Session 1: The War in the Far East

Chair: Dr Philip Towle,

Centre of International Studies, University of Cambridge

Commentator: Colonel Graham Dunlop OBE MSc,

Centre for Second World War Studies, University of Edinburgh, Royal Marines (Retired)

Keiichiro Komatsu,

Author of 'Origins of the Pacific War'

Could the War have been avoided?

(because of the length of this abstract, it is included without footnotes)

The study of misunderstanding and misperception, and the persistence of stereotypes and 'images', has been an important part of the growth of the discipline of international relations since only as recently as the Second World War.

Mutual misconception grew between the two sides in the Pacific War over a long period and not from just immediately it. The cumulative effect of such perception gaps in the talks preceding the Pacific War contributed to the outbreak of the conflict. The conflict was then precipitated by faulty communication, which included the significant role played by 'Magic' (the decoded intercepts of Japanese diplomatic messages). Serious mistranslations and misinterpretation in Magic were significant factors in the failure to reach an agreement in the talks leading up to the attack on Pearl Harbor and thus contributed to the outbreak of war.

During Japan's 'seclusion' which lasted nearly 250 years, Japanese and Western peoples had very limited materials from which to learn about each other until the middle of the 19th century, with the exception of those written in the late 16th and early 17th century. This means that the initial images of each other developed in the late 16th and early 17th century were more or less 'preserved' until the 1860s when Japan decided to end her seclusion policy and opened up the country to the Western powers. From then it was only two or three generations before Pearl Harbor. Both sides were influenced by the deep-rooted historical gaps in perception. Cumulative misconception between the US and Japan gave the mistranslations a direction and force they would otherwise have lacked.

The Japanese were ever conscious of the proximity of the main Russian naval base in the Far East, at Vladivostock. The United States, a continental power with no real threat to its own security, has had an entirely different perception and for her Russia is rather Moscow. As president, Franklin Roosevelt was always concerned with domestic politics partly because of the strong sentiment of isolationism in the country at that time. In foreign policy, he gave primacy to Europe, not Asia. He was increasingly concerned by the growing power of Nazi Germany in Europe. Roosevelt supported Britain and her allies against Nazi Germany after Germany invaded Poland on 1 September 1939, and Britain and France declared war against Germany on the 3rd. This date, the beginning of the Second World War in Europe, is also significant in the history of Asia: evident when one looks at a certain 'link' between the

Russian invasion of Poland on 17 September and contemporary developments in Russo-Japanese military clashes in the Far East.

American isolationism at the time was based on her experience of the First World War and Americans wanted to avoid being involved in the Second World War 'in Europe'. In fact, when Roosevelt ran for a third term, public-opinion polls showed that most Americans supported Britain but wished to stay out of war in Europe. Roosevelt therefore had to pursue very carefully his policy to support Britain in Europe, and, at the same time avoid appearing to be against the popular sentiment of isolationism.

The 'Germany-first' military strategy was decided in December 1940 immediately after he was re-elected to an unprecedented third term. He was carefully moving away from the neutrality between Britain and Germany to which he had been tied by Congressional legislation before the outbreak of war in Europe. In March 1941, around three months after the decision of the Germany-first strategy, the Lend-Lease Act passed, with much debate, through Congress, and on the basis of this act, the US Navy was to supply the Allies on credit. Germany extended its war zone to include Iceland and the Denmark Strait between Iceland and Greenland (the area west of Iceland) on 25 March. Roosevelt retaliated by extending the American Neutrality Patrol to Iceland in April 1941. The US eventually occupied Iceland in July 1941.

Lend-Lease was extended to the Soviet Union after the outbreak of the Russo-German War which started on 22 June. Although it was extended to Russia to support the war against Nazi Germany, it was a most important development in terms of the impact on the Japanese who saw Russia as the most serious threat to Japan at the time. At this stage, Japan was already involved in the war in China (from 1937). However, there was as yet no declaration of war from either Japan or China. Both were hesitant to commit officially to war. This was partly because both were trying, for different reasons, to end the conflict.

Japan is geographically and historically close to the Asian continent. Japan saw the political situation across the Japan Sea, between the Japanese islands and the Asian continent, as unstable and her policy was more pragmatic because of this: a real threat to Japan existed, and she therefore gave less importance to 'principles' in international politics. The Japanese were thus preoccupied with the frontier region of China, Korea, Manchuria and Mongolia. Even today some significant differences between Japan and the West in their approaches in international affairs are evident.

The heavy conflict between Japan and China, which grew out of the skirmish at Marco Polo Bridge, south of Peking (Beijing), in 1937 is often called the 'Sino-Japanese War', (Nitchu Senso). The combatants were Japan and the Republic of China, established by the Han Chinese, the people of the historical core of Chinese civilization, after they had recaptured power to rule mainland China through the Revolution of 1911-12 against the Manchu rulers. Since neither the Chinese nor the Japanese ever declared war on the other until December 1941 some prefer to call this the 'China Incident', (in Japanese 'jihen' which means 'emergency' rather than 'incident' translated as 'jiken').

It is not known how the skirmish between the Japanese and Chinese armies at Marco Polo Bridge on 7 July 1937 began, but it subsequently led to the large scale China Incident. There was no clear purpose among the Japanese leaders as to why they had to fight in China and a peace agreement became more difficult because nobody knew the conditions to be 'agreed'. This is quite different from the case of the Manchurian Incident where the field officers created a pre-conceived plan, with clearly defined aims in terms of both territory and time. With no

clear purpose or driving force to guide and limit the conflict, Japan blundered into the war with China, which developed into the full-scale Pacific War lasting eight years until 1945. Japan's main concern was therefore how to extricate itself from the war in China, on terms favourable to herself. On these the various factions in Japan could not agree. In China there was a similar lack of unanimity in China because it was very unclear, at that time, as to who would eventually rule China –the Nationalists of Chiang Kai-shek, who were supported by the Allies, or the Communists. The Nationalists did not want a full-scale war against the Japanese since they wanted to defeat their domestic enemies and gain control of the whole of China. They also recognised, however, that they might have to fight the Japanese if they continued to invade China, even though this could result in increased power for the Communists. In fact, the Communists eventually came to power in the whole of China, with the exception of Taiwan, only four years after the end of the War.

Another reason for avoiding a declaration of war, of particular importance to Japanese Ministry of the Navy, was to ensure that there was no obstruction to the flow of American supplies, as they were vital for the survival of Japan's economy. So long as it was not a war, under international law, supply from a third party including the US could not be interrupted (according to the records of the Japanese Judge Advocate of the Military Authorities). The US and Chinese authorities, also wishing to maintain the supply route from the US to China, insisted that 'there was no war'. At the same time various groups tried to negotiate a cease-fire between different powers in Japan and different powers in China. Between China and Japan and between the different groups in both countries records show that there were complicated misconceptions.

The Japanese Army's main concern was not China or the US but Russia. 'The Kwantung Army was an "army which looked northward", consistently regarding Russia as the potential enemy, and tended to judge that Tokyo underestimated the seriousness of the Russian threat'. By the end of 1938 the Army 'unanimously' agreed that Japan would 'have to fight the Soviet Union within the next few years' while the possibility of 'a war with Britain must be considered 100 years later or 200 years later in the future' (the Army's statement at the meeting with the Navy in November 1938).Of course, '100 years later or 200 years later' might be 'five generations later, six generations later or even more', and therefore nobody would have to take responsibility. In other words, they had no intention of fighting against Britain at all, but acknowledged the possibility of having to fight against the Soviet Union.

From the late 19th century towards the early 20th century, the Russians made evident their determination to have a special position in Manchuria, including a naval base at Port Arthur (Lushun) and a commercial port at Dalian, both of which were secured in 1898, and both of which were to be connected by railway with the new Trans-Siberian. The Germans consolidated their control over the port of Kiaochow and their influence in the Shantung Peninsula. The French, coming up from Indo-China, successfully negotiated with the Ch'ing government for the lease of a port, for railroad concessions, for the appointment of a French citizen as head of the Chinese postal services, and for other favours. 'To balance the Russian position at Port Arthur' the British 'leased a strategic port on the other side of the Gulf of Pechili. They went into the railway concession business in a big way, particularly in the Yangtze Valley' and leased Kowloon in 1898.

Then, the Russians moved southwards even further by putting pressure on Korea and in March 1900 secured a naval concession in Masan on the southern coast of Korea as the anchorage of the Russian fleet. This meant that the Russian Navy could now connect Dalian and Vladivostok

by anchoring in Masan which lies only 50 miles from Tsushima in Japan, the same distance as from London to Oxford. In January 1902, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was established under the Taro Katsura Cabinet. From 1903, the Russian Army increased the number of troops stationed along the border of the northern part of Korea. In February 1904 the Russo-Japanese War broke out after the failure of the negotiations between the two countries (which had begun in 1903), and Japan fought with the support of Britain on the basis of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The US also took a favourable view of Japan, and seeing her as a small power fighting the despotic Tsarist Empire and defending Manchuria from Russian penetration.

In July 1905, three months before the end of the Russo-Japanese War (16 October), the US Secretary of War William Howard Taft visited Tokyo and signed an agreed memorandum with Prime Minister Katsura: 'Secretary Taft observed that Japan's only interest in the Philippines would be, in his opinion, to have these islands governed by a strong and friendly nation like the United States … Count Katsura confirmed in the strongest terms the correctness of his [Taft's] view on the point.' Thus, Japan accepted the American acquisition of the Philippines as a consequence of the Spanish-American War of 1898. The memorandum continues: 'In regard to the Korean question, Count Katsura observed that Korea being the direct cause of our [Japan's] war with Russia it is a matter of absolute importance to Japan … [to preclude] the possibility of Korea falling back into her former condition … Secretary Taft … remarked to the effect that, in his personal opinion, the establishment by Japanese troops of a suzerainty over Korea to the extent of requiring that Korea enter into no foreign treaties without the consent of Japan … would directly contribute to permanent peace in the East.'

Japan's acquisition of Korea took place in 1910, five years after the memorandum had been signed between Taft and Katsura, and in the following year, 1911, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was renewed and lasted another decade until 1921. Following the Russo-Japanese War, however, US-Japanese relations began to be more difficult. The Americans reacted against the Japanese because the Kwantung Army resisted when the US attempted to expand her concession in Manchuria. Conversely, the Japanese reacted against the Americans because of the immigration dispute in California.

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was eventually terminated at the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921-22, since the US had put a lot of pressure on Britain and Japan to abrogate it. This occurred in spite of the fact that Britain and Japan avoided listing the US as a hypothetical enemy of the Alliance in its renewal of 1911, and Britain's obligation to participate in the Alliance in the event of the outbreak of a US-Japan war was intentionally deleted. The US contingency war plan of 25 October 1920, 'The Naval Operations of Red-Orange [Anglo-Japanese] Campaign', maintained the assumption that Japan would occupy Alaska in the event of the outbreak of an Anglo-American war. 'In December, 1920, London revealed that it would not consider the Alliance binding in the event of a war between America and Japan, but the Hearst press and other anti-Japanese spokesmen refused to trust this announcement' (Bailey).

The termination of the Alliance caused a mood of anger in Japan. While the Japanese Navy began to worry about the danger of an 'Anglo-American Alliance', the Army faced the Russian Far Eastern Army without any allies. Thus, the decision to dissolve the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was significantly influenced by Anglo-American mistrust, and the consequence of the decision was to create or deepen Anglo-Japanese mistrust. Both of these suspicions can be traced back to American-Japanese distrust, which had been developing since immediately after the end of the Russo-Japanese War. This all served to accelerate the unstable developments involving the Kwantung Army in Manchuria, the Army now facing the serious threat posed by

the Russians in the North.

In 1929, a Chinese local warlord Chiang Hsueh-liang based in Manchuria became involved in a dispute with the Soviet Union over a railway concession, and this turned into a war in which his forces were defeated by the Russians. Then, in 1931, two years after the defeat of Chiang's Army, the Manchurian Incident was caused by a group of field officers in the Kwantung Army, creating a buffer zone in front of the Russian Far Eastern Army. This happened ten years after the termination of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and the Japanese Army increasingly continued to confront the Soviet forces on the northern front for the next nine years until the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy was established in 1940 in an attempt to stabilise the situation. This Pact resulted in the creation of even more serious distrust between the US and Japan in the peace talks of 1941. The cumulative effect of misconceptions again caused the deterioration of international relations between countries.

The serious nature of the sensitive relations between the Japanese and the Russians originated in the late 18th century when the Tokugawa shogunate was alerted to the Russian advance around the area of Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, north of Hokkaido (the northern-most island of the four main islands of Japan).

A series of military clashes between the two sides began in the early 19th century and included Russian raids on Sakhalin in September 1806 and the Shana War (Incident) of April to May 1807 in Etorofu (Iturup) Island in the southern Kuriles. Japan's policy of seclusion was still in force at this time so international conflict was very rare and these northern conflicts with the Russians were thus especially notable to the Japanese. Consequently, the shogunate fortified the northern front against Russia and in 1806 gave orders to local authorities to drive off all foreign ships.

The 1812 invasion of Russia by the French Army led by Napoleon I removed the heavy Russian pressure to Japan from the North and the Russian threat was for a while considered by the Japanese to be 'almost negligible'. However, this lasted only 'until after the Crimean War' of 1853-56. For the Russians these conflicts in the early 19th century were perhaps very minor local incidents which occurred in the 'Far East', however to the Japanese they were quite traumatic experiences in their foreign relations.

Territorial disputes over the southern Kuril Islands, including Etorofu, still remain unresolved and continue to be the major issue between Russia and Japan even after the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the creation of the new Russian Federation during the post-Cold War period. These disputes have prevented the establishment of a peace treaty between the two sides, an issue that has continued from the end of Russo-Japanese fighting in the Second World War up to the current Jun'ichiro Koizumi Cabinet and the Russian government of President Vladimir Putin.

Following the overthrow of the Tokugawa shogunate, the new Meiji government in 1870 again defined Russia as the major hypothetical threat to Japan. Subsequently, the Japanese so-called 'victory' in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 was obtained at the cost of the highest number of casualties ever in the history of Japan. Relations with Russia again became traumatic, particularly to members of the Army. It did nothing to diminish, in the Japanese perception, the threat from the North. In fact, the size of the Russian Far Eastern Army increased rapidly after the War.

On the basis of the new 'Directives for Japan's National Defence' (Teikoku Kokubo Hoshin) of

1923, the Navy became responsible for the potential threat of the Americans, while the Army remained responsible with regard to the Russian threat. This continued to be the situation until Autumn 1943, nearly two years after Pearl Harbor. This was also several months after the first major defeat of the Army by the American forces in Guadalcanal Island in the Pacific, where the Japanese troops suffered over 21,000 casualties out of its total strength of around 31,000 on the island. Furthermore, the creation of Manchukuo (1932), as a result of the Manchurian Incident of 1931, established a long and ill-defined frontier with the Soviet Union and Outer Mongolia. The border was originally 'agreed' between the Manchu Ch'ing Dynasty and Imperial Russia through centuries of fighting, and on the basis of 11 vague and complex treaties between the two sides, starting with the Nerchinsk Treaty of 1689. In fact, Vladivostok did not become Russian until as recently as 1860 when it was finally taken by the Russians from the Manchu Dynasty. Under these circumstances, it was not clear which geographic line was the 'correct' border between the sides. This was an issue which proved to be so complicated that border disputes continued until up to as late as the 1990s between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union and the subsequent Russian Federation. The Sino-Soviet military clashes around the Ussuri River in the 1960s are particularly well known.

In June 1934 the Soviet Far Eastern troops alone matched in number the whole of the Japanese Army, including those troops stationed in mainland Japan. The total number of Japanese troops on the Russian front was less than 30% of that of the Russians, thus the Kwantung Army faced the Russians under a strong sense of crisis. The number of reported conflicts between the Russian and Japanese armies were: 152 between 1931 and 1934, increasing rapidly to 136 in 1935 alone, then 203 in 1936, and then over 1,600 clashes up to the end of the Pacific War. They include major battles such as the Kanch'atzu Incident of 1937, the Ckangkufeng Incident of 1938 and the Nomonhan Incident of 1939. These conflicts took place despite the fact that the official Russian declaration of war on Japan was announced only on 9 August 1945, just six days before the end of the Pacific War. The Japanese Nineteenth Division lost over 20% of its members in the Ckangkufeng Incident of 1938 in return for nothing but a withdrawal under orders from Tokyo. This is, however, not well known in the West, and thus becomes one of many similar events which have created significant gaps of perception between Japan and the West.

The Nomohan Incident was a series of great military clashes between the Japanese-Manchukuoan allied troops and the Russo-Outer Mongolian allied troops in the remote border area of eastern Siberia called 'Nomonhan' in Japanese ('Nom-un-Khan' in the Mongol language). The heavy fighting began initially between the Outer Mongolian troops and the Manchukuoan troops in the Khalkhin River around the border, and the Japanese and the Russian troops then became involved in a series of clashes. The Japanese Kwantung Army suffered as many as 18,000 casualties in only four months between May and September 1939. In the case of the Twenty-third Division, stationed at the front with the Russian Far Eastern forces, the number of casualties reached more than 70% of its total strength of 11,000. The Russian and Outer Mongolian troops lost at least 19,381 men in the same Incident.

