

Essence of United States Forces in Japan (USFJ)

Takao SEBATA

Abstract

Since the end of World War II in August 1945, the United States forces have stationed in Japan for almost seventy years, first being as the American Occupation Forces, then as the United States Forces in Japan (USFJ). Japan provides USFJ with a large area of her land as military bases and pays a huge amount of Host Nation Support every year, but the Japanese people, in particular, the people in Okinawa, suffer from crimes, accidents, and environmental destruction caused by USFJ. While many host countries pay little to or some even receive money from the United States for hosting the United States forces, Japan is very generous to bear the cost to maintain USFJ up to 75% in spite of the fact that the Japanese Government suffers from huge budget deficit. Japan's situation, in which there is a foreign troops' base in the capital of a sovereign state and pays 75% of the cost to keep USFJ, is a very rare case even in the world. USFJ enjoy extraterritoriality and receive generous financial support from Japan, but they do not defend Japan. On the contrary, USFJ have harmed the Japanese people since 1945. Up until now, more than 1,000 Japanese people have been killed by USFJ. Accidents and crimes caused by USFJ take place about ten cases per day. Many people might wonder if USFJ really defend Japan. Of course, for the Japanese Government and the United States Government the answer is "YES," they defend Japan. Many Japanese and American people will also say "YES." Nevertheless, the statistics show a different answer. Therefore, I will argue that USFJ do not defend Japan, rather harm the Japanese people. USFJ are bouncers, but they are not doing their job. Even the Japanese YAKUZA (gangster) protect the local people from other YAKUZA if the people pay. USFJ are not in Japan to defend the Japanese people, but rather to protect and promote the United States national interests. Essence of USFJ is the fact that the United States freely uses her military bases in Japan without consulting with the Japanese Government. This is clearly shown when the United States deployed Osprey helicopters to Okinawa and other places in Japan. The paper argues that the United States-Japan Security Treaty in essence means that the United States can freely build her military bases anywhere in Japan, deploy any number of troops she wishes, and stay in Japan as long as the United States wants. The United States does not treat Japan as an ally, but regards Japan as a vassal.

Key words: The United States Forces in Japan (USFJ), defense of Japan, military bases

Introduction

In August 1945, the United States occupied Japan. Since then, the United States forces have never left Japan. In other words, the United States still occupies Japan for almost seventy years, first being as the American Occupation Forces, then as the United States Forces in Japan (USFJ). Of course, in April 1952,

Japan regained her sovereign power, but Japan's sovereignty is violated by the Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and Japan (SOFA). Up until now, members of USFJ, civilian workers of USFJ, and their family members kill more than 1,000 Japanese people. These members of USFJ cause accidents and crimes about ten cases every day.¹ More than 87% of those USFJ members who committed crimes or accidents are not indicted in Japan. It is because there is a secret agreement between the United States Government and the Japanese Government concerning the first jurisdiction over a suspect in case of an off-duty. The secret agreement states that the Japanese Government agrees that Japan does not wish to exercise the first jurisdiction over the crimes that took place during an off-duty except for the crimes *deemed to be extremely important matters to Japan*.² (The italics are mine.)

Under this secret agreement, Japan would not exercise the first jurisdiction over such felony as arson, rape, or murder needless to say misdemeanor in case of an off-duty because these crimes are not extremely important matters to Japan. These crimes are very serious ones to individuals, but they do not affect the Japanese national interests. As a result, a large number of suspects, who committed a crime whether it is felony or misdemeanor, are not indicted in Japan. In other words, members of USFJ are beyond the Japanese law. They know that even if they are arrested, they will be released without being indicted because SOFA protects them. In other words, crimes committed by the members of USFJ are repeated in Japan because of SOFA.

