



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Master's Thesis of International Studies

**Analyzing Japan's Rearmament and
Role During the Korean War**

한국전쟁: 일본의 재군비 및 참여의 분석

February 2020

Graduate School of International Studies

Seoul National University

International Cooperation

Yeonjoo Cho

국제학석사학위논문

Analyzing Japan's Rearmament and Role During the Korean War

한국전쟁: 일본의 재군비 및 참여의 분석

2020년 2월

서울대학교 국제대학원
국제학과 국제협력전공

조연주

Abstract

During the Korean War (1950 – 1953), Japan underwent a unique experience. While the first major sequence of the Cold War was undergoing 700 miles away from Tokyo, Japan was in a position where its actions had extreme restrictions. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution and the American occupation of Japan prevented the country both from holding military forces and from directly partaking in the Korean War. By the end of the war, however, the United States and Japan had agreed on rearming the latter.

This thesis focuses on analyzing Japan's role during the Korean War, its effect on Japanese rearmament, and the United States' attitude toward this issue. It is relatively unknown that the Republic of Korea (hereafter South Korea) and Japan have first "cooperated" in the early 1950s during the Korean War. The main question here is how this cooperation contributed to Japan's rearmament.

Keywords: Rearmament, Korean War, Article 9, National Police Reserve, Maritime Safety Agency, SCAP

Student Number: 2016-26818

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Literature Review	8
III. Post-War Japan: 1945 – 1950	12
1. The United States, SCAP, and the Occupation of Japan.....	12
2. The Internal Cold War.....	18
IV. Japan and the Korean War: 1950 – 1953	23
1. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution.....	23
2. Japan’s Korean War.....	26
3. The National Police Reserve & the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency.....	36
4. The Unsuccessful Plan of the Pacific Regional Security Pact....	41
5. The United States and Japan’s Rearmament.....	54
V. Conclusion	70
Reference	73
Abstract in Korean	79

I. Introduction

The Joint Security Area (JSA), Military Demarcation Line, and the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) all serve as few of the last remnants of the Cold War even after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the demise of the Soviet Union more than two decades ago. The main, and one could argue the sole, factor for such visible residue is the Korean War (1950 – 1953). More a result of an ideological collision than a mere military clash between two states, the Korean War is one of the most crucial events in modern South Korean history. North Korea's southward invasion, the United Nations, and General Douglas MacArthur are but a few of the topics that are usually discussed pertaining the war.

What is not really discussed, on the other hand, is Japan's involvement and role during these three years. This omission is unsurprising considering how the two states share animosity towards each other that is stemmed from unresolved historical issues, especially those surrounding the Japanese occupation period from 1910 to 1945. The main reason, however, for such insouciance is attributed to how Japan's participation has been kept confidential in both South Korea and Japan. It was not until the 1980s that this classified information was gradually disclosed. Despite the fact that Japan's participation was revealed more than three decades ago, the general public in both South Korea and Japan still lack an unabridged understanding of how the two states partook in the same war.

Recently in July 2019, however, the South Korean Ministry of National Defense proclaimed that South Korea did not recognize Japan as a state that participated during the Korean War, rejecting any plans of Japan joining the United Nations Command (UNC) and sending its Self-Defense Forces (SDF) troops to the Korean Peninsula if the Korean War was to resume.

The other main reason why Japan's involvement in the Korean War has not been discussed as often is because it may stir controversy regarding Japan's pacifist nature. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution renounces Japan's right to war and Japan have abided by this law. This no war clause has been the center point of not only Japan's involvement in the Korean War, but also to the question of Japanese rearmament. As a result, it must be noted that Japan's covert operations were not those of offensive and bellicose ones. In other words, Japan mostly dealt with logistics support to the United States as well as removing mines across the coast of the Korean Peninsula. The main personnel involved were those of the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency (MSA)¹ and the National Police Reserve (NPR). The MSA (currently the Japan Coast Guard) was the Japanese coast guard established in April 1948, while the NPR was formed in August 1950 shortly after the breakout of the Korean War. The NPR is the precursor of the current Japan

¹ The original English title of the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency was officially changed to the Japan Coast Guard in April 2000.

Ground Self-Defense Forces and shared the defensive nature of the latter of being unable to engage in offensive warfare.

In order to thoroughly comprehend how Japan's involvement was made possible, analyzing Japan's situation prior to the Korean War is imperative. This paper will begin by first doing so of postwar Japan or the Occupation of Japan (1945 – 1952). Japan under the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) has been planned before Japan's surrender mainly under the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) after it was established in December 1944. The SWNCC and SCAP not only handled reconstructing postwar Japan but was also instrumental in designing the Constitution of Japan, including Article 9, during the Occupation Period. In addition, unlike postwar Germany where it was divided into four distinct occupation zones, postwar Japan was under a single occupation by the United States despite how the name SCAP is an acronym for the "Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers."

Documents and memorandums such as the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4) and the Basic Initial Post Surrender Directive to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan (JCS1380/15) demonstrate a situation of disarmament and demilitarization policies implemented by the United States and the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers on Japan, paralleling the German situation in Europe. The Truman

administration's willingness of establishing a pacifist Japan would ultimately influence in drafting a new Japanese Constitution, moving away from the Meiji Constitution.

The International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE or the Tokyo Trial) began the Occupation Period. Unlike the Nuremberg Trials, the Tokyo Trial had more lenient results as the United States was keen on keeping pro-American Japanese figures available due to the lurking and emerging threat of communism from the Soviet Union. As the Cold War was entering its commencing phase, the United States prioritized its foreign policy towards containing the spread of communism. This inclination was not only focused in Europe with the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), but also in East Asia as the United States wanted to have an ally in the region that could check Soviet and Chinese influence.

The postwar Japanese situation provided the perfect opportunity to do so when Japan changed into a democratic state. Japan not only offered one of the newest allies of the United States in the region, but it also offered itself as a base-state in which the United States could station its armed forces throughout the Japanese archipelago. From 1949 to 1951, the United States would engage in talks with Japan, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia (and, to a lesser degree, Indonesia) and propose a Far East version of NATO – The Pacific Regional

Security Pact. This proposed collective security system would stretch down from the Aleutian Islands near the Bering Sea to Japan and the Okinawan Islands to the Philippines and ultimately down south to Australia and New Zealand. However, due to the complexion of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, remaining animosity and anxiety from the Pacific War, and ultimately Japan's reluctance in officially rearming, the five states would fail to create such defense line.

Discord regarding Japan were not only seen with the Pacific Regional Security Pact, but also with peace treaties, especially at the domestic level. After the Pacific War came to an end, the Allies had to decide on how to design a peace treaty with Japan. At the same time, Japan was not able to do to anything else except voice its opinion pertaining to how it wanted to secure peace treaties.² There were, naturally, divided opinions among Japanese politicians on how to conduct peace treaties with the Allied states. The rightist politicians, or mainly the Yoshida cabinet, were keener on multiple peace treaties with the Allies, while excluding communist states such as the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.³ The leftist politicians, on the other hand, were aiming for an overall treaty that included the communist states.⁴

² Akagi Kanji, "The Korean War and Japan," *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 24, no. 1 (June 2011): 176.

³ Akagi Kanji, "The Korean War and Japan," 176-177.

⁴ Akagi Kanji, "The Korean War and Japan," 177.

However, the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 proved to be a definitive factor in which way the Allies, especially the United States, were going to approach their peace treaties with Japan. The Treaty of San Francisco, which included the presence of 48 states but not the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, was signed on September 8, 1951. This treaty then became effective on April 28, 1952, officially ending the American occupation period in Japan. In addition, further American military presence after the occupation was made possible with the Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan that was signed on the same day and location in San Francisco, California. Specifically, Article I of the treaty states the following:

“Japan grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right, upon the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace and of this Treaty, to dispose United States land, air and sea forces in and about Japan. Such forces may be utilized to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East and to the security of Japan against armed attack from without, including assistance given at the express request of the Japanese Government to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers.”⁵

⁵ “Security Treaty Between Japan and the United States,” The University of Tokyo, accessed February 3, 2019, <http://worldjpn.grips.ac.jp/documents/texts/docs/19510908.T2E.html>

The United States, with this security treaty, successfully gained a strategical advantage when it came to deploying troops to the Korean Peninsula during the Korean War. Along with fifteen other United Nations members, the United States, which was the largest contributor, sent soldiers to fight off the North Korean threat. Furthermore, the United States was able to gain Japanese support, mostly logistics, during this period – a part of the Korean War which has been largely neglected.

However, the most colossal result that the United States got through this security treaty was the base for Japanese rearmament. Discussions regarding this issue between the Americans and the Japanese developed more rapidly. Although the Maritime Safety Agency and the National Police Reserve were established prior to this treaty, they became the nucleus for the United States' plan of rearming Japan.

This paper will aim to underscore the primary factors leading up to the Japan's involvement during the Korean War and its rearmament. In other words, under what circumstances was Japan in that it decided to partake in a war merely five years after its surrender to the United States? What led to the failure of the proposed Pacific Regional Security Pact? And ultimately, how did Japan rearm?

II. Literature Review

It was not easy to find substantive and thoroughly analyzed academic works on Japan's role during the Korean War as it was kept secret from the public for around three decades after the Korean Armistice Agreement was signed in July 1953. From what I could find, many of the literatures mainly discussed the impact of the Korean War on the Japanese economy while others focused on how the war had an influence in Japan's rearmament. Some zeroed in on the issue of leftist movements within the Japanese archipelago (Choi, 2017). Interestingly, there were a couple of studies where the respective authors discussed about the other roles of the Japanese during the war.

In order for Japan to have assisted the United States during the war, it is important to understand the role of Japan itself especially during the early stages of the post-war period. Nam (2016) provides a detailed account on how Japan transitioned from a state with the most offensive firepower into a base-state. Japan, as a base-state, was able to offer the United States the necessary tools to station the latter's troop in close proximity to the Korean War.

As a base-state, Japan was able to provide the United States with sixteen airbases and airfields used for bombers, aircrafts, and supply transportation. Additionally, Lee (2002) also pointed that Japan provided hospitals for the United Nations

during the Korean War. Along with the fourteen hospitals in Japan, Japan also dispatched nurses to each of these hospitals to help the wounded.