It is likely that the Russo-Japanese clashes in Nomonhan were again caused by extensive misunderstanding and confusion between the Russians, Outer Mongolians, Manchukuoans and Japanese, including questions of how to understand the contents of the Kyakhta Treaty of 1727 agreed between Russia and the Ch'ing Dynasty, and the change of the administrative line within the territory of the Ch'ing Dynasty in 1734. Regarding the border disputes of the time, the Russian recognition of the border between Mongolia and Manchukuo 'changed' in the middle of the 1930s following their geographic search (implemented probably at the request of Outer Mongolia). There are many other theories and speculations about how the military

clashes began, although much is still unclear due to the shortage of primary sources, particularly ones from the Soviet/Russian side. The Manchukuoan side translated a huge amount of public records, amounting to around 50 volumes, originally written in the Manchu language (an official language of the Ch'ing empire) into Chinese and then into Japanese in order to send them to the relevant Japanese authorities. The Manchukuoan side in fact recognised (on the basis of these records) that the Russians' mid-1930s reinterpretation of the border was justified. In this sense, the Russians 'corrected' the border on their maps, rather than 'changed' it. The materials translated by the Manchukuo were, however, too difficult to read and understand for most of the Japanese leaders responsible for developments in the region. Therefore, these materials were virtually ignored by them. This happened partly because, due to technical problems in translation caused by the differences of linguistic structure, the translated texts still required proper knowledge of Chinese in addition to that of the Japanese, together with those of the local languages of both Manchu and Mongol.

For instance, in the translated materials the Manchu and Mongol names of places and persons were written phonetically in Chinese characters (kanji), even though kanji are primarily ideographic characters. This means that the readers of the translated texts had to distinguish between kanji which were being used ideographically and those being used phonetically to describe Manchu and Mongol terms. Similar linguistic difficulties to those which greatly misled US-Japan peace talks when the American Magic interpreters were confused by the decoded Japanese messages existed here. The Magic team were able to decode these messages, but the messages appeared in Japanese phonetic letters (kana) only, since the ideographic kanji characters had already been converted by the Japanese radio operators into kana letters from the original messages, which were written in a mixture of kanji and kana. The Japanese operators had to convert all kanji into kana letters to send them in Morse code, because the code does not recognise ideographic characters.

In addition to these linguistic difficulties there were other areas of misconception. The idea of 'borders' was in itself a very ethnic cultural concept, and the causes of the Incident could be interpreted, in a certain sense, as a conflict between the concepts of 'borders' of the Japanese, who were traditionally islanders with little sense of land borders, and of the Russians, who were traditionally surrounded by long and strictly controlled land borders in the great Eurasian continent, and of the Mongol nationalities, nomadic people with a loose sense of borders.

The Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact was announced on 23 August 1939, only three days after the beginning of the Russian heavy attack on the Japanese from the 20th in Nomonhan. For the Japanese this Pact meant the possibility of an increase in the Russian troops facing the Kwantung Army. Indeed, by the 29th, the Kwantung Army was facing defeat under the intensified Russian attack with three divisions and over six machinery brigades with tanks and 300 planes. Then, immediately after attacks by the Japanese-Hsingan (part of Manchukuo) troops resumed in early September, the formal cease-fire of 15 September 1939 was agreed between the sides in Moscow. On the 17th, only two days after the cease-fire in the Far East, the Russian forces invaded Poland. As already mentioned, it was an important month because the US President became increasingly supportive of Britain after Germany invaded Poland on 1 September.

In short, the Second World War began in the same month as the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, just before Germany invaded Poland the Japanese had been fighting against the Soviet forces in the Far East; immediately after the cease-fire in the Far East the Russians invaded Poland on the basis of the new Pact with Nazi Germany. These events are therefore not separate but historically linked from the Russian point of view.

In the aftermath of the Incident and other military clashes, the Japanese Army began to prepare a new military plan against the Soviet Far Eastern Army. It is called the Kan-Toku-En (the Special Manoeuvres of the Kwantung Army) and was originally defined in late 1940. Again, as already mentioned, it is very significant because in the same period, December 1940, the US decided on the Germany-first military strategy. The US' primary concern was Nazi Germany, while the Japanese Army were concentrating on the Russian front.

The Japanese Army made a plan to deploy 1.2 million of its total strength of troops in the North on the basis of a decision of 10 July 1941. This is a huge number, particularly in comparison with those deployed in other military operations in the front with the Western Allies. For instance, in the cases of the major battles in the Pacific between the Japanese and the Allied forces (mainly Americans) during the Second World War, the Japanese Army sent 'only' around 31,000 troops to Guadalcanal, 'only' 26,000 troops to Saipan Island and 'only' 23,000 troops to Iwo Jima. The British war veterans who fought in Burma (now Myanmar) have emphasised the important fact that the military campaign there was the largest engagement with the Japanese in the War, and still, Japan sent 'only' around 231,000 troops to Burma.

It can certainly be said, however, that in the event of the outbreak of a war between Japan and Russia in August 1941, there would have been no possibility of war breaking out between the US and Japan in the Pacific in December in the same year. This is particularly so given that the number of Soviet troops invading Manchuria against the Kwantung Army four years later (August 1945) was as many as 1.6 million.

Under the circumstances, from the beginning of November 1941 the number of Japanese troops in the northern front (in Manchuria and Korea) increased to 800,000 in total. In contrast, the number of Japanese troops in the southern and eastern areas facing the Western Allied forces was in total less than 100,000 during the same period. Even by the date of the outbreak of the Pacific War in December 1941, the number facing the Western Allied forces increased to only 150,000 troops while 740,000 troops were still stationed on the northern front against the Russian forces. This number was even larger than those of the troops stationed in mainland Japan (680,000 troops) and in China (530,000 troops) on the date of Pearl Harbor. This increase of troops in the North continued even after Pearl Harbor, up until the summer of the next year, 1942. When the War was over in August 1945, the Japanese Army still maintained nearly 700,000 troops in the North, although they were no longer the 'first class' troops that had already been sent to the fronts in southern and eastern areas against the Western Allies.

It is now widely known that the relations between the Army and the Navy were unusually sensitive. The first Army-Navy joint operational plan in the history of the Japanese armed forces was only formulated as late as 20 January 1945, the last in the four years of the Pacific War. The Navy was also not confident enough to continue to fight in the Pacific at all in the event of the outbreak of a war with the Allies. In fact, considering the capacity of the Navy it was too vast an area to cover for the Japanese fleet, and therefore the principal strategy was to fight only when the enemies entered into waters that were definted as directly strategically sensitive to mainland Japan. In this sense, Pearl Harbor was a very exceptional plan made by Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto (Commander-in-Chief of the Combined Fleet), on the basis of his outstanding personality as a naval strategist, and even Yamamoto himself stated in autumn 1940 to Prime Minister Konoe that 'should the war be prolonged for two or three years, I have no confidence in our ultimate victory'. He also predicted on 29 September 1941, less than three months before Pearl Harbor, that a US-Japan war must last several years [far longer than two or three years] in the event of the outbreak of such a war. Thus, Japan was not ready, from the military point of view, to fight with a power as mighty as the US and its allied countries at all. At the Liaison Council Conference held on 26 August 1941, less than four months before Pearl

Harbor, Colonel Hideo Iwakuro stressed the serious difference in military and economic power between the US and Japan; the capacity ratio in steel was 20 to I, oil more than 100 to 1, coal 10 to 1, electric power 6 to 1, cars more than 100 to 1, planes 6 to 1 and labour force 4.5 to 1. Overall, US capacity was twenty times greater than Japan's.

The threat to Russia in Europe was Germany. This made relations with Germany extremely important to Japan.' In fact, the Japanese defence policy has been consistent for over a century until up to very recently, in that it 'targeted Russia' as the most threatening hypothetical enemy, first Tsarist Russia and then the Soviet Union. The situation is different now as North Korea poses a much more serious problem for Japan. This 'traditional' defence policy has been, at least in the eyes of Japan, consistently maintained first in the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 against Tsarist Russia, then in the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy established in 1940 against the Soviet Union, and subsequently in the US-Japan Security Pact against the Soviet Union in the post-war period. All these treaties held Russia to be the principal threat. In contrast with the Western point of view, it therefore made a great difference to Japan whether she was on the side of the Anglo-American power or the German power even though there were significant differences between Japan and Germany in their policies. This gap in perception has not been fully explored either by Japan or the West.

The German-Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936, targeting the Soviet Union as the only communist country in the world (not yet a military alliance), led eventually to the Tripartite Pact as the military alliance. However, the negotiations to establish it lasted for more than two years from spring 1938 onwards, since Japan initially insisted on limiting the hypothetical enemy to only one country, the Soviet Union, while Germany wished to list Britain and France. Then, after suffering heavy casualties in the Nomonhan Incident, and thus having lost confidence in its ability to face the threat by the Russians during the negotiations with Germany, the Army again proposed an alliance with Germany in order to create a potential second front against Russia. The Navy eventually conceded but Foreign Minister Matsuoka was adamant that 'we should firmly suppress any useless anti-Britain and anti-American activities [in Japan]'.

In terms of the national interests of both the US and Japan in the early 1940s, there were many reasons why both sides wished to avert a war in the Pacific, and none, crucially affecting their national interests, for war. The US wished to concentrate on the front in Europe against Germany while Japan, as has been explained, wished to concentrate on the northern front with Russia in the Far East. Nonetheless, the Pacific War broke out in 1941. The US and Japan engaged in informal peace talks, conducted by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull with three Foreign Ministers and two Prime Ministers between November 1940 and April 1941 and in semi-formal peace talks, with Foreign Ministers Matsuoka and Toyoda and Prime Minister Konoe from April 1941 – December 1941. Just hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the talks were technically still underway. Discussions about Pearl Harbor began under the Hideki Tojo Cabinet, which was appointed on 18 October, although Tojo did not become Prime Minister in order to lead Japan into war. It was at this time, in November 1941 that the Magic mistranslations came to have disastrous significance.

In Washington Ambassador Nomura was sent two proposals, one as a back up in case the first was not accepted. The Magic interception ensured, tragically, that the first proposal was not taken seriously. Amongst a number of serious mistranslations by Magic, an example is that the term, saigo, was consistently translated as 'final' in Proposal A, rather than 'the latest'. The Proposals, as a result, were considered ultimatums whilst Foreign Minister Togo and Prime Minister Tojo at the time had agreed: 'Japan should compromise further, if the American authorities indicated any interest in either Proposal A or B'. On 26 November the Hull Note was, against this background, presented, with the decision having been made not to attach to

this tough Ten Point note the more acceptable 'modus vivendi' proposal for a three month truce, as had originally been intended. It was the Hull note which eventually triggered the Japanese decision to launch the attack on Pearl Harbor. In Japan the Conference of the Council of the Japanese Supreme Command in the Presence of the Emperor was opened at 14:05 (Tokyo time) on 1 December, and the decision to begin hostilities against the US was taken, with the provision, which had been in place since 5 November, that the attack would be aborted if the diplomatic negotiations were successful. The intention to call off the attack if the peace talks were successful remained even after the Japanese planes took off from the aircraft carriers; radio communication was possible after that, so long as the fighter planes and bombers flew together.

There are many serious mistranslations by the Magic translators, which cannot here be listed. One example, however, relates to Japan's position in the Tripartite Pact. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance against Russia, as discussed, had been terminated some time before, and therefore Japan established the alliance with Germany in order to create a potential second front against Russia. Japan did not have any surplus resources to open hostilities against the US. The Japanese Army was exhausted in the war in China, and had lost confidence in its ability to face the threat posed by the Russians. Under the circumstances, Japan worried seriously about the possibility of being involved in a war with the US which could be caused on the basis of the Tripartite Pact. This was the reason why Japan tried to emphasise repeatedly to the American government that the Japanese decision as to whether Japan had to join a war against the US would not be made 'automatically' in the event of the US starting to fight against Nazi Germany, and the decision would be made 'independently' from Germany. Japan's intention to act 'independently' was therefore stressed in two telegrams in Japanese sent from Tokyo to the Japanese Embassy in Washington in November and they were intercepted by Magic immediately. However, the term 'independently' was mistranslated by Magic as 'automatically' (Telegram #773) or was abbreviated (Telegram #800). The American decision-makers thus never actually saw the term 'independently' sent in Japanese.

A detailed examination of this and other misconceptions perpetrated by 'Magic', and of 40 serious mistranslations in the telegrams from Tokyo, from early November up until Pearl Harbor, shown against the original sources, together with an explanation of the reasons for them, are contained in Dr. Komatsu's book 'Origins of the Pacific War and the Importance of Magic' (ISBN 1-873410-66-2, Japan Library, 1999) Chapter 10. It concludes that efforts made by the participants on both sides to achieve a successful outcome and avert the conflict, or at least to delay the outbreak of the war until the following March of 1942, might have been much closer to achieving success than is generally believed up to now without the problems created by Magic.

Fumitaka Kurosawa,

Professor, Tokyo Woman's Christian University

Why did the Japanese Imperial Army Abuse Allied Prisoners of War?

The treatment of Allied prisoners of war (POWs) by the Japanese armed forces during World War II was extremely brutal and inhuman, and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) cited it as one of three areas in which the organization abysmally failed in its mission during the war. According to the records of the Military Tribunal for the Far East pertaining to Japan's war responsibility and war crimes, there were 132,134 Allied prisoners of war captured by the Japanese, and 35,756 of them, 27.1 percent of the total, died in captivity. Compared

with the approximately 4 percent mortality rate reported in German and Italian POW camps, the figure is disproportionately high. In terms of British POWs, 5.1 percent of those captured by the Germans and Italians died, whereas 24. 8 percent in Japanese custody did not live to see the end of war.

The abuse of POWs is an aspect of the general inhumanity of war, and as such, the practice was hardly a monopoly of the Japanese military during World War II. That said, there is no denying that the mortality rate among Allied POWs held by the Japanese was exceedingly high. The abuse by the Japanese military left an indelible scar on former POWs and their families long after the war ended, making it extremely difficult for Japan to achieve postwar reconciliation with former POWs and their governments. It also created an image in the Western world of Japan as a nation even more barbaric than Nazi Germany.

Was the Japanese military, a principal arm of the modern Japanese state, really a band of barbarians with no regard for or understanding of wartime international law? A perusal of the history of international warfare waged by Japan since the Meiji Restoration of 1868 reveals a portrait of a "civilized" military standing in sharp contrast to the organization that earned such notoriety for its brutish practices during World War II. It is well known among historians of modern Japan that during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, Russian POWs at the Matsuyama POW camp received what amounted to kid glove treatment, as did German detainees at the Bando POW camp during World War I. Statistical evidence confirms the humane treatment of POWs by the Japanese military in the early 20th century: the mortality rate among Russian POWs during the Russo-Japanese War was a minuscule 0.5 percent. The German POWs during World War I interacted freely with the local population, teaching their Japanese "neighbours" how to make German-style bread and sausages, and many of them elected to stay in Japan after the war.

These contradictory historical records inevitably raise a question: why was there such a stark difference in the Japanese military's treatment of captured enemy combatants in World War II in comparison with that in the period up to and including World War I? In this presentation, I would like to unlock this historical puzzle by pulling together the existing literature that seems to me to provide some clues.

In considering the question of the abuse of Allied POWs, it is important to keep in mind that what the Europeans and Americans regarded as "abuse" by the Japanese military covered a wide gamut of experiences. The list of charges ranges from the degrading nature of food, shelter, clothing and medical services made available to POWs to physical and emotional abuse, torture, psychological humiliation, cruel and unusual punishment, forced labour, forced marches and forfeiture of Red Cross relief materials. The sheer diversity of the charges leads me to believe that the abuse was a multi-faceted practice, induced by multiple causes.

One of the general contributing factors was the vast difference between the cultures, customs and mores of the Western world and Japan at the time. The everyday practices of the two worlds differed hugely, even at the level of personal conduct and manner of interaction, such as how to bow or sit. Such cultural difference led an ICRC adviser to remark in his postwar report that everyday practices of Japanese soldiers were tantamount to institutionalized starvation and incubation for disease in the eyes of Western soldiers. In considering the deprivation experienced by the Allied POWs, it is also important to remember that the Japanese population at large was enduring highly impoverished material conditions. For example, as early as in 1940 (before the outbreak of World War II in the Far East), commercial distribution of pork was banned in Tokyo, and fruit and vegetables were placed under strict rationing. This

larger context of wartime deprivation in a decidedly under-resourced nation naturally impacted on the treatment of POWs.

With these preliminary observations in mind, I would like next to explore other structural forces that seem to have conditioned the Japanese military's approach to Allied POWs. In particular, I would like to compare the Japanese military before and after World War I. What changed and how did it change during this critical period? The first thing that comes to my mind is the changing degree of affinity the Japanese military, as an institution, felt towards the Western world. During the Meiji (1868–1912) and Taisho (1912–26) periods, Japan as a nation made it its utmost priority to gain acceptance in the Western international community by adopting Western, "civilized" norms of conduct. During the early Showa period (from 1926), however, Japan's national project shifted to assertion of Japanese identity and the autonomy of its indigenous values from the West. This altered aspiration drove the nation towards anti-Westernism in the period before World War II. The eager acceptance of Western norms was replaced by hostility towards the West and an emphasis on Japan's uniqueness and narrowly conceived nationalism. Transcending the West and creating a new type of "civilized nation" became Japan's new obsession.

One index of this ideological sea change was discernible in the war declarations issued by the Japanese government. At the time of the Sino-Japanese War (1894–5) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904–5), war was declared in the name of *Kotei* (the Emperor) in the same manner as European colonial empires. In contrast, World War II was declared by *Tenno*, a term suggestive of the distinctiveness of Japan's imperial institution. Whereas in the earlier war declarations, Japan made a point of emphasizing its adherence to international law, the declaration of World War II was notable for the absence of any reference to international law. This omission indicated that the "civilized" and humane treatment of POWs, a cardinal tenet of Western norms of warfare, was never a formal element of Japanese government and military policy during World War II. True, Japan had not ratified the 1929 Geneva Convention concerning the treatment of POWs, but the nation was subject to the terms of this international convention. However, the absence of formal government and military policy requiring humane treatment of POWs according to the accepted Western norms meant that the military infrequently failed to implement the terms of the convention in actual battlefield settings. A comment made by a member of the POW Intelligence Bureau (established in accordance with the Hague Convention) points to the lack of enforcement: "At the time of the Russo-Japanese War, Japan was obsequious to the West. At present, we are simply asserting Japan's own ways of doing things." Similarly, a report (dated 25 March 1942) submitted by Zentsuji POW camp to Army Minister Hideki Tojo stated that the "existing international laws are a vestige of Japan's inferior position vis-à-vis the West. Now that Japan has risen to the international mainstream, these laws are no longer befitting to our country."

