

SAN FRANCISCO: 50 YEARS ON

Part One

Professor Roger Dingman, University of Southern California:

‘Anchor for Peace: The United States Navy in the Shaping of the Japanese Peace Settlement’

Professor Kenji Tozawa, Ehime University:

‘Yoshida’s Party-political Difficulties over the Question of the San Francisco Peace Treaty’

Sir Hugh Cortazzi, GCMG, former ambassador to Japan:

‘Britain and Japan, 1951: San Francisco and Tokyo’

Dr Peter Lowe, University of Manchester:

‘Looking Back: The San Francisco Peace Treaty in the Context of Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1902-52’

Discussion Paper
No. IS/01/425
September 2001

The Suntory Centre
Suntory and Toyota International Centres
for Economics and Related Disciplines
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
Tel.: 020-7955 6698

Preface

An all-day symposium was held at the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines on 10 July 2001 in order to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the San Francisco Conference of September 1951. It attempted to reassess that conference and the peace treaty with Japan which emerged from it both from international and national perspectives. This attracted a distinguished panel of speakers and a large distinguished audience. The symposium was held in conjunction with the Japan Society, London. The eight papers will be issued in two parts. Part I begins with papers about the main players, the United States by Professor Dingman and Japan by Professor Tozawa. These are followed by papers about the British approach to the conference by Sir Hugh Cortazzi and Dr Peter Lowe. Part II containing the four remaining papers will be issued as soon as possible.

September 2001

Contact address: Dr Janet Hunter, STICERD, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, email: [j.e.hunter@lse.ac.uk/](mailto:j.e.hunter@lse.ac.uk)

© by the authors. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Abstracts

Dingman argues that the San Francisco settlement signaled the emergence of a new Pacific maritime order in which the United States Navy is the dominant naval force relying on significant bases in Japan. In particular, he focuses on the Yokosuka naval base whose retention was called for by the navy and became an important element in Washington's approach to the peace negotiations.

Tozawa deals with the attitudes of the Yoshida government and the opposition parties to the peace negotiations and later to the ratification of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the United States-Japan Security Pact. The points of difference were: whether Japan should negotiate with all the victors or with individual countries; whether Japan should observe disarmed neutrality; whether amendment to the Constitution was necessary.

Cortazzi presents the perspective of a junior official in the United Kingdom Liaison Mission from October 1951. He gives an account of the activities of the British delegation to the San Francisco Conference and the conversations of Herbert Morrison and Robert Scott, especially with Prime Minister Yoshida.

Lowe argues that British ministers and officials looked backward, influenced by economic, strategic and public opinion factors, the last referring to prisoners-of-war who had been treated harshly in Southeast Asia. The Labour government was worried over a probable revival in Japanese economic competition, referring particularly to textiles, shipping and the potteries. The British views of the treaty were much more critical of Japan than the USA. Foreign Secretary Herbert Morrison, anxious that the British contribution to the ultimate treaty should be properly acknowledged, agreed to be in San Francisco at the last moment for the signing of the peace treaty.

Keywords: San Francisco Treaty; Attlee Government; Herbert Morrison; Robert Scott; John Foster Dulles; Yoshida Shigeru; USA; Japan; United Kingdom Liaison Mission (Tokyo); United States - Japan Security Pact; British delegation to the San Francisco Peace Conference; Ratification; new Pacific maritime order; United States Navy; Yokosuka naval base.

ANCHOR FOR PEACE: THE UNITED STATES NAVY IN THE SHAPING OF THE JAPANESE PEACE SETTLEMENT

Roger Dingman

I. Anchor for Peace

The city of San Francisco, where the peace and security treaties that constitute the Japanese peace settlement of 1951 were signed, is surrounded on three sides by water. One can smell the salt air of the bay from the War Memorial Opera House, site of the peace conference; and the Presidio, where signatures were put to the United States – Japan Security Treaty, perches on a neck of land that anchors the Golden Gate Bridge. The closeness to the sea of the ceremonies that concluded these agreements fifty years ago was entirely appropriate, for that proximity reminds us of an essential but often overlooked characteristic of the Japanese peace settlement. The peace that was signed at San Francisco in September 1951 marked much more than the end of a state of war with Japan. It signaled the emergence of a new Pacific maritime order.

That new order differed from those of the past in that one power, the United States of America, became the dominant naval force in the Pacific. The United States Navy commanded the waters of the world's largest ocean as no other nation had ever done. That pre-eminence was achieved by defeating Imperial Japan, the dominant regional naval power before the war; by relegating allies, in that great conflict and in the Korean War, to distinctly secondary naval status; and, most importantly, by securing bases along the Asia/Pacific littoral. The most significant of those bases were in Japan.

Today, fifty years after their retention was confirmed in the Japanese peace settlement, those bases on the Japanese home islands and on Okinawa, remain the anchor for peace in the Pacific. Today, the men and women of United States Navy and Marine Corps in Japan constitute the preponderant element of the largest American military force in any Asian nation. And today the American naval presence in Japan remains an essential element in Japan's defense and a vital, living symbol of the American commitment to alliance with Japan – the alliance that was signed at San Francisco in September 1951.

That alliance and the American military/naval presence that sustains it has often been the subject of public debate and scholarly controversy over the past half century. Yet surprisingly little attention has been paid to its origins – its naval origins. In this essay I seek to remedy that deficiency. The story of how the United States Navy came to acquire bases and permanent presence in Japan is worth telling in its own right. But the tale is also valuable for what it reveals about the processes of peacemaking that culminated in the agreements concluded at San Francisco fifty years ago.

In this essay, I propose to address the questions of how and why the United States acquired, and the Japanese government accepted, naval bases in Japan by focusing on the largest and most important naval base – Yokosuka. Its history from 1945 through 1951 demonstrates, I will argue, several important points about the peace-making process that culminated in the signature of peace and security treaties at San Francisco in 1951.

That process began on the individual level, broadened to the Yokosuka community, and set the stage for the commencement of formal peace negotiations. The U.S. Navy played a key role in shaping an American policy that looked toward retention of the base after conclusion of a peace treaty. The political and diplomatic decisions that affirmed that position were taken, I will argue, voluntarily on both sides; Washington did not force base retention upon Tokyo as a condition for peace. Those choices, as I will demonstrate, were made before the outbreak of the war in Korea confirmed the wisdom, from both American and Japanese points of view, of making forward basing of U.S. Naval forces in Japan the cardinal element of a new Asian/Pacific maritime order.

II. Uneasy Beginnings, August 1945- March 1946

The starting point for understanding the peace process that culminated at San Francisco is the hostility between Japan and its enemies during the Pacific War.

For forty-four months the fighting forces and civilian populations of Japan, America, and its allies were bombarded by government propaganda that made them see the enemy as a vicious, less than human 'other'.¹ The final months of the war, marked for Americans by casualties on an unprecedented scale at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and for

Japanese by preparations for a defense to the death of their homeland and the horrors of fire- and atomic- bombing, made it extremely unlikely that people from the two countries would find it possible to live together in peace.

Thus preparations for the landing of American and British forces at Yokosuka, a city of two hundred thousand located twenty-two miles southwest of Tokyo that was home to the Imperial Japanese navy's largest base, were marked by apprehension on both sides.² American senior officers insisted upon wartime 'darkened ship' conditions when they first approached the coast near Yokosuka and planned for full scale combat-style landings.³ They had cobbled together a force of just under nine thousand men that would be going ashore in an area known to contain a quarter million armed Japanese. It was, as the task force's chief of staff put it, 'a very alarming prospect'.⁴

For Yokosuka Imperial Japanese Navy and local civilian officials, what loomed ahead was both alarming and humiliating. Defeat was about to become real in the persons of an invading army. To minimize trouble, the Yokosuka base commander, Vice Admiral Totsuka Michitoru, sent staff members to the USS *San Diego*, flagship of Admiral William F. 'Bull' Halsey, the invasion force commander, to get precise information about how the surrender would proceed and what the Americans and their allies required.⁵ They were received in a 'strictly cold and formal' manner designed to impress upon them the totality of defeat and the necessity of 'strictly taking orders' from the Americans.⁶

Ashore, a Yokosuka Liaison Committee was formed to identify and deal with anticipated problems, and two hundred extra police and five senior police officials were rushed in to preserve order. Fearing rape, local officials negotiated with the associations that had provided 'comfort facilities' to Imperial Japanese Navy personnel to meet the sexual needs of the invaders. Reluctantly, some four hundred twenty-eight women agreed to do so. On the eve of the landings, Yokosuka's mayor and the chairman of the Liaison Committee issued strict orders for citizens – especially women and children - to stay in their houses and avoid walking or driving through areas where the invaders were expected to land.⁷

Thus when elements of the 4th Marine Regimental Combat Team, a U.S. Navy landing party, and a small British landing force came ashore on the morning of August 30, 1945, they were met by an eerie silence.⁸ Only a few sentries at major buildings on the naval base remained; and the marines treated them roughly, tearing up carefully prepared property inventories.⁹ The landing party camped out in base buildings¹⁰ as if they were on the beach of some South Pacific island, uncertain as to what might follow. Their commanders warily sent patrols into the city; checked out its water supply for fear of poisoning; and heaved sighs of relief that no casualties had occurred.¹¹ Still cautious, they refused to give their men liberty to go into Yokosuka for several days thereafter.¹²

Indeed, frostiness at the higher command level was the norm for the first ninety days of the occupation of Yokosuka. Rear Admiral Oscar C. Badger, the invasion force and first base commander, and Brigadier General William T. Clement, the marine commander, remained 'Jap haters'.¹³ When Admiral William F. 'Bull' Halsey, commander of the third fleet that brought the invaders to Japan, visited Imperial Japanese Navy officers' quarters on the Yokosuka base that his subordinates had appropriated, he took one look at the *tatami* flooring and spat on it saying, 'living like rats'.¹⁴ Even Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Commander-in-Chief Pacific, had his doubts about what was going on at Yokosuka. When he visited the city and its environs following the surrender ceremonies aboard the USS *Missouri*, he was struck by the Japanese people's apparent indifference to the Americans' presence. 'Most [Japanese] people', he noted, 'acted as if we did not exist'.¹⁵

Captain O.O. 'Scrappy' Kessing, a hardened submariner who commanded the Yokosuka base from September through November 1945, wanted to preserve the distance between Americans and Japanese.¹⁶ He had no respect for the former enemy, and he did nothing to keep skylarking sailors from covering the half-sunken battleship *Nagato* in Yokosuka Harbor with graffiti.¹⁷ Kessing was willing to let Navy Japanese language officers negotiate prices for his men's visits to geisha houses but opposed fraternization beyond that. Carefully controlled tours to see the ruins of Tokyo were all right, but contact with Japanese was not, in his view, supposed to lead to friendship. Kessing went so far as to have posters depicting an anguished prisoner of war and captioned 'Remember what they did to him when you think of getting friendly with a

Jap!' put up around the base. He even called in Yokosuka's mayor and chief of police to show them the posters and signify his determination to keep fraternization to a minimum.¹⁸

But Kessing and other senior officers could no more control the human interaction that developed in Yokosuka than King Canute could command the waves. Americans were curious about the defeated foe and prepared to give him - or her - a close look. What intelligence officials told them in a one hundred page book circulated to the fleet at the time of the surrender was tantalizing. The Japanese were not always at war, and in peace 'they are among the world's most delightful people'. Although they were 'extremely courteous...selective imitators', they had 'courage and determination' [and the ability to] 'endure hardship and suffering for a long time without outcry'.¹⁹ The invaders wanted souvenirs, both tangible and experiential, and very quickly shopping and sex became major leisure pastimes.

Yokosuka Japanese were willing to meet their needs, for they recognized that doing so was one means of getting enough income to feed their families. The American who passed through the base gate into the city was greeted by a huge taxi advertisement that said, 'Hello, Sir. Please Ride Cheerfully Around Yokosuka With Us'.²⁰ Other more imaginative businesswomen flashed 'Girls, girls!' in morse code to lonesome bachelor officers on the base. What followed was 'like a salmon run'. Some men rowed across the channel; others swam towing their clothes in a water-tight container; and still others commandeered a jeep to drive to Yokosuka's Yoshiwara district. An evening of drinking, singing, and mutual discovery followed.²¹ A mutually profitable barter trade for souvenirs, with cigarettes, chocolate, and sugar as currency, also flourished – so much so that base officials began searching men departing on liberty so as to keep them from worsening inflation and black markets in Yokosuka.²²

Such unofficial and mutually beneficial interaction between the invaders and their hosts amazed many observers. They struggled to explain how people who yesterday had been bitter enemies could today relate to one another so pleasantly. Some explained this phenomenon as a byproduct of war weariness; sailors and marines happy to have survived recent battles were simply full of *joi de vivre*.²³ Others, at higher levels, were

more sophisticated. In Yokosuka, for example, American interpreters were entertained by the chief of police, the boss of local fish markets, the family of a dancer who performed on the base, and, eventually, the mayor – who turned out to have been a Japanese commissioner to the New York World's Fair of 1939. They became victims of the Japanese culture of gift-giving, acquiring swords and kimono as souvenirs and providing chocolate and cigarettes as token repayment. But they recognized this controlled social interaction for what it was: a means of making them feel better about the Japanese with whom they interacted on a daily basis.²⁴

Indeed, one can see in their socializing no less than in the countless exchanges of grins and gum or candy between Japanese children and the American occupiers of Yokosuka an important beginning to the peace-making process. In these encounters, Japanese and Americans began to see one another as individuals – not as an alien “other” or “the enemy.” As one navy lieutenant, junior grade – who chose to move off the base with several of his mates to live in a Japanese house in the city – put it:

‘Should I feel that because I am civil to the old women and children I meet am betraying the men who died on Iwo Jima and Bataan? My first contact with the Japanese has presented them to me as a fawning, polite, and essentially stupid people. I cannot hate them. I can but treat them as individuals.’

The lieutenant admitted that he might have been ‘easily deceived and tricked by a deliberately planned hypocrisy’. But in time he, and others like him, would develop through their participation in heart-wrenching scenes such as the repatriation at nearby Uraga of Japanese soldiers stranded for years on ‘by-passed’ South Pacific islands or a New Years’ feast at the home of their house boy, an empathy for the Japanese people that completely separated them from the deeds of their government and its agents in war.²⁵

But that empathy was, as yet, too shallow to serve as the foundation for peace in the longer term. Americans and Japanese in Yokosuka during the first six months after the surrender sensed that their relationships were temporary, perhaps even ephemeral. The invaders, whether combat-hardened sailors and marines or language officers who had spent most of the war in school or in intelligence work at Pearl Harbor, were more obsessed with when they would be allowed to go home than they were entranced by the

charms of the Japanese people and the beauty of their country. They *knew* their time in Yokosuka was nothing more than a pleasant interlude.

So, too, did their hosts, one of whom composed and printed in the local newspaper a parting song supposedly sung by a departing American officer:

‘Goodbye, Yokosuka – my beloved town;
The day she stood and watched my jeep run by
In cute kimono of a long-sleeved gown,
Renders me the memory of her charming eye.

Good-bye, Yokosuka, Mt. Fuji, cherry, and all—
With all my G.I’s off my soul,
I’ll be longing to see you once again
In good old civvies in which I’ll for’er remain.’²⁶

What the Yokosuka songwriter wrote anticipated only slightly what Japanese Ministry of Foreign officials thought when they composed their first studies on a possible peace treaty in the late winter and spring of 1946. One, written before the promulgation of a new national constitution that abjured the use of force to settle international disputes, looked to the reconstitution of a Japanese army and navy to defend the nation. A second supposed that the famous Article Nine of the new constitution meant that Japan must rely upon the United Nations or some other form of international guarantee to protect its security.²⁷ Neither imagined that the American naval presence at Yokosuka could or would become a permanent element in the preservation of that security.

III. Towards Coexistence and Cooperation, 1946-1949

In April 1946, just as the cherry blossoms burst into bloom, however, the American naval presence in Yokosuka showed its first sign of permanence in the person of a new base commander, Captain Benton Weaver Decker. ‘Benny’ Decker had visited Japan, but not the virtually closed city of Yokosuka, in April 1939 when the USS *Astoria* returned the ashes of former ambassador Saito Hiroshi to his homeland.²⁸ He brought a mix of wartime experiences with him – sea duty on both a battleship and landing craft in the South Pacific; command of a training base in Florida; and Washington duty that included membership on the Joint Civil Affairs Committee.²⁹ But his sense of the possibilities inherent in American occupation of the Yokosuka naval base was even

more important for the future. At his very first meeting with his staff, Decker instructed them to act as if the United States Navy would be in Yokosuka for ten, or possibly, fifty, years.³⁰

That idea, although then only Decker's personal view and not official U.S. Navy policy, lay at the heart of his approach to his job. The ambitious and energetic captain, unlike his predecessors, realized that there was a symbiotic relationship between the base and the city of Yokosuka and its people. One could not thrive if the other suffered. To that end, he began, within a month of his arrival, distributing surplus food to local Japanese who were facing severe food shortages.³¹ He had the wall that had hidden the base from ordinary citizens' view torn down.³² Then, with the aid of his wife, Edwina Naylor Decker, he set out to change both the base and the city so as to make their peaceful coexistence possible. Decker wanted both to become examples of clean and modern multi-cultural democracy.

