

Japan as an American Protectorate and External Threats

Takao Sebata

Abstract

The paper describes Japan as an American protectorate, which means that the United States, specifically the United States Forces in Japan (USFJ), has violated Japan's sovereignty since 1952 when Japan regained her independence. It reviews different opinions on Japan's status toward the United States and considers the external threats against Japan, which the United States Government and the Japanese Government emphasize. Both governments argue that Japan needs the United States Marine Corps in Okinawa as deterrent. However, nobody clearly states whom deterrent should be aimed at. Who is a potential enemy? Neither the United States Government nor the Japanese Government specifies their enemy. Therefore, this paper examines potential external threats for Japan. The paper concludes that Japan should rely on diplomacy rather than her military forces.

Key Words : An American protectorate, external threats, Japan's diplomacy

Introduction

A principle of the Security Treaty is that the United States would defend Japan in case of an attack on Japan while Japan provides the United States with a right to keep American Forces in Japan. However, its real intention is that as John Foster Dulles stated in January 1951, the United States can freely build her military bases anywhere in Japan, deploy any amount of troops she wishes, and stay in Japan as long as the United States wants. (Toyoshita, 1996, 47 and Schaller, 2004, 58).

Review of Literature

In August 1945, the United States occupied Japan. Since then, the United States Forces has never left Japan, and Japan has been under the influence of the United States. Particularly, it became obvious after Japan signed Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America (hereafter referred to as the Security Treaty) in 1951. Some argue that Japan is not an American colony, but an American protectorate or vassal. (Brzezinski: 1997; McCormack: 2007, and Magosaki and Wolferen: 2013) Others argue that an American occupation of Japan has not ended

indicating that Japan is still under the American occupation. (Magosaki and Kimura: 2013) Still others argue that Japan has been subordinate to the United States since the end of World War II and Japan is not an independent country. (Maeda: 2009; Akahata Seijibu: 2010; and Hatoyama, Magosaki, and Uekusa: 2013)

As a victor, the United States Forces took huge areas of the Japanese land for military bases. In particular, people in Okinawa were forced to move out of their land at the point of bayonets and bulldozers. In addition to their receiving free land, since 1978, USFJ receives a huge amount of Host Nation Support every year. Although the Japanese Government has no obligation to pay Host Nation Support under the Security Treaty, the United States Government asks for such monetary support in exchange for protecting Japan. Nevertheless, the Japanese people, especially people in Okinawa and those who live near the United States military bases in homeland, suffer from crimes, accidents, and environmental destruction caused by USFJ personnel.

Extraterritoriality in relation to USFJ is another issue to consider. The subordination stems from Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and Japan (SOFA), which guarantees extraterritoriality of USFJ in Japan. In fact, SOFA violates Japan's sovereignty in many areas. (Chiikyotei Kenkyukai: 1997; and Maedomari: 2013) There are many secret agreements between the United States and Japan that allow USFJ to enjoy extraterritoriality in Japan. (Yoshida: 2010; Fuse: 2010, and Suenami : 2012) The paper will look into in detail USFJ personnel who live beyond the Japanese law. Okinawa opposes USFJ bases and demands for revision of SOFA. (Miyasato, et al: 2009; and McCormack: 2012) However, both the United States and the Japanese Governments have not listened to the people in Okinawa and have ignored their opinions for many decades. SOFA was made when the Security Treaty was signed in order to protect USFJ personnel against the Japanese law. The United States Government wanted to make sure that American soldiers, civilian officials, who worked for the military, and their family members would be able to receive a fair trial in Japan. In other words, only American law, not Japanese law or international law, would try American citizens. SOFA is made to protect the soldiers and civilian officials of USFJ and their family members.

The objective of the Security Treaty was designed for the United States to be able to watch and exercise her influence over Japan. In other words, the post-World War II United States-Japan relations were after all the relations that the United States would prevent Japan from seeking a path of militarism again or of independent foreign policy. (Schaller: 2004) Therefore, the Security Treaty was not made to mainly defend Japan, but to keep an eye on Japan so that Japan would never pose a threat to the United States again. This was the most important objective of the United States occupation policy toward Japan during 1945 and 1952. In order to do so, the United States Government imposed Article 9 of the Constitution on the people of Japan and made the Security Treaty, which enabled the United States Forces to continue to be stationed in Japan after 1952 when Japan regained her independence.