For the Japanese government and military touting World War II as a war of liberation being fought on behalf of the Asian peoples against White colonialism, Allied POWs were a useful propaganda tool. These captive Western soldiers could be used to disabuse Asians of their belief in Anglo-American superiority and put an end to their worship of Western civilization. The Japanese might also impress on other Asians the superiority of the people of Yamato (Japan’s historical heartland) and thus legitimate the project to construct the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

Around this time the Japanese military underwent a conceptual shift, defining itself as *Kokugun* (national army) as opposed to *Kogun* (Imperial Army). From the inception of the modern Japanese military, it had been answerable directly to the Emperor, the generalissimo.

But it was Japan's national army as well as the Emperor's private army, and, as such, it was widely referred to as *Kokugun* during the Meiji and Taisho periods. The term *Kogun,* which emphasizes the mythical and almost filial nature of its link to the Emperor, only gained currency after the Manchurian Incident of 1931. Not incidentally, Army Minister Sadao Araki, who was instrumental in popularizing this term, headed an intra-service faction known as *Kodoha* (the Imperial Way Faction). In the 1930s, the Japanese military transformed itself into an institution driven by manic emphasis on and emotional commitment to the cult of the Emperor, Japanese exceptionalism and Bushido-esque martial values.

It is useful to remember in this context that the late Masao Maruyama, Japan's preeminent political theorist, elucidated the ideological workings of the prewar Japanese Emperor system by employing the concept of *yokuatsu no ijo* or "the system of trickle-down oppression". In this structure of hierarchically enforced oppression, the Japanese Imperial military was idealized as the agent of a moral war ordained to construct the Great East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere. It was lionized in terms of the Japan-centric and Emperor-centric world view. Western POWs were placed at the bottom of this hierarchy in which the merits of individuals and groups were measured by their proximity to the Emperor. In other words, the Emperor's military was the carrier of superior values such as "justice" and "civilization" in this concentric ideological universe. The sense of superiority born of this mode of constructing the world provided an impetus for abusing Western POWs, who supposedly had lowly and degenerate Western values and world views. In a way, this sense of superiority was the mirror image of the inferiority complex that the Japanese had historically felt towards the West.

The third factor that may have contributed to the mistreatment of Western POWs was the preponderance of military priorities in Japan's political life in the 1930s. After the Manchurian Incident and the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War, Japan entered a period of prolonged military mobilization. As a result of this chronic state of crisis, military imperatives began to take precedence over all other aspects of society. By the time Japan entered the all-consuming war in 1941, military mandates had come to dominate society completely. Even prior to these spiralling events, the institutionalization of the Japanese military as a professional group had advanced to such an extent that it became easy for the military to assert and legitimate its imperatives in the nation's policy-making. For example, the Japanese military opposed (and blocked) ratification of the 1929 Geneva Convention on four grounds. One of the cited reasons was that a guarantee of the humane treatment of captured enemy airmen would promote long-distance aerial bombing attacks. Once made in terms of military imperatives, most of the military's political positions tended to carry the day.

The primacy of military imperatives in Japanese politics reached its apogee when Army Minister Hideki Tojo assumed premiership and launched the nation into an all-out war in 1941. As mentioned earlier in this presentation, the declaration of war did not specifically refer to compliance with existing international law, and the question of how to treat captured enemy combatants became heavily influenced by the initiatives of General Tojo, who, as Army Minister, was in charge of this matter. On 8 January 1941, Tojo issued his famous Battlefield Directive (*Senjinkun*), in which he admonished Imperial soldiers against the "humiliation and dishonour of captivity and posthumous criminal prosecution". This directive profoundly shaped the ideas of Japanese soldiers and civilians concerning POWs and humanitarianism. Tojo's views of POWs and humanitarianism thus provide a key to understanding Japan's track records in the POW question. At the same time, it should be pointed out that Tojo's Battlefield Directive was issued against the backdrop of a growing number of Japanese soldiers becoming enemy POWs amid the military stalemate in China. The Japanese military's top brass was hard pressed to deal with this increasingly serious lapse in military behaviour, and the Directive was

conceived as a way to restore morale and discipline within the fighting force.

The fourth reason for the abuse of POWs that I see is a major change in Japanese views of POWs, which occurred as part of a larger shift taking place in other aspects of Japan's military practices. If one divides views concerning POWs into two broad categories, one may be called the Western, "modern enlightenment" ideology of POWs, codified since the 18th century in the Western world to inject humanitarianism into interstate warfare. Opposite this idea was prewar Japan's view of POWs, the kind of ideology that spawned Tojo's Battlefield Directive. It held that becoming an enemy captive was the ultimate form of disgrace and that an honorable and self-respecting soldier must chose death over captivity. This way of thinking associated surrender and subsequent captivity with moral bankruptcy and conduct unbecoming.

In the typology I have just outlined, Japan in the Meiji and Taisho periods accepted the Western and "modern-enlightenment" POW ideology as it sought to integrate international law into its statecraft. In the period between the Sino-Japanese War and World War I, Japan thus treated enemy POWs in conformity with the prevailing Western norms. Since the Japanese government and military during the Meiji and Taisho periods accorded "civilized", Western treatment to enemy combatants, they faced a conundrum regarding how to treat Japanese soldiers captured by the enemy. According to the Western, "modern-enlightenment" ideology, becoming a POW could be justified under certain circumstances: for example, after doing one's very best on the battlefield. It was extremely hard, however, to draw the line as to when a soldier could be judged to have done his best or when it made more sense to surrender than to continue fighting. During the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese military's top brass chose not to court martial the Japanese military personnel who had surrendered to the enemy. But the intra-service POW investigation committee staffed by lower-ranking officers took a more draconian position when it evaluated these cases and indicted the Japanese POWs under the provisions of the military penal codes. Not surprisingly, the subjective nature of the assessment that "one did one's best on the battlefield" opened the door for glaring inequity and miscarriage of justice. The military leadership thus came to recognize the question as a real moral and legal conundrum.

British Lieutenant General Hamilton, who observed Japanese battlefield practices, remarked that Japanese soldiers would rather kill themselves by self-disembowelment than be taken prisoner. These historical records suggest that the Western or modern ideas about the legitimacy of POW status accepted at the military's highest level were not shared by lower-ranking officers, rank-and-file soldiers and, perhaps, civilians. In the case of the Japanese POWs during the Russo-Japanese War, a majority were eventually forced out of service and socially ostracized even after they returned to civilian life in their hometowns. At the same time, enemy POWs received semi-red-carpet treatment. During the Meiji and Taisho periods, Japanese POW policy was thus characterized by a kind of double standard, whereby Japanese POWs were penalized and maligned while enemy POWs were treated like honoured guests.

Facing these discordant practices, certain elements within the Japanese military became highly critical of the way the military leadership "coddled" German POWs during World War I. The Army Minister at the time disapprovingly reported that the enemy captives were served better food than Japanese officers and soldiers. The hardening attitudes towards the captured enemy combatants reflected Japan's emerging sense of identity after victory in World War I as an equal to the Western powers.

After World War I, the Japanese military leadership conceived of the nature of future wars as total war. As a developing economy devoid of critical natural resources, Japan found it difficult

to satisfy all its material requirements for preparation for a total war. The military had no recourse but to modernize and enhance its battle capabilities through better organization and equipment, but was hampered by the chronic economic stagnation and the post-World War I Japanese public opinion favouring disarmament. In order to build a mighty military despite the acknowledged resource deficiency, the military leadership drove itself to increasing, and ultimately fanatical, emphasis on compensatory spiritual fortitude to be instilled in its officers and soldiers. Army Minister Kazushige Araki, who presided over the modernization of the Japanese military after the mid-1920s, talked of the critical importance of "the dogged determination to win" among the military personnel. His exhortation was codified in the early Showa Period in the Japanese Army's official combat manual. Araki supervised the compilation of this manual himself.

As the Japanese military sought to incorporate the lessons of World War I, it took up a perverse form of spiritual determinism, or the spirit of victory-by-all-means, as the guiding principle of what its leadership envisioned as an invincible fighting force capable of winning a total war. Just as the military made this fateful "spiritual" turn, the debate over the 1929 Geneva Convention came to the fore of Japanese politics. By this time, the military leadership saw no choice but to beat the increasingly hollow slogan of spiritual determinism into the minds of its officers and soldiers to force them to keep fighting to the death. Given this paramount institutional mandate, upholding the Western, modern POW ideology simply was not an option. The military thus vehemently opposed ratification of the Geneva Convention. The reason it cited was two-fold. First, since Japanese military men would rather kill themselves than allow themselves to be captured by the enemy, the convention would not be reciprocal and only put the Japanese military at a disadvantage. Second, enemy POWs should be treated on an equal basis with the Japanese military personnel, and this would undermine the Japanese military's own internal discipline. The convention included many stipulations that would require a major revision of the Japanese military's own penal codes. But such a revision would be detrimental to the maintenance of military discipline among Japanese officers and soldiers.

The attitude to POWs embraced by the military leadership thus began to move inexorably towards the kind of unquestioning espousal of spiritual determinism that had long been prevalent among its lower echelons. After experiencing a declining morale as a result of the prolonged state of war in China, the Japanese military top brass felt compelled to issue the infamous Battlefield Directive. At this point, the distinctly Japanese POW ideology was no longer a mere statement of general principle or an extremist standpoint professed by individual officers and soldiers: it had hardened into a sacrosanct rule of military conduct to be upheld by all members of the military. The double standards that had characterized Japanese policy until World War I were thus eliminated, but this new orthodoxy became a perfect recipe for mistreatment of POWs during World War II.

This fundamental shift in Japanese attitudes towards POWs led to widespread practices incongruous with international law – there is no question about it. But I would argue that it also derived from the pressing military imperatives perceived by the Japanese military seeking desperately – and perhaps hopelessly – to build and maintain a powerful fighting force in the face of the nation's profound resource and material deficiencies. In a perverse sense, this ideological shift was propelled by hard-nosed military calculations on the part of the Japanese military.

These are the four structural factors that I would like to suggest as reasons, both direct and indirect, for the abuse of Allied POWs by the Japanese military during World War II. In short, a misguided ideology disparaging military captivity combined with sanctimonious nationalism

against the backdrop of the tyranny of military priorities to create attitudes condoning the abuse of POWs. A tragic result of this institutional and moral bankruptcy was the complete disregard for universal humanitarian imperatives and the immense human sufferings endured by those who fell victim to it.

Session 2: The Aftermath

Chair: Professor Nobuo Shimotomai,

Faculty of Law, Hosei University, Former President of the Japanese Association of International Relations

Commentator: Dr John Swenson-Wright

Fuji Bank University Lecturer in Modern Japanese Studies and a Fellow of Darwin College, University of Cambridge

Ian Nish

Professor Emeritus of International History at the London School of Economics

British-Japanese Dilemmas in Southeast Asia after 1945

This short paper originated in work I have been doing on the years following the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 when troops and guns stayed in position for two years after the so-called cessation of hostilities. There is a common popular misapprehension that wars end with the ceasefire, or armistice or the peace treaty. In fact, the approach of peace generates new and unforeseen problems. Often in history fighting is succeeded by fighting of a different kind. It would be a good thing if more time and effort were devoted by historians to aftermaths of war – equally with the amount of time devoted to the origins of wars.

The other origin came from the words of Professor Dennis: "Wars rarely end tidily and the war against Japan was no exception." (Dennis, p. 225) This conclusion matches my own personal experience. I reached SEAC in Singapore in July 1946 and joined a language unit called SEATIC. It had branches (just single officers) in Rangoon, Bangkok, Saigon and Jakarta as well as the headquarters in Malaya where I was stationed. It was natural that I should wonder what these officers were doing at our out-stations.

The basic problem was that SEAC units in 1945 found themselves assuming military, administrative and political responsibilities as part of the allied war effort. In effect they were called on to restore the status quo ante, and thus reestablish European empires, with the tacit disapproval of the US. The chaos created by the atomic bomb and sheer suddenness of the Japanese surrender left occupying armies with the unenviable task of establishing law and order without the resources of troops, shipping and intelligence to undertake it.

It would of course have been good if the occupation of Southeast Asia had been planned systematically at leisure during the war as the US planned the occupation of Japan. There American administrators and military officers due to be involved were sent on training courses at America's most prestigious universities. Such luxuries were not available to British who had to switch from the role of fighting and take over from the Japanese on behalf of the Dutch and French.

This transition from enemy to partner spoken of in the title of this conference – or 'from foe to friends' in another publication – is often slow and full of discord. We would be foolish to pretend otherwise. There was a measure of pragmatic cooperation between Britain and Japan in the special circumstances of 1945-7, not friendly but practical cooperation. But it was not partnership which took some time to establish.

Dr John Weste

Department of East Asian Studies, Leeds University

Post-War Economic and Military Relations

Introduction

Japan's surrender on 15th August 1945 marked several crucial events. Firstly, clearly, there was the simple fact of Japanese surrender, occupation, de-militarisation and the, however temporary, removal of Japan from the ranks of the Great Powers. Secondly, the end of the Second World War confirmed the United States' position as the pre-eminent Western power. Great Britain, while still powerful, had been clearly replaced in East Asia, and, particularly from the latter half of the 1950s onwards, London looked increasingly to Western Europe and the United States, rather than the former Empire, for military security and economic prosperity.

Nonetheless, one should also be wary of over emphasising these trends. Whether occupied or not, Japan was not an unimportant nation to Great Britain. Japan retained significant economic potential, which the Allies would soon be utilising with the July 1950 outbreak of war in Korea, for example. Further, the Cold War and heightening tensions between the capitalist and communist blocs stimulated an American interest in Japanese rearmament and the military nature of the US-Japanese alliance. Both of these outcomes directly impacted upon British territories and Commonwealth partners in South-East Asia, for example. Equally, the extent of British decline was not immediately obvious in the 1940s and the early 1950s: much of the pre-war Empire had been re-captured intact and the UK retained a formidable military capacity and global influence. American domination of the western relationship with Japan was by no means absolute. An American upper hand did not automatically cancel out any British interest in East Asia, and specifically, in Japan. London had definite economic and military concerns in its relationship with Japan and did not at least wish to dismiss them utterly to meet the needs of the United States.

Indeed, the United Kingdom's elite had no intention of surrendering a global role for itself. Churchill spoke of the "Three Circles" – three interlocking circles of Empire, the English-speaking dominions and the United States, and Europe, with only Great Britain having a place in each circle – as the model demonstrating a long-term global British role. While not the equal of the Superpowers, each circle would reinforce Britain's position in the other to guarantee a role as mediator between the more powerful United States and the Soviet Union.[1] Ultimately, of course, this vision was not sustainable. Nonetheless, as long as the UK attempted to maintain a position in each of these circles, it was similarly required to consider the economic and military impact of Japan in every circle, too. Anglo-Japanese relations thus held the potential to impact upon the UK in its links with the United States, British territories in South-

[1] Churchill, W *Europe Unite: Speeches 1947 and 1948* (London: Cassell, 1950) and Frankel, J *British Foreign Policy 1945-1973* (London: OUP, 1975), pp. 157-60.

East Asia, Australia, and, of course, between the Japanese and British home islands directly.

This paper seeks to place Anglo-Japanese economic and military relations over the 1950s in the context of British assumptions of a global role. Japan certainly held the capacity to harm British interests, as the shipbuilding and textile sectors, for example, readily pointed out. Equally, Britain also did find itself subordinating its own interests to those of the United States. Again, British representatives in Japan regularly complained, inevitably to no great advantage, of US economic and trading policies in Japan directly harming British interests. Nonetheless, it is also a mistake to see Britain as a faltering imperial power and merely responsive, however sullenly, to US and Cold War demands. At times, the promotion of Japanese economic activity in South-East Asia, for example, also met long-term British interests: tying Japan to the capitalist bloc and helping to keep British territories free from communism and open to British trade was not a purely American concern.

Finally, it is important to remember that the experiences of World War Two were no absolute determinant of the nature and course of post-war Anglo-Japanese relations. Doubtlessly they were important and memories of the treatment of British prisoners-of-war remain to this day an emotive issue and the cause of anti-Japanese sentiment, but nonetheless, it is striking at the speed at which the British elite recognised the importance of Japan, despite its defeat and occupation. In 1952, Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, whose son died in the war against Japan, acknowledged that the Japanese 'count for a great deal and will count for more'.[2] Malcolm MacDonald, the British Commissioner General in South-East Asia 1948-55, held that a capitalist Japan allied to the west was essential to British security in light of its 'strategic land area…the potential industrial power of this populous nation and…its energetic, efficient and aggressive military capacities'.[3] Equally, it is important to acknowledge that British fears of any Japanese threat were not limited to the War. UK shipping-lines, for example, drew heavily upon pre-war Japanese competition, characterised as a cause of incalculable damage to the decline of British shipping in Asia, rather than wartime atrocities in its case against Japan.[4] Nonetheless, both pre-war and wartime memories proved to be a powerful force conditioning British views of Japan: however important Japan might be, Eden also added as a people they were not 'easy to like'[5] and MacDonald declared them to be 'an unsatisfactory people' for whom defeat had but tempered a desire to dominate East Asia.[6] Whether it be in terms of political, economic or military matters, to Britain's mind Japan was still not a nation open to fair play and worthy of trust.