As a victor, the United States forces took huge areas of the Japanese land to use for military bases. In addition to their receiving free land, since 1978, USFJ receive a huge amount of Host Nation Support every year, but the Japanese people, who live in Okinawa and near the United States military bases in homeland, suffer from crimes, accidents, and environmental destruction. While many host countries pay little to or some even receive money from the United States for hosting the United States forces, Japan is very generous to bear the cost to maintain USFJ up to 75% in spite of the fact that the Japanese Government suffers from huge budget deficit. Japan's situation, in which there is a foreign troops' base in the capital of a sovereign state and pays 75% of the cost to keep USFJ, is a very rare case even in the world. USFJ enjoy extraterritoriality and receive generous financial support from Japan, but they do not defend Japan. On the contrary, USFJ have harmed the Japanese people since 1945. The Japanese people are the most generous, naïve, or softhearted people in the world since they pay money to the members of USFJ who harm them.

The Japanese Government and the United States Government tell their respective people that USFJ defend Japan. Nevertheless, the statistics show that USFJ do not defend Japan, but hurt the local people in Japan. USFJ are bouncers because the Japanese people pay to USFJ to defend them, but they are not doing their job. Even the Japanese gangster called YAKUZA protect the local people from other YAKUZA members if the people pay. YAKUZA members are in principle not supposed to hurt the laymen. One can argue that USFJ are worse than YAKUZA because YAKUZA members would be indicted if they committed a crime and were arrested, but many USFJ members would not be indicted even if they committed a crime in Japan. If USFJ had not been in Japan, these 1,000 or so people would not have had to die. USFJ are in Japan to protect and promote the United States national interests.

Under the United States-Japan Security Treaty (hereafter referred to as the Security Treaty), the United States can freely use her military bases in Japan without consulting with the Japanese Government. This is clearly shown when the United States deployed Osprey helicopters to Okinawa and other places in Japan in spite of a strong protest from the Japanese people. Then Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda said that there was nothing Japan could do over the deployment of Osprey to Japan. He was right under SOFA, but wrong

as Japan's prime minister, who is supposed to protect the lives of the Japanese people. Osprey is infamous for crashing many times killing more than thirty people in many places. In fact, in the United States, the United States military listen to the voices of the local Americans and delayed or cancelled the deployment of Osprey. However, in Okinawa and other places in Japan, USFJ ignored the opposition of the local people against deployment of Osprey. This attitude shows the United States double standard.

The paper argues that the Security Treaty and SOFA protect the United States national interests, which the United States can freely build her military bases anywhere in Japan, deploy any number of troops she wishes, and stay in Japan as long as the United States wants. This is the essence of the Security Treaty. USFJ do not protect Japan and SOFA is made to protect the soldiers of USFJ and their family members. SOFA is the root of crimes, accidents, and environmental destruction in Japan caused by USFJ. It is because the Japanese Government cannot take an effective legal action against USFJ members and their family members due to SOFA.

The paper concludes that it is the time for the Japanese people to stand up, protect their own lives, and abrogate the Security Treaty. Japan should seek a neutral and demilitarized state.

The Essence of the Security Treaty

In September 1951, Japan signed the Security Treaty with the United States. The 1951 treaty, however, did not specify that the United States would defend Japan. Therefore, in 1960 Japan revised the treaty so that the United States would defend Japan "in accordance with *its constitutional provisions and processes*."³ (The italics are mine.) Even the 1960 treaty does not guarantee an automatic support from the United States since the United States President has to get an approval from United States Congress. If Congress says "No," there would be no American forces that would come to help Japan. Unlike the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which guarantees an automatic military support, it is up to United States Congress whether the United States forces would come to help Japan under the Security Treaty.