Some argue that in the post-World War II Japan, politics was a struggle between those who sought independent foreign policy and those who blindly followed American foreign

policy. The United States crushed those who sought Japan's independent foreign policy. Yukio Hatoyama is a recent case in point. (Magosaki: Sengoshi no Shotai 2012; and Amerika ni Tsubusareta Seijikatachi 2012) Since the 1980s, those who blindly followed American foreign policy began to gradually increase power and influence in Japan, particularly the bureaucrats. (Hirano: 2011; Wolferen: 2011; Mori: 2012; Hirano: 2013; and Magosaki and Wolferen: 2013) Since the Meiji era, the bureaucrats have controlled Japan, not the politicians. The bureaucrats wish to continue paying Host Nation Support and do not want to revise SOFA so that the United States Government would not be offended or USFJ would not leave Japan. They think that if there would be no USFJ, the right wing in Japan would demand for Japan to acquire nuclear weapons or an autonomous defense capability. In other words, the bureaucrats think that USFJ would prevent Japan from pursuing a path of militarism or seeking independent power projection capability. Moreover, the bureaucrats of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, not the politicians, would be always in charge of handling matters with the United States.

Concerning USFJ and crimes, many studies have been published over the last ten or so years. Nihon Bengoshi Rengokai (1998) compiled a book on SOFA, crimes caused by USFJ, and Japan's sovereignty. The book contends that USFJ brought about many problems such as accidents, crimes, and damage to the environment. As a result, Japan's security is in danger because of USFJ. It points out that the real issue over SOFA is the fact that Japan does not have sovereignty over USFJ. That is the essence of the Security Treaty, the book argues. From the beginning, the Security Treaty was designed to secure the United States national interests, which were to use USFJ for the defense of a free world during the Cold War. Although the study does not state a secret agreement, it shows the true nature of the Security Treaty, whose main purpose is not to defend Japan but to defend the United States national interests.

Gavan McCormack (2007) describes Japan as a client state depending on the United States. He talks about Okinawa and relocation of the Futenma United States Marine Corps Air Base as a symbol of Japan's subordination. McCormack argues that Japanese economic and social reforms in the 2000s were designed to fulfill United States requests, and as a result, Japan became a client state or a vassal state. He concludes that the United States has maintained decisive control over Japan since 1945, and Japan's submission and the United States exploitation have increased in recent years. Since the end of the war in 1945, Japan has been a United States vassal state. As a client state, it is necessary for Japan to give priority to the United States national interests over Japan's. As a result, the Japanese Government has not revised SOFA and the people in Okinawa continue to suffer.

Karel van Wolferen (April 2011, May 2011) describes the United States-Japan relations as abnormal and contends that there is no other similar relationship in history. He continues to point out that the Japanese bureaucrats exercise enormous influence and power and try to faithfully obey the desires of the United States as if Japan were an American colony. The United States acts like a probation officer toward Japan, checking whether Japan can continue to behave well. Wolferen states that the United States would

wish to maintain the status quo in keeping the current level of USFJ even though the North Korean threat has virtually disappeared. Wolferen has been watching the Japanese politics and the United States-Japan relations for the past forty years. In his many studies, he argues that there is no central authority which takes responsibilities in Japan and that as a result, the Japanese bureaucrats control Japan. According to Wolferen, these bureaucrats' primary concern is how to satisfy the United States Government or how to fulfill the United States demands. Therefore, it is necessary for them not to antagonize the United States and to keep good relations with the United States. This bureaucrats' attitude toward the United States was clearly shown in the case of the relocation of the Futenma Marine Corps Air Base.

