

Thoughts on the Pacific War

Yoko Kato

Introduction

I have heard that over 300 guests are present here today. I can see that the majority of the audience is men. You must have been surprised to see that a woman gives the keynote address first even if we are living in the age of gender equality.

However, you may encounter a surprising fact when the theme of “war” is linked to women. For example, if you check Vol.1 of *On War* by Clausewitz (translated by Hideo Shinoda, Iwanami Shoten Publishers) of which many panelists are going to make mention today, do you remember what is the first word you see? In fact, the first word is “woman.” As you know, the “foreword” of this book published after the death of Clausewitz includes the part written by his wife Marie to describe the background of publication. It begins with her word “you may think that it is disgraceful for a woman to add the foreword to this kind of work.” According to the foreword, Clausewitz himself had not expected that his book would be published when he was alive and often said to his wife, “you will publish my book.”

Marie used to serve as a Madam Secretary of Princess Wilhelm and expected “the infant prince of whom I was entrusted to take care” to read that book later on as she herself wrote at the end of the foreword. This prince refers to later Friedrich III who was less than one year old in those days. He was born as an eldest child of Wilhelm I, the first emperor of Germany, and assumed the throne in 1888 as a second emperor of Germany. However, he was already 56 years old at that time and he died after only about 100 days passed since his succession. He is said to have done great work in leading the Austro-Prussian War and the Franco-Prussian War, both of which were important wars for Prussia. The causal connection between his action in battlefields and *On War* Marie may have read is unknown, though.

Now I finish trivial talks and get to the main point. I assume that there are a number of foreign panelists today so that I will try to speak more slowly than usual in order for simultaneous interpreters to interpret sufficiently by checking the degree of progress of interpretation. This may cause the lack of fluency for the audience whose native language is Japanese, but I would like to ask for your kind understanding.

1. Review and Characteristics of the International Forum on War History

I was asked to give this address about six months ago by Mr. Junichiro Shoji, Director of the Center for Military History (former Department of Military History), which was reorganized recently, of the National Institute for Defense Studies. As Prof. Shoji and I belonged to the same study group from when we were postgraduate students, I have no choice but saying yes if I am asked to give this address by him.

Although I have said yes, I did some researches and I am nervous now to be honest, because I found out that my assignment is not that simple. First of all, the “International Forum on War History” commemorates the 10th anniversary this year and this forum is thought to contribute to the writing of “Pacific War History” in which members of the Center for War History have involved since 2007.

I would like to look back at the themes of this International Forum in the past four years. The theme for the year 2007 was “New Perspectives on the War in the Pacific: Grand Strategies, Military Governments and prisoners of war (POWs),” for the year 2008 was “The Japan Strategies of the Allies during the Road to Pearl Harbor,” for the year 2009 was “Strategy in the Pacific War” and for the year 2010 was “The Strategy of the Axis Powers in the Pacific War.” According to reports posted on the website of the National Institute for Defense Studies, we can understand that attention is paid to the view of capturing the Pacific War from strategic problems of Japan, the Allies and the Axis and also to new issues such as the background of its outbreak, truth of the coordination among the Allies, military governments and POWs.

When I read past reports, I have noticed that this International Forum has characteristics different from those of a number of international conferences held by researchers belonging to universities and academic circles. They are comprehensiveness and completeness. When an academic conference focuses on strategies of the Allies, it only touches on the U.S. and the U.K. in many cases. However, conferences hosted by the NIDS pick up the U.S., the U.K., China, the Netherlands and Australia. In a similar way, in the case of the Axis, Italia is picked up in addition to Germany. Moreover, scholars are invited from Canada and Singapore, because the theme is the Pacific. This indicates that careful consideration has been given to the point that the Pacific War was not equal to a war between Japan and the U.S.

2. Problems in the Pacific Area Seen in Newspaper Reports

Before I prepare for this address, I read over a year’s worth of clips of various newspapers. My

impressions and ideas that occurred to me at that time are written in the summary distributed to you today. I would like to read it.