John Foster Dulles in this respect clearly showed in the 1950s its true nature of the Security Treaty saying that the United States did not have to defend Japan. Although the Security Treaty was revised, the essence of the treaty has not changed. Ukeru Magosaki states that only the case if United States Congress regards an attack against Japan as a threat to the United States would the United States take an action. Therefore, he argues that the United States would not defend Japan. Karel van Wolferen agrees with him. Regarding the Senkaku Islands issue, van Wolferen says that there is no reason why the United States would militarily intervene. There is little possibility that Congress would approve such an intervention. van Wolferen points out that the Security Treaty is in essence a lease of the military bases. The United States leases Japan's land for the United States military bases. In return, the United States would protect Japan. According to an argument by the United States, they defend Japan; therefore, Japan must bear the cost including the Host Nation Support to keep USFJ. But, he wonders if the United States really defends Japan.⁴

Under SOFA, Japan has no obligation to pay the Host Nation Support since Japan already provides the United States with her land for free. It is very important for the Japanese people to know that there would be no automatic military support from the United States when Japan was attacked. It is extremely doubtful if the United States would militarily intervene over the Senkaku Islands issue on behalf of Japan. The United States often says that she provides deterrence to Japan. However, USFJ do not deter China over

the Senkaku Islands issue. According to the Japanese Government, China continues to violate the Japanese territorial waters near the Senkaku Islands. USFJ or the Security Treaty does not prevent China from entering the Japanese waters because the United States does not support Japan over the Senkaku Islands issue saying that the United States does not concern who has sovereignty over the Senkaku Islands.

Concerning who defends Japan, the Guidelines for United States-Japan Defense Cooperation clearly show that it is Japan's Self Defense Forces (SDF) that defends Japan. The Guidelines say, "When an Armed Attack against Japan Takes Place . . . , Japan will have primary responsibility immediately to take action and to repel an armed attack against Japan as soon as possible. The United States will provide *appropriate support* to Japan."⁵ (The italics are mine.) As the Guidelines above clearly show, it is Japan's SDF that defends Japan, not USFJ. The United States will provide appropriate support to Japan, which is very vague. What does a word "appropriate support" mean? Does it mean "military support"? Or "logistics support only"? Or "diplomatic support"? In any case, it is clear that Japan must take an initial action to defend her own country until the United States forces would come to rescue Japan if they ever come.

A principle of the Security Treaty is that the United States would defend Japan in case of an attack on Japan while Japan provides the United States with a right to keep American forces in Japan. However, its real intention is that as Dulles stated, the United States can freely build her military bases anywhere in Japan, deploy any number of troops she wishes, and stay in Japan as long as the United States wants.⁶ Therefore, Yukio Hatoyama's idea of the Security Treaty without American military bases is not acceptable to the United States. The United States military bases in Japan are of vital importance to the United States global strategy. Without their bases in Yokosuka, Sasebo, Iwakuni, Misawa, or Okinawa, the United States would not sustain her global military power. Although the United States military bases in Okinawa have become more vulnerable than before due to recent naval military buildup of China, USFJ including one in Okinawa are still a great asset for the United States. Given the fact that Japan pays up to 75% of the cost to keep USFJ, there is no reason why the United States should withdraw her military forces from Japan.

In Okinawa, human rights are violated by USFJ. The crime rate among USFJ in Okinawa is very high. Many traffic accidents take place on daily bases. Crash of aircraft and helicopters took place many times before. Air, water, soil, and noise pollution caused by USFJ contaminate and annoy the people in Okinawa. The Japanese courts cannot help the people in Okinawa due to SOFA, which is de facto beyond the Japanese law. One can argue that Japan is still under the United States occupation if one looks at a situation in Okinawa. In August 2004, a helicopter of the United States Marine Corps from the Futenma base crashed on the campus of the Okinawa International University. The Japanese authorities were not able to enter the scene, needless to say to investigate the accident. The accident took place outside of the United States military bases, but the United States authorities kept off the Japanese police and government officials and took away all the evidence of the accident. This incident clearly violates the Japanese sovereignty and SOFA. According to SOFA, both authorities were to cooperate with each other to investigate the accident in such a case as this.

van Wolferen argues that the relations between the United States and Japan are not those of an alliance.⁷ The crash of the helicopter on the campus of the Okinawa International University clearly shows that the United States does not treat Japan as an ally. The attitude of the American occupation forces toward the Japanese people continues even today after more than sixty years. In fact, SOFA is created to make sure that the status of USFJ would be beyond the Japanese law after Japan regained her independence. Almost 90% of the members of USFJ who committed crime walk away from their crimes without punishment in

