

## EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

UNITED STATES policy toward East Asia has been one of the major fields of research and writing for Japanese specialists of American studies. Current issues in United States policy toward East Asia have always attracted the wide attention of the Japanese public. Although journalists and political analysts have been major participants in the discussion of current issues, some American studies specialists have joined in the discussion to provide it with historical perspectives. In the 1960's Makoto Saito wrote several essays which explained the character of contemporary American foreign policy in terms of the American political and diplomatic tradition.<sup>1</sup> Several other scholars discussed American East Asian policy in a broad historical context in the late 1960's and early 70's.<sup>2</sup> However, since sources were very limited for research on contemporary topics, scholars interested in America's Asian policy or Japanese-American relations tended to do most of their research on the years before Pearl Harbor.

In the 1950's a group of scholars affiliated with the Japan Association

<sup>1</sup> Those essays were collected in his *Amerika gaikō no ronri to genjitsu* [The Rhetoric and Reality of American Diplomacy] (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1962); also see his "Amerika no Ajia kan" (The American Way of Looking at Asia), *Shisō*, No. 503 (1966), pp. 1-11.

<sup>2</sup> Tomohisa Shimizu, "Amerika taigai seisaku ni okeru Ajia" [Asia in American Foreign Policy], *Shisō*, No. 500 (1966), pp. 1-10; Nagayo Homma, "Nichi-Bei kankei no rekishi teki yakusetsu" [Historical Ironies in Japan-U.S. Relations], *Chūō kōron*, Dec. 1967, pp. 50-65; Tadashi Aruga, "Nichi-Bei kankei ni okeru Chūgoku" [China in Japan-U.S. Relations], *ibid.*, Dec. 1972, pp. 80-96; and Akira Yamagiwa, "Amerika no sengo kōsō to Ajia" [America's Postwar Plan and Asia], *Sekai*, No. 370 (Sept. 1976), pp. 51-73.

of International Relations started a research project on the process leading to the Pacific War. The results of their research were published in the early 60's in an eight-volume series, *Taiheiyō sensō eno michi* [The Road to the Pacific War].<sup>3</sup> Its purpose was to analyze Japanese policy in the context of international as well as domestic politics. They paid due attention to the policy of other powers, and the policy of the United States toward Japan was dealt with in detail. Shigeo Fukuda, a participant in this cooperative project, later published a book, *Amerika no tai-Nichi sansen* [America's Entry into the War against Japan], mainly an outgrowth of his research for the project.<sup>4</sup> The multi-volume cooperative work was selectively translated into English and published by the Columbia University Press.<sup>5</sup>

On the basis of their achievements exemplified by *Taiheiyō sensō eno michi*, Japanese scholars were able to organize a joint research project with American scholars on Japanese-United States relations in the pre-Pearl Harbor decade. A conference was held at the foot of Mt. Fuji in the summer of 1969. The papers submitted to the conference were compiled subsequently and published in book form both in Japanese and in English. The English edition was published by the Columbia University Press with the title *Pearl Harbor as History*.<sup>6</sup> As a sequence to that joint project, another research project was organized to reexamine Japanese-United States relations in the 1920's from fresh viewpoints, and a conference with American colleagues was held in Hawaii in 1975. The result of this project was published in Japanese with the title *Washinton taisei to Nichi-Bei kankei* [The Washington System and Japanese-American Relations].<sup>7</sup> An English edition is to be published in the near future.

Chihiro Hosoya, a prominent Japanese diplomatic historian and the promoter of these joint research projects on the Japanese side, wrote in the 1950's and 60's several articles and books which touched upon

<sup>3</sup> Research Group on the Causes of the Pacific War, Japan Association of International Relations, ed. (8 vols., Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun-sha, 1962-63).

<sup>4</sup> (Kyoto: Minerva Shobo, 1967).

<sup>5</sup> James Morley, ed., *Japan's Road to the Pacific War: Deterrent Diplomacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976). Other volumes are expected to follow.

<sup>6</sup> Chihiro Hosoya, Makoto Saito, Seiichi Imai and Michio Royama, eds., *Nichi-Bei kankei-shi: 1931-1941* [A History of Japan-U.S. Relations: 1931-1941] (4 vols., Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1971-72). The English version was edited by Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto and published in 1975.

<sup>7</sup> Chihiro Hosoya and Makoto Saito, eds., (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1978).

