SCHOOLING FOR DEMOCRACY?:
THE CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OF EDUCATION
IN OKINAWA, 1945-1972

By

So Mizoguchi

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

History- Doctor of Philosophy

2018

ABSTRACT

SCHOOLING FOR DEMOCRACY?:
THE CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OF EDUCATION IN OKINAWA, 1945-1972

By

So Mizoguchi

This dissertation analyzes U.S. policy on higher education during the American occupation of Okinawa. As the rise of the Cold War shaped the character of the Ryukyu Islands, postwar educational rehabilitation was positioned as the basis of an ideological battle between the United States and the Soviet Union. Among educational rehabilitation projects, the University of the Ryukyus Project was a centerpiece of Cold War educational policy. The U.S. military expected that the university would consistently educate new pro-American elite groups. With the scope of education policy expanding, however, the military was forced to handle many issues which required advanced academic skill. To accelerate the reconstruction process, the Army sought assistance from outside experts. MSU was selected as the mentor of the University of the Ryukyus because its excellent curricula satisfied the Army's requirement of practical programs.

While many scholarly works argue that postwar Okinawa succeeded in developing a democratic educational system, Okinawans were in fact disillusioned with American educational system because undemocratic practices and wide-spread racial and economic discrimination raised uncomfortable feelings in Okinawan society. Ironically, Okinawan teachers and the students of the university became the vanguard of the restoration movement in Okinawa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted to numerous institutions and people for their help and support over the course of writing this dissertation. The bulk of the research for this project was financially supported by Michigan State University, Rikkyo University, The Konosuke Matsushita Memorial Foundation, and Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, which allowed me to conduct my research in many places in the United States and Japan. The staff at U.S. National Archives, the Rockefeller Archival Center, University Archives & Historical Collections of Michigan State University, the National Diet Library in Tokyo, Diplomatic Archives of Japan, the Okinawa Prefectural Library, the Okinawa Prefectural Archives, Hosei University Institute for Okinawan Studies, University of the Ryukyus Library, and Rikkyo University Library provided valuable assistance.

My foremost intellectual obligation is to the great scholars I had the good fortune to work with as a graduate student. Takuya Sasaki introduced me to ways of thinking and pushed me to grow as a scholar. Even after I graduated from Rikkyo University, he politely inquired about my progress on dissertation and generously offered support and advice. Mary Ann Heiss helped me to broaden my scope to encompass the discipline of history. She listened to my ideas and then improved on them. Sayuri Guthrie Shimizu gave me a model of excellence in scholarship and teaching. Her multilingualism, imaginative thinking, and encyclopedic knowledge of U.S.-Japan relations are awe-inspiring.

The history department at Michigan State University provided a supportive environment to complete this dissertation. The members of my dissertation committee---Michael Stamm (chair), Charles Keith, Sidney Lu, and Aminda Smith--- were paramount in sharpening my historical

understandings of social movements, the politics of identity, and colonialism. All of them are exemplars of scholarly rigors and personal integrity. Michael Stamm, particularly, kindly read every chapters of the earlier version of the manuscript and gave me invaluable suggestions and insights which are reflected in my arguments in this dissertation. I am grateful to Pero G. Dagbovie, Malcolm Magee, Edward Murphy, Dean Rehberger, and Ethan Segal for their many kindnesses. I also owe special thanks to the extraordinary history department staff: Deb Greer, Jeanna Norris, and graduate secretary Elyse Hansen.

I was fortunate to share my graduate life with many talented and generous friends. I am grateful to David Bennett, Sara Bijani, Eddie Bonilla, Beth Dutridge-Corp, Emily Elliott, Ryan Huey, Kathryn Lankford, Carolyn Pratt, Richard Mares, John Somerville, Liz Timbs, and Adrienne Tyrey. Jacob Jurss and Brian Van Wyck read a part of this drafts and gave me insightful suggestions. My life in East Lansing would not have been more enjoyable without John Milstead and Amanda Milstead's generous hospitality. Shaonan Liu and Liao Zhang's friendships are wonderful gifts. It is hard to know how to thanks Helen Kaibara, and Jess McLeod, who always supported my grad school life abroad.

My experiences in Okinawa was greatly enriched by the kindness of Masaaki Gabe, Yoko Fujita, Ayano Ginoza, and all of the scholars and staff at International Institute for Okinawan Studies of University of the Ryukyus. Their intellectual generosity and friendship helped me to enhance the quality of my research.

During my graduate studies I had the good fortune to meet dozens of scholars at conferences and events whose perspective and encouragement enriched my education. I would like especially thanks to Keith L. Camacho, Brian Masaru Hayashi, Takeshi Iida, Kohei

Kawakami, Seung-Young Kim, Itsuki Kurashina, Asuka Matsumoto, Saho Matsumoto, Takayuki Nishiyama, Jun Sakurada, Alessandra Sarquis, Yuka Tsuchiya, Yoshitsugu Kosuke, and Hidekazu Wakatsuki. Their friendly critiques and comments have made this dissertation much better.

My colleagues, friends, and teachers of the college of law and politics at Rikkyo University have enriched my life and work with their advice and support. I owe thanks to Kunio Miyokawa, Ryo Nakai (now, at the University of Kitakyushu), Mizuki Nagami, Junichiro Shiratori, Amuro Wakasa, and Go Cheol Woong. Other mentors in the college of law and politics helped along the way. Among those who pushed me to grow as a researcher are Yusuke Ando, Hisashi Harada, Yoshiya Ichinose, Akio Igarashi, Sohn Jeyong, Osamu Kawasaki, Toru Kurata, Koichiro Matsuda, Masataka Matsuura, Koji Nakakita (now at Hitotsubashi University), Ariyoshi Ogawa, Chiharu Takenaka, Lee Jong Wong (now at Waseda University), and Tomoya Yoshioka.

There are also other friends and mentors who have helped, directly and indirectly, strengthen and improved my arguments. I owe special thanks to Aki Asai, Jason Csehi, Fumitaka Cho, Nathan Fly, Julie Green, Keisuke Ida, Patti Kameya, Hideaki Kami, Hongshan Li, Michel and Kimiko Lynch, Marlene J. Mayo, Ralph Menning, Jerry and Nancy Naughton, Satoshi Niijima, Yusuke Nishizumi, Elizabeth Omar, Karin Rosemblatt, Elizabeth Smith-Pryor, Richard Steigmann-Gall, Jon T. Sumida, Kazutoshi Tamari, Yoo In Tae, Shojiro Yakushimaru, Chen Yue, Wu Yujiang, Megumi Watanabe, Clarence E. Wunderlin, Jr and Sarah Zabic.

Lastly, my family has always been supportive me during this time. Without my mother and my brother's help, I would not have finished this dissertation. I only regret not to be able to show the dissertation to my father, Hajime.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Throughout the twentieth century, the U.S. has exerted considerable influence across the world. As its position in global politics rose, those who subscribe to American exceptionalism asserted that the U.S. had a duty to preserve and enhance its principles of democracy, the free market, and respect for liberty, drawing from the strength of its extensive military capacity. Such interpretations have sometimes resulted in successful regime changes, such as those occurring in West Germany and Japan after World War II. Education, political ideology, and the Cold War share an interwoven, yet convoluted history. The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze how postwar Okinawan higher education policies are intertwined with the U.S. occupation of Okinawa.

The military discourse manifested huge progress towards democratic education under U.S. tutelage. In the case of Okinawan occupation, the U.S. military government proclaimed that the postwar education in Okinawa aimed at the full development of a liberal mentality among indigenous people. Establishment of the first university in Okinawa, the University of the Ryukyus was a paragon of democratic education in the postwar Okinawa. In fact, the University of the Ryukyus was organized to resemble the American university system, which has been tried to live up to the motto, "academy of freedom."[1] The incessant growth of student enrollments at

*In accordance with Japanese practice, the surname is placed first in all Japanese names, except in referring to published work in English where the author's name is given in the reverse order.

[1] Arnold G. Fisch, *Military Government in the Ryukyu Islands 1945-50* (Washington D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1988), 96-102.

the University of the Ryukyus meant that soft power worked differently as military bases has been highlighted a hallmark of hard power.

American cultural expansion abroad has been analyzed through the lens of cultural diplomacy. Cultural-diplomatic propaganda came to be presented as an evidence of the superiority of the American Way of life.[2] The Cold War changed public understanding of cultural diplomacy. Although cultural infiltration usually remained on the periphery of America's Cold War strategy, as many studies note, cultural infiltrations became a component of national security policy.[3] Numerous official agencies such as the Department of State, the United State Information Agency (USIA), and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) associated with cultural diplomacy, but the Army underestimated the importance of cultural activities. In fact, the State Department and the former military civil affairs officers doubted the administrative skill of the military government and its ability to successfully engaged in cultural-diplomatic activities

The rise of transnational approaches raised the value of non-governmental actors in the field of the U.S. cultural diplomacy. As a scholar of English literature Greg Barnhisel remarks, the United States has relied on the private sector such as foundations, businesses, and professional organization for its cultural-diplomatic activities.[4] Okinawa is no exception. Therefore, rather than examining the processes of the educational policies proposed by the U.S. military government, this dissertation focuses on non-governmental cultural and social activities in

[2] Greg Barnhisel, *Cold War Modernists; Art, Literature, & American Cultural Diplomacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 2-3.
[3] See, Walter L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle of Home and Abroad* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006); Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Gregory M. Tomlin, *Murrow's Cold War: Public Diplomacy for the Kennedy Administration* (Lincoln: Potomac Book, 2016).
[4] Barnhisel, op. cit., 12.

Okinawa, especially the role of Michigan State University (MSU) advisory groups in the University of the Ryukyus Project.

Since Truman's Point Four Speech in 1949, American universities became involved in international educational programs. For the United States, international education programs were a great opportunity to teach indigenous people how to understand the American way of life. However, it is an inevitable truth that not all academics were ideal mentors as the representatives of the United States. Little interest in indigenous culture and history and little motivation among American advisory groups led to poor performance in many projects.[5]

In war-devastated Okinawa, reconstructing higher education meant not only advancing the pedagogy of democracy but also providing practical programs, such as English, agriculture, and science, to promising youth who would make significant contributions to Okinawan society. Since the U.S. military government lacked experienced civil affairs officers who were properly trained in such efforts, it sought advice from academia. Seven academic institutions in the U.S. contended for the role, including MSU. Due to its excellent curricula in agriculture, home economics, and pedagogy, the military government considered MSU to be the best mentor for the fledgling University of the Ryukyus. Founded as the Agricultural College of the State of Michigan in 1855, MSU had grown to be a leading land-grant institution in the U.S. MSU played a special leadership role in the educational programs of several developing countries, such as Columbia, Pakistan, and South Vietnam.[6] While MSU went on to make significant contributions to Okinawan social reform, few studies have examined the interactions between the U.S. military

[5] Walter Adams, *Is the World Our Campus?* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960), ix, 82.
[6] See Robert Scigliano and Guy H. Fox, *Technical Assistance in Vietnam: The Michigan State University Experience* (New York: Fredrick A. Praeger Publishers, 1965); Ralph H. Smuckler, *A University Turns to the World* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003).

government and MSU advisory group.[7] Many educational rehabilitation projects were financially dependent on the U.S. military government, but MSU educators recognized that the pedagogy of democracy could not be implemented in Okinawa without painstaking efforts on their part.

By inquiring into the relationships between the U.S. civil affairs officers and MSU faculty members, this dissertation reveals that the postwar revival of Okinawan higher education was a byproduct of the military–academic complex. The research outcomes will contribute to the transnationalization of U.S. occupation history by integrating the social and cultural activities of non-governmental institutions into the study of military occupation. The broader implication of this research can be found in the transformation of South Vietnam and other countries that was driven by the military–academic complex.

Considering MSU's leading role in the field of international education, the University of the Ryukyus Project was a Cold War-era prototype of the military–academic complex, which provides many excellent opportunities to examine the complexity of U.S.–Okinawa relations. The rise of the Cold War in East Asia and the Korean War caused the Truman administration to shift from minimizing reconstruction to constructing a garrison colony in the Ryukyu Islands. This new phase of the rehabilitation and recovery of Okinawa, which combined the initiative to retain long-term military bases with Cold War educational programs for indigenous people, led the University of the Ryukyus to depend on the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR). USCAR attempted to curb communist ideology and propagate American democracy in Okinawa; however, the goals of public diplomacy are not always parallel with the realities of political and military priorities. Like many citizens of developing countries, the Okinawans

[7] See Yamazato Katsunori, *Ryudaimonogatari 1947–1972* (Naha: Ryukyu Shinposha, 2012); Ogawa Tadashi, *Sengobeikoku no Okinawabunkasenryaku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012); Mire Koikari, *Cold War Encounters in US-Occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity, and Transnationalism in East Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

became disillusioned with American democratic principles, as the U.S. military government engaged in undemocratic practices and perpetrated economic and racial discrimination against the indigenous Okinawans under the guise of paternalistic guidance. Okinawans called the hypocrisy of the occupation into question, complaining that U.S. military personnel treated them like second-class citizens. These frustrations gave rise to the anti-military-base protests of the 1950s and the anti-Vietnam-War movements of the 1960s, which have become the main focus of the literature on U.S.–Okinawa relations.

Many scholars conclude that American occupation policy was responsible for many blunders in Okinawa.[8] While the military presence caused much of the friction in U.S.–Okinawa relations, the present research will reveal that both the American and Okinawan experiences of occupation were so complex that neither pro- nor anti-Americanism discourses can illustrate the whole picture. If Okinawans hated America and were uncooperative during the occupation era, why did Okinawan society recover from the devastation so quickly, and why has American culture spread in postwar Okinawa society? For example, Okinawan protesters invoked the principles of democracy when demanding human rights, which the military officials claimed they were restoring in the Ryukyu Islands.

As recent studies of cultural history reveal, the affluence of American consumer society and images of American democracy were so attractive that these phenomena spread beyond national borders.[9] The development of mass media, such as newspapers, radio, TV, and cinema,

---

[8] See Nakano Yoshio and Arasaki Moriteshi, *Sengo Okinawashi* (Tokyo:Iwanami Shoten, 1976); Kensei Yochida, *Democracy Betrayed: Okinawa Under U.S. Occupation*. (Bellingham: Center for East Asian Studies, West Washington University, n.d. 2002); Yakabi Osamu, *Okinawasen, beigunsenryoshi wo manabinaosu: kioku wo ikani keisyosuruka* (Yokohama: Seori Shobo, 2009).