Changing the base from its dilapidated, war-worn state could be done fairly easily. Decker ordered his subordinates to 'clean it up!' When his wife, Edwina, arrived, she joined him in trying to create a small town community atmosphere on it, complete with clubs and chapel, park areas and recreation facilities. Decker built a gymnasium and championed athletic competitions of all sorts. A base theater showed recent movies.³³ The Japanese government built 193 new family homes and 96 apartments for base residents.³⁴ And, to lessen the likelihood that young sailors or marines would engage in socially deviant behavior once they left this replica of home, Decker poured funds into a resplendent Enlisted Men's Club just beyond the base gates. It hired top Japanese entertainers and set limits to the amount of alcohol that young Americans could consume.³⁵

Changing Yokosuka, however, was a far more complex task. Despite his prewar visits to China and Japan, Decker was not cross-culturally sensitive. Ambitious for success (and the two stars of a rear admiral), he was used to issuing orders and having them obeyed.³⁶ He wanted to get things done in a hurry, and within one hundred days of his arrival he had developed a list of nearly three hundred 'projects' for change in Yokosuka that he wanted completed as quickly as possible. These actions ranged from controlling

typhus and venereal diseases to changing the city government, renovating schools, and finding employment for former senior Imperial Japanese Navy officers.³⁷

Decker, with the assistance of his wife, Edwina, developed a three-pronged strategy for achieving such changes. At one level, it mimicked General Douglas MacArthur's mode of acting through Japanese government officials. Decker brought in the mayor, a wartime appointee who had cooperated fully with the Imperial Navy, and later the chairman of the city council, and told them what he wanted done. Reforming the police was first on his list.³⁸ At another level, Decker's strategy mobilized Japanese citizen constituencies for change. The Deckers strongly supported a reorganized and independent local Women's Club that worked to improve social conditions by distributing food, staffing orphanages, and pressing their more conservative spouses for better schools and more democracy.³⁹ The captain championed industrialization of former base areas and the establishment of a local chamber of commerce to promote trade.⁴⁰ And at a third level, Decker promoted change by trying to penetrate Japanese society with American voluntary associations. He provided surplus land and facilities to Catholic and Protestant missionaries; helped fund the establishment of YMCA, YWCA, and Red Cross organizations; and championed the Boy and Girl Scout movements as well as Freemasonry.⁴¹ If these non-governmental agencies succeeded in making Yokosuka Japanese just a bit more like Americans living on the base – with just a modicum of official support from him – then Decker would achieve 'democratization' consistent with broad Occupation policy and conducive to peaceful coexistence of Americans and Japanese.

The Navy captain's ambitious program for change would have failed, however, had he not had vital assistance from two sources. One came from dedicated subordinates who were far more flexible and cross-culturally sensitive than he. Commander Wallace L. Higgins, technically the allied military governor of Kanagawa Prefecture but in fact Decker's executive officer in Yokosuka, stood first among them.⁴² He had headed the first American military government team at Kure, the Imperial Japanese Navy's Inland Sea base, from October 1945 through January 1946. What he experienced there changed him from indifferently successful salesman turned naval reserve civil affairs officer into a savvy manager of cross-cultural change. At Kure Higgins quickly

discovered that one must listen and learn from the Japanese if he was to gain more than minimal, sullen cooperation. He learned to party with them and fell in love with his Japanese housekeeper. With her help, he improved his Japanese language and social skills so as to maneuver local officials and businessmen into doing what he wanted. By the time Decker brought him to Yokosuka in August 1946, Higgins knew that patience, indirection, and sensitivity to a person's status within the group were vital keys to getting things done in Japan.⁴³

Higgins was prepared, in ways the Decker was not, to cooperate with local community leaders to secure their cooperation in changing Yokosuka for the better and their acceptance of the U.S. Navy's continuing presence in their city. The Deckers occupied (and painted in proper New England white), the Tadodai residence of the local Imperial Japanese Navy commander.⁴⁴ Higgins and his Japanese wife-to-be set up housekeeping in a beautiful house at Otsu, located for them by one of the Japanese Navy interpreters.⁴⁵ He had no qualms about the fact that the principal local employer, the Uraga Dock Company, paid for its maintenance.⁴⁶ There he wined, dined, and sang songs with local officials and businessmen so often and so openly that Decker forbade other junior officers to join them. Higgins, nevertheless, continued this informal socializing as a way of gaining information about what was going on at the upper echelons of Yokosuka society and a means of smoothing the way for acceptance of American-desired changes.⁴⁷

Higgins and Decker both would have failed miserably, however, if they had not had the acquiescence and/or approbation of Japanese officials. In January 1946 Uchiyama Kantaro, a former diplomat and friend of Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, was named governor of Kanagawa, the prefecture in which Yokosuka was located. Uchiyama, unlike his predecessor and Home Ministry officials who served elsewhere as governors, took a positive attitude toward the presence of occupation forces in Japan.⁴⁸ While he undoubtedly wanted the Eighth Army out of the center of bomb-ruined Yokohama, he recognized that good things could come from a new international leaven in Japanese society. Uchiyama established a sub-unit within his administration to act as liaison with the foreigners. He sometimes found the ebullient Decker's methods difficult to understand, but he welcomed police reform and the introduction of American-funded

non-governmental agencies. The governor also became friendly with Higgins and other subordinates and learned to use them to smoothe frictions between Decker and Yokosuka city officials.⁴⁹

Officials sent from Tokyo to help manage civil-naval relations in the city also greatly aided Decker. In 1946 the local branch of the Central Liaison Office, an agency that brought diplomats and Home Ministry officials together to deal with the American occupiers, assumed responsibility for labor procurement, ending a corrupt process of hiring through local private labor brokers who skimmed off large portions of base workers' salaries.⁵⁰ These Japanese officials also acquiesced when the base commander, in response to protests from church and women's groups back home, demanded closure of the special 'comfort facilities' for foreigners in the city's pleasure quarter.⁵¹ Indeed, one of their number, Ota Saburo, stepped in to halt a bitter behind-the-scenes struggle between the Navy and city hall during the first election campaign for mayor in April 1947. He won the contest, and for the next two years put his diplomat's skills of negotiation and compromise to work in the management of civil-naval relations in Yokosuka.⁵²

Thus there developed between the base and the city a mutually profitable and tolerant coexistence that none could have imagined during the first, anxious postwar days. Yokosuka was not the perfect base host city that 'Benny' Decker dreamed it might become. A substantial leftist opposition to the Navy's presence developed. It was driven, in part, by communists and fanned by the base commander's vigorous and not always wise application of anti-communist labor and demonstration control measures.⁵³ But at the same time, an increasing number of Japanese and Americans worked side by side on the base. By 1948 three thousand men in navy and marine corps uniforms lived and worked there,⁵⁴ and new and returning residents pushed the city's population back up to nearly ninety percent of its wartime high.⁵⁵ One in four Japanese residents in Yokosuka owed their livelihood, directly or indirectly, to the American presence.⁵⁶

Americans and Japanese also learned to celebrate together and to live with their differences. Decker saw to it that Japanese as well as American holidays were observed, with parades, special ceremonies, and games between Japanese and

American teams. The base was opened to ordinary Japanese who were given treasured bottles of Coca Cola as a remembrance of the occasion.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, city officials continued to dream of and plan for the day when they would recover full control of the harbor area. They stopped trying to get U.S. Navy officials to subsidize their budget as the Imperial Japanese Navy had done and turned to the national government (in conjunction with other former navy base cities) to establish procedures for the eventual return of former Japanese navy facilities. Eventually the Diet approved such legislation, and a local referendum indicated that eighty-seven percent of the city's population agreed with it.⁵⁸

In the meantime, Americans and Japanese found ways to manage their differences, even in the difficult area of sexual relations. Licensed and free-lance 'pan-pan' prostitutes did not vanish from the city's pleasure quarter, as American matrons on the base and Japanese social reformers might have desired. But base officials and the local women's club worked to try to lower the venereal disease rate in the city.⁵⁹ Female Japanese base workers successfully resisted, however, humiliating American demands for venereal disease checks as a condition of employment.⁶⁰ Occasionally American men raped Japanese women; but perpetrators were court martialed and quickly shipped back to the United States.⁶¹ In time, base and city officials agreed on a system of health inspections for sex workers and the establishment of a clinic for sexually transmitted diseases in one of the city's hospitals. Those measures helped preserve the health of Japanese and Americans alike.⁶²

'Benny' Decker was not one to let what had been achieved at Yokosuka under his leadership go unnoticed. During the first three years of his tenure as base commander, he worked hard to let his military superiors, visiting dignitaries from the United States, the press, and important Japanese know what was going on there. He tried and failed to get Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal to stop during a brief visit early in 1946; undaunted, he went on to court the assistant secretary and members of the House Naval Affairs Committee before the year ended. When the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Louis Denfeld visited Yokosuka in April 1947, he was impressed and agreed with Decker's expressed hope that 'the United States should keep this base'. He showed the commandant of the Marine Corps, members of the House Armed Services

Committee, and Rear Admiral Oscar Badger, who by 1948 commanded the Seventh Fleet that advancing communists were about to push out of Tsingtao, China, the base and touted its long term utility. Early in 1949, only a few days after he stunned official Tokyo by saying that Japan had no strategic value to the United States, Army Secretary Kenneth Royall visited Yokosuka at Decker's behest to see and hear quite the opposite message.⁶³

The Navy captain also broadcast news of what was happening in Yokosuka back to the United States through every means that he could. He welcomed religious figures, like Father Flanagan, the founder of the famous Boys' Town orphanage; Francis Cardinal Spellman, the pope's vicar to the American armed forces; and Protestant missionary leaders. He cultivated the press, greeting visiting newspaper publishers and contacting members of the Tokyo Press Club. That got results in the form of numerous news stories and articles about Yokosuka in two of the most popular magazines in America, the *Readers' Digest* and the *National Geographic*.⁶⁴

Decker also reached out to an ever-widening circle of important Japanese to let them see how Yokosuka was changing and to plant seeds of possible permanence for the American presence there. Kanagawa Prefecture Governor Uchiyama Kantaro quickly became a friend, and as early as August 1946 Decker hinted to him that even though it currently appeared that the Navy would not stay for long, the Americans would have to remain – to keep the Russians from coming in and to allow war-devastated Japan to sit on the sidelines of a possible Soviet-American war.⁶⁵ The Deckers brought the emperor's younger brother Prince Takamatsu, a former Imperial Japanese Navy officer, back to Yokosuka, ostensibly in his capacity as patron of the Japan Red Cross; he and his wife became frequent visitors and genuine friends over the years. Contacts with the imperial family continued, and in the spring of 1949, Decker arranged a tour of the base for the emperor's three younger sons. Given sailor hat souvenirs, they asked for one more for their elder brother, the Crown Prince. In April of that year Decker entertained ten Diet members and sent all other Diet members passes to enter the base so as to let them know that 'they were more than welcome to see what we were doing with the base'. Finally, in May 1949, the Deckers brought Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru to Yokosuka for a banquet attended by local Japanese and American notables whose

diversity attested to the kind of cooperative community spirit that had developed in the city.⁶⁶

Before 1949 ended, Decker was doubly honored for the peaceful coexistence in a reformed Yokosuka that he had worked so hard to create. In May he was at long last promoted to rear admiral, and instead of retiring, as was the norm, he was extended on active duty at Yokosuka for another year. SCAP himself was so impressed with what he had achieved there that he considered sending him to Okinawa to try to achieve a similar success. In November, the mayor and city assembly installed his bust in front of the city hall. On the occasion of its installation, Prime Minister Yoshida, then in his dual capacity as Foreign Minister, sent a message of congratulations that was read to the assembled crowd.⁶⁷ Such recognition only redoubled Decker's determination to see that the U.S. Navy remained in Yokosuka long after the signature of any possible peace treaty.

IV: Deciding to Remain, 1947-1951

But did the changes in Yokosuka that 'Benny' Decker promoted and publicized make any real difference in shaping the specific terms of the eventual peace settlement? I believe the answer to that question is clearly yes. The evolution of civil-naval relations in Yokosuka demonstrated, well before political leaders and diplomats began in earnest to define the security terms of the peace treaty, that retention of an American naval base in Japan was a viable option. Thanks to 'Benny' Decker, policy makers and ordinary citizens in both Japan and America were aware of that possibility. But it remained for government leaders to make the choice to keep Yokosuka as an American naval base after conclusion of a peace treaty. How, then, did leaders on opposite sides of the Pacific come to agree that the 'Yokosuka option' was the preferred solution to America's defense problems and Japan's security dilemma?

The paths by which they came to that conclusion were quite distinct. In Washington, decision-makers, both within the Navy and beyond it, traveled a twisted road to that end. Their choices were constrained during the first two postwar years by what appeared to be conflicting international and domestic political considerations. On the one hand, as the Cold War deepened, operational demands upon the Navy increased;

Soviet hostility and the weakness of wartime allies required creation and maintenance of the Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean.⁶⁸ But on the other, public and congressional support for maintenance of a large navy dropped dramatically. Admirals and generals plunged, moreover, into a bitter fight over service roles, missions, and declining budgets that created a poisonous atmosphere within the Pentagon – hardly one conducive to long-range thinking about the potential value of a naval base in Japan.⁶⁹

Thus in the spring and summer of 1947, following General MacArthur's futile call for an early Japanese peace treaty, the Navy, its sister services, and the State Department found themselves unable to agree on the specifics of American security needs in and around Japan. Joint Chiefs of Staff planners deemed the island nation *the* most important strategic position for the United States in East Asia, concluding that it would be impossible to retain the use of Chinese ports as communist forces advanced. The more they thought about what a Soviet-American war might look like, the clearer it became that the United States must maintain an essentially maritime 'offensive-defensive' strategic posture in the Western Pacific. Successive revisions of war plans moved from essentially defensive antisubmarine warfare to offensive, if not pre-emptive, naval and air strikes against Soviet ports and other East Asian industrial facilities.⁷⁰

When in August 1947, in reaction to the State Department's initial draft peace treaty for Japan – one which envisaged four-power enforcement of its terms – Navy representatives called upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff to study the question of base retention in Japan 'as a matter of priority', the chiefs spurned their request.⁷¹ Moreover, a clear difference of opinion between admirals and diplomats surfaced. Acting upon the advice of the rear admiral responsible for political-military affairs, the Chief of Naval Operations admitted that there were objections to maintaining a 'semi-permanent base' in Japan after conclusion of a peace treaty. He felt it would be 'prudent', however, to retain the freedom of action to disagree with any action that might prejudice the chances of retaining the Yokosuka base and its facilities.⁷² But State Department Policy Planning staffers, while eager to keep the Soviet Union out of a friendly Japan, thought American power in general, and perhaps a bilateral treaty guaranteeing its security or a base on

Okinawa, would suffice to achieve that end. Only 'in the extreme event' would keeping US forces in the Japanese home islands be necessary.⁷³

Over the next year little progress was made in resolving this difference. George Kennan went to Japan in March 1948 to assess its place in American grand strategy. Chief of Naval Operations Louis Denfeld told him, prior to his departure, that the United States had 'nuclei of naval bases' in Japan, and added that Yokosuka was the most valuable among them. General MacArthur, however, told Kennan that Okinawa should be transformed into America's Western Pacific stronghold. Although that 'typhoon-ridden, poverty-burdened' island held no charms for any operationally minded naval officer, Vice Admiral Robert M. Griffin, 'Benny' Decker's immediate superior, first told Kennan of Yokosuka's value and then implied that the Navy would not be 'averse' to developing an Okinawan base instead.⁷⁴ Seven months later, the best the National Security Council could produce was a very muddy policy statement: the Navy should 'shape its policy' so as to retain use of Yokosuka on a commercial basis and simultaneously 'develop the possibilities of Okinawa' as a base. Doing the latter would not preclude the former, so long as the prevailing international situation and American political objectives at the time – still vague and in the future – made doing so 'desirable' when a peace treaty was concluded.⁷⁵

The prospects for such a treaty did not brighten until the autumn of 1949. By that time, American diplomats, politicians, and strategists all worried about the consequences of China's 'fall' to communist control. In the view of State Department Japan experts, that made it all the more urgent to Tokyo on Washington's side by moving as quickly as possible toward conclusion of a peace treaty. Secretary of State Dean Acheson recognized that he needed an East Asian 'success' after 'failure' in China.⁷⁶ In June 1949, the Joint Chiefs of Staff reaffirmed Japan's importance in American grand strategy: continued American military presence there would force the Soviets to think about a two-front war, stiffen Japanese resistance to communist pressures, and provide 'staging areas' from which Washington could project its power onto the East Asian mainland. A base at Okinawa could not meet those requirements, and so 'arrangements' for continued use of Yokosuka were of 'major importance'.⁷⁷

This statement reflected a new convergence of strategic and budgetary thinking within the American armed services, and it paved the way for State Department endorsement of the concept of retaining post-peace treaty bases in Japan. In 1947, army, navy, and fledgling air force leaders had been so at odds with one another that no common posture in dealing with diplomats was possible. By 1949, however, leaders of all three services recognized that bases in Japan could help check what they perceived as a growing threat from China and the Soviet Union on the East Asian mainland. As they prepared to withdraw American occupation troops from the Korean peninsula, Japan provided an attractive alternative. Moreover, keeping and maintaining forces there was cheaper and operationally more effective than doing so in the United States.⁷⁸

As 'Benny' Decker pointed out, Yokosuka in fiscal year 1949 provided a million dollars more in services than it cost to operate, and replacing the base could cost over six hundred millions.⁷⁹ With the services in agreement on base retention, the State Department's principal Japan peace treaty drafter, Robert Fearey, moved in September 1949 from neutrality toward basing to advocating the retention of U.S. forces in Japan 'in defined bases on a self-supporting basis' for up to ten years following the conclusion of a peace treaty.⁸⁰

By early December 1949, even General MacArthur was inclined to accept that concept. While he still thought Okinawa should be developed into the principal base for American forces, he acknowledged that the United States would have to retain a 'token force' at air and naval bases in the Japanese home islands until facilities could be built there.⁸¹ That was a very distant prospect, given President Truman's agreement with congressional defense budget cutters.

