Are Social Welfare Services

In its public statement of January 31, 2012, there is the caption “The Holy Mission of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan to Protect the True Teachings of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi.” There it states that Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi had made the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* “the basic assets of the Nonprofit Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan to permanently and everlastingly preserve as the cherished treasure of humankind and to contribute to the public good of national society.” In regards to this, in our opinion of February 17, 2012, we argued “where can we find a statement as in the public statement that we can attribute to Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi?”

Jigyodan responded to this in its letter by referring to “Establishment of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” in the November 1945 issue of the *Seicho-No-Ie*. Nevertheless, in “Establishment of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” there is absolutely no mention of “the holy mission of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan to Protect the True Teachings of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi” or the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* was made “the basic assets of the Nonprofit Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan to permanently and everlastingly preserve as the cherished treasure of humankind and to contribute to the public good of national society.”

After printing “Establishment of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” in the November 1945 issue of the *Seicho-No-Ie*, on November 14, 1945, as its founder, Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi, submitted the “application for the establishment of an incorporated foundation” with the “Prospectus” and “Deed of Endowment for Incorporated Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” to Hisatada Hirose, the then chief officer of the Tokyo Metropolitan Government.

As stated in our opinion, in the Prospectus it is written, “as the site for the building of the various facilities of the foundation, the President of Seicho-No-Ie, Masaharu Taniguchi, contributes a tract of land of 90 thousand *tsubo* in his possession... and as permanent liquid assets, he contributes his royalty income from the *Seimei no Jisso*,” and in the item on

basic assets in Article 5 of the “Deed of Endowment for Incorporated Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” there is only written “copyright of the work of Masaharu Taniguchi, *Seimei no Jisso*.”

In addition, the Religious Constitution of Seicho-No-Ie, the highest standard for religious affairs of Seicho-No-Ie, was carried out in 1951 during the lifetime of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi. It is clearly written in item 2 of Article 26: “In order to reflect the teachings in the direction of social welfare services and contribute to the public good by putting that into practice, this organization will separately establish Incorporated Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan for this purpose.” These immovable facts are indeed the intentions and the will of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi.

That is to say, while Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi printed “Establishment of Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan” in the November 1945 issue of *Seicho-No-Ie*, the ultimate role that permeates it is “social welfare services.” Accordingly, during the lifetime of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi not once had Jigyodan engaged in “the great movement of saving the national society that includes a political movement and cultural movement.” This solemn fact proves that the role of Jigyodan was exclusively “social welfare services.”

II. The February 27, 2012 letter by Jigyodan contains as reference material excerpts from an article about an interview with Chairman Akira Matsushita in the April 2012 issue of the *Taniguchi Masaharu Sensei wo Manabu*. The article contains various items that are different from the facts.

1. Regarding the Problem of the Reversion of the Copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso*.

About the problem of the reversion of the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso*, Mr. Matsushita said: “The start of the problem is the strong assertion by Director Masanobu Taniguchi (at the time) that the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* is owned by the Taniguchi family.... The result of the legal opinion of consultant lawyer, Ms. Masako Wakana, and Mr. Yoshiyuki Sato, a lawyer specializing in tax law, was ‘the copyright is with Shakai Jigyodan’ and this was settled at the Board of Directors meeting in 1988....”

In that case, we hope that he will show us the legal opinion of Messrs.

Wakana and Sato. There is no such document at our corporation. Incidentally, in the written statement dated November 4, 2010, which was submitted by Ms. Wakana to the Tokyo District Court, it is clearly written: “ Except for the opinion (A 64) of July 5, 1986 about the *Kanro no Hou* and the opinion of July 25 of the same year and the letter of April 27, 1987 (C 65) nothing has been presented to Seicho-No-Ie”; “Concerning matters about the rights of Incorporated Foundation, Seicho-No-Ie Shakai Jigyodan, except for the stated opinion regarding the *Kanro no Hou*, at the time I did not express my views to ‘Seicho-No-Ie.’”

The facts are as stated above. Accordingly, there is no such fact about “the strong assertion by Director Masanobu Taniguchi (at the time) that the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* is owned by the Taniguchi family” and concerning the reversion of the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* that “the copyright is with Shakai Jigyodan and this was settled at the Board of Directors meeting in 1988.”

Generally speaking, in 1988 Mr. Matsushita was not a Director of this Corporation, he was not in the Headquarters office in Harajuku, Tokyo, and he was not in a position to be directly involved with this problem. Therefore, we can think of this as giving full rein what are false imaginings based on hearsay. It is probably the case that someone is confusing things with the opinion concerning the *Kanro no Hou* that Ms. Wakana refers to in her written statement.

2. Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi Omitted the “Shinto Section” from the *Seimei no Jisso*

Mr. Matsushita says that during the lawsuit we “built up assertions that desecrated the Holy Master such as ‘after the war the Holy Master was reprimanded by God to change his view of the nation and the Emperor and he did not allow the revival of the Shinto Section.’” We ask that he point out specifically where such assertions are made in the documents that we had submitted to the court.

On page 5 of the December 1946 issue of the *Seicho-No-Ie* there is the article “Invitation to the Private Publication Committee for the Peace Edition, *Seimei no Jisso*.” In that article it is written: “It is a committee that attempts to distribute at cost the eternal authentic book that has been

scrupulously revised by the author himself, which omits the portions about the mental attitude that is strictly applicable to wartime but completely includes all other subjects. The twenty volumes of the *Seimei no Jisso*, the books of Seicho-No-Ie, are most difficult to obtain at present, and the most sought for and there are countless examples of illness healing and the improvement of destiny by reading...”

In the March 1947 issue of the *Seicho-No-Ie* it is written, “the private publication plan for the Peace Edition, *Seimei no Jisso* has also been unavoidably postponed” (*Meiso-joki Sengo-hen*, p. 31). As is stated here the publication of this Peace Edition, *Seimei no Jisso* was not realized. Yet since then the *Seimei no Jisso* that was published has not included the “Shinto Section,” which had been included in the *Seimei no Jisso* before the war. This can be thought of as the result of omitting the “Shinto Section” by Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi as being “the portions about a mental attitude that is strictly applicable to wartime.” Accordingly, we claimed that it goes against the will of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi and so forth to bring out the “Shinto Section” that Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi could have published in his lifetime if he had wished to but did not do so, and in spite of this to dare to publish the “Shinto Section” that was not published for being “the portions about a mental attitude that is strictly applicable to wartime,” and what is more to extract and publish one portion of it. We believe that Mr. Matsushita’s assertions are not based on facts.

3. About the Pending Reprinting of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi’s Books

Mr. Matsushita says: “About the fact that works of the Holy Master being out of print, such as *Kojiki to Gendai no Yogen* and *Kami Hito ni Katari-tamau*, these were first deliberated at the standing board of directors meeting that was attended by Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi, the Vice President at that time. Since I was a standing board of director I remember this well. About the books out of print, I directly stated my opinion to the Vice President, Rev. Taniguchi that ‘I am against this because these works are like the starting point of my faith.’” He makes this totally absurd assertion.

The President and the Vice President do not attend the standing board of directors meeting. Therefore such statements by Mr. Matsushita that he directly expressed his opinion to the then Vice President, “I am against this

because these works are like the starting point of my faith,” are his fabrications. Moreover, while Mr. Matsushita speaks of being “out of print” properly speaking these works are possibilities for reprinting that are “pending reprinting” and they are not “out of print” because their publication is impossible.

Furthermore, Mr. Matsushita says that it is the current President of Seicho-No-Ie, Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi, who has deferred the reprinting the books of Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi. Yet this is different from the facts. For example, when the reprinting plan of Nippon Kyobunsha was deliberated at the standing board of directors meeting, as stated above the President and the Vice President are not present, and that is why the President and Vice President could not express their opinion on the that reprinting plan. However, the President had the authority of approval in regards to the deliberations of the standing board of directors meeting. Hence, after passing through the deliberations of the standing board of directors meeting, the final decision for the reprinting plan, including books “pending reprinting” was by the then President of Seicho-No-Ie, Rev. Seicho Taniguchi, and it was not Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi.

On the other hand, if the plan for reprinting had been decided at the Nippon Kyobunsha directors meeting, Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi, who was formerly a director, had never made a concrete proposal about a reprinting plan. The President at the time, Mr. Shoji Nakajima (Chief Representative of Taniguchi Masaharu Sensei wo Manabu Kai), served as the chairman and after deliberating on reprinting plan that had been proposal by the responsible officer, who was not Rev. Masanobu Taniguchi, the result of the vote by the raising of the hand was approved by President Nakajima and decided.

Regarding the reprinting plan that was decided by Nippon Kyobunsha, Mr. Matsushita says: “The Vice President Masanobu changed the strategy and he next used the Nippon Kyobunsha directors meeting of whom he is a director and had the books be out of print, and without inquiring of the President, Rev. Seicho Taniguchi, who presides over all matter of *Seicho-No-Ie*, through the method of *ex post facto* reporting to the Headquarters board of directors meeting, he made the works of the Holy Master go out of print.” This is also different from the facts.