Anglo-Japanese Economic Relations

It is not difficult to list examples of British industry and trade which suffered directly in competition with Japanese industry. As early as 1946, Lancashire, the home of the British textile industry, was warning against Japanese competition and, over the 1940s and 1950s, repeatedly called for the British government to impose quota and import restrictions on the

[2] Malcolm MacDonald Papers (hereafter MMP), University of Durham, 22/10/24 'Anthony Eden to Malcolm MacDonald', 23rd May 1952.
[3] MMP 33/2/85-7, 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952.
[4] Janet Hunter and Shinya Sugiyama, 'Introduction' in Hunter, J and Sugiyama S (eds) *Economic and Business Relations*, Volume 4, *The History of Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1600-2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 57-9.
[5] MMP 22/10/24 'Anthony Eden to Malcolm MacDonald', 23rd May 1952.
[6] MMP33/2/92 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952.

Japanese.[7] Sir Raymond Streat, chairman of the Cotton Board 1940-57 saw in Japan a dangerous rival and the cause of acute discomfort.[8] Japan needed to be curtailed lest low-wage Japanese competition undo Lancashire's programmes of modernisation and investment: the 'capitalist and entrepreneur in the East' had to be convinced that 'if he enlarged his bid for world trade to unreasonable proportions he would be met with such counteraction…as to make his bid highly unprofitable.'[9] Similarly, the British shipbuilding industry held post-war Japanese competition to be unfair and lobbied the government and bureaucracy for support: between 1948-50, for example Great Britain held 35% of the world's export market.[10] However, in 1956, for the first peacetime years since 1920, a foreign nation launched more merchant ships that the UK. That it was Japan hardly lessened the pain. Again, echoing the textile sector, and emphasising a perceived tendency of the Japanese to cheat at trade, in its 1955 annual report, the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom declared, 'the aspirations of Japan to play a prominent part in world trade are understandable. But it is idle for her to think that she will be readily accepted back into the comity of nations so long as she continues to pursue an aggressive trade policy.'[11]

It is also of equal importance to confirm, however, that such fears did not necessarily translate into a blanket British opposition to the re-emergence of Japanese trade and manufacturing: the government, the civil service, industry and colonial officials were by no means united. As early as October 1946, the president of the Board of Trade, Sir Stafford Cripps, stated that Japan must be left 'internationally solvent' as the alternative of 'permanent foreign support' was clearly way beyond Britain's capacities.[12] In May 1948, Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin warned against leaving Japan and its 'ninety millions of people…in a cesspool of poverty'.[13] Later that July, Bevin emphasised his point by refusing to receive a Lancashire delegation demanding that restrictions be imposed on Japanese spindles. In a letter to Harold Wilson, the then president of the Board of Trade, he explained that 'On the grounds of economic principle, political possibility and administrative expediency, H.M. government have always maintained that no proposal for restricting the development of Japanese consumption good industries should be put forward'.[14]

Naturally, as depicted by the Three Circles, neither did the revival of Anglo-Japanese economic competition occur in a vacuum. British fears, and ambitions, were played out in the context of the crucial relationship with the United States, but also with the remaining British territories in South-East Asia and with the emerging Commonwealth. Indeed, it is evident that a great deal of Anglo-Japanese economic competition was in fact mediated through the Commonwealth and South-East Asia. Commonwealth connexions not only served to deflect Japanese competition away from directly threatening the home islands, but also provided

[7] Gordon Daniels 'Britain's view of post-war Japan' in Nish, I (ed.), *Anglo-Japanese Alienation 1919-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 273-4.
[8] Dupree, Marguerite (ed.), *Lancashire and Whitehall: The Diary of Sir Raymond Streat*, Volume 2, 1939-57 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), p. 737.
[9] *Ibid*., p. 552.
[10] Johnman, L and Murphy, H *British Shipbuilding and the State since 1918* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), p. 103.
[11] Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom – Annual Reports, 1955-6, p. 80.
[12] Cited in G. Daniels, 'Britain's View of Post-war Japan, 1945-9' in Nish, I (ed.), *Anglo-Japanese Alienation,* pp. 260-1.
[13] *Ibid*., p. 262-3.
[14] Dupree, M (ed.), *Lancashire and Whitehall: the Diary of Sir Raymond Streat*, vol. 2, 1939-57 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 198), pp. 460-1.

potential leverage vis-à-vis Japan and the United States.[15]

Japan's return to South-East Asia was rapid. By 1949, Japanese shipping was lifting bulk purchases of rice from Siam and iron ore from Malaya and the Philippines.[16] Reparation negations over the 1950s also provided a further opportunity for Japan to re-establish its economic presence in the region. Hara Yasusaburô, head of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs South-East Asia Council, held that reparations could create a permanent market for Japanese goods in the region and that quite simply Japan could 'turn misfortune in fortune'.[17] A Japanese economic return to the region also enjoyed powerful American support as over the late 1940s and early 1950s, the US gradually sought to re-orientate Japanese trade away from the communist dominated North-East Asia. Japan was held to be the "Workshop of Asia" and, while American visions at the time of Japanese economic might have perhaps been exaggerated given the extraordinary Japanese economic growth of the 1970s and the 1980s, special procurement for the Korean War nonetheless demonstrated the economic advantages Japan brought to the capitalist powers.[18] Great Britain, with its former empire and commonwealth presence in the region, was, therefore, of some importance as the US sought to direct Japanese trade southwards.

London was clearly mindful of American, and Japanese, perceptions that the UK was discriminating against legitimate Japanese trading interests. An outright denial of Japan in South-East Asia could well have invited an American assault on the sterling area and Britain's regional position in order to ensure Japanese economic penetration. US grumblings about the denial of Japanese shipping by Commonwealth governments and British territories were regularly reported back to London.[19] Nonetheless, Britain's agreement to the opening of its South-East Asian territories to Japanese trade reflected far broader concerns and an ambition to retain broad control over the nature of the Japanese return.

Firstly, by the end of the 1940s, Britain had come to accept that it could no longer dominate South-East Asia. Instead, inter-regional co-operation and economic growth was seen as the best means to perpetuate political and economic influence. Attracting American interest and cash to support British trade and aid policies was of paramount importance; perhaps less emphatically, Japanese involvement was nonetheless see as desirable and inevitable even if repugnant.

Malcolm MacDonald, the Commissioner-General of the United Kingdom in South-East Asia, 1948-55, vigorously promoted expanded Anglo-Japanese trade in the region. Chinese

[15] On Anglo-Japanese economic relations see, for example: Tomaru, J *The Postwar Rapproachment of Malay and Japan, 1945-61: The Roles of Britain and Japan in South-East Asia* (London: Macmillan, 2000), Yokoi N *Japanese Postwar Economic Recovery and Anglo-Japanese Relations 1948-62* (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003) and John Weste 'Facing the Unavoidable – Great Britain, the Sterling Area and Japan: Economic and Trading Relations, 1950-60' in Hunter, J and Sugiyama, S (eds) *The History of Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1600-200*, Volume 4, *Economic and Business Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

[16] FO 371/76233 Ministry of Transport to Foreign Office, 13th January 1949.

[17] Hara Yasusaburô, 'Baishô mondai to Tônan Ajia shokoku no dôkô' in *Keidanren Geppô*, No. 3, 1957, p. 7.

[18] On this topic see, for example, Borden, W *The Pacific Alliance: United States Foreign Economic Policy and Japanese Trade Recovery, 1947-1955*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

[19] FO 371/84004, untitled, 22nd February 1950, p. 2.

communist victory in 1949 persuaded him of the "Domino Effect" and he predicted the fall of Indo-China within six months to be followed quickly by Thailand and Burma, thus exposing Malaya and India to the peril. Only a regional political, economic and military policy would endow Britain and South-East Asia with the capacity to resist: Japan also had a valuable role to play. In essence, MacDonald held that a Japanese return to the region 'should be viewed with friendly understanding'.[20] Securing Japan for the capitalist camp was held to be crucial, and South-East Asia was solid economic bait. The alternative, Japanese isolation, in MacDonald's mind offered no more the return of Japanese nationalism or worse, a turn to communist North-East Asia.[21] The Foreign Office concurred in that Japanese prosperity was of cardinal importance and it should be made plain to Tokyo that co-operation would be made worth its while.[22] South-East Asians also, not that they were asked, expected to gain: Japanese cheap consumer goods would demonstrate to them the immediate advantages to be obtained from remaining with the capitalist bloc and thus deny communism a foothold. MacDonald, in line with Japan's prime minister, Yoshida Shigeru, argued that economic suasion was a far more subtle means to win hearts and minds, and preferable to what he regarded as American over enthusiasm for military solutions.[23] Finally, MacDonald argued that trade with the region would improve the standards of living for both, deny communism and stimulate the expansion of international trade from which Britain could only gain.[24]

Separate from such broad geo-political concerns, the British found other reasons to support Japanese trade in South-East Asia. Firstly, it could often be to immediate British commercial advantage. As a case in point, in early 1950, SCAP[25] approached UKLM requesting permission for Japanese vessels to load 112,000 tons of ore at Dangun (British Malaya) over September that year. Rather than panic, the British were keen to accede to this request: it would absorb Japanese tonnage into a bulk trade relatively unattractive to British tramp shipping. In addition, total exclusion would only artificially increase the concentration of Japanese competition elsewhere, quite likely to ports where Great Britain had no control; far better, then, that competition be minimised by spreading Japanese incursions as broadly as possible, and, where convenient, under local British supervision.[26]

Secondly, South-East Asia and the Commonwealth also worked to very effectively dissipate concentrated Japanese competition and provided useful leverage against Japan and the United States. This latter point, for example, informed a mid-1950 HMG request to the South East Asian colonies to accept that Japanese shipping be cleared for as wide a range of trade as possible to spread it as thinly as practicable. The wording of the request openly acknowledged it was based on the interests of British shipping and that Commonwealth security and economic interests were only indirectly involved. The colonial response was even so generally gratifying, though the Japanese were to be restricted: crews would not be allowed ashore and Special Branch agents would need to guard against the infiltration of Japanese communists.[27]

---

[20] MMP 18/4/15 'Bukit Serene Conference 1951 – Japan', 28th November 1951
[21] MMP 33/2/85-7, 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952
[22] FO 371/110435 'Foreign Office minute on draft paper policy affecting commercial relations with Japan', July 1954.
[23] MMP 33/2/86 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952
[24] MMP 33/2/90 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952
[25] SCAP: Supreme Commander of Allied Powers, which refers both to the American occupational bureaucracy for Japan and its leader, General Douglas MacArthur.
[26] FO 371/84004 UKLM to MacDonald (untitled), 22nd February 1950, p.2; see also: FO 371.84005 'Japanese trade Arrangements – Shipping', 11th June 1950, pp. 1-2.
[27] FO 371/84005 Secretary of State of the Colonies to North Borneo, Sarawak, Federation of

The Japan-Australia shipping lines, a point of bitter rivalry and contention from before the War, also serve to emphasise the role of the Commonwealth in Anglo-Japanese shipping rivalry.

A major post-war Australian export to Japan was wool and the Japan/Australia Conference, originally consisting of five European/Australian lines, expanded in 1952 to include Nippon Yusen Kaisha (NYK) and Osaka Shisen Kaisha (OSK), in order to oversee orderly trade and a balanced Japanese presence. This supposedly cosy arrangement was rudely shattered in mid 1953, when the Japan Australia Line (in reality a joint service of NYK, OSK and Mitsui) demanded admission. The Japanese were acknowledged to hold a strong position inasmuch as they were important customers of Australian wool, but nonetheless their actions were seen as a virtual assault.[28]

Both the UK shipping firms concerned and Canberra raised the issue with Britain. On the one hand, London was not eager to interfere directly in commercial shipping questions on the basis that the Conference system, negotiated privately between the commercial lines concerned, was the best means to guarantee orderly shipping at a stable cost. Australia was requested to hold back, but nonetheless to watch closely, given Japan's dubious pre-war reputation, and to resist stoutly any pressure to ship by Japanese vessels as a condition of sales to Japan.[29] On the other, however, London was equally aware that many Commonwealth nations discriminated against Japan to the advantage of the UK; reductions on British economic discrimination against Japan might encourage others to do likewise much to the detriment of the home islands.[30] Slightly earlier Anglo-Australian discussions on the nature of Canberra's control over Japanese shipping adopted a compromise: the Australian government should make it clear that any readiness to see the 'Japanese coming back into trade with the Australians depended upon the Japs coming in in an "orderly" manner'.[31] The former empire remained vital to British attempts to mediate Japanese trade and to dissipate concentrated competition.

Finally, it must be recognised that often, even if it so desired, Britain simply could not always replace Japanese goods and services. As early as 1946, for example, British representatives in Japan had noticed a practice, disturbingly recognised as almost 'natural and normal' of Japanese shipping, with SCAP's support returning to the lines between Japan and Korea, and China and Formosa, where British firms also sought to regain their former position. Moreover, where Japanese vessels were not available, SCAP's Economic and Scientific Section (ESS) advocated using Japanese crews on US ships carrying Japanese trade to decrease Japanese foreign currency expenditure. While it was 'most desirable that everything should be done to arrest at an early stage this tendency', United Kingdom Liaison Mission staff were also forced to observe it was one 'the Japanese know to exploit' and that anyway British shipping could hardly fill all the gaps.[32] Significantly, as they reported to the Foreign Office, it was 'the price we have to pay for not being able to do the job ourselves'.[33]

Malaya, Singapore, Fiji and Brunei, 'Japanese Merchant Shipping', 6th May 1950, pp. 1-2; and *Ibid*., 'Japanese Merchant Shipping' (Singaporean response to the above), 26th May 1950, pp. 1-2.

[28] MT 59/3046 Sir John Masson, John Swire and Sons to Morris, 'Australia/Japan', 8th March 1954, pp.1-2.

[29] *Ibid*., 'Note of Meeting', undated (probably 27th August 1953), p. 1.

[30] FO 371/110436 'Problems Affecting UK Relations with Japan – Memorandum: Commercial Policy of the United Kingdom Towards Japan', 1954, p. 1.

[31] MT 59/3046 'Note of a meeting held in the Secretary's room on 23rd October 1951', p. 1.

[32] *Ibid*.

[33] FCO 371/63736, UKLM to Foreign Office D.F. McDermot, 13th January 1947, p. 1.

Over the latter 1950s, the significance of the former South-East Asian empire gradually faded. Former colonies became independent and often withdrew from the Commonwealth. British interest in colonial development further waned: the Treasury refused to surrender double taxation under which a UK company gained relief neither from UK income tax nor colonial government levies. [34] Similarly, from conception the Colombo Plan, regardless of its Commonwealth origins and symbolic value as evidence of United Kingdom commitment to colonial development, was reliant upon the United States for funds. From 1950-61, American aid to South-East Asia through the Colombo Plan totalled $8.3 billion in comparison to the UK sum of just £250 million over the same period.[35] In this context, de-colonisation and relative British decline also helped ease acceptance of the Japanese economic presence in South-East Asia.

Great Britain and Japanese Rearmament

Japan's defeat and occupation seemingly guaranteed demilitarisation. The Imperial Army and Navy were abolished, war criminals were tried, and Article Nine of the new 1946 Constitution went as far to state that land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained'. The overwhelming nature of defeat further disillusioned popular Japanese faith in military solutions to foreign policy problems. However, the Cold War, marked in Asia by the 1949 communist victory in the Chinese civil war, and the July 1950 outbreak of the Korean War, dissolved American interest in a permanently disarmed Japan. While never satisfied with the progress and scale of Japanese rearmament, some measure of success was incrementally achieved with the July 1950 formation of the 75,000-strong National Police Reserve, followed by the August 1952 formation of the National Safety Force, which was in turn replaced in May 1954 with the Self-Defence Forces, in which form the Japanese military remains to this day.

Studies of the external pressures on Japan to rearm have, for obvious reasons, focussed on the United States. Nonetheless, America's dominant position in this regard, does not equate to a sole interest: both American allies and enemies considered Japanese rearmament as core global concern, and, central to these allies at least, was Great Britain.

While a study of Britain's policy on Japanese rearmament is worthwhile purely in the sense of providing an alternative view to the role of the United States, it also serves to emphasise that Anglo-Japanese relations in the 1950s, whether they be economic or military, were more active than a focus on the US-Japan nexus might suggest. That the United Kingdom might be willing to accept American dominance over Japanese rearmament did not equate to trivialising the issue. Again, it was Churchill's model of the Three Circles which required Great Britain to confront the politically difficult issue of Japanese rearmament on three fronts. Firstly, in the context of the crucial relationship with the United States: what was the nature of American plans for Japan and where did Britain fit in? Secondly, how would the diverse membership of the Commonwealth react to a rearmed Japan, particular as many had rather direct and recent exposure to Japanese military forces. Thirdly, there was Japan itself: limited rearmament could well fit in with British interests, for example in terms of a market for weapons exports, and a chance to mediate between Japan and the US as they contested the nature and extent of Japanese rearmament[36]. Finally, Japanese rearmament again emphasised that importance bears

[34] Porter, A and Stockwell, A (eds), *British Imperial Policy and Decolonisation, 1938-64, Vol. 2, 1951-64* (London: Macmillan, 1989), pp. 25-32.

[35] Remme, T *Britain and Regional Cooperation in South-East Asia, 1945-59*, (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 214-5.

[36] On the potential for British weapons' exports to Japan see: J Weste 'Facing the Unavoidable –

no relation to affection: if Japan could not be trusted to trade fairly, then could it be trusted again with modern armaments?