MacArthur's drift toward 'Benny' Decker's position may also have reflected an awareness of trends in American public opinion. When, in February 1949, Army Secretary Kenneth Royall had hinted that peace might permit the departure of American forces from Japan, the press exploded in criticism. The *New York Times* editorialized that withdrawal from a militarily defenseless Japan was unacceptable 'on either moral or strategic grounds'. Its military affairs critic and the editors of *Newsweek* magazine and the American Council on Japan all agreed that the island nation was America's 'most

important' Pacific base. Keeping U.S. forces there was the way to preserve the peace of the Pacific and American security won in the war against Japan, the *San Francisco Chronicle* editorialized. Gallup poll numbers confirmed strong public opposition to withdrawing American forces from Japan.⁸²

Those numbers, and his sense that further delay might be fatal to retaining Japan's friendship, prompted Secretary of State Dean Acheson to renew, that same autumn of 1949, efforts to get the Pentagon to agree on an early Japanese peace settlement.⁸³ The Joint Chiefs of Staff ordered their subordinates to update their studies of Japan's strategic significance, and these confirmed the importance of retaining bases there from which 'offensive operations' could be conducted against the Soviet Union. As if to reinforce that point, the Chief of Naval Operations announced that the Seventh Fleet would be reinforced by the aircraft carrier *Boxer* and additional destroyers. At the same time, however, the chiefs urged limited rearmament of Japan and opposed commencement of negotiations looking toward a peace treaty.⁸⁴

The need to break the bureaucratic stalemate between the State and Defense Departments set the stage for a series of American officials' trans-Pacific missions to Japan in the winter and spring of 1950. First Dean Acheson's principal counsellor, then the Joint Chiefs of Staff came to Tokyo.⁸⁵ 'Benny' Decker worked behind the scenes beforehand to try to get the Marine Corps' commandant to persuade the chief of naval operations to commit to permanently stationing a fleet marine force at Yokosuka. While he failed in that attempt, he did get maximum exposure, at home and in Japan, for the chiefs' visit to the naval base there.⁸⁶ The chiefs' visit produced a strong inter-service consensus on the need to retain the Yokosuka base, and other mainland Japanese bases, regardless of what might eventually be built on Okinawa.⁸⁷ A spate of newspaper editorials followed that echoed that conclusion: bases in Japan, including Yokosuka, must be retained as part of a systematic projection of American power to shores of East Asia.⁸⁸ Little wonder, then, that Secretary of State Dean Acheson decided in April 1950 to let the Pentagon define what America's specific security requirements in Japan in any peace settlement must be.⁸⁹

That decision, and his acceptance of John Foster Dulles as a special counselor with responsibility for a Japanese peace treaty, set the stage for two American official missions to Tokyo in June 1950. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, accompanied by JCS Chairman Omar Bradley, in effect ratified the decision about bases in Japan that the chiefs and the defense secretary had already made. The two men visited Yokosuka, where Rear Admiral Decker gave them a tour and a briefing that emphasized, for the parsimonious Johnson, the cost-effectiveness of base operations under his command.⁹⁰ John Foster Dulles, who rejected neutrality for Japan and recognized that accepting what the chiefs wanted was an essential precondition for negotiating a treaty, helped nudge General MacArthur toward a more expansive version of the Joint Chiefs' position: all of Japan, not just Okinawa or Yokosuka or some other specific point, must be regarded as a base for American forces until, in the words of the Potsdam Declaration, 'irresponsible militarism' was driven from the world. MacArthur, in turn, made clear his strong conviction that a peace treaty should be concluded as soon as possible.⁹¹

That meeting of the minds set the stage for what became Washington's definitive statement of American policy regarding the bases, including Yokosuka, in Japan. As Dulles prepared to begin in earnest negotiations looking toward a peace treaty, the secretaries of state and defense agreed upon, and President Truman concurred in, a statement on American security requirements in a Japanese peace treaty. That treaty 'must give the United States the right to maintain armed forces in Japan, wherever, for so long, and to such extent as it deems necessary' as well as exclusive control over Okinawa. Details regarding the relationship of American forces on bases in Japan to the government in Tokyo, cost-sharing, and other administrative matters were to be the subject of a Japanese-American 'supplementary bilateral agreement' that would come into effect at the same time as the peace treaty.⁹²

That agreement of September 8, 1950, was reached as American and United Nations forces were preparing to land at Inchon and restore Seoul to the control of the government of South Korea. But the essential consensus within the American government on retaining Yokosuka and other bases in Japan, was defined, as the foregoing has shown, well in advance of the outbreak of war in Korea. Rear Admiral Decker contributed to it by keeping the 'Yokosuka option' before decision-makers as

much as he could. In the last analysis, however, Washington policy-makers agreed to retain the base for a combination of strategic, bureaucratic political, and financial reasons that were far more complex than anything even he could have imagined. In so doing, they set the stage for the Japanese Government, in the person of Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, to decide whether or not to accept a potentially permanent American naval (and military) presence in his country.

By the time that President Truman decided that retention of American bases in Japan, including Yokosuka, must be an essential condition of any peace settlement, Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, the man who more than any other shaped Japan's foreign policy, had come to the same conclusion. Between September 1950, when Truman made that decision, and late January 1951, when John Foster Dulles came to Tokyo to implement it through 'consultations' with the Japanese, Yoshida shaped a consensus within his government and among Japanese conservatives in favor of accepting the continued presence of American bases. His decisions and actions go far in explaining why retention of the bases, a concept which grated against nationalism on the Right and on the Left, did not prove a contentious issue in the talks with Dulles that shaped the basic security features of the Japanese peace settlement.

How and why did Yoshida come to a decision in favor of allowing the continuation of a foreign military and naval presence after conclusion of a peace treaty? While a full answer to that question lies beyond the scope of this essay, several important points about his choices are pertinent here. The first is how early Yoshida grasped base continuation as the preferred solution to Japan's post-Article 9 security dilemma. He certainly knew and approved of Foreign Minister Ashida Hitoshi's September 1947 suggestion to retiring Eighth Army commander General Robert L. Eichelberger and Australian Foreign Minister Herbert V. Evatt that the United States and Japan might, as part of a peace settlement, agree that American forces remain in Japan, on 'off-shore islands', after its conclusion.⁹³ As early as May 1949, he expressed the thought that an 'overall peace,' including the Soviet Union and other communist states, an arrangement favored by intellectuals and his opponents on the Left, was impractical. Nine months later, he told a junior American diplomat that Japan would have to rely on America for its post-peace treaty security and let his friend, former foreign minister and

ambassador to the United States, Admiral Nomura Kichisaburo know of his openness to base retention.⁹⁴

Those remarks proved a prelude to Yoshida's May 1950 dispatch of Finance Minister Ikeda Hayato, his sometime advisor Shirasu Jiro, and financial expert Miyazawa Kiichi to Washington. Their ostensible purpose was to discuss economic recovery plans with the Detroit banker turned financial counsellor, Joseph E. Dodge. In fact they hinted at Japan's growing desire for American protection, telling Dodge that if Washington hesitated to ask for retention of its bases and forces, the Japanese government would 'try to find a way to offer' conditions that would allow such. This offer, which was passed on to State Department officials and General MacArthur, was made well in advance of the outbreak of the Korean War.⁹⁵

The second point, one that bears repeating, is Yoshida's awareness of the Yokosuka option. While it would be wrong to suggest that that consciousness caused him to make the choice he did, it seems clear that he opted for base retention knowing that the Americans were giving serious consideration to the idea. In the summer of 1947, after the failure of General MacArthur's call for an early peace treaty but before Foreign Minister Ashida gave his memorandum to Eichelberger and Evatt, two articles on retention of Yokosuka appeared on the news wires. In the first, dated June 22, 'Benny Decker' suggested that the United States might keep it as a 'Guantanamo of the Orient', using funds from reparations to pay for its long-term lease. In the second, on July 17, he stressed the value of Yokosuka's facilities and workers and suggested that a separate Japanese-American agreement, concluded after a peace treaty, could guarantee their continued use to the United States.⁹⁶ Yoshida approached Ikeda about going to Washington late in February 1950, scarcely three weeks after the Joint Chiefs of Staff had made their highly publicized tour of Yokosuka and other bases in Japan. By the time Ikeda met Dodge, Secretary of State Dean Acheson had already conceded to the chiefs the definition of what American base requirements in a peace settlement would be.⁹⁷

But Yoshida, like all Japanese leaders, had to build consensus in favor of allowing American forces to remain in Japan after a peace treaty. During the fall of 1950, in

anticipation of John Foster Dulles's return to Tokyo for specific talks on the terms of a peace settlement, he had the Foreign Ministry and former military and naval leaders, in consultation with senior business leaders and opinion makers, prepare and debate four alternative plans for post-peace treaty security. On October 5, 1950, the head of the Foreign Ministry's Treaty Bureau presented Plan A to Yoshida. It conceded that foreign troops might remain in post-treaty Japan in accordance with a bilateral security agreement, provided such respected the feelings of the Japanese people and the spirit of the United Nations. That same day Yoshida met with his non-military 'brain trust'. While some of its members lofted the idea of a regional defense organization, Yoshida insisted that policy must be determined in terms of what was best for Japan.

That prompted him to order the Foreign Ministry to prepare Plan B. It insisted that a separate security arrangement with the United States must avoid creating problems in terms of both Article 9 and relations with the Soviet Union. It drew upon NATO and the US-Philippine bases agreement for specific terms and argued that they must be consistent with Article 51 – which premised collective efforts for self-defense – of the UN Charter.⁹⁸

Yoshida then had the Foreign Ministry prepare a third plan, C, which rested on a radically different set of premises. Rather than depend on the United States for its security, Japan (and Korea) would become the center of a demilitarized zone. That idea prompted what Yoshida most probably wanted – sharp objections from his informal group of military and naval advisors. Those men were more concerned about the Americans' leaving Japan in the event of a major military challenge in Europe than about reactions of the Japanese public or the Soviet Union to their remaining. Further discussions of a refined zone of disarmament plan, one which conceptually amounted to an updated version of the Washington Naval Arms Limitation and Pacific Island non-fortification agreements of 1921-1922, resulted in consensus that such was simply too idealistic and impractical while war raged in Korea.⁹⁹

Finally, a fourth position, Plan D, which tried to amalgamate acceptance of limited rearmament with continuation of US forces' presence in Japan, was drafted by the Foreign Ministry and debated by Yoshida's unofficial advisors during the third week of

January 1951. It stressed 'equal partnership' in defense matters with the United States, contemplated building a 150,000 man armed force, and, at Yoshida's insistence, excised any lingering traces of regional disarmament.¹⁰⁰ Thus, well before Dulles arrived and made clear specific American desires for peace and security treaties, Yoshida had rejected others' lingering desires for a return to something like the old Washington Conference Pacific Asian maritime order and defined the essentials of a new security policy that premised American military and naval presence as the keystone of Japan's post-treaty security policy.

In retrospect, three points about the Dulles-Yoshida conversations of January-February 1951 stand out. First, the Japanese position was not based simply upon recognition of the need to bow before American *force majeure*, but on careful consideration of alternatives and voluntary choice before the 'consultations' began. Second, what Washington saw as necessary – temporary retention of control of Okinawa, early Japanese rearmament, and continuation of American military and naval presence, was far greater than anything 'Benny' Decker or Japanese Foreign Ministry officials earlier had imagined. Third, there was a marked contrast between the way in which both sides dealt with base retention and their mode of dealing with the Okinawa and rearmament issues. Dulles, at General MacArthur's suggestion, scotched any discussion of the former, but persistent debate between the negotiators and on the Japanese side, continued over the latter.¹⁰¹ But both Yoshida and Dulles found it possible to accept, virtually without discussion, what had once seemed unthinkable – the continued presence of American forces in post-treaty Japan. By the time the Americans left Tokyo, the two sides had agreed on the essentials of what would become the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and the administrative agreement governing details of its implementation.¹⁰²

The immediate explanation for that cooperation was, of course, the war raging on the Korean peninsula. That conflict made obvious America's need for a forward naval and military presence in Japan; and it created a collaboration between Americans and Japanese working in and around those bases far greater, more intense, and more mutually profitable than anything 'Benny' Decker or the Japanese he invited to the Yokosuka base could have imagined earlier.¹⁰³ It was also true, in narrow negotiating

terms, that Yoshida could not have 'played the bases card'. He could not have pressed the Americans for concessions on other issues in return for acceptance of bases because he had already made clear to Washington how much Japan desired U.S. forces to stay after a peace treaty.¹⁰⁴ But in retrospect a much broader reason for the ease with which Dulles and Yoshida agreed on retention of bases is clear: the cooperative spirit and peaceful civil-naval relations that emerged in Yokosuka (and elsewhere) demonstrated that Japanese and Americans could work together to preserve the security of both countries. The negotiators who went on to refine the terms of that accord and its accompanying administrative agreement governing the status of American forces in Japan were not dealing with legal or diplomatic abstractions, but with practical, working realities.¹⁰⁵ That, it may be said, was the U.S. Navy's greatest contribution to the peace-making process.

V. Conclusion

What, then, does the story of how the United States Navy came to acquire the Yokosuka base reveal about the larger peace making process that culminated in the treaties signed at San Francisco?

The first and perhaps most important point to be made in response to that question is that the peace making process began long before diplomats and politicians put their hand to the wheel. It started with individual choices rather than governmental decisions. The first and most essential of those choices was for Japanese and Americans to regard one another as individual human beings rather than as abstract enemies. Those choices began to be made at Yokosuka in August 1945, blossoming from the individual to the community level, so that by 1949 the city was a working example of the kind of peace that could be achieved.

The Yokosuka story also makes it clear that the U.S. Navy, in Japan and in Washington as well, took the lead in moving others toward conclusion of a peace settlement that would allow it to remain at Yokosuka. 'Benny' Decker outlined the essentials of what the Japan-United States security relationship would be for Governor Uchiyama in August 1946, nearly a year before Douglas MacArthur issued his famous – and ineffective – call for an early peace treaty. He acted in such a way that neither his naval superiors nor his

Japanese hosts had any doubts about his expectation that the Navy would long remain. By keeping the Yokosuka option before those superiors at a time when Washington politics and other, seemingly more important global strategic concerns pressed upon them, he provided vital support for their insistence that there could be no peace treaty without an American naval presence in Japan. By welcoming Japanese officials to the base, Decker provided them with a practical understanding of what post-peace treaty reliance upon American security assistance might be.

Third, the evidence presented in this essay suggests very clearly that something other than the raw logic of great power politics shaped the security terms of the treaties signed at San Francisco. Decker's – and the Navy's – desires were checked and conditioned by bureaucratic politics and budget considerations as much as they were shaped by the events of the early Cold War years. Similarly, in Japan even Yoshida Shigeru, despite his 'one man' style of political leadership, moved cautiously toward formal acceptance of the American naval presence that he himself had seen at Yokosuka. Mindful of a nationalism that infected both his opponents on the Left and Right alike, he let Foreign Ministry officials and members of his 'brain groups' work through security alternatives in a way that led them to his original conclusion: continued American naval (and military) presence was the least costly and most practical means for preserving Japan's post-peace treaty security. Thus Yokosuka's continuation as an American naval base was as much a Japanese as an American policy decision.

It also seems quite clear that Tokyo and Washington decided to make retention of an American naval presence in Japan a key element of the San Francisco settlement before the outbreak of the Korean War. That conflict provided, in a sense, a convenient fig-leaf for both governments to cover decisions taken before it began. The war also provided, for any lingering doubters of the value of an American naval presence in Japan, clear evidence of its operational and economic importance. The United States and its United Nations allies could not have fought the Korean War without bases in Japan. Japan would not have achieved economic stability and prosperity as rapidly as it did without American 'special purchases'. The Japanese-American economic interdependence that manifested itself in Japanese production of trucks for the American military in the Oppama section of Yokosuka during the Korean War had its

origins in sailors' and marines' purchases of souvenirs in the city nearly five years earlier.¹⁰⁶

Finally, the Yokosuka story suggests one other important point about the San Francisco settlement. It was not something artificial, imposed by one side – America, Britain, and the other victors – upon the vanquished – Japan. It was a manifestation of an organic, symbiotic political, strategic, and economic bilateral relationship that had developed over the preceding six years. It did constitute a new Pacific/Asian maritime order, one marked by American naval pre-eminence tempered by dependence upon the cooperation of allies like Japan along the Asian littoral. That order and the presence of the United States Navy in Japan continue to this day. That both have endured so for so many decades, long after the circumstances of the early Cold War era in which they were born have vanished, attests, in my view, to the wisdom of those who shaped the peace and security treaties signed at San Francisco fifty years ago.

Endnotes

¹ John Dower, *War without Mercy* (New York: Pantheon, 1986) remains the best analysis of Japanese and American wartime images of one another.

² Yokosuka hyakunen shi hensan iinkai, ed., *Yokosuka hyakunen shi [A Centennial History of Yokosuka]* (Yokosuka: Yokosuka shi, 1965), 359. The population had dropped by nearly a third during the last year of the war.