Toshihiro Yoshida (2010) argues that there was a secret agreement between the United States and Japan over SOFA. Under the agreement, Japan abandons the primary right to try suspects of USFJ except for the very important Japanese national interests. Using the Japanese Justice Ministry's Secret Practical Documents, which are difficult to obtain in Japan, Yoshida presents many statistics and cases in relation to crimes and accidents brought about by USFJ personnel, showing how the Japanese people suffer from accidents and crimes. Many of these accidents and crimes have not been tried by either a Japanese court or a United States military court in Japan. He reveals how the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Justice try to hide the secret agreement. The bureaucrats of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Justice seem not to care much about the Japanese people's lives or properties, but to more care about USFJ personnel. They are the Japanese civil servants, but these elite bureaucrats are not working for the Japanese people, but for USFJ. The Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) politicians and the bureaucrats of the Justice Ministry and of the Foreign Affairs' Ministry have not protected the Japanese people from USFJ for more than sixty years. In September 2009, the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) came to power, but the situation did not change. The Japanese Government continues to ignore the requests of the people in Okinawa to revise SOFA so that the Japanese judiciary has more authorities to control accidents and crimes by USFJ.

Yujin Fuse (2010) also asserts that the United States and the Japanese Governments reached a secret agreement concerning SOFA and the cases of crimes committed by USFJ. He states that USFJ violates human rights of the victims in Japan and SOFA prevents the Japanese judiciary from prosecuting suspects of USFJ. What is even worse from the victims' point of view is that the Japanese police and prosecution do not protect the Japanese victims due to the secret agreement, he argues. As a result, many suspects walk free. This study presents many examples that the Japanese victims suffer when accidents and crimes take place in relation to USFJ. In this respect, Okinawa is still under the United States occupation, and the Japanese Government has not taken any effective legal actions against USFJ personnel, who enjoy "extraterritoriality." Moreover, the Japanese Government has no intention of revising SOFA.

Akahata Seijibu Anpo Gaiko Han (2010) discusses a secret agreement over nuclear weapons and SOFA and discloses unequal characteristics of the Security Treaty. Akahata Seijibu describes diplomatic negotiations between the United States and Japan over the

Security Treaty and maintains that Japan has been subordinate to the United States since 1951 when the Security Treaty was signed. Seijibu concludes that Japan should abandon the Security Treaty since it does not fit international relations in East Asia in the 21st century.

The External Threats of North Korea, Russia, and China

In Japan, major mass media and the Japanese Government have regarded North Korea as a threat for a long time. North Korean abduction of the Japanese citizens, nuclear testing, missile launch, and its political system of the dictatorship all contribute to the image that North Korea is an irrational and a dangerous country taking a risk of nuclear war. However, the image mentioned above is the product of propaganda of the major mass media and the Japanese Government as well as the United States. North Korean nuclear weapons, if any, primarily aim at the United States, not Japan.

The major concern of the North Korean leadership is a survival of the current system. North Korea wants a written promise from the United States that the United States would not attack North Korea. First of all, North Korea wishes to change the armistice of the Korean War to a peace treaty. Then, she wants to establish diplomatic relations with the United States. North Korea knows that if the United States recognizes her, Japan would follow. In order to normalize relations with North Korea, Japan must pay to the people of North Korea. Japan has a debt to settle with the people of North Korea for her colonization of Korea from 1910 to 1945 since Japan paid to the people of South Korea in 1965. When Japan normalized relations with South Korea in 1965, the Japanese Government paid \$5 million to the South Korean Government for ODA/compensation, but has not paid to the people of North Korea. This is not fair to the north since there was no north or south in Korea from 1910 to 1945. North Korea would be able to grow her economy using the money from Japan just like South Korea did after 1965. Since the United States or China would not financially support North Korea or South Korea cannot afford to financially help North Korea, Japan is the only country that North Korea can count on.