America's Asia policy. He dealt with such topics as the American response to the Twenty-one Demands, the Siberian intervention in the context of Japanese-United States relations, the Russian problem at the Paris Peace Conference, and America's failure in deterring the Japanese war drive in 1939–41.<sup>8</sup> In all of those articles, Hosoya analyzed the political process by combining the dynamics of international politics with the dynamics of domestic politics in the respective countries. Focus on interaction of domestic and international politics characterizes his diplomatic history.

Sadao Asada, another diplomatic historian, wrote extensively on Japanese-United States relations, especially of the 1920's and 30's. His "Nichi-Bei kankei to imin mondai" [The Immigration Problem and Japanese-American Relations] discusses the problem of Japanese immigration not simply as a diplomatic issue but also as a cultural problem, analyzing comparatively the Japanese and American political cultures and their respective perceptions of the outside world. "Washinton kaigi o meguru Nichi-Bei no seisaku kettei katei no hikaku" [A Comparative Study of the Japanese and American Decision Making Process at the Time of the Washington Conference], another essay by Asada, is a detailed comparative analysis of the decision making process for naval limitation in the two governments.<sup>9</sup>

During the 1960's, only a few notable books were published with regard to American policy toward Asia. One was Volume One of *Nichi-*

<sup>8</sup> "Nijūichi-jō yōkyū to Amerika no taiō" [The Twenty-One Demands and American Response], *Hitotsubashi ronsō*, Hitotsubashi Gakkai, Vol. 43, no. 1 (1953), pp. 28–50; *Shiberia shuppei no shiteki kenkyū* [The Siberian Intervention: A Historical Study], (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1955); "Verusaiyu heiwa kaigi to Rosia mondai" [The Russian Problem in the Versailles Peace Conference], *Hōgaku kenkyū*, Hitotsubashi U., Vol. 2 (1959), pp. 59–122, "Shiberia shuppei o meguru Nichi-Bei kankei" [The Siberian Intervention in Japan-U.S. Relations], *Kokusaiseiji*, No. 17 (1961), pp. 73–90, both reprinted in his *Rosia kakumei to Nihon* [The Russian Revolution and Japan] (Tokyo: Hara Shobo, 1972); and "Nichi-Bei kankei no hakyoku, 1939–1941" [The Breakdown of Japan-U.S. Relations, 1939–1941], *Hitotsubashi ronsō*, Vol. 54, no. 1 (1965), pp. 55–79.

<sup>9</sup> "Nichi-Bei kankei to imin mondai" was published in Makoto Saito, et al., eds., *Demokurashi to Nichi-Bei kankei* [Democracy and Japan-U.S. Relations] (*Nihon to Amerika—Hikaku bunka ron*, Vol. 2), (Tokyo: Nan'undo, 1973), pp. 161–210; and "Washinton kaigi o meguru Nichi-Bei no seisaku kettei katei no hikaku" in Chihiro Hosoya and Joji Watanuki, eds., *Taigai seisaku kettei katei no Nichi-Bei hikaku* [A Comparative Study of the Foreign Policy Decision-making Process in Japan and the United States] (University of Tokyo Press, 1977), pp. 419–464. There are several other well-researched articles on U.S. East Asian policy in the 1920's by Shinkichi Eto, Masataka Kosaka, Tadashi Aruga and Takeshi Matsuda.

*Bei kankei no kenkyu* [Studies in Japanese-American Relations] edited by Yasaka Takagi.<sup>10</sup> Others were works by Fuji Kamiya and Hiroshi Yamada.<sup>11</sup>

It was in the last decade that Japanese scholars began to study in detail United States policy towards Asia in the early postwar years. Anticipating the rapid archival opening of wartime and postwar official American documents and other primary sources, Yonosuke Nagai, a political scientist who had written several books on contemporary international politics, took the initiative in 1972 in planning a research project to study the international environment of postwar Japan. He obtained the cooperation of a number of prominent scholars to organize the research project and secured a research grant of the Ministry of Education for three years. In 1975, Nagai and his associates held in Kyoto an international symposium on the international environment of postwar Japan, inviting a number of leading scholars from abroad, mostly from the United States. The papers submitted to the symposium, edited by Nagai and Akira Iriye, were published in English in book form in 1977.<sup>12</sup> Works by major participants in the project began to be published in Japanese in 1978 in a series called *Sōsho kokusai kankyō* [Studies in International Environment]. Five of the ten volumes of the first installment have been published so far.<sup>13</sup>