The publication plan of Nippon Kyobunsha (including reprinting) was

originally an item to report. It became an item for deliberation after the board of directors meeting that was held on May 9, 1987. When the “List for the Planned Publications for June 1987” was presented by Nippon Kyobunsha to that board of directors meeting, Rev. Seicho Taniguchi, who was the chairman had beforehand entertained doubts about the publication of *Seicho-No-Ie Seika Josei Gassho Gakufu Shu (1)*, and it was through Rev. Seicho Taniguchi that the item to report was changed to an item for deliberation. This is clear from the handwriting of Rev. Seicho Taniguchi that remains in agenda list of that board of directors meeting.

Since that time the publication plan of Nippon Kyobunsha was treated as an item for deliberation, but with the passage of time, of course with the understanding of Rev. Seicho Taniguchi, it reverted back to no more than its original item to report. In addition, as we clearly know from the above circumstances for Nippon Kyobunsha “to report *ex post facto* to the Headquarters board of directors” the understanding of the chairman of the board of directors meeting, Rev. Seicho Taniguchi was needed in advance, and at that level it was possible for Rev. Seicho Taniguchi to freely express his opinions. Consequently, the remarks by Mr. Matsushita about the circumstances are no more than groundless speculations.

Furthermore, the materials (reference chronological table) at end of *Rekishi Kara Nani wo Manabu-ka*, the record of the 2003 Seicho-No-Ie Special Conference, officially announces the books of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi that are pending reprinting (excluding those for economic reasons) and on pages 220 to 225 of *Heiwa no Senjin ni Manabu*, the record of the 2004 Special Conference, it is explained as an answer to a question by the lecturer in charge about why those Seicho-No-Ie books are pending reprinting.

4. Burning the *Seimei no Jisso*?

Mr. Matsushita makes fascinating statements that go beyond the bounds of common sense that “the actions of President Masanobu consistently neglect the *Seimei no Jisso* and I strongly feel that he hope to someday burn them.”

As you know it is clearly stated in item 1 of Article 2 of the Religious Constitution of Seicho-No-Ie, the highest religious standard, “Based on the

doctrines of the Seicho-No-Ie Founder, Masaharu Taniguchi, and with the major work, the *Seimei no Jisso* as the key, to reveal the religious truth that is common to all religions....” As is stated here the *Seimei no Jisso* has never been neglected, and until the occurrence of the present conflict, for many years it has been unremittingly published by Nippon Kyobunsha.

We can only think that Mr. Matsushita is making eccentric statements to justify their actions to prevent Nippon Kyobunsha from publishing the *Seimei no Jisso* in order to obstruct the propagation through literature of Seicho-No-Ie.

While saying that they “will protect the proper teachings of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi and the like,” they ignore the “teaching of being united as one through the teaching given by President of Seicho-No-Ie” of Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi. They openly rise against the person who has assumed the Seicho-No-Ie Presidency based on provisions in Article 10 of the Religious Constitution of Seicho-No-Ie, which was established under Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi, and engage in activities that hinder the Humanity Enlightenment Movement that was started by Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi. Do you think that Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi is happy with this?

Jigyodan did not recognize the payment of royalties for the reprinted edition of the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso* to Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi, and to Mrs. Teruko Taniguchi, Rev. Seicho Taniguchi and Mrs. Emiko Taniguchi and demanded payment of double royalty from Nippon Kyobunsha. On the pretense that Nippon Kyobunsha rejected their demand on the grounds that there was no reason for such payment, Jigyodan gave notice to Nippon Kyobunsha that it arbitrarily discontinues the publication contract for the 34 works, whose copyright belong to Jigyodan, including not only the reprinted edition of the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso* but the headnote edition of the *Seimei no Jisso*, Holy Sutras and *Shinri*, and they even started a suit for payment of double royalty for the reprinted edition of the first edition of the leather cover *Seimei no Jisso*, which is the start of the present dispute.

Mr. Matsushita, used the fact that Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi donated the copyright of the *Seimei no Jisso* and so forth to Jigyodan because of his deep love, suddenly denied the right of supervision of “Seicho-No-Ie” for the publication and other uses of the *Seimei no Jisso* and so forth that he himself had recognized for many years, excluded the participation of “Seicho-No-Ie”

that unifies religious activities, freely published Seicho-No-Ie books and confused followers by such false facts as “Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi is saying to make Jigyodan the main axis of Seicho-No-Ie missionary activities,” and started a lawsuit that befits an “anti-Seicho-No-Ie movement.” This is the true nature of the present conflict. When all is said and done Jigyodan and others are simply using Rev. Masaharu Taniguchi’s name at their convenience to oppose the “Seicho-No-Ie” Headquarters.