9 See Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion 1890-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982); Julio Moreno, *Yankee Don't Go Home!: Mexican Nationalism, American Business Culture, and the Shaping of Modern Mexico, 1920-1950* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Victoria de Grazia, I*rresistible Empire: America's Advance Through Twentieth-Century Europe*

contributed to achieving the diffusion of American culture globally. Although these technologies worked as a double-edged sword in Okinawa by transmitting images of military government hypocrisy, I believe anti-military protesters could not deny or attack the idea of American democracy itself. By analyzing images of democracy in newspapers, journals, and leaflets published by the military government and anti-American student protesters, the present research will consider how the democratic discourse persuaded Okinawans to mobilize for anti-militarism and resist American colonialism, with a special focus on the role of Okinawan teachers and university students. Although university education in Okinawa resembled the American educational system, an ironic outcome was that many students and teachers spearheaded the anti-U.S.-military movement. A close look at their political activities, from educational rehabilitation

Literature Review/Historiography

The historiography of the American occupation of Okinawa has increasingly embraced new methodologies. Traditional scholarly works have explored the occupation as a political and diplomatic experience. Miyazato Seigen's pioneering study, *Amerika no Okinawatochi* (The American Control of Okinawa), revealed strategic connections between the rise of the Cold War in East Asia and the fortification of the Ryukyu Islands.[10] Relying on painstaking archival research and policy analysis, later works using the traditional approach have uncovered the U.S. military's endeavors to militarize the Ryukyu Islands. Kono Yasuko and Gabe Masaaki attempted to compromise with the State Department, recommending that the U.S. demilitarize

(Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2005); Laura A. Belmonte, *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Margaret Peacock, *Innocent Weapons: The Soviet and American Politics of Childhood in the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

[10] Miyazato Seigen, *America no Okinawatochi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966).

the island and return it to Japan to avoid further damage to the fragile relationship between former enemies.[11] Nicholas Sarantakes explained that "the occupation of Okinawa was the result of American policy makers' security concerns in Asia," and the U.S. government therefore decided to retain Okinawa as "a forward base" against possible communist threats in the region.[12] Robert E. Eldridge maintained that the U.S. government balanced the demands of the State and the Defense Departments by forging a "residual sovereignty" formula, which allowed Okinawans to retain Japanese nationality, but their rights and freedoms were protected by the U.S. military government.[13] Some scholars revealed the diplomatic negotiations that took place between the U.S. and Japanese governments. Focusing on the Sato cabinet, Nakajima's and Hoey's works examined the two-track negotiations, which occurred through an official diplomatic channel between the DOS and the Ministry of Foreign Relations and an unofficial channel between special envoys Wakaizumi Kei and Henry Kissinger.[14]

Since these works were published, interest in the U.S. occupation of Okinawa as a social and cultural phenomenon has grown. The presence of military bases had a profound impact on interactions between indigenous Okinawans and American military personnel.[15] Intent on understanding the U.S. military government's broader relationship with the Okinawans, a new

[11] See Kono Yasuko, *Okinawahenkan wo meguru seizi to gaiko*: Nichibeikankeishi no bunmyaku (Tokyo: Tokyodaigakushupankai, 1994); Gabe Masaaki, *Okinawahenkan toha nandattanoka: Nichibeisengokoshoshi no nakade* (Tokyo: Nihonhosokyokai Shuppankai, 2000).
[12] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Key Stone*: *The American Occupation of Okinawa and U.S.–Japanese Relations* (College Station: Taxes A&M University Press, 2000), 193.
[13] Robert D. Eldridge, *The Origins of the Bilateral Okinawa Problem: Okinawa in Postwar U.S.–Japan Relations, 1945-52* (New York: Garland Publishing, INC, 2001).
[14] See Nakajima Takuma, *Okinawahenkankosyo to nichibeianpotaisei* (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 2012); Fintan Hoey, *Sato, America, and the Cold War: US–Japanese Relations, 1964–72* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
[15] See Masamichi S. Inoue, *Okinawa and the U.S. Military: Identity Making in the Age of Globalization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007); Yakabi Osamu, *Okinawasen, beigunsenryoshi wo manabi naosu: kioku wo ikani keisyo suruka* (Kanagawa: Seori Shobo, 2009); Sakurazawa Makoto, *Okinawa no fukkiundo to hokakutairitsu: Okinawa chiikishakai no henyo* (Tokyo: Yushisha, 2012); Toriyama Atsushi, *Okinawa: kichisyakai no kigen to sokoku 1945-1956* (Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 2013).

trend in scholarship portrayed the narrative of the occupation through racial, gender, and cultural relations. Donna Alvah argued that, while American military wives played a significant role in constructing "cultural and social bridges" with Okinawans, the huge imbalance of power between Americans and Okinawans affected their relations.[16] According to Alvah, American military wives ultimately reinforced the cultural and racial stereotypes of Okinawans as a backward and childlike people who needed U.S. guidance and protection.[17]

The rape of an Okinawan schoolgirl by three U.S. servicemen in 1995 also embodied the fundamental difference in power between the U.S. and Okinawa. This incident became a turning point in the representation of the history of Okinawa, serving as a metaphor for "the violation of the Okinawan body" by the U.S.[18] Afterward, Western scholars started to recognize the significance of felonious crimes committed by U.S. soldiers in Okinawa. Michael Molasky noted that Okinawan literature and journalism was saturated with stories of barbaric G.I.s preying on female Okinawan victims.[19]

The next methodological shift in the study of military occupation was catalyzed by the increasing popularity of the transnational approach. Scholars are now more willing to recast the narratives of occupation within a global context. Chris Ames challenged the assumption of female Okinawans as victims of U.S. military men. Ames argued that academics have not considered the consensual relationships between American G.I.s and Okinawan women. His article further explained that Okinawan women who dated or married U.S. military men were

[16] Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946–1965* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 196–197.
[17] Ibid., 15.
[18] Linda Isako Angst, "The Rape of a Schoolgirl: Discourses of Power and Gendered National Identity in Okinawa," in *Islands of Discontent*, ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden (Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2003), 145.
[19] See Michael S. Molasky, *The American Occupation of Japan and Okinawa: Literature and Memory* (London: Routledge, 1999).

marginalized in Okinawan society. In the anti-military-base discourse, which sought the closure of U.S. bases, these women were regarded as betrayers of the homeland.[20] Johanna O. Zulueta's article also challenged this binary framework, which has completely ignored the presence of an estimated 6,000 Filipinos who lived in Okinawa during the U.S. occupation.[21] Her argument recast the narrative of a mono-ethnic society into that of a transnational history. Although Filipinos were an ethnic minority in Okinawa, they were ranked above the indigenous population due to their association with the Allied forces of World War II.

These studies sparked renewed interest in the occupation of Okinawa as scholars sought better ways to understand the history of the American empire. Some scholarly works reinterpreted postwar Okinawan history within the context of the U.S.–Japanese alliance. Focusing on the types of political regimes in host countries, Alexander Cooley pointed out that active demonstrations did not achieve Okinawan wishes to remove the unfair political burden caused by the United States so long as the central government of Japan had strong political legitimacy.[22] Yuko Kawato's work also remarked that removing all military installations from the Ryukyu Islands was difficult, as "the U.S. and Japanese governments' ultimate objective to maintain American military effectiveness led to a limited change in policy."[23] These narratives suggest the possibility that the Japanese government invited the U.S. to build the garrison state in Okinawa.

[20] Chris Ames, "Marginality and Agency among Okinawan Women in Relationships with U.S. Military Men," in *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present,* ed. Maria Hohn and Seungsook Moon (Durtham: Duke University Press, 2010), 176–202.
[21] Johanna O. Zulueta. "Living as Migrants in a Place That Was Once Home: The Nisei, the US Bases, and Okinawan Society," *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 60, no. 3 (2012): 367–390.
[22] Alexander Cooley, *Base Politics: Democratic Changes and the U.S. Military Overseas* (Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2008), 138.
[23] Kawato, op. cit., 64.

Some scholarly works explore the complexity of the occupation of Okinawa through the lens of cultural diplomacy. The imperialization of Okinawa was a fundamentally hierarchical process, as has been highlighted in some cultural histories of the American empire.[24] Okinawans were often imagined as the children of their benevolent American fathers, which suggested an inability to grow into a civilized society. This discourse positioned education as the hallmark of civilization; therefore, the establishment of the University of the Ryukyus was central to the metaphor of development. The U.S. hoped that "the university would play a significant role as the dynamo of civilization which spread power and light of education into every part of the Islands of the Ryukyus."[25] Furthermore, Yamazato Katsunori considered the University of the Ryukyus Project to relay a story of friendship between MSU and the University of the Ryukyus.

However, the cultural-diplomatic activities were not always based on reciprocal relationships and often became American-centered. From the outset of the occupation, Okinawan scholars challenged its benevolent and paternalistic narratives, contending that Okinawans constructed their collective identity through the rejection and modification of Americanization.[26] For example, the huge military complex hosted by the Okinawans serves as a constant reminder of the trauma caused by the American occupation. Although new pedagogical methods were implemented in Okinawan university education, an ironic result was that many students and alumni spearheaded anti-U.S. militarism. This pattern contrasts the largely successful stories of cultural diplomacy in mainland Japan.[27] Ogawa Tadashi's work interpreted the University of the

[24] See, for example, Eileen J. Findlay, *Imposing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico, 1870–1920* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999); Naoko Shibusawa, *America's Geisha Ally: Reimaging the Japanese Enemy* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2006).
[25] Yamazato, op. cit., 135.
[26] Arasaki Moriteru, *Okinawa hansen jinush* (Tokyo: Kobunsha, 1986); Mori Yoshio, *Okinawa sengominshushi: gama kara henoko made* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2016).
[27] See Takeshi Matsuda, *Soft Power, and Its Peril: U.S. Cultural Policy in Early Postwar Japan and Permanent Dependency* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007).

Ryukyus Project as the story of Okinawan resistance against colonial education.[28] Mire Koikari's book also critically examined this project, but her focus was on the feminized perspective of military occupations. According to Koikari, the American occupation infiltrated Okinawan homes, where politics and the economy collaborated toward modernization.[29] Both Ogawa's and Koikari's works made an impressive contribution to bridging the gaps between cultural diplomacy, militarism, and gender.

As scholars continue to bring new methodologies into the study of military occupation, the elements of the Cold War have waned. However, Okinawa's postwar history is inseparable from the political, economic, military, and cultural battles of the Cold War in East Asia. Through a combined review of Okinawan and American scholarly works, the present study unearths the tensions between the metropolitan and colonial perspectives of the Cold War era. For this challenging project, I collected information from many places. In Japan, the National Diet Library, the Research Center for Cooperative Civil Studies, and the University of the Ryukyus Library have extensive collections concerning the social and cultural activities of the U.S. occupation. In the U.S., the National Archives at College Park (Archives II), the Rockefeller Archival Center, and the University Archives and Historical Collections at MSU are among the main repositories of government publications and records on the University of the Ryukyus Project. By comparing the historical records and local newspapers of Okinawa with the archived materials and published reports of the U.S., this dissertation will significantly advance the discussion of transnationalism during the American occupation of Okinawa.

[28] Ogawa, op. cit., 102-113.
[29] Koikari, op. cit., 4-19.

Overview of Chapters

This dissertation is divided into three parts. Part I provides an analysis of U.S. occupation policy in Okinawa. Chapter one will examine how the rise of the Cold War in East Asia shifted the occupation policy priority from democratization to creating an anti-communist garrison state. This chapter reveals that the process of remilitarization led Okinawans to distrust U.S. military personnel and reinterpret the ideology of American democracy in order to resist the American empire. Chapter two highlights the links between foreign policy and educational policy in Okinawa. Throughout the Cold War, the U.S. military government reiterated the success of democratic education in postwar Okinawa. Although Okinawans cooperated to reestablish educational institutions and facilities, this chapter will show how Cold War educational policy caused friction between the military government and Okinawan educators.

Part II focuses on the analysis of cultural and social activities of the University of Ryukyu Projects. Chapter three traces the history of the project. It argues that the establishment of the university conjoined with occupation and democratization. This chapter also explains how and why the military government expected the university to work as a cornerstone of reconstruction, which led to multiple projects that fed, enlightened, and modernized the islanders. Chapter four explores how the faculty members of MSU interacted with the military government and Okinawan students. This chapter highlights the predicament of faculty who were caught between the military government officers and the students. This chapter will also reveal that MSU academics favored the military government rather than the students with the rise of the anti-military movement on campus.

Part III shifts to analyzing the images of democracy education in published materials such as newspapers, journals, magazines, and leaflets. The main purpose of this part is to reveal how

Okinawans reinterpreted American democracy. Although many scholars admit that Okinawans embraced the ideology of American democracy before the military government prioritized occupation policy to refortify the Ryukyu Islands in the 1950s, few literary works analyze visual images of materials. Focusing mainly on two military propaganda magazines, *Konnishi no Ryukyu* (Ryukyu Today) and *Syureino Hikari* (The Light of Observance of Courtesy), the first half of chapter five examines how the military government expected to broadcast the discourse of democratic education toward Okinawans. In contrast, the latter part evaluates Okinawans' understanding of U.S. military discourses. In particular, this chapter focuses on student newspapers and Okinawan teachers leaflets because the student and teacher protesters played a leading part in anti-base and anti-Vietnam movements in the 1950s and the 1960s. This chapter will reveal that moderate student activists were the true representatives of Okinawan society.

CHAPTER 1: DIVIDED OCCUPATIONS AND RECONSTRUCTIONS: RECONSIDERING POSTWAR HISTORY OF OKINAWA IN THE LATE 1940s

Introduction

While mainland Japan achieved independence from the United States in 1952, Okinawans under the military occupation lived in poverty and called for reversion to Japan. Okinawan society recovered from the devastation with the assistance of the United States, but the pace of reconstruction always lagged behind Japan. Many scholars could strongly highlight distinguished narratives of postwar Okinawa from those of the mainland.[1] As painstaking archival research was conducted, however, it became more evident that U.S. military and passive Japanese government hindered the processes of reconstruction in Okinawa.[2] By relying on the recent scholarly works on the occupation studies, this chapter will reconsider the early stages of military occupation in Okinawa. In particular, my concern is to evaluate whether the military preparation for occupation functioned to Americanize people in the ruined society where many unexpected difficulties such as budget shortages, a lack of civil affairs officers, and political conflicts in top officials arose.

Analysis of the U.S. military occupation in Okinawa in the late 1940s led to reconsiderations of how the military government promoted civil affairs activities and controlled Okinawan society for twenty-seven years. The evaluation of American foreign policy in the postwar Okinawa is still a goal of my dissertation, but this chapter will complicate arguments that seek to classify the Okinawan occupation within the binary of success or failure, and instead point to the

[1] See Nakano Yoshio and Arasaki Moriteshi, Sengo Okinawashi (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976); *Kensei Yochida, Democracy Betrayed: Okinawa Under U.S. Occupation*. (Bellingham: Center for East Asian Studies, West Washington University, n.d. 2002); Yakabi Osamu, *Okinawasen, beigunsenryoshi wo manabinaosu: kioku wo ikani keisyosuruka* (Yokohama: Seori Shobo, 2009).
[2] See Taira Yoshintoshi, *Sengo Okinawa to beigunkichi: "zyuyo" to "kyozetu' no hazamade 1945-1972* (Tokyo: Hoseidaigakushuppankyoku, 2012)

complexities of respective American and Okinawan experiences during the occupation to demonstrate that the discourses of pro- or anti-Americanism falls short of grasping the full complexities of the occupation. For instance, Ruth Ann Keyso urges scholars to pay more attention to the ambivalent feelings of Okinawans on the topic of Americanization, and she points out that, while many people in Okinawa recall with the gratitude the initial generosity and kindness of the American occupiers, they also remember with nostalgia the peace and tranquility of the island which was destroyed by the war and the subsequent U.S. military bases.[3]

As Keyso argues, the memories of Okinawans and of US military personnel are malleable, and thus it is necessary to revisit the dominant discourse of military occupation. As this chapter mentions below, the U.S. military history concludes that the military worked smoothly because the U.S Army and Navy had prepared well before the war ended. It seems to be logical causation that a well-prepared military plan led to the success of the occupation. However, a closer look at many materials on the occupation of Okinawa reveals how scholars have simplified postwar Okinawan history. Many Western historians highlight the story of the rapid economic recovery and democratization of Japan in Asia and treat Okinawa as a part of this narrative. However, they overlook the fact that the early stage of occupation in Okinawa was a time of hardship for the indigenous people and their survival was not guaranteed at all, just as the future of the state building project in Japan was uncertain. In addition, Okinawa was a furious battleground where everyone faced the sight of blood and death and thus it took a long time to reconstruct ruined society.