Akagi Kanji (2011) successfully dealt with the chronological and reactive procedures that followed with the outbreak of the Korean War. He explained about the establishment of the National Police Reserve (NPR) and Japan's direct and indirect role during the war in the Korean Peninsula, specifically that of the Japan Coast Guard. However, as mentioned above, his reading was not solely focused on Japanese involvement in the war itself but more on the economic impact the Korean War had on Japan. In addition, since the National Police Reserve is the predecessor of the Japan Self-Defense Forces, there seemed for a need of a more comprehensive review and analysis of the NPR, which is thoroughly done by Kuzuhara Kazumi.

Kuzuhara Kazumi (2006) successfully dissects the establishment as well as the role of the National Police Reserve during the Korean War. While Article 9 of Japan's Constitution renounces Japan's right to war, it does not deny a right to defend itself, hence the leeway of the establishment of the National Police Reserve and ultimately the Japan Self-Defense Forces. There is a common misconception that Japan's non-offensive prowess is weak. However, the NPR actually was far more superior when it came to artillery firepower, the quantity of discharge bullets at maximum discharge speed per hour, and vehicular mobility

when compared to its predecessor, the Japanese Imperial Army. A much powerful NPR was later converted into the SDF, with an increase in firepower over the years.

While Japan's role as a base-state and a supplier of logistics to the United States have been numerously mentioned, there were two studies that dealt with the different roles of the Japanese soldiers during this period. Jung (2010) provides the account of Japanese and United States soldiers of how the latter utilized the former during the war as translators between the Korean nationals and the Americans. As South Korea was a Japanese colony from 1910 to 1945, the United States military assumed that the South Koreans still spoke Japanese, creating a new role of Japanese translators.

Along with this study of individuals, there are two more studies centered on individual accounts. Morris-Suzuki (1998) illustrates the role of the Japan Coast Guard and its minesweeping activities during the Korean War. While Kanji (2011) gave a brief and overall description about the Japanese minesweepers, Morris-Suzuki offered individual accounts of those who served as minesweepers off the coast of Wonsan.

In addition, Morris-Suzuki (2012) gives an additional account of a more belligerent role. In her study, she found out that a small number of Japanese

soldiers were controversially sent to Korean Peninsula under United States chain of command to fight the North Koreans (and later on the Chinese) in strict confidentiality. There have been more than several instances where these Japanese, the majority of them being former Imperial Japanese Navy members, were given South Korean military attire as well as carbines with live ammunition. Since this section of Japan's participation in the Korean War is controversial and kept in strict confidentiality, there are only a handful of studies available.

However, as most of these readings were secondhand accounts, I relied on the *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS) as one of my primary sources for this paper. The historical documents provided by the United States Department of State give a thorough and vivid firsthand account on the perspective of the United States during this period. They illustrate a situation in which the United States had its priority with drafting a peace treaty with Japan (later the Treaty of San Francisco signed in 1951). The documents also give us subtle details on how the United States was keen on Japanese rearmament, the topic that this paper will mainly focus on.

III. Post-War Japan: 1945-1950

1. The United States, SCAP, and the Occupation of Japan

While Europe was enduring the blitzkrieg by Hitler and the Third Reich, East Asia would soon engage in its own battlefront. The Empire of Japan (1868 – 1947) challenged the United States with the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 1941. With exceptional machinery and warfare, specifically the Mitsubishi A6M (or more commonly known as the Zero), the Japanese forces were initially successful in the early stages of the Pacific War. However, a series of unsuccessful campaigns on the four main theaters and the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ultimately led to Emperor Hirohito's unconditional surrender on August 15, 1945.

From 12:00 PM to 12:04 PM, the Jewel Voice Broadcast played a prerecorded speech by Emperor Hirohito announcing Japan's surrender. His speech started with the following:

“To our good and loyal subjects: After pondering deeply the general trends of the world and the actual condition obtaining in our empire today, we have decided to effect a settlement of the present situation by resorting to an extraordinary measure.

We have ordered our Government to communicate to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union that our empire accepts the provisions of their joint declaration.”⁶

He proceeded on talking about the reasons behind Japan’s surrender and offers words of comfort to the Japanese people who suffered individual losses as well as to Japan. However, the point that must be highlighted here is the word “declaration.” The declaration Hirohito mentioned in this speech is the Potsdam Declaration, a proclamation by the United States, the United Kingdom, and China for Japan’s surrender on July 26, 1945. The end of the Pacific War meant that Japan would fall under the General Headquarters (GHQ) and the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) jurisdiction. Point 7 of the Potsdam Declaration specifically expounds this occupational trait.

“Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan’s war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.”⁷

⁶ “Hirohito Speech,” World War II, accessed April 29, 2019, <https://www.worldwar2.org/p/jewel-voice-broadcast-was-radio.html>

⁷ “Potsdam Declaration,” National Diet Library, accessed April 30, 2019, <https://www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/etc/c06.html>

This period, from Japan's surrender in 1945 until the signing of the San Francisco Peace Treaty in 1952, is known as the Allied Occupation of Japan. Japan's post-war period faced consequences as the United Nations War Crimes Commission (UNWCC) moved to make the Japanese war criminals responsible. The Allied forces, as in the case of Germany and the Nuremberg Trials, intended to try the Japanese head figures for their war crimes after the war was over. This plan can also be seen in the Potsdam Declaration as the United States, the United Kingdom, and China declared the following.

“We do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners. The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.”⁸

The three Allies' determination to put those responsible for war crimes on trial was consistent and firm as this part of the declaration was a reiteration of one of

⁸ “Potsdam Declaration,” National Diet Library, accessed April 30, 2019, <https://www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/etc/c06.html>

the main cores of the Cairo Declaration issued on November 26, 1943. The second paragraph of the communiqué specifically states that “the three great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan.”⁹ Building from the points made in Cairo and Potsdam Declaration, the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE or the Tokyo Trial) were in the making by GHQ led by General Douglas MacArthur. MacArthur established the Tokyo Tribunal on January 19, 1946 and appointed Sir William Webb of Australia as the President of the trials.¹⁰ Unlike Germany, where the Nazi Party had complete control, Japan never had a single dominant political party, making the Tokyo Trial convoluted.¹¹

Nevertheless, those who were guilty had to be judged. Having took over more than two years, the trials found all 25 defendants guilty (originally there were 28 defendants but two died during the trials and one was sent to a psychiatric ward and his case was dropped).¹² Of the 25, seven defendants were sentenced to death while sixteen were sentenced to life imprisonment, and the remaining two were sentenced to twenty and seven years each.¹³

⁹ “The Cairo Declaration,” Wilson Center Digital Archive, accessed April 30, 2019, <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/122101>

¹⁰ Fujita Hisakazu, “The Tokyo Trial: Humanity’s Justice V Victors’ Justice,” in *International Humanitarian Law Series* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011), 7.

¹¹ George L. Hicks, *Japan’s War Memories* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), 11.

¹² Hisakazu, “The Tokyo Trial: Humanity’s Justice V Victors’ Justice,” 8.

¹³ Hisakazu, “The Tokyo Trial: Humanity’s Justice V Victors’ Justice,” 8.

The Tokyo Trial was one of the first and major operations during the Occupation Period. However, the United States had been slowly preparing on Japanese occupation before 1945. Acting Secretary of State Edward Stettinius introduced a proposal of a joint committee that would represent the State, War, and Navy departments to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and James Forrestal in November 1944 – the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC). The SWNCC was established the following month and would go on to handle documents regarding postwar Japan including the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4) that provided the fundamental layouts for SCAP regarding postwar Japan.

As the SWNCC was preparing policies for Japan after the war (presuming that Japan would eventually surrender to the United States and its allies), General Douglas MacArthur was appointed as the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in August 1945 by President Truman. Postwar Germany had German territories were divided into four military occupation zones by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union. Despite the title “SCAP,” the “Allied Powers” in this situation in regard to postwar Japan would, unlike the German situation, solely mean the United States with a single zone of military occupation by the American government.

MacArthur, SCAP, and the Truman administration's primary objective was to disarm and demilitarize Japan. Documents regarding postwar Japan – namely the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4), the Basic Initial Post Surrender Directive to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan (JCS1380/15), and the Decision of the Far Eastern Commission Concerning Basic Post-War Policy in Japan – have a tendency of focusing on and emphasizing the issue of disarmament and demilitarization of Japan. This tendency would later determine the design of the Japanese Constitution and the inclusion of the no war clause in Article 9.

However, SCAP's attitude towards Japan's military, or the lack thereof, would alter swiftly when communism was knocking on the doors of the southern half of the Korean Peninsula. While historians and scholars differ in their opinions when it comes to Japanese rearmament, SCAP, the United States, and Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida all viewed that Japan had yet revitalized its military during the Korean War. Under MacArthur, Japan promptly established the 75,000-person National Police Reserve and underwent an 8,000-person expansion of the already existing Japanese Maritime Safety Agency. Neither were considered rearmament by the United States and Japan at that time, although there is a growing voice that Japan had rearmed when it established the NPR.

SCAP would push for further rearmament processes in the final years of the American occupation when it pursued an expansion of the NPR by 100,000 men and, most importantly, tried to include Japan into the proposed Pacific Regional Security Pact. However, Japan and Prime Minister Yoshida were adamant in their belief that Japan was not yet ready to hold military forces and, thus, rejected both the expansion of the NPR and, ultimately, the Pacific Regional Security Pact in 1951, two years after the collective security system was first proposed. However, it must be noted that Yoshida actually supported Japanese rearmament but was simply against a rapidly executed one.

The United States, along with 48 other states, signed the San Francisco Peace Treaty on September 8, 1951, which came into effect in April 28, 1952. This date marked the end of the Occupation Period by the United States in Japan.

2. The Internal Cold War

When discussing the Korean War, Japan's domestic situation is usually overlooked. This phenomenon is only natural (but obviously unfitting) as the main parties involved were the two Koreas, the United States, China, and the Soviet Union. While the Korean Peninsula was experiencing bloodshed, Japan's internal Cold War had begun three decades ago during the 1920s.