Japan. The Japanese politicians and bureaucrats are indifferent to miserable and very poor living condition of the people in Okinawa. The Japanese politicians, either the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) or the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), have little intention to revise SOFA. The Japanese bureaucrats are also indifferent to the revision of SOFA. The United States is satisfied with the current situation and will strongly oppose the revision of SOFA. Therefore, they are afraid of antagonizing the United States. They all know what will happen to them if they make the United States angry. Yukio Hatoyama wished to relocate the Marine Corps base in Futenma to outside of the country or at least to the outside of Okinawa. The Japanese people including those in Okinawa supported his idea. However, the bureaucrats of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, politicians of the LDP, business leaders, leaders of the mass media, and even some politicians of his own party, the DPJ, all did not support him. It was because Hatoyama got the United States angry. Any Japan's future prime minister will take the same destiny as Hatoyama did if he or she tries to revise SOFA. As a result, SOFA has become untouchable among the Japanese officials.

As for the Host Nation Support, Magosaki asks why Japan pays the Host Nation Support. Americans argue that Japan does not have to come to rescue the United States while the latter is obliged to defend the former. This is not fair to the Americans. Therefore, Japan has to pay the United States the Host Nation Support to contribute to the defense of the United States and the Western World. This is logic of the American people. Magosaki, however, disagrees to this argument. Japan provides the United States with a right to keep her military bases in Japan while Japan supports the United States in a security issue. In exchange for Japan not having offensive weapons, the United States would defend Japan, he says.⁸ In other words, the Security Treaty is a "give and take" treaty, which means that the United States provides security to Japan while Japan allows the United States to keep her troops and military bases in Japan. Moreover, Japan has paid Host Nation Support since 1978 in spite of the fact that Japan does not have to pay such a cost under the Security Treaty or SOFA. If one considers that members of USFJ harm the Japanese people, enjoy extraterritoriality, and receive generous Host Nation Support while there has never been an opportunity for the United States to defend Japan since 1952, the United States benefits more than Japan does.

Those Americans and Japanese who support the Security Treaty often argue that USFJ play a role of deterrence. Without USFJ or the Security Treaty, China would threaten Japan or take Okinawa needless to say the Senkaku Islands. It is important to realize, however, that the international community would criticize China if she took such an action with military forces or a military threat in today's world. Moreover, China needs a peaceful environment in East Asia to continue her economic development. Without economic growth, the Chinese Communist Party would not survive. Therefore, China would not disturb the international order in East Asia. Of course, the recent Chinese behavior and remarks over the Senkaku Islands, the Paracel Islands, and the Spratly Islands are aggressive and annoy China's neighboring countries including Japan. Nevertheless, it is obvious that China does not want a conflict or a war with any country in East Asia. The Chinese threat is exaggerated by the Japanese media.

van Wolferen argues that USFJ are not welcomed in Japan particularly in Okinawa. Therefore, there is no reason why Japan pays about \$2 billion every year.⁹ When Hatoyama tried to find a substitute place for the Futenma base in 2009 and 2010, no municipal government in Japan welcomed an American military base. Nevertheless, Japan is to pay for USFJ about \$1.88 billion every year between 2011 and 2015 in spite of the fact that the Japanese Government suffers from a huge amount of budget deficit. This is an ultimate nonperforming loan which Japan must cut. Magosaki says that although the direct Host

Nation Support is about \$2 billion, if one includes the cost of countermeasure for American military bases and its neighboring areas, the amount would reach about \$5 billion every year. No nation pays more than Japan does. The reason why USFJ are stationed in Okinawa is “money,” Magosaki argues.¹⁰ Moreover, the Marine Corps in Okinawa has the largest number of troops among USFJ, which is about 15,000 troops, although the actual number is said to be less than that. If the Japanese Government reduces the amount of the Host Nation Support, the troops of the Marine Corps in Okinawa will decrease too since the United States Government cannot afford to keep such a number of the troops due to its financial difficulty. But, the Japanese Government is so generous that it continues to pay the Host Nation Support.