Japanese rearmament was the immediate concern of the British Joint Chiefs of Staff, and also the Foreign Office in London and also its representatives stationed in the Liaison Mission, Tokyo, In 1949, the Joint Chiefs, as part of the lead up to a peace treaty with Japan, prepared its first paper on Japanese rearmament. It concluded, fairly obviously, that Japan, now denied resources from the Asian continent, constituted but a risible military threat. Nonetheless, strategic value, such as air bases in Okinawa, remained and it was important that Japan be denied to a potential communist enemy.[37] The solution was a peace treaty which would deny Japan to an enemy, eliminate any future Japanese military threat, and to guarantee the Western democracies military rights in Japan during war. In this context, a permanently disarmed Japan was an expensive luxury for the Allies, limited Japanese rearmament was soured by the memories of limited German rearmament after the Treaty of Versailles, which left a US-Japan bilateral treaty as the clear choice. Such a treaty would protect Japan, leave it with minimal military forces, and ensconce the US as the senior military partner.[38]

Approximately, one year later, Sir Alvary Gascoigne, head of UKLM, also prepared a paper for the FO and again out of concern for a viable peace treaty with Japan. For Gascoigne, the choice was simple: was a rearmed Japan good or bad for the UK. He concluded, in balance, that it was good. While his basic conclusions mirrored the aforementioned chief of staff report, Gascoigne went far beyond them, and indeed beyond the Japanese government. A defensive Japanese military was simply inadequate: with World War Three to consider: the new Japanese military should also have an offensive capacity to carry it once again to China, but this time to fight communism.[39] The impact such a military build up might have on Japanese democracy was considered but essentially rejected as the 1946 Constitution, the basis of post-war Japanese democracy, 'will, in my opinion, be in any case emasculated after the peace, and one of the first modifications…will be the complete deletion of Article 9.'[40]

Gascoigne's report certainly stimulated British government debate on Japanese rearmament and several papers further appeared over 1950 even though, Gascoigne's views on the extent of Japanese rearmament were politically unacceptable to the British government. Indeed, over 1950-51, Britain approached peace with Japan basically in accordance with the earlier 1949 joint chief's paper, namely that a bi-lateral US-Japan Security Treaty was the best means to guide Japanese rearmament. Any Japanese military adventurism, which the United States could not immediately curtail, could be further cut dead by the Allies retaining control over supplies of raw materials to Japan. Long-distance and indirect control was considered less an affront to Japanese national dignity.[41]

Clearly, the UK was acknowledging the preponderance of the American position, yet it did not represent a total abrogation of any British role. Britain continued to consult its Commonwealth partners, namely Australia and New Zealand, on Japanese military affairs and the Peace Treaty. The views of Australia, in particular, often proved challenging, especially with regards to the

---

Great Britain, the Sterling Area and Japan' in Hunter and Sugiyama *Economic and Business Relations*.

[37] FO 371/83887 'Japanese Peace Treaty – Defence Aspects' 23rd December 1949, p. 2.

[38] *Ibid*., pp. 3-4.

[39] FO 371/83889/1194 'The Problem of Japanese Rearmament', 18th September 1950, p. 2.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 3.

[41] FO 371/83889/1194 'Rearmament of Japan', 1st December 1950, p. 5.

disposal of former Imperial Japanese Navy vessels. Reflecting differing internal Commonwealth security concerns. British proposals to share some ships with the Netherlands attracted a sharp response from Canberra: 'the Netherlands is using every means in its power…to bring the Republic of Indonesia to a point of submission…In doing so the Netherlands are threatening the peace of this area…their action is inimical to the interests of Australia and we cannot be party to any arrangements such as you suggest.'[42] Greater Anglo-Australian concord was achieved with Canberra's agreement to British support for a bilateral US-Japan Security Treaty, though Australian concerns that the Peace Treaty did not contain limitations on Japanese rearmament was not shared by Britain.[43]

Esler Dening, stationed in UKLM, also continued to regularly report on Japanese rearmament to the foreign secretary, Anthony Eden. Dening astutely observed the potential for US-Japanese conflict on this complex issue, namely the Japanese insistence that its economy would not support large-scale rearmament. He sensed the possibility of acute difficulties for the Americans and, not entirely without pleasure, a resultant British opportunity to offer counsel.[44] An chance for Britain to mediate and perhaps partially dilute the overly thick Washington-Tokyo relationship was not without attraction.

Dening's desire, however, did rest upon an American interest in British counsel, and evidence of that was not forthcoming. Indeed, Dening argued that one major cause of Japanese public suspicion of rearmament was that it appeared to be an American-only concern. The fault lay entirely with the US for failing to bring Britain into its confidence.[45] Dening's concern was not to criticise the notion of a rearmed Japan nor American sponsorship of the process, but rather to emphasise that a collective view was far more likely to secure Japanese co-operation.[46] The Foreign Office was also alive to such views and ordered its Embassy in Washington to enquire further. Officials in the Department of State were quick to re-assure the Embassy that the failure to involve Britain reflected more disagreement between State and the Department of Defense (which did consider Japanese rearmament a US-only concern) rather than a general reluctance on the part of Washington to consult Britain. Nonetheless, nine months later, the Washington Embassy was again re-assuring a nervous London that internal discord, rather than a lack of trust, characterised American failure to take London's views into account.[47] Nonetheless, it was not until April 1953 that UK, New Zealand, Australian and Canadian representatives were summoned to the Department of State to be fully informed of US plans for Japanese rearmament.[48]

Conclusion

The intention of this paper has been to place Anglo-Japanese economic and military concerns in the context of British assumptions of a global role in the late 1940s and 1950s as cast by Churchill's notion of the Three Circles. In hindsight, relative British decline and the consequent reduction of interest and influence in East Asia is as clear as American preponderance.

[42] DO 35/2458, untitled 5th April 1948.
[43] DO 35/5850 'Japanese Re-Armament views of the [Australian] Defence Committee', 26th March 1953, p. 1.
[44] FO 371/99470, untitled, 14th January 1952, pp. 3-4.
[45] FO 371/99470 untitled, 15th September 1952, p. 5.
[46] *Ibid*., p. 5.
[47] FO 371/99470, untitled 20th November 1952, pp. 1-2.
[48] DO 35/5805, 'Japanese Rearmament – summary of US proposals', undated, pp. 1-2.

However, neither did the United Kingdom intend to be a faint taste of the bygone in the new American-led world order. Anglo-Japanese relations over the 1950s demonstrate an elite reluctant to relinquish a global role: British involvement with Japan provided an opportunity to mediate between Japan and the United States, and equally between Japan and the newly emergent British Commonwealth. Indeed, as a self-appointed tutor and mediator, Britain's first task was to 'encourage the Japanese in their present tendency to look to Great Britain as the greatest stabilising influence in international affairs'.[49] (The United States, inevitably, also required British guidance as 'over and over again in Asia they do the right thing in the wrong way…we must do all we can to "educate" the Americans so that they make a more subtle understanding and wise approach to the Japanese'.[50])

British interest in US-Japanese rearmament planning, for example, further testifies to a belief in a global and stabilising role for the UK: it was an important concern to London both in terms of its global strategy, but also in the context of Commonwealth relations, Anglo-US relations and hope of providing Japan a small, yet to the UK a helpful, alternative to the United States in military matters. Japan's economic return to the global community was also to be gradual and under British guidance. Certainly, Britain's potential to deflect and mediate economic competition with Japan through South-East Asia and the Commonwealth testifies at least to a short-term capacity to limit and define the nature of Japan's economic return to South-East Asia, which flattered Britain's own long-term interests in a managed withdrawal. Nonetheless, Britain did clearly lack the resources to overturn the American position in Japan. British interest in Japanese rearmament planning attracted little American concern, and any attempt to insert itself as mediator between US-Japanese spats on the matter was wishful thinking at best. British political influence in East Asia was clearly eroded.

Kimihiko Baba,
Chief Editor, Iwanami Publishers and author of 'The Burmese Harp and Post-War History'

Post-War Japanese Intellectuals' Perspective on Reconciliation between British and Japanese Soldiers over the War in Burma: the case of Michio Takeyama (1903-1984) and Harp of Burma

Relations between Japan and Britain have been interwoven in a complex pattern over time, encompassing both alliance and open confrontation. Here post-war reconciliation between the two sides is examined through '*Harp of Burma*' (1947). Originally conceived as a piece of children's literature, and since transposed to cinema on two occasions, this is a novel acclaimed by many Japanese as a masterpiece of the anti-war and peace literature canon after WWII, and provides an appropriate example by which to examine post-war reconciliation.

When *Harp of Burma* was first published, written by outstanding essayist and critic Michio Takeyama (1903-1984), Japan found itself in the ashes of destruction, disarmed, and enveloped in the conviction never again to become embroiled in war. Although Takeyama had voiced criticism of Nazism during the war, he found himself wracked with guilt for being

[49] MMP 18/8/30 'Mallaig Conference 1955' 5th March 1955.
[50] MMP 33/2/86 'Note on Japan', 26th July 1952.

unable to fulfill his obligation as an intellectual to roundly condemn Japanese militarism.

When Takeyama started writing *Harp of Burma* in 1946, Japan was under United States occupation. Takeyama was intensely interested in the International Military Tribunal for the Far East that had been instigated at that time. He called for public debate on the injustice he perceived in the winners unconditionally dismissing any questions over their own criminal responsibility, while judging the loser in a one-sided manner in the name of civilization. At the same time as criticizing Japanese militarism, by emphasizing its distinctness from German Fascism, he attempted to highlight that in Japan a case based on crimes against humanity and a joint conspiracy would not stand. It was almost at the same period, during the Nuremberg Trial that German philosopher Karl Jaspers was offering his critique from the perspective of an intellectual on the crimes of Nazism and the German people. Given that *Harp of Burma* was written with more than a sideways glance at the proceedings of the Tokyo Tribunal, we see Takeyama's own conscience for war responsibility revealed and the structure of the trial hearings also become apparent through the text.

Reconciliation between Japanese and British soldiers on the Burma front is one of the main subjects in *Harp of Burma*. Conciliation between friend and foe, the disappearance of grudges and salving of consciences and the granting of absolution was not performed by an all-transcendent god between the two sides. Here lies the basic difference with the case of Jaspers who stressed judgment and purification by god, particularly in the case of the Holocaust. In *Harp of Burma* the basis for reconciliation between Japanese and British soldiers lies in culture that is common to both sides. In contrast to these commonalities, the decision by the protagonist, Mizushima, to devote his own life to collecting soldiers' remains and giving them proper burial was arrived at through becoming a Buddhist monk. Behind this humanitarian narrative are the Burmese people, portrayed as common victims for both the Japanese and British.

In the post-war period, Takeyama expounded criticism of Christianity as being the source from which Nazism descended, in addition to repudiating Communism. In his later years, Takeyama gradually came to express his Japan-oriented opinions more and more clearly. His critique on modern civilization has a significant connection to that of Yuji Aida (1916-1997), a scholar of western history. Aida emphasized Japanese culture's uniqueness and superiority as being something distinct from Western civilization. Behind his assertions there was his own personal experience of being maltreated by British soldiers as a Japanese Surrendered Personnel (JSP) at a British army-managed camp on the Burma front. Contrary to the points stressed by Takeyama or Aida, for the real British war veterans who endeavored to realize a reconciliation with former Japanese soldiers, there seems to have been a tendency for *Harp of Burma* to imbue symbolic meaning to the realization that they shared a common modern civilization with their Japanese counterparts, changing their previously held prejudice that Japanese culture was different because ordinary Japanese were inferior to Westerners.

Takeyama, as a leading advocate of the right in critical circles, called for the revision of the war-renouncing Article 9 of the Constitution, repeatedly citing his objections to post-war democracy which for him was synonymous with Communism. When he expressed support for the Vietnam War and respect for the Japan-U.S. security alliance in a major newspaper, readers were unwilling to believe that this was the same person who had penned *Harp of Burma*, roundly criticizing his stance as betraying his magnum opus novel. Although the argument for rearmament co-existing with antiwar sentiments seem to be contradictory, criticism of Japanese wartime militarism and the attainment of peace through the Japan-US alliance is consistent with the concepts held by post-war right wing intellectuals on the grounds that

alliance with Anglo-Saxon nations would assure a stable foundation for Japanese international relations, particularly with a view to avoiding what was perceived as a failure of foreign policy after Japan set aside the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1921 and pressed ahead with the invasion of China.

In actual fact, Takeyama's initial intention was to write a story of reconciliation between Japanese and Chinese soldiers, but given that reality and the content of the story were divergent in the extreme, he abandoned this initial plan and modified the story from a Chinese setting to one in Burma. Concerning reconciliation after the end of the war in China, in a similar manner to the case of reconciliation among the Japanese and British war veterans, both Japanese and Chinese governments emphasized a common civilization as a means of attaining long-lasting friendship, as illustrated at the time when Japanese political leaders visited Beijing to discuss rapprochement. Nevertheless, even though the Japan-China Joint Communiqué of 1972 declares "Japan and China are neighboring countries, separated only by a strip of water with a long history of traditional friendship," despite the two countries sharing a mutual history of exchange that far surpasses the length of Japanese-British historical ties, the road to reconciliation with China seems even more remote than that of with the United Kingdom.

Kimihiko Baba
kbaba@mips.ne.jp

Professor Kei Nemoto,
Professor, Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

Where is Burma?A Comment on K.Baba's Paper

Post-War Japanese Intellectuals' Perspectives on Reconciliation between British and Japanese soldiers Concerning the War in Burma: the case of Michio Takeyama (1903-1984) and *Harp of Burma*

First of all, I apologize to all of the participants for my absence from this conference. Since my wife felt uneasy about a series of two indiscriminate terrorists' attacks occurred in London, she did not want me to visit the city for the time being. In order to make her feel easy, I finally decided to cancel my trip. Instead, I will send here a short comment on Mr. Kimihiko Baba's attractive paper.

As Baba acutely pointed out in his paper, the main ideological characteristics of Takeyama's novel *Harp of Burma* can be described as follows.

Takeyama realized that the Japan's part of the Second World War was unjustifiable, but he thought that the responsibility should be taken by the state leaders, not by the young officers and soldiers who had been mostly conscripted and lost their lives in battlefields. On the other hand, Takeyama understood that Japanese ultra-militarism which overwhelmed man's reason and conscience had come out of a symptom of modernity itself, which had been also shared by the British. Throughout the novel *Harp of Burma*, Takeyama dealt with Burma as a background of the story, using the Burmese people and their Buddhist cultural value as the tool of healing the ills of modern civilization and the trauma of war. The war in Burma was interpreted as the clash of civilizations between a "civilized" modern country (Britain) and a modern country "without civilization" (Japan), which developed in a non-modern country (Burma). In such a situation, Burmese *Theravada* Buddhism was used as the means by which mediation and reconciliation are achieved between the two modern states. Through describing an impressive scene that both corps of British and Japan singing the same song in a battlefield, Takeyama stressed that they were

able to feel "us-ness" through finding out the fact that both of them belonged to "civilizations" or the world of "modernity."

Baba indicates that *Harp of Burma* anticipated the post-war progress of reconciliation between the British and Japanese. Also, he mentions that the role of the novel can be understood as a mirror reflecting the common guilt shared by both Japan and Britain, since the Burmese people were a common victim of both of them. These indications drive us to think about a simple (but substantial) question. That is:

"When we discuss the matter of Anglo-Japan reconciliation, where is Burma positioned? As far as Burma is given a place just as a main background of the two countries' reconciliation, can such kind of reconciliation be meaningful in the real sense? Don't we have to seek for reconciliation among three countries, Britain, Japan and Burma?"

Burma was colonized by Britain and the country was re-structured as a modern state from the latter half of the 19th century to the beginning of 1940s. The country made a remarkable development under the colonial regime, but at the same time the Burmese people's eagerness and their movements for attaining self-government and independence were kept under strong control of Britain. Japan invaded Burma by taking advantage of this political situation. They promised independence from Britain, therefore many Burmese nationalists cooperated with Japanese military in order to drive out the British. However, it did not take a long time for them to realize that Japanese militarism was another unwelcome guest. They had to fight against Japan too at the final stage (March-August 1945).

After attaining independence in January 1948, Burmese government has formulated a national memory among the people which regards the British colonial period as the days of "imperialism", and the period of Japanese military occupation as the days of "fascism." This memory was formed through education of patriotic understanding of history and nationalistic state propaganda. The crucial understanding of the memory is that Burma did suffer from both imperialism and fascism and did fight against both enemies in order to attain a full sovereignty. Needless to say, various individual memories among the ordinary people, which might include some kind of affirmative remembrance about British or/and Japanese regime, have been omitted from this national memory. It is also true that political justification of the Burmese Armed Forces (*tatmadaw*) has been emphasized. However, it is natural for a country such as Burma, which has once suffered from the rule under colonialism and foreign militarism, to hold a "common" memory of distrust against any kind of foreign interventions in the past. It is also natural to think that whether they have any affirmative memories about the colonial or fascist period in their individual levels, the majority of the Burmese people may not admire the economic development made by the British under the colonial days. They may not admire the Japanese occupation period either. Both were unwelcome guests.

When we consider this national feeling of Burma, it will be not so difficult to realize that reconciliation between Britain and Japan should include Burma too. If not, reconciliation itself will become imperfect or even a self-satisfactory of the two countries. Burma is not a country to be placed just as the background of reconciliation between Britain and Japan. It is not a country either which heals the people who are "civilized" but distressed from "a symptom of modernity" and "the trauma of war". We should know that "a symptom of modernity" and "trauma of war" also exist among the people of Burma. At the same time, Burmese *Theravada* Buddhism should not be understood as a mere religion of forgiveness and forgetfulness.

In order to make the reconciliation progress more fruitful, the Burmese people deserves to be invited more. For example, when we promote a project of collecting books and materials related to the war in Burma, we have to pay attention to not only English and Japanese stuff but also to those materials written in Burmese. At the same time, if any of the ceremonies or conferences concerned with reconciliation be held in Burma, it will be quite meaningful.

