CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
With the surrender of Japan in 1945, the Allied forces under the leadership of United States had initiated certain measures to implement their war-time policies towards building the post-war world order. Their policies in Japan which aimed at putting the Japanese on the path of democracy and peace, both in domestic politics and in international relations, were actually directed towards Japanese socio-political structures on which the pre-war militarist and autocratic polity of Japan had flourished and thrived. For instance, the common man in Japan who had for centuries been nourished on the values of discipline (defined as blind obedience) was now being taught the significance of individual rights and liberties which were actually intended to weaken the hold of ruling oligarchy on Japanese politics. Interestingly, the U.S. was implementing these policies through the agency of Japanese government. This on the one hand made it easier for the U.S. to obtain legitimacy for these policies, and on the other it also saved them from any popular hostile reaction from the peoples of Japan.

This American operation of "externally planned and controlled political change on a national scale" lasted for about seven years. During this period, it was, thus, a clear illustration of the type of linkage politics in the sense in which it has been defined: the participation of a foreign power in the domestic political decision-making process of an alien society.

Chapter 1 introduces the subject by elaborating the inadequacy of the existing predominant paradigm of
international relations theory and underlines the need to modify it in the context of the much transformed nature of international system in the post World War scenario. It describes the tremendous advancements taking place in the field of science and technology, the emerging interdependence among nations, and the growing role of non-state actors at the international level. These developments have shrunk the distances among states. The traditional division between domestic and international politics has, therefore, become increasingly blurred. The contemporary world is no more a system of various independent, mutually exclusive, and absolutely sovereign units (nation-states), instead it has become a single integrated global village dominated by various state and non-state actors. In such a system events occurring at one place have bearings upon the environment of another and vice versa. Therefore, political process at one level cannot be studied in isolation from the other.

The realist approach to international relations which is based on the neat demarcation of domestic and international politics fails to take stock of the mutually inclusive character of domestic and international political processes. What takes place in the overlapping areas of these levels is also beyond its comprehension.

Linkage politics is premised on the conception that domestic and international political systems affect each other and the understanding of political processes taking place in either system would be incomplete if
studied in isolation from the other. It serves as a unit of analysis bridging the gap between domestic and international politics, and accounts for the study of overlapping areas between them. Linkage politics is not only confined to the interactions among states as the sole actors at the systemic level but also covers the society to society relations popularly known as transnational transactions.

The studies of conflict linkage did not take into account the totality of the linkage phenomenon. These studies confined their framework to the impact of domestic environment on the foreign conflict behaviour of a state. Some of these studies also dealt with international causes of the civil wars. But then, the main focus of linkage politics approach, that is, the confluence of domestic and international politics, has not been taken into account.

U.S. occupation of Japan provided an interesting case study for the investigation of linkage between domestic and international politics. It fits closely to the "penetrative process" of linkage framework as defined and elaborated by Rosenau. During its tenure the decision making-process in Japan was not exclusively administered domestically. It was greatly influenced directly and indirectly by the occupation authorities. Thus, the various domestic reforms undertaken during the occupation period were the outcome of both domestic and international environment which could neither be
explained only in the context of international politics nor in the framework of comparative politics alone.

Chapter II analyses the development of pre-war Japanese militarism and its impact on the foreign policy of Imperial Japan. The factors which provided background to the emergence of militarism and ultra-nationalism were: the myth of the divinity of Emperor, divine origins of the land and people of Japan; the subservience of the individual to various social groups including the state; the oligarchic structure of the Japanese polity, society, and economy; predominant hold of military over the government; the widely disseminated ideology of 'National polity' (Kokutai), Confucian philosophy, the principles of loyalty and respect, and 'the way of warrior' (bushido); state controlled system of education, mass media for indoctrination of the common peoples; and the virtual absence of open dissent and democratic ethos of protest.

The entire history of domestic set-up of Japan from middle of the seventh century to the end of the World War II (with an exception of party rule for a few years during the Taisho era) was distinctly oligarchic where governmental administration had been run by a few, and the rest of the peoples were to follow the commands of the rulers. Moreover, for seven centuries (starting from the middle of the twelfth century onwards), the oligarchic rule was exercised by military cliques. This pattern of blind obedience was deeply ingrained in the
Japanese people by centuries old social system of discouraging the assertion of individual identity.

Such a socio-political set-up, devoid of democratic traditions and marked with the absence of the principle of governmental responsibility to the people, provided a solid background for the upsurge of militarism and ultranationalism in the pre-war Japan and its military adventures abroad. The factors of democracy and responsible government became central to the political evolution and development of Japan after its defeat in World War II and its subsequent military occupation by the U.S. as a prelude to peace and security in the Pacific.