As for the Marine Corps in Okinawa, its main task is to assault enemy bases, not to defend Okinawa. It is the troop for an attack against Iraq and Afghanistan. The Marine Corps has nothing to do with the defense of Japan.¹¹ Therefore, the role of the Marine Corps in Okinawa does not fit the purport of the Security Treaty. For those who support the Security Treaty, the *raison d’être* of the Marine Corps in Okinawa is not military but political. It is a symbol of deterrence against an external threat. Therefore, for both the United States and the Japanese governments, the number of the troops is not that important. Showing the flag in Okinawa is the essence of USFJ in Okinawa. The main reason why the Marine Corps in Okinawa has not reduced is because its members are comfortable with their life in Okinawa enjoying beautiful beaches, receiving generous Host Nation Support including utilities for family members of USFJ, and living beyond the Japanese law.

van Wolferen argues that the Marine Corps is an offensive troop. In this respect, the Marine Corps violates the Security Treaty which allows only troops for the defense of Japan to stay in Japan in exchange for Japan providing the United States with the right to keep her military bases in Japan. However, the Marine Corps in Okinawa cannot do anything to defend Japan. The Marine Corps cannot defend Japan against the North Korean missiles or the Chinese air attack. Most experts including American ones would agree to this point, van Wolferen says.¹² Moreover, due to the growing power of the Chinese naval and air forces, USFJ in Okinawa become vulnerable against the Chinese attack. That is one of the reasons why the United States initially decided to move about 8,000 troops from Okinawa to Guam. In case of war with China, USFJ in Okinawa are too close to China to defend the island. So, it is the time that the Marine Corps should go home. Nowadays, many Marine Corps troops are directly sent to Iraq and Afghanistan from the United States mainland by air. Assaulting enemy bases by sea with landing crafts is an old way of fighting and no longer used.

One of the purposes of the Security Treaty is to prevent Japan from going back to militarism or becoming a communist country. Richard Nixon told the Chinese leaders that USFJ and the United States forces in other countries in Asia would defend China against the present or the future Soviet or Japanese threats as well as prevent Japan from pursuing a road to militaristic nationalism. He also said that the United States would not be able to exercise her influence over Japan without the Security Treaty. Dulles admitted that the United States would not be able to keep her position in Asia without Japan. In fact, the Senate Military Committee acknowledged in April 1966 that the United States would have extremely a difficult task in fighting in Southeast Asia without American military bases in Yokosuka or Sasebo.¹³ Therefore, the Security Treaty is of vital importance to the United States. It is a pity that the United States, the only friend and ally for Japan, does not trust Japan. As the above statements clearly show, the purpose of the Security Treaty was not to defend Japan but to control Japan or prevent the Japanese militarism and use American military bases in Japan for the United States national interests. It is obvious that USFJ do not defend Japan.

A so-called “cork in the bottle argument” is still effective today. It is an argument that the real reason why USFJ are in Japan is to prevent the Japanese militarism or the Japanese power projection.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur thought that the basic purpose of the American occupation policy was accomplished by achieving democratization and demilitarization of Japan and denied a Russian threat against a neutral Japan. Although he changed his mind later due to the progress of the Cold War, he envisaged a neutral and demilitarized Japan. George Kennan, Director of the United States State Department Policy Planning Staff (PPS), and his colleagues had little thought that Joseph Stalin would attack Japan. Many American diplomats denied a possibility of the Soviet attack against Japan and believed that the centralized police, one or two naval bases leased to the United States forces, and continuous American economic support to Japan would be sufficient to defend Japan. Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) thought that China or the Soviet Union would pose little threat against Japan. However, the JCS regarded American bases in Japan as important areas for the power projection against the Asian Continent and the neighboring Soviet islands and wished to keep American bases permanently. Kennan suggested that the United States agree to Japan’s neutrality and demilitarization if the Soviet Union agreed to the conclusion of the Korean War. The analysis of the Department of Defense stated that the Soviet Union would value a neutral Japan. On the Japanese side too, many politicians had the similar view to that of the American officials. Shigeru Yoshida and the conservative politicians of his colleagues did not worry about external aggression of the Communists.¹⁴ There were two different opinions within the United States State Department in the 1940s concerning future of Japan. On the one hand, the Far Eastern Bureau argued that the United States should seek a demilitarized Japan and conclude an overall peace with Japan to prevent the resurgence of the Japanese militarism. On the other hand, the PPS insisted that the United States retain her military bases in Japan so that she could defend Japan and seek a minority peace with Japan without the Soviet Union. Although Kennan supported a minority peace with Japan, he also suggested a neutral Japan on condition that the United States would retain her military bases in Okinawa forever.¹⁵