As for North Korean threat to Japan, North Korea can easily attack Japan, if she wishes, even without nuclear weapons or missiles. Japan is very vulnerable to any attack since she has more than fifty nuclear power plants throughout Japan. North Korea can send to Japan via the Japan Sea by rubber boats a couple of hundred operatives who dress exactly like the Japanese people and speak perfect Japanese. They can easily destroy some of the nuclear power plants. Then, it is not difficult to imagine that Japan would be perished even without using one nuclear bomb. As the recent accident of the Fukushima nuclear power plants clearly shows, destruction of a couple of the nuclear power plants would be sufficient enough to cause a panic among the Japanese people and economic and political function in Tokyo would be paralyzed. In that case, the Marine Corps in Okinawa becomes useless. Why does North Korea not attack Japan? Does the Security Treaty prevent such a North Korean attack? North Korea can always say that the attack was

done by the terrorists, not North Korea.

Or, North Korea can launch a number of missiles against the Japanese nuclear power plants. The result would be the same. It is extremely difficult to intercept these missiles with the SDF's Patriot missiles. Marine Corps in Okinawa would be hopeless to deal with the missile attack. Concerning North Korean missile or satellite launch, according to Motofumi Asai, North Korea launched a satellite after she joined the Outer Space Treaty and followed due process of International Civil Aviation Organization. In other words, North Korea launched a satellite exercising her deserved right guaranteed to all nations by international law, Asai argues. However, President Barack Obama criticized North Korea that she broke the international rule by launching a rocket that could be used as a long range missile; therefore, we must take an action against the provocation. Asai continues that an argument on North Korean threat in Japan originally stems from the remarks of Obama mentioned above and an image of unpredictable North Korea held by the Japanese Government, people, and major mass media. (Asai, November 2009, 153)

Moreover, North Korea has suffered from shortage of food and fuel for a long time. It is true that the North Korean Government gives the armed forces priority over the people in providing food and fuel. However, in fact, many North Korean soldiers have not received enough food or training. If the second Korean War breaks out, many experts agree that South Korea would easily win in a short period of time even without the help of the United States armed forces. In terms of training and quality of weapons, South Korean armed forces are superior to North Korean armed forces. Besides, it is certain that United States Forces stationed in South Korea as well as USFJ would support South Korean armed forces. Of course, if the war breaks out, Seoul would be destroyed by North Korean missiles, but North Korea cannot win.

As for North Korean nuclear weapons, it is not sure whether North Korea actually developed nuclear weapons that can be used. Up to now, North Korean nuclear weapons are more like diplomatic weapons than military weapons against the United States. North Korea primarily developed nuclear weapons to deter American aggression rather than attack Japan. Therefore, North Korean nuclear weapons do not directly threaten Japan except for the case that USFJ would be attacked by North Korean nuclear weapons in case of war. In fact, some expert argues that there is "No public information to verify that North Korea possessed operational nuclear weapons." (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2013, 323)

It might be accurate to say that North Korea has not acquired operational nuclear weapons. As for the defense of Japan, it does not matter whether North Korea has nuclear weapons or not since she does not need the weapons to attack Japan. North Korea can always attack Japanese nuclear plans with missiles without nuclear weapons. Or, North Korea can send special attack troops or spies to destroy these plans. However, so far North Korea has not taken any action against Japan. Is it because the United States is supposed to defend Japan with the Security Treaty? Or is it because North Korea has other things in mind instead of attacking Japan?

There is no major issue between North Korea and Japan except for abduction

issue. From the North Korean viewpoint, she does not need to take any action on this issue since no North Korean citizens are abducted by Japan. North Korea wants Japan to pay compensation for Japan's colonial rule. North Korea knows that if North Korea destroys Japan, she cannot get money from Japan. Moreover, nuclear blackmail does not work as the past experience clearly shows. President Truman tried to threaten Stalin with atomic bombs in the 1940s, but Stalin was not influenced by such blackmail. Japan did not surrender even after two atomic bombs were dropped. It was the Soviet entry into the war against Japan that induced Japan to surrender.

Concerning Russian threat to Japan after the Cold War, Russia does not threaten Japan. Although there is an issue of the Northern Territory, Russia needs Japan as much as Japan needs Russia. From the Russian viewpoint, Japan could become a Russian partner against China in the areas of economy and defense. Russia needs Japanese technology and capital to develop Siberia and can keep the balance against China with Japan. Japan, on the other hand, needs Russian natural resources including oil and diplomatic support against China. If Japan could obtain oil from Russia, she could reduce oil imports from the Middle East which would reduce her vulnerability.