Burma is neither a background, nor a healer for the British and Japanese, but an equal subject among the reconciliation progress concerned in the war in Burma.

knemoto@aa.tufs.ac.jp

Session 3: Today and Tomorrow

Chair: Professor Arthur Stockwin,

Emeritus Fellow, St Antony's College, formerly Professor of Modern Japanese Studies and Director of the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies, University of Oxford

Commentator: Dr Hugo Dobson,

Department of East Asian Studies, Sheffield University

Reinhard Drifte

Emeritus Professor, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Visiting Research Fellow, Asia Research Centre, LSE, Visiting Professor at the Institut d'Ētudes Politiques, Université de Toulouse

British-Japanese Relations in the Global Context

The UK and Japan both have interests which go beyond what can be done about them within a bilateral framework or which have to be pursued simultaneously or even exclusively in multilateral fora. In addition the UK's bilateral relationship with Japan is increasingly being shaped by its membership of the European Union (EU) and also by its involvement in multilateral organisations and fora. I will therefore specifically look at the impact of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) on UK-Japan relations as well as UK-Japan interactions within international organisations, notably in the UN. One can state without exaggeration that both countries share a great concern for strengthening the multilateral system which has become indispensable in order to address global issues of a great variety. The reform of the UN system, including the enlargement of the UN Security Council, which is currently a very topical subject, partly because of Japan's advocacy, belongs to this category. The UK's political support is very important for Japan because of the former's status as a permanent member of the Security Council, as it is vital for the UK that Japan strengthens the Security Council with its contributions. Finally there is what I would call 'elite multilateralism', notably the G-8, where both countries are heavily involved. Britain hosted this year the annual G-8 summit in Gleneagles and the preparation for it had certainly the additional effect of enhancing their bilateral relationship.

The EU context

The evolving CFSP of the EU is driven by the ambitions of individual member states as well as by the efforts of the EU Commission. The former want to multiply their national capabilities to enhance their national interests, and the Commission aims at developing the CFSP to enhance its role as the engine of European cooperation. A common approach also aggregates the pressure from allies and friends on the EU to make greater contributions to the maintenance of the international system. The US pressure on its European allies and Japan to help in the anti-terrorist campaign is a recent example, prompting allies to consider individual as well as multilateral contributions at a military, political or economic level. The EU framework is an essential tool for Britain to enhance its foreign and security policy although its political and

economic differences with its European partners somewhat reduces the existing potential. In the area of foreign trade, the EU has already supplanted national governments and enhanced the bargaining power of the individual member states. This is not only for the benefit of the latter, but also positive for outside countries like Japan who do not have to negotiate with an increasing number of member states. It can also e.g. deflect protectionist tendencies of certain countries as Japan found out in the past.

The EU started to focus on Asia within the framework set out in the EU's Asia paper of 1994 (*Towards a new Asia strategy* 1994) which was followed by several other policy papers focused on individual Asian countries. The policy paper dealing with EU-Japan relations came first out in the following year (*Europe and Japan: The next steps* 1995). The Asia paper stated that the 'Union needs as a matter of urgency to strengthen its economic presence in Asia in order to maintain its leading role in the world economy' (*Towards a new Asia strategy* 1994, p. 1). As a result of its growing economic weight and the 'unparalleled political fluidity' in Asia, the region warrants much closer attention in order to maintain peace and stability which is essential for the EU's economic interests in that region, but also to maintain the 'respect of international obligations and agreements on which the Union itself depends for its security, e.g. regarding nuclear non-proliferation' (*Towards a new Asia strategy* 1994, p. 7). In order to adapt the policy paper to the new developments and changes in both regions, the EU adopted an updated paper in 2001 which speaks of 'strengthening the EU's political and economic presence across the region, and raising this to a level commensurate with the growing global weight of an enlarged EU' (*Europe and Asia* 2001, p. 3).

The EU-Japan relationship plays a very prominent role in implementing this enhanced EU strategy towards for Asia. One of the main tools to achieve its goals is the strengthening of relations with key Asian players which, of course, includes Japan. The Joint Declaration between the European Community and Japan ('The Hague Declaration of 18 July 1991') sets forth common objectives such as enhancement of policy consultation and coordination, including international security matters and cooperation with the countries of the Asia Pacific for the promotion of peace, stability and prosperity of the region. To celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Hague Declaration, both sides declared at the 9th summit meeting in July 2000 the inauguration of a decade of Japan-EU Cooperation from 2001 onwards. A new Declaration with a concrete Action Plan and a regular progress review mechanism was launched on the occasion of the 10th summit meeting in Brussels in December 2001 (*An Action Plan for EU-Japan Cooperation 2001*). It aims at greater cooperation which is to include harmonizing positions, concerted actions, and joint declarations. Through this Action Plan, the relationship between Japan and the EU is to move from mere dialogue and exchange of opinions to closer policy coordination and concrete joint activities in the political and security, economic, justice and social fields. In addition the EU plans a streamlined Regulatory Reform Dialogue with the aim of reviving the Japanese economy through opening markets further and stimulating direct investment from the EU. The EU wants to form stronger alliances with Japan. Two recent examples are the cooperation in launching a new trade round, achieved in November 2001, and to implement the Kyoto Protocol, also achieved in Marrakesh in the same month. The goals of the Action Plan are:

- promoting peace and security
- strengthening the economic and trade partnership
- coping with global and societal change
- bringing together people and culture

The most recent EU-Japan summit meeting took place in May this year in Luxemburg. An issue

of particular interest to Japan was the EU's intention to lift the arms embargo on China, a proposal which originally had been supported by the UK but strongly opposed by Japan. After the March 2005 anti-recession law of the National People's Congress some member states, including the UK, became less enthusiastic about ending the embargo and a decision was postponed indefinitely, to the great relief of Japan and other EU allies in Asia.

The main regional fora which involves both the EU as well as Japan to discuss and address security issues in Asia are the Asia-Europe Summit Meeting (ASEM) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). The EU is represented by the Commission as well as the Presidency in the ARF which aims to improve regional security dialogue and to implement concrete measures through various inter-sessional meetings. The most important one is the Inter-Sessional Support Group on Confidence-building Measures where the EU can bring in its experience from the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The European experience is also passed on to Asia through the observer status in the OSCE granted to Japan, South Korea and now also Thailand. The UK is a member through the EU seat. Several years ago, both the UK and France tried to acquire an individual seat on the strength of their P5 status but they were firmly rebuffed by the Asian members.

ASEM is the highest level meeting between Europe and Asia and the agenda of its summits every two years include also security issues. For Japan, ARF and ASEM are important organizations to promote Asian cohesion and balance China's rising influence over the region. For the UK, ASEM is an important forum to continue to play some role in Asia which goes beyond what is feasible at a bilateral level. Japan is the most important Western ally in the forum with the greatest affinities in terms of values and policies. Japan is keen to avoid the impression of wanting to play a too visible role and thus working through ARF and ASEM eases the political as well as economic burden.

The most important divergence between the UK and Japan which is mainly played out in ASEM is the representation of Myanmar which is now a new member of ASEAN. This issue is interesting in our context today in view of the war experience of both countries in what was then known as Burma. Whereas Britain has joined the EU position of putting sanctions in place against Burma (this is also the American position) because of its human rights and governance problems, a silent coalition of nostalgic and hard-nosed strategic realists in Japan do not want to isolate Burma and oppose the position of their Western allies. The intention of the strategists is not to force the Burmese rulers even more into the arms of their major if not sole Asian friends, the Chinese government.

In the broader global context China is the top agenda item of all political dialogues at bilateral and multilateral level which involve the UK and Japan. Whereas Britain like the rest of the EU has primarily an economic interest in China and likes to hear Japan's evaluation of Chinese developments , Japan's concern is much greater and addresses both political and economic dimensions in equal measure. It is probably fair to say that the predominant economic focus of the EU may lead to some future strains between the EU and Japan. The UK's position as a permanent UN Security Council member, a nuclear weapon state and the closest ally of the US, China's avowed strategic competitor, may at least occasionally, as in the case of the arms embargo, make London show more understanding of Japanese interests.

Multilateral fora and ad hoc coalitions

It is of particular poignancy in our context here, that as a result of multilateral cooperation and coordination, the UK and Japan are currently fielding military forces to the same areas, i.e. Iraq

and the Indian Ocean. In the former case, Japan would probably never have sent its SDF to Iraq if it had not been for the involvement of the UK (as well as other Western allies). In addition the small Japanese garrison of around 600 soldiers is in the Samawah area which is part of the UK-controlled south of Iraq. As a result there are frequent consultations between Japan and the UK, particularly after the withdrawal of the Dutch forces which until then provided direct protection to the Japanese. Both countries have also closely been working together on the reconstruction of Iraq and on how to involve the UN in this endeavour. It is natural that the British side, particularly the military, is not very impressed with the scope of the SDF's activities which are becoming now further reduced with mounting instability in the area, but in view of Japan's past, and particularly Japan-UK relations before 1945, the situation in Iraq illustrates the development from enemy to friend.

The same reflections apply to Japan's naval presence (now only two ships) in the Indian Ocean since November 2001 which provides fuel to American , British, French and other Western naval units looking for terrorists since the US and some other Western countries started to intervene militarily in and around Afghanistan. According to an MOU between the UK and Japan, the Japanese navy may transfer up to 950 cubic meters per month to the RN. The UK government has given permission for the Japanese ships of the Maritime Self Defence Force to use the British territory of Diego Garcia during command handovers. The island serves as the anti-terror coalition's main logistic base in the Indian Ocean.

Incidentally, in order to pick up fuel, Japanese warships are now regularly entering another former war theatre where the UK confronted Japan, i.e. India. Japan is at least financially heavily involved in the reconstruction of Afghanistan, and this work benefits from the military protection provided now by the EU's stabilization force which includes British forces. Britain is part of the UN-mandated and NATO-commanded International Security Assistance Force (it includes 23 EU member states) and the EU-organised five Provincial Reconstruction teams. Britain and Japan have co-hosted two major international conferences for the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

A new stage in British-Japanese security cooperation in a global context was reached in September 1999 when both countries agreed on an action agenda for Cooperation in Diplomacy, National Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace-Keeping. The first case materialised in May 2002 when both sides decided to contribute to the "Community Reintegration Programme: Phase 2 (CRP 2)" in Sierra Leone to help the country overcome the devastation of its civil war. The UK provided L8.7 million and Japan L1.5 million. This had been preceeded by a joint fact-finding mission to the African country by Britain's Department of International Development (DID) and Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) in October 2001.

Saying that the opportunities for a more substantive security cooperation between the two countries are expanding should not blind us to the many limitations and obstacles which both sides are still facing, and in some cases will always have to accept. Understanding these constraints are important in order not to overburden the deepening cooperation with unrealistic expectations. Britain is foremost anchored in the EU and in the transatlantic frameworks, whereas Japan looks first to the alliance with the US and the Asian region. The security environment for both countries is very different, and so is the perception of security problems. The UK is a self-assured military power and has a very different approach to security as a long-time colonial power in the past and permanent member of the UN Security Council today. For Japan, security issues are only now leaving the realm of taboo and military power is viewed with great suspicion, even in the case of UN-sanctioned Peace Keeping Operations (PKO). Japan is therefore more comfortable addressing human security challenges rather than straight forward

military problems, and it prefers to act with the huge material resources of a great civilian power. Different political styles and cultural approaches compound these circumstances.

The much wider context for UK-Japan relations in the global arena is the enhancement and reform of the multilateral framework. Both countries share a great concern for improving this framework which has been suffering recently. For both countries this framework is a hedge against an over-reliance on their bilateralism with the US, but also an indispensable tool to address more successfully global issues ranging from poverty alleviation to ecological challenges. Both countries are very keen on keeping the US committed to international organisations and to counter-steer the US inclinations toward selective and ambivalent multilateralism. The UK has assisted Japan in learning about Peace Keeping Operations (PKO). When Japan was involved in mine-sweeping in the Gulf in 1991, it was done with the supervision by and coordination with the Royal Navy. There was also some cooperation on peacekeeping and peace-building in 1997 and 1998.

An interesting case illustration of UK-Japan interactions in international issues is the issue of debt forgiveness for the world's poorest countries which is being addressed in international fora like the Paris Club, the international financial institutions (e.g. the World Bank and the IMF) and the G-8. Britain has been from early on very committed to debt forgiveness whereas Japan has been very reluctant. While Britain is a much lesser creditor than Japan, the latter has until recently adhered to the strict principle that debts have to be repaid despite the overwhelming evidence that the poorest countries not only will never be able to do so, but that their economic development will be further hindered by a mounting debt burden. Debt relief packages have been consistently one of the issues discussed at the G-7/8 summits since the one in Toronto in 1987. Only in 2002 did Japan finally make a significant policy change for which the UK can take considerable credit although it was the US policy switch which was the direct cause. In this context one should also mention the ODA cooperation between both countries thanks to their complementarity in this area. Whereas the UK has the greater experience and manpower, Japan has the greater financial means. In view of the decline of Japan's financial means it will become even more important for Japan to use British know-how to achieve greater impact with fewer resources.

Finally, the outcome of Japan's quest for a permanent UN Security Council seat will very much determine the future direction and modus of Japan's multilateralism, but also the cooperation between the UK and Japan. If Japan achieves its aim, it would finally, 60 years after the war, regain institutional parity with the UK at the international level. UN reform is for Japan also about being recognised as a country which is very different from that before 1945 and for this reason Tokyo insists very strongly on the removal of the so-called enemy clauses (Articles 53 77 107 of the UN Charter) which discriminates against the former enemies like Japan, Germany and Italy. To Japan's relief, the UK has been supporting Japan's quest since March 1994 after some initial hesitation and some embarassing references to the nuclear status of the P5. Today Britain understands that the Security Council's legitimacy and efficiency would benefit from Japan's permanent membership and at the same time make the continued membership of Britain and France as former victors in a war which ended 60 years ago more acceptable in a very much changed world. It will not be easy for Japan to match many of the UK's SC qualifications, like its international experience, status and contributions to international security, notably Peace Keeping Operations, but Japan has become the second biggest economic power, is flexing its political and even military muscles abroad to help with international security issues, and could reduce the reliance of Asia on China as the only Asian representative on the Security Council. I have always been very pessimistic about the chances of SC reform for reasons which are related to Japan's perceived qualifications as well as the dissens among the P5 and the UN member

states. When thinking about the UK and Japan in the global context, it may therefore be useful to give some considerations to the kind of support Britain and other Western allies could give to Japan after its failure to join the Council becomes evident to avoid any knee-jerk nationalistic reactions to what would be perceived as an international rejection of Japan's changes since 1945 and its contributions to the international community. Such a frustration of Japan's ambitions will certainly lead to a greater focus on bilateral ODA to the detriment of multilateral aid and to a greater involvement in 'elite multilateralism'.

Conclusions

Reflections on the UK-Japan relationship in a global context further deepen the recognition of the path which both countries have taken from enemy to friend. Britain has played a certain role to enhance the general recognition of how much Japan has changed since 1945 and to assist Japan in assuming an international status commensurate with its political and economic stature. It has certainly been helped by the recognition that its own national interests are well served by responding favourably to Japan's change and willingness to share the international burden. Looking at the growing instability in some regions, notably the Middle East and East Asia, both countries will have to work even more together and strengthen the multilateral regime. China will loom increasingly larger on the horizon of Japan and the UK and care must be taken that it will not lead to disputes in the bilateral relationship nor eclipse the potential for cooperation and coordination between London and Tokyo. Neither should write off the other as a spent regional and/or international force. Japan will not gain more attention in Europe if it only addresses the global impact of China in terms of threat, nor will the UK, and the EU in general, improve their cooperation with Japan in the global context if they conceive China merely as a golden business opportunity.

Nobuko Kosuge
Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Yamanashi Gakuin University

British-Japanese Reconciliation: A Successful Story?

In this presentation, post-war reconciliation is defined as the resolution of emotional antagonisms remaining after the restoration of peace and to actions that would tend to bring this about in the context of the years following the Second World War in both the defeated "Axis" countries and the victorious "Allied" countries. It is also defined as a process, bringing into play the dynamics of war and peace, which aims to bolster post-war peace and to prevent further conflicts, and in principle both these aspects are themes that are worthy of further study.

In the Second World War, the total number of combatants throughout the world who died as a direct result of the fighting is estimated as over 22 million, and if the number of injured is included, the total number of victims is estimated at more than 56 million. In the period soon after the end of the war, there were several tens of millions of refugees in Europe and Asia. In terms of numbers and otherwise, there were extremely serious losses in all the belligerent countries and the renovation of relations between former enemies after the end of that war, during which so many heinous war crimes had been committed, meant, in the case of Japan and Germany, that this was accomplished with the help of "drawing a line" and "striking a balance." In other words, citizens of the defeated, aggressor countries were divided into a relatively small group of "criminal elements = perpetrators of harm" and "those who had been misled by the criminal elements = those who were their victims." After the victorious countries had brought about a certain approximation of justice by punishing the criminal leaders of Japan and Germany

and those who were responsible for carrying out some of the most heinous wartime atrocities, a new sort of harmony was promoted between the victorious counries and the peoples of Japan and Germany who had been so terribly "misled" by their former criminal leaders and those who carried out wartime atrocities, and in a variety of ways efforts were made to renew and improve international relations.

The holding of international "tribunals" by the victors to judge the war crimes of the defeated was one of the things which most prominently marked the new type of post-war peace sructure that was brought into being as a result of the Second World War. One of the value judgments which became a precondition for this new type of post-war peace structure was the view that "peace is not tantamount to forgetting".

As Philip Towle observes in *Democracies and Peacemaking* (Routledge, 2000), traditionally, in premodern Europe, Christianity exercised an overwhelming influence over the ways of making peace after an armed conflict, and "reconciliation" and "forgiveness" were concepts that tended to mean that, by the grace of God, "total amnesty" could and should be quickly and equally granted to former enemies. In such times, and in such a society, customarily efforts were made to have the evil deeds taking place in wartime cast into oblivion at the time peace was made, with the philosophy that "to forgive is to forget."