Another problem in this field is that many scholarly works have not adequately explored how the histories of occupation by the United States in mainland Japan and Okinawa have been

[3] See Ruth Ann Keyso, *Women of Okinawa: Nine Voices from A Garrison Island* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).

interwoven. As many historians and political scientists reveal, U.S. military bases abroad have caused many frictions with the local community stemming from issues such as noise and environmental pollution, and residents who lived close to military bases usually have had more negative responses to American occupation. Considering the Okinawans' perspectives in the postwar era, it seems clear that Okinawans demanded not to be under the military occupation. At the same time, however, it is an inescapable fact that U.S. military bases helped recoveries of the postwar Okinawan economy and society by providing base-related jobs and funds for a few decades. In addition, it was not easy for many Okinawans to forgive racial segregations from mainland Japan and to rely on the war-devastated Japan. In other words, it became a realistic choice to reconstruct Okinawan society with the United States in the 1940s, even if the military provided only a small amount of money.[4]

Research outcomes of Okinawan case will also explain the importance of cultural aspects in the processes of nation-building projects. After the United States and the United Nation have blundered in nation-building projects in Afghanistan and Iraq, scholars have become interested in analyzing how failed states can be transformed into liberal democratic countries. Current scholarly debates on military occupation or armed state building are sophisticatedly theorized. Moreover, the history of nation-building projects has tended to be connected to histories of peacekeeping and have focused mainly on Post-Cold War state building projects.[5] While the influx of recent case studies provides many reasons to consider why the U.S. military failed in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq, these works do not offer credible insight to explain why the United States succeeded in some countries such as West Germany and Japan. Officials in the

[4] See Toriyama Jun, *Kichisyakai no kigen to sokoku 1946-1956* (Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 2013).
[5] See Jeremi Suri and Paul D. Miller, *Armed State Building: Confronting State Failure 1898-2012* (Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2013); James Dobbins ed., *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2003).

Pentagon praised a RAND report from 2003 titled "America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq" calling as a marvelous manual for post-conflict and stabilization and reconstruction.[6] Without analyzing the differences of West Germany and Japan, however, the report praised nation-building projects in both countries, mainly because the United States achieved maximum results with minimum costs. Comparing West Germany and Japan with other nation-building projects, the report utilized quantitative data such as the number of military personnel and the police presence, the amount of external assistance, the number of post-combat deaths, and time to democratic elections.[7]

Although quantitative data is useful in judging nation-building projects, it raises the question about whether quantitative analysis is able to present the most useful framework for nation-building. Scholars have engaged in a long controversy to decide the definition of a nation-building project. For example, there are debates on military occupations such as those in the Philippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam. Considering social, cultural, and historical differences of these countries, however, it is difficult to generalize the process of stable nation-building. In fact, stockpiles of occupation studies are growing to reveal the complexity and diversity of projects rather than a sort of theoretical framework.[8] In this view, the success or failure of state building depends not only on the occupiers' material resources, such as the amount of money, the number of troops, or durations of time invested in a location, but also on the dynamics of bargaining that transpire between the great powers and local actors.[9]

---

[6] Robert K. Brigham, *Iraq, Vietnam and the Limits of American Power* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), 74.
[7] Dobbins, op, cit., xv-xvi.
[8] See Nadia Schadlow, *War and the Art of Governance: Consolidating Combat Success into Political Victory* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2017).
[9] Miller, op.cit., 17.

Despite growing interest in cultural interactions between occupiers and the occupied, few studies explore how their interactions contributed to nation building projects with the exception of some recent works.[10] The new generation of occupation studies about postwar Japan have also expanded the scope of the research field. For example, John Dower's pioneer work of this field, *Embracing Defeat*, examines a variety of American and Japanese social and cultural interactions during the years of occupation following WWII.[11] While many scholars have given considerable attention to an examination of the American occupation of Japan, most works by Western scholars on postwar Okinawa have been limited in scope and have been primarily concerned with the battle of Okinawa and politics of running a military base there.[12] With the regard to the historiography of nation-building projects, the occupation of Okinawa provides an excellent case study to remind many people that the story of American occupation was not effective and benevolent as we believe. As Donnal Alvah explains, Americans have hesitated to see their nation as a militaristic and imperial power and thus, the trope of the American service man has been portrayed as a force for good in the popular culture.[13] The best example of this narrative is the film version of the *Tea House of the August Moon* (1956). The closing scene of American

[10] Solsiree del Moral, *Negotiating Empire, The Cultural Politics of Schools in Puerto Rico 1898-1952* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press), 2013; Alfred W McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance States* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009); Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government; Race Empire, the United States & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 2006); Eileen Findley, *Imposing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000)

[11] John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1999). In addition to Dower's work, there works also examines social and cultural interactions between Americans and Japanese. Hiroshi Katayama, *Screening Enlightenment: Hollywood and the Cultural Reconstruction of Defeated Japan* (Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2010); Naoko Shibusawa, *America's Geisha Ally: Reimaging the Japanese Enemy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); Yukiko Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific Racism and the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1999).

[12] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Keystone: The American Occupation of Okinawa and U.S.-Japanese Relations* (College Station; Texas A&M University Press, 2000), xvii.

[13] Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946-1965* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 57.

military personnel enjoying teas with Okinawans represents the goal of American occupation. In fact, many Americans did not know that angry Okinawans launched the massive land struggle against the U.S. military, when the movie released in the United States.

Japanese and Okinawan scholars have developed an alternative perspective on the occupation. For example, a pioneer of this field, Miyazato Seigen argues that paternalism is a key concept to understand American occupation. According to Miyazato, the United States promoted its foreign policy with the faith that American national interest would completely match Okinawans' interests.[14] These scholars are interested in investigating diplomatic and military elements of the occupation. However, the whole picture of Okinawan occupation could not be revealed without exploring social and cultural interactions between Okinawans and American military personnel. By shedding light on the early stage of American Occupation in Okinawa, this chapter attempts to enrich the historiography of state building through examining social and cultural interaction between the occupying authorities and the locals.

Invented History of the Victors and Reality of the Vanquished in Okinawa

On March 3, 1947, Gen. Douglas MacArthur reported to the American press that "the war-ravaged islands of the Ryukyu groups, including Okinawa, are slowly returning to normal."[15] MacArthur never missed an opportunity to impress on people his achievements and he radiated a self-assured assessment about the American occupation of Okinawa.[16] Many American media reported the self-congratulatory opinions of the commander. For example, one article from *New York Times* on April 1. 1946 reported that "the native Okinawans are genuinely appreciative of

[14] Miyazato Seigen, *America no Okinawatochi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966), iv.
[15] "M'arthur Reports Gains in Okinawa," *New York Times*, March 3, 1947.
[16] Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 20-25

the benefits conferred on them by the Americans [and] these include elaborate systems of highways, the reestablishment of the school system, the furnishing of employment and the outright maintenance of the destitute and hungry."[17] Many American servicemen, who were stationed in Okinawa, shared, to a degree, the self-congratulatory opinions of their commander. Through their eyes, "the relations between Americans and natives are clearly on a friendly" and "We (Americans) have managed in re-establish so many of schools."[18]

The U.S. occupation authorities, who regarded the occupation as an example of American benevolence that liberated and democratized Okinawa, had a tendency to highlight the effectiveness of deliberated research on the Ryukyu Islands and planning on civil affairs activities before the military occupation started. Before the Battle of Okinawa, the United States had already prepared for the military occupation of Japan. By 1943, the U.S. Navy had enlisted the help of economists, political scientists, lawyers, and anthropologists as well as men with practical experience in East Asia. The purpose of this diverse group was to collect and organize all the available information on the Pacific islands that the Imperial Japanese military would occupy. The outcome of this research was a number of handbooks of factual knowledge about the North Pacific. Some of these handbooks formed the basis of military planning and operations in the Ryukyu Islands as they became the target of the Tenth Army's invasion.[19] The Ryukyuan Handbook covered a wide range of topics about Ryukyuan (Okinawan) society.

The U.S. experts on the Far Eastern affairs also contributed to the military occupation by offering Army and Navy officer civil affairs courses. On an experimental basis, the University of Chicago started a civil affairs program for the Far Eastern theater. Five other schools (Harvard,

[17] "Okinawa Recovering," *New York Times*, April 1, 1946.
[18] "Army Making Friend On Strategic Okinawa," *The Sun*, September 14, 1947.
[19] Clellan S. Ford, "Occupation Experience on Okinawa, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 267 (Jan, 1950), 176.

Michigan, Northwestern, Stanford, and Yale) also provided Far Eastern programs. The civil affairs policies evinced idealistic principles, stressing that "an occupation should be as just, humane and mild as possible and that the welfare of the people governed should be the goal of every civil affairs officer."[20] U.S. relief efforts, which Okinawans were amazed by and grateful for during the Battle of Okinawa, represented the U.S. military personnel's high-mindedness. In fact, many Americans showed their goodwill towards the enemy's civilians. Some of them handed out their own rations such as candy, chocolate, cigarettes, and chewing gum to people, in spite of instruction by Tenth Army headquarters not to do so. In addition, most captives could survive by depending on the U.S. military government for food, clothing, shelter, and work even as they were forced to live in internment camps under a state of martial law.[21]

For the Tenth Army, however, the relief mission was an integral part of the tactical preparation for the direct assault on Okinawa known as Operation Iceberg. The assault forces were certain to encounter thousands of Okinawans in the U.S. advance across the islands. To facilitate military operations, the civilian islanders had to be removed from the front lines. U.S. Military government planning began on August 15, 1944, when four Army and fifteen Navy civil affairs officers arrived at Schofield on Oahu. The Tenth Army's planners received guidance from the Pacific commander, Admiral Chester William Nimitz. The Nimitz directive contrasted in tone with the military government manual. Admiral Nimitz made clear that "the treatment afforded the islanders would depend on how they behaved"[22] At every point, plans for dealing with the islanders had to be further adapted to the plans for fighting the war. The planners expected that the Imperial Japanese Army might have used civilians as a weapon of war. They

[20] Arnold G. Fisch, *Military Government in the Ryukyu Islands 1945-50* (Washington D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1988), 8.
[21] Michael S. Molasky, *The American Occupation of Japan and Okinawa* (London: Routledge, 1999), 19.
[22] Ibid., 16-20.

explored the possibility that the enemy would cause panic among civilians and employ them to hamper U.S. operations. Densely populated areas were regarded as an ideal set-up for such schemes. One of the most effective ways to prevent the islanders' sabotage was to send them to segregation points which would cause the least interference with military operations.[23] During the Battle of Okinawa, one combat division of the U.S. landing force was in charge of establishing internment camps. In October of 1944, the Tenth Army military government headquarters had prepared lists of supplies and equipment for the future occupation. The planners estimated that the Tenth Army would need to take care of some 450,000 natives who would presumably be rendered helpless and homeless as a result of Operation Iceberg. The mission of civil affairs was to provide Okinawans with minimum food and shelter, screen out any Japanese military personnel, prevent sabotage, restore law and order under U.S. military rule, combat disease and maintain health and sanitation, and to begin their rehabilitation as soon as conditions would permit.[24]

Okinawans could not deny that Americans showed hospitality than the Imperial Japanese soldiers and they achieved social and economic progress under long American tutelage.[25] One of the most tragic aspect of the Battle of Okinawa was that the Japanese military leaders ordered to commit suicide and Okinawan civilians who accepted the order killed their own families and village members. The survivors of this tragedy knew that the leaders and core members of the Imperial Japanese soldier survived and surrendered to the U.S. soldiers after their village member died. Contrary to the images of brutal U.S. soldiers spread by Japanese war propaganda,

[23] Civil Affairs Okinawa Operation Book No.2, Box 704 RG389, National Archives, College Park MA.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Mikio Higa, "Okinawa Recent Political Development," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 3, No. 9 (Sep, 1963), 415-426.

the U.S. soldiers provided civilians materials for survival.[26] However, the contrast of such stories is not always constructed from a shared past. As John Dower describes, "victors control the history books and rewrite the moral codes as well."[27] In fact, the U.S. soldiers also committed brutal war crimes such as the widespread rape of local women.[28] However, the United States, like other victors, cherishes invented history and its master narrative induces a selective historical amnesia in relation to specific event that would not fit into the well-organized structure. By analyzing governmental documents, Okinawan scholars reveal that the military planning was not as well-organized as the Army describes.[29] According to Miyazato Seigen, the military government had little concern for the economic development of the island in the first stage, but when the U.S. government decided to retain Okinawa on a long-term basis, military funds flew into various economic activities. In addition, Miyazato points out that economic investments from mainland Japan also contributed to rapid economic development in Okinawa.[30] As mentioned below, the voices of Okinawans show the gaps between the U.S. military and local people in regards to stabilization and reconstruction. Although the brutality and destruction of total war were covered with the praise of liberation, the frustration, confusion, and resentment of indigenous people as well as stationed soldiers were not rapidly dissipated.[31]

The plight of postwar Okinawa was the result of war and U.S. military operations. On October 10, 1944, U.S. B-29 planes repeatedly struck Naha City, the capital of Okinawa

---

[26] Miyume Tanji, *Myth, Protest and Struggle in Okinawa* (London: Routledge, 2006), 38-39.
[27] John W. Dower, *Cultures of War: Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, 9-11, Iraq* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2010), 196.
[28] "3 Dead Marines and a Secret of Wartime Okinawa," *New York Times*, June 1, 2001.
[29] See Matsuda Yoshitaka, *Sengo Okinawa syakaikeizaishikenkyu* (Tokyo: Tokyodaigaku Shuppankai, 1981) Ryukyu ginko chosabu, *Sengo Okinawa keizaishi* (Naha: Ryukyu ginko, 1984); Yonakuni Noboru, *Sengo Okinawa no Syakaihendo to Kindaika* (Naha: Okinawa Taimus sha, 2001).
[30] Miyazato, op. cit., 26-32.
[31] Craig M. Cameron, *American Samurai: Myth, Imagination, and the Battle in the First Marine Division, 1941-1951* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 203-209

prefecture, and burned down 90 percent of the city.[32] Many islanders who were frightened by the threat of air raids rushed away from densely populated areas. Lieutenant General Ushijima Mitsuru was quickly ordered to construct defense fortifications in the southern parts of the Island. The Thirty-Second Japanese Imperial Army established three lines of defense using an interconnected system of tunnels, caves, and Okinawan spacious tombs.[33] Before the Battle of Okinawa reached the brutal climax, Admiral Nimitz issued the proclamation to Okinawans. The Nimitz proclamation noted that "Japan's aggression and attack on the United States have forced the United States to wage war against Japan," and "military occupation and government of these islands are necessary part of military occupation." According to the proclamation, the military government was necessary "in order to preserve law and order and to provide for the safety and welfare both of my forces and of yourselves."[34]

On April 1, 1945, the Tenth Army started the actual invasion of Okinawa but they soon realized that there no enemy fire. This was because the Japanese Thirty-Second Army lacked the strength to defend the beaches. While the landing operations were timid, the Army units were soon forced to start intense fights with the Japanese Army. At the end of April, the U.S. Army pushed through the first Japanese defense line. On May 29, the Tenth Army captured Shuri Catle. The seizure of the castle represented both strategic and psychological blows for the Japanese and was a milestone in the Battle in southern Okinawa.