The remarks mentioned above accurately indicate that at the beginning both Japanese and American leaders including many American military officials and diplomats did not worry about external threats such as the Soviet or Communist attack against Japan. Some even accepted a neutral and demilitarized Japan. Although the PPS won the argument in the end, there was a possibility that Japan could have become a neutral and demilitarized state without concluding the Security Treaty or having the American military bases in Japan. It is very interesting to see that the official position of the United States Government and the Japanese Government at that time and today was that the Security Treaty was signed to defend Japan against the Soviet attack or Communist aggression. However, in reality, the treaty was not for the defense of Japan. It is now obvious that the official position was fabrication since many Japanese and American leaders had little thought that there would be the Soviet attack or Communist aggression against Japan. Now, it is the time for the Japanese people to wake up and abrogate the Security Treaty. Japan should sign a new friendship treaty with the United States and take a neutral and demilitarized policy. Many people who support the Security Treaty criticize such a policy as unrealistic. However, MacArthur, Kennan, and many American diplomats as well as Yoshida and his colleagues in the late 1940s and early 1950s had supported the idea of either a neutral or a demilitarized Japan. The international environment for creation of such a Japan is more suitable now than the late 1940s and early 1950s.

Concerning Japan’s necessity to keep American military bases in her own soil, there was no such necessity as many Japanese and Americans indicated above. They accepted the possibility of a neutral

Japan. Emperor Hirohito, however, obstructed a possibility of a neutral Japan. A message coming from Emperor Hirohito states that Japan wanted the American occupation of Okinawa to continue under the fiction of a lease to the United States of the land in Okinawa for the use of American military bases for twenty five to fifty or more years.¹⁶ It is certain that there were mutual interests between Emperor Hirohito and the United States. For the former, a Communist revolution in Japan and the Korean War posed a threat to the Imperial System. For the latter, losing United States military bases in Japan would be a nightmare and a tremendous blow to the United States national interests. Therefore, both Emperor Hirohito and the United States thought that they must defend Japan and the Imperial System against a Communist takeover of Japan. The answer was that Japan would welcome the American forces and bases in her soil, particularly in Okinawa under the Security Treaty. Emperor Hirohito sacrificed Okinawa for the maintenance of the Imperial System. However, a Communist threat was exaggerated as many American and Japanese leaders mentioned above stated. There was little threat of the Communists in or against Japan at that time. These leaders made the most of the Communist threat to consolidate their positions.

Some argue that the Security Treaty was not a “give and take” treaty. It was Japan that first offered the United States the right to keep American military bases in Japan without asking for American protection of Japan. In response to such a Japan’s request, the United States would keep military bases as her favor. This was a scenario which Yoshida and his close advisers made.¹⁷ Therefore, it was a “give and give.” In the 1951 treaty, there was no United States obligation to defend Japan although Japan had to give the United States the right to keep her military forces and bases in Japan. Instead of negotiating with the United States concerning the American military bases in Japan and American promise to defend Japan, Yoshida begged that the United States would keep her troops and military bases in Japan after Japan’s independence. Emperor Hirohito and his close advisers were afraid of a Communist takeover of Japan. Therefore, they thought that American military bases in Japan would protect the Imperial System.¹⁸