Like numerous countries during the early 20th century, Japan also had communist activists within the country. Of course, the degree of the communist power in Japan was nothing compared to that in the Korean where ultimately the country (with additional exterior influences) was divided into two based on different political ideologies. Nevertheless, communism in Japan played a pivotal role domestically during the Korean War. The Japanese Communist Party (Nihon Kyōsan-tō) or the JPC cannot be seen as the sole factor for Japan's rearmament, but it certainly played a pivotal role in accelerating it, specifically with the establishment of the 75,000-person National Police Reserve.

The Japanese Communist Party can trace its roots back to July 15, 1922 when it was founded by socialist intellectuals and members such as Yamakawa Hitoshi, Sakai Toshihiko, and Katayama Sen. Established with huge ambitions, the JCP would be recognized as the Japanese representative of the Communist International (or Comintern) later that year in November at the Fourth World Congress of the Communist International. However, suppression of the JPC by the Empire of Japan would soon follow.

In May 12, 1925, the Imperial Japanese government passed a legislation called the Peace Preservation Law of 1925. The law began with the following:

“Anyone who forms, or knowingly participates in, groups whose goal is to deny the system of private property or to change our national essence shall be sentenced to prison or penal servitude of up to ten years. Anyone who attempts to commit this crime also will be punished.”¹⁴

The law that prohibited political dissent was targeting mainly one group, a group that was against imperialism and would eventually be against the upcoming Pacific War: the Japanese Communist Party. By mentioning concepts such as “the system of private property” and “our national essence” (*kokutai*), the Peace Preservation Law was specifically aimed at making the JCP irrelevant and powerless. Persecution and oppression of the Japanese communists continued well into the 1930s when the Japanese government made any activities by the JCP illicit in 1936. It took twenty years for the JCP to become an official political party in Japan since SCAP began to occupy Japan in 1945.¹⁵

SCAP ordered the Japanese government that it removed legislations that prohibited certain political activities, notably the Peace Preservation Law, which basically denied the Japanese Communist Party’s power, and released its political

¹⁴ “Peace preservation law of 1925,” Japan Society, accessed March 3, 2019, http://aboutjapan.japansociety.org/content.cfm/peace_preservation_law_of_1925#sthash.zTGWzsxh.dpbs

¹⁵ John M. Maki, “Japan’s Subversive Activities Prevention Law,” *Political Research Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (September 1953): 490.

prisoners in October 1945.¹⁶ While the JCP's status as a political party have altered throughout thirty years, its foundation has been consistent.

Just as it was opposed to Japan's imperialistic nature in the first half of the 20th century, as well as to the Pacific War against the Allied forces, the JCP was also against the changes that Japan was undergoing with the outbreak of the Korean War. It viewed that the United States and the Yoshida administration was tampering with Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution by altering Japan's peaceful nature. Furthermore, the party was also averse to the "international imperialist forces" of the American occupation as it viewed that the United States was pulling Japan into what could be escalated into a third world war.

Although not as big of an influence and potential threat to the United States and the Yoshida administration as the JCP, the Zainichi Koreans were also a presence in Japan, especially during the Korean War. In Japan, Zainichi Koreans are divided largely into three groups – those who selected South Korean nationality, those who selected North Korean nationality, and those who did not choose. The Korean expatriates who chose ties with North Korea were naturally viewed as communist threats (if not worse than the JCP).

¹⁶ John M. Maki, "Japan's Subversive Activities Prevention Law," *Political Research Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (September 1953): 490.

While GHQ could deal with the JCP and its affiliated personnel through the purge, Prime Minister Yoshida had a different solution regarding the Zainichi Korean population. Yoshida first requested GHQ, or more specifically General MacArthur, in August 1949 that the Korean expatriates be deported.¹⁷ MacArthur, however, was against such forced repatriation. In April 1951, Yoshida reiterated his stance and request concerning these Koreans to John Foster Dulles.¹⁸ Specifically, Yoshida not only wanted to exclude the Zainichi Koreans (regardless of their affiliation with either South or North Korea) from gaining property gains discussed in the imminent peace treaty, but he also requested again that the Japanese government would like to send them back to the Korean peninsula.¹⁹ Yoshida was not shy in expressing about how he viewed the Korean nationals in Japan as potential communist threats.

Indeed, the Japanese Communist Party were nothing close of a majority power nor did it have the potential. The Zainichi Koreans associated with North Korea were also not a formidable adversary to the Yoshida administration. Nevertheless,

¹⁷ Philip Brasor, "Japan's resident Koreans endure a climate of hate," *The Japan Times*, May 7, 2016, (<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2016/05/07/national/media-national/japans-resident-koreans-endure-climate-hate/#.XhsR5RczbOQ>). (accessed December 11, 2019).

¹⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter *FRUS*), 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 561.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 561.

the United States and Japan were fixated on containing the spread of communism and it could not take the slightest risk of letting a communist “threat” on the loose.

IV. Japan and the Korean War: 1950 - 1953

1. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution

Japan has been a perennial military powerhouse after establishing its Self-Defense Forces (SDF) and increasing its military expenditures, consistently holding a top ten place among military strength. Despite how the SDF may be seen as a military force, it does not have any offensive functions but rather only defensive ones. One of SDF’s predecessor, the NPR, was also designed not as an “armed forces,” but rather in terms of dealing with domestic security. However, there have been conflicting opinions over whether the NPR was a military organization or not. This debate over the NPR’s militaristic nature stems from a single factor – Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution.

Enacted in 1947 during the Occupation period of Japan, Article 9 states the following:

“Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the

nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.”²⁰

Article 9 is a “no war” clause that denies Japan the right to war and the right to maintain any armed forces, namely the army, navy, and air force. With GHQ supervision, Japan enacted its constitution in 1947, electing to become a pacifist state. Two documents related to Japan’s post-surrender situation – the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4) and the Basic Initial Post Surrender Directive to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan (JCS1380/15) – depict the United States’ intention of not only disbanding the Japanese military forces, but also maintaining this condition.

The United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4), which was a memorandum for the Secretary of State James F. Byrnes sent on September 6, 1945, stated that “disarmament and demilitarization are the primary tasks of

²⁰ “The Constitution of Japan,” Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet, accessed February 3, 2019, https://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html

the military occupation and shall be carried out promptly and with determination...Japan's ground, air and naval forces shall be disarmed and disbanded and the Japanese Imperial General Headquarters, the General Staff and all secret police organizations shall be dissolved.”²¹ This part of the document, which is under the Disarmament and Demilitarization section, portrays that the United States government had a concrete idea regarding the future of Japan's militaristic nature. The Basic Initial Post Surrender Directive to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan (JCS1380/15), which was sent on November 3, 1945, re-emphasized SCAP's role in demilitarizing post-war Japan. It reiterated that one of SCAP's primary objective was to abolish militarism and ultra-nationalism in all forms while disarming and demilitarizing Japan.

Before the Korean War occurred, the Japanese government was not focused on either amending or reinterpreting Article 9 mainly because it saw no real foreign threat that would require military actions. However, when North Korea sent its troops down south, there were talks about reinterpreting Article 9 as both Japan and the United States were wary of a communist threat especially in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China that could very well directly affect Japan. Furthermore, the United States was seriously contemplating in amending

²¹ “United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan” (September 6, 1945)

the Japanese Constitution from late 1950 to 1951 when it was trying to include Japan as a member state of the proposed Pacific Ocean Defense Council.

Article 9 has been undoubtedly the center point regarding Japan's rearmament and, to a further degree, Japan's involvement in the Korean War.

2. Japan's Korean War

Immediately, Japan was occupied by the United States with General Douglas MacArthur as the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. Under the Allied occupation, the Constitution of Japan was enacted in 1947 and with it, the era of post-war Japan was commenced. One pivotal section of the newly legislated constitution is Article 9 (a somewhat Japanese domestic form of the Kellogg-Briand Pact). As mentioned earlier in the previous section, Article 9 states the following:

Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.²²

In other words, it cemented Japan's status as a pacifist country by renouncing war and its rights to military forces, denying any measures that included militaristic elements. Under Article 9, Japan was technically not to partake in any wars. However, the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, a mere three years after the Japanese Constitution was enacted, would accelerate Japan's rearmament process and alter the outlook of its security.

The United States was in need of Japan's assistance during this conflict in the Korean Peninsula. As a base-state to the United States, Japan offered the necessary bases of the United States military within its territory as well. Moreover, as Article 9 laid the foundations for a pacifist government in Japan, which translated into how Japan could not be directly involved during the war, it managed to find other measures to partake in Korea.

The United States, with all its military prowess and with the other United Nations members, still needed to come up with a quick response as the South Korean

²² "The Constitution of Japan," Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet, accessed February 3, 2019, https://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html

capital of Seoul was taken within a matter of days after the war broke out. Moreover, while China (and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union) was in close proximity to its North Korean ally, the United States did not enjoy the same geographical advantage. Its closest state (Hawaii) to South Korea was more than 4,500 miles. Fortunately for the United States, it had a new (but not yet official) ally less than 600 miles from South Korea in Japan.

United States President Harry S. Truman and his high-ranking officials were discussing countermeasures to the situation on the Korean Peninsula as well as the possible roles of Japan. One clear role was the utilization of the Japanese Archipelago, including the Okinawa Islands, as a base for the US military forces as Japan was under the Allied occupation. Okinawa has been used especially used by the United States Air Force and currently retains the largest U.S. Air Force base in the Asia-Pacific region even today. Operating as a U.S. military stronghold during the Korean War and the Cold War (and until the present), Japan and its geographic location have been primary factors to how the United States had little to no doubts that it could contain the spread of communism in the Far East.

Indeed, the Occupation period of Japan ended in 1952 with the signing of the San Francisco Treaty, but South Korea and North Korea did not come to an armistice until July 1953. In other words, it meant that the war was still in place when the

peace treaty between Japan and the Allied Powers. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan in 1951, specifically Article I, enabled the United States to continue to have its military bases on Japanese territory. Article I states the following.

“Japan grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right, upon the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace and of this Treaty, to dispose United States land, air and sea forces in and about Japan. Such forces may be utilized to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East and to the security of Japan against armed attack from without, including assistance given at the express request of the Japanese Government to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers.”²³

The United States now had a clear path of receiving Japan’s assistance as a base-state throughout the whole course of the Korean War. Naturally, Japan’s major role came through logistic supports to the United States as well offering its territory as United States military bases.