During the Cold War, the Japanese Government and the United States Government often said that the Security Treaty and USFJ deterred Soviet aggression. The United States Government states that the Japanese people receive deterrent from USFJ in exchange for the Host Nation Support. The United States Government argues that the Soviet Union or China did not attack Japan because USFJ deterred aggression during the Cold War. It is important to examine, however, if the Soviet Union had intention to attack Japan during the Cold War. It is well known that the main concern of the Soviet defense lied in the central Europe among the Russian defense mentality so that the Russians could defend themselves against Germany. As a result, the Russian Far East played a defensive role.

Moreover, the Soviet Union did not have naval capability or economic power to invade Japan during the Cold War. It is important to consider military capability and intention when one thinks about a threat. One needs to ask, first of all, if the Soviet Union had intention to invade the Western nations including Japan and carry out the policy based on global expansionism. According to Eiichi Shindo, Soviet military intervention during the Cold War was limited in the sense that the Soviet Union projected her military power in the neighboring countries of the Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union with the help of the friendly countries. Moreover, the Soviet Union tried to avoid militarily provoking the United States. In other words, one could argue that the Soviet intervention was limited to the countries under the Soviet sphere of influence. In fact, according to Shindo, the Soviet military intervention was relatively fewer than that of the Western capitalist countries and the intervention stemmed from the security complex which was based on her historical experience. Germany invaded the Soviet Union twice in less than thirty years and the Soviet Union suffered tremendous casualties in two world wars. This historical experience made the Soviet Union overreact to the containment policy by the Western countries. (Shindo, 1986, 41-42; 1988, 246-49)

Shindo also argues that the Soviet Union had continuously rejected the United States request in October 1945 that the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Soviet Union, and China dispatch their troops to occupy Japan. Instead, the Soviet Union insisted that only the United States occupy Japan and showed no intention to participate in the occupation of Japan. It is true that right after Japan's surrender, the Soviet Union requested to occupy half of Hokkaido, but withdrew her demands within a week in the face of the American rejection. The Soviet Union suffered the death of over 20 million people during World War II and her land was devastated and economy was ruined. In other words, the Soviet Union was not in the position of sending troops to occupy Japan, which would impose a financial burden on her postwar economy. It would be extremely difficult for the Soviet Union to militarily and financially participate in the occupation of Japan. (Shindo, 1999, 320-21; and 1988, 253-54)

The Soviet Union had hoped that Rumania and Bulgaria would be under the influence of the Soviet Union in exchange for Japan under the influence of the United States. In other words, according to Shindo, the position of the Far East is relatively lower than that of the Eastern Europe in the Soviet security complex. It was the United States that offered the Soviet Union the Kuril Islands and the Southern Sakhalin at Yalta rather than the Soviet Union demanded. In exchange for the American occupation of Okinawa and other places, the United States offered the Soviet Union the islands mentioned above. (Shindo, 1988, 255, 256, 258)

Shindo also contends that the Soviet Navy lacked power projection capability such as aircraft carrier groups, naval air power, assault landing crafts, and marine corps. Particularly, the Soviet Marine Corps troop strength had less than one tenth of the American Marine Corps and the Soviet Navy did not have blue navy with the aim of controlling the sea during the Cold War. Moreover, the Soviet Union was inferior to the United States in nuclear weapons, military technology, and the military capability of the allies. (Shindo, 1986, 47, 50-51, 57, 59, 60; and 1987, 320-2) Yoshimasa Muroyama also agrees that there was no possibility of Soviet invasion of Japan unless the United States attacked the Soviet Union in the Far East during the Cold War. (Muroyama, 1992, 514)