The morning edition of the Nikkei (*Nihon Keizai Shimbun*) of 29 July 2011 reported in detail that an interdepartmental team, including Kurt M. Campbell, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs and Admiral Patrick Walsh, Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, visited eight Pacific Island states (Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, the Marshall Islands, Kiribati, Samoa, and Tonga) from 29 June to 1 July and discussed bilateral-approach plans for various issues. The newspaper concluded that the U.S. had two major aims for the tour: to secure their freedom to execute missions in the Pacific Ocean area, whose center is Guam, the front base for U.S. military strategy execution, and also to watch as well as counter China's attempt to expand its influence in the East and South China Sea areas for the sake of natural resources.

Coincidentally, on 27 July, China's Ministry of National Defense officially acknowledged for the first time that they had an aircraft carrier, which until then they had kept quiet about. Recently, the disputes over the right of possession of the Spratly Islands in the South China Sea between China and the other states making claims, such as the Philippines and Vietnam, are getting worse.

The military expansion of China in the Pacific region, including both the East and South China Seas has already become a major factor causing tension among the states around that area. Observing the current situation mentioned above, times have changed: during the 1920s and 1930s, on the grounds of the London Naval Treaty and the Washington Naval Treaty, the U.S. and the U.K. tried with much effort to control and restrain Japan from expanding its naval forces; however, you can see that Chinese naval forces have now become the ones to watch in the Pacific region. The situation has certainly changed.

This is only a summarization of my impressions on newspapers I read. As a more recent issue, the morning edition of the Nikkei of August 2 reported that the People's Liberation Army commemorated its foundation day on August 1 and cited the summary of remarks made by Zhang Qinsheng, Deputy Chief of the General Staff, in a magazine for the party's leaders. He said "if it is an overall defensive action, an active and aggressive behavior may be permitted in a specific operation." This highlights the importance of securing interests in the territorial conflict in the South China Sea and the newspaper reported that Deputy Chief of Staff emphasized that "China cannot rule out a possibility of war."

Further, there are a number of reports that Russia is keenly interested in the Pacific area. The morning edition of the Nikkei of December 2, 2010 reports that Russian President Medvedev visited the Northern Territories (Russian name: South Kuril Islands) for the first time as a chief of state on November 1 and that he described the islands as “an extremely important region of our state.” It also introduced an argument of Mr. Pavel Felgenhauer, Russian military analyst, on Novaya Gazeta dated November 17. According to the article, he said that a base of nuclear submarines that carry multiheaded submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM) called “Bulava” that are capable of slipping through the missile defense (MD) network of the U.S. is being developed in the coast of Kamchatka Peninsula. In addition, more recently, the morning edition of Nikkei of September 1, 2011 reported that the Russian Pacific Fleet is going to carry out joint exercises with the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force in the Sea of Japan and with the U.S. Navy in Guam from early September. These exercises with Japan and the U.S. will be realized by the request from the Russian side. The Russian Fleet is expected to call at Vancouver, Canada and return to Vladivostok in December this year via the Tsugaru Straits. This article analyzes those movements as “Russia has a purpose of appealing its presence as a Pacific nation.”

The increase in the defense budget and the progress of domestic production of aircraft carriers in China which has become the second economic power in the world and the U.S. is highly sensitive to such movements. In addition to that, there is a sign that Russia advances southward. We are in an unsafe world. Concerning this point, the morning edition of *Mainichi Shimbun* of March 5, 2011 reports that the defense budget of China recorded an increase of 12.7% over the performance of the previous year and that U.S. Secretary of Defense Gates said in a speech he gave in a military academy in February as follows. Firstly, the axis of the U.S. defense policy has returned from antiterrorism measures to state-to-state wars. Secondly, the U.S. assumes that China is developing aircraft carriers in order to obstruct actions of the U.S. Army in the western Pacific.