During this historical period, however cruel a war may have been carried out, and even if people had tasted hardships that were almost beyond speaking or writing about, what was called "peace" was, in a time and society where it had become possible to have this peace planned and constructed rather separately from the will or emotions of those who had directly suffered war's ravages, something that, once peace was restored, nevertheless took little account of how one might go about healing individuals' war-related sufferings.

However, as Towle points out in the book, as the secularisation and democratisation of society progressed, nationalism grew apace and what came to be called "the law of nations", today more often referred to as "international law", also developed, and while reflecting all four of these modern factors, there came into being new views of post-war peacemaking which nonetheless inherited one of the traditional characteristics of post-war peacemaking that had been seen in premodern times, with their emphasis on permanent peace and eternal friendship in future.

Following the Second World War, a new type of post-war peacemaking came into being which was characterised by its emphasis on appeals to public opinion, on positively *denying* the forgetting of the past, and on building a "durable peace." Since the Second World War, in order never again to repeat the calamities that had come with it, a political cultural system was completed that aimed at strengthening peace by keeping within people's memory the aggression and atrocities of the war and that would be watched over, so to speak, by the workings of journalism and public opinion. In this way, in contemporary society, people tend to firmly believe that it is harmful for the cause of peace to "forget" the devastations and cruel deeds of past wars, and it has come to be seen as important to "forgive but not forget."

A problem with this sort of post-war peace sructure is, so to speak, that it can easily become prey to irrational emotionalism. For example, even though the intention may be to learn from the past as a way of helping to maintain peace and friendly international relationships in the future, what are most often propagated to the general populace through education and journalism are only rather narrowly specified small parts of past war experiences and situations relevant to them. When considering the history of past wars, even if we look just at the cause-and-effect situations leading up to the beginning of hostilities, these are usually extremely complex. A certain amount

of both time and patience are needed to come to some appropriate understanding of past wars. On the other hand, no particularly sophisticated knowledge is needed to feel anger over cruel actions once carried out by past "enemies" or to sympathise with the pain undergone by the victims of such actions. Yet it nonetheless would seem to be the case that the more brutal a certain period of past warfare has been, the more determined people are likely to be, in their "feelings of surprise and anger" over the fact that such brutalities could occur, to fervently wish for peace in the future. The voices of persons who directly and personally suffered the ravages of war do not usually cast doubt on how these experiences might contribute to the building of postwar peace, and they tend not to cast doubt on the value judgment that it is not in the interests of peace to "forget the past." On the other hand, in the process of trying to build and maintain a postwar peace that engages the complex factors and components of historical analysis mentioned above can lead to an almost limitless dissecting and condemnation of this or that aspect of the past, with the result that history can become highly "politicised" while certain events that occurred during past wars are perhaps overemphasised. It carries the danger that certain incidents that happened during the war will be newly emphasised and that by using such discussions as historical justification earlier prejudices and antagonisms toward former enemies could be reborn.

In this sense, what is in this presentation is called "post-war reconciliation" and refers to a historical phenomenon that has surfaced against the background of a specific sort of time and society where the formula "peace means forgetting" has broken down.

*

Germany's policies aimed at post-war reconciliation have clearly won a high regard internationally. Germany's "drawing the line" and providing a sense of "balance" are quite clear. Whether we speak about an "aggressive war" to control Europe, or about the "Holocaust" with its gruesome crimes symbolising the Nazi period, the Nazis were the perpetrators of crime, the Jews and others were victims, the countries that won the war were liberators, the aggression and the Holocaust were wrong, and the judgments put forth by the countries on the winning side were just.

On the other hand, in Japan's case, "drawing a line" and striking a "balance" became something that has come to seem more complicated and confusing. In Japan's case, the principles of "drawing a line" and striking a "balance" were clearly shown in clauses 6 and 10 of the Potsdam Declaration of July 1945, and were again made clear in the American initial post-surender policy toward Japan issued in September 1945 (SWNCC150/4). A line was initially drawn between those who had misled the Japanese people and those who had been misled, and a balance was to be struck by reeducating the latter as to the true state of affairs while punishing the former, in this process making a clear distinction between justice and injustice. This was an indispensable precondition and process for promoting reconciliation between former enemy states.

However, in thinking about Japan's post-war reconciliation from today's perspective it is apparent that at the stage when the Tokyo Tribunal was carried out, those issues concerning neighboring countries which are now seen as the most fundamental and difficult -- in other words, "colonialism" and the control of colonies -- were not as such, or in themselves alone, thought to fall in particular under the scope of "international crimes" by the European and American counries which made up the great majority of the countries who sent judges to take part in the Tokyo Tribunal.

While focusing on the years 1928-1945, the Tokyo Tribunal showed a very considerable "imbalance" in that it judged Japan's war as an "aggressive one" while at the same time failing to sufficiently question the very premises of colonialism and control over colonies. In connection

with the Tribunal, priority considerations were given to the supposed military requirements and political interests of the United States as the country which had the greatest influence in guiding the Tribunal's proceedings.

At the same time, when it came to "drawing a line," public opinion in the European and American Allied countries, tended more so than in the case of how it perceived Germany, to class the Japanese together in an unfavorable light. The "lines drawn" and the "balances struck" with regard to Japan were not so clear-cut as in the case of Germany. In the case of Japan, the process of creating the preconditions for post-war reconciliation -- again involving "lines" and "balances" -- and the related process of reeducating the Japanese people were carried out, in the emerging Cold War environment, primarily with a view to renewing and reinvigorating the US-Japan relationship.

It was largely in the decades of the 1980s and 1990s that larger number of Japanese themselves came to consider more closely the history of the harm their country had inflicted on others during the Second World War. A major task was to gain a clearer understanding of the fundamental questions of colonialism and control over colonies which had been largely ignored by the Tokyo Tribunal. Nonetheless, with regard to the question of Japan's "colonial aggression in Asia," there was not seen to be such an easy correlation, when compared to the case of Germany's aggressions, between "justice" and the assertions of the countries which had won the war.

Consequently, the movement in Japan to look squarely at the history of the perpetration of harm on others, which may said to have reached a certain peak in the 1990s, tended to be largely carried forward by the momentum of "feelings of surprise and anger" toward revelations about specific types of shocking wartime misdeeds like the issue of the so-called "*jugun ianfu*" (women mainly from Korea and other Asia contries who were forced into sexual slavery for Japanese soldiers), while the consciousness of large numbers of Japanese regarding the overall context of the war itself continued to be vague. And in approaching the task of squarely facing up to past Japanese misdeeds that caused harm to others, there could also be seen the tendency to try to see the misdeeds as a sort of reverse side of criminal actions which could be found in the past histories of the European and American Allied countries. Many of those who have had the keenest interest in elucidating Japan's responsibilities for perpetrating harm to others in the past have put much effort into avoiding an aproach which would limit these sorts of considerations to Japan's relationships with just those countries which were victors in the war, and rather have tried to give these considerations a "global" scope and meaning.

The sort of feeling on the part of many Japanese that "even though we are aware that is appropriate to making amends to Asian countries, this is no so when it comes to Europe and America," has meant that a certain "line" was drawn between, on the one hand, Asians who were victims of Japan's past war, and those Europeans and Americans who could also with justification be classed as victims. In this way, even if there are today various lively discussions surrounding Japan's earlier history of inflicting harm on others, the issues of Japan's maltreatment of "white" Allied war prisoners, or even other subjects of central importance like details of the actions of Japanese military personnel in China and other Asian countries, continue to be very largely relegated to a peripheral and still insufficiently position.

* *

The issue of how Japanese army units treated British prisoners during the Second World War has been a sharp thorn in the side of post-war British-Japanese relations, has given rise to discord between the two countries, and has in the UK been a cause of distrust and

prejudice toward Japan. The cruel experiences of wartime prisoners at the hands of Japanese army units, while perhaps not something which can be placed at the core of Britain's "nationalism of war memories" has nevertheless, throughout the post-war period continued to bring painful memories and to frequently jostle and irritate the feelings of the British people.

On the other hand, in Japan, while one may say that interest in Japanese-British reconciliation has not always been as high as it should be, this issue has nevertheless in fact become a core theme in the way Japanese view the war. As I mentioned before, it has been often observed that even among those Japanese who claim they wish to look squarely at the history of their country's bringing harm to others during the war there is a tendency to admit the need for atonement toward Asia while ignoring Europe and America in this context.

Among things which no doubt conributed to this discrepancy, we should probably mention the book by Aida Yuji entitled *Aron shuyojo - Seio hyumanizumu no genkai* (The Alon Camp -- The Limits of Western Humanism), which has gone through 87 editions since it was first published in 1962. This book chronicles the life of forced labor which British military units in Southeast Asia caused "Japanese surrendered personnel" (including author Aida) to endure during two years even after the end of wartime hostilities. The book has long had a high evaluation, and elicited feelings of sympathy, among Japanese readers.

The fact that this book, painstakingly translated into English in 1966 as *Prisoner of the British*, through the instrumentality of Louis Allen, has been published in the UK can be said to be of symbolic importance in the process of Japanese-British reconciliation. And giving prominence to the aforementioned processes of "drawing lines" and "restoring balance," post-war reconciliation has also been promoted by direct person-to-person meetings between persons who were former "enemy soldiers" on both sides. Activities contributing in one way or another to "Japan-UK reconciliation" are indeed of many different types, but mention must also be made of the activities -- to be reported on in greater detail later today by Mr. Hirakubo and Mr. Mailins -- of the Burma Campaign Fellowship Group, which is the forerunner of today's Burma Campaign Society and in which Louis Allen has also played a part. Also mention must be made of the reconciliation-oriented activities of such members of the "war generation" as Nagase Takashi, Amamiya Takeshi, and Saito Kazuaki, who have shown their willingness to promote shared Japanese-British ceremonies to mourn the war dead and joint investigations into what happened in the past. Such efforts may be highly evaluated on two scores: promoting, so to speak, a "common feeling" and furthering mutual understanding in our present-day world.

Even today there still remain, in both Japan and Britain, a certain amount of pain, mistrust and prejudice rooted in the past. However, it should be especially pointed out that, consistently since the 1980s, we have seen, both among former military personnel of the two countries and also at the people-to-people level including those of younger generations in both Japan and the UK, many activities which have aimed to prevent these sorts of mistrust or prejudice from taking those painful episodes from the past as a sort of "kindling coal" that could reignite new antagonisms, and to work instead to stimulate and move forward, in a variety of ways, toward more mutual understanding and feelings of empathy. Parallel with these types of activities, already from a period soon after the end of the war, courses of full-scale "Japanese studies" were promoted at Oxford and London Universities, and especially in more recent years Japan itself has contributed in important ways to the development of Japan-related studies in the UK. The "Murayama Fund" provided support for history-related exchange projects, and the publication of the results of these projects in both Japan and the UK similarly deserves to be highlighted, to which Prof Nish greatly contributed.

Also not to be overlooked in the history of Japanese-UK reconciliation are Keiko Holmes's reconciliation activities which take religious beliefs as a common point of departure, the development in the UK of movements to request from Japan post-war compensation for various losses and damages, as well as monetary assistance from the Japanese government to carry out mutual visits among war survivors and their young families.

Characteristics of the British-Japanese reconciliation activities can be said to be (1) the fact that they are centered around individal citizens; (2) their continuity; and (3) the diversity of the ways in which they are promoted and carried out. It seems to often happen that "organisations" or "groups" of people who suffered the pain and trauma of war are liable to "autocratic tendencies." In the case of such organisations, so long as the "emotions," so to speak of such an organisation as a whole are not somehow "healed" – at a "vibratory amplitude" that is distinct from that of the emotions of the individual war victims who belong to such an organisation (whether the individual may yearn for healing and reconciliation or may in fact want to keep strong negative emotions toward the "former enemy") – obstacles will continue to exist for a variety of innovative healing processes by which the individuals making up the organisation might benefit. In such an environment, it has been often observed that attempts at reconciliation have been quite limited, short-term or "exclusive" in nature. On the other hand, there are many examples which show that in the task, on both sides, of pursuing post-war reconciliation an important precondition is for there to be interest and curiosity about "the other," transcending the former enemy relationship, and for there to exist a "democratised society" which can allow the exercise of individual will and initiative as well as variegated and continuous activities that can be positively evaluated or even freely criticised.

So even while there still exist in both the UK and Japan much pain, distrust and prejudice rooted in the past, I think we can be justified in at least saying that, building from the three points of (1) a matured democratic society which respects individuals' diverse volitions, ideas and opinions, (2) sharing, as a "value judgment," the idea that "reconciliation" is a good thing, and (3) the continued development of durable and diverse reconciliation activities at a people-to-people and grass-roots level, the efforts to achieve British-Japanese reconciliation are continuing to be relatively successful.

* * *

The successes of Japan-UK reconciliation can hopefully be borrowed, as a useful reference, for efforts at Japan-China reconciliation, something which we must admit is a particularly "hard case" among Japan's various efforts at post-war restoration of friendship.

Against the backdrop of its Civil War and the global Cold War, China, which is the country which suffered more losses and damage than any other from Japanese aggression, tended to divide the Japanese into two groups one of which was those Japanese who were considered to be responsible for inflicting the harm and toward whom the laying of responsibility for wartime crimes was focused with the expectation that these persons should be, to the extent possible, strictly punished. On the other hand, a generous attitude was taken toward other Japanese. While assuaging in this way popular sentiment at home, the post-1949 Chinese government also strongly suppressed its own people's resentment against Japan in various ways. Amid a very complex international situation, China was in a position of needing to restore relations with the former enemy Japan that had carried out colonial aggression against it, and under these circumstances, China in effect agreed to the judgments of the Tokyo Tribunal, which Japan had also accepted and agreed to internationally. And even if China did not as quickly as the European and American Allies conclude a peace treaty with Japan, the judgments of the Tokyo Tribunal nevertheless likewise formed a context for "drawing a line" and "striking a balance" which

contributed to post-war reconciliation and facilitated a restoration of Chinese-Japanese friendship.

The issue of visits by Japanese Prime Ministers to the Yasukuni Shrine which has come to the forefront in recent years deviates from the patterns of “drawing a line” and “striking a balance” that did so much to help restore relations in the period following the Second World War. Even if there are many points about the Tokyo Tribunal that merit criticism, given the fact that it constituted a point of departure for constructing a post-war peace system and given the irrefutable fact that Japan internationally agreed to accept its judgment in the Peace Treaty of 1951, it is hard to countenance the idea of Prime Ministers paying homage at the Yasukuni Shrine after it was designated in the late 1970s as a shrine that would also honor the spirits of persons who were designated “A-Class War Criminals” according to the findings of the Tokyo Tribunal.

In China, the memory of the “Anti-Japan War” and the atrocities commited by the Japanese Army are indeed still at the core of the nationalism surrounding the war memories, and are indeed one of the biggest factors contributing to the present government’s claims to legitimacy. Post-war reconciliation has been not only a political task, of a mutual nature, for the restoration of good relations, but has also been, and continues to be, a task that involves “cultural creativity” in a democratic society. As China’s trends toward democracy continue to develop, it is to be hoped that the present government will be able to point to brilliant successes that will to a large extent eclipse the great attention still being given to the past victory in the “Anti-Japanese War,” and that it these other successes can be appealed to more and more to bolster the government’s legitimacy, a rich political and cultural soil can be cultivated which will work to further cultivate China-Japan reconciliation and can in China bring increased interest in promoting a true reconciliation with Japan.

At present, it may be difficult to expect too much in the way of developing the sorts of grass-roots, people-to-people reconciliation activities in the sorts of diverse and continuing patterns seen in UK-Japan relations, and yet by re-forming the problems and issues so far as possible into fresh, simple and easy-to-explain formats, it should be possible to look forward to important new developments in China-Japan reconciliation. Considering the fact that in the 60 years following the end of the war international interest in Japan-China reconciliation has never before reached the height where we see it today, it can surely be said that the “timing” for a new and positive stage of Japan-China reconciliation is already appropriate and will probably begin to show some positive results in the near future.

＊ This presentation is a sort of summary of a portion of Kosuge Nobuko, *Sengo wakai* (Postwar reconciliation), published in Japanese by Chuo-koron-shinsha (2005). With respect to the history of peace-making in Europe, which I have referred to in the above text, I was given many valuable suggestions by Dr. Philip Towle, to whom I wish to express my special gratitude. In the process of preparing this presentation, I was fortunate to receive in advance some queries and comments from session commentator Dr. Hugo Dobson. I here wish to express my deep thanks to him.

kosuge@ygu.ac.jp

Dr Caroline Rose

Department of East Asian Studies, Leeds University

Reconciliation – The Broader Context

As Dr Kosuge's presentation has highlighted, Anglo-Japanese reconciliation has been ongoing for many years, and much progress has been made in recent years thanks to the numerous activities of individuals and groups who have worked tirelessly to ensure that the past is addressed, remembered and commemorated in appropriate ways. The efforts made at both governmental and private levels over the years can be considered to reflect general trends or patterns of behaviour identified by academics and practitioners in the fields of peace studies and memory studies with regard to reconciliation and/or transitional justice as a whole. In particular, the end of the Cold War witnessed a number of seemingly worldwide trends which have brought to the fore debates about history, national identity, memory and so on. Coining terms used by other academics, these can be identified as the 'memory boom', the 'rush for restitution', and 'the age of apology'. These trends have contributed (both positively and negatively) to processes of reconciliation between various former warring parties, and this paper considers the general approaches to reconciliation (as described in the academic literature) with a view to setting the Anglo-Japanese case in a broader context.