²³ “Security Treaty Between Japan and the United States,” The University of Tokyo, accessed February 3, 2019, <http://worldjpn.grips.ac.jp/documents/texts/docs/19510908.T2E.html>

As soon as the war broke out, South Korean President Syngman Rhee understood that his army could not withstand the North Korean offensives. He immediately requested the United States for supplies, especially weapons and ammunitions. Upon receiving Rhee's request, Truman ordered MacArthur to send all of the American military supplies in Japan, with the exception of the emergency supplies, over to South Korea. GHQ appointed the Shipping Control Administration Japan (SCAJAP) to provide logistic support to the United States Navy. Major shipping ports that sent supplies to South Korea included Osaka, Kobe, and Yokohama.

Furthermore, the United States had sixteen air bases in Japan (mainly in Hokkaido, Honshū, and Kyushu) during the Korean War.

Table 1. Key United States Air Bases in Japan during the Korean War

Region	Base	Region	Base
Hokkaido	Chitose	Chūgoku	Miho
Tōhoku	Misawa	Chūgoku	Iwakuni
Tōhoku	Matsushima	Chūgoku	Hōfu
Kantō	Iruma	Kyushu	Gannosu
Kantō	Yokota	Kyushu	Ashiya
Kantō	Tachikawa	Kyushu	Itazuke
Chūba	Komaki	Kyushu	Tsuiki
Kansai	Itami	Kyushu	Okinawa

Source: 이종환, *한국전쟁시 일본의 후방지원*, (군사, 2002), 263.

Table 1 shows the sixteen United States bases in Japan that are equally dispersed throughout the Japanese Archipelago, from Hokkaido up north to Okinawa down south. The Kadena Air Base in Okinawa was (and still is) the largest air base utilized by the United States Air Force, sending out B29s to the Korean Peninsula. Apart from Okinawa, the Tachikawa Air Field, located west of Tokyo and formerly used during the Pacific War by the Imperial Japanese Army, was the largest and busiest airfield. B29s also departed from this air fields along with other bombers and large military transport aircrafts.

The Ashiya Air Field, as its name suggests, is based in Ashiya, Fukuoka. Like how Killeen, Texas is associated with Fort Hood and Dongducheon, South Korea

is associated with Camp Casey and Camp Hovey of the United States 2nd Infantry Division, Ashiya served as a military town during the Korean War. The city's main role was transporting weapons, ammunitions, and soldiers because it was closest to South Korean territory out of the sixteen United States bases in Japan. From 1950 to 1953, it is estimated that around 3 million soldiers, 300,000 wounded, and 70,000 tons of supplies were transported through Ashiya, Fukuoka.

In addition to Japan's role as a base-state or a supply base to the United States during the Korean War, Japan also contributed to the United Nations' cause to help South Korea mainly through its Maritime Safety Agency. In other words, Japan with the use of both the Japanese soil and Japanese personnel, despite not being a United Nations member yet, assisted the United States and the other United Nations members in a war against North Korea.

As soon as the Korean War broke out, General Douglas MacArthur, as SCAP, wrote a letter to Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru requesting the establishment of the 75,000-person National Police Reserve and an 8,000-person expansion of the already existing Japanese Maritime Safety Agency. This letter is significant because it represents the beginning phases of Japan's rearmament while also hinting to how Japan was involved in the Korean War.

First of all, the Maritime Safety Agency was actually established prior to the Korean War in May 1948. During the final phases of the Pacific War, the United States installed around 10,000 underwater mines as a barricade that surrounded the Japanese coast. From this period and even after Japan accepted the Potsdam Declaration, minesweeping personnel (both military and civilian) were assigned to continue to execute Japan's minesweeping operations. The plethora of Japanese minesweepers, or at least compared to those of the United States, would turn out to work towards MacArthur's favor.

Similar to the United States' strategy against Japan during the Pacific War, North Korea also exhibited the use of underwater mines during the Korean War. The Korean People's Army blitzed throughout South Korea, with only Busan and its surroundings left to complete its goal of reunification. Anticipating a counterattack by South Korea and its allies centered on ports, the North Korean military forces defended them through planting underwater mines on the shores of ports such as Wonsan and Incheon (both ports were major strategic ports, while latter port would ultimately serve as the battleground for Operation Chromite).

The aforementioned situation with Japan's continued removal of the mines along the Japanese coast proved to be crucial to the United States right before the Battle of Incheon. During this stage, MacArthur had merely ten to twelve minesweepers in his command that could operate in the Korean War. Japan, however, had more

to offer. It must be noted that Japan was technically unable to participate in warfare as it was not a United Nations member that could directly partake in the Korean War, not to mention how Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution forbade Japan to rearm.

However, United States Navy Rear Admiral Arleigh Burke, who was also the Deputy Chief of Staff to Commander Naval Forces, Far East, understood that the Japanese still had approximately hundred minesweepers that were still active. Burke made an argument that because the Japanese minesweepers were neither unarmed nor would it directly engage in warfare with the North Koreans, they did not violate Article 9. Burke discussed this matter with his deputy Kyozo Tamura, a former captain in the Imperial Japanese Navy, and Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru and eventually agreed to receive twenty Japanese minesweepers (with MacArthur's approval as well).

After the Battle of Inchon proved to be successful, which occurred in September 1950 in the western part of Korea, MacArthur now looked towards the east in the port of Wonsan. By capturing both ports in the each of the eastern and western parts of the Korean Peninsula, MacArthur could move his troops from both sides and advance to the North Korean capital of Pyongyang. In October, the United States troops of the X Corps were planning to proceed to Wonsan, currently a port city in North Korea. However, North Korea, with its abundant and exceptional

supplies from China and the Soviet Union had built a fortress of underwater mines along the Wonsan shore. This situation was why the X Corps were moving with the ten of the twenty Japanese minesweepers that Yoshida promised Burke.

Insufficient records and data illustrate an extremely limited account of the actual accomplishments of the Japanese minesweepers. The sensitive issues of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, Japan's status of not being a United Nations member, as well as South Korea and Japan's recent relationship of colonialization prevented history to have thorough records of what the Japanese accomplished at Wonsan. What is certain, on the other hand, is out of the twenty minesweepers Yoshida promised to Burke, ten operated (such as the MS06 and the MS14) on the shores of Wonsan and the other ten were employed in other ports and harbors.

Like all wars, casualty is inevitable. Unlike how the RMS Lusitania's sinking off the coast of Ireland ultimately triggered the United States to get directly involved in World War I, the sinking of one Japanese minesweeper off the coast of Wonsan had the opposite effect. On October 17, Japan experienced one of its first casualties during the Korean War with the sinking of one of the Japanese minesweepers, the MS14, after making contact with a mine. The explosion of the vessel resulted in eighteen wounded and one missing. After the MS14 incident, many of the Japanese minesweeping crews expressed great resentment of their roles as what could basically be seen as military personnel and decided to withdraw

their missions. Severe criticism by the Americans led to the Maritime Safety Agency chief Ōkubo Takeo apologizing to the United States military, but it did not alter the fact that the Japanese minesweepers were pulling out. The minesweeping activities at Incheon, Chinnampo (currently Nampo), and Gunsan ended on December 15, 1950, while the last minesweeper remained in Korean waters until June 30, 1952.

Japan pulled out of the Korean by 1952, but the communist threat that Prime Minister Yoshida and the United States feared was still present. The United States believed that China and the Soviet Union were looking for legitimate reasons, such as a Japanese rearmament, to directly involve Japan into the Korean War and a potential World War III. As a response, the United States responded with accelerating talks of the proposal of the Pacific Region Security Pact and the expansion of the NPR.

3. The National Police Reserve & the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency

For some time, Japan's military forces were represented by the Japanese Imperial Army and Navy until they were officially dissolved after Japan's surrender in 1945. Their disbandment, along with the impossibility of future military branches, were cemented through Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution in 1947 when the second paragraph stated "in order to accomplish the aim of the preceding

paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained.”²⁴ Surprisingly, signs of Japanese rearmament began to emerge by 1948.

Not acting as a true military institution, the Japan Coast Guard was established on May 1, 1948 as a civilian law enforcement organization. The National Police Reserve’s establishment, on the other hand, was primarily triggered and hastened by the outbreak of the Korean War two years later. This establishment is not to be confused with the pre-existing Japanese police force that was divided into the national rural police and the municipal police. Nevertheless, it was evident that the United States was investing in Japan and possibly mulling over the idea of a Japanese rearmament even before the outbreak of the Korean War. In December 1949, all 30,000 of the national rural police were armed with U.S. revolvers while 40,000 of the 95,000 municipal police were done the same.²⁵

By 1950, Japan had a national police force and a coast guard, but SCAP wanted more. Two weeks after Kim Il Sung ordered the Korean People’s Army to cross the 38th parallel, General Douglas MacArthur sent a letter to Prime Minister

²⁴ “The Constitution of Japan,” Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet, accessed April 7, 2019,

http://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html

²⁵ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1950, East Asia and the Pacific, Volume VI, eds Neal H. Petersen, William S. Sampson, John P. Glennon, and David W. Mabon (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), doc. 694.

Shigeru Yoshida. In this letter, MacArthur requested the formation of the National Police Reserve and an 8000-person expansion of the Japan Coast Guard. However, Yoshida was concerned with the Japanese Constitution that denied Japan of any military force, the public sentiment towards rearmament, and Japan's economic situation. One of the Yoshida administration's main priority was to reconstruct Japan's economy (thus, the Yoshida Doctrine), and Yoshida was cautious with the rearmament issue as it could easily hinder and obstruct the economy.

Notwithstanding this situation, the war on the Korean Peninsula proved to be too big of a variable. While Japan did not officially go through a rearmament process, it did establish the National Police Reserve on August 10, 1950, almost a month after MacArthur's letter. This paper uses the word "officially" because both the United States and Japan during this period did not view the National Police Reserve as a military branch. This perspective meant that both states did not also see that Japan had rearmed itself.