On the other hand, the Marines easily reached the northern tip of Okinawa on April 13. The consequences of the rapid conquest of the northern half of the island was that a greater effort than expected was put on civilian affairs. The uncontested landing of American forces and the

[32] Fisch, op. cit., 38.
[33] Sarantakes, op. cit., 7.
[34] Proclamation No. 1 (The Nimitz Proclamation), April, 1945, accessed August 28, 2015, http://ryukyu-okinawa.net/pages/archive/nimitz.html. This proclamation was repealed in September of 1966.

rapid conquest of the northern half of the island, including the taking of 200,000 Japanese captives, put a greater than expected emphasis on logistical efforts. The blueprint for planning had concentrated on the construction of airfields, roads, munitions storage buildings, and other military installations. The remaining areas had been allocated for housing and sheltering civilians. The planners had calculated that 12 refugee camps would be built to house some 120,000 civilians, in addition to the military government personnel.[35] As it was, engineering teams soon understood that the U.S. military needed more space for military installations and thus no space remained for the captives.[36] Although the construction work in the initial plan supported the tactical forces engaged in the battle of Okinawa, the ultimate goal was to construct the bases and airfields for the final assault on mainland Japan. Engineers had to engage in extra work such as widening roads and bridges due to the poor conditions of roads in the rural areas. Under these adverse conditions, the military government decided to use the Okinawans' houses as emergency shelters. Some dwellings which had housed five to 10 people became shelter for 50 or more. Such overcrowding made sanitary standards difficult to maintain. Many Okinawans have never forgotten their squalid quarters in the emergency shelters. For example, one Okinawan woman remembers that her daughter gave birth to a child in an overcrowded shelter. She had terrible anxiety about cutting her grandchild's umbilical cord with scissors that were covered with mold.[37]

Meanwhile, in the southern parts of the islands, the bloody battle continued. The battle of Okinawa raged for three months from April to June 1945 and resulted in the deaths of

[35] Fisch, op. cit., 55.
[36] Ford, op. cit., 178.
[37] Okinawa-ken, *Okinawa kenshi 10* (Tokyo: Gennando Shoten, 1974), 447.

approximately 94,000 noncombatants, 65,000 Japanese soldiers, and 12,500 Americans.[38] As the war continued, the U.S. military government increasingly relocated refugees to the northern areas of the island. Under the strain of the abrupt evacuations from the front lines, the military government sometimes mismanaged the movement of refugees. On several occasions, refugees were sent to locations that had been filled beyond capacity and were refused admittance. For the evacuees, these refusals meant waiting many hours in the backs of overcrowded trucks, during which time some became dehydrated or ill.[39] On the whole, approximately 75 percent of the population was relocated from the area of its original domicile as a direct result of the war.[40] After the suicide of the Japanese Army commander Ushijima on June 23, 1945, Japan's military resistance largely ceased, and thousands of Okinawans were placed in internment camps. The number of residents in camps had been increasing from the first month of the invasion in April 1945. By the end of June, it amounted to a majority of the surviving population on the Ryukyu Islands. Most Okinawans wanted nothing more than to return to their homes.

After the bloody war ended, the most pressing concern of the islanders was to obtain food. Even before the Pacific War, food production did not achieve self-sufficiency in Okinawa and thus food had to be imported from the mainland of Japan. In some villages, rations from the Japanese Army were so poor that infanticide occurred as a way to save food in order to feed others. The Tenth Army Headquarters, which was in charge of the American occupation of Okinawa after the battle of Okinawa, knew of this food problem and planned to take care of some 450,000 islanders. Relatively speaking, Okinawans were better fed in the camps than in

[38] Kensei Yoshida, *Democracy Betrayed: Okinawa Under U.S. Occupation* (Bellingham: Center for East Asian Studies Western Washington University, 2002), op. cit., 3.
[39] Fisch, op. cit., 59.
[40] Daniel D. Karasik, "Okinawa: A problem in Administration and Reconstruction," *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. 7 No.3 (May, 1948), 264.

their old hideouts. However, the severity of food shortages depended on locality. While a fortunate teller recalled that she "never experienced food shortage," another woman suffered from malnutrition in her camp because rations were not enough to survive. [41] In general, food soon became very scarce. This scarcity was the result of the tremendous devastation visited upon Okinawa. Although the food situation on the outer islands (where battle-related destruction was far less than on Okinawa) was less serious, the battle-related damage to the main islands included not only devastation of fertile farming land but also loss of most of the livestock and the fishing fleets. In addition, confiscations of arable land for construction of military installations decreased the amount of food production. One Okinawan recalled that only butter was distributed in his internment camp for a week.[42] Because of this difficulty in obtaining food, the Okinawans sought out the remaining crops such as sweet potatoes, wheat, barley, and millet with military personnel. In places where the food situation was aggravated, the islanders often scavenged from garbage or stole food from the U.S. bases. Opportunistic people sold the leftovers of garbage after adding water. The islanders called stolen things the fruits of a battle. In sum, the moral order of the old society broke down under these extreme conditions.[43] Some of stone commodities were sent to the black market or smuggled out to Taiwan, Hong Kong or mainland Japan.[44]

Testimonies of the islanders also reveal that the female food seekers were "highly vulnerable" to the threat of sexual assaults. One woman witnessed her niece being abducted by a white soldier and claimed that "the soldier threatened us with a gun." [45] Regulations prohibited enlisted Americans from having sexual relations with these women, but the nonfraternization

[41] Okinawa-ken, op. cit., 447.
[42] Fisch, op.cit., 44-48.
[43] Yakabe Osamu, "Ekkyo suru Okinawa: Americanism to Bunka Henyo," Yoshimi Shunya ed., *Reisen taisei to sihon no bunka* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002), 249.
[44] Yoshida, op. cit., 31.
[45] Okinawaken, op. cit.., 441.

rule ceased to be binding on outsides of villages where the Military Police (MP) could not monitor individual female Okinawans. The report issued by the Military government concluded that "at the end of the fighting on Okinawa crime was at a minimum," but testimonies of civilians in Okinawa reveal a different situation.[46] According to a newspaper article, as many as 10,000 Okinawan women were raped after the U.S. military landed in the island.[47] For Filipino troops, the sexual exploitation of the islanders did not always mean just seeking pleasure. Seeing no difference between the Okinawans and the Imperial Japanese soldiers who had occupied the Philippines, these solders avenged their homeland on Okinawan women.[48]

Despite the plight of Okinawans, the military government still emphasized how they helped the islanders to recover from the war-related ruin. The military government broadcast the image that reconstruction was proceeding successfully because of cooperation between Okinawans and Americans. News reports that depended on military press releases provided the stereotypical images of benevolent Americans. For example, the *Washington Post* reported that "United States Army engineers also are busy, rebuilding military installations wrecked by the storm. Japs—fast being repatriated—are helping out."[49] The reality in Okinawa was different from the articles in local newspapers. In Okinawa, the military government could more strictly control the mass media under the guideline of press codes. The main purpose of press code was to facilitate democratization by prohibiting media from causing social disturbance, yet the military government applied the press code to avoid the broadcast any potentially negative images of the

[46] Summation of United State Army Military Government Activities in the Ryukyu Island, No1 (July-November, 1948), box 13 Miscellaneous Untitled Weekly and Monthly Summations of Various Activities of SCAP 1945-48, Record of the Allied Occupational and Occupation Headquarters, WWII, RG331.
[47] "3 Dead Marines and a Secret of Wartime Okinawa," *New York Times*, June 1, 2000.
[48] Fisch, op, cit., 82-86.
[49] "Army Settles Down to Stay In Okinawa," *Washington Post*, November 19, 1946.

occupation.[50] For example, the local newspaper in Okinawa, *Okinawa Taimus*, reported that jobs on bases gave a good opportunity to the youth who did not have enough money to even buy a cigarette.[51] On the contrary, a primary school teacher remembers that "many able Okinawans got a job related to military installations, although salary was not so good."[52] For Okinawans, jobs on military bases were attractive because proximity to military supplies made theft of those supplies convenient.[53]

Press censorship also concealed racial prejudices against Okinawans that were prevalent during the military occupation. As many military historians have mentioned, the anti-Japanese education that American troops had received and the effects of traumatic experiences in the Pacific War were not easily dissipated. Unfortunately, many U.S. troops also knew the island from the Ryukyuan Handbook, which focused on the traditional Japanese bias that Okinawans were backward rustics.[54] For example, Colonel William S Triplet wrote in his diary that:

> The devils have by far the strongest hold on Okinawan beliefs and the term "devil worship" is misleading; "fear of devils" is closer to the truth….Most popular way to deal with devil is to get him killed. By dodging quickly across a road, close in front of a horse or even an ox cart, a man leaves his evil to be trampled to death by animal…Strange vehicles (American driving jeeps and trucks), moving at high speeds, were found to be much more effective in disposing of devil than were the slower-moving animal-drawn carts. Unfortunately, the unsophisticated natives were unable to gauge the speed of an ongoing truck.[55]

The American view of Okinawans as superstitious was not always a problem for the occupiers because the military government believed that what they understood primitive as people could be transformed into docile children obeying American parents. Consul General U. Alexis Johnson

---

[50] See Monna Naoki, *Okinawagenrontoseishi: genronnojiyuenotatakai* (Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1996)
[51] *Okinawa Taimus*, June 25, 1951
[52] Ryuzo Saki, *Kiroku shogen Okinawa zyumin gyakusatu* (Tokyo: Shin Zinbutsu Ourai Sha, 1976), 177.
[53] Okinawa Taimus sha, *Syominga tsuzuru Okinawasengoseikatsushi* (Naha: Okinawa Taimus sha, 1998), 88-91.
[54] Leaflets during the battle of Okinawa, *Papers of James T. Watkins IV*, Reel 1, Box1.
[55] William S. Triplet. *In the Philippines and Okinawa: A memoir, 1945-48* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 206-207.

remembered that when he met the Governor of the Ryukyu Islands, Shikiya Koshin explained to him that his job was only to nod and smile at the Americans. An American liaison officer between the military government and the governor was satisfied with Shikiya because of his docile personality.[56]

While the military government ordered Okinawans to obey the military authority, the occupiers broadcast the images that Okinawans urged the Army stationing in the islands in order to keep the occupation indefinitely. On August 1, 1947, an Okinawan newspaper, *Uruma Shinpo*, reported the governor's interview with American journalists on the front page. In this article, the governor explained to the journalists that the islanders appreciated assistance from the United States. According to Shikiya:

> A small number of Okinawans long for reverting to the mainland, but almost all want to economically develop under the American tutelage. Okinawans would die of starvation if the American military left Okinawa. To avoid this, the military should stay for a long time.[57]

However, the credibility of this narrative was treated with skepticism even in the American media because this press conference was restricted under military government supervision. The Deputy Commander for the Military Government, Col. William H. Craig, always stayed by the governor and interrupted journalists' questions about the military occupation. For the military government, the governor was "a landmark for progressive self-government" because the representative of the local village and city councils elected Shikiya. The official Army history claimed that "the evolution of political reforms continued under Army auspices."[58] However, Okinawans realized that the governor held a purely ceremonial status and that he was not able to exercise political power without the military government's permission. American journalists who

[56] Kano Masanao *Sengo Okinawa no shisozo* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun Sha, 1987), 81.
[57] *Uruma Shinpo*, August 1, 1947.
[58] Fisch, op. cit., 108.

observed the actual circumstances on the islands reported on negative aspects of the military occupation. As Roger Dingman argues, some former language officers pursued Japan-related careers in journalism and they improved the quality of news coverage by using the linguistic and cross-cultural skills they had developed as well as their connections with indigenous people.[59] For example, a *Time-Life* correspondent, Frank Gibney who graduated from the Boulder Navy Japanese Language School and served as a naval interrogator, reported that:

> The U.S. troops "in Okinawa" whose morale and discipline have probably been worse than of any U.S. force in the world, have policed 600,000 natives who live in hopeless poverty. The battle of Okinawa completely wrecked the islands' simple farming and fishing economy; in a matter of minutes, U.S. bulldozers smashed the terraced fields which Okinawans had painstakingly laid out for more than a century. Since war's end Okinawans have subsisted on a U.S. dole.[60]

An article in *New York Times* summarized the feelings of Okinawans with the caption "Island's people remain docile but are ready to see us go." The article reported Okinwans' voices as saying, "Thank you very much for all you've done for us, but please go away as soon as we are able to stand on our own feet economically."[61] The feelings of Okinawans which the article described represented how many felt about living in the ruined society ruled by foreigners. Even if the occupation army contributed to social reconstruction, Okinawans were subjected to psychological hardships. However, their patience would not be hold forever and thus the military needed to provide a reward for obedience. As the stockpile of military reliefs and the number of qualified military personnel reduced, the military government realized that the reliability of the future occupation depended on the politics of Washington for the budget of military occupation in Okinawa.

---

[59] Roger Dingman, *Deciphering the Rising Sun: Navy and Marine Corps Codebreakers, Translators, and Interpreters in the Pacific War* (Annapolis: Naval Institutes Press, 2009), 236.
[60] *Time*, November 2, 1949.
[61] "Oinawans Prove American to Rule: Island's People Remain Docile, but Are Ready to See Us Go," *New York Times*, April 1, 1946.

The Rise of the Cold War and Reconstruction with Military Bases

One of the main reasons why the pace of reconstruction became slow was the absence of a blue print for a long-term occupation. As many diplomatic historians reveal, the Truman administration had long debated about Okinawa's future.[62] By the fall of 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) decided "the Ryukyu Islands were vital and that they were to be considered as one of the primary bases areas in American postwar security arrangements."[63] The JCS thus argued that the United States should have exclusive control of Okinawa. However, not all in the Truman administration were satisfied with this recommendation. The State Department wanted instead to follow the principle of the Atlantic Charter, which declared that there should be no territorial aggrandizement, and it also sought to keep cooperative and friendly relations with Japan in the context of the growing the Cold War. In response to the JCS, the State Department argued that control of the Ryukyu would involve the United States in the thankless task of governing the three-quarters of a million people of totally alien culture and outlook.[64] The President, Harry S. Truman, was placed in a dilemma between the JCS and the State Department. In his diary, Truman wrote:

> I found that the State Department held views that differed from those of the War and Navy Department. I listened carefully to both points of view. In the end I sustained the Army and Navy chiefs on the major issues of the security of the bases. But I also saw the validity of the ideal for which the State Department was contending.[65]

---

[62] See Kono Yasuko, *Okinawahenkan wo meguru seizi to gaiko*: Nichibeikankeishi no bunmyaku (Tokyo: Tokyodaigakushupankai, 1994); Robert D. Eldridge, *The Origins of the Bilateral Okinawa Problem: Okinawa in Postwar U.S.-Japan Relations, 1945-52* (New York: Garland Publishing, INC, 2001).
[63] Ibid., 83.
[64] Sarantakes, op. cit., xix.
[65] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs, Volume I: Year of Decisions* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955), 274-275.