³ Colonel Fred D. Beans oral history, March 11, 1959, Annapolis, Maryland; Colonel Orville Bergren oral history, January 15, 1959, Washington, D.C., box 10, U.S. Marine Corps oral history collection, Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

⁴ Charles R. Smith, *Securing the Surrender: Marines in the Occupation of Japan* (Washington, D.C.: Marine Corps Historical Center, 1997) 6-7; Betty Carney Taussig, *A Warrior for Freedom* (Manhattan, Kansas: Sunflower Press, 1995), 129. Ms. Taussig is the daughter of Admiral Robert B. 'Mick' Carney, chief of staff to Admiral William F. 'Bull' Halsey, commander of the invasion fleet.

⁵ Tezuka Goro, *Senryo ka no Yokosuka [Yokosuka under Occupation]* (Yokosuka: Privately printed, 1993), 18.

⁶ Taussig, 139; Dingman interview with Takemiya Takeji (Imperial Japanese Navy interpreter) interview, June 7, 1999, Yokosuka, Japan.

⁷ Tezuka, 16-19, 22, 35.

⁸ Vice Admiral Philip A. Beshany United States Naval Institute oral history, 148, Special Collections Department, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

⁹ Major James M. Jefferson, Jr. oral history, January 12, 1959, box 79, U.S. Marine Corps oral history collection, Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

¹⁰ James H. Durbin to parents, September 7, 1945, James H. Durbin papers, Japanese Language School collection, Norlin Library, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

¹¹ Hart H. Spiegel, *The War Years 1942-1946 and Better Days*, mss. memoir, in possession of Hart H. Spiegel, San Francisco, California; Dingman and Pedro Loureiro interview with Hart H. Spiegel, September 22, 2000, San Francisco, California. Lt. Spiegel was the Japanese language officer attached to the 29th battalion, 4th marines at the time of the invasion.

¹² James H. Durbin to parents, September 7, 1945, James H. Durbin papers, Navy Japanese Language School collection, Norlin Library, University of Colorado, Boulder.

¹³ Brigadier General Fred D. Beans oral history, March 11, 1959, Annapolis, Maryland, box 10, U.S. Marine Corps oral history collection, Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard.

¹⁴ William W. Burd to Roger Pineau, May 12, 1980, Roger Pineau papers, Navy Japanese Language School Collection. Burd was the interpreter for Admirals Nimitz and Halsey when Rear Admiral Badger showed them around the Yokosuka Naval Base.

¹⁵ Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to Mrs. Nimitz, September 3, 1945, Chester William Nimitz collection 1989, Special Collections, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

¹⁶ Benton Weaver and Edwina Naylor Decker, *Return of the Black Ships* [New York: Vantage Press, 1978], vi.

¹⁷ Henry F. May, 'MacArthur Era, Year One', *Harpers* 192 (March 1946), 267. May was a U. S. Navy Japanese language officer assigned to the Naval Technical Mission, Japan.

¹⁸ Decker and Decker, *Return of the Black Ships* (New York: Vantage Press, 1978), vi; James H. Durbin to parents, October 29, 1945.

¹⁹ *Guide to Japan* (CINCPAC-CINCPOA Bulletin No. 209-45) 1 September 1945, Japanese Sources collection, box 137, Classified Operational Archives, Naval Historical Center, Washington, D.C.

²⁰ May, 267.

²¹ Spiegel, 106.

²² Fred D. Beans 1959 oral history, Marine Corps Historical Center.

²³ May, 271; Jefferson oral history.

²⁴ Durbin to parents, September 5, 25, November 13, December 16, 1945; February 26, 1946.

²⁵ Durbin to parents, October 4, 29, 1945; January 2, 1946.

²⁶ Durbin to parents, December 2, 1945.

²⁷ Robert Eldridge and Kusunoki Ayako, 'To Base or Not to Base? Yoshida Shigeru, the 1950 Ikeda Mission, and Post-Treaty Japanese Security Conceptions', *Kobe University Law Review*, # 33 (1999), 102-103.

²⁸ For a detailed account of this episode, see my 'Farewell to Friendship: the USS *Astoria's* Visit to Japan', *Diplomatic History* 10 (Spring 1986), 121-139.

²⁹ Benton Weaver Decker class of 1920 biography, Special Collections, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy. Decker served on the USS *South Dakota* at the beginning of the war and commanded the USS *Maryland* at its end.

³⁰ Decker and Decker, 5.

³¹ *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 422.

³² Decker and Decker, 49.

³³ Decker and Decker, 18, 87-103; 204-205.

³⁴ 'Navy Life in Japan', *All Hands*, # 368 (October 1947), 6-7.

³⁵ Interview with Benton W. and Edwina Naylor Decker, San Diego, California, August 25, 1979.

³⁶ Decker 1920 class biography, Special Collections, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy; Higgins, 123-125.

³⁷ Priority projects listed in Commander Wallace L. Higgins notebook, Wallace L. Higgins papers in possession of Raymond A. Higgins, Phoenix, Arizona.

³⁸ *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 206; Uchiyama nikki, July 2, August 30, 1946, 25, 35.

³⁹ 'A New Concept of Things in Yokosuka', *Nippon Times Magazine*, September 28, 1946. I am indebted to James Zobel, archivist at the MacArthur Memorial, Norfolk, Virginia, for calling my attention to this article; *Uchiyama nikki*, May 13, 1946, 13; Decker and Decker, 68-74.

⁴⁰ *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 423.

⁴¹ Decker and Decker, 77-84, 165, 169-170; *Uchiyama nikki*, July 2, 1946, 25.

⁴² Higgins and Decker had been classmates at the U.S. Naval Academy, but Higgins had left before graduating to marry. The future Edwina Decker had been a bridesmaid at the wedding. Raymond A. Higgins, *From Hiroshima with Love* (Central Point, Oregon: Hellgate Press, 1997), 103-104; W. H. Standley first endorsement, April 16, to Wallace L. Higgins to Secretary of the Navy, April 14, 1919, in Wallace L. Higgins midshipman records, Special Collections, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy.

⁴³ Higgins, 44, 51-54, 62, 66.

⁴⁴ Decker and Decker, 10-14.

⁴⁵ Takemiya Takeji interview, Yokosuka, June 7, 1999. The ownership of the house at 3-52 Otsu remains unclear. Mr. Takemiya recalled that it originally belonged to the Sumitomo Company; but Higgins, 127 identified it as the former home of a senior Yokosuka shipyard official.

⁴⁶ Takemiya interview; Higgins, 130.

⁴⁷ Higgins, 128-135; Higgins went so far as to prepare, with the help of his wife-to-be, a bilingual song book for use at his Otsu entertainments. See Wallace L. Higgins papers.

⁴⁸ Amakawa Akira, 'Fuken kara mita senryo kaikaku' [The Occupation Reforms as Seen from the Prefectures and Special Urban Districts], in Watanabe Akio, ed., *Sengo Nihon no keisei [The Structure of Postwar Japan]* (Tokyo: Gakujitsu shikyokai, 1996), 40-41.

⁴⁹ *Uchiyama nikki*, May 13, June 10, July 2, October 23, December 16, 1936; March 11, 1947, 13, 25, 35, 40, 43, 56.

⁵⁰ James H. Durbin to parents, December 29, 1945, Durbin papers; *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 422-423.

-
- ⁵¹ Takemiya Takeji interview, June 7, 1999, Yokosuka.
- ⁵² *Uchiyama nikki*, April 13, 1947, 57; *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 366-367.
- ⁵³ Tetzuka, 38-39; Decker and Decker, 297-300. Decker created a hornets' nest of labor protest when in 1947, he tried to require every base worker to sign a statement avowing that he or she was not a communist.
- ⁵⁴ Population Report, 1 August 1948, Field Liaison and Reports Section, Base Maintenance Division (Op 441H), Box 75, Base Maintenance Files, Classified Operational Archives, Naval Historical Center, Washington, D.C.
- ⁵⁵ *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 421, 424.
- ⁵⁶ Tezuka, 59.
- ⁵⁷ Decker and Decker, 260, 320-321.
- ⁵⁸ *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 369, 424, 427-428.
- ⁵⁹ Decker and Decker, 138-140.
- ⁶⁰ Tezuka, 44.
- ⁶¹ Headquarters Tokyo-Kanagawa Military Government District Public Health and Welfare Activities Section, QPH-01, to Dr. Anna R. Manitoff, Annex b-1 to Monthly Military Government Activities Report for 1-31 December 1947, folder 5, box 2813, locator UD 1516, Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP) Civil Affairs Section papers, Record Group 331, U.S. national Archives; Decker and Decker 17.
- ⁶² Tezuka, 40-41; *Yokosuka hyakunen shi*, 429. It should be noted, however, that 'decent' women subsequently stopped visiting the hospital that housed this clinic.
- ⁶³ Decker and Decker, 123, 130-131, 158, 177-178, 183-184, 2118, 271-272; Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 164-165.
- ⁶⁴ Decker and Decker, 137, 142, , 145, 168, 179-183, 242-243, 289, 382.
- ⁶⁵ *Uchiyama nikki*, August 20, 1946, 35.
- ⁶⁶ Decker and Decker, 163-165, 167-168, 173, 288, 294, 303.
- ⁶⁷ Decker and Decker, 303, 312, 334-335, 347-348. Decker's possible mission to Okinawa was cancelled at the last minute, in his view, because in the aftermath of a *Time* magazine article sharply criticizing SCAP's administration there, senior U.S. Army

officers did not want to appear to be beholden to a Navy man for cleaning up the mess they had created.

⁶⁸ Steven T. Ross, 'Chester William Nimitz 15 December 1945 – 15 December 1947', in Robert William Love, Jr., ed., *The Chiefs of Naval Operations* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1980), 189; Ronald H. Spector, *At War at Sea: Sailors and Naval Combat in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Viking, 2001), 316-318.

⁶⁹ Taussig, 161. Vice Admiral Robert B. 'Mick' Carney said that the budget struggles of this era were the toughest fights he was ever in – 'with all due respect to the Japs'.

⁷⁰ Minutes of meeting of Joint staff planners, August 7, 1947, CCS 3444 JSPC (9-26-46) JWPC 476/1 June 16, 1947, JWPC 476/2, August 29, 1947; JSPC 496/2-4 December 15, 1947 – February 11, 1948, CCS 381 (USSR (3-2-46)), sections 4, 6,8-10, Joint Chiefs of Staff papers, RG 218, United States National Archives. For a fuller description of joint war planning efforts, see my 'Strategic Planning the Policy process: American Plans for War in East Asia, 1945-1950', *U.S. Naval War College Review* 32 (November-December 1979), 4-21.

⁷¹ Memorandum for Generals Schuyler and Kissner, August 5, 1947, ABC 323.3 Japan (8-5-47), Records of the Operations Section, Army General Staff, RG 165; Joint Staff planners' meeting August 7, 1947, CCS 334, JSPC (9-25-46), RG 218, United States National Archives.

⁷² E.T. Woolridge to Hugh Borton, August 19 draft, August 25, 1947; Woolridge to Secretary of the Navy, August 21, 1947, file A14/e37, Chief of Naval Operations to Commander Naval Forces, Far East, October 24, 1947, file SC a-1-2/ef 37, Op 61 files, Classified Operational Archives, Naval Historical Center.

⁷³ Historical Office, Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1947*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972), 540-541. This source will hereinafter be cited as *FRUS*, with appropriate date, volume, and pagination data.

⁷⁴ Louis Denfeld to George F. Kennan and C.V.R. Schuyler, February 20, 1948, box 19, Army Chief of Staff papers, Record Group 319, National Archives; *FRUS, 1948, 1: part 2: 523-526, 6: 692, 701, 858-859*. PPS 23, February 24, 1948 demonstrates that Kennan had gone to Japan strongly favoring development of Okinawa as the major American base in the Western Pacific.

⁷⁵ *FRUS, 1948, 6:* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1974), 859.

⁷⁶ Dean G. Acheson, *Present at the Creation* (New York: Norton, 1969), 37-40; Bishop memorandum, May 19, 1949, in Webb to Souers, May 29, 1949, 740.0011 pw (peace) /5-2249, Department of State decimal file, Record Group 59, U.S. National Archives.

⁷⁷ NSC 49, June 15, 1949, in *FRUS, 1949 7, part 2:* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976), 774-777.

⁷⁸ *FRUS, 1948, 6: 706*; Royall to Forrestal, May 18, 1948 and Plans and Operations Military Survey 73265, April 19, 1948, tab 106, Op 61 files. The air force was particularly interested in retaining Misawa, site of the first runways capable of handling jet aircraft in Japan. See Lieutenant General Ennis C. Whitehead to Hoyt S. Vandenberg, February 21, 1949, box 56, Hoyt S. Vandenberg papers, Library of Congress; Tracy S. Voorhees, 'After Twenty-five Years', 22-26, and 'Memorandum on Lengthening of Airfields in Japan', October 15, 1950, Tab C, Tracy S. Voorhees papers, Rutgers University Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

⁷⁹ Decker and Decker, Yokosuka Story, 628-629, box 4, Benton Weaver Decker papers, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. Yokosuka Story is the original draft of the Deckers' *Return of the Black Ships*.

⁸⁰ Fearey memorandum, June 25, 1949, 840.00/6-3049, RG 59; Fearey to Allison, October 14, 1949, 740.0011pw (peace) /10-1449; draft treaty, October 13, 1949, 740.0011pw (peace) /10-1349, RG 59.

⁸¹ Sebald to Butterworth, December 9, 1949, in Fearey 'Black Book' declassified under Freedom of Information Act request 5-b-21, 1976.

⁸² *New York Times*, February 15, August 6, November 17, 1949; Special Report on American Public Opinion: Public Opinion on Japan and Korea 1945-1954, Nos. 38, 107, 115, March 8, September 23, November 18, 1949, Office of Public Opinion Studies, Department of State 'Schuyler Foster files', memorandum of Graves-Butterworth conversation, February 11, 1949, 740.00119 control (Japan) /2-1149, RG 59; *FRUS, 1949, 7, part 2: 648-649*.

⁸³ Richard B. Finn, *Winners in Peace: MacArthur, Yoshida, and Postwar Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) 246-247.

⁸⁴ JCS 1380/77 December 10, 1949, P & O 091 Japan/TS section 1, case 1, RG 319; *FRUS, 1949, 7, part 2: 992-923*; JCS 1630/14, December 8, 1949, CCS 381 (2-18-46), section 2, RG 218.

⁸⁵ Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 220-222.

⁸⁶ Decker and Decker, 346-357, 359-361.

⁸⁷ Memorandum: Sherman and Collins Views on Far East, February 27, 1950, Japan Peace Treaty file, record group 5, Douglas MacArthur papers, MacArthur Memorial, Norfolk, Virginia; *New York Times*, February 12, 14, 1950; 'Japan: Costly Base for U.S.', *U.S. News and World Report*, 27 (February 17, 1950), 26; *FRUS, 1950, 6:1177*.

⁸⁸ *New York Times* May 25, 27, June 3, 1950; Special Report on American Opinion: Public Opinion on Japan and Korea 1945-1954, Schuyler Foster files, RG 59.

⁸⁹ Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 556-561 and *FRUS*, 1950, 6:1109-1296 detail the State-Defense controversies and discussions that followed this decision.

⁹⁰ *FRUS*, 1950, 6: 1162-1163; Testimony before Senate Foreign Relations committee, Executive Session, January 26, 1950, box 146, *Yomiuri shimbun*, box 12, Louis Johnson papers, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia; Decker and Decker, 400-403.

⁹¹ *FRUS*, 1950, 6: 1213-1221, 1227-1229, 1242-1243. Scholarly opinions on MacArthur's role and decisions at this point vary greatly. Schaller 277-278 concludes that the general, in 'almost desperate desire' to get a peace treaty caved in to what Johnson and the Joint Chiefs desired. Finn, 254-256, portrays MacArthur as a more sophisticated go-between, trying to reduce frictions between the Pentagon and State Department that had held up any real progress toward an early peace treaty. MacArthur's authoritative biographer, D. Clayton James, portrays MacArthur as broker of an 'ingenious compromise' that enabled the peace negotiations to go forward. See D. Clayton James, *Years of MacArthur: Volume III: Triumph and Disaster, 1945-1964* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), 340-343.

⁹² *FRUS*, 1950, 6: 1293-1296.

⁹³ Shindo Eiichi and Shimokawabe Motoharu, eds., *Ashida Hitoshi nikki* [The Ashida Hitoshi Diary] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1986), 2:14; Finn, 250; Kusunoki Ayako, 'Sengo Nihon no anzen hoshō seisaku, 1949-1951: Yoshida Shigeru, Gaimusho, Burein grupu ni yoru keisei' [Postwar Japanese Security Policy, 1949-1951: Its Formation by Yoshida Shigeru, the Foreign Ministry and the 'Brain Group'] , *Kobe Hogaku zasshi* [Kobe Law Review] 50 (June 2000), 184.

⁹⁴ *FRUS*, 1950, 6: 1166-1167; Kusunoki, 181.

⁹⁵ Finn, 249-250; Eldridge and Kusunoki, 111-113.

⁹⁶ Decker and Decker, 178-179.

⁹⁷ Eldridge and Kusunoki, 99; *FRUS* 1950,6: 1178.

⁹⁸ Kusunoki, 200-205; Nishimura Kumao, *Nihon gaiko shi 27: San Furanshisuko kowa joyaku* [A Diplomatic History of Japan Volume 27: The San Francisco Peace Treaty] (Tokyo: Kajima kenkyu jo, 1971), 80-82.

⁹⁹ Kusunoki, 206-211; Nishimura, 82-83; Watanabe, 170-171.

¹⁰⁰ Kusunoki, 212-217; Nishimura, 83-85.