With the establishment of the NPR and the expansion of the Maritime Safety Agency, Japan seemed to be going on a path towards rearmament. However, unlike the MSA which was involved in the Korean War with minesweeping activities, the NPR was initially and primarily established as a means to deal with the Cold War within Japan. The Yoshida administration, and also the United

States, were aware of a growing communist power led by the Japanese Communist Party. As a responsive measure, Yoshida was not hesitant in establishing the NPR as a force that could detain the communists in Japan if it got to a point where forces were required. There are differing views towards the functions and nature of the NPR whether it was a militaristic one. Some scholars view the NPR as the start of Japanese rearmament, while others see the establishment of the SDF in 1954 as the beginning. Despite the NPR's conflicted militaristic trait, Yoshida viewed it initially as a means to contain the spread of communism within Japan.

Table 2. Newspaper's opinion survey on Japan's rearmament, 1950-51

Newspapers	Date	Approve (%)	Disapprove (%)
Asahi Shimbun	November 15, 1950	53.8%	27.6%
Mainichi Shimbun	January 3, 1951	65.8%	16.5%
Mainichi Shimbun	March 3, 1951	63.0%	19.5%
Mainichi Shimbun	March 15, 1951	70.0%	20.0%
Yomiuri Shimbun	December 22, 1950	43.8%	38.7%
Yomiuri Shimbun	March 26, 1951	47.3%	29.1%
Tokyo Shimbun	February 21, 1951	71.3%	16.2%

Source: Hajimu, Masuda, *Fear of World War III: Social Politics of Japan's Rearmament and Peace Movements, 1950-3*, (Journal of Contemporary History, 2012), 566.

Table 2 illustrates the change of the public view on rearmament from November 1950 to March 1951. It must be noted that all four newspapers do not share the same political spectrum. Asahi Shimbun, Mainichi Shimbun, and Tokyo Shimbun are biased towards center-left while Yomiuri Shimbun is conservative and leans toward the center-right. As the Yomiuri Shimbun depicts, surprisingly, the conservative side reported that the idea of rearmament was not so strongly supported. Yoshida also firmly believed that the Japanese public opinion towards Japan regaining a military force was a negative one, which was one of the main reasons why he remained extremely cautious because he did not want the Japanese public to know that talks of rearmament was going on with the United States.

By 1951, the United States suggested that the National Police Reserve should be expanded, while MacArthur, as SCAP, requested a more heavily equipped NPR with American equipment such as medium tanks and 15 mm. Howitzers. While the latter was denied by the United States government, the former was actually rejected by the Prime Minister Yoshida.

However, from 1952 to 1953, the NPR was expanded to 110,000 men and officially changed its name to the National Security Forces. Similar to the NPR, the Maritime Safety Agency was also strengthened during the same period when it received direct loans of 18 patrol frigates (PF's) and 50 Landing Ship Support,

Larges (LFFF's) from the United States in mid-1952.²⁶ The newly equipped MSA established a new branch called the Coastal Safety Force (CSF) that would utilize the equipment provided by the United States. The NSF and the CSF would later become the foundations for Japan's Ground Self-Defense Force and Maritime Self-Defense Force respectively in 1954.

4. The Unsuccessful Plan of the Pacific Regional Security Pact

Japan's participation in the Korean War mainly came through logistics support to the United States, minesweeping divisions by the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency, and individual (yet potentially controversial) individual efforts. During the Korean War, or more specifically before 1956 when Japan was accepted as a member to the United Nations, Japan was yet included in any major collective security group. This part of history, however, might have been different as Japan was in talks for roughly two years about joining one: The Pacific Regional Security Pact. This international organization would have meant that an offensive attack on any of the member states would give the other members the right to join in a collective response to the aggressor. The United States, in this case especially, regarded the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union as the potential aggressors.

²⁶ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 589.

When the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established on April 4, 1949, some Asian and Pacific states envisioned a system of collective security of the same caliber. From 1949 to 1951, the United States, the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, and potentially Indonesia (the latter five states with key island possessions in the Pacific Ocean) were discussing about a joint collective security pact that would enhance the stability, or the lack thereof, in the region during this period. This defense line would stretch down from the Aleutian Islands near the Bering Sea to Japan and the Okinawan Islands to the Philippines and ultimately down south to Australia and New Zealand. Moreover, John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the United States believed that with such pact, Japan would be able to contribute in the region's security defense, relying less on the United States militarily.

While the Korean War did establish the National Police Reserve and expanded the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency, Japan had yet to undergo an official rearmament process. Indeed, there are conflicting views today towards whether or not Japan had already rearmed itself when the NPR was founded. However, documents and memorandums from the Foreign Relations of the United States illustrate how both the United States and Japan regarded the latter without any revitalized military presence during the Korean War. Naturally, the main issue

regarding the forming of a Pacific Regional Security Pact was fixated on if Japan should go through a rearmament process and if so, how.

When communism was yet a physical and legitimate threat in the East Asian region in 1949, there were no concrete propositions of constructing a collective security system in the area. The breakout of the Korean War did provide an awareness of the necessity of such system, but because the main communist threat was North Korea, the United States was focused more on the war itself. While the United States, the United Nations, and South Korea were preoccupied by North Korea, China was in the aftermath of the Chinese Civil War which ended earlier in 1950. However, when Truman dispatched the United States Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait, it only provoked China and ultimately resulted in China's intervention in the Korean War. It was only after such intervention in late 1950 did the talks of the Pacific Regional Security Pact gain momentum.

There were, however, a myriad of obstacles that needed to be overcome before such pact could actually come into fruition. First of all, Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution renounced Japan's right to war and to hold any land, sea, and air forces. Another issue pertained to the other states' stance on Japan's rearmament. In other words, the other members of the potential pact – the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, and to some extent Indonesia – were not completely ready to accept Japan's rearmament process. Moreover, the Soviet Union and China also

considered that a rearmed Japan could be a threat to them, which generated serious debate within the United States whether to continually pursue the Pacific Regional Security Pact. The most important issue and question, however, was whether or not Japan was ready to rearm itself.

John Foster Dulles suggested a Pacific Ocean Defense Council that would provide two focal points regarding Japan that needed to be emphasized in order for the Pacific Regional Security Pact to come into place. He claimed that the Japanese government would not have to entirely overhaul its constitution, especially Article 9. Instead, notwithstanding the fact that Japan was yet a member of the United Nations, minor changes would be sufficient to the extent that any military forces Japan develops would be under the terms of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. In other words, Japan's military forces would be formed not solely for Japan's self-interest and purpose.

Article 51 of the United Nations Charter under Chapter VII (Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression) states the following:

“Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the

measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.”²⁷

Along the lines of Article 51, Japan would be able to hold the right of collective self-defense if it was included to the Pacific Regional Security Pact, and would likely do so, according to Dulles, without amending a large portion of the Japanese Constitution. However, there was a simple and fundamental problem to this situation – Japan was yet a member of the United Nations. Four states of the proposed security pact – the United States, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia – were all original members from 1945, while Indonesia (although a proposed member) joined the U.N. in 1950. In other words, Japan’s membership, or the lack thereof, was another setback that needed to be resolved. Japan did join the United Nations after the Korean War in 1956, but the proposed pact did not survive until that year.

²⁷ United Nations, “Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice” (San Francisco, 1945), 28.

Dulles' second point was centered on how the other states of the pact would accept Japan's rearmament process. He proposed that the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia all have a strong voice in the aforementioned council regarding Japan's military forces. By doing so, the three states could be reassured that Japan would not use its forces in the future as it did in the first half of the 20th century during the period of Japanese imperialism. However, Dulles' proposition was not enough to overcome the chasm between relationships and the uncertainty of a rearmed Japan that were caused by Japan's history. Indeed, Elpidio Quirino, president of the Philippines, expressed in February 1951 that his country would be willing to cooperate with Japan not because he did not see any potential threats in a rearmed Japan, but rather because of geographical reasons. He said that the Philippines would be willing to work with Japan because both countries were ultimately located in the Pacific, but only if Japan would pay reparations for its past. In the end, however, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia all viewed that a rearmed Japan could pose a potential threat.

However, the members of the possible Pacific Regional Security Pact were not the only countries that viewed Japan's rearmament as a threat. Both China and the Soviet Union highly were highly opposed to the idea of Japan reconstructing its army and expressed that they would retaliate if it did so, providing the Pacific Regional Security Pact with yet another drawback. A memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Dean Rusk, to the Acting

Secretary of State regarding heavy armament of Japanese divisions provides a detailed account of both Chinese and Soviet responses.

“Responsible officials of the USSR have in effect declared in public statements and speeches in the UN and Allied Council for Japan that they consider the rearmament of Japan as intolerable. The Chinese Communists have taken the same line. Both have officially and in their propaganda repeatedly charged that the rearmament of Japan is already taking place and that the manpower and material resources of Japan are being used by the United States to support the “war of aggression against the Korean people” ...

A CIA Special Estimate of February 21, 1951, with which all the intelligence organizations concurred, concludes that the Soviets “would not resort to direct military action merely to prevent the conversion of the Japanese National Police Reserve into fully equipped divisions,” but that “should the USSR decide to invade Japan, even a partial rearmament of Japan would of course provide a convenient pretext to justify such aggression.”²⁸

²⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 490.

Both the Chinese and Soviet governments viewed that Japan had already begun its rearmament process after the Korean War broke out. Moreover, because of a strong Sino-Soviet opposition to Japan's rearmament (or, in China and the Soviet Union's view, the continuation of Japan's rearmament) Rusk advises the Truman Administration that the United States should not pursue such actions. It was evident that the United States was consistently aware of a Soviet threat and that it was ill-advised to provoke or provide the Soviet Union with any legitimate reason for turning the Korean War into a larger theater. And the Truman Administration realized that such development of schemes would likely garner little to no support from its allies already fighting in the Korean War.

Apart from these legality, historical, and international issues, another, and maybe the most pivotal, question was if Japan was ready to rearm. Various reports and data illustrate some form of disparity of the public opinion on rearmament in Japan.

Table 3. Newspaper’s opinion survey on Japan’s rearmament, 1950-51

Newspapers	Date	Approve (%)	Disapprove (%)
Asahi Shimbun	November 15, 1950	53.8%	27.6%
Mainichi Shimbun	January 3, 1951	65.8%	16.5%
Mainichi Shimbun	March 3, 1951	63.0%	19.5%
Mainichi Shimbun	March 15, 1951	70.0%	20.0%
Yomiuri Shimbun	December 22, 1950	43.8%	38.7%
Yomiuri Shimbun	March 26, 1951	47.3%	29.1%
Tokyo Shimbun	February 21, 1951	71.3%	16.2%

Source: Hajimu, Masuda, *Fear of World War III: Social Politics of Japan’s Rearmament and Peace Movements, 1950-3*, (Journal of Contemporary History, 2012), 566.