Furthermore, the Soviet Union had logistical problems, which would make her almost impossible to carry out the two simultaneous frontal attacks in Europe or the Middle East and the Far East. (Shindo, 1987, 317-8) Shindo contends that Soviet foreign policy toward Japan stemmed from security complex rather than "Soviet expansionism." The Soviet Union hoped that the United States occupation policy would make Japan a democratic country and did not want to directly control her. The Soviet Union was concerned that the old powers of Japan would remilitarize Japan, which would attack the Soviet Union. In order to prevent such a situation, the Soviet Union wanted that the United States would take the leadership in the occupation of Japan and promote "democratization" and "demilitarization" in Japan.¹ (Shindo, 1988, 254; and 1999, 322)

In this way, even during the Cold War, there was no real Soviet threat to Japan. It was all exaggerated, and the Soviet threat was used to justify the Security Treaty and keeping American Forces and bases in Japan after Japan regained independence. In recent

years, Chinese threats are also exaggerated. The major mass media in Japan propagate anti-Chinese. As a result, many Japanese people became anti-Chinese.

As for Chinese threats, since collision between a Japan's Coast Guard's vessel and a Chinese fishing boat in 2010 and Japan's nationalization of the Senkaku Islands in 2012, the relations between China and Japan became antagonistic. In both China and Japan, nationalism is growing. Under such circumstances, the Abe Administration tried to reinterpret Article 9 so that Japan could exercise the right to collective self-defense. It is obvious that Abe aims at China as a potential enemy and wants Japan to be on an equal footing with the United States by allowing the SDF to help the United States Forces under the name of the collective self-defense.

In case of an emergency, it is difficult to image the scenario that only Japan would be attacked. It is true that the US 7th Fleet has a home port at Yokosuka, but its main task is not to defend Japan. The main task is to defend vast areas from Asia and the Pacific Ocean to the Middle East and East Africa. The number of the United States armed forces which would come to rescue Japan is limited and they would be late in case of an emergency in other areas. In the meantime, the SDF has to defend Japan.

Conclusion

Relations between the United States and Japan have not changed for more than sixty years. The United States is a master and Japan is a servant. SOFA clearly shows this relationship. Yukio Hatoyama, then Prime Minister of Japan, tried in vain to change this relationship from 2009 to 2010 and to regain Japan's sovereignty when his government endeavored to find relocation of the Futenma Marine Corps Air Base. However, he was not able to achieve his goal due to opposition from not only the United States, but also from within Japan. The bureaucrats of the Japanese Foreign Ministry and Defense Ministry who cooperated with USFJ successfully kept a status quo and prevented Hatoyama from regaining Japan's sovereignty. For these Japanese bureaucrats, keeping good relations with the United States was more important than regaining Japan's sovereignty. As the Japanese Government in the 1950s gave in to the demands of the United States, the Hatoyama Administration could not hold the Japanese national interests.

Japan has been subordinate to the United States as a vassal state or a protectorate state. USFJ still exists as occupation forces in Japan. The secret agreement is the major reason why accidents and crimes committed by USFJ do not decrease, and SOFA provides USFJ with "extraterritoriality" in Japan. Moreover, the Japanese police and prosecution do not help the Japanese victims in many cases. Instead, they let a suspect of USFJ go free or hand over a suspect to USFJ even when Japan has the primary right to try a case because the Japanese judiciary deals with a case according to the secret agreement.

Therefore, Yukio Hatoyama's idea of the Security Treaty without American military bases is not acceptable to the United States. The United States military bases in Japan are of vital importance to the United States global strategy. Without their bases in Yokosuka, Sasebo, Iwakuni, Misawa, or Okinawa, the United States would not sustain her

global military power. Although the United States military bases in Okinawa have become more vulnerable than before due to recent naval military buildup of China, USFJ including one in Okinawa is still a great asset for the United States. Given the fact that Japan pays up to 75 percent of the cost to keep USFJ, there is no reason why the United States should withdraw her military forces from Japan.