Caught between the military's request for the outright annexation of the Ryukyus and the State Department's insistence to consider the eventual return of Okinawa to Japan, the Truman administration prepared a plan for a "strategic trusteeship" that left Okinawa's status undetermined.[66]

The policy debate in Washington had left the military government in Okinawa uncertain about their mission. The JCS originally assigned both operational control and military government responsibility for the Ryukyu Islands to the Navy, but neither the Navy nor the Army wanted to assume responsibility for the region.[67] The Navy cast doubt on the cost-effectiveness of Naval bases in Okinawa because powerful typhoons damaged many military facilities. Due to a lessened interest in Okinawa on the part of the Navy, all administrative authority on the islands was finally transferred to the Army on July 1, 1946. The Army command in Okinawa promoted base construction projects, but these projects were not based on a long-term military planning.[68] This transfer of command soon affected occupation policies. Although the Okinawans overseas had sent relief items to their native country, the relief transportation, for which the Navy was in charge, was suspended.[69] In addition, a series of miscommunications between the U.S Army and Navy on responsibility for governing Okinawa delayed reconstruction of the island's infrastructure because the command reorganization coincided with a general demobilization of engineer units in Okinawa. By late spring, only four of twelve units were actually engaged in construction activity. The funds available for base construction also dwindled. In February 1946, Headquarters, Army Forces, Western Pacific estimated that $93 million would be needed to build

[66] Micheal Schaller, op. cit., 57.
[67] Fisch, op. cit., 79.
[68] Taira, op. cit. 23.
[69] Nahashi, *Sengo wo tadoru* (Okinawa: Ryukyu Sinposha, 2007), 44.

base facilities in Okinawa. However, Congress actually provided only $31 million.[70] The decline in military construction was worldwide, but the particularly dramatic curtailment of funds for Okinawa reflected the lowered priorities that characterized American policy toward the Ryukyu Islands. In sum, the Army struggled with reconstruct project with very limited resources, until the rise of the Cold War in East Asia increased the strategic importance of Okinawan.[71]

In October 1947, the military government submitted a report to the Secretary of War, Kenneth C. Royall, which outlined a plan to maintain occupation while annually reducing the budget. The reports predicted that the annual year budget requirement for the Ryukyus would be reduced from the 1948 level of 35.0 million dollars to approximately 18.0 million dollars within five years. At the same time, the report did not mention that the military government had changed the general objectives and had decided to focus on three specific goals: the liquidation of political, social, and economic ties with the Japanese mainland; the restoration of the standards of living consistent with those existing prior to the war; and the early establishment of self-governing communities supervised by a minimum of military government personnel. In order to achieve these goals within a limited budget, the report pointed out that the Ryukyus should improve agricultural methods to reduce the imports from the United States and produce exports in sufficient quantity to maintain the import balance. According to the report, if their proposed programs were approved and reduction came about as indicated, the expected program for 1953 would be a continuing subsidy which would amount to only 20 dollars per capita of native population for the maintenance of the Ryukyu chains.[72]

[70] Fisch, op. cit., 78.
[71] Sarantakes, op. cit., chapter 2.
[72] Political, Social, and Economic Report of the Ryukyu Islands for the Secretary for War, in *Okinawaken Kenkyugyosyo 16* (Naebarucho: Okinawaken Kyoiku Iinka, 2006), 5, 29-39.

According to the military historian Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, the civilian leadership of the army realized the problem of massive poverty in Okinawa, but the army could do nothing for Okinawans because the Ryukyu Islands were an occupied area where the Japanese were responsible for paying the costs of the occupation and the military policy prohibited the army from spending funds on nonmilitary improvements as long as the Ryukyu Islands were part of Japan.[73] In 1946, Congress had already appropriated aid for the occupied area, called Government and Relief in Occupied Area (GARIOA), but the main part of this fund was allotted to purchase basic necessities such as foodstuffs and agricultural commodities such as insecticides and fertilizers. As the United States later shifted the policy toward retaining the island as a garrison colony with the rise of the Cold War, GARIOA funds were applied to develop construction and industrialization business in Okinawa. [74]

The long political debate and the financial issue also influenced on the mentality of the Army troops stationed in Okinawa. Sarantakes explains that "military government personnel were uncertain about their mission and purpose."[75] Since the military was unsure how long it would stay on the island, it did not repair the damages of war or to build permanent buildings that would stand up to typhoons. Even facilities for Americans were not much better. Colonel Triplet describes that:

> Housing at Awase was becoming slowly, very slowly, available, and three or four quonset houses would shortly became available to us…. Three lieutenants preferred the housing offered in Awase now to waiting for out construction. I certainly couldn't blame them for wanting to move out. Even since one of these child brides had been awakened from a sound sleep by a rat biting her on the lip, they had shown signs of cracking a bit.[76]

[73] Sarantakes, op. cit, 45.
[74] Matsuda, op. cit., 15-19.
[75] Ibid., chapter 2.
[76] Triplet. Op.cit., 214.

While U.S. military personnel lived in derelict barracks, Okinawans' housing conditions were usually worse than occupiers. Even as late as 1950, only a few families lived in two-by-four buildings constructed by U.S. military engineer units around Nara area. For many Okinawans, military surplus tens became alternative to two-by-four buildings. Many Okinawan later recalled that military tents were uncomfortable in this tropic environment and fragile when a typhoon hit the island.[77]

When the Chairman of the JCS, Omar N. Bradley, visited Okinawa, he inspected the condition of the various housing areas and "was tremendously impressed with the utter necessity of pressing for a solution of the housing program"[78] In addition, Bradley realized that the morale of the Army troops should be improved by sending more qualified offers to work in Okinawa. The military government understood that the "success of [the] occupation depended not only upon the dedication of the civil affairs personnel, but also upon the good behavior of all American servicemen on Okinawa."[79] U.S. soldiers were expected to behave like ambassadors, whether or not they were conscious of that expectation. Some soldiers maintained their goodwill to the islanders, but it was difficult for others to discipline themselves in their behavior toward Okinawans. For example, sexual intercourse with native women was a common practice and thus the military personnel in Okinawa had the highest venereal disease rate in the entire Army.[80] Despite the military's realization of these difficulties of troops stationed in Okinawa, they could not improve the social condition of the island without a significant increase in funding from Washington.

[77] Okinawa Taimus sha, op. cit, 53-56.
[78] Notes on Visit of The Joint Chief of Staff to The Far East, Chairman's File General Bradley 1949-1953, box1, RG 228.
[79] Fisch, op. cit., 81.
[80] "Neglected Okinawa Getting Buildup as Pacific Gibraltar," *Washington Post*, November 6. 1949.

This political deadlock began to gradually dissolve after the Navy reached a compromise with the Army about the strategic importance of Okinawa. At first, the Navy assumed that Okinawa was desirable as a naval base and thus accepted responsibility for the military government. However, after examining the anchorages in Buckner Bay, the Navy finally found these places to be less desirable than they had originally thought. Typhoons, which devastated the developing ports in the region, clearly added to the decline of naval interest in the islands. Admiral Nimitz recommended a trusteeship for Okinawa. Trusteeship implied that the military government would administer the territory for a limited time. Trusteeship was also useful to camouflage "the unpleasant odor of colonialism."[81] The Army compromised on the condition that the United States could possess exclusive control over all military installations.[82] The State Department also modified its opinion after the director of policy planning, George F. Kennan, reported that "the United States Government should make up its mind at this point that it intends to retain permanently the facilities at Okinawa, and the base there should be developed accordingly."[83] After the inspection in Okinawa, Kennan pointed out the problems of military occupation. In his view, "neither the base development nor the ordering of civil affairs in the islands can proceed satisfactory until some reasonable certainty is created." Kennan's evaluation of civil affairs was lower than those of the base development. Kennan reported that:

> Except for preventing disease and unrest, we have done little to improve their [Okinawans'] situation; and what we have able to give them has been taken, for the most part, from the odds and ends of surplus remaining in the island… There is no real economy among the islanders themselves. A certain degree of inflation is in progress, in due partly to the

[81] Sarantakes, op. cit., 26.
[82] Eldridge, op. cit., 175.
[83] Report by the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Kennan), *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS), 1948, Vol. 6, 692; Sarntakes, op. cit., 42-43;

> smuggling in of yen from Japan…. There is no university in the islands. This has meant that university training for Okinawans and other Ryukyu islanders has been terminated.[84]

Kennan's observation revealed the problems of civil affairs activities in Okinawa and warned of social and economic relations between the mainland and the Ryukyus islands. With the establishment of the military government, the U.S. military proclaimed to suspend "all power of the Government of the Japanese Empire."[85] However, Okinawa's economy was not separated from the economic activities of mainland Japan because there was not enough customs facilities and coast guard stations in the war-torn societies to block the flow of yen currency and contraband goods out of Okinawa.[86] The policy shift to long-term retention of bases indicated that military planners realized the necessity to alleviate the burden on establishing political and economic security without making the islands dependent on any other occupied areas such as mainland Japan. In this way, the United States tightened controls over activities between Japanese and Okinawans.[87]

In October 1948, debate over Okinawa's future was roughly portrayed when the president approved policy paper, *Recommendations with Respect to U.S. policy towards Japan* (NSC 13/2). NSC13 was based on Kennan's report, PPS/28.[88] NSC13/2 concluded that:

> The United States should make up its mind at this point that it intends to retain on a long-term basis the facilities at Okinawa…. The base on Okinawa should be immediately developed. The United States agencies responsible for administering the above mentioned islands should promptly formulate and carry out a program on a long-term basis for the

[84] "PPS 28/2, Observation," March 25, 1948 in Department of State, *The State Department Policy Planning Staff Papers, 1947-1949,* vol.2 1948 (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1983), 210-213: Kono op. cit., 21-22; Robert D. Eldridge, "George F Kennan, PPS to Okinawa: Beikoku no Okinawaseisakukeiseikatei," *Kokusaiseiji* vol. 120 (February, 1999), 47-50.
[85] See Article II of the Nimitz Proclamation: available from http://ryukyu-okinawa.net/pages/archive/nimitz.html
[86] Matsuda, op. cit., 13.
[87] "Report by the National Security Council on Recommendation with Respect to United State Policy Toward Japan," May 6, 1949, *FRUS,* vol. 7, 731; Kono, op. cit., 27.
[88] Eldridge, op. cit., 45.

economic and social well-being, and to the extent practicable for the eventual self-support of the natives.[89]

In February 1949, the president finally approved a postponed part of Okinawa in NSC 13/3.[90] Until the Truman administration outlined the blueprint for the future of the Ryukyu Islands, the international affairs in the Far East were deteriorating. The circumstances of the Chinese Civil War showed no sign of improving and many officials in the Washington predicted that Jiang Jieshi's Guomingdang (GMD) would not stay in the mainland of China. As the situation of GMD became desperate, Japan's strategic importance was increased in the Washington. The National Security Council paper, NSC49, pointed out the importance of obtaining a chain of military bases from Japan, Okinawa and the Philippine.[91] The outbreak of the Korean War also provided an incentive to reinforce commitments to U.S. bases in Okinawa. In 1950, Congress appropriated $50 million of aid, which was higher than the amount of the previous three years combined.[92] According to Alvah, "The United States spent over two billion dollars strengthening and supplying military bases in Okinawa, installing radar domes and surface-to-air missiles and rockets."[93]

The next step which the United States carried out to tighten the control of Okinawa was to reserve a final United States position concerning the post peace treaty arrangements with Japan. While the State Department considered retaining Okinawa under the trusteeship of the United States, the Defense Department disagreed with this idea. JCS considered the peace treaty "premature" in the light of the uncertainties in the changing situation in the Far East and agreed

[89] "Revised Paragraph 5 of NSC13/1," October 26, 1948, *FRUS*, 1948, Vol. 6, 877-878.
[90] Eldridge, op. cit., 228; Taira Yoshitoshi, op. cit., 32.
[91] "Note by the Executive Security (Sources) to the National Security Council," June 15, 1949, *FRUS*, vol. 7, 773-777; "Evaluation of Pacific Deployment to Meet Possible Development, May 1 1950 Chairman's File General Bradley 1949-1953, box1, RG 228; Kono, op. cit., 30.
[92] Sarantakes, op. cit., 69.
[93] Alvah, op. cit., 169

with MacArthur's opinion that a peace treaty was a propaganda move to embarrass the USSR and improve U.S. relation with the Japanese but it was not a move to connect with military consideration.[94] The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, also criticized the peace treaty because the United States was not sure whether they could move or increase bases and have a right to do these action if the strategic situation would change in the future.[95] In Johnson's view, it was not sure whether Japan would be cooperative with the United Sates for the sake of democracy in the future. Receiving these views from the Defense Department, Secretary of State Dean Acheson suggested the idea of leaving "the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands under Japanese sovereignty, subject to the provisions of the contemplated military security agreement which would presumably take special account of the position in Okinawa."[96] The Defense Department declined Acheson's offer, but they changed to a no-compromise stance after a special representative to negotiate a treaty of peace with Japan, John Foster Dulles, negotiated with the Japanese side under the condition that "no treaty would became operational until the end of the Korean War" and the United States would secure exclusive strategic control of the Ryukyu Islands after the end of occupation.[97]

While the U.S. government argued over the status of military bases after the peace treaty, the Japanese deliberated on the question of national security and U.S. military bases. In September 1950, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs submitted documents titled "plan A." In these documents, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out that "the Ryukyu Islands, the Ogasawara Islands, and

---

[94] "Memorandum of Conversation: Japanese Peace Treaty," April 11, 24, 1950 in Dennis Merrill ed., *Documentary History of the Presidency Truman* vol. 5 (Bethesda: University of Publications of America, 1996), 559-560.
[95] Ibid., 561.
[96] "*The Secretary of State to the Secretary of Defense* (*Marshall*)", December 13, 1950, FRUS, vol. 6, 1363-1364; Taira, op. cit., 57.
[97] "The Secretary of State to the United State Political Advisor to SCAP (Sebald)," January 3, 1951, *FRUS*, vol. 6, 778-779; "Memorandum by the Consultant to the Secretary (Dulles), June 27, ibid, 1152; "The Secretary of State (Marshall) to the Secretary of State," June 25, 1951, ibid, 1155-1156; Sarantakes, op, cit., 52; Kono, op. 59-60; Taira, op. cit., 58.

the Iwo Islands would not be separated" for the following logic that as far as the United States would request to retain military bases in the mainland, there would be no reason to separate the military bases in these islands from those in the mainland. At the same time, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan also predicted the possibility that the United States might offer a different defense treaty in order to control these island and thus the documents indicated that if the United States showed the different options in these islands, the Japanese government would request to leave those islands under Japanese sovereignty.[98] As Taira Yoshitoshi argues, however, Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru declined the plan of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because this document consider the problem of national security and the U.S. military bases from the standpoint of trusteeship of United States. In Yoshida's view, the national security of Japan would be certain under a U.S. security umbrella. With Yoshida's initiative, the Japanese government conducted negotiations with the assumption that the United States could secure exclusive strategic control of Okinawa. Considering partisan politics and the rise of concentrating on territorial issues in the Diet, Yoshida changed his stance on the Ryukyu Island by offering a long-term lease treaty but Dulles claimed that the United States would not reconsider the disposition of Okinawa. Yoshida had little choice but to accept the idea of "residual sovereignty" and thus the Japanese government sought to remain its influence on Okinawa in the field of economic and cultural relations.[99] Despite the issue on the future of the island people, the voices of Okinawans were largely ignored in the process of the peace treaty. In Okinawa, the San Francisco Peace Treaty stimulated political parties as well as individuals in Okinawa to mobilize in support of restoration movements in the 1950s.