Nagai's own book, *Reisen no kigen* [The Origins of the Cold War], was published in 1978. From the last chapter of the book, "The Korean War: A Cold-War Pearl Harbor," an article is adapted for this journal. The contents of Nagai's book are not limited to a discussion of origins of the Cold War. The book discusses various issues of American policy and international politics from the World War II years through the Korean War. Although Nagai extensively cites primary sources in the book, detailed documentation is not its major strength. Like his previous works, *Reisen no kigen* is characterized by esoteric but attractive

<sup>10</sup> Volume One is composed of four articles on U.S. policy toward Japan, written by Yoshimitsu Ide, Tadashi Aruga, Nagayo Homma and Yasukichi Yasuba. Volume Two is devoted to the analysis of Japanese images of and opinions about America. Volume One was published by University of Tokyo Press in 1968.

<sup>11</sup> Kamiya, *Gendai kokusai seiji no shikaku* [A View of Contemporary International Politics] (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1966) and Yamada, *Amerika no sekai seisaku to Nihon* [United States Global Policy and Japan] (Kyoto: Horitsu-Bunka sha, 1967).

<sup>12</sup> *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (University of Tokyo Press and Columbia University Press, 1977).

<sup>13</sup> This series is published by Chuo Koron-sha in Tokyo.

concepts, brilliant rhetoric and perceptive observations.<sup>14</sup> His discussion of George F. Kennan's famous "long telegram" dispatched from Moscow in February 1946 may serve as a case in point. The telegram, Nagai argues, was a call for action to prevent the "virus" germinated deep in the core of the Soviet system from "infecting" surrounding areas. He discerns in this telegram "geopolitics expressed in an epidemiological metaphor." He concludes that this telegram could exert profound influence in Washington because of its "epidemiological geopolitics," which was rooted in the traditional American ethos characterized by a sense of geographical separation and a notion of uncontaminated innocence.

The other four books already published in this series are Akira Iriye's *Nichi-Bei sensō* [The Japanese-American War], Nagayo Homma's *Amerika seiji no chōryū* [Trends in American Politics], Mineo Nakajima's *Chū-So tairitsu to gendai* [Sino-Soviet Conflicts and the Contemporary World], and Shigeo Fukuda's *Dainiji taisen no Bei gunji senryaku* [U.S. Military Strategy in the Second World War]. Among them, the most relevant to our theme is Iriye's *Nichi-Bei sensō*. As usual, Iriye combined in this book ample archival research with a broad historical perspective. Although this book retains his usual multilateral framework, it focuses on Japan and the United States, comparing their visions of international order. The term "Nichi-Bei sensō," it seems to me, is used here for the first time. Iriye's emphasis is upon similarity, not difference, between the approaches of the two nations toward international affairs. Both entered into the modern international arena as capitalist nations; both began to pursue imperialist policies in the 1890's; both espoused the policy of international cooperation and peaceful expansion in the 1920's; both strayed from that course toward a unilateral way in the 1930's; and then they came into collision in the Japanese-American War when the United States returned to the policy of internationalism. Even during the war years, Iriye argues, the visions of the world order enunciated by the two nations were not so different. Comparing such documents as the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of Greater East Asia, he points out certain similarities in ideas. This comparison of the two documents is very unique. Although his point is

<sup>14</sup> His previous publications include *Heiwa no daishō* [The Price of Peace] (Tokyo: Chuo Koron-sha, 1967), *Jūkōzō shakai to bōryoku* [Societies with a flexible Structure and the Problem of Violence] (Chuo Koron-sha, 1971), *Takyoku seikai no kōzō* [The Structure of the Multi-polar World] (Chuo Koron-sha, 1973).

debatable, no doubt he raises a very interesting point for discussion. Iriye also maintains that American leaders were rather optimistic during the war about the postwar reconstruction of a peaceful, friendly Japan since they knew such a Japan had once existed. It is his conclusion that the continuation of friendly Japanese-United States relations in the postwar decades was possible because the two nations had pursued similar policies and had shared the same ideals in the past.<sup>15</sup>

