

Alliances of Modern Japan from the Perspective of “Casus foederis”

SHOJI Junichiro

Abstract

This paper overviews the characteristics of the alliances of modern Japan, and analyzes these while placing a focus on the duty of support.

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance had the effect of deterring third countries from entering the war during the Russo-Japanese War. On the other hand, the United Kingdom never had the duty of support, so it did not provide direct military assistance, and Japan fought against Russia on its own.

At the time of the outbreak of World War I, Japan did not have a reason for the arising of the duty of support based on the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and in spite of the opposition from the allied country the United Kingdom, Japan proactively participated in the war based on its own national interests.

Looking at the duty of support under the Tripartite Pact between Japan, Germany, and Italy during World War II and the Greater East Asian War, even though there was a reason for the arising of the duty of support, it was never discharged in reality, and each of the countries participated in the wars at their own discretion, based on trends in international political situations and the perspective of their national interests.

As is clear from the abovementioned considerations, matters related to the duty of support to allied countries during outbreaks of wars, such as reasons for arising, methods of assistance, and regions of application, are subtle issues, and in particular, the use of military force based on the duty of support has rarely been implemented in reality, and the hurdles to doing so have been high. That said, as can be seen from instances such as Japan's participation in World War I, and Germany's entering a war against the United States when a war started between Japan and the United States, even in situations in which there is no duty of support based on an alliance, there are cases in which wars have been joined based on national interests.

It seems that based on such lessons from history, Japan will need to boost the

## 英文要旨 (Abstract)

quality of the United States-Japan Alliance in relation to the duty of support even during peacetime, while strengthening relations in politics, economics, diplomacy, and culture, and basing such on shared values.

Wartime Lessons Applied: The US Army Air Corps in the War Against Japan

SHINDO Hiroyuki

Abstract

Prior to World War II, research and preparations regarding a war with Japan was not a priority of the United States Army Air Corps. Its focus was rather on strategic bombing, and Japanese aviation was underestimated in terms of both personnel and equipment. Racial prejudice against the Japanese was one of the causes of the latter.

Due to the outbreak of war between Japan and the United States in December 1941, the US Army Air Corps began conducting operations against the Japanese army and navy air forces. Although initially the fight was an uphill battle, the Army Air Corps revised and improved its operational tactics and equipment, based on lessons learned from battles and trial and error, and gained superiority against Japan. The main examples of such adaptations were: avoidance of dog fighting, thorough adherence to formation fighting, conversion of medium bombers to “commerce destroyers,” and the introduction of skip-bombing against ships. Furthermore, by pursuing new missions (airlifting of troops and supplies), the Army Air Corps was also able to overcome theater-specific geographical difficulties. Thus, the war against Japan by the Army Air Corps was characterized by flexibility and innovation that were not constrained by preconceived ideas, and this resulted in success.

Finally, looking at the United States’ evaluation of the Japanese, the United States highly praised elements of the Japanese such as the morale and fighting spirit of individual crew members, while aerial tactics and the use of air power by the Japanese was disdained.

Joint Education for the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force: The Training of Aircraft Maintenance Personnel in the Early Days of the Self-Defense Force

KUDO Aya

Abstract

At the time of the establishment of the Japan Self-Defense Forces in 1954, a debate took place regarding whether to have “Aircraft” be centrally controlled by the newly established Japan Air Self-Defense Force or by the ground, maritime, and air self-defense forces. Although a confrontation arose between the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force, which especially insisted on directly controlling air units, and an internal subdivision of the National Safety Agency, which wanted to have aircraft be centrally controlled by the Air Self-Defense Force, ultimately, based on the “Chief’s Directive on the Assignment of Aircraft, etc.” that was issued by the chief of the Defense Agency, it was decided that the assignment of aircraft and aviation-related operations would be in principle centrally managed by the Air Self-Defense Force. As a result of this, it came about that aircraft maintenance personnel of the Maritime Self-Defense Force would be trained by the Air Self-Defense Force.

Although the joint education of maintenance personnel started in 1955, the Maritime Self-Defense Force started its own education in 1957. The reason why the joint education ended seem to include: differences in ways of thinking regarding how to maintain aircrafts between the Maritime Self-Defense Force and the Air Self-Defense Force, difference in types of equipment and aircraft, and differences in organizational formation that caused the above—namely differences between the two self-defense forces arising from whether the US Navy or the US Air Force had been used as a reference. The abovementioned differences caused problems regarding joint education, so such joint education by the Air Self-Defense Force was suspended.

Ordinarily in order to train maintenance personnel who maintain aircraft for

differing missions through joint education, it would be necessary for each of the self-defense forces to be prepared to make changes to their personnel systems and organizations. Nevertheless, shifting to joint education was undertaken with a careless approach, so efforts in this regard ended up being quickly suspended.