Emperor Hirohito offered Okinawa to the United States for the maintenance of the Imperial System. In any case, the Japanese Government did not use Japan’s acceptance of American military bases as a negotiating card to regain Japan’s sovereignty. In other words, Japan, in fact Emperor Hirohito, begged the United States to keep United States forces in Japan to prevent a Communist revolution and to maintain the Imperial System. There was a possibility that Japan could have stayed on the side of the Western World in exchange for the elimination of the American military bases in Japan or Japan could have chosen a neutral policy if there had been no intervention from the Emperor. This Emperor’s action violates the Japanese Constitution, which stipulates that the Emperor “shall not have powers related to government.”¹⁹

In relation to Emperor’s intervention, Okinawa became a victim. Okinawa was abandoned again by the Emperor. Okinawa was once abandoned in 1945 by the Japanese Government as a sacrifice to gain time for the final battle in the homeland. This time too, Okinawa was sacrificed for a peaceful life of the Japanese people living in the homeland and the maintenance of the Imperial System.²⁰ As a result, Okinawa suffered under the American occupation for twenty seven years and still continues to suffer from hosting 75% of the land of the American military bases in Japan. The Japanese Government continues to ignore the opinions of the people in Okinawa and SOFA violates their human rights. This attitude is clear discrimination against the people in Okinawa and shows that Japan is not a democratic state. It is because the Japanese Government ignores the people’s opinions. The opposition against the deployment of Osprey was simply dismissed. The Japanese Government pays more attention to the demands of the United States Government than the requests of the people in Okinawa. As a result, SOFA in principle has not changed for

more than sixty years.

Conclusion

The paper discussed the essence of the Security Treaty. Since the end of World War II in 1945, the United States forces have never left Japan. USFJ are in Japan for almost seventy years. Many Japanese people believe that USFJ defend Japan against external threats, but it is the SDF that defends Japan, not USFJ. Essence of the Security Treaty is the fact that the United States freely uses her military bases in Japan without consulting with the Japanese Government. The paper argued that the Security Treaty is designed to enhance the United States national interests, which mean that the United States can freely build her military bases anywhere in Japan, deploy any number of troops she wishes, and stay in Japan as long as the United States wants. USFJ are not here to defend Japan but to carry out the United States global strategy.

In order to defend the people in Okinawa and the people living in neighboring areas to the American military bases, Japan should first stop paying the Host Nation Support to the United States and then revise SOFA. That is the only way that the Japanese Government could protect the Japanese people against crimes, accidents, or environmental destruction caused by the members of USFJ. Japan should eventually abrogate the Security Treaty so that the Japanese people would enjoy their life without crimes, accidents, or environmental destruction by USFJ. Only the revision of SOFA is not enough. Otherwise, the people in Okinawa will continue to suffer. In this respect, Emperor Hirohito played an important role. The message from Emperor Hirohito kept Okinawa under the American occupation until 1972 and has kept the people in Okinawa in a miserable situation for almost seventy years.

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, there was a possibility of a neutral and demilitarized Japan, which many American and Japanese leaders acknowledged at that time. If that is so, I am sure that there is more possibility of a neutral and demilitarized Japan now than in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The Cold War is over a long time ago. The trade between China and Japan is larger than the trade between the United States and Japan. The relations between the United States and China are closer than in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Hatoyama tried to expand Japan's relations with China by promoting the idea of the East Asian Community. This idea is very natural when Japan's largest trading partner is now China, not the United States. However, the mind of the Japanese people, particularly the Japanese leaders, has not changed. For many Japanese people and leaders, Japan has to rely on the United States for her security and economy.

In the 21st century, it is extremely difficult to imagine a war among states even in East Asia. North Korea is often said to be a threat to Japan. However, its nuclear development is designed to protect North Korea against an American attack. Russia is now democracy although she is still authoritarian under the President Vladimir Putin. Japan should deal with North Korea and Russia through the diplomatic means. China needs a peaceful environment for her economic growth. Moreover, the United States has little intention to wage a war against China for Japan. Therefore, there is little external threat against Japan and there is not much reason why Japan has to continue to keep the Security Treaty and pay a huge amount of the Host Nation Support. As for the United States, it is important to keep the Security Treaty because Japan pays generous Host Nation Support and the United States could control Japan. But, being subordinate to the United States is not a Japanese national interest.