¹⁰¹ Finn, 272-281 summarizes these negotiations, which are detailed in *FRUS*, 1951, 6: 822-874.

¹⁰² *FRUS, 1951, 6*: 856-857, 875-880 provides the texts of these draft agreements.

¹⁰³ For a fuller discussion of the impact of the Korean War upon Japan, see my 'The Dagger and the Gift: The Impact of the Korean War on Japan', *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 2 Spring 1993), 29-55; Yokosuka, Honshu, Japan Brief History of Naval Activities, 10 September 1951, 22 September 1953, box 12, Base population report, 30 May 1953, box 75, Base Maintenance files, Classified Operational Archives, Naval Historical Center; and Yokosuka shi shi hensan iinkai [Editorial Committee for the History of Yokosuka City] *Yokosuka shi shi*, [A History of Yokosuka City] [Yokosuka: Yokosuka shi, 1988], 3:184 summarize the impact of the Korean War on the city and base of Yokosuka.

¹⁰⁴ Watanabe, 172-173.

¹⁰⁵ Finn, 299-300, 309-310 ably summarizes the final negotiations and drafting of the US-Japan Security Treaty and its implementing administrative agreement.

¹⁰⁶ Tezuka, 169-171.

YOSHIDA SHIGERU AND POLITICAL PARTIES' DIFFICULTIES OVER THE QUESTION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PEACE TREATY

Kenji Tozawa

Yoshida's Attitude towards Party Politics before the San Francisco Conference

It seems that Yoshida Shigeru understood the significance of party politics or democratic rule from his experience in Britain as a diplomat, but his political behaviour was far removed from democracy before the Second World War, partly because democracy could hardly be seen in those days. But whether he liked it or not, Yoshida had to get involved in party politics after accepting the position of a party leader; and before the San Francisco Peace Treaty he succeeded in introducing party politics in Japan, though the final responsibility was taken by GHQ.*

In Japan especially before the Second World War many politicians sought power without principles. Their concern was mainly to obtain office. Office brought them money. As a result there were many changes of party-names and changes of politicians' affiliation. There were political parties; and changes of government occurred often. But there was no democratic control, and military power got involved with politics. Party politics did not work.

After the Second World War the JCP revived, and the JSP became strong. So the differences of principles between parties became explicit. The JLP and the DP were conservative, the JCP and the JSP were radical. The PCP was centre right. While the JLP was right wing and the JCP was left, three parties, the DP, the JSP, and the PCP were central. It seemed that the condition of party politics was totally changed.

[* Abbreviations are explained on pages 47 and 48.]

Yoshida started his career as a party politician by accepting the position of General Secretary (sōmu-kyokuchō) of the Japanese Liberal Party (nihon jiyūtō) in May 1946, [later becoming President at the General Meeting (tō taikai) in August.] He was appointed Prime Minister by the Showa Emperor based on the Meiji Constitution of Japan in May of the same year after holding office as Foreign Minister for 7 months.¹

On the process of drafting the Constitution of Japan, GHQ suggested that another general election should be held. Yoshida government decided to hold it on 25 April 1947. This time Yoshida had to be elected to the Diet. Yoshida had been inaugurated as Prime Minister under the practices of the old regime. This was the first time Yoshida had been faced with a personal election campaign based on party politics.

Yoshida was elected, but his party lost in this election. The JSP became the largest party with 143 seats, and established a coalition government with the DP and the PCP.² In fact Yoshida was asked to join the government, but he insisted that party politics had to be conducted by parties that profess similar policies. So he refused to join the JSP-led coalition government. What Yoshida tried to do was to build up a formidable opposition in a political party system.

Between April 1947 and October 1948 the JSP, the DP, and the PCP kept power under two governments. Katayama Tetsu of the JSP formed the government from 1 June 1947 to 10 February 1948, and Ashida Hitoshi of the DP from 10 March to 7 October 1948. One can see the difficulties of these governments easily. They were a mixture of right wing and left wing opinion. Eventually the coalition governments did not last long because of inner discord, and after their collapse the LP naturally came back to power in October 1948. When Ashida, President of the DP, was elected prime minister in March, Shidehara and his group left the DP and joined the LP. Absorbing 36 MPs the LP changed its name to the DLP (minshu jiyūtō). As the LP government

was still a hung parliament, Yoshida held a general election in order to strengthen the party on 23 January 1949, and established political stability by gaining a safe majority (264 out of 466 seats). As Table 2 shows, judging from the figures a two-party system between the LP and the JSP appeared possible in the 1950s.

Political Parties' Difficulties over the San Francisco Peace Treaty

As a defeated country Japan could not have many choices for the peace conference. But there were still many things to consider. The Japanese government had started to make up a draft of a peace treaty in 1946; and as part of it 'the Present Economic Situation', and 'the Present Political Situation', and 'the Territory Problem' were written with great effort. Since the DS (Diplomatic Section of SCAP) informally received these documents in 1948, Yoshida government added more documents on the Japanese population problem, war damages, Japanese standard of living, the reparation question, shipping, fishing and other questions till 1950.

It seems that three choices had to be made among the problems with which the Japanese government was faced before the peace conference. Firstly, whether Japan should negotiate with all the allies (*zenmen kōwa*) or with each country (*tandoku kōwa*) was one of the biggest issues. It should be noted that trade with China was a major issue when negotiation with all the allies was under consideration. Secondly, whether Japan should introduce rearmament after independence or observe disarmed neutrality or introduce some other security policy was a really serious concern. And thirdly, whether the reform of the Constitution of Japan was necessary or not was also a great issue.

To Yoshida's mind there was really no possibility of negotiation with all the allies since the confrontation between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union was becoming serious and Mao Ze-dong's Chinese Communist Party had participated in the Korean War

fighting against the U.S.-led UN Forces. But many Japanese intellectuals embraced quite different ideas from Yoshida's. The Talking Group on Peace Question (heiwa mondai konwakai) consisting of famous scholars issued statements several times. They insisted that the negotiation should be with all the allies, and made the two points that Japan would be faced with jeopardy in the future without a treaty with the Soviet Union and the PRC; and that Japan would have to sacrifice her trade with the continent through making a treaty with the ROC. Very few scholars were for Yoshida's choice. But in reality negotiation with all the allies together was impossible. Even the statement of the Talking Group on 15 January 1950 described its conclusion as follows:

'As for the Peace Talks, if we Japanese can express our hopes, there is no course but making peace with all the allies'.³

The Yoshida DLP Government recognized this as a mere dream or an expression of Japanese people's wish, and never changed its policy. Yoshida negotiated with the U.S.A. as there was no alternative, and as a security policy he rejected both rearmament and disarmed neutrality, and introduced no substantial rearmament with the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, though he agreed to build up the SDF (jieitai) in order to meet part of the request of John Foster Dulles, the envoy of the US Secretary of State. As for the Constitution of Japan Yoshida believed that it should not be changed easily unless the demand for reform became overwhelming. He explained these policies in his memoirs. First he made clear his policy on how to proceed with the peace negotiations.

'The idea of peace with all the allies was just a delusion of those who did not know the reality of international relations, therefore it was out of question. I believe that those who knew the political situation even a bit agreed with each other that there was no other way of conducting the peace talks except that of the San Francisco Conference.'⁴

Let us hear the reasons for a non-rearmament policy.

'The question of rearmament was one of the biggest issues while I was in office, especially in the latter years I myself never sought rearmament, rather disagreed with it. It will be a great burden for any country to try to be equal to the U.S.A. Even if we spend such a vast expense on armament as America, it is doubtful whether we can achieve highly modern armaments to that extent. Besides, a defeated country like Japan never can expect to have such large-scale rearmament. This is my first reason for being against rearmament. Secondly, in terms of people's thinking the psychological foundation for rearmament has been lost totally. Thirdly, the great misery and cruelty still haunt the people who went to war without reason.⁵ To make my own position crystal-clear on this point, I declared in my policy speech delivered at the opening of the fifteenth session of the Diet, following the formation of my fourth Cabinet in October 1952, that Japan should naturally reinforce its defensive power as the nation's economy recovered, but that the time had not yet arrived, by any means, to consider rearmament. To subsequent questions I replied that, if rearmament was to be undertaken, it would have to be achieved with the acquiescence of the Japanese people.'⁶

As for the Constitution of Japan, Yoshida estimated the ideal character highly, saying that

'there are those also who lay emphasis on the fact that the Constitution was framed immediately after a disastrous war and when the country was under the military Occupation of foreign Powers. There exists little reason for being sensitive to the circumstances in which Japan's present Constitution was drawn up. It is far more important to consider whether or not that document actually operates to the advantage of the Japanese people.'⁷

But it should be understood that Yoshida's original idea of a constitution was quite different from the present one. He accepted it as a compromise. Thus Yoshida adopted the broad interpretations of the Constitution.

'In regard to the position of our Emperor, for instance, he is defined as 'the symbol of the state and of the unity of the people', legally speaking, sovereign power has passed from the Emperor to the people. Whatever the vicissitudes of legal phraseology, the conception that we Japanese have of our Emperors

has never changed.⁸

While the Japanese government decided its policies with a safe majority, the JSP kept its policy similar to the Talking Group on Peace Question supporting the peace negotiations being opened with all the allies, disarmed neutrality depending upon the protection of the collective security of the United Nations, and the vindication of the Constitution of Japan. In fact the JSP was split into two wings by the discord over accepting the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty as Table 3 shows. The right wing supported the San Francisco Peace Treaty but not the Security Treaty. The left wing was against both treaties the same as the JCP.

The DP (after March 1950 the party's name was the PDP-kokumin minshutō) basically voted for two treaties. But many politicians of this party did not support Yoshida's security policy, which meant that Japan would not go for rearmament, and Japan would not build up war potential, and yet Japan would have SDF. As depicted above, Yoshida adopted a broad interpretation of the constitution, which was to be called later 'a reform of the constitution with reinterpretation (kaishaku kaiken)'.

Difficulties after the San Francisco Peace Treaty

After the Peace Treaty was signed, Yoshida had difficulties at the Diet where the treaty had to be ratified. The atmosphere became confrontational, and many questions were focused on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. Ashida Hitoshi, the former prime minister, debated the contradictions within the government's policy. According to Ashida, the Self Defense Forces would be unconstitutional because the Constitution did not allow Japan to hold any war potential, or if Japan could maintain the right of minimum self-defence, why did Japan not regain its military forces? But Yoshida never changed his view that Japan would not rearm but keep the SDF since Japan had a right of self-defence. Questioning was severe, but the party in power was

strong enough to pass the ratification bill same year.

After the ratification Yoshida had the most difficult problem on peace talks with China. On 10 December 1951 Dulles came to Japan with two Senators to press the Japanese government to enter into a treaty with the ROC. Yoshida had been told after the Dulles-Morrison Agreement in June 1951 that Japan was free to choose either the ROC or the PRC to make a peace treaty with. As Yoshida understood the situation of the Congress, he made a promise to enter a treaty with the ROC, but tried to keep the door open to the PRC, too. The Japan-China Peace Treaty (*nikka heiwa jōyaku*) was signed on 28 April 1952, the same day as the coming into effect of the San Francisco Peace Treaty. The opposition parties criticised this treaty, but again the Yoshida government could afford to turn down the opposition parties' complaints. Especially the JSP warned the government of the danger of loss of trade with the PRC. Though Yoshida knew the point, he denied the importance of trade with the PRC. If you look at Table 4, it is easy to understand that Yoshida was aware of the devastating situation of the continent at that time.

The real problems could be seen only inside the LP. But the true row inside the party was not related to a particular policy but a power struggle. Within the LP there were some politicians who believed in the necessity of maintaining the Self Defense Forces based on the reformed Constitution of Japan. Hatoyama, though he was still out of public office, and the politicians of his faction insisted on not amending part of the Constitution of Japan but reassessing it entirely. But what Hatoyama wanted was to make Yoshida return the premiership to him.

After the big job of signing the treaties and getting their ratification through the Diet, Yoshida never dissolved the Diet, nor returned power to Hatoyama, the former president of the LP, not to mention to the Opposition. Since the seats held by the

opposition parties were much less than the LP, there was no possibility for the opposition parties to gain political power. But Hatoyama's faction could cooperate with the DP, and if the coalition exceeded half of the seats, it was possible for it to change the government. Instead of giving a chance to the opposition, Yoshida struggled to keep political power.

One can point out that Yoshida's endeavour to retain power as long as possible could be seen in two fields at least. Yoshida tried to form coalitions with other political groups to make the LP bigger. In a sense Yoshida thoroughly knew the importance of the number of seats held in a democracy. In democracy it is natural that a political party tries to get as many votes as possible. Yoshida's party drew vast votes at every election, which was fine. But, apart from that, Yoshida always tried to pull the opposition parties down. In March 1948 the J LP absorbed Shidehara and his group from the DP and changed its name into the DLP. Further Yoshida's party annexed part of the DP (28 MPs) again and changed its name into the LP in March 1950. Finally Yoshida unsuccessfully tried to annex the PP (formerly the DP) in April 1953. As another case Yoshida did not put all possible efforts into lifting Hatoyama's purge. It is obvious that Yoshida wrote many letters to the SCAP begging to lift the purges. But Yoshida never wrote any letter about Hatoyama to SCAP. In June 1951 many war criminals came back to the political scene, and they were waiting for the next general election. But Hatoyama's name was not there. Only after knowing that Hatoyama had a stroke at his house in June did the announcement reached him in August. Yoshida wrote in his memoirs that he was surprised to know that Hatoyama was unwell when the purge-lift notice reached him, but since he had written a kind letter immediately after Hatoyama fell down in June, he should have been fully aware of the situation.⁹

Yoshida's solid beliefs and MacArthur as supreme power (saikō kenryoku)

Yoshida was surrounded with many difficulties outside and inside the party. It seems that there were two reasons to be able to break through all difficulties before the San Francisco Peace Treaty. One was his strong belief, which became the cornerstone of his party's policies. It was that Japan must follow the policy of anti-communism, of economic development with the first priority of retaining good relationships with the U.S.A. In addition he respected Japanese tradition and history, and hated drastic change and extreme instability. His choices over the San Francisco Peace Treaty can be explained from these beliefs.

The other reason why Yoshida could overcome political-social turbulence was that the ultimate power, SCAP/GHQ, cooperated with Yoshida when he desperately needed help. One can find those occasions easily. On 1 February the General Strike was planned by the JCP, the JSP, and the trade unions. It was a crucial moment to keep political stability. But the SCAP instruction was issued by Douglas MacArthur on 31 January and the strike was banned at the last moment. The Dodge budget was another example. It was the extreme austerity budget. It was actualised in April 1949, but eventually brought serious recession. In fact the national railway announced the displacement of 37,000 workers on 4 July, and 63,000 workers on 12 July. It was part of a plan for the 220,000 civil servant's displacement. President of National Corporation of Railway Shimoyama Sadanori disappeared the day following the displacement notice and was found dead on 6th. Other mysterious incidents followed, the Mitaka Incident in July, and the Matsukawa Incident in August. Social convulsion was conspicuous. Yoshida wrote several letters to SCAP and GS, expressing his own determination to pacify the riotous situation and asking for more information and the centralisation of police power.¹⁰ There was no doubt that Yoshida was zealous in stabilising the society. As Inoki Masamichi stressed, without Yoshida's solid determination it would not have been possible to reduce such a vast number of civil

servants. Also it would have been tremendously difficult to regain social stability without the back-up of the super power of GHQ.¹¹

After the San Francisco Peace Treaty political turbulence took place, but there was no super power of GHQ any longer. Immediately after the treaty came into effect on 28 April 1952, the labour movement organized a violent riot on May Day. One man was killed and about 1,000 people were arrested, and many casualties were hospitalised. It was called the Bloody May Day.

Looking back on politics after the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Yoshida was clearly losing his authority and yet he never thought of giving up political power. Hatoyama and his group still aimed for power within the LP, and since they realised Yoshida would never give a chance to anybody else to become Prime Minister as long as the LP kept its majority, they decided to split the LP and established a new party, the JDP, on 24 November 1954. 121 MPs belonged to the JDP, 185 remained in the LP. It was a final blow to Yoshida's government. In a sense Yoshida was kicked out of his party by the rest of faction leaders. Yoshida resigned on 7 December.

Conclusion

Yoshida did not want drastic changes in the Japanese regime. He wanted a so-called soft landing. He adopted neither rearmament nor unarmed neutrality. Instead he clearly chose non-rearmament, and yet gradually expanded the security coverage of the Self Defence Forces.

Yoshida wrote a letter to Dulles on 24 December 1951 promising to enter a peace treaty with the ROC not the PRC. This letter enabled the U.S. Congress to ratify the San Francisco Peace Treaty. But, because of this letter, Japan lost a chance to recognise the PRC and tie a peace treaty with it for a long time. And an awkward

principle such as 'the separation between politics and economy' was adopted towards the PRC. Kōsaka Masataka admitted that the resolution of China-Japan diplomacy had to be Yoshida's chance to show his ability, but due to this letter it was frustrated.¹²

Yoshida's real intentions are now clear. If there were no barriers, he wanted Japan independent with proper forces, and he also wanted to open the public relationship with the PRC as soon as possible. But his sharp sense of real politics forced him to apply soft landing politics. Yoshida's politics has been criticized for his 'double tongued politics (nimaijita seiji)' or 'politics of gradual faits accomplis (nashikuzushi seiji)'.¹³

By the same token Yoshida resisted any change of political power. He was afraid to see completely different policies adopted by the opposition parties. Hence his followers also took the same guidelines. Drastic changes were avoided, and the system of one dominant party with no change of a party in power where political power circulated inside factions (habatsu tarai-mawashi seiken) was established. In terms of party politics it is also a precious price for the Japanese people to pay.