Another volume in the same series, Makoto Iokibe's *Beikoku no tai-Nichi senryō seisaku* [The Making of U.S. Occupation Policy toward Japan] will soon come out. A scholar who had studied modern Japanese political history, Iokibe began in the early 70's to work on the wartime planning of U.S. occupation policy toward Japan. Although his book is not published yet, Iokibe has published several articles on the subject.<sup>16</sup> The article which appears here in this journal is an English version of one of his recent publications. In this article, Iokibe discusses the meaning of the term "unconditional surrender" and examines the origin of the policy to demand "unconditional surrender." He then traces how U.S. policy evolved toward the Potsdam Declaration. Since neither the concept of unconditional surrender nor the origin and evolution of "unconditional surrender" policy has been much scrutinized, it is hoped that this article makes a valuable contribution to illuminating an aspect of the wartime policy of the United States. In another article published very recently, Iokibe discusses the Cairo Declaration, another important declaration by the heads of the Allied Powers regarding Japan. He points out in this article that the opinion of East Asian specialists in the State Department had no influence upon American policy at the Cairo and Teheran Conferences, that Roosevelt was primarily concerned with securing a system of long-term cooperation with the major allies, not with defending the principles of the Atlantic Charter, that he therefore was quite in favor of offering Chiang the Ryukyus and Stalin the Kuriles to satisfy their territorial ambitions, and that only because of Chiang's

<sup>15</sup> The English version, *Power and Culture: The Japanese-American War, 1941-1945* has just been published by Harvard University Press.

<sup>16</sup> "Beikoku ni okeru tai-Nichi senryō seisaku no keisei katei" [The Process of the Planning of U.S. Policy toward Japan], *Kokusaihō gaikō zasshi*, Vol. 74, no. 3, 4 (1975), pp. 191-252, 343-372; "'Mujōken kōfuku' to Potsudamu sengen," *ibid.*, Vol. 79, no. 5 (1980), pp. 469-510 (translated in this journal); "Kairo sengen to Nihon no ryōdo" [The Cairo Declaration and the Problem of Japanese Territory], *Hiroshima Hōgaku*, Hiroshima University, Vol. 4, nos. 3-4 (1981), pp. 339-407. See Asada's review article, note 33.

declining the offer, were the Ryukyus not included in the territories to be ceded to China.

In studying postwar United States policy toward East Asia, Japanese scholars naturally paid major attention to her policy toward Japan. A joint research project on the occupation of Japan, organized by Robert E. Ward and Yoshikazu Sakamoto, has been completed. Its results are awaiting publication.<sup>17</sup> Among a number of excellent studies which appeared in Japan in the last ten years, Ikuhiko Hata's *Amerika no tai-Nichi senryō seisaku* [American Occupation Policy toward Japan]<sup>18</sup> is most significant. This voluminous work, using extensively U.S. primary sources, describes the formulation and development of the occupation policy within the context of the overall American foreign policy. He also published a smaller book, *Shiroki Nihon sai-gumbi* [A History of Japanese Re-armament], as a by-product of his research for the work cited above.<sup>19</sup> This essay will not go into further detail about his work, because Hata's books, together with other important Japanese books on the Occupation, are to be discussed in the review article by Sadao Asada.

For this issue of our journal, the Editorial Board selected an article by Takeshi Igarashi on the early phase of the development of American policy on the peace settlement with Japan. This is one of the four articles he wrote on American policy toward Japan during the Occupation Period.<sup>20</sup> Combining his insights as a political scientist as well as a historian, Igarashi analyzes how the policy making process began to

<sup>17</sup> The Japanese edition is to be published by University of Tokyo Press. The English edition will be published probably by Princeton University Press.

<sup>18</sup> Hata's *Amerika no tai-Nichi senryō seisaku* was published in 1976 by Toyo Keizai Shimpo-sha as Volume 3 of *Showa zaisei-shi: Sengo-hen* [A History of Finance of the Showa Era: Postwar Years], a series edited by Ōkurashō zaisei-shi shitsu [Financial History Staff, Ministry of Finance].

<sup>19</sup> (Tokyo: Bungei Shunju Shin-sha, 1976).

<sup>20</sup> "Tainichi kōwa no teishō to hankyō-kan no isō" [MacArthur's Proposal of a Japanese Peace Treaty and his Anti-Communist View], *Kokusai mondai*, No. 196 (July 1976), pp. 41–59; "Tainichi kōwa no teishō to tai-Nichi senryō seisaku no tenkan" *Shisō*, No. 628 (October 1976), pp. 21–43 (translated in this journal); "Tai-Nichi senryō seisaku no tenkan to reisen—Tai-Nichi keizai fukkō seisaku no ritsuan o chūshin ni shite—," [Re-direction of the Occupation Policy and the Cold War], and "Jōji Kenan to tai-Nichi senryō seisaku no tenkan" [George F. Kennan and the Re-direction of the Occupation Policy], both in Takafusa Nakamura, ed., *Senryō-ki Nihon no keizai to seiji* (Japanese Economy and Politics during the Occupation Period) (University of Tokyo Press, 1979), pp. 25–57, 59–86. He read revised and extended versions of the last article listed above at the Amherst Conference on the Occupation of Japan (Aug. 1980) and at the University of Maryland's Japan Seminar (Feb. 1981).

evolve in Washington on the question of the peace settlement with Japan in response to General MacArthur's proposal for an early peace and how American policy on the question was integrated into her overall Cold War policy. In another article he analyzes major factors that stimulated change in the occupation policy and points out that the change was caused not simply by the Cold War factor but also by such factors as SCAP's concern with the tardiness of economic recovery, the impact of the creation of the Bizonia in Germany, the American desire to reduce the cost of the occupation, and the emergence of the economy-minded, Republican-dominated Congress.

Another recent article on United States policy toward Japan in the same period is Eiichi Shindo's "Bunkatsu sareta ryōdo: Okinawa, Chishima, sosite Ampo" [The Islands Divided: Japanese Territory, the Soviet Spectre, and American Bases, 1945–1948].<sup>21</sup> Written for an opinion journal for the general public, this article adopts a polemical style. But it is based on archival research. In this article, Shindo argues that the Cold War situation surrounding Japan was created not by the Russians who initially sought cooperation with the United States on Japanese affairs, but by the American confrontationists who won against the cooperationists in shaping Washington's Japan policy. He also argues that the emerging ruling group of postwar Japan opted to collaborate with Washington's confrontationists to seal the fate of the Ryukyus. To reinforce his argument, Shindo quotes the so-called "Emperor's message," conveyed to William Sebald by Hidenari Terasaki, which favored a long-term lease of the main island of Okinawa to the United States for military use. In this connection, however, Seigen Miyasato comments that the arrangement suggested by the message did not satisfy Washington's interest in the Ryukyus. The military, he says, did not show any interest in the proposal; the State Department showed some interest first, but rejected it later.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> *Sekai*, No. 401 (April 1979), pp. 31–51. Shindo read the English version of this article, "The Islands Divided: Japanese Territory, the Soviet Spectre, and American Bases, 1945–1948," at the meeting of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations and the Amherst Conference on the Occupation of Japan, both held in August 1980.

<sup>22</sup> Miyasato's interpretation is presented in his essay serialized in the *Okinawa Taimusu* (Naha, Okinawa), June 20–24, 1971. He is the author of *Amerika no Okinawa tōchi* [America's Rule in Okinawa] (Tokyo, Iwanami, 1966). His new book, *Amerika no taigai seisaku kettei katei—Okinawa Betonamu* [U.S. Foreign Policy Decision Making Process: Okinawa and Vietnam] will be published by Sanichi Shobo in the fall of 1981. For Shindo's supplementary discussion of the Emperor's message, see *Sekai*, No. 407



Chihiro Hosoya, whose name has been mentioned in this introductory essay, is working on a book which analyzes the international political process leading to the San Francisco peace settlement. His article which appears in this issue of the journal is a part of his book-length study in progress. Following Igarashi's article, Hosoya's traces the development of American policy on the peace settlement with Japan from September 1949 to January 1951. He emphasizes the key importance of a series of meetings held in Tokyo in June 1950 in the process of consensus making within the United States government on the question of a Japanese peace treaty. He also points out that official Washington, shocked by the disastrous retreat of U.N. forces in Korea, began to feel in December 1950 the necessity of paying some higher price to induce Japan to become an American ally.

Studies of America's East Asian policy in the early postwar years have by no means been limited to her Japan policy. They have paid considerable attention to her policy toward Korea. Seizaburo Shinobu, a highly respected leftist-oriented political historian, wrote an article and then a book on the Korean War which caused considerable controversy among the Japanese scholars on the left by refuting their thesis that the war was started by American imperialists and their Korean clients.<sup>23</sup> He argued instead that the war was started by the North Koreans as a war of national liberation. Fuji Kamiya, author of a concise book on the Korean War, edited a three-volume documentary collection on post-World War Korean affairs, in which due attention was given to American policy toward Korea.<sup>24</sup> Masao Okonogi, a younger specialist in Korean affairs, has been working on the Korean War. Part of his work is known to foreign scholars to some extent through his articles published in English.<sup>25</sup> Very recently, he published an article, "Beikoku

---

(Oct. 1979), pp. 104–13. He maintains that these facts pointed out by Miyasato do not affect the validity of his central contention.