The U.S. Occupation Administration, its organizational profile, and goals and objectives are discussed in Chapter III. Technically, the occupation of Japan was an allied action, but for all practical purposes it was predominantly an U.S. operation. The office of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers which was assigned the task of implementing the U.S. Occupation policies in Japan was headed by two eminent persons: General Douglas MacArthur and, after his recall, General Mathew Ridgway. Both of them were American nationals. In addition, the overwhelming majority of the staff of Supreme Commander for Allied Powers were American officials. The basic policies for the occupation were formulated by United States. No concerted effort was made by the Allied Powers collectively at the international level to specifically
chalk out policy-matters for the occupation of Japan. Although the two international bodies (the Far Eastern Commission and the Allied Council for Japan) were constituted to supervise the occupation operations and to provide advisory assistance to SCAP, they could not perform such functions in the face of cold treatment meted out to them by General MacArthur.

The U.S. Occupation policy was based on the premise that the domestic set-up of Japan contained the seeds of militancy which provided background for its belligerent policy abroad. The defeat of Japan did not automatically mean the destruction of the ideas and values, traditions and social practices, and socio-political and economic structures which gave rise to such militancy. Hence the policy-makers in the U.S. administration were of the opinion that the imperatives of peace and freedom in the world after the war warranted that these ideas and socio-political structures should be subjected to strategies of fundamental transformation.

Therefore, the major task of the occupation was first to dismantle the monster of militarism by doing away with the sources, authority and influence of militarists. This was to be followed by the democratization of Japan. Demilitarization policy was begun by demobilizing, disarming and dismantling Japan's war industry, Army and Navy, and by purging all the important military leaders and other anti-democratic elements from the places of public responsibilities. In addition, war as a sovereign right of the state was
renunciated in the new constitution of Japan drafted under the direction of the Occupation Administration.

The democratization was aimed at the reorientation of the Japanese polity and society. Land reforms, industrial deconcentration, reparation proposals, educational reforms and the amelioration of women were all adopted. Political opponents of the pre-war militaristic state apparatus were set free, and labour organization and parliamentary political process were strongly supported. The Emperor of Japan renounced his alleged divinity and the religion (Shinto) was liberated from the control of the state. These goals were achieved during the period from 1945 to 1947.

Chapter IV deals with the shift in the U.S. Occupation policy towards Japan. Before the Occupation Administration could run the full course of its mission to introduce domestic reforms in Japan, the World came to be divided into two opposite power blocs: U.S. advocating the cause of democracy, and USSR representing the cause of socialism. Both became the staunch adversaries of each other and wanted to strengthen their position vis-a-vis each other.

The advancements made by the Soviet Union in the direction of spreading the ideology and social system based on Marxist-Leninist philosophy cautioned the United States of America about the increasing strength of the totalitarian regimes of the socialist brand. Since the challenge of communism and its containment was global in
dimension, it also affected the U.S. policy towards Japan.

Thus, Japan was characterized as a "Workshop of Asia" like Germany as "Workshop of Europe". U.S. policy-makers emphasized their strategic interests in the Far East. Defeat of Japan in the Pacific War led to the predominance of the USSR in the Far East. China which could act as a check on the proliferation of Soviet influence in the region was also won over by communism. In such a situation Japan was the only choice.

Accordingly, Japan was strengthened economically and militarily to provide the much needed strategic support to the U.S. in the Far East, and to act as its anti-communist bastion in Asia. It was precisely for this reason that along with the peace treaty ending the Occupation, U.S. signed a security pact with Japan.

However, such a shift in the U.S. Occupation policy known as "reverse course" was not, in fact, a case of drift from its main motive of establishing democracy in Japan as a prelude to peace in the Pacific. Before the onset of the cold war the focus of the Occupation policy was on the obliteration of militant elements and structures from the domestic life of Japan which were the moving spirit behind its autocratic rule at home and its belligerent policy abroad. After the onset of the cold war, the major threat to the establishment of democracy in Japan used to be perceived against the surging influence of communism. Thus in order to ensure the sustenance of democratic institutions and to provide a
conducive environment for liberal values and attitudes in post-war Japan, U.S. adopted the policy of economic rehabilitation and military build-up (in the name of self defence) to thwart the overt and covert onslaught of the communist camp.

Hence as far as the shift is the U.S. policy towards Japan was concerned it was more in the context of means to achieve the goals than in the goals itself. But whatever be the case, the key to shift in the U.S. Occupation policy toward Japan lies in the cold war environment as against the domestic requirements of Japanese society. It was also in this context that the impact of external environment on the 'allocation of values' within Japan became clear.

Chapter V deals with the post-occupation political system of Japan. It evaluates the sustenance and endurance of various domestic reforms introduced in Japan during the occupation period. The first and foremost among them was the establishment of pacifistic tendencies in the Japanese society. This was, in fact, setting the ground for the thorough reorientation of Japanese society, polity, and economy along democratic values.

Since the adoption of the post-war 'American written' constitution of Japan, the famous Article-9 denouncing war as a sovereign right of the nation has not been revised. The various attempts made by the ruling Liberal Democratic party of Japan in response to its U.S. patrons to clear the way for rearming Japan were foiled by the wide prevalence of popular disgust with such
course of action. The failure of the recent 'U.N. Peace Co-operation Bill' meant for sending Self Defense Forces to the Gulf War is a case in point.

In accordance with the democratic principle of parliamentary political process, national as well as local elections are being conducted regularly. Armed forces are placed under the popular control. Individuals are now no more the docile and loyal subjects of the Emperor. They are guaranteed the rights and liberties available to citizen in a democratic set-up. As against the pre-war discriminatory practice of treating the women as not equal to men, equality of men and women in all spheres of life came to be duly recognized in the post-war political system of Japan.

What makes distinctive the importance of these various domestic reforms was their origination in the policy-making apparatus of a foreign power and their implementation by the governmental machinery of the occupied Japan under the supervision of Occupation Administration. The endurance of these internationally induced domestic reforms has proved the case of the feasibility of a society to internalize values which were alien to it and were imposed from above by another power through such arrangements like military occupation after its defeat in a war. While obviously the single case of externally "Planned and directed" reorientation of Japanese society cannot be considered for establishing any generally valid proposition with respect to such a
complex problem, the immense experience gained over there cannot be discarded altogether.

After the withdrawal of Soviet Union from the world scene and the dramatic downfall of the socialist political systems, the equation of the impact of external environment and the consequent adaptability of the domestic politics in Japan once again came to light. The spirit of the domestic reforms introduced during the occupation is subjected to critical assessments and re-assessments. Trade war-fare between U.S. and Japan and the latter's much aired insignificant role in the maintenance of world order in commensurate with its economic strength was attributed to the "closed nature of Japanese society"¹, and its non-democratic character, where national policy is guided "by a tiny bureaucratic and political elite."²

Pressures are being mounted on Japan to adjust its social and political systems according to democratic norms. 'Structural Impediments Initiative Talks' between Japan and U.S. were conducted in that respect. The response of some Japanese scholars to the recent phase of Japan-bashing is that it was not motivated by the 'undemocratic' and 'closed nature' of Japanese society but by some other considerations. They felt that Japan-bashing was motivated by the fear of a rapid growth of


the Japanese economy and the macroeconomic imbalances it had caused, including within the U.S. In other words, the recent U.S. tirade against Japan has less to do with democratic commitments and is, in fact, a cover for action to make up for the bad performance of its own economy.

Thus, the common thrust of the views of both U.S. and Japan regarding the growing loss of cordiality in their mutual relations was the attempt of each of them to locate the crisis in the domestic setting of the other. This in turn sought structural adjustments in the domestic set-up of each other as a step towards harmonious relations and peaceful resolution of conflicts.

The recent changes in international relations catalyzed by reforms within the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe leading to the end of cold war have highlighted the importance of democratic institutions and values in the furtherance of world peace. In line with the tradition of U.S. Occupation the new emphasis is again on democratic institutions including protection of human rights. Different forms of interventions to promote these institutions and tendencies are being advanced as rightful strategy in the promotion of world peace. For instance, U.S. Secretary of State, James Baker laid down five principles (America's Panchsheel) for Russia and the former Soviet Republics to be followed as a precondition for any U.S. assistance. These principles

3 "Containment Jargon", n. 1, pp. 3-4.
4 Ibid, p. 3.
were: the future of the Soviet Union to be decided by its own people; respect for existing borders; peaceful change through democratic processes; respect for human rights (minority rights in this context); and respect for existing treaty commitments.5

But these strategies are seen by developing countries as unwarranted interference in their domestic affairs. They emphasized on national sovereignty. Such reactions have been expressed strongly in various Conferences of Heads of State, the Conferences of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministerial Meetings of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries.6 The principle of non-interference in the affairs (internal and external) of states has also been proclaimed in the charters of the Organization of American States, the League of Arab States, and the Organization of the African Unity.7 In relation to that effect, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution in December 1965, according to which, "no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, 5 Indian Express (New Delhi), September 15, 1991.


for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs of any other state..."

But the main concerns of world politics today are the effects of technology, environment degradation and violation of human rights. The implication of modern technology knows no boundaries and territorial demarcation among 'sovereign' states. Environmental hazards pose common threat to entire mankind. Communication networks and fast media services brought the peoples of the different parts of the world closer to one another. While these global concerns are shared by the peoples and governments in the Third World, and solutions to this as suggested by the developed nations are not acceptable to the developing nations. In the case of the developed nations the problems arise because of overdevelopment, while in the case of the developing countries the problems arise from underdevelopment. This has to be taken into account in any strategy of promoting global values in the society and politics of developing nations. Any artificial and mechanical inducements of global values in the Third World is not likely to have long terms developmental consequences. At the same time it is necessary to reform the time honoured social and political values which conflict with global concerns.

It is in this context that the present study of Japanese transformation under the Occupation Administration is relevant. Such modes of transformation are very costly both in economic and political terms and

It is an open question whether similar or other forms of intervention can be undertaken on a large scale with a view to create the necessary conditions for world peace.