References

1. John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Aftermath of World War II* (London: Penguin Press, 1999).
2. Shigeru Yoshida, Kenichi Yoshida(translated), *The Yoshida Memoirs: the Story of Japan in Crisis* (London: Heinemann, 1961); YOSHIDA Shigeru, *Kaisō Jūnen* (Chūkō Bunko, 1957, 1998).
3. IGARASHI Takeshi, *The Formation of the U.S.-Japan Relationship after the Second World War (Sengo nichibeikankei no keisei: Kōwa anpo to reiseigo no shiten ni tatte)* (Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1995).
4. Yoshida Shigeru Memorial Foundation (ed.), *The Letters of Yoshida Shigeru (Yoshida Shigeru shokanshū)* (Chūō Kōronsha, 1994).
5. SODEI Rinjirō (ed.), *Letters of Yoshida Shigeru=MacArthur 1945-1951 (Yoshida Shigeru-MacArthur ōfuku shokanshū)* (Hōsei UP, 2000).
6. INOKI Masamichi, *A Biography of Yoshida Shigeru (Hyōden Yoshida Shigeru)* (Yomiuri Shibunsha, 1981; Chikuma Gakugei Bunko, 1995), 4 vols.
7. KOSAKA Masataka, *Chancellor Yoshida Shigeru (Saisho yoshida shigeru)* (Chūō Kōronsha, 1968, 1998).
8. HORI Yukio, *Political History after the War 1945-60 (sengo seijishi 1945-60)* (Nansōsha, 2001).
9. MASUMI Junnosuke, *Politics After the War 1945-55 (Sengo seiji 1945-55)* (Tōkyō UP, 1983), 2 vols.
10. *Statistics of Ministry of Administration 1945 - 51(nihon tōkei nenkan 1945 - 51)*.
11. WATANABE Akio and MIYASATO Seigen, *San Francisco Peace Treaty (San Francisco kōwa)* (Tokyo UP, 1986).
12. MIURA Yōichi, *Yoshida Shigeru and the San Francisco Peace Treaty (yoshida shigeru to San Francisco kōwa)* (Otsuki Shoten, 1996), 2 vols.
13. IOKIBE Makoto, *Founding Premiers after the War: From Yoshida Shigeru to*

Tanaka Kakuei (senjo nihon wo kizuita saishō tachi: Yoshida Shigeur kara Tanaka Kakuei made) (Bungei Shunjū, 1996).

14. Richard B. Finn, *Winners in Peace: MacArthur, Yoshida, and Post War Japan* (Berkeley, L.A.: University of California Press, 1992). Richard B. Finn, *MacArthur to Yoshida Shigeru* (Kadokawa Shoten, 1995), 2 vols.

15. ASO Kazuko, *Yoshida Shigeru as Father (chichi Yoshida Shigeru)* (Kōbunsha, 1993).

16. KATAOKA Tetsuya, *Good Bye Yoshida Shigeru: A Post War Political History without Fallacies (saraba Yoshida Shigeru: kyokō naki senjo seijishi)* (Bungei Shunjū, 1992).

17. Yoshida Shigeru Memorial Foundation (ed.), *Yoshida Shigeru as Humanbeing (ningen Yoshida Shigeru)* (Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 1991).

18. KITAOKA Shinichi and IOKIBE Makoto, *Occupation and Peace Treaty: The Departure of Japan after the War (senryō to kōwa: senjo nihon no shuppatsu)* (Seiunsha, 1999).

Abbreviations

DLP	Democratic Liberal Party (minshu jiyuutō)	3.1948 - 3.1950
DP	Democratic Party (minshutō)	3.1947 - 3.1950
DS	Diplomatic Section (SCAP)	
GHQ	General Headquarters	
GS	Government Section (SCAP)	
JCP	Japanese Communist Party (nihon kyōsantō)	10.1945
JDP	Japanese Democratic Party (nihon minshutō)	11.1954 - 11.1955
JLP	Japanese Liberal Party (nihon jiyūtō)	11.1945 - 3.1948
JPP	Japanese Progressive Party (nihon shinpotō)	11.1945 - 3.1947
JSP	Japanese Socialist Party (nihon shakaitō)	11.1945 - 9.1996
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party (jiyū minshutō)	11.1955

- LP Liberal Party (jiyūtō) 3.1950 - 11.1955
- PCP People's Cooperative Party (kokumin kyōdōtō) 3.1947 - 3.1950
- PDP People's Democratic Party(kokumin minshutō) 3.1950 - 2.1952
- PP Progressive Party (kaishintō) 2.1952 - 11.1954
- ROC Republic of China (chūka minkoku)
- PRC People's Republic of China (chūka jinmin kyōwakoku)
- SCAP Supreme Command for the Allied Power
- SDF Self Defence Forces (jieitai)

Endnotes

¹ Hatoyama Ichiro founded the Liberal Party as early as in November 1945. The LP obtained 141 seats and became the largest party after the General Election on 10 April 1946. Purged from public office by the GHQ on 3 May, Hatoyama asked Yoshida to replace him as President of the Liberal Party and to be inaugurated as Prime Minister. Yoshida accepted it with three or four conditions. The conditions were: 1) I have no money yet I won't raise fund. 2) Do not interfere in choosing ministers. 3) I will resign any time when I want to give up. Plus Yoshida said in his memoirs that he would keep office till Hatoyama came back to politics. Shigeru Yoshida, Kenichi Yoshida (translated), *The Yoshida Memoirs: the Story of Japan in Crisis* (London: Heinemann, 1961), p.75; YOSHIDA Shigeru, *Kaisō Jūnen* (Chūkō Bunko, 1957, 1998), vol.1, pp.156 - 7.

² See Table 1 at the end of this paper.

³ IGARASHI Takeshi, *The Formation of the U.S.-Japan Relationship after the Second World War (Sengo nichibeikankei no keisei: Kōwa anpo to reisengo no shiten ni tatte, Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1995)*, p. 182.

⁴ Yoshida, *Kaisō jūnen*, vol.2, p.203. (There is no translation in the English version.)

⁵ *Do.*, vol.2, pp.182 - 3.

⁶ Yoshida, *Memoirs*, p.194; Yoshida, *Kaisō jūnen*, vol.2, p.200.

⁷ Yoshida, *Memoirs*, p.145; Yoshida, *Kaisō jūnen*, vol.2, pp.56 - 7.

⁸ Yoshida, *Memoirs*, pp.145 - 6; Yoshida, *Kaisō jūnen*, vol.2, p.57.

⁹ Yoshida, *Memoirs*, p.93; Yoshida, *Kaisō jūnen*, vol.1, p.192. No translation of Yoshida's 'surprise' is found in the English version. Yoshida Shigeru Memorial Foundation (ed.), *The Letters of Yoshida Shigeru (Yoshida Shigeru shokanshū)* (Chūō Kōronsha, 1994), p.506.

¹⁰ SODEI Rinjirō (ed.), *Letters of Yoshida Shigeru-MacArthur 1945-1951 (Yoshida Shigeru-MacArthr ōfuku shokanshū)* (Hōsei UP, 2000), pp.261 - 9.

¹¹ INOKI Masamichi, *A Biography of Yoshida Shigeru (Hyōden Yoshida Shigeru:*

Santen no maki) (Chikuma Gakugei Bunko, 1995), vol.4, p.325 and 329.

¹² KOSAKA Masataka, *Chancellor Yoshida Shigeru (Saisho yoshida shigeru)* (Chūō Kōronsha, 1968, 1998), p.61

¹³ Hori Yukio, *Political History after the War 1945-60 (sengo seijishi 1945-60)* (Nansōsha, 2001), pp.225 - 8.

Table 1: Results of General Elections between 1945 and 1955 (Shugiin-Lower House)

	Total seats	LP	DP	PCP	JSP		JCP	others
1946.4	466	JLP 141	JPP 94	14	93		5	81
1947.4	466	131	DP 121	29	143		4	38
1949.1	466	DLP 264	69	14	48		35	36
1952.1	466	LP 240	PP 85		JSP Left 54	JSP Right 57	0	30
1953.4	466	234	76		72	66	1	17
1955.2	467	112	JDP 185		89	67	2	12
1958.5	467	LDP 267			168		1	13

Source: Masumi Junnosuke, *Politics After the War 1945-55 (Sengo seiji 1945-55)* (Tōkyō UP, 1983), vol. 2, Appendices p. 23.

Key: **LP** - Liberal Party (jiyuto)
 DP - People's Democratic Party (kokumin minshuto)
 JSP - Japanese Socialist Party (nihon shakaito)
 JCP - Japanese Communist Party (nihon kyosanto)

Table 2: Opinion Polls between 1950 and 1956

	Conservative		Subtotal	J S P	Others	No Party	No Answer	Subtotal
1950.2	DLP 29	DP 5	34	15	2	18	31	49
50.4	LP 32	6	38	16	4	9	33	42
50.9	32	NDP 7	38	17	2	20	22	42
1951.3	36	5	41	18	3	12	26	38
51.9	45	5	50	10	1	17	22	39
5110	32	5	37	12	2	26	23	49
1952.2	33	PP 4	37	14	1	22	26	48
52.5	32	5	37	18	1	19	25	44
52.9	32	6	38	18	1	16	27	43
1953.3	46	12	58	26	1	3	12	15
53.6	49	10	59	27	1	3	10	13
53.9	48	7	55	26	1	4	14	18
1954.5	39	7	45	27	2	5	18	23
54.6	34	8	42	31	1	8	17	25
54.12	28	DP 24	52	25	0	3	20	23
1955.1	22	29	51	25	2	3	19	22
55.11			LDP 48	31	2	4	15	19
1956.6			43	33	3	4	17	21
56.8			45	38	1	4	12	16

Source: Masumi Junnosuke, *Politics After the War 1945-55 (Sengo seiji 1945-55)* (Tōkyō UP, 1983), vol. 2, Appendices p. 23.

Table3: Ratification Votes for the Peace Treaty and Security Treaty

Lower House	Peace Treaty		Security Treaty	
	for	against	for	against
LP	221	0	234	0
DP	49	3	44	4
JSP Right	24	0	0	23
JSP Left	0	16	0	16
JCP	0	22	0	22
Others Independent	13	6	11	6

Source: Asahi Shinbun, 27 October 1951

Table 4: Foreign Trade of Japan

(In millions of Yen)

	PRC		ROC	
	Export	Import	Export	Import
1946	222	303	1	30
1947	792	255	31	73
1948	292	1885	5	610
1949	3071	14520	2143	8933
1950	7068	14158	13684	12894
1951	2098	7779	18216	19089
1952	215	5365	21840	22955
1953	1634	10692	21948	23054
1954	6875	14677	23737	20552
1955	10277	29080	22978	29116

Source: Customs Division, Tax Bureau, Ministry of Finance. In *Statistics of Ministry of Administration (nihon tōkei nenkan)*, 1953, p. 240; 1958, p. 240.

Britain and Japan, 1951: San Francisco and Tokyo

Sir Hugh Cortazzi

Peter Lowe in his article 'Great Britain and the Japanese Peace Treaty, 1951' (in 'Western Interactions with Japan: Expansion, The Armed Forces and Readjustment, 1859-1956' Japan Library, 1990) described the British part in the negotiation of the Peace Treaty with Japan and concluded with a brief account of the conference in San Francisco and reactions in Tokyo. He also covered the British part in the peace Treaty negotiations in his chapter 'Uneasy Readjustment, 1945-58' in volume II of the 'Political-Diplomatic Dimension, 1931-2000' published as part of the Anglo-Japanese History Project (2000).

I do not want to go over all the same ground, but, when I looked at some of the papers in the PRO of reports from the British Mission in Tokyo in the second half of 1951 and of letters from the Foreign Office to the British Mission in Tokyo, I thought that some of what was said in these papers was interesting and worth quoting. After drawing on these papers I propose to say a few words about my own involvement in Japan at that time. I arrived in October 1951 as a third secretary (a very junior post) in the United Kingdom Liaison Mission (UKLIM) to SCAP (the mission became the British Embassy in Tokyo when the Peace Treaty came into force at the end of April 1952).

Rob Scott (later Sir Robert Scott) who had replaced Bill Dening (Sir Esler Dening, appointed to be Head of the British Mission in Tokyo in October 1951), as the Assistant Under Secretary responsible for Asian Affairs in the Foreign Office attended the San Francisco conference as one of the senior officials in the British delegation. This was led by Kenneth Younger, Minister of State in the Foreign Office. Herbert Morrison, the Foreign Secretary, who had planned a holiday at the time of the conference, reluctantly agreed to attend the conference for one day to sign the Treaty.

Rob Scott in a personal letter to Bill Dening in Singapore on his way to Tokyo gave a frank account of the proceedings in San Francisco. He noted that the 'level of oratory' of the delegations was 'not very high' (a Foreign Office

euphemism for 'low' and 'deadly boring'). Dean Acheson was, he said, 'a great hit with the public' (i.e. he played to the crowds!).

Rob Scott had this to say of the Japanese at San Francisco:

'A strong Japanese delegation, decked out in frock coats of curious cut and various hues such as Japan alone finds it possible to produce, sat quietly to one side in the fifth and sixth rows of the opera house throughout the proceedings...They were, I think, genuinely very pleased indeed not only by the nature of the Treaty but also by the friendly attitude of the delegates towards them.'

Scott commented 'My impression of Yoshida and indeed of the other Japanese delegates was that they genuinely want to cultivate very good relations with us. I would not exclude a desire in the back of their minds to play us off against the Americans and of course we must guard against this, but I think that there was a good deal of sincerity in Yoshida's remark that for Japan there were only two countries that mattered: Britain and America.'

Yoshida had called on Kenneth Younger accompanied only by Matsui, his private secretary (later Japanese Ambassador to the UN). Yoshida 'began by formally expressing the gratitude of the Japanese Government to the British Government for the part we had played in drawing up this generous peace treaty.'

Yoshida later called on Herbert Morrison for what Scott described as 'a long and friendly talk' in which he reiterated his thanks for the part played by HMG. This conversation was summarised in a 'saving telegram' (a telegram sent by bag to save the chore of hand ciphering). This was No 1 Saving from San Francisco and was dated 8 September 1951. It was drafted by Rob Scott and approved by Herbert Morrison who made one change. He called Denning our 'Ambassador' and not simply head of the UK Liaison Mission. Scott was concerned that this might cause embarrassment to Denning as Britain could not seek agreement for him before the Peace Treaty had been ratified and we knew when it would come into force. But Denning had the personal rank of Ambassador and no harm was done by Morrison's remark.

Morrison urged Yoshida to take an interest in the Japanese trade union movement and to pay attention to the interests of Japanese workers. As Peter Lowe recorded the specific causes for concern felt by British firms and trade unions were directly cited by Morrison: 'there was anxiety in Great Britain lest pre-war conditions of sweated labour and competition were revived. In the interests of the people of Japan and of relations between Japan and Britain it was essential that this should not happen. Indeed I felt that my signing of the Treaty would be justified only if the Japanese Government took steps to see that there was no recurrence of these conditions.' This was tough talk and foreshadows the economic friction, which caused real difficulties in relations between Britain and Japan in the next few years.

Morrison and Yoshida also briefly discussed China. Britain had recently recognized the Chinese Communists as the government of China. Recognition did not imply approval it was merely an acknowledgement of the fact that the communists were in control of China. The Foreign Office decision had been made while Dening was still the Assistant Under-Secretary and while fully endorsed by the British cabinet and by the Foreign Office legal advisers it was seen as an achievement of Dening's time as Assistant Under Secretary. He and Morrison both hoped that Japan would follow suit or at least would not be swayed by the Americans into recognition of the Nationalist regime in Taiwan as the Government of China.

Yoshida stressed that in his view there could be no stability while communism prevailed. This was a point he returned to on a number of occasions later. He would not be drawn on the line, which Japan would take over recognition of China. It is not clear from the British papers, which I have seen, when John Foster Dulles began to urge Japan to reach an agreement with the Nationalists. He must have realised quite early on that it might be necessary to push the Japanese towards the Nationalists in Taiwan if the Treaty was to be approved by the US Senate. If the Americans had told the British at an early stage that this would be necessary some of the ill-feeling which arose over this issue might have been obviated. Perhaps the British Embassy in Washington drew attention

to this aspect of the ratification problem, but I do not recall seeing any such report. Peter Lowe comments that Dulles acted contrary to the agreement reached with Morrison in June 1951 in putting pressure on Yoshida to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's government, but 'Given the vitriolic attitudes toward China found within the Republican party and bearing in mind Dulles's political aspirations, he had little choice but to act as he did. Reactions in London were bitter.' Eden who succeeded Morrison in October 1951 shared Morrison's anger. Bill Dening thought he had been double-crossed by Dulles. Looking back after fifty years it is possible to understand British anger, but ratification by the US Senate of the Peace Treaty had to be the first priority. Delays in ratification could have had more far-reaching consequences for US relations with Japan and for the western position in Asia. An early Japanese recognition of the Peoples Republic of China would hardly have altered the course of history in Asia.

Rob Scott also met in San Francisco the Social Democratic party leader Katayama Tetsu. Katayama had asked to call on Scott but then changed his mind and asked Scott to call on him. He seems to have thought Scott was an American! Rob Scott, who had suffered a great deal at the hands of the Japanese as a prisoner in Changi jail in Singapore during the war, never stood on ceremony or bore grudges against Japan; he responded positively. Katayama told Scott that his party were 'quite satisfied with the Peace Treaty.'