By improving relations with China, normalizing diplomatic relations with North Korea, and

concluding a peace treaty with Russia, Japan would be able to enhance security, secure energy, and continue economic growth. Continuing relying on the Security Treaty for the defense of Japan is not a wise choice in the 21st century. It is now the time for the Japanese people to stop supporting the United States at the expense of the people in Okinawa and regain Japan's sovereignty.

Notes

- ¹ Akahata Seijibu Anpo Gaiko Han. *Jyuzoku no Domei* (An alliance that is dependent on the United States). Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 2010, p. 111.
- ² Toshihiro Yoshida. *Mitsuyaku: Nichibei Chiikyotei to Beihei Hanzai* (A secret agreement: the Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and Japan and crimes committed by American soldiers in Japan). Tokyo: Mainichi Shimbunsha, 2010, pp. 69-70.
- ³ Minoru Tada. *Nichibei Anpo Jyoyaku* (The United States-Japan Security Treaty). Tokyo: Mikasa Shobo, 1982, p. 153.
- ⁴ Ukeru Magosaki and Karel van Wolferen. *Dokuritsu no Shiko* (Independent thoughts). Tokyo: Kadokawa Gakugei Shuppan, 2013, p. 23.
- ⁵ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/guideline2.html>: accessed on 6 September 2013.
- ⁶ Narahiko Toyoshita, *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu* (Conclusion of the United States-Japan Security Treaty), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996, p. 47; Michael Schaller, *Nichibei Kankei towa Nan daata no ka* (Altered states). Tokyo: Soshisha, 2004, p. 58.
- ⁷ Magosaki and van Wolferen, *Dokuritsu no Shiko*, pp. 20-21.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- ¹³ Schaller, *Nichibei Kankei towa Nan daata no ka*, pp. 345, 426-427.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 30, 44-45, and 48, 58; Toyoshita, *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu*, p. 195.
- ¹⁵ Eiichi Shindo, "Bunkatsu saretu Ryodo," *Sekai*, April 1979, pp. 41-42.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48; Toyoshita, *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu*, p. 223.
- ¹⁷ Toyoshita, *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu*, pp. 189-191.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 156, 184, 207-210.
- ¹⁹ House of Councillors, ed., *The National Diet Japan*. n.p., 1969, p. 4.
- ²⁰ Toyoshita, *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu*, pp. 223-225.

References

- Akahata Seijibu Anpo Gaiko Han. *Jyuzoku no Domei* (An alliance that is dependent on the United States). Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 2010.
- House of Councillors, ed. *The National Diet Japan*. n.p., 1969.
- Magosaki, Ukeru and Karel van Wolferen. *Dokuritsu no Shiko* (Independent thoughts). Tokyo: Kadokawa Gakugei Shuppan, 2013.

- Schaller, Michael. *Nichibei Kankei towa Nan daata no ka* (Altered states). Tokyo: Soshisha, 2004.
- Shindo, Eiichi, “Bunkatsu saretu Ryodo,” *Sekai*, April 1979, pp. 31-51.
- Tada, Minoru. *Nichibei Anpo Jyoyaku* (The United States-Japan Security Treaty). Tokyo: Mikasa Shobo, 1982.
- Toyoshita, Narahiko. *Anpo Joyaku no Seiritsu* (Conclusion of the United States-Japan Security Treaty), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.
- Yoshida, Toshihiro. *Mitsuyaku: Nichibei Chiikyotei to Beihei Hanzai* (A secret agreement: United States-Japan status of forces agreement between the United States and Japan and crimes committed by American soldiers in Japan). Tokyo: Mainichi Shimbunsha, 2010.
- <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/guideline2.html>: accessed on 6 September 2013