Abstract

This study aims to analyze the relationship between “home” and “economics” in the consumer cooperative movement of Japan that took place during the consumer cooperative movement of the 1920s—1940s in Japan. The subjects of this analysis are: *Ie no Hikari* published by *SangyōKumiai*, *Shinkatei* published by *KōbeSyōhikumiai*, and *Fujinsenki*, *HatarakuFujin*, *Shonensenki*, and *Pionier* published by *Zenkoku Nōminkumiai*. In this study, unions are featured differently depending on whether importance is placed on class cooperation or class struggle. The study has especially focused on how “women” and “children” should have been involved in the unions.

The development of the consumer cooperative movement overlaps with the era of the mass consumer society. In this context, the images of “innocent children” and “women as a consumer” are relevant to discussion of “home.” Additionally, harsh child labor associated with the development of capitalism was problematic, and “home” was, therefore, discussed from the perspective of child welfare.

The analysis of the articles about “women” led to four findings. First, *Ie no Hikari* and *Shinkatei* discussed the “economic independence of women” and the expectations that women ought to contribute to the state and society. This was important in order to acquire a general understanding of economics. Second, the “economic independence of women” was not the same as that of men; women were not permitted to work as men were and their role of women was limited to indulging in home economics. They should be involved in the home economics with their neighbors. Third, the analysis of *Ie no Hikari* revealed a comparison of the rural versions of home economics. Both version agree that steady rural women are ideal examples of women involved in home economics. Fourth, *Fujinsenki* and *HatarakuFujin* differ from *Ie no Hikari* and *Shinkatei*. The former two stated that “home” was an exploited place. Furthermore, it was important that women joined the class struggle against the Japanese imperialism.
According to these findings, “home” has a positive meaning in *Ie no Hikari* and *Shinkatei*, while a negative meaning in *Fujisenki* and *HatarakuFujin*. This difference is based on whether importance is placed on class cooperation or class struggle.

Furthermore, analysis of the articles about “children” led to three findings were obtained. First, children are members of industrial unions in *Ie no Hikari*. Moreover, it explained the industrial union spirit was explained using stories for children. Additionally, regardless of the difference between the rich and the poor, establishment of simulated consumer unions at schools was recommended; children needed education in class cooperation. Second, *Shonensenki* and *Pionier* were premised on the conflict between children. They insisted that children should become part of a class struggle. Third, an examination of the arithmetic content of *Pionier* revealed that arithmetic content was created to cultivate a critical attitude toward imperialism and capitalist economies.

Based on the above findings, it can be said that the articles about “women” and “children” were regarding class cooperation and class struggle. However, regarding children, there was a common point: it was difficult to discuss the concept of “home” in the context of children. It is speculated that the practice of simulated consumer unions at school is positioned as an extension of school education. the practice is not part of home education. In addition, it is difficult to discuss “home” in the context of *Shonensenki* and *Pionier*. The reason may be that “home” was regarded as a place of exploitation in *Fujisenki* and *HatarakuFujin*.

In this study, the relationship between “home” and “economics” was examined by analyzing articles on “women” and “children.” The articles formed different discourses and reflected upon class coordination or class struggle. However, it is necessary to exercise caution while in understanding differences in ideological or economic positions as “differences” among women. This is because the logic of “cooperation” and “struggle” has been formulated by men. Therefore, this point needs further consideration. Additionally, for children, “home” was difficult to discuss, but it does not mean that children are not related to “home.” Given that Since this study is based on limited data, research on this topic should continue. Finally, this paper discusses the possible link ages between the findings and this study can be linked to modern research subjects.