What about China? Dai Xu, active Colonel of the Chinese Air Force, who attracted attention due to his work entitled *The C Encirclement* (Japanese title is *Chugoku Saidai no Teki Nihon wo Kogeki Seyo* [*Attack Japan-Worst Enemy of China*], translated by Masataka Yamaoka [Tokuma Shoten]) that sold 300,000 copies is said to have made the following judgment. You may remember that the heavy snow disaster in early 2008 paralyzed the transportation infrastructure and national function in China. Colonel Dai Xu saw that disaster with his eyes and has come to think that China should never wage a decisive battle in the mainland in the future and should prevent war outside 4,000 kilometers alongside the east coastal region. When I read this book, I felt that Colonel Dai Xu understands sensitive issues. Have you ever read an essay entitled “Natural Disaster and National Defense” written in 1934 by Torahiko Terada who was a physicist

and student of Soseki Natsume? Currently it is available as *Tensai to Kokubo (Natural Disaster and National Defense)* (Kodansha), and on the Internet “Aozorabunko” as its copyright has expired. The key of this essay is that it includes the truth that “catastrophes” intensify along with the progress of civilization.

If the civilization progresses, the quantity of high-rise buildings and transportation and communications infrastructures that would be destroyed by catastrophes increases significantly. It is assumed that mental tolerance to the destruction of a highly-advanced and comfortable lifestyle diminishes remarkably as a mental problem of human beings. More fierce “catastrophes” attack all advanced countries without exception both physically and mentally. China now produces 63% of its GDP only in cities in the coastal areas. The idea of waging a battle and ambushing an enemy in the mainland adopted by the People’s Liberation Army can be supported based on extraordinary endurance of the nation. The judgment of Colonel Dai Xu that coastal urban areas where a market economy prospers cannot be placed under violent war seems convincing.

Such movements of the Chinese side help us to understand better the content of the following coverage reported in the morning edition of *Asahi Shimbun* of January 16, 2011 by a byline article of Mr. Yoichi Kato. It is a report that anti-ship ballistic missiles (ASBM), new weapons that have been developed by China as an ace to contain US aircraft carriers in the western Pacific, have been almost completed. In response, the U.S. analyzed that the Chinese Army is increasing its capabilities of “anti-access and area-denial.” A report submitted to the US Congress by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission in November 2010 points out that “the Chinese Army is capable of attacking Misawa, Yokota and Kadena Air Force Bases by ballistic and cruise missiles” and that “Andersen Air Force Base in Guam is the only base not under threat of ballistic missiles in the western Pacific.”

We can understand that the involvement of China in the Pacific has become active as shown in the possession of aircraft carriers, the active involvement in the South China Sea, ASBM and the anti-access strategy against the U.S. Army. Also, Russia does not hide active interests in the Pacific any more based on the bond of the former Soviet bloc in the continental interior. The modern age is summarized as an age when states that have been continental states in nature such as China and Russia have started to look to the Pacific. If we sum it up in that way, we are forced to notice that there was actually an age when China and Russia (Soviet Union) were closely linked to the Pacific in the past.

3. The Pacific and its Spatial and Geographical Reality

(1) Meaning of the Pacific

I pointed out that the concept of the Pacific has changed with the times in the “summary” I submitted in advance. The following is that part.

On the other hand, one opinion has been gaining in popularity among people in Japan in recent years: that it is appropriate to change the name of the war—which broke out with the first strikes of Japanese forces on British-controlled Malaya and on Pearl Harbor on December 8, 1941—the Asia and Pacific War rather than the Pacific War (they called it the Greater East Asia War in those days). If you took into consideration the two facts that Japan fought against not only the U.S. but also other states and that the Pacific islands are not the only areas where they caused damage during the war, you can consider such an opinion persuasive enough seen from the current viewpoint. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is important to pay attention to the fact that the Japanese in the middle of 1920s actually used the term “the Pacific Ocean” with a connotation of a larger area than only the sea lying between Japan and the U.S. By using the term, they meant to include not only the areas and states in the Pacific Ocean, but also those in and connected to the Pacific Rim. For example, Japan is surrounded by five seas: the Bering Sea, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Japan Sea, the East China Sea, and the South China Sea. In accordance with that, they acquired a spatial sense including the regions, states, and colonies around those seas in the Pacific area.