---

[98] "Beikoku no tainichiheiwazyoyaku no koso no taiousuruwagahouyoubouhousin (an)", October 4, 1950, in Gaimusho, *Nihongaikobunsyo: San Franciscoheiwazyoyakutaibeikosyo* (Tokyo: Gennandoshoten, 2007), 19-20.
[99] Taira, op. cit., 61-64: Toyoshita Narahiko, *Anpozyoyaku no seiritsu: Yoshidagaiko to tennogaiko* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996), chapter 1 and 2; Sarantakes, op. cit., 57.

As the United States solidified its strategic position in East Asia, Okinawan society gradually recovered from the war-related devastation. Under the guidance of Major General Joseph R. Sheetz, the Army Military government also engaged in "the first organized effort to cope with the Okinawan's problem."[100] The centerpiece of the new occupation policy was to promote political, economic and social rehabilitation. For example, the military government reinforced the projects to repair Okinawan cultural heritage sites which were destroyed by the battle of Okinawa. Although the military government embarked on restoration projects immediately after the war, these projected were considered an important way to spread the ideology of American democracy with the rise of the Cold War in East Asia.[101] In addition, the military focused more on the rehabilitation of the educational field, because these activities were necessity to facilitate democratization as well as to continue economic development. However, the educational rehabilitation did not proceed as the military government expected. As late as 1952, a military civil affairs report indicated shortage of qualified instructors and supplies. The report also points out that "schools there were already overcrowded and the cost of sending students to Japan was so great that few from the large number of qualified young people could be sent."[102] Facing the difficulty of civil affairs activities, the military government had little choice but to seek assistances from academic institutions and non-governmental organizations.[103] For example, the U.S. Army asked the American Council on Education to select the most excellent academic institution, which would assist the development of the University of the Ryukyus. The American

[100] *Time*, November 28, 1949.
[101] Nahashi, op. cit., 80-81.
[102] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, Vol.1 No.1, 181, 183-186.
[103] See Yamazato Katsunori, *Ryudai Monogatari* (Naha: Ryukyu Sinposha, 2010); Ogawa Tadashi, *Sengo beikoku no Okinawa bunkasenryaku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012); So Mizoguchi, "Schooling for Democracy?: Michigan State University and Cold War Education in American-Occupied Okinawa in the 1950s," *Virginia Review of Asian Studies* vol. 15 No.1 Spring (2013).

Council on Education nominated seven academic institutions and the Army chose Michigan State University.[104] MSU President John Hannah realized the significance of international educational project in the Cold War and he was very cooperative with the U.S. military.[105] On the war-devastated island, the reconstruction of higher education meant not only complementing the pedagogy of democracy but also providing practical programs such as English, agriculture, home economics and engineering. MSU had the excellence in those fields too.

Although the military government needed to modernize industries for economic recovery in the islands, the construction of massive military facilities temporarily brought an economic boom in the island. The military government maximized the effects of this boom by importing construction materials from mainland Japan as well as by hiring Okinawan laborers. In other words, the United States could enhance economic rehabilitation in both the mainland and Okinawa by circulating capital. In the same way, the U.S. military promoted commerce and financial interactions between the mainland and Okinawa under the surveillance of the Military Command.[106] As Alva argues, however, the expansion of the military bases accompanied with the renovation of lives for servicemen and their families, and seizing more land to construct bases for military operation as well as facilities for personnel and their families further damaged U.S.-Okinawan relationship.[107] Okinawans also were anxious about the construction of

[104] Other six applicants were Brigham Young University, University of Hawaii, Louisiana State University, Southern University and A&M College, Oregon States University, and Washington States University. See Ogawa, op. cit; David A. Thomas, *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008).
[105] Mire Koikari, *Cold War Encounters in US-Occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity, and Transnationalism in East Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 70-71.
[106] Although private commercial activities resumed in 1951, the biggest comport of imports were commodities purchased by GARIOA of other military funds. It took more time to develop non-military trade activities in Okinawa. Matsuda, op. cit., 47-49; Ryukyuginkochosabu, *Sengo Okinawakeizaishi* (Naha: Ryukyuginko, 1984), 181, 194.
[107] Alvah, op. cit., 170.

recreation facilities. Although General Sheetz proclaimed that dance halls which were constructed to provide an opportunity for socialization would not become a hotbed of prostitution and venereal disease under the strict guidelines, the proliferation of bars and clubs catering to the military personnel betrayed Sheetz's expectation and the red-light district in Okinawa continued to become a base-related issue between U.S.-Okinawan relations.[108] In sum, the reconstruction of Okinawan society was achieved with the installation of a base-centered economy in the 1950s, and there was a little room for the voices of the island people to choose their future within this dialogue. It is certainly ironic that the United States regarded the rehabilitation of the islands as democratization, while Okinawans defined it as the process of the emerging American garrison state.

Conclusion

During the American military occupation of the islands, the military government often overstated the benefits of occupation to Okinawans as well as Americans. The financial shortages and the political debates in Washington over the future of the Ryukyu Islands restricted the progress of reconstruction and rehabilitation projects. Under these circumstances, the military government had to downsize the scale of projects in the first stage, and their achievements were primarily to maintain the social order by supplying minimum food requirement and imposing press censorship. As victors, the U.S. military embraced selective history in Okinawa, but the validity of this interpretation is a matter of debate. Compared with narratives of vanquished, we are uncertain whether the United States demonstrated its morality and benevolence as the military reports described. Some Okinawans' testimonies revealed the plights as well as the

[108] "Sheetzchokan, Seitodaihyokaikennaiyo," in Nanpodohoyogokai, *Okinawamondaikihonsiryoshu* (Tokyo: Nanpodohoyogokai, 1968), 427; Alvah, op. cit., 171.

shrewdness of the vanquished to survive in the war–torn society. By examining diplomatic and governmental documents, we can know the real situation of international relations that economic support funds did not flow into Okinawa without quid pro quos in the form of military bases.

The rise of the Cold War in East Asia shifted the Truman administration from minimizing reconstruction to construct the garrison colony in the Ryukyu Islands. The second phase of the rehabilitation and recovery of Okinawa, which combined the initiative to retain long-term military bases with improvement in social and economic welfare, led the islands to depend on a base-centered economy. Through constructions of military facilities, the military government also intended to exclude social and economic influences on Okinawa from the mainland. While the military government enhanced the speed of base constructions in the islands, the Truman administration also achieved governmental and legal frameworks for the garrison colony through negotiations with the Japanese government. The United States sought a way to retain Okinawa after the peace treaty that uphold the idea of "residual sovereignty." Although the Japanese government was not always satisfied with abandoning actual rights to govern the Ryukyu Islands, the Prime Minister Yoshida placed his priority on national security and economic development in mainland Japan.

The peace treaty became the turning point detaching the Ryukyu Islands from Japanese political structure. Okinawans was legally classified as Japanese citizens, but they were put under the control of the U.S. military government. Postwar Okinawan educational system also developed under U.S. tutelage. Focusing on the uniqueness of the islands as a key stone of Pacific defense in the context of the Cold War, postwar Okinawan history became the story of military operations to retain military bases in the islands. Considering the complex relations

among Okinawa, Japan, and the United States, however, it should not be reliable argument to describe the military occupation of Okinawa as military or diplomatic history.

In sum, we should consider that although the U.S. government and military invested huge amount of capital into the Ryukyu Islands in order to construct military installations, social and cultural aspects of occupation were deeply entangled with military and diplomatic history in postwar Okinawa history. In addition, it was a mistake for historians to focus on state actors to describe civil affairs activities in Okinawa. Flows of military and economic funds to Okinawan society facilitated social and economic progress, but some significant contribution to the social welfare of Okinawan such as the field of education was achieved with assistances from non-military organizations. The next chapter sheds light on the history of higher education in the postwar Okinawa and examines how the military government consider educational policy in the context of the military occupation.

CHAPTER 2: ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH THE COLD WAR ISLANDS

Introduction

The rise of the Cold War in East Asia spurred the United States to accelerate the process of establishing the Cold War Islands in Okinawa. As mentioned in Chapter One, the Truman administration spent over $1 billion to expand military installations in the Ryukyu Islands. However, it did not take long before the fortification of the Ryukyu Islands became a sensitive political issue for the indigenous people who experienced the tragic Battle of Okinawa. Resistance of landowners to providing land for military operations, confiscation of their properties, and the scarcity of compensation from the United States government created concerns among the Okinawan people.

While scholarly works on the problem of military bases began immediately after the American occupation, other aspects of the Okinawan occupation have gone without scholarly scrutiny. This chapter will examine social and educational rehabilitation programs undertaken by the U.S. military in Okinawa. As the new generation of scholars reveals, the essence of the Cold War includes not only traditional military and diplomatic battles but also social and cultural activities that attempted to engage ordinary people in building a free world.[1] As the Cold War ended without major military action between the United States and the Soviet Union, the social and cultural aspects of this global conflict have become a major concern of Cold War Studies.

[1] See Walter L. Hixon, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997); John Fousek, *To Lead the Free World: American Nationalism & the Cultural Roots of the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle of Home and Abroad* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006); Tony Shaw, *Hollywood's Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007); Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

The ultimate goal of this dissertation is to enrich the understandings of U.S. cultural diplomacy in Okinawa. In the case of Okinawa, social and cultural activities comprised a large part of U.S. public diplomacy during the Cold War era. Scholars in both the United States and Japan recognize the necessity of studying public or cultural diplomacy in Okinawa and have produced excellent scholarly works on the subject. However, it is more difficult to evaluate the efficiency and effects of soft power as compared to military power. For example, skeptics argue that if people enjoy American culture, this does not mean that they approve of the United States itself.[2] Considering the history of confrontations caused by U.S. military installations and personnel, evaluations of cultural diplomacy in Okinawa may be more negative than those in other countries. In the end, the United States failed to promote pro-Americanism in Okinawa, and the Nixon administration restored Okinawa to Japan in 1972. However, despite the American military occupation having stimulated hostilities in Okinawa, Okinawan society has nevertheless embraced the ideal of democracy that the United States counted as a primary goal of occupation. Even if Okinawans rejected American culture and choose instead to absorb and modify it, as some scholars argue, there is no doubt that the legacy of American culture remains strong in the lives of ordinary people.[3]

In order to disentangle these complicated relations, this chapter expands the traditional definition of cultural diplomacy. A major objective of cultural diplomacy in the Cold War era is to offset negative images of the United States broadcasted by the Soviet Union. Many American wanted the U.S. government to conduct overseas cultural activities in an objective and unbiased

[2] Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 12.
[3] See Naha-shi Shimin Bunkabu Rekishi Shiryoshitsu ed., *Naha Shishi* 3, no.2 (Naha: Hirayama Insatsu, 2002), 100; Yakabi Osamu, *Okinawasen beigun senryoshi wo manabinaosu: Kioku wo ikani keisho suruka* (Yokohama: Seori Shobo, 2009), 323.

manner.[4] However, recent scholarly works argue that public diplomacy covers not only official advertising campaigns but also covert and spy activities. As CIA and the United States Information Agency (USIA) broadcast the negative images of Mohammad Mossadeq, the United States enhanced public distrust and fear of anti-U.S. groups or governments in the world. Some scholars categorize public diplomacy actions by coloring them white, grey, or black.[5]

In the case of Okinawa, Miyagi Etsujiro points out that the United States conducted its cultural diplomacy using these three rough guidelines: encouragement, prohibition, and persuasion. According to Miyagi, encouragement was used to promote Okinawan identity and culture through reconstruction of Okinawan historical heritage sites, and exhibitions of Okinawan culture in museums. Prohibition was aimed at curtailing the proliferation of anti-American propaganda and activities. The military authority conducted this strategy by aiming political directives at anti-social groups and the licensing of publications such as Okinawa Peoples Party's newsletter, *Jinminbunka* (*People's Culture*). Persuasion was intended to spread the American way of life to Okinawan society through propaganda activities such as American sponsored magazines, radio and TV programs, and social gatherings.[6] By focusing on American magazines, Kano Masanao analyzed the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR)'s preferences in cultural activities. Masanao's articles on the USCAR propaganda magazine *Konnichi no Ryukyu* (Ryukyu Today) highlighted four categories:

[4] William A. Rugh, *Front Line Public Diplomacy: How US Embassies Communicate with Foreign Publics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 10.
[5] See Osgood, op. cit. 97-102, 136-137.
[6] Miyagi Etsujiro, "Amerika Bunka to Sengo Okinawa," in ed. Teruya Yoshihiko and Yamazato Katsunori ed., *Sengo Okinawa to Amerika: Ibunka Sessyoku no Gozyunen*, (Naha: Okinawa Timussya, 1995), 20-26.

economic development in Okinawan society, fraternity of Americans and Okinawans, encouragement of anti-Communism, and Okinawa nationalism.[7]

While the quality of scholarly works on public diplomacy in the Cold War era has been improved by critically examining overseas propaganda activities, most scholars have focused on covert activities and information policy such as censorship and media control.[8] It is important to analyze how Okinawan society was suppressed under U.S. military tutelage. Studies have revealed that the U.S. military government and the subsequent USCAR prevented the development of true democracy through undemocratic methods such as censorship and psychological operations.[9] However, it became obvious that cultural and social activities as well as covert operations were a significant part of public diplomacy. As mentioned in Chapter One, problems such as chronic shortages in human and material resources, budgetary limitations, and an inter-institutionary rivalry between the State and Defense Departments restricted the process of social rehabilitation. As previous scholarly works conclude, the military authorities failed to demonstrate the ideological and cultural supremacy of the United States as they expected. Even so, it is impossible to fully evaluate the effects of public diplomacy without examining social and educational rehabilitation programs such as school construction projects.