<sup>23</sup> *Chōsen sensō no boppatsu* [The Outbreak of the Korean War] (Tokyo: Fukumura, 1965).

<sup>24</sup> *Chōsen sensō* [The Korean War] (Tokyo: Chuo Koron-sha, 1966), *Chōsen mondai sengo shiryō* [Documents on the Korean Affairs, 1945–65] (3 vols., Tokyo: Nihon Kokusai Mondai Kenkyūjo, 1976–80).

<sup>25</sup> "The Domestic Roots of the Korean War" in Nagai and Iriye, eds., *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia*, pp. 299–320; and "The Shifting Strategic Value of Korea, 1942–1950," *Korean Studies*, Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii, Vol. 3 (1979), pp. 49–80.

no Chōsen seisaku: 1947–49” [U.S. Policy toward Korea: 1947–49].<sup>26</sup> He emphasizes ambivalence in America’s Korea policy in those years. It was so because involvement was politically desirable, whereas withdrawal was militarily preferable. He considers the adoption of such documents as NSC 8 and 8/2 as Washington’s attempt to pursue a middle course that was neither total involvement nor total withdrawal. Its sequences are expected to follow.

Strangely, there are few significant works by Japanese scholars on American policy toward China in the early postwar years. There are several good articles such as the one by Shigeru Usami, but they are limited in scope or based on limited research.<sup>27</sup> As for American policy toward Southeast Asia, we have a series of well-researched articles by Seigen Miyasato.<sup>28</sup> A political scientist interested in the foreign policy decision making processes, Miyasato applied his framework to these studies in American Southeast Asia policy. All of his articles were published in English. Since they appeared in *Ryūdai hōgaku*, a publication of the University of the Ryukyus, the circulation of which is very limited, this journal’s Editorial Board considered it appropriate to publish one of his articles here in shortened form. Relying on archival sources and his interviews with some of the former State Department officials, Miyasato finely reconstructs the policymaking process in the State Department with a focus on intra-departmental conflict between “globalists” and “regionalists,” which ended in the victory of the

<sup>26</sup> Published in *Hōgaku kenkyū*, Keio University, Vol. 54, no. 3 (Mar. 1981), pp. 449–470.

<sup>27</sup> The most recent among them is Shigeru Usami, “Styuato taishi no Pekin hōmon keikaku” [Ambassador Stuart’s Plan to Visit Peking], *Kokusai mondai*, No. 198 (September 1976), pp. 45–61. Akira Yamagiwa wrote a good short article on the policymaking process of the China Aid Act of 1948. See his article in Makoto Saito and Mitsuo Fukaya, eds., *Amerika taigai seisaku kettei to gikai* [Congress in U.S. Foreign Policymaking] (Tokyo: Nihon Kokusai Mondai Kenkyūjo, 1965). Yamagiwa mainly dealt with the World War years. See also “Chūgoku kyosantō no han-bei rosen no kakuritsu katei” [The Consolidation of the Anti-American Posture of the Chinese Communist Party] in Shinkichi Eto and Masataka Banno, eds., *Chūgoku o meguru kokusai seiji* [China in International Relations] (University of Tokyo Press, 1968).

<sup>28</sup> “The Roosevelt Administration and Indochina—An Analysis from Bureaucratic Perspectives,” *Ryūdai hōgaku*, No. 23 (October 1978), pp. 73–128; “The Truman Administration and Indochina—Three Case Studies,” *ibid.*, No. 24 (December 1978), pp. 49–109; “The Truman Administration and Indonesian Independence—Case Studies—,” *ibid.*, No. 25 (September 1979), pp. 69–128. The Japanese version of these essays will be included in his book, *Amerika no taigai seisaku kettei katei—Okinawa Betonamu* (cf. footnote 22). *Ryūdai hōgaku* is also referred to as *Ryudai Law Review*.

former. Like Igarashi's, Miyasato's article illuminates the process in which American policy toward a particular country or area was integrated into the overall Cold War policy. It is expected that he will write a book on the basis of these published articles.

The five articles which appear in this first issue of the journal are only a small portion of the Japanese works on the theme, "United States Policy toward East Asia: 1945-50." However, they may serve as samples of Japanese scholarship in this field. It is hoped that this brief introduction can provide interested foreign scholars with an overview of the present state of Japanese scholarship on United States policy toward East Asia in the early postwar years. The editors and the members of the Editorial Board would be very happy if foreign scholars interested in U.S. foreign policy could find the first issue of this journal stimulating and useful.

TADASHI ARUGA  
EDITOR