Table 3 shows the Japanese public’s approval and disapproval rates regarding rearmament. As explained in Section IV, Chapter 4 of this paper, each newspaper is affiliated with a different political spectrum. Nevertheless, with the exception of the polls conducted by Yomiuri Shimbun, the numbers indicate that the Japanese people were more in favor of a rearmament process after the outbreak of the Korean War. Again, with the exception of the numbers provided by Yomiuri Shimbun, the approval rate for a rearmed Japan is notably higher in 1951 compared to 1950. It must be noted that Yomiuri Shimbun may have had a distinctively lower figure as it is the only conservative media out of the four newspaper companies listed in Table 3.

While the figures pertaining to the public opinion on Japan's rearmament are bipolar depending on the media's affiliation to a political side, a memorandum sent by the Deputy to the Consultant, John M. Allison, on January 29, 1951 vividly shows that Prime Minister Yoshida's stance on the public opinion on this key issue coincided with Yomiuri Shimbun's numbers. Because Yoshida was a member of the Liberal Party, one of the predecessors to the current Liberal Democratic Party, his political views and decisions were based on conservative thoughts. In Allison's memorandum, Allison explains how Yoshida was initially open to discussions of the Pacific Regional Security Pact but was also extremely cautious of rearming Japan for two main reasons.

“The Prime Minister said that it was necessary to go very slowly in connection with any possible rearmament of Japan as he foresaw two great obstacles. The first was the danger that any precipitate rearmament would bring back the Japanese militarists who had now gone “underground” and might expose the State to the danger of again being dominated by the Military...The other obstacle which confronted Japan in rearmament was the economic one. Japan was a proud country and did not want to receive charity from anyone but the creation of a military force just at the time when Japan was beginning to get on its feet

financially would be a severe strain and probably result in a lower standard of living.”²⁹

Prime Minister Yoshida, according to this memorandum, was wary of the possibility of the reemergence of a militarist Japan, merely six years after the demise of the Empire of Japan. While Japan did have the National Police Reserve and the Maritime Safety Agency in 1951, Yoshida (and Japan and the United States) did not view them to be of military forces. The Japanese economy was another paramount issue that the Yoshida administration concentrated and prioritized. Specifically, reconstructing Japan’s economy (through the Yoshida Doctrine) has constantly been a focal point of Yoshida and he viewed rearming Japan would jeopardize this sequence.

Prime Minister Yoshida would ultimately let the United States know that Japan would not undergo a rearmament process, thus ending the talks of a potential Pacific Regional Security Pact. In a memorandum by Yoshida to the United States later that year in 1951, he stated the following regarding rearmament:

²⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 487

“1. As a question for the immediate present, rearmament is impossible for Japan the reasons as follows.

- (a) There are Japanese who advocate rearmament. But their arguments do not appear to be founded on a thorough study of the problem, nor do they necessarily represent the sentiment of the masses.
- (b) Japan lacks basic resources required for modern armament. The burden of rearmament would immediately crush our national economy and impoverish our people, breeding social unrest, which is exactly what the Communists want. Rearmament, intended to serve the purposes of security, would on contrary endanger the nation’s security from within. Today Japan’s security depends far more on the stabilization of people’s livelihood than on armament.
- (c) It is a solemn fact that our neighbor nations fear the recurrence of Japanese aggression. Internally, we have reasons for exercising caution against the possibility of the reappearance of old militarism. For the immediate purpose we should seek other means than rearmament for maintaining the country’s security.”³⁰

³⁰ Daniel J. Lawler and Erin R. Mahan, “Foreign Relations of the United States, 1951, Volume VI, Part I, Asia and the Pacific” (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 2018), doc. 490.

Just as the previous memorandum by Allison mentioned, Yoshida reiterated his concern about the public view and the economy. It can also be seen that he acknowledged how the neighboring nations – which also includes the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia – would have seen Japan as a threat if it were to revitalize its military forces. And because both the proposed Pacific Regional Security Pact members and Japan saw the latter as a potentially militaristic threat, talks and negotiations on the idea of a collective security system in the Pacific part of the Far East would gradually abate.

In the end, the issue of Japan's rearmament was too big of an obstacle to overcome. Despite the fact that the United States was assertive in that Japan's military forces would not act as a future threat to members of the pact, such convincing was insufficient. Ultimately, as soon as Japan's initial hesitant and reluctance stance on rearmament developed into an impossible one, it became evident that the outcome would be fruitless. The unsuccessful Pacific Regional Security Pact did, however, generate two separate collective security treaties. The United States and the Philippines signed the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States on August 30, 1951. 48 hours later, Australia and New Zealand formed their own collective security with the United States when the Australia, New Zealand, United States (ANZUS) Treaty came into effect on September 1, 1951.

5. The United States and Japan's Rearmament

The Korean War for Japan had ended in 1952 when the last minesweeping operations were withdrawn. However, it was this period that discussions of rearmament gained momentum between the United States and Japan. Yoshida's stance of opposing rearmament also showed great change as Yoshida was more fervent in rearming his country. The U.S. also had a major change when General Douglas MacArthur was relieved as SCAP on April 11, 1951. The position was succeeded by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway who was more eager with Japanese rearmament than MacArthur. Plans regarding this process became, ironically, more concrete after Japan was slowly "pulling out" from the Korean War.

Just as how Germany was forced to disband its military forces by the Allied Forces, Japan also had to go through a process of disarmament. After Japan's surrender, the United States prioritized making Japan a demilitarized state. As mentioned previously, Washington's focal points on Japan's post-surrender situation is thoroughly evident in documents such as the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (SWNCC150/4), the Basic Initial Post Surrender Directive to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for the Occupation and Control of Japan (JCS1380/15), and, most importantly, Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. There is no doubt that the Truman administration focused on

demilitarizing Japan in 1945. However, this direction, even though Washington and Tokyo disagreed from time to time, would soon change its course.

A peace treaty between the United States and Japan (later signed in 1951 as the Treaty of San Francisco) had been a work in progress since the occupation of Japan. Indeed, other issues, such as Japan applying for membership for the United Nations, were discussed within the United States (and other countries, namely the United Kingdom).³¹ However, as the Korean War was taking place some 700 miles away from Tokyo, Washington had its eyes on solidifying Japan's status as its ally in East Asia. It was no secret that the Truman administration's containment policy encompassed not only Europe, but also Asia. When Chiang Kai-shek and Kuomintang (KMT) lost control of mainland China to the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in 1949, it became evident that the United States was in dire need of a "bulwark against Communism" in Asia.³² As a result, Washington was determined to rebuild Japan as a democratic state and ally against the two most prominent threats in the area – the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. At the same time, however, it was wary about the two communist states and their potential reactions when it came to Japan.

³¹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 544.

³² George L Hicks, *Japan's War Memories: Amnesia or Concealment?* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), 15.

While it is indicated that the United States had preliminary talks with Japanese rearmament even before the Korean War in 1948, there is no doubt this conflict accelerated and generated talks regarding this issue. Japan's recognized participation in the war have been primarily as minesweepers and as a military base to the United States, but its potential enemy was not North Korea. The United States and Japan were more attentive to the other two communist regimes in the region (the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union), indicating how World War III was a real possibility. In other words, Japan was in a situation where it was preserving the balance of power in East Asia, but, at the same time, also being potentially the direct factor of a third world war.³³

One of the reasons why the United States was heavily invested in a country that it declared war on about ten years ago was because Japan had much more potential militarily and economically compared to any other Asian countries. General Matthew Ridgway, MacArthur's successor as SCAP in 1951, even believed that the United States could obtain more security through Japanese rearmament than spending and investing the same amount of money to any other country.³⁴ The CIA approximated that a 500,000-men Japanese army could

³³ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 749.

³⁴ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H.

established in six to twelve months after rearmament.³⁵ However, there were legal obstacles that the United States had to overcome as well as a potential public outcry from Japan and the communist states.

China and the Soviet Union were getting more disgruntled with Japan, especially after the outbreak of the Korean War. Moscow was already aware of Washington's intention to allow or at least encourage Japan to rearm.³⁶ As the discussions regarding Japan's peace treaty were accelerating in 1951, it became more evident that the Soviet Union was not going to sign this treaty in San Francisco. The Treaty of San Francisco, in fact, was not the main concern for Stalin. On the contrary, the Central Intelligence Agency firmly believed that the Soviet Union was extremely sensitive about Japan's rearmament issue.³⁷

China's disgruntlement was deeper and more personal than that of the Soviet Union. Modern China's animosity towards Japan had been developing since its

Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 800.

³⁵U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 556.

³⁶ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 467.

³⁷ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 556.

defeat in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894 – 1895) and was only exacerbated during the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937 – 1945). By the start of the Korean War, the Chinese Communist Party was in firm control of the Chinese mainland. Beijing was in the hands of a communist regime, and the Yoshida administration had no intention of establishing a bilateral treaty.³⁸ Furthermore, an unresolved debate regarding whether the People’s Republic of China or the Republic of China should represent China resulted by neither party getting invited to San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Because of this precarious situation, the United States naturally proceeded the Japanese rearmament discussions with extreme discretion. Any leak of the details of these talks may have had disastrous results. Therefore, a majority of U.S. official documents and memorandums that the Foreign Relations of the United States disclosed concerning Japanese rearmament were classified as Top Secret.

The United States was not planning on rearming Japan from ground up. It is true that the Japanese did not have a foundation for an air force, with conversations of establishing it only occurring by late-1952.³⁹ However, Japan did have two

³⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 466.

³⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 608.

organizations that had potential to develop – the Maritime Safety Agency and the National Police Reserve, with the latter as the nucleus for Japanese rearmament. As mentioned previously, the former was established in in April 1948, while the NPR was formed in August 1950 shortly after the start of the Korean War. Both were allowed by the Far East Commission. These FEC policies, however, would later become an obstacle in rearming Japan.

One example of a such policy was the FEC 017/21. In 1947, Appendix I of the FEC 017/21, paragraph 6 allowed the National Police Reserve to hold small arms. It states the following.