In addition, many scholars overlook the fact that U.S. military personnel were not the sole actors in the social and cultural activities in the Ryukyu Islands. Government documents at the time remarked on the problems of USCAR's social rehabilitation programs and suggested remedial measures. As the United States attempted to resolve similar troubles in other countries,

[7] Kano Naomasa, "Konnichi no Ryukyu wo toshitemita zaibeigun no bunka seisaku," *Nihon Rekishi* 375 (Aug 1978), 5-7.
[8] See Yoshimoto Hideko, *Beikoku no Okinawa senryo to zyoho seshisaku: gunji syugi no muzyun to kamofurazyu* (Yokohana: Syufusya, 2015).
[9] See Monna Naoki, *Okinawa Genron to Seishi: Genron no Ziyuhe no Tatakai* (Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1996).

the military authorities in Okinawa sought assistance from outside groups. Their social rehabilitation programs covered too many fields to handle using military civil affairs officers alone. During World War II, the military mobilized many intelligent people from the academic and business worlds. Although most civil affairs officers returned to their former posts at academic or business institutes, the connections that were constructed during wartime remained. In addition, many presidential advisors such as Henry Kissinger, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Walt W. Rostow moved among academic, military, and political fields.

Although military civil affairs officers and intellectuals committed to military occupation in postwar Okinawa are not well-known as presidential advisors, their contribution to social rehabilitation should not be neglected or belittled. By considering these aspects, my study will demonstrate the significant influence of non-state actors such as educational institutions and private foundations. In Chapter Two, my focus is to grasp the principles of the military's cultural diplomacy and to reveal how the military promoted cultural activities. The evaluation of military cultural activities will explain how USCAR got non-state actors involved in the military occupation and why they used covert activities and information policy such as censorship and media control. These questions will be examined in the later part of this dissertation.

Cultural Diplomacy in Okinawa and the Cold War

Throughout the Cold War, U.S. policymakers attempted to contain Communist ideology and to sell American democracy around the world. As many scholars have revealed, however, the goals of public diplomacy did not always mesh with the realities of political, economic, and military priorities. Justin Hart writes that attempts to broadcast positive images of the United

States failed more often than they succeeded.[10] Many people in developing countries were disillusioned with American democratic principles, as unjust practices and widespread racial and economic discrimination throughout the world raised uncomfortable questions about the reality of racial and political equality in American society. Domestic politics such as budget cuts from Congress, sectionalism within the bureaucracy, and the paranoia of McCarthyism also curbed the effectiveness of American public diplomacy.

The same story was repeated in Okinawa. The U.S. military government was in charge of public diplomacy in Okinawa but did not achieve better results than USIA or the Peace Corps in other countries during the Cold War.[11] The U.S. military government often enacted policies of economic and racial discrimination against indigenous people in the name of paternalistic guidance toward democracy.[12] Okinawans had doubts about the hypocrisy of this occupation policy and complained that U.S. military personnel treated them as second-class citizens. With these frustrations among the indigenous people, the rise of antimilitary base protests in the 1950s and the anti-Vietnam movements in the 1960s became the main focus of the literature on U.S.-Okinawa relations. As a result, most scholars have concluded that the American occupation policy committed many blunders in Okinawa.

I have no intention of neglecting the many problems with the policies of public and cultural diplomacy conducted by the military authorities in Okinawa. As other scholars have revealed, the United States did not always engage in legal, official activities such as cultural exchange

---

[10] Hart, op. cit., 201.
[11] See Nancy Snow, *Propaganda, INC*: *Selling America's Culture to the World* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 1998); Elizabeth Hoffman, *All You Need Is Love: Peace Corps and the Sprits of the 1960s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).
[12] Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Families Overseas and the Cold War* (New York: New York University Press, 174-175, 190.

programs to promote the ideal of American democracy. Secret funding for negative campaigns against left-wing politicians and covert actions to topple anti-American regimes were conducted in many countries.[13] In Okinawa, the United States restricted the growth of left-wing political activities and created social movements against anti-Americanism. One notorious incident during the occupation occurred when USCAR intervened in the result of a democratic election and repealed the left-wing mayor of Naha City, Senaga Kamejiro, in 1957. USCAR revised election laws and forced groups of conservative city councilors to pass a vote of non-confidence.[14]

Even though USCAR often betrayed the ideals of the democracy that it propagandized, the U.S. military still believed Okinawa to be one of the best examples of nation-building worldwide. Indeed, it is an inescapable truth that Okinawan society achieved rapid economic rehabilitation and developed a democratic society. As nation-building projects attracted people's concerns after the Iraq War, however, many people came to realize that democratization tends to be more complicated than what policymakers consider, and that socio-cultural understandings of their counterparts are essential in order to construct a stable society. In the case of Okinawa, the cultural and social aspects of the occupation should be reviewed in detail to explain the success of the democratizing process. By examining government documents and testimonies, my research reveals how U.S. cultural and public diplomacy achieved a certain amount of success in Okinawa despite the many problems.

Before describing the details of U.S. cultural activities, this chapter will point out key elements that contributed to the rehabilitation processes of Okinawan society but that have been neglected by most scholars. First, social rehabilitation involved more cooperative works between

[13] Osgood, op. cit., 93, 146.
[14] Sakurazawa Makoto, *Okinawa gendaishi* (Tokyo: Chuokoronsha, 2015), 59-61.

Americans and Okinawans than previous scholarly works have mentioned. Of course, my research does not suggest that the military occupation of Okinawa was filled with a group of entirely benevolent Americans. Rather than framing the occupation as amicable collaboration, this chapter defines U.S.-Okinawan relations as a realistic approach which maximized the process of rehabilitation using limited resources. Second, this approach could work only for a certain amount of time as the rise of the Cold War weakened the legitimacy of democratization, even if USCAR maintained their military occupation by increasing financial assistance and appealing to the material prosperity of American consumer culture. Third, America was not the sole international actor to have cultural and social influence on Okinawan society. In sum, American soft power functioned well in Okinawan society and caused many Okinawans to wonder whether their restoration to Japan would overcome the disadvantage of losing their rich conqueror until the early 1950s.

For the U.S. military, the occupation of Okinawa is counted as an excellent case because the United States achieved two goals: military installation and democratization. Many scholars have described the history of the occupation, but it takes painstaking work to explain why the United States succeeded in the Ryukyu Islands. As I described in Chapter One, the military government planned to occupy Okinawa as a part of a larger military operation to invade mainland Japan. Under these circumstances there was no long-term military occupation plan, and thus military civil affairs officers conducted their activities without a concrete guideline. A summative report of the military government describes that its priority was “to prevent civilians from interfering

with military operations" and "to take whatever measures were necessary to preserve order and to prevent unrest and remediable hardship."[15] Following the war, this report added:

> It became feasible and even imperative for Military Government actively and materially to encourage the rehabilitation of the island socially, economically, and politically. All efforts toward rehabilitation, however, have been conditioned by uncertainty with regard to the future status of the island and the willingness of the United States government to underwrite a reconstruction program.[16]

Many people believed that the end of the war would bring new hope for the future. However, military records demonstrate that the people's expectations had to be constantly put aside before the reality of international politics. At this stage, the rehabilitation of the Ryukyu Islands existed solely in the rhetoric of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who stated that "the war-ravaged islands of the Ryukyu groups, including Okinawa, are slowly returning to normal."[17]

Following President Truman's approval to retain the Ryukyu Islands on a long-term basis in 1948, the United States provided economic aid to Okinawans on a somewhat larger scale. Following the fiscal year of 1949, it is more accurate to say that the military government was no longer concerned with restrictions that permitted military expenditure only for direct relief measures such as the prevention of disease and unrest. Massive expansion of the U.S. appropriation for the Ryukyu Islands also increased the capacity of military power in the realm of civil affairs activities. The Department of the Army recommended to the National Security Council (NSC) that "the [Ryukyu] islands should no longer be financially dependent upon or obligated to any other occupied area."[18] In addition to economic ties, the Army moved to exclude the cultural influence of mainland Japan by encouraging the separation of Ryukyuan culture

[15] "Report of Military Government Activities for the Period from 1 April 1945 to 1 July 1946", in Okinawa-ken Bunka Hukkou-kai ed., *Okinawa kenshi* 9, (Naha: Kokusai Insatsu, 2000), 2.
[16] Ibid., 2.
[17] *New York Times*, March 3, 1947.
[18] Annex to Black Book for Royal Secretary, January 25, 1949, RG 335.

from mainland Japanese culture. For this purpose, the Army emphasized the expansion of the Civil Information and Educational Program. The primary object of this rehabilitation program was to unite Okinawa into a single economic, political, and social entity under the Army's tutelage.[19]

As cultural and social activities in Okinawa became more active, the United States also reinforced anti-Communist and pro-American propaganda programs. According to Yoshimoto Hideko, the Truman administration initiated these propaganda campaigns, but the Eisenhower administration advanced them with the new strategy that the U.S. government should not directly engage in propaganda activities but rather provide funds to private corporations. Academic institutions also contributed to these activities. Universities like George Washington and Johns Hopkins conducted research projects about psychological operations using public research funds.[20] In addition to propaganda activities, the military government encouraged social and cultural exchange between Americans and Okinawans. As mentioned below, educational rehabilitation with an emphasis on English learning became a pillar of cultural diplomacy. In sum, the development of cultural diplomacy was entangled with the military strategy of the Cold War and became a byproduct of joint cooperation between the public and private actors.

The U.S. Army and the U.S. government shared the view that cultural activities were an essential part of military occupation in the Ryukyu Islands. According to Kenneth Osgood, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had first realized the power of propaganda during World War II. His belief was reinforced in the mid-1950s when the Soviet Union represented a new type of

[19] Ibid.
[20] Yoshimoto, op. cit., 205, 245-246.

Cold War strategy: peaceful coexistence. The administration concluded that this new challenge had shifted the nature of world struggle from the arena of military power to that of ideas.[21]

However, the Eisenhower administration soon faced the difficulty of balancing military strategy and the ideological battles of the Cold War in Okinawa. Since the legal justification for military occupation disappeared after the United States signed the Peace Treaty with Japan in 1952, the Eisenhower administration was forced to demonstrate the supremacy of the American way of life in Okinawa in order to retain its military bases. Eisenhower realized that continued occupation of Okinawa jeopardized the U.S. relations with Japan, but he was also concerned about military installations. To avoid frustrations with Japanese and Okinawans, the military should have promoted material progress and greater autonomy for Okinawans. As many scholarly works have revealed, the administration's expectations for improving the relationships between the military government and indigenous people soon moved to the opposite side due to land confiscation for the sake of military installations. In other words, the U.S. government reached a diplomatic stalemate with Okinawans in the 1950s. Even while demonstrating the ideological and cultural supremacy of the free world became more important, the United States could not ignore the strategic importance of its military installations, and thus Present Eisenhower stated in his 1954 State of Union Address that "we shall maintain indefinitely our bases in Okinawa."[22] As the frustrations of indigenous people crystalized in the shape of restoration to Japan movement, the United States had no option but to reverse the tide of the

[21] Osgood, op. cit., 48-49.
[22] Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union, January 7, 1964 in *the Presidential Papers of the Presidents*: available from https://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/all_about_ike/speeches/1954_state_of_ the_union.pdf; Internet

political situation in Okinawa. The Eisenhower administration chose to avert the rise of anti-Americanism by furthering rehabilitation activities.

Pressures from Congress also pushed the Eisenhower administration to address anti-Americanism in Okinawa. In 1955, the members of the House Committee on Armed Service visited in Okinawa to inspect the problem of military bases. Okinawan frustration increased when the inspectors endorsed the confiscation of their land, and the inspectors' report remarked on the gloomy future of the occupation. According to this report, "the land problem is not one for the present alone and for the immediate future but one with a relative permanence," and "the eyes of the world, and particularly the hooded eye of the communist, are fixed attentively on our actions in Okinawa."[23]

Eisenhower responded to this critique by proclaiming an executive order that assigned administrative power of the Ryukyu Islands to the High Commissioner, a position first taken by the deputy of the Secretary of the Defense in 1957. The Eisenhower administration announced that this new top post at USCAR would smooth over antagonism between USCAR and the Okinawan Civil Administration. In a press release, the Eisenhower administration also stated that "the Secretary [of Defense] is make every effort to improve the welfares and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyus and to promote their economic and cultural advancement."[24]

In contrast with this press release, however, most Okinawans perceived the power of the High Commissioner as a paragon of imperial power. This stereotype was confirmed when the third High Commissioner, Paul W. Caraway, stated that "the self-government of the Ryukyu

[23] Report of Special Subcommittee of the Armed Service Committee, House of Representatives, 7658.
[24] James C. Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President, June 5, 1957, *White House Central Files*, box 158.

Island was a mythology."[25] Caraway believed that the future of military occupation would depend on stable economic and social development in Okinawa. He was eager to reform Okinawan Society, and so USCAR helped him to expose bribes made between local banks and corporations. In Caraway's view, the Okinawan Civil Administration was too immature to take responsibility for developing a stable economic and social condition itself, and thus USCAR needed to tighten its control first. In other words, Caraway was too paternalistic to construct a fraternal relationship with Okinawans. The only exception was young Okinawans who studied in the United States, as Caraway respected that experience as a businessman who adhered to old customs. Caraway promoted young, Americanized Okinawan talents to senior posts.[26]

The Army and other branches of the U.S. government shared the view that the United States must retain military bases in Okinawa as well as improve its relationship with the indigenous people. However, there were different understandings of USCAR's approach. The State Department held the most severe views on the military occupation. In a telephone conversation with the president, Secretary of State John F. Dulles remarked:

> The military people should start on a program which might take three to five years to rearrange their affairs on Okinawa so as to facilitate subsequently a return to the Japanese most of the administrative responsibilities over the Okinawan people.[27]

The former military civil affairs officers also criticized the Army for not realizing the importance of cultural activities in Okinawa. For example, the former chief of the Army Military Government's Information Division, James N. Tull, pointed out that the deficiencies of the

[25] Ota Masahide, *Okinawa no teio kotobenmukan* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsya, 1996), 248, 265.
[26] Nahashi Rekishi Hakubutsukan ed, *Sengo wo tadoru: Amerika yo kara Yamato yo he* (Naha: Ryukyu Shinposya, 2007), 189-90.
[27] Telephone Call to the President, April 17, 1958, White House Telephone Conversation, *John Foster Dulles Papers.*

military authorities in Okinawa stemmed from the following reasons: insufficient knowledge of Okinawan history, society, and culture; a lack of clear and coherent policy; inadequate number of qualified personnel; and prolonged military occupation.[28] The former military government officer, Dr. James T. Watkins, also remarked that "Washington has expected the military establishment to introduce and foster democratic principles while at the same time continuing to operate as if in Enemy Alien Territory."[29] Considering the difficulty of balancing ideology and military strategy, Watkins also argued that a combination of active cultural rehabilitation programs and the liberalization of political control could remove the principal sources of restoration movement.

In particular, Watkins highlighted the importance of reconstructing school and public health services. In his view, "education still remains the highest good in the Ryukyu scale of social value," and thus "America's failure to provide adequate schools after seven years of Occupation had notably diminished our national prestige in the island and in Japan."[30] Indeed, many Okinawans were eager to reconstruct their educational system. However, there was no way of knowing how long any project based on the ideological and cultural supremacy of the United States would work for maintaining good relations. Even ex-military officers critical of the military occupation believed that once the United States assuaged Okinawans' discontent, the local people would prefer the United States to Japan as their mentor.