Such an idea is supported by the actual activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). The IPR started its activities in 1925: its central committee was composed of members from territories and states such as Australia, Canada, China, Hawaii, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, the U.S. and the U.K. It is noteworthy to underscore the fact that Hawaii, the U.S., “Korea” and Japan sent their own respective committee members. The IPR hosted the Kyoto conference in 1929 and had participants from not only Pacific rim countries such as Japan, the U.K., the U.S., China, the Philippines, and New Zealand, but also “Korea”, the League of Nations, the USSR, Mexico, and the Netherlands, etc. The IPR was a non-governmental organization that was organized mainly by Japanese, British, and American Christians and bourgeoisie. The members of the Comintern (or the Communist International) also perceived the world in front of them with a concept of the expansive Pacific area, as the IPR did. Those polar-opposite groups in some sense seemed to share the common idea of an expansive Pacific area. This fact deserves greater attention. In this report I would like to clarify

what the concept of the Pacific area was during the 1920s and 1930s.

As I mentioned in the above-mentioned part, it is certainly meaningful to call outward invasions of Japan from 1931 with the name the Asia and Pacific War¹ in the background of chronological understanding that the Pacific War in 1941 is continuation of the Manchurian Incident in 1931 and the Sino-Japanese War in 1937. However, I feel a sense of slight discomfort that it has been suggested to call it as the Asia and Pacific War² in order to avoid the following two points. 1) The naming called Pacific War that has been widely used until now may be understood as war between the states on both sides of the Pacific and 2) regions such as China, the Philippines, Burma, New Guinea and Indonesia that turned into actual battle fields where a number of noncombatants were killed may be forgotten. To prevent these two points, a researcher advocate the name of the Asia and Pacific War, however I feel awkward in some ways with the naming.

My idea is as follows. I can understand to call the war as the Asia and Pacific War for a chronological reason. However, if we call the war as the Asia and Pacific War to include Asia in the Pacific spatially and geographically, I think that the unique meaning included in the term and concept of the Pacific in the 20's and the 30's would be lost. Professor Blakeslee (George H. Blakeslee, Professor of History and International Relations, Clark University) served as a representative of the U.S. of IPR mentioned in my "summary" and involved in the preparation of Japanese policies of the U.S. Department of Interior. We can read a paper he prepared for the third IPR held in Kyoto now as a book entitled *The Pacific Area: An International Survey* (1929). Professor Blakeslee included the following states and regions as target. They are China,

¹ Concerning the naming of wars including that in those days, please see detailed consideration by Mr. Junichiro Shoji in his works "Nihon ni Okeru Senso Kosho ni Kansuru Mondai no Ichi Kousatsu (Consideration on Problem of Naming of Wars in Japan)," in *Boei Kenkyusho Kiyo (NIDS Journal of Defense and Security)*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (March 2011). In the Government Liaison Conference of the Imperial General Headquarters held on December 10, 1941, it was decided to call the war as Great East Asia War including the Manchurian Incident. In the same conference held on February 17, 1942, specific values are cited as a geographical range of Great East Asia (Japan, Manchuria and China and the southern area north of 10 degrees north latitude in the range of 90 to 180 degrees east longitude).

² As a simple summary by Hiroshi Yoshida, see *Shirizu Nihon Kingendaishi 6, Ajia Taiheiyo Senso (Series of Modern Japanese History 6, the Asia and Pacific War)* (Iwanami Shoten, Publishers, 2007). He describes "although 'Pacific War' is commonly used now, it is the naming for a war between Japan and the U.S. so that the importance of battle in China and occupied lands in South East Asia may be lost," and "the eight volumes of *Iwanami Koza – Ajia Taiheiyo Senso (Iwanami Koza Series of the Asia and Pacific War)* of which I am a member of editorial board suggests that a series of wars (the Manchurian Incident, the Sino-Japanese War and 'the Pacific War') is grasped by a broad concept of 'the Asia and Pacific War.' This is based on awareness that the war should be reviewed based on a temporal spread including postwar periods and on a spatial spread of the 'empire.'"