Back in Tokyo the Peace Treaty was submitted to the Japanese Diet for ratification. According to a telegram (no 344) dated 16 October 1951 from Dening who had recently arrived in Tokyo Yoshida gave a speech at the opening of the 12th session of the Diet, which 'consisted in the main of a lengthy recapitulation of the terms of the Treaty and followed the usual pattern which is now considered Mr Yoshida's usual form, in that he contrived to make a major speech without saying anything that was not already fully known'. He confirmed that Japan 'would abide by the terms of the Treaty and carry it out in all sincerity in spite of the difficulties which some of the provisions would impose'.

Dening commented that when he lunched with Yoshida on 7 October the latter had remarked, 'in his usual puckish way, that it was better to tell the Japanese

people what the Allied delegates at San Francisco thought of the Treaty than what he thought of it himself'. In his speech he had stressed that the Treaty represented what the allies wanted and that 'what the allies want is what Japan has to accept.' Dening thought that Yoshida's attitude 'contained an element of disdain for public opinion'. But looking back after fifty years we must conclude that Yoshida's attitude was eminently realistic.

The Diet duly approved the Peace Treaty and the Security Treaty. The Peace Treaty was approved by the House of Representatives by 307 votes to 47 against and by the House of Councillors by 174 to 45 votes. The US Japan Security Treaty, which was part of the package, was approved by 387 votes to 71 in the lower house and 147 to 76 in the upper house. The opposition came essentially from the left wing socialists and the communists. The right wing socialists (i.e. social democrats) voted for the Peace Treaty but against the Security Treaty. The members of the Japanese Diet realised that they had 'no real alternative'. In sum the Japanese accepted the Peace Treaty as the best they could hope for and determined to make the best of it. The opposition focussed on the Security Treaty and ensured that this would be the main political issue for years to come.

Before Dening arrived in Tokyo in early October 1951, George Clutton, the Charge d'Affaires, had sent home various despatches commenting on the Japanese scene. In a despatch (No 242) of 16 July 1951 Clutton urged steady progress in the transfer of power from the occupation authorities to the Japanese. He noted that the Japanese were reluctant to assume further responsibility unless compelled to do so. The current level of efficiency in the Japanese civil service was 'not high'.

In his despatch (No 319) of 25 September 1951 Clutton gave a cautious assessment of 'recent signs of a revival of nationalism in Japan'. His conclusion was: 'all that can be said is that in an increasingly conservative and, therefore, in certain ways, Nationalist society, there are certain factors which could help in a Nationalist revival of a dangerous sort, but which at present are of little danger'. Democracy 'had not yet taken firm root.'

In another despatch (N0332) of 2 October 1951 Clutton surveyed Japan's relations with the rest of Asia. He noted that the Japanese attitude to their fellow Asians was 'one of unqualified superiority' while towards China it was 'one of qualified superiority'. He declared that the majority of Japanese at that time had 'no idea of the legacy of hatred they may have left' in Asia.

Dening in his despatch (No 373) of 26 November 1951 gave his assessment of the situation in Japan and of prospects for the future. This is a typically acerbic but balanced piece. He noted that 'With a capacity for collective action unparalleled elsewhere in the world, the Japanese people have been doing a 'defeat drill' for six years. Now that the Treaty is signed they consider the drill is over and they can hardly conceal their impatience for the day when the Treaty comes into force and they resume full sovereignty.' Dening was 'unable to discover that the Japanese people have changed very much, and indeed there is very little reason for them to have done so, since six years represent a very short span in the life of this nation.'

He thought that militarism was 'for the present discredited', but most Japanese probably hope and expect that Japan will once again recover a place in the sun, and every Japanese remains as nationally conscious as he ever was'. He believed that 'the prospects of good government in Japan in a Western democratic sense are not very encouraging.' He was particularly conscious of the continuation of corruption in government, which had so undermined parliamentary institutions in pre-war years. He feared that extremism of the left might command wider support than extremism of the right. He expected that Japan would remain in the Western camp. There were good Japanese and bad Japanese. It must be the British aim to support the former.

Dening stressed that in order to live Japan had to export and he sounded a note of warning about the dangerous implications of protectionism in relation to Japan. In this and other contexts we should consult with Commonwealth and European governments. Dening's reference to European governments at this point is of some significance.

Dening, perhaps reflecting on Herbert Morrison's comments to Yoshida at San Francisco, which I have outlined above, had sent a secret and personal telegram on 30 October 1951 to Sir William Strang, the Permanent Under Secretary. In this he had urged that Britain should move quickly on ratification of the Peace Treaty. He pointed out that 'our own difficulties with Japan were likely to be in the economic field' and noted that the US, 'by and large, were not concerned about Japanese competition'. 'We have said in public that Japan must live, and we must be careful not to put ourselves in a false and vulnerable position.' Dening was right to warn London of the damage which a protectionist approach towards Japan would cause not only to our relations with post-war Japan but also to relations with the US whose economic assistance in the occupation years had saved Japan from starvation. The Americans at that time and in the next decade or so made the mistake of putting all the emphasis on politico-strategic relations with Japan and neglecting the economic dimension. When the extent of Japanese competition for American firms became clear the Americans realised their mistake.

Dening's relations with Yoshida were cordial, but as usual Yoshida played a canny game. In his despatch (No 339) of 12 October 1951, reporting on his private lunch with Yoshida, when relations with China had been a major theme, Dening said that he had suggested to Yoshida that while, of course, Japan must make her own choice she might 'establish a modus vivendi both with the authorities in Formosa and with China proper', Yoshida 'was not to be drawn.' Dening did not explain how he thought such a modus vivendi could be reached. Indeed in view of the PRC's adamant opposition then and since to any suggestion of a two Chinas policy it was unrealistic. Yoshida probably realised this.

The question of relations with China was one on which, as I have said above, Dening felt strongly. When Dulles accompanied by Senators Sparkman and Smith came to Japan that winter Dening who had had many dealings with Dulles over the Peace Treaty entertained them to dinner. As a junior secretary I was on duty. It was already clear that the Japanese would have to come to an

arrangement with the Nationalists in Taiwan in order to secure US ratification, but Dening felt betrayed by Dulles. Dening who was the son of Walter Dening, an Anglican missionary, had no sympathy with Dulles whom he thought smug and self-righteous as well as deceitful. So the atmosphere was cold and we were all glad when the American visitors withdrew.

This was one of the few occasions in my early months in Tokyo after my arrival in late October 1951 when I was involved with higher policy issues. Arthur de la Mare who was then the Head of Chancery had been a member of the Japan Consular Service and a Japanese language student before the war. His attitude to post-war Japan was similar to that of his boss. Dening and he knew from personal experience what the militarists and the Kempeitai were really like and understandably took a pretty sceptical view of the Japanese who regained power in post-occupation Japan.

Peter Lowe in his essay 'Uneasy Readjustment' drew attention to a despatch from Dening written on 28 April 1952, the day that the Peace Treaty came into force. Dening commented that 'the most striking feature of the occupation had been the violent change in American policy, from preaching radical reform and disarmament to advocating rearmament and castigating all signs of weakness in combating communism. 'Much of the good which the Occupation has undoubtedly brought to Japan is vitiated by this. Until two years ago complete pacifism was the badge and sign of progress and international respectability: today it is evidence of susceptibility to Communist indoctrination. Doubt has thus come to be cast on democracy, parliamentary institutions and all the other new wonders which the Occupation brought in its train.' This was a harsh comment on the occupation, but though oversimplified it contained a kernel of truth.

In the autumn of 1951, pending the entry into force of the Peace Treaty when sufficient ratifications had been lodged, the British Mission faced a major administrative challenge. During the occupation staff and services had been provided free by the Japanese authorities to Missions accredited to SCAP on the grounds that they were part of the occupation force. As soon as the occupation ended the mission would have to pay its own way. It would have to give up

houses, which had been commandeered by the occupation forces, and find alternative accommodation in a city, which still showed the signs of war-time devastation and where acceptable western style accommodation was very difficult to find.

The Mission only had a junior and inexperienced administration officer. So Arthur decided that I should deal with many of the pressing administrative issues. One tricky issue was local staff where each section of the Mission wanted to hang on to their existing staffs even though their productivity was low and some really had very little to do. Austerity was very much the order of the day and the Foreign Office told us that we would have to make draconian cuts. One of my tasks was to negotiate on Arthur's behalf with the various sections. Not surprisingly I was pretty unpopular!

Another major task, which fell to me, was to help in looking for alternative accommodation. Much of what we found was distinctly sub-standard and staff had to be persuaded reluctantly to take what was available. We noted that rents seemed very high in relation to the cost of purchase. Often two to three years rent, much of which in any case had to be paid in advance in the form of key money and deposits, would amount to as much as the purchase price. We explained this to the authorities in London and urged that we be given authority to purchase some of the better properties, which became available, but they would not listen. HMG would have saved quite a tidy sum if they had been willing to go into the real estate business in Japan!

I was only able to pull one deal off. We were offered at very reasonable prices three houses which had been German property and which under the Peace Treaty were forfeit. The Admiralty wanted a house for the Naval Attache and were not inhibited by Foreign Office rules. They agreed that we might purchase the best of these three houses for what, if I remember correctly, was about £3,000, which even in those penurious days was a very good price. Eventually it was sold, I think in the 1980s when it had become increasingly run down, for getting on for £1 million!

This purchase brought me into touch with a most unattractive part of the Japanese bureaucracy. To complete the purchase innumerable forms had to be completed and I had to deliver the cheque in person to the official concerned. I recall that he received me with his feet on the desk in front of him and paring his nails. When I handed over the cheque he made some sneering remarks about sterling implying that he trusted that the cheque would not bounce.

It was, I suppose, inevitable that Japanese officials longing for an end to the occupation would take every opportunity to get in a few hits at the foreigners who had dominated their lives for the last six years, but it was not a pretty sight and did not endear me to the new Japan.

While the officials in Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Finance with whom I came in contact were much more sophisticated they too could be awkward and sometimes unnecessarily difficult e.g. in the tough negotiations over the status of UN Forces in Japan in connection with the Korean War. At the beginning of 1952 I had to spend many long days on these negotiations, which were supposed to be completed before the Peace Treaty came into force on 28 April 1952. Meetings were held in the old Gaimusho, where there was no central heating. Often, as I was suffering from sinus trouble, I would sit huddled in my overcoat, no doubt much to the disgust of the Japanese officials on the other side of the table.

Our agreement was supposed to be based on the Americans own status of forces agreement, but the Japanese were unwilling to give us parity, wanting to use any agreement reached with us as a lever to get alterations in the American agreement. The Americans were supposed to make the running over the UN Forces agreement as well but for understandable reasons were unwilling to stick their necks out.

The main sticking point was over jurisdiction for offences, which might be committed by members of the UN Forces against Japanese. We sought extraterritorial rights claiming that, a similar right having been granted to the Americans, such offenders should be tried under our laws by our own courts

martial. No compromise was possible and the agreement was only concluded when in 1954 the American conceded to the Japanese on this issue.

The Japanese Ministry of Finance also pressed hard for a decrease in the burden on the Japanese taxpayer. When we urged that they should regard the costs as a contribution to the UN effort and pointed out that Japan had frequently asserted that 'Korea was a dagger pointing at the heart of Japan' they were unmoved. They were also unwilling to recognize that they should help UN Forces because of the obligations which Japan had accepted under Article 5 a) iii) of the Peace Treaty to give the UN 'every assistance in any action which it takes in accordance with the charter.'

Although these negotiations were very time-consuming and frustrating I learnt a lot from them about negotiation and about Japanese officialdom. I had to admire their meticulousness and also their command of English.

Japan in those last months before the Peace Treaty came into force was not a comfortable place. There was still a great deal of poverty and Japanese accommodation generally was of a very low standard. Japanese officials had a particularly hard time and it says much for their discipline and restraint that they were generally polite and helpful to us foreigners.

Social discontent, if not seething, was not far below the surface and Dening's fears of left-wing extremism were justified by the May Day riots in 1952 soon after the entry into force of the Peace Treaty when radicals threw stones at foreigners and burnt foreign cars in Hibiya and near the Palace.

Dening and de la Mare were also right to be concerned about corruption and neo-nationalism. The old guard was creeping back into power.

Many of the concerns of those days have long since disappeared. The extreme left is no longer a threat to stability in Japan and poverty has been replaced by affluence. But Japanese politics would appear to be just as venal as they ever were. Japanese still seem ultra-conscious of being Japanese although attitudes towards the rest of Asia have matured.

Few Japanese today will remember the various articles of the Peace Treaty except perhaps the territorial clauses (especially Article 2 c) about renunciation of the Kurile islands. The Japanese, of course, claim that the four southern islands, Etorofu, Kunashiri, Habomai and Shikotan, do not constitute a traditional part of the 'Kuriles'.

The Japanese government have stuck to a strictly legal interpretation of Article XVI, which deals with compensation for former prisoners of war. A more generous interpretation would have been beneficial to Japan's relations, especially with Britain.

Looking Back: The San Francisco Peace Treaty in the Context of Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1902-52

Peter Lowe

The British foreign secretary, Herbert Morrison, was not present for the opening of the peace conference in San Francisco: he arrived for the concluding stage including the signing of the treaty. It was symbolically appropriate that the foreign secretary was absent at the beginning of the conference. It symbolised the extent to which Britain's role in Japan had declined compared to pre-war days and, equally, the extent of American domination of the Pacific region. Kenneth Younger, the minister of state in the Foreign Office, headed the British delegation until Morrison arrived. Early in the conference Younger was visited by Yoshida Shigeru who looked back to the beginning of the twentieth century: 'Yoshida referred with some emotion to the long standing tradition of friendship between our two countries, a tradition unhappily broken by the war. The Japanese leaders before the war, he said, had gone 'crazy' and lost common sense and he hoped this would never recur'.¹ Yoshida was notorious for looking back to the former days of Anglo-Japanese amity and, in particular, to the Anglo-Japanese alliance of his early years. He referred to past cooperation and spoke of his desire to rekindle this spirit. Of course, present and future calculation entered into this nostalgic retrospect: Yoshida thought that a revived British role could modify certain of the brash (or rash) initiatives emanating from Washington. British leaders wished to exert more influence over American policy but they did not think in terms of recreating the Anglo-Japanese alliance. When Ian Nish invited me to contribute to this symposium, I thought it would be interesting to place the San Francisco treaty in the context of Anglo-Japanese relations during the preceding fifty years. This was strengthened when Sir Hugh Cortazzi invited me to contribute an essay to a volume he is editing in the series of Anglo-Japanese biographical portraits, since the period of this essay extends back to the era just before and during the Great War. I would like to begin by looking at the principal areas of concern for Great Britain in negotiating a treaty and then to consider the repercussions of past Anglo-Japanese relations before returning to San Francisco.

The allied occupation of Japan was dominated by the United States or, to be more specific, in the early years of the occupation, by General MacArthur.² Original British

hopes of playing a significant part in the occupation were dashed: Britain's contribution was limited. The head of the British liaison mission in Tokyo, between July 1946 and February 1951, was Sir Alvary Gascoigne and he proved effective in communicating British views during his frequent meetings with MacArthur even if he had to pay the price of enduring MacArthur's monologues.³ MacArthur was later to describe Gascoigne as 'sharp' and more adroit than Sir Esler Dening.⁴ British concern in approaching a peace treaty may be defined under the following sub-headings: economic, strategic and public opinion. Anxiety regarding economic issues resulted from the nature of Japanese competition before the Pacific war, accentuated by the determination of the Labour government in Britain to restore the British economy after 1945. Concern focused on textiles, shipping and the potteries. Textile manufacturers and trade unionists were vociferous in reminding the government of the threat to Lancashire posed by economic revival in Japan. Sir Raymond Streat, a prominent businessman in Manchester and chairman of the Cotton Board, worked skilfully to achieve recognition of the problems facing Lancashire while concurring that rationalisation and modernisation had to be implemented within the mill towns.⁵ When Herbert Morrison reached San Francisco, he met Yoshida and emphasised that pre-war economic tension should be avoided:

There was anxiety in Great Britain lest pre-war conditions of sweated labour and competition were revived. In the interests of the people of Japan and of relations between Japan and Britain it was essential that this should not happen. Indeed I felt that my signing of the Treaty would be justified only if the Japanese Government took steps to see that there was no recurrence of these conditions.⁶

It had been agreed earlier, during exchanges between Streat, the Foreign Office and SCAP, that it would not be feasible to deal with textiles in the treaty itself and that a solution should be found via regular consultations between the British, American and Japanese textile industries.⁷

The Labour government showed more alarm over shipping. The British view was that the Japanese merchant marine should be restricted so as to ensure fair competition internationally. In the past shipping had been subsidised and British firms feared that the Japanese merchant fleet would pursue discriminatory practices, as had applied previously. John Foster Dulles had made clear during his negotiations with the British that he would not entertain direct reference to shipbuilding within the treaty.

The Foreign Office wanted to reach an understanding with the United States to curb Japanese construction but the cabinet was informed by Morrison on 1 August 1951 that the Truman administration sympathised with Japan rather than Britain. The cabinet discussion confirmed more general anxiety over future competition, ranging beyond shipbuilding.⁸ Since the United States was looking towards Japan pursuing an enhanced role in South-East Asia, in addition to assisting American defence aims in Eastern Asia and the western Pacific, it could not be expected that the pleas of the British shipping industry would elicit undue sympathy.

The Staffordshire potteries represented a more localised lobby but one that had some importance in that Stoke-on-Trent had two Labour MPs and vocal trade unions.⁹ However, the British made little headway over economic matters before and during Dulles's visit to London in June 1951. The one concession obtained concerned the Congo Basin treaties. Dulles agreed that Japan would forfeit rights under the Saint-Germain convention which would assist British companies in Africa against Japanese competition.¹⁰

Strategic issues possessed implications for the Commonwealth of crucial importance to Australia and New Zealand. Given the profound damage caused to the Empire and Commonwealth by the Japanese offensives in 1941-2, it was very understandable that there was determination to avoid a recurrence of a Japanese military/naval threat. The approach of the Truman administration was very different. Japan was an essential cornerstone in the defence of the 'Free World' and Dulles favoured significant Japanese rearmament, placed within a framework of interconnected defence arrangements. In January 1951 Dulles was pondering defence questions. The Attlee cabinet then noted the preference of Australia and New Zealand for a restrictive treaty that would minimise the danger of renewed Japanese militarism;¹¹ at this time American thinking was fluid. Dulles soon made clear that he was contemplating regional defence arrangements from which Britain would be excluded. This created resentment, although the Labour government eventually acquiesced. However, the leader of the opposition, Winston Churchill, was outraged at British exclusion from ANZUS and he engaged in a futile bid to reverse the American decision when he returned to office in October 1951. The Korean war and various communist rebellions within South-East Asia stimulated the British desire for a new defence structure and this materialised eventually in the creation of SEATO in 1954-5.¹² Officials in the Foreign Office were doubtful at the

likely success of the reforms implemented during the occupation of Japan in the medium to long term: Japanese politics could veer either to the right or left. While the potential of communism succeeding could not be ignored, it was more probable that Japan would move to the right. Members of the Attlee cabinet were not happy about Japanese rearmament and they were less reconciled than the civil servants to this trend continuing. At the time of the San Francisco conference, British leaders could but hope that the strategy devised by Dulles would prove effective.

The issue of compensation for POWs is, as we know only too well, fraught with deep controversy. The matter was mishandled in 1951 and subsequently. The allied governments should have ensured more generous financial recompense and the Japanese government should have shown more awareness of the strength of feeling over wartime atrocities. Members of the cabinet sometimes referred to the powerful emotions felt in Britain over POWs during their deliberations in 1951.¹³ The compensation paid after the signing of the treaty was wholly inadequate. It was not until the 1990s that the Japanese and British governments demonstrated greater appreciation of the problem by which time the majority of those affected were dead. Awareness of the sufferings of POWs in part explained the Labour government's reaction over Japanese gold holdings and a war guilt clause. Hugh Gaitskell, the chancellor of the exchequer and next leader of the Labour party, held fervently that Japanese gold deposits should be retained. He observed that West Germany had been compelled to surrender gold holdings in addition to making larger reparations payments.¹⁴ When Gaitskell met Dulles in June 1951, he argued that Japan did not deserve to be treated generously and alluded to hostility to Japan in Britain arising from the sufferings of POWs.¹⁵ Dulles replied that the Japanese economy could not be crippled through excessively harsh retribution and that Japanese gold deposits should be regarded as a reserve when the occupation ended. Neither Gaitskell nor Dulles gave ground in their exchanges but Dulles was in a position to ensure that American preferences prevailed. Dulles was also adamant over the question of a war guilt clause. He had attended the Paris peace conference in 1919 and the bitter disputes concerning the Treaty of Versailles convinced him that war guilt clauses served no useful purpose. Officials in Whitehall tended to agree but some cabinet ministers still inclined towards including such a clause. Once again Dulles's will prevailed. I shall return to the intractable discussions concerning China later.

I shall now go back to the early twentieth century but using spectacles rather less rose tinted than those worn by Yoshida in the quotation with which I began. The Anglo-Japanese alliance lasted for twenty-one years (1902-23). What did each signatory gain from it? Britain benefited from the blocking of Russian expansion in the war of 1904-5. The alliance permitted Britain to concentrate the Royal Navy closer to home during the Anglo-German naval race. Both Sir Edward Grey and Winston Churchill, foreign secretary and first lord of the Admiralty respectively, emphasised how essential the alliance was between 1911 and 1914.¹⁶ This was proved between 1914 and 1918 when the Imperial Japanese Navy assisted in capturing German possessions and in defeating German raiders in addition to sending a squadron to the Mediterranean. The alliance acted as a partial brake on Japanese expansion in China, although this diminished during the Great War. Japan gained from possessing an alliance with the largest empire in the world. Japan expanded significantly but without advancing its interests in China as far as it would have wished. F.R. Dickinson, in his recent study of Japan during the Great War, has underlined the stimulus given to 'reinvention' through participation in war.¹⁷ Japanese leaders diverged in their attitudes towards Britain. The genro, notably Yamagata Aritomo, wanted a less exclusive relationship with Britain and wished to encourage closer relations with Russia and France. Some in the army and in the universities mused on switching partners and backing Germany instead of Britain. The entry of the United States into the war in 1917, plus the two revolutions in Russia in 1917, complicated matters greatly. Wilsonian liberalism was not relished by conservative Japanese leaders while the army and the navy warily observed the rapid growth in American naval power.

Developments in China caused growing friction following the revolution of 1911-12 which terminated the empire and ushered in a republic. Most Japanese, whatever their political opinions or loyalties, wished to expand Japanese political, economic and strategic interests in China. Dickinson points out that Kato Takaaki, a courageous and tenacious advocate of developing party politics, took the initiative dramatically in 1914-15 in endeavouring to expand Japan's role in a manner that Dickinson describes as a continuation in traditional European imperialism of the nineteenth century.¹⁸ I am not persuaded by his arguments over Kato but I shall not pursue this further in this paper. British suspicion of Japanese policy in China resulted in the belief that Japan intended to undermine British interests, particularly

in the Yangtze valley, which had accumulated since the opening up of China. While there were phases when Britain and Japan collaborated against Chinese nationalism during the 1920s, fundamentally the former allies diverged sharply. This was starkly evident during the Manchurian crisis when Japanese forces became involved in serious fighting in Shanghai in 1932. The outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in July 1937 led to problems of such gravity as to threaten war between Britain and Japan in the summer of 1939.¹⁹

Japanese espousal of Pan-Asianism accentuated tension during the 1930s and this was a continuation of suspicion dating back to links between Indian dissidents and Pan-Asian nationalist societies in Japan before 1914. The Japanese decision to attack the United States, Britain and the Netherlands East Indies in December 1941 marked a point where, as Yoshida had remarked, Japanese leaders had gone 'crazy' in their attempt to liquidate western interests in Eastern Asia and the western Pacific. Responses in Britain, Australia and New Zealand after 1945 were governed by the trauma experienced in 1941-2. The course of Anglo-American exchanges in negotiating a peace treaty revealed contrasting approaches of some interest. Why should the United States be distinctly more magnanimous than Britain? Reactions in sections of American public opinion to the 50th anniversary of the outbreak and termination of the Pacific war, in 1991 and 1995, showed that animosity towards Japan was still present, as illustrated in the dispute over the exhibition in the Smithsonian. American opinion was not conspicuously critical in 1951, however. Several factors explain this situation. The United States had been principally responsible for the functioning of the allied occupation and this connoted heavy responsibility; the development of the Cold War in Asia in 1948-9 and the eruption of a localised 'hot war' in Korea meant that retribution gave way to realisation that Japan must be treated generously in order to accomplish wider American aims. General MacArthur and John Foster Dulles each advocated leniency. Thus it could be said that the Truman administration, MacArthur and Dulles were looking forward where Japan was concerned.

However, Britain was looking back. The fact that the Attlee government did not bear particular responsibility for the running of the occupation encouraged a more critical and less positive reaction. Officials in the Foreign Office were sceptical of the political reforms, and certain of the economic and social changes, introduced by SCAP. But, as Esler Denning put it, the 'dead hand' of occupation had to be removed

in 1951.²⁰ The occupation had lasted for too long, certainly longer than Britain had desired or MacArthur professed to desire. Dening's deduction was that the occupation should be ended because Japan would be more difficult to deal with if this did not occur – 'keeping Japan in quarantine presents to my mind far greater dangers'.²¹ Labour ministers often uttered more critical opinions when the cabinet reviewed progress during the treaty negotiations in 1951. Gaitskell was the most critical. It is clear that the cabinet was looking back and resented Japan's contribution to British decline and the problems they were to contend with, for example in seeking to regalanise the economy which could be jeopardised through the revival in Japanese competition.

As we have seen, China was very important in accentuating the strains within Anglo-Japanese relations between 1911 and 1941. Ironically China again presented difficulties during the treaty negotiations and indeed into the proceedings in San Francisco. This resulted from the triumph of the Chinese Communist Party during the civil war in China. On 1 October 1949 Mao Tse-tung proclaimed the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC). Three months later Britain recognised the PRC. The British argument for so doing, as advanced by the prime minister, Clement Attlee, and the foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, was that the outgoing Kuomintang regime, led by Chiang Kai-shek, had been defeated comprehensively and was likely to be cast into the dustbin of history later in 1950 when Taiwan fell to subversion or attack from the mainland.²² Attlee and Bevin also wished to keep in step with India, Pakistan and Ceylon who favoured recognition; to protect Hong Kong; and to revive British trade in China. They argued further that recognition of the PRC could seduce China away from the embrace of the Soviet Union. Dean Acheson, the American secretary of state, was attracted by the latter argument but the strength of anti-communism in the United States, fuelled by unscrupulous Republican censure of Truman and Acheson for permitting the 'loss' of China to occur, rendered it impossible for the Truman administration to recognise the PRC. Chiang Kai-shek's moribund regime was based in Taiwan. American strategists came to regard Taiwan as vital to American defence in 1949-50. MacArthur strongly urged denying Taiwan to the PRC. Acheson adopted the same view in May-June 1950, not because he wished to continue propping up the Kuomintang but because he believed that Taiwan could be denied to the PRC without necessarily entailing support for Chiang. The outbreak of the Korean war and the subsequent entry of the PRC into the

conflict in October-November 1950, created a far more hazardous situation. While Chinese forces were fighting UN forces, no thought could be given to rapprochement with China, despite the proposals made by Attlee at his meeting with Truman in December 1950.²³

Disagreement between Britain and the United States over China was exacerbated by criticism of trade with China via Hong Kong expressed by American politicians, especially those associated with the right wing of the Republican party: prominent in this faction were Senators Robert A. Taft, William Knowland, Richard Nixon and Joseph McCarthy, to which should be added the name of General MacArthur who had been dismissed by President Truman in April 1951. The Truman administration pressed for tougher economic sanctions against China.²⁴ Dulles was arguably ideally placed to handle the dilemma of China within the context of the peace treaty. He was a Republican and maintained regular contact with both wings of the party: thus he could allay suspicion more readily than would have been the case had a Democrat conducted the negotiations. Dulles revealed great dexterity in pursuing talks with the British, SCAP, Japanese and with the Australian and New Zealand governments. One trump card Dulles could play when the occasion demanded was to remind whoever was being obdurate that the peace treaty would not only have to be signed but also ratified by the U.S. Senate. The latter step was not to be taken for granted, given the record of independence displayed by the Senate over many years. Dulles exaggerated the danger for his own reasons but the danger existed.

The Labour government favoured the participation of the PRC in the peace conference but appreciated that this could not be accepted by the Truman administration. Herbert Morrison approved a proposal emanating from the Canadian government that the peace treaty should provide for eventual Chinese adhesion but that a Chinese signature should be postponed until a more appropriate time. The Labour cabinet did not wish to be associated with a treaty signed by the Kuomintang regime, although Dulles suggested at one point that both Chinese governments could sign.²⁵ Dulles reminded the British during his talks in London in June 1951 that he was concerned at the emotional state of American public opinion over China – ‘He was above all anxious to keep the Japanese Peace Treaty free from entanglement with the Chinese problem’.²⁶ Dulles angled for the Japanese government to have the freedom to decide subsequently which Chinese regime to recognise. The cabinet concluded on 7 June, accurately enough, that ‘if Japan were

left nominally free to make her own arrangements with China, she would be more likely, while under United States tutelage, to enter into relations with the Chinese Nationalist Government'.²⁷ At the end of Dulles's discussions in June, it was agreed that neither of the rival Chinese governments would be invited to sign and that the peace treaty would permit Japan to conclude a bilateral treaty on similar terms to that contained in the peace treaty. This was the best attainable solution in the circumstances but Dulles had secured the freedom to manoeuvre the Japanese government into recognising Chiang Kai-shek's regime. Morrison and his Conservative successor, Anthony Eden, were irate when this turned out to be the case but it should have occasioned no surprise and it was not worth the ill-tempered exchanges that occurred later in 1951.

For Great Britain the Japanese attack in December 1941, leading to the surrender of Singapore on 15 February 1942, was a devastating blow to the Empire, Commonwealth and British prestige. The fall of Singapore was a milestone in British decline. For the United States the attack on Pearl Harbor was a grave and humiliating episode but it was a potent spur to the growth of American power, not an indication of decline. Vigorous resilience characterised the American reaction to war and the occupation of Japan. Britain had advocated an early peace treaty for a lengthy period, wavering only briefly in March 1951 when the inexperienced Morrison agreed that negotiations should be halted temporarily. British officials contributed positively to the final drafting of the treaty. Herbert Morrison believed that more open recognition should be given to the British contribution (and the contribution of Herbert Morrison). On his instructions a telegram was sent to Washington on 7 August 1951 reading in part:

We do not wish to advertise the influence we have exerted behind the scenes but in the circumstances ... we think that excessive modesty about our contributions would be against the interests of His Majesty's Government and of Anglo-United States cooperation generally. It seems to us that it would also be to the United States Government's own advantage in their relations with the other Governments concerned to avoid letting the draft Treaty appear as a purely single-handed American achievement.²⁸

It was all the more ironic that Morrison originally indicated that he would not even attend the San Francisco conference because he had booked a holiday before the dates of the conference had been decided. Somewhat reluctantly he agreed to

attend for the closing stages. The British approach to the peace treaty was based largely on past British experiences economically, strategically and in dealing with POWs. British politicians and officials were looking back, the politicians engaging in this to a greater degree than the officials but the latter also looked back. The Americans looked ahead and did not dwell too much on the negative side of Pearl Harbor. As George Bush, Sr, put it, on the 50th anniversary of Pearl Harbor, I paraphrase, 'We won, we beat them, what have we to worry about?'. The British reaction was rather different.

Endnotes

1. San Francisco to Foreign Office, 5 September 1951, FO 371/92594/1348.
2. For an excellent, wide ranging analysis of the occupation, see John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Aftermath of World War II* (London, 1999). For MacArthur, see D. Clayton James, *The Years of MacArthur* vol. III *Triumph and Disaster, 1945-64* (Boston, 1985).
3. See Roger Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy: Britain, the United States and Japan, 1945-1952* (Cambridge, 1982) and Peter Lowe, 'Sir Alvary Gascoigne in Japan, 1946-51', in Ian Nish (ed), *Britain and Japan: Biographical Portraits* (Folkestone, 1994), pp.279-94, 340-2.
4. Peter Lowe, *Containing the Cold War in East Asia: British Policies towards Japan China and Korea, 1948-53* (Manchester, 1997), p.46n44.
5. See M.W. Dupree (ed), *The Diaries of Sir Raymond Streat* 2 vols. (Manchester, 1987), II, pp.423-615.
6. San Francisco to FO, 12 September 1951, FO 371/92614/5.
7. Note the reactions of the Textile Firms Advisory Committee at a dinner hosted by the Board of Trade, 3 July 1951, minute by C.P. Scott, 8 July 1951, FO 371/92561/670.
8. Cabinet minutes, 1 August 1951, CM57(51)5, Cab 128/20.
9. See the contributions made by the two Labour MPs for Stoke-on-Trent in the House of Commons, 4 July 1951, contained in FO 371/92562/671.
10. Lowe, *Containing the Cold War*, pp.55-7.
11. Cabinet minutes, 2 January 1951, CM1(51)4, Cab 128/19.

12. See W.D. McIntyre, *Background to the ANZUS Pact: Policy-Making, Strategy and Diplomacy, 1945-55* (London, 1995).
13. Lowe, *Containing the Cold War*, p.33.
14. Cabinet minutes, 29 May 1951, 38(51)2, Cab 128/19.
15. Treasury memorandum, by A.J. Phelps, 6 June 1951, FO 371/92557/564A.
16. See Ian Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: the Diplomacy of Two Island Empires* (London, 1966) and *Alliance in Decline: a Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1908-1923* (London, 1972). See also Peter Lowe, *Great Britain and Japan, 1911-15: a Study of British Far Eastern Policy* (London, 1969).
17. See F.R. Dickinson, *War and National Reinvention: Japan in the Great War, 1914-1919* (London, 1999).
18. *Ibid.*, p.86.
19. Peter Lowe, *Great Britain and the Origins of the Pacific War: a Study of British Policy in East Asia 1937-1941* (Oxford, 1977), pp.72-102.
20. Letter from Dening to Strang, 8 December 1950, FO 371/83837/217.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Lowe, *Containing the Cold War*, pp.85-122.
23. *Ibid.*, pp.215-18.
24. *Ibid.*, pp.123-35.
25. Record of meeting held in House of Commons, 5 June 1951, FO 371/92554/513.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Cabinet minutes, 7 June 1951, 41(51)1, Cab 128/19.
28. FO to Washington, 7 August 1951, FO 371/92585/1144.