The memory boom

Since the late 1980s, states and sub-state groups (ethnic or religious groups) began to review their histories as part of a re-affirmation of their local or national identities. Huyssen talks about a 'memory boom of unprecedented proportions' in the last 15 years of the 20th century, marked by debates about memory and identity in political, social and cultural spheres, the proliferation of memorials, museums, celebrations of national heritage, anniversary events (1995: 5).

Nowhere was this more apparent than in Germany. Niven, for example, refers to a 'veritable explosion of discussion' in the 1990s amongst the German media, intellectuals, politicians of all parties and the general public about the National Socialist past prompted by key anniversaries (e.g., the 50th anniversary in 1995 of the end of the war), new interpretations and images of the past (for example, Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, exhibitions and concentration camp memorial sites), Hollywood films (*Schindler's List*), unification, and the 'right timing' for Germans to (re-)consider the past (2002:1-2). We have also witnessed a memory boom in the UK, and key anniversaries have prompted publication of diaries and personal accounts of wartime experiences in addition to academic studies and quasi-fictional accounts of both the first and second world wars. Similarly, there is a marked trend towards commemoration and memorialisation, with the National Memorial Arboretum representing a new site of remembrance commemorating the Far East Prisoners of War. In Japan and China too, memories of the war and debates about (very different) historical narratives have become a prime focus of governmental and popular attention since the early 1980s.

The rush for restitution

The 1990s also saw a marked increase in calls for compensation or justice for human rights violations of World War II which had not been addressed previously. This was in part a corollary of the renewed focus on history. The discovery of archival evidence, revised interpretations of the past, or the establishment of new international institutions, laws or norms provided greater opportunities for victims of war crimes or crimes against humanity to seek justice. It was also part of a broader trend, described by Barkan as 'a sudden rush of restitution cases all over the

world' which testified to a 'new globalism that pays greater emphasis on human rights' (2001:46).

Restitution is a process where 'victims and perpetrators [come] face to face to barter the suffering and responsibility for the past and create a future, which both sides can subscribe to' and it can encompass compensation to victims, an admission of guilt, recognition of suffering, and forgiveness by the victims (2001:49). An important element is the '*willingness of governments to admit to unjust and discriminatory past policies* and to negotiate terms for restitution or reparation with their victims based more on *moral considerations* than on power politics' (Barkan 2000:317 italics added). Restitution has potential benefits for both sides – the perpetrators 'hope to purge their own history of guilt and legitimise their current position, the victims hope to benefit from a new recognition of their suffering and to enjoy certain material gains' (Barkan 2000: 321). Material gains derive from compensation claims for damages or loss of life, repayment of wages, veterans' pensions, medical support and so on. In the 1990s such claims were brought by non-governmental groups, human rights lawyers, and trans-national civil society. World War II-related cases include German compensation for forced labourers and plundered art, Swiss compensation for the handling of Nazi gold, American compensation of Japanese internees.[51] In Japan's case, Asian and non-Asian victims (former Prisoners of War, Korean and Taiwanese veterans, 'comfort women', forced labourers and victims of biological and chemical weapons and so on) began to demand acknowledgement and individual compensation, but faced fundamental problems in the form of a Japanese government and judiciary unwilling to admit to past injustices, or to negotiate based on moral considerations.

The age of apology

Another global pastime of the 1990s, in addition to remembering one's past, was to apologise for it. Roy Brooks refers to the 'age of apology' characterised by 'a matrix of guilt and mourning, atonement and national revival' (Brooks 1999: 3). Dudden refers to the 'demands for official state apologies [which] brought about a transnational explosion of national contrition, and heads of state were transformed into articulators of new national histories' (2001:598). The apology is considered deeply significant since it provides international recognition of the victims' own memory and suffering, and an admission of guilt by the perpetrator and so helps the healing process. As part of the reconciliation process, apologies are sometimes more important to the injured parties than material compensation. Indeed, offers of compensation are often rejected by victims if an apology is not considered sufficiently sincere, or if no apology is forthcoming. There are different types of apology: one to one, one to many, many to one, many to many. The type of apology we will be most concerned with is from one state (acting as a collectivity) to another, or 'many to many' (Tavuchis 1991:48). Such an apology must satisfy certain conditions: it must be offered with backing and authority of the collectivity so that the apology is official and binding; it must be made publicly and on the record: and it should acknowledge the violation, accept responsibility, and indicate that there will be no repetition of such acts in future. The wording of an official apology is often very different to that of a personal apology, tending to be 'couched in abstract, remote, measured and emotionally neutral terms' (Tavuchis 1991:102). The expression of sorrow, a central component of a personal apology, appears to be lacking in the collective variety, but according to Tavuchis is not as essential to the apology as putting things on the record (ibid 109).

[51] The rush for restitution was not just about World War II – countries previously split by civil war or victims of brutal regimes or discrimination (for example, South Africa, Eastern Europe, Rwanda) also sought restitution as a means of settling the past and attempting to move forward, as did minority groups (for example Native Americans, Australian aborigines). For cases studies of these see Barkan 2000, Rigby 2001, and Neier 1998.

For an apology to be effective it must also be accepted and acknowledged by the injured party. As Jeong warns ' no reconciliation is achieved without forgiveness not only because the hurts of the past cannot be undone but also because any harm cannot be truly compensated' (Jeong 1999: 25-6). Forgiveness, therefore constitutes an important, if not essential, component of reconciliation and has recently become a major topic in social science research (on the back of such endeavours as the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the efforts of countries riven by (recent) bitter conflicts to build a new, peaceful society (for example, the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Sudan etc). Various projects have been launched, both quasi- and non-governmental to encourage studies of forgiveness and to promote grassroots projects aimed at conflict resolution and victim support (Hunter, forthcoming).[52]

Approaches to reconciliation

The literature on reconciliation agrees that the whole process is a future-oriented, joint endeavour between the victims and perpetrators, but one which is lengthy, complex and prone to failure. Lee defines reconciliation as:

an effort to establish a new and constructive relationship between the perpetrators and the victims based on shared principles of justice, equity, and mutual respect. Without reconciliation, conflicting parties may come to some sort of accommodation, perhaps an uneasy truce, but seldom an enduring peace. In reconciliation, the parties involved take steps to ensure that justice be served. They then work to remove the residues of mistrust which, if unaddressed, would linger as latent sources for future conflicts (Lee 2003:21).

There is, of course, no single, ideal model for reconciliation, and in some cases reconciliation is impossible to achieve. Different groups, and different individuals, approach the process in different ways with different results. Kreisberg's elements of reconciliation illustrate this. He identifies, for example, several types of 'units' or agencies (individuals, officials, groups and peoples), 'dimensions' or models (acknowledgment, acceptance, apology, redress and forgiveness), and degrees of reconciliation (full, partial, accommodation, coexistence) (1999:105-8)

The process cannot be unilateral, and to prevent future recurrence of crimes against humanity such as those committed by the Japanese military during the war 'both perpetrators and victims [should] develop a commitment to share a common future in which mutual trust and harmony reign' (Lee 2003: 23). Similarly, in Rigby's words reconciliation 'requires *active participation* of those who were divided by enmity' (Rigby, 2000: 12). Rather than it being left to states to deal with issues such as compensation or trials, it is increasingly recognised that other actors, in particular those who suffered directly (or their representatives – family members, civil groups etc), should play an active role if the process is to be successful. Thus, Rigby argues that:

> *the process should not be confined to a narrow strata of society.* The different dimensions and values that together contribute to any healing process must be deepened and broadened to encompass *all levels of society*, creating in the process a new culture of respect for human difference and human rights (2001:183, italics added)

Activities contributing to reconciliation can be official and unofficial, private or public, top down

[52] Hunter, Alan (ed.) *Peace Studies for the Chinese Century* (Ashgate, forthcoming)

or bottom up. Usually governments take the lead in creating the conditions necessary to stimulate reconciliation on a mass scale (for example, by agreeing with the other state on reparations or acknowledgment of wrongdoing), but the activities of private groups or individuals are equally important to re-build trust and understanding. Barkan argues that although it is more likely that liberal societies will 'recognize past public injustices … *other governments, NGOs, commercial companies, and even individuals* may take the burden of the past upon themselves (2000:315, italics added). Winter and Sivan stress the importance of individuals and groups who act as 'agents of remembrance' – whether the state is liberal or totalitarian (1999:29).

But even if citizens, NGOs, companies and the like do become involved in the process, it does not guarantee full reconciliation. As Kreisberg points out, 'it is not to be expected that reconciliation will be universal among all members of the opposing sides' (1999:106), and the degree of reconciliation can vary according to the particular experiences of the injured parties. In China, for example, it is perhaps more difficult for people in the Northeastern provinces (formerly Manchuria) or in Nanjing to achieve reconciliation than it is for those who were not so directly affected by Japanese actions. In the Anglo-Japanese case, we can see very clearly the split between those who have been able to reconcile, and those who have not – for very different, often personal reasons.

The sequence of the reconciliation process is not always agreed upon in the literature, but the elements are often the same. Fisher argues for acknowledgment, apology, forgiveness and assurance (1999:97), Montville suggests acknowledgment of grievances, acceptance of responsibility, expression of contrition, and seeking and receiving forgiveness (1993 cited in Fisher 1999:98), whereas Tavuchis suggests that an official apology is the 'prelude' to reconciliation (Tavuchis 1991:109).

Rigby's ideal-type reconciliation process describes similar steps: once peace has been secured between the two parties, one pressing task is to *uncover the truth*. There are various means by which this can be achieved, for example through trials or truth commissions. It is then necessary to *seek justice* for the victims, again perhaps through trials of those responsible for their suffering or through reparations, which can either be symbolic or material in form. Eventually it should be possible to *settle the past*, or 'put the past in its proper place' through an apology to the victims, or through some form of memorial to honour the memory of war dead (Rigby 2001). In addition, assurances that past actions will not be repeated are important in order to reduce the fears of the injured party. Forgiveness would be another element at this stage, and one which many believe to be the key to resolving conflict (Fisher 1999:100).

Finally, an essential condition for reconciliation is time, and plenty of it. Thus, Rigby states:

> The necessary conditions for reconciliation between formerly antagonistic parties can only be realized over time. Moving beyond the divisions of the past is a *multidimensional process that can take generations*, and the *different constitutive elements involved in the journey toward reconciliation can rarely be pursued all at the same time* (2001:183, italics added).

Conclusion

The successes noted by Dr Kosuge and the other speakers today with regard to Anglo-Japanese reconciliation do perhaps provide a template for others to refer to and draw from, and it is certainly the private or at least non-state spheres that I believe hold the key to greater success in

future. These activities should not diminish (and indeed show no signs of doing so) as the generation of those who experienced the Second World War gives way to those whose memories of the period are formed very differently, but no less potently, through oral history, education, commemorative ceremonies, and events like today's workshop. Remembrance forms a central part of the process of reconciliation, and helps to keep the past firmly where it belongs - in the present.

The Meaning of Reconciliation

Masao Hirakubo OBE
Chairman, The Burma Campaign Society

I believe that reconciliation means that both parties with a common dispute settle it by mutual compromise. Its prerequisite is that both sides have the intention of settling the dispute and that there is a real dispute existing between them. If one party does not have the sincere intention to reconcile with the ex enemy, there will be no reconciliation. Most Japanese army veterans bore no hatred towards enemy personnel; they simply followed the order of their commanders. When their countries signed the Peace treaty, their hostility automatically disappeared.

To tell the truth, my own plans for reconciliation originated in Burma in June 1946 when we embarked on a steamer to be repatriated to Japan. In the 4 years of war, both our own and the British armies destroyed the Burmese economy. I resolved that it was our responsibility to appeal to both countries to rebuild Burma. In order that this should be possible, I determined to make the utmost effort possible to "make it up" between Japan and the UK.

For the process of reconciliation, continuing dialogue between the parties is the most important. Between Britain and Japan, there is a particular and large barrier, it is the difference of languages. When I invited British veterans to Japan from 1989 to 1995, I asked them to give me drafts of speeches they might like to give in Japan so that I might translate them into Japanese. Each veteran was, as a result, able to read out his own war experience with a Japanese translation over dinner each day. I made the same thing possible when Japanese veterans visited UK in 1992 and 1994. In addition, on these occasions, some Japanese ladies living in London, voluntarily helped with the interpretation between the British and Japanese veterans.

Burma veterans, on both sides, on many occasions, witnessed the deaths of their comrades in the most miserable of circumstances on the battle fields. It is a matter of great regret that they should have died, at such young ages, for their countries. Day in day out we experienced this tragedy. I asked myself repeatedly why I remained alive, although I suffered from various tropical diseases such as malaria, amoebic dysentery, beriberi and eczema.

When I had the opportunity to talk about these thoughts with British veterans, I found that their experiences were similar. Now the surviving veterans of both sides stand side beside, remembering similarly the war dead, on both sides. This is the origin of our joint memorials and it is also the proof of reconciliation having been established. The late Captain Shosaku Kameyama used to talk about "the joy of being allowed to be alive as a result of the wishes of those who died in war".

Since Prime Minister John Major refused to allow Japan to participate in reconciliation events as we headed towards the 21st Century, the Burma Campaign Fellowship Group began British-

Japanese joint Memorials each year at the Three Wheels Buddhist Temple in London and at Anglican cathedrals, of Westminster, Canterbury and Coventry, on the weekend of or after 15th August.

The Burma Campaign Society regularly holds Discussion Meetings to listen to and debate accounts and analyses of the war and veteran members give lectures to younger generations. It is important to pass on this first hand experience.

Philip Malins MBE MC

Deputy Chairman, The Burma Campaign Society

I fought throughout the Second World War and never hated the enemy German or Japanese, regarding them as young men like me in no way responsible for causing the war. I gave the order to open fire when we killed 22 Japanese in an ambush in Burma and went to bed thinking of the terrible sorrow their deaths would cause their families. Never could I have envisaged then that so long after the war I would make wonderful friends among the Japanese we had fought in a savage war. It has greatly enriched my life.

There was no reconciliation after the First World War leading 21 years later to the Second World in which some 55 million people died. Victory without reconciliation is never complete. Reconciliation with the enemy is the ultimate victory for both sides. Germany greatly helped reconciliation by readily admitting the Holocaust in which some six million innocent people were killed, and made it a crime to deny it had happened. In general our prisoners of war were properly treated by the Germans. The Cold War brought Britain and Germany closer together and the reconciliation was early achieved. Two weeks ago at Coventry Cathedral the German Ambassador thanked the British people for helping liberate Germany from an evil regime.

Reconciliation with Japan has been more difficult because of the treatment of our prisoners of war and that it took 50 years before Mr Murayama became the first Japanese Prime Minister courageously to apologise on behalf of his country for what had happened before and during the Second World War. 25% of our prisoners of the Japanese died in captivity compared with 5% in German captivity, or 5% of our people killed across all the battle fronts in the Second World War. It is impossible, unless one suffers from acute amnesia, for any of our prisoners of the Japanese to forget what happened, and only each one can decide for himself whether he can forgive. But to avoid the same things happening again we must seek reconciliation.

In 1991, with Masao Hirakubo as our Councillor, we formed the Burma Campaign Fellowship Group, followed by the Burma Campaign Society, comprising Burma campaign veterans and prisoners of the Japanese seeking reconciliation with our former enemies. We had an immediate and heart-warming response from the All Burma Veterans Association of Japan. Visits of British veterans to Japan and Japanese veterans to Britain took place. We visited Burma and walked over some of the old battlefields together in peace. I think all of us deep within ourselves gave thanks that we had totally removed all bitterness between arising from the war.

We found our former foes were the same sort of people as us and were astonished to learn that like us they had sung “Home Sweet Home” and “Auld Lang Syne” in Burma during the war, and that we could sing them together.

Since 1995 we have helped organize Acts of Reconciliation and services at Westminster Abbey, Canterbury, Coventry, Durham, Rochester and other cathedrals, enabling successive Japanese Ambassadors to speak publicly on reconciliation. In 2004 we arranged the first ever visit of a

Japanese Ambassador to our Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst. There is an exchange of cadets with the Japanese National Defense Academy.

But we have not ignored our prisoners of war. In 1998 I initiated the Royal British Legion campaign which, with the help of many people, resulted in our Government making ex gratia payments of £10,000 each to our prisoners of the Japanese, widows, merchant seamen, and civilian internees, totalling £300 millions to date. It established the principle that if ever any of our people are terribly treated in the service of our country by an enemy, it is the responsibility of our Government to compensate them, and, if it chooses to do so, to seek reimbursement or a contribution from the enemy country. It should not be left to individuals to seek compensation at their own expense in the courts of the enemy country.

Visits of prisoners of war to Japan have taken place paid for by the Japanese Government. It has had a profound effect in removing their bitterness against the Japanese. I have talked to scores of them who all speak of the universal kindness of the Japanese people, their respect for old people, their cleanliness, honesty, artistry, success in world markets, and so many other fine qualities and achievements. But many prisoners are still loath to talk about their visits to prisoners who have not been to Japan for fear of being ostracized and accused of betraying their comrades who died in captivity.

Visits of widows, children and grandchildren of prisoners of war to Japan have also been made, paid for by the Japanese Government, and there has been a considerable exchange of young people who have stayed with British and Japanese families.

The majority of those who fought against the Japanese in Burma and prisoners of war will die still unreconciled, but soon they will all have passed away and the great and lasting reconciliation we have sought will be completed by younger generations.

It would be another small step in reconciliation if we renamed VE Day (Victory in Europe Day) and VJ Day (Victory over Japan Day) respectively PE Day (Peace in Europe Day) and PJ Day (Peace with Japan Day). It would help Germany and Japan to join us in remembering these days as a deliverance for all of us, not as anniversaries of defeat.

I give thanks that sixty years free from world war, and the prospect there will never be another, have been the reward for all the sacrifice.

Cabinet War Rooms, 7th September 2005