Manchuria, Japan, British dominions (Australia, Canada, New Zealand), the Soviet Union, states that concluded the Peace Treaty on the Pacific Islands (four-power treaty in 1921, the U.K., the U.S., Japan and France) and states that concluded the Treaty for the Sovereignty and Open Door of China (nine-power treaty in 1922, the U.K., the U.S., Japan, Italy, Belgium, Portugal, France, the Netherlands, China).

Excluding duplication, they are the U.S., the U.K., France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Soviet Union, China, Japan and “the Manchurian area.” The first important point is that the Pacific in those days used to include colonial powers and their colonial islands and regions. The Netherland Indies, British Burma, French Indochina and the Philippines are included in the Pacific region. The second important point is that the Soviet Union was included in the Pacific.

(2) Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR)

The studies of Yasuo Katagiri³ and Michio Yamaoka⁴ reveal in detail that IPR was a precedent of international nongovernmental organizations and the participants of each round and the content of reports. Materials related to IPR maintained by Yasaka Takagi still remain in the “Takagi Bunko” stored in the Center for Pacific and American Studies, University of Tokyo. As you know, IPR has started its activities from July 1925. It was the “Conference on Issues of the Pacific Nationals” held in Honolulu, Hawaii. Christians in Hawaii who were concerned about strained U.S.-China and the U.S.-Japan relations due to the anti-immigration movement in California called for YMCA to hold this meeting. IPR can be regarded as a NGO consisting mainly of Christians, bourgeoisies, private-sector intellectuals and officials of governmental organizations from Japan, the U.S. and the U.K. After its headquarters was moved to New York, IPR started its activities as a permanent entity and held regular international conferences on disarmament, labor problems and agricultural problems mainly by states that were interested in the Asia-Pacific area in order to take on the function of study, publishing and research. Although those matters had been discussed by various organizations of the League of Nations, it tended to focus on themes related to Europe.

States and regions such as Australia, Canada, China, Hawaii, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, the U.S. and the U.K. used to dispatch central members. The fact that each of Hawaii

³ Nobuo Katagiri, *Taiheiyo Mondai Chosakai no Kenkyu (Study on the Institute of Pacific Relations)* (Keio University Press, 2003).

⁴ Michio Yamaoka, ed., *Taiheiyo Mondai Chosakai to Sono Jidai (Institute of Pacific Relations and its Age)* (Shumpusha Publishing, 2010).

and the U.S., and each of “Korea” and Japan used to send central members separately is noteworthy. As IPR was originally a Christian organization, the central members were dispatched by each place of branch. This fact seems to have enabled such a situation that would not normally occur.

The following are years, places and themes of the conferences held in the 1920's: The first Hawaii round (immigration issue) in 1925, the second Hawaii round (extraterritorial right and unequal treaties of China) in 1927, and the third Kyoto round (Manchurian incident, approach to peace and security in the Pacific) in 1929. Although IPR was a NGO, its branch in Japan was, without mistake, consisting of prestigious government and business leaders. The chairman and its members included Eiichi Shibusawa (Chairman, entrepreneur), Junnosuke Inoue (President, Governor of the Bank of Japan), Yoshiro Sakatani (Director, Minister of Finance in the later stage of the Russo-Japanese War, son-in-law of Eiichi Shibusawa), Kenzo Takayanagi (Professor of the Tokyo Imperial University), Yasaka Takagi (Professor of the Tokyo Imperial University), Yusuke Tsurumi (member of the House of Representatives, son-in-law of Shinpei Goto), etc. Its president changed from Junnosuke Inoue to Inazo Nitobe in 1929.

Participants from Pacific states such as Japan, the U.K., the U.S., China, Canada, the Philippines, New Zealand and Korea, the League of Nations (2), the Soviet Union (2), Mexico (1), the Netherland (1), France (1), International Labour Office (3) attended the IPR Kyoto round held in 1929. France, North Borneo, Dutch East Indies, Mexico and the Soviet Union were candidates of new member state (or region) and the possibility of their accession was discussed. The official accession of the Soviet Union was held at the time of this discussion. We can understand from this that colonies could be a member and that France that does not face directly the Pacific Ocean area was considered as a possible member. I already talked about the Soviet Union when I introduced the discussion of Blakeslee.