“6. Military equipment seized from the former Japanese Armed Forces or from members of the Japanese civil populace should after examination be destroyed or scrapped except for:

- a. Military equipment required for operational needs of the occupation forces or the lawful activities of the Japanese civil police.”⁴⁰

Initially, the Truman administration attempted to pursue changes within the policy lines. In January 6, 1951, Acting Director of the Office of Northeast Asian

⁴⁰ Far Eastern Commission, United States, Department of State, Division of Publications. *Second report by the Secretary General, July 10, 1947 – December 23, 1948* (Washington D.C.: Dept. of State, Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, 1949), 2.

Affairs Ural Alexis Johnson discussed the possibility of expanding the NPR and the MSA without breaking any FEC policies with the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS).⁴¹ During this period, the NPR only had carbines, but GHQ was planning on strengthening the NPR through light and heavy machine guns and 2.5 bazookas (and ultimately tanks and artillery).⁴² Increasing the number of personnel and equipping both organizations with small arms did not violate any FEC policies, although the FEC would much likely question the U.S. Department of State of its intentions.⁴³

By mid-1951, the Korean War was in a stalemate with either side gaining much territory. Surprisingly, Washington planned on further rearmament of the National Police Reserve when there seemed to be no progress on either side of the war in Korea. Up until this point, there had been only talks surrounding light weapons. This time, however, the U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett brought up the idea of the heavy armament to the NPR to the U.S. Department of

⁴¹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 468.

⁴² U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 478.

⁴³ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 468.

State, while the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarded this issue with much urgency.⁴⁴ The Department of State defined the term “heavy armaments” with the following: “tanks, all types; artillery, all types; recoilless rifles; mortars larger than 81mm; rockets larger than 3.5 inch; and similar heavy weapons.”⁴⁵ Furthermore, 100mm and 155mm howitzers were already on their way to Japan in an effort to enlarge the NPR.⁴⁶ The Joint Chiefs of Staff wanted the NPR to be combat-ready.

One of the reasons that is attributed to this risky plan was because General Ridgway, the new SCAP, was mainly concerned about the Soviet Union and its potential influence in East Asia. Ridgway had a more aggressive approach towards the issue of Japanese rearmament than MacArthur. By 1952, Ridgway was trying to convince Prime Minister Yoshida that the NPR double its size from 75,000 to 150,000 with Japan’s budget of 56 billion yen.⁴⁷ Yoshida, because of domestic political issues, was cautious of expanding the NPR to more than

⁴⁴ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 742.

⁴⁵ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 742.

⁴⁶ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 742.

⁴⁷ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 549.

110,000 men, 40,000 less than what Ridgway had hoped for.⁴⁸ These discussions were taken place after Japan signed the Treaty of San Francisco and before its ratification, implying that the United States may have been simply waiting for the appropriate timing.

However, after internal discussions, the heavy armament plan was dismissed by the Department of State largely for three reasons: the plan would violate the FEC policies such as FEC 017/21, other Pacific states may be against ratifying the Treaty of San Francisco, and World War III might be a possible ramification.⁴⁹ Instead, the Department of State recommended that Japan's National Police Reserve be reinforced within the boundaries of the FEC policies by providing more equipment for the U.S. military forces and handing them over to the Japanese after the ratification of the peace treaty.⁵⁰ Furthermore, the NPR would train with American equipment at American bases in Japan under American

⁴⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 549.

⁴⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 749.

⁵⁰ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 749.

supervision.⁵¹ By mid-1952, President Truman authorized the loans of 500 heavy guns and 500 light tanks to the NPR.⁵²

From late-1952 to early-1953, the NPR expanded its strength from 75,000 to 110,000 with the Japanese Diet's authorization (just as Yoshida had hoped for).⁵³ Furthermore, along with its strength, the National Police Reserve also changed its title to the National Security Force (NSF) in 1952. The NSF would later become the foundations for Japan's Ground Self-Defense Force in July 1954.

The National Police Reserve was one of the key organizations that the United States viewed that had great potential of developing into a formidable armed force. Another one that had similar capabilities was the Maritime Safety Agency. Unlike the NPR, the MSA had actually undertaken missions during the Korean War with its minesweeping operations until mid-1952.⁵⁴ Although the Japanese coastguard's minesweeping activities were declining by late 1950, proposals for strengthening the MSA began to materialize the following year.

⁵¹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 772.

⁵² U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 589.

⁵³ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 636.

⁵⁴ Tessa Morris-Suzuki, "Japan and the Korean War: A Cross-Border Perspective," *アジア研究* 61, no. 2 (2015): 6-7.

The U.S. Departments of State and Defense, more concretely and detailed compared to past discussions, were examining the possibility of reinforcing the Maritime Safety Agency in July 1951, a similar period to when talks of strengthening the National Police Reserve began to accelerate.⁵⁵ Paralleling the rationale behind the need to arm the NPR with heavy armament, the main factor for this proposition was also largely due to the transparent Soviet threat in the East Asian region.⁵⁶ Because Japan was still under United States occupation in mid-1951, the proposed reinforced coastguard would be under SCAP jurisdiction and operating under the Commander Naval Forces, Far East (COMNAVFE).⁵⁷ The new MSA's crew would be composed of Japanese coast guards under the command of American officers operating in vessels with the appropriate weapons.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁵⁶ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁵⁷ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁵⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

The Foreign Relations of the United States does not explicitly list the proposed weapons for the MSA, but it does provide a list of the weapons of the United States Coast Guard, implying that the U.S. intended on arming the MSA in comparable ways. FRUS documented that the U.S. Coast Guard's small vessels were "equipped with small arms rifles to medium caliber machine guns and automatic machine guns up to 22mm, while intermediate craft carry all other straight armament and also heavy caliber guns up to and including 5-inch guns."⁵⁹

Similar to the situation with the National Police Reserve, the Truman administration had some obstacles in achieving this goal. First, there was always the Soviet issue. Washington was aware that the strengthening of Japan's coast guard could very well be a legitimate pretext for the Soviet Union in attacking Japan.⁶⁰ Moreover, the United States and Japan would not only be disregarding the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan, but also violating FEC policies just as with the situation of the NPR. Other FEC members were slowly becoming irritated by SCAP because of the latter's report (or the lack thereof) regarding these rearmament issues.⁶¹ Therefore, the reactions of the other FEC members,

⁵⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁶⁰ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁶¹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H.

along with that of the Soviets, were also an obstacle with strengthening the Maritime Safety Agency.

Notwithstanding the consequences, U.S. President Truman approved the Departments of State and Defense's proposition of strengthening the MSA on August 29, 1951.⁶² The Department of State, aware of a potential backlash, hoped to report this decision to the United Kingdom and other U.S.-friendly FEC members (such as France and the Philippines) within the next two to three weeks.⁶³ Because the U.K., France, and the Philippines had no objections, the United States could move on to the next step of Japanese rearmament. By mid-1952, the United States was ready to equip the Maritime Safety Agency through direct loans of 18 patrol frigates (PF's) and 50 Landing Ship Support, Large (LSSL's).⁶⁴ These PF's and LSSL's would become the backbone of a new branch within the MSA – the Coastal Safety Force – and, ultimately, that of Japan's Maritime Self-Defense Force in July 1954.

Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁶² U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁶³ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 650.

⁶⁴ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 589.

Unlike the ground and naval forces, Japan's air force had to be created and developed from ground zero. The National Police Reserve and the Maritime Safety Agency were gradually shaping up in becoming legitimate defense (at the same time, military) forces by 1952. Therefore, conversations of creating a new Japanese air force became serious in November 1952. As Japan barely had any foundation in developing an air force, the United States put emphasis on providing aid through technical and flying training schools by 1954.⁶⁵ Other realistic goals, through an estimated budget of \$287 million, were building two F-86 type fighter squadrons, one air depot wing, and service and support units by 1954.⁶⁶

By October 1953, the Ikeda-Robertson talks had commenced. These secret negotiations by between Hayato Ikeda, personal representative of Yoshida, and Walter S. Robertson, the Assistant Secretary of State, was one of the last major steps that the United States and Japan took before the three branches of the Japan Self-Defense Forces were founded. During the talks, a more general idea of Japan's new air force was taken into form. The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that the Japanese air force have at least a total of 800 aircrafts and 30,000 men,

⁶⁵ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 611.

⁶⁶ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 617.

divided into the following: 9 squadrons of jet interceptors (225 planes), 3 squadrons of all-weather interceptors (75 planes), 6 squadrons of fighter bombers (150 planes), 3 squadrons of tactical reconnaissance (54 planes), and 6 squadrons of transport (96 planes).⁶⁷ By October 30, 1953, the Ikeda-Robertson had concluded and gave out the following statement.

“The conferees agreed on the necessity of increasing Japan’s self-defense forces in order to protect her from possible aggression, and to reduce the United States burden related to the defense of Japan.”⁶⁸

The self-defense forces would not be established right away, but rather during the following year in 1954. Japan’s Air Self-Defense Force, along with the ground and naval branches, was ultimately launched in July 1954. Thus, the United States’ quest of rearming Japan and instituting another power in East Asia was complete.

Of course, the United States government was firmly adamant on not publicizing these actions and bilateral meetings, and even if the either the American public found out, it planned on saying that the loans were part of the U.S.-Japan Security

⁶⁷ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 699.

⁶⁸ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 713.

Treaty that was signed the previous year in 1951.⁶⁹ Prime Minister Yoshida was also consistently apprehensive about the Japanese public. He was, in private and in contrary to popular opinion, an advocate of rearming Japan, although he was against rapidly doing so. He claimed that if the Japanese people fully comprehended the gravity of the communist threat and were educated of this issue, they themselves would demand rearmament.⁷⁰ In addition, Yoshida was keen on even amending the Japanese Constitution – a situation in which he thought the only obstacles were the Japanese Communist Party and the leftist socialists.⁷¹

The United States, with great risks, was willing to undergo the rearmament procedures mainly because of its containment policy. The Koreans were in a war and it seemed unlikely that the communist threat would be completely eradicated from the Korean Peninsula. The Americans also viewed that the United States and the potential of Japan were the only two legitimate powers in the East Asian region. U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson even regarded the relationship and the alliance with Japan as most essential only after those with Germany during

⁶⁹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 589.