Notes

- ¹ Regarding the Soviet foreign policy and her military strategy, see Eiichi Shindo, *Gendai no Gunkaku Kozo* (The structure of contemporary military expansion) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), 1988, 238-283. With respect to the Soviet military, see *Ibid.*, 130-235. Moriteru Arasaki argues that there was no evidence among vast material which was made public after the Soviet Union dissolved to indicate that the Soviet Union had intention to attack Japan. Neither China nor North Korea had intention, capability, or interests to attack Japan, he says. Nevertheless, the United States needed the bases in Japan including Okinawa as a means of keeping hegemony in the Asia-Pacific areas after World War II and the ruling class in Japan relied on the United States hegemony and believed that following the United States was their own interests. Moriteru Arasaki, "Kichi no Nai Okinawa o Mezashite" (Seeking Okinawa without the bases), in *Okinawa Jiritsu e no Michi o Motomete* (In search of a way toward Okinawa's self-reliance), eds., Seigen Miyasato, et al. (Tokyo: Kobunken, 2009), 224-25. Yukio Gengawa, former Commanding General of the Eastern Army of the Ground Self-Defense Forces (SDF) says that the United States took in the 1970s the position that it would be impossible for the Soviet Army alone to directly invade Hokkaido. *Asahi Shimbun Jieitai 50 Nen Shuzaihan. Jieitai Shirarezaru Henyo* (Unkonwn transformation of the Self-Defense Forces) (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2005), 309.

References

- Akahata Seijibu Anpo Gaiko Han. *Jyuzoku no Domei* (An alliance that is dependent on the United States). Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 2010.
- Asahi Shimbun Jieitai 50 Nen Shuzaihan. *Jieitai Shirarezaru Henyo* (Unkonwn transformation of the Self Defense Forces) Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2005.
- Asai, Motofumi. "Kenryoku Seijiteki Kokusaikan kara no dakkyaku o" (Slough off power political view of international relations!) *Sekai*, November 2009, 147-156.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *The Grand Chessboard*. Ney York: Basic Books, 1997.
- Chiikyotei Kenkyukai. *Nichibei Chiikyotei Chikujyo Hihan* (Criticism of Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and Japan article by article). Tokyo: Shinnihon Shuppansha, 1997.
- Fuse, Yujin. *Nichibei Mitsuyaku, Sabakarenai Beihei Hanzai* (A secret agreement between the United States and Japan: Crimes committed by American soldiers in Japan that were not tried). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010.

- Hatoyama, Yukio, Ukeru Magosaki, and Kazuhide Uekusa. *Taibei Jyuzoku to iu Shukua* (Japan's chronic disease called subordination to the United States). Tokyo: Asuka Shinsha, 2013.
- Hatoyama, Yukio and Hajime Takano. *Minshuto no Genten* (The origins of the Democratic Party of Japan). Tokyo: Kadensha, 2012.
- Hirano, Sadao. *Ozawa Ichiro Bosatsu Jiken* (The premeditated murder case of Ichiro Ozawa). Tokyo: Bijinesusha, 2013.
- . *Ozawa Ichiro Kanzen Muzai* (The complete innocence of Ichiro Ozawa). Tokyo: Kodansha, 2011.
- House of Councillors, ed. *The National Diet Japan*. n.p., 1969.
- Iha, Yoichi, "Beigun Saihen to Okinawa Beigun Kichi" (The reorganization of the United States armed forces and the United States military bases in Okinawa), in Owaranai Senryo (Endless occupation), ed. Ukeru Magosaki and Akira Kimura. Kyoto: Horitsu Bunkasha, 2013, 169.
- Maeda, Tetsuo. *Jyuzoku kara Jiritsu e: Nichibei Anpo o Kaeru* (From subordination to independence: We will change the Security Treaty). Tokyo: Kobunken, 2009.
- Maedomari, Hiromori, "Nichibei Chiikyotei ni Miru Nichibei Kankei" (The United States-Japan relations seen in the Status of Forces Agreement between the United States-Japan). In *Owaranai Senryo* (Endless occupation), ed. Ukeru Magosaki and Akira Kimura. Kyoto: Horitsu Bunkasha, 2013, 113-127.
- Magosaki, Ukeru. *America ni Tsubusareta Seijika tachi* (The Japanese politicians whose political career was ruined by the United States) Tokyo: Shogakukan, 2012.
- . *Sengoshi no Shotai* (The true character of Japan's postwar history). Osaka: Sogensha, 2012.
- Magosaki, Ukeru and Akira Kimura. *Owaranai Senryo* (Endless occupation). Kyoto: Horitsu Bunkasha, 2013.
- Magosaki, Ukeru and Karel van Wolferen. *Dokuritsu no Shiko* (Independent thoughts). Tokyo: Kadokawa Gakugei Shuppan, 2013.
- McCormack, Gavan, "Zokkoku Mondai" (A problem of a vassal state), in Magosaki, Ukeru and Akira Kimura. *Owaranai Senryo* (Endless occupation). Kyoto: Horitsu Bunkasha, 2013, 18-38.
- McCormack, Gavan. *Resistant Islands*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2012.
- . *Client State*. London: Verso, 2007.
- Miyasato, Seigen, et al. Okinawa *Jiritsu e no Michio Motomete* (In search of a way toward Okinawa's self-reliance). Tokyo: Kobunken, 2009.
- Mori, Yuko. *Kensatsu no Wana* (The trap of the prosecution). Tokyo: Nihon Bungeisha, 2012.
- Arasaki, Moriteru. "Kichi no Nai Okinawa o Mezashite" (Seeking Okinawa without the bases), in *Okinawa Jiritsu e no Michi o Motomete* (In search of a way toward Okinawa's self-reliance), eds., Miyasato, Seigen, et al. Tokyo: Kobunken, 2009.
- Muroyama, Yoshimasa. *Nichibei Anpotaisei II* (The United States-Japan Security Treaty

- System II) Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1992.
- Nihon Bengoshi Rengokai, ed. *Nihon no Anzenhosho to Kichi Mondai* (Japan's security and United States military base issues). Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1998.
- Schaller, Michael. *Nichibei Kankei towa Nan daata no ka* (Altered states). Tokyo: Soshisha, 2004.
- Shindo, Eiichi. *Sengo no Genzo: Hiroshima kara Okinawa e* (The postwar original image: From Hiroshima to Okinawa). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1999.
- . *Gendai no Gunkaku Kozo* (The structure of contemporary military expansion) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten), 1988.
- . *Gendai Funso no Kozo* (The structure of contemporary conflicts) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987)
- . "Bunkatsu sareta Ryodo," *Sekai*, April 1979, pp. 31-51.
- Shindo Eiichi., ed. *Heiwa Senryaku no Kozu* (The composition of peace strategy). Tokyo: Nihon Hyoronsha, 1986.
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, ed., *SIPRI Yearbook 2013*, London: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Suenami, Yasushi. Taibei *Jyuzoku no Shotai* (The true character of Japan's subordination to the United States). Tokyo: Kobunken, 2012.
- Tada, Minoru. *Nichibei Anpo Jyoyaku* (The United States-Japan Security Treaty). Tokyo: Mikasa Shobo, 1982.
- Takano, Hajime. *Okinawa ni Kaiheitai wa Iranai* (Okinawa does not need the United States Marine Corps). Tokyo: Ningenshuppan, 2012.
- Toyoshita, Narahiko. *Shudan teki Jieiken to wa nanika* (What is a collective self-defense?) Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2007.
- . *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu* (Conclusion of the United States-Japan Security Treaty), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.
- Yoshida, Toshihiro. *Mitsuyaku: Nichibei Chiikyotei to Beihei Hanzai* (A secret agreement: Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and Japan and crimes committed by American soldiers in Japan). Tokyo: Mainichi Shimbunsha, 2010.
- Wolferen, Karel van. *Dare ga Ozawa Ichiro o Korosu no ka?* (Who assassinates Ichiro Ozawa?). Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 2011.
- . "Amerika ni Amaeru Jidai wa Owatta" (The age that Japan depended on American generosity has ended) *Bungei Shunju*, April 2011, 412-420.
- . "Amerika ni Amaeru Jidai wa Owatta (The age that Japan depended on American generosity has ended: A sequel)," *Bungei Shunju*, May 2011, 386-397.
- <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/guideline2.html>: accessed on 6 September 2013.