At the opening of this IPR meeting, Inazo Nitobe gave an “opening address.” The main points of his address were: 1) the League of Nations is a “government-related entity,” while IPR is a “voluntary entity,” 2) the League of Nations “forces others to act,” while IPR “appeals to reason” and 3) the civilization was born in “the Mediterranean area,” but its center has shifted gradually to “the Pacific area,” and he celebrated the opening.

(3) Intention of the U.S. Side in the Third Kyoto Round

What Professor Blakeslee, one of the U.S. delegates, revealed in the Kyoto round can be

summarized as follows.⁵ The U.S. believes that the U.S., the U.K., France and Japan that have interests in the Pacific should conclude not only the four-power treaty which is nothing but a peace treaty on Pacific islands but also a security treaty including their home countries between the four countries. The Japanese know that the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was abolished by the four-power treaty in 1921 so that the U.S. side observed coldly that this is nothing but a treaty on Pacific islands. The way of thinking of the U.S. at the time of 1929 that security measures excluding the Soviet Union from the Pacific are nonsense is interesting.

U.S. chief delegate Green said in the “statement” as the U.S. “the U.S. delegates did not come to the conference carrying an approach of agreement we force the delegates of China, Japan and the Soviet Union to adopt. We accept that each of those three countries has the best interest in the prosperous development of economic resources in the three eastern provinces as a producer, seller, buyer or consumer excluding all political demands.” The idea that the stability of Manchuria cannot be achieved without taking the interests of China, Japan and the Soviet Union into consideration is similar to the tone of solutions in the report made later by the Lytton Commission.

The materials indicate that Professor Shotwell (James T. Shotwell, Professor of History, Columbia University) and Professor Wright (Quincy Wright, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago) had a similar idea in addition to above-mentioned Professor Blakeslee. They argued that the League of Nations did not include the U.S. and the Soviet Union that are the Pacific coastal states and that it is necessary to materialize the content of the non-belligerency pact concluded in 1928, while the four-power treaty concluded 1921 is enhanced.

As I mention in the “summary,” China and Russia have clearly started to adopt aggressive policies in the Pacific area from the perspective of naval and air forces. I believe that it is meaningful today to study the Pacific War that occurred seventy years ago broadly and deeply as a case of failure of security and preventive measures in the Pacific.

4. Past and Present of Trend of Studies

(1) History of U.S.-Japan relations

The aim of this forum was written in a request from Professor Tomoyuki Ishizu who coordinated this symposium as “we would like to examine the meaning of the Pacific War as total

⁵ Based on materials such as “Taiheiyō Mondai Chosakai Dai San-kai Taikai Shusseki Daihyō no Kaigi ni Kansuru Enzetsu narabini Kansō (Speech and Impressions of the Delegates on the Third Round of the Institute of Pacific Relations)” (The Information Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, September 1930) and Inazo Nitobe, ed., *Taiheiyō Mondai (Pacific Issue)* (Institute of Pacific Relations, 1930).

war and its position in the history of wars in the 20th century in the big picture.” The meaning of the Pacific War as total war will be deepened by specialists who give an address in the three sessions today so that I would like to focus on the position of the Pacific War in the history of wars in the 20th century, in my report.

First of all, I introduce past and present of the trend of studies on the Pacific War. The four volumes of *Nichibei Kankeishi (History of U.S.-Japan Relations)* co-edited by Chihiro Hosoya et al. have been referred to as a standard of this field for a long time and still maintain its position. They were published in 1971 and 1972, 30 years after the strike of Japanese forces on Pearl Harbor, or 40 years ago from now. The volumes make a comparative study of the process of deciding foreign policies of Japan and the U.S. from 1931 to 1941. They were the achievement of discussions by the governments, diplomatic leaders, armies, economic officials, congresses and political parties, economic world, private organizations, mass media, intellectuals and political players of the two states in an international conference held at Lake Kawaguchi at the foot of Mt. Fuji. There is an English version, published by Columbia University Press under the title *Pearl Harbor As History*, edited by Dorothy Borg and Okamoto Shunpei.

We can easily understand that there is the prolonged Vietnam War behind said achievement of comparative studies of Japan and the U.S. In those days, Professor Richard Leopold of Northwestern University described as follows. “Today, the Americans look back at the Pacific War and see it as ‘a past mistake and one of mistakes that brought about uncontrollable problems the U.S. is facing now.’” One of the reasons for causing the Pacific War was the Sino-Japanese War between Japan and China that started in 1937. This war used to be expressed as the prolonged Sino-Japanese War from the Japanese side, but it was this time when the idea to understand the war by assimilating the U.S. to then Japan was born probably for the first time in the U.S.

Professor Waldo Heinrichs of the University of San Diego criticized the report of Japan as follows in a place for joint discussion. This was because of frustration of the US side that Japan did not reveal what they wanted to know. Professor Heinrichs commented “according to papers submitted by the Japanese side, although there were organizations and political groups in Japan that intended to prevent the war, they were trying to say that unfortunately they were helpless and gradually became weak. However, what is more important is an attitude to strive to find out an internal logical system that exists in any organization by assuming that it has a meaning to a party concerned, although it may seem to be ridiculous to a third party.” He is trying to say that we must find out why an irrational logic of the Army was dominant in those days. This is a very persuasive comment.

(2) Study of 70th Year Study

Now we would like to focus on the trend of academic societies this year, the 70th year from the attack on Pearl Harbor. There are a number of reports made by researchers who have an attitude explained by Professor Heinrichs as “it is important to have an attitude to strive to find out an internal logical system that exists in any organization by assuming that it has a meaning to a party concerned, although it may seem to be ridiculous to a third party.” In a symposium entitled “World War II: From a Position after 70 Years” hosted by Professor Richard Smethurst of the University of Pittsburg on September 30 and October 1 this year, more than 20 specialists in Japanese study of said period come are expected to have discussions from the U.S., the U.K., Australia, Hong Kong and Japan. I am going to participate in this symposium, too, and I have no doubt that it would be an interesting conference based on “summaries” submitted by participants in advance.

Taking one example, the interest in issue and the angle of analysis of the report of an Australian professor, Charles Schenking, of the University of Hong Kong entitled *In the Shadow of Bombers* are as follows. “After the Great Kanto Earthquake in September 1923, the Japanese military, particularly the Army, had prepared for the damage of air attacks by carrying out large-scale air defense exercises. Nevertheless, Japan could shoot down only about 50 aircrafts out of 28,782 B29 bombers flying from Mariana and the success rate was only 0.17%. What was the reason for such a disastrous result?”

The setting of issue of Professor Schenking is interesting. The Great Kanto Earthquake on September 1, 1923 and subsequent catastrophic fires, a panic of the crowd associated with the earthquake, the massacre of Koreans by false rumors made Japanese military leaders regret deeply. Kazushige Ugaki, Director of Educational General Directorial Division, wrote in his diary on September 6, 1923 “I actually saw the disaster of fires after the earthquake and imagined a situation when air attacks of foreign aircrafts occur. That gives me goose bumps, although I am under the scorching sun.” Paul Claudel, French Ambassador who was in Tokyo then, send a diplomatic letter dated September 20 to his state, saying “what surprised the Japanese most by fires occurred on September 1 was that they found out what could happen to the capital in the case where it received air attacks.” It is widely known that the U.S. side prepared for a large-scale air attack on March 10, 1945 by analyzing a map of fire spreading of the Great East Japan Earthquake in detail, but why the military could not take advantage of the most ideal environment for them? It may be a very interesting subject of study.

Of course, the U.S. could produce aircrafts with 2000-horsepower engines, because the heavy and chemical industries including the automobile industry had advanced to the production level of

consumer durable goods. The study of Professor Schenking could be more interesting if his analysis included a psychological factor that bound Japanese policymakers that Japan intended to prevent the attack of the U.S. far outside the Japanese archipelago, that is, outside the absolute national defense zone in the Pacific and outside Manchuria and Korea in mainland China, in addition to the above-mentioned external factor.

(3) Achievements of Japan

I have repeatedly mentioned the word of Professor Heinrichs “it is important to have an attitude to strive to find out an internal logical system that exists in any organization by assuming that it has a meaning to a party concerned, although it may seem to be ridiculous to a third party” and explained a new angle of analysis produced by such an attitude with examples.

In that sense, there have also been excellent study outcomes in Japan. One example is a book entitled *Senji Keizai Taisei no Koso to Tenkai (Framework and Deployment of Wartime Economic System)* published by Professor Kenichi Arakawa of the National Defense Academy, this year. The Japanese military could only play a limited role in terms of the commitment to the war by regarding World War I as economic total war. However, the institutional design of wartime economic system was made by the Japanese Army that faced fierce total war. Professor Arakawa opened a new frontier for understanding war and economy based on questions such as “how was such institutional design as a thought? Was it irrational from the beginning? Was it designed rationally at the beginning? If so, when was it converted into an irrational system?”

Concerning the breakthrough of an “internal logical system” of the Japanese side then, an internal logic held by a group of persons called reformists of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was revealed progressively. *Gaimusho Kakushinha (Reformists of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2010)* by Professor Ryoichi Tobe who are present here today as a commentator, *Nichibei Kosho Kankei Chosho Shusei (Collection of History of Japan-U.S. Negotiations)* edited by Professor Motoei Sato of the Hosei University and *Kaisen Shinwa (Demystifying Pearl Harbor, 2008)* by Takeo Iguchi, a former ambassador to New Zealand are considered as such examples.

The reformists of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not think that a cooperative approach with the League of Nations and the Washington system led by Kijuro Shidehara was a way to be followed by Japan. The existence of reformists in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs where there are a number of pro-U.S. and pro-U.K. officials was thought to be exceptional by the official record of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself. Tadashi Kurihara, Director General of the East Asia Affairs Bureau in 1939, Kumaichi Yamamoto, Director General of the US Bureau in 1941 and Nobuo Fujimura, Director of the U.S. Bureau took a clear stance of anti-U.S. and anti-U.K. based on a

feeling that they wanted to free Asia that was colonized by western powers. It became clear by the efforts of the above-mentioned researchers that those reformists extended a network of contacts to the Treaty Bureau that handled issues related to the declaration of war and the Pacific Bureau that had a deep relation with the go-south forces of the Army and the Navy (persons who wished to advance into French Indochina). The notification of the declaration of war to the U.S. was delayed not by the mistake of the Japanese embassy but Shintaro Sato, Director of the Second Treaty Division, chose the policy of waging war without declaration.

We should not ignore those reformists of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as its dark side. Rather, it is necessary to look for the background of their thoughts and logic such as what led them to adopt their way of thinking. I would like to focus on the perspective on the Pacific of Hideoto Mouri who had originally been a director of the Ministry of Finance but become a researcher of the Planning Board of Japan from November 1941. He announced a research paper entitled “*Taiheiyo Kukan no Seikaku Kakumei (Revolution of Mentality in the Pacific Space)*” in *Chuokoron* of November 1940.

He describes “Japan in the 19th century experienced the waves of the industrial revolution, the western culture and the Meiji Restoration as a test of wave splash of the Pacific Ocean. Japan had been in the world economic structure of free trade that was at the peak of its prosperity in the Pacific space from World War I to the Manchurian Incident, but it started to change to an economic structure of continental space including the planned economy because of the emergence of Manchukuo in 1932.” Mouri, one of the most famous economic officials in those days, analyzed as follows: The Pacific that had brought about new knowledge and resources now became synonymous of the old order for Japan, and the world has arrived where continental states such as Japan, Manchuria, Germany, Italy and the Soviet Union become synonymous of the new order. We need to pay attention to the thought of Mouri, famous progressive bureaucrat that the continent, not the Pacific, has become what represents new value. There is no doubt that the Pacific War has a number of points in question still to be elucidated from different angles of analysis. Thank you for your attention.