⁷⁰ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 543.

⁷¹ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, eds David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985), no. 581.

the Cold War.⁷² As a result, Japan, albeit without the ability of an offensive warfare, had fully rearmed by 1954.

V. Conclusion

Japan's stance on rearmament, military activities, and Article 9 has been a topic of debate even until today. The complexity of Article 9 has given myriad different perspectives on these issues. One of the fundamental reasons to why the South Korean Ministry of National Defense refused to acknowledge Japan as a state that participated in the Korean War in July 2019 can be also attributed to this no war clause. Nevertheless, Japan as both a base-state to the United States and with the use of the Japanese Maritime Safety Agency was mostly indirectly involved with the Korean War, providing supplies to the Allied forces and minesweeping divisions off the shores of the Korean Peninsula.

While the answer to the question of Japanese rearmament during this period varies, the Foreign Relations of the United States vividly shows that both the United States and Japan did not regard Japan as a rearmed country, even with the establishment of the National Police Reserve and the expansion of the Japanese

⁷² U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of the Historian, *FRUS*, 1951, Volume VI, Part 1, eds Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl Raether (Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1977), doc. 711.

Maritime Safety Agency. Furthermore, it was actually the United States that saw more benefits than losses to a rearmed Japan. Japan and the Yoshida Administration were firm in their position that Japan was not ready for a quick rearmament due to several factors.

Prime Minister Yoshida's main priority was to reconstruct the Japanese economy and he considered that a revitalizing Japan's military would come at the expense of the gradually recovering economy. He was also wary about how Japan, domestically, would have to deal with the rise of a militaristic population, many of whom were still nostalgic of the Empire of Japan. Lastly, he acknowledged that Japan could not build up a new military force because the neighboring states (i.e. the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia) viewed a militaristic Japan as a threat. The last factor was the definitive cause to the failed talks of the Pacific Regional Security Pact.

Nevertheless, the United States was extremely adamant on its plan of a rapid rearmament of Japan and ultimately succeeded. After General Douglas MacArthur was relieved as SCAP on April 11, 1951, the position was succeeded by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. Unlike MacArthur, who had a lukewarm attitude with Japan rearming, Ridgway was more eager with the Japanese rearmament process. Consequently, negotiations gained speed by mid-1951 and a new Japanese defense force became more concrete by the end of the Korean

War in 1953. Japan would complete its rearmament by July 1954 when it authorized the establishment of the Self-Defense Force and its three branches – ground, naval, and air.

The Korean War was the first major conflict that was a result of the Cold War. However, it was the Cold War, and not the Korean War in specific, that created a new Japan. Yoshida and the United States were on common ground midway through the Korean War, which prompted the reinforcements of the National Police Reserve and the Maritime Safety Agency. Soon afterwards, plans for instituting Japan's air force would begin, forming the cores of a rearmed Japan.

Bibliography

- Buell, Thomas B. *Naval Leadership in Korea: The First Six Months*. Naval Historical Center, Department of the Navy:--For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002.
- Choi, Deokhyo. "Fighting the Korean War in Pacifist Japan: Korean and Japanese Leftist Solidarity and American Cold War Containment." *Critical Asian Studies* 49, no. 4 (2017): 546-68. doi:10.1080/14672715.2017.1378585.
- "Decision of the Far Eastern Commission Concerning Basic Post-War Policy in Japan, June 19, 1947 1." *International Organization* 2, no. 1 (1948): 207-13.
- Dolbow, Jim. "Japan Coast Guard A Tool of Maritime Security'." *United States Naval Institute* 143, no. 3 (April 2017): 90.
- Editors, About Japan. "Peace Preservation Law of 1925." Japan Society. Accessed March 3, 2019. http://aboutjapan.japansociety.org/content.cfm/peace_preservation_law_of_1925#sthash.zTGWzsxh.dpbs.
- Far Eastern Commission. United States. Department of State. Division of Publications. *Second report by the Secretary General, July 10, 1947 – December 23, 1948*. Washington D.C.: Dept. of State, Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, 1949.

- Gady, Franz-Stefan. Toothless Tiger: Japan-Self Defence Forces. *BBC*. 15 October 2015. Accessed 13 November 2017. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-34485966>
- Gough, Terrence J., and Center of Military History. U.S. Army Mobilization and Logistics in the Korean War: A Research Approach. Center of Military History, United States Army, 1987.
- Hicks, George L. *Japan's War Memories: Amnesia or Concealment?* Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.
- "Hirohito Speech." Hirohito Speech. Accessed April 29, 2019. <https://www.worldwar2.org/p/jewel-voice-broadcast-was-radio.html>.
- Hisakazu, Fujita. "The Tokyo Trial: Humanity's Justice V Victors' Justice." In *International Humanitarian Law Series*, 3-21. Vol. 30. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.
- Hughes, Christopher W. *Japan's Remilitarisation* / Christopher W. Hughes. Adelphi; 403. London, UK: New York, NY: International Institute for Strategic Studies; Routledge, 2009.
- Kang, David. (2003), "Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Frameworks." *International Security*, 27-4: 57-85.
- Kanji, Akagi. (2011), "The Korean War and Japan." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 24, no.1: 175-184.

- Kim, Mi-Kyoung. Japan's Korean War. *The Korea Times*. 23 June 2015.
 Accessed 12 November 2017. http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2015/06/137_181440.html
- Kuehn, John T., and Gale Group. A Military History of Japan: From the Age of the Samurai to the 21st Century. Gale Virtual Reference Library.
- Hajimu, Masuda. (2012), 'Fear of World War III: Social Politics of Japan's Rearmament and Peace Movement, 1950-3', *Journal of Contemporary History* 47(3), 551-571
- Leavitt, William M. "General Douglas MacArthur: Supreme Public Administrator of Post-World War II Japan." *Public Administration Review* 75, no. 2 (2015): 315-324.
- Mabon, David W. "Elusive Agreements: The Pacific Pact Proposals of 1949-1951." *Pacific Historical Review* 57, no. 2 (1988): 147-77.
- Maki, John M. "Japan's Subversive Activities Prevention Law." *Political Research Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (September 1953): 489-511.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. "Japan and the Korean War: A Cross-Border Perspective." *アジア研究* 61, no. 2 (2015): 3-14.
- "Potsdam Declaration." 国立国会図書館—National Diet Library. Accessed April 30, 2019. <https://www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/etc/c06.html>.
- Stratton, Samuel S. "The Far Eastern Commission." *International Organization* 2, no. 1 (1948): 1-18.

Takeda, Hajime. (2017). トランプ氏歓迎の夕食会、元慰安婦招待「独島エビ」も. *Asahi Shimbun*. 7 November 2017. Accessed 10 November 2017. <http://www.asahi.com/articles/ASKC75TG1KC7UHBI01S.html>

Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between Japan and the United States of America. Accessed 14 November 2017. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/q&a/ref/1.html>

Umetsu, Hiroyuki. "Communist China's Entry into the Korean Hostilities and a U.S. Proposal for a Collective Security Arrangement in the Pacific Offshore Island Chain." *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* 15, no. 2 (1996): 98.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, The Far East and Australasia, Volume VI*, edited by John G. Reid and David H. Stauffer. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1949, The Far East and Australasia, Volume VII, Part 2*, edited by John G. Reid and John P. Glennon. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, East Asia and the Pacific, Volume VI*, edited by Neal H. Petersen, William S. Sampson, John P.

Glennon, and David W. Mabon. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1950, Korea, Volume VII, edited by John P. Glennon. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1951, Asia and the Pacific, Volume VI, Part 1, edited by Paul Claussen, John P. Glennon, David W. Mabon, Neal H. Petersen, and Carl N. Raether. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1952-1954, China and Japan, Volume XIV, Part 2, edited by David W. Mabon and Harriet D. Schwar. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

Wada, Haruki. "The Korean War, Stalin's Policy, and Japan." *Social Science Japan Journal* 1, no. 1 (1998): 5-29.

Ward, Robert E. E. "The Origins of the Present Japanese Constitution." *American Political Science Review* 50, no. 4 (1956): 980-1010.

Wilson Center Digital Archive. "The Cairo Declaration." Wilson Center Digital Archive. Accessed April 30, 2019. <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/122101>.

Yoshioka, Akiko. (2007), 'Japan's Foreign Policy toward Iraq after 2003: Perceptions in Iraq and the Arab World', *Gulf*, 2, 22.

남기정. 기지국가의 탄생 : 일본이 치른 한국전쟁 / 남기정 지음. 서울: 서울대학교 출판문화원, 2016.

이종관. "한국전쟁과 일본 -한국전쟁당시 일본의 대응과 협력내용을 중심으로." *한일군사문화연구* 1 (2003): 55.

이종관. "한국전쟁시 일본의 후방지원." *군사* 46 (2002): 255-297

정혜선, and Hye Sun Jeong. "1930 년대 전쟁시기 일본사회주의운동과 평화 공간 -일본공산당의 반전운동을 중심으로." *人文科學研究* 32 (2014): 115.

米韓夕食会に元慰安婦識者に聞く日本政府、過剰反応控えて. *Nikkei*. 9 November 2017. Accessed 11 November 2017.

"2019 Military Strength Ranking." *Global Firepower - World Military Strength*. Accessed May 08, 2019. <https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing.asp>.

초 록

일본은 한국전쟁 당시 특수한 상황에 놓이게 되었다. 냉전시대의 첫 번째 주요 사건이 도쿄에서 불과 700 마일 떨어진 한반도에서 진행되고 있었지만, 일본의 운신은 매우 제한적이었다. 일본 헌법 제9조 및 미국의 일본 군정기 아래 군사력을 확보하는 것과 한국전쟁에 참전하는 것은 불가능했다. 그러나, 한국전쟁이 끝날 무렵에 미국은 마침내 일본의 재무장에 동의하게 된다.

이 논문은 한국전쟁 당시 일본의 역할과 이것이 일본 재군비에 끼친 영향 및 이에 대한 미국의 입장을 분석하는데 중점을 두었다. 대한민국과 일본이 1950년대 초 한국전쟁에서 처음으로 “협력” 관계였던 것은 상대적으로 알려져 있지 않다. 여기서 중요한 점은 이 협력 관계가 어떻게 일본의 재무장에 기여했는지이다.