These critiques of the Army's cultural and social activities were not entirely incorrect. Even after the Truman administration announced the longtime occupation of the Ryukyu Islands and

[28] James N. Tull, *The Ryukyu Islands, Japan's Oldest Colony—America's Newest: Analysis of Policy and Propaganda* (MA thesis, University of Chicago, 1953), 72.
[29] After June 1946: Reversionism 1953 Correspondence, *Paper of James T. Watson IV*, box 10.
[30] Ibid.

multiplied the military budget for Okinawa, the Army still placed a lower priority on the cost of civil affairs activities than those of military installations. In addition, the budget for reconstruction activities included the cost of improving housing and living conditions for military personnel.[31] Okinawans soon realized that social rehabilitation programs had ensured further construction and maintenance of military installations.[32] For example, the Okinawan Civil Administration Director of the Department of Education, Yara Chobyo, recalled that the military government did not proceed with the reconstruction of school buildings, and thus Okinawans worked to construct them using their own limited resources. When Yara left Okinawa for a school-building fundraising tour of Japan, he was surprised that students on the mainland learned in brand-new buildings.[33]

As the military put aside social and civil rehabilitation programs in Okinawa, the Okinawan people wondered whether the United States brought more disadvantages than advantages in the war-devastated society. The affluence of Japanese society soon approached that of American society, and the power of American culture could not attract the minds of the Okinawan people as many military officers once believed. Although the United States had never doubted the supremacy of its ideology and culture, the reality of military occupation hindered the proliferation of the American way of life abroad. As restoration movements became the prominent goal of Okinawan politics, the indigenous people hesitated to talk about American culture.

[31] Basic Information Concerning Civil Information and Education, Ryukyu Command, RG 331, box 5775, folder 17.
[32] Yakabi, op. cit., 269.
[33] Yara Chobyo, *Yara Chobyo kaikoroku* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsya, 1977), 6-7.

However, it seems unreasonable to categorize the influence of cultural activities in stark moral terms. In fact, many people recalled that "the United States did something good for Okinawans too."[34] As this dissertation later describes, the limitations of civil affairs activities by military personnel led to the invitation of non-military actors to cover the deficit, and thus military activities became a part of cultural diplomacy. To avoid failure or success arguments regarding policymakers and high rank officers, the rest of this chapter will focus on examining these military cultural activities from the bottom up. Given the wide range of possible cultural activities, however, it is impossible to evaluate every aspect of military civil affairs. Therefore, my focus in this chapter is mainly on the process of educational rehabilitation, which many U.S. officials and Okinawans both regarded as the foundation of postwar Okinawan society.

Educational Rehabilitation and Limits of Military Occupation

The revival of education faced many difficulties in postwar Okinawa. The Naval Military Government hesitated to authorize the revival of schooling because the military authorities believed "the school program could be so easily utilized by agitators against American interests."[35] Distrust from military authorities was based on the assumption that prewar Japanese education emphasized producing people of unquestioning loyalty to the emperor. The Civil Affairs Handbook closely describes this nationalistic education in the Ryukyu Islands and concluded that the school system was directed by the Ministry of Education in Tokyo.[36]

Many officers were surprised that Okinawans in internment camps were docile and did not engage in any subversive activities, and under these circumstances the military government

[34] Bunkyo Tomonokai, *Sengo Okinawa kyoiku no kaikoroku* (Naha: Bunkyo Tomo no Kai, 1993), 89.
[35] Social Rehabilitation: Hanna/Watkins, *Paper of James T. Watson IV*, box 9.
[36] Civil Affairs Handbook Ryukyu (Loochoo) Islands, 156, ibid, box 11.

authorized the opening of elementary school classes on May 15, 1945, six weeks after the invasion of the Ryukyu Islands. Authorization was also granted for the reason that schools were the best place to place children so they would not hinder military operations.[37] Because the Navy positioned schools as a supplementary part of the military government's operations, postwar education of Okinawa began in internment camps, where non-educators taught students under a concrete pedagogical guideline. This situation demonstrated that the Naval Military Government placed a relatively low priority on educational activities.

In Camp Susupe, children began attending regular classes barely ninety days after the camp was established. While some schools opened with relatively good conditions like a leveled playground, most were crudely constructed. Classes usually were held in partially destroyed buildings or outdoors under the shade of trees. School supplies were often scarce, and teachers acquired minimal paper and pencils with the assistance of military officers in the camps. If textbooks were available, these were often problematic, as they were written in the preoccupation era and thus contained outdated concepts like admiration for the Japanese Emperor and militarism. An intelligence corps report noted:

> In the majority of schools, only the teacher has a textbook. As a consequence, instructions are accomplished by the lecture method supplemented, when possible, by mimeographed sheets produced by teachers from memory or extracted from old Japanese books. Numerous text books, subjects of previous reports by this detachment, have been found to contain material prejudicial to the interest of the occupation forces.[38]

Consequently, the military banned the use of prewar Japanese materials and endeavored to build a new educational system. Ideally, postwar education would be reconstructed following the Act Concerning the Basic Code of Education for the Ryukyu Island:

[37] Okudaira Hajime, *Sengo Okinawa kyoiku undoshi* (Naha: Boda Inku, 2010), 19.
[38] A Monograph on the Okinawan Educational System, 15 May 1948, box 1, Entry 34179, Record Groups 338.

> Education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving for the rearing of people, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labor, and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent sprits, as builder of the peaceful state and society.[39]

As mentioned above, because the military government proclaimed this code without concrete educational planning, postwar education began as a patchwork of the prewar school system along with the ideology of American democracy.[40] Many teachers remained in the same position as during the prewar era but began to teach the value of democracy. As military occupation continued and the military government instructed an increasingly dogmatic Cold War education to Okinawans, however, many people believed the military had little intention to develop independent spirits in Okinawa.

As the clash between the United States and Okinawa on educational policy grew, certain military officials contributed to positive relations with Okinawa by respecting indigenous culture. Officials in the Okinawan Civil Administration admitted that highly educated officers such as Dr. James T. Watkins and Dr. Willard A. Hanna endeavored to introduce Okinawan culture to military personnel in order to prevent a slowdown of rehabilitation processes caused by cultural misunderstandings.[41] Some Okinawans who worked with Hanna called him "the benefactor of education in Okinawa."[42]

Many Okinawan teachers realized that rehabilitation activities were deeply entangled with colonization of the Ryukyu Islands. Even so, many appreciated that the Americans gave them an opportunity to abandon the militaristic educational system of wartime.[43] In this war-devastated

[39] "Ryukyu Kyoiku Hihonho", in Okinawa-ken Kyoiku Iinkai ed., *Okinawa no sengo kyoikushi siryohen* (Naha: Okatsuki Shuppan, 1978), 1127.
[40] Nahashi Rekishi Hakubutsukan ed., op. cit., 67.
[41] Kayo Yasuharu, *Okinawa minseifu: hitotsu no zidai no kiseki* (Tokyo: Kumeshobo, 1986), 30-31.
[42] Bunkyo Tomo no Kai, op. cit., 89.
[43] Ibid., 83.

society, the people could not miss even a small chance for progress even if the military did not give them a free hand in educational rehabilitation. Some teachers believed in the supremacy of the American educational system and devoted their energies to the ideal of democratic education; they suffered from the guilt of having taught the Japanese militarism that forced students to die in the war.

Other recalled that they were inspired by children who were ardent for learning. Yara Chobyo remembered that "although students did not have a piece of paper, these students took a lot notes of lectures in a tiny space of books or magazines which were abandoned in somewhere to somewhere."[44] Under these conditions, many school functions depended on teacher and parent volunteers, including some teachers who worked without salary.[45] Military personnel endorsed the reliability of these testimonies. For example, the Director of the Ryukyu Command Civil Information and Education Department, Arthur E. Mead, remarked that Okinawans were eager to progress and "miserably parents [would] sacrifice to keep schools open and to build more."[46]

Despite the painstaking efforts of Okinawans and certain military civil affairs officers, the process of educational rehabilitation was generally not filled with benevolence and fraternity. Many educators stressed that the relationship between Americans and Okinawans should not be constructed with a spirit of racial superiority, yet strong biases about indigenous people remained in the minds of most Americans.[47]As Donna Alvah argues, the U.S. government placed great emphasis on not appearing imperialistic in the world, and thus the Army wanted the military and their families to generate an image of benevolent Americanism through cultural exchange

[44] Yara, op. cit., 6.
[45] The Study of Military Government (Ryukyu Area), 1946, box 1, Record Group 260.
[46] Educational Progress in Japan and the Ryukyus, May 25, 1950, *Paper of James T. Watson IV*, box 11.
[47] Ibid.

programs in military occupation zones. According to Alvah, however, while West Germans were perceived as having a kind of equal partnership by their common feature of whiteness, Okinawans were treated as a backward and childlike people who needed guidance and protection for Western-centered cultural and racial stereotypes.[48]

Okinawans have been sensitive to the racial prejudice of their rulers since the Satsuma Domain semi-colonized the Ryukyu Islands in the early seventeenth century. Due to these widespread and often tragic experiences, many Okinawans understood how they would be perceived and treated by the U.S. military personnel. Many GIs were surprised that Okinawans were very polite and showed friendly attitudes immediately after a brutal war that devastated their homeland. Some GIs were friendly with the indigenous people, but others were disgusted by their strange behaviors and used discriminatory terms, such as "gook," to refer to them.[49] Despite their lack of English knowledge, the indigenous people nevertheless realized the meaning of many abusive words.

Holding in frustrations regarding encounters with their new rulers, many Okinawans placed priority on promoting rehabilitation processes rather than mutinying against the United States. For example, the Governor of the Okinawan Civil Administration, Shikiya Koshin, believed that the political leader of a defeated country should put the priority on constructing a mutually trusted relationship with its rulers. In his view, even a small strike could easily increase the rulers' suspicions of their former enemies; thus it would be more practical for Okinawa to show cordial manners to the United States.[50] Although all Okinawans did not share Shikiya's view on

[48] Alvah, op. cit., 10
[49] Miyagi Etsujiro, *Senryosya no me* (Haebaru-cho: Naha Shuppan, 1982), 55-57.
[50] Kayo, op. cit., 108.

the military occupation, many people at least pretended sincerity in the front of the military authority.

One eminent educator, Higa Hiroshi, remarked that the U.S. military was enthusiastic to democratize Okinawa but that their approaches were paternalistic and dogmatic. In his view, the U.S. military did not have the patience to wait until Okinawans developed their own democratic educational system, and thus Okinawan educators faced many difficulties, such as having to introduce American pedagogy into Okinawan society. Okinawan educators requested the military civil affairs officers to slow the process of democratization, but their opinions were almost always ignored.[51]

These awkward relations gradually worked to improve the quality of educational system in Okinawa, although the speed of reconstruction was much slower than Okinawans expected. In the early stage of educational rehabilitation, the personality of military civil affairs officers dictated the process of educational rehabilitation.[52] Some officers such as Hanna and Watkins realized the importance of cultural activities before the U.S. government embarked on official cultural diplomacy, and they endeavored not to ruin Okinawan culture. Hanna and Watkins contributed to reconstruction of the prefectural library by preserving a few priceless manuscripts. They reported that although most library collections were destroyed by bombs, the Department of Cultural Affairs and the Department of Education succeeded in salvaging books from ruined homes and school buildings. They also dug up a number of priceless manuscripts in air-raid

[51] Higa Mikio, *Kyoiku gozyunen no ayumi* (Kita-chu Zyoson: Hirayama Insatsu, 1999), 223.
[52] Tamaki Tsuguhisa, *Okinawa senryo seisaku to Amerika no kokyoiku* (Tokyo: Toshindo, 1987), 68.

shelters and caves.[53] These episodes demonstrate that cultural understanding was a key factor in making educational rehabilitation successful.

The high reputation of the military rehabilitation with Okinawans suggests that many achievements could not have been achieved without the assistance of U.S. occupiers. For example, the compiling of textbooks is an excellent example for expressing the complexity of establishing a democratic educational system under military occupation. The Okinawa Textbook Compilation Office was established by the Military Government Headquarters at Higaonna immediately after the end of the Pacific War on August 15, 1945. The compilation of new textbooks carried the primary goal of removing the influence of Japanese nationalism and militarism from elementary school education.

The U.S. military government strictly censored the context of these textbooks. For example, Okinawan editors were forced to change the name of the prewar subject "Kokugo" (Japanese) to "Yomikata" (Reading).[54] The military government also emphasized images of a pro-American and independent Okinawan identity. A fifth-grade Japanese textbook inserted the story of Okinawan immigrants in the Philippines who completed a painstaking road construction project and were praised by Americans. Under military supervision, new mimeographed textbooks were published and distributed to schools.[55] At the same time, however, it was an inevitable truth that the military government could not have achieved the compilation of textbooks without the assistance of Okinawan educators due to the shortage of bilingual American officers. Although

[53] Social Rehabilitation: Hanna/Watkins, *Paper of James T. Watson IV*, box 9.
[54] Okinawa-ken Kyoiku Iinkai ed., *Okinawa no sengo kyoikushi* (Naha: Okinawa-ken Kyoiku Iinkai, 1977), 9.
[55] Roger Dingman, *Deciphering the Rising Sun: Navy and Marine Corps Codebreakers, Translators, and Interpreters in the Pacific War* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2009), 151; Gordon Warner, *History of Education in Postwar Okinawa* (Tokyo: Nihon Bunka Kagakusha,1972), 15-17; Kensei Yoshida, *Democracy Betrayed: Okinawa Under U.S. Occupation* (Bellingham: Center for East Asian Studies, Western Washington University, 2002), 34-35; "Sample Text Book" in Nakano Yoshio ed., *Sengosiryo Okinawa* (Tokyo: Nihon Hyoronsya, 1969), 31.

the Army contributed by collecting textbooks from destroyed school buildings, they could not understand the contents of these textbooks without an editor's English translations.

Considering the difficulty of communicating with indigenous people, the military government emphasized English as one of the most important subjects to be taught in schools. According to the school curricula of 1946, English was a compulsory subject even in elementary school. The wages of qualified English teachers able to serve as translators or interpreters were five to ten percent higher than those of other occupations. Special schools were also established for the teaching of English. These schools provided six-month courses devoted entirely to the study of conversational and written English in order to ensure the acquisition of capable personnel under U.S. military guidance.[56] English language policy has long been considered a typical metaphor for American colonization in Okinawa. Unlike the British classical and intellectual approach, American occupiers emphasized the establishment of an English or bilingual educational system in their colonies over instruction in the indigenous language. The choice of English also carried the ideological implication that English was a transmitter of reform, and especially of American democratization.[57]

In the case of Okinawa, some historians maintain that the military government abandoned its language policy of enforcing the use of English in schools because the authorities lacked sufficient bilingual instructors, and thus exhorted the younger generation to learn their own cultural heritage instead.[58] Other scholars argue that the military adhered to its English language

[56] "Eigozin no hokyu ichiwari kyuyo ni tsuite," Ibid., 29; Warner, op. cit., 42.
[57] Alfred W. McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance States* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 42-43; Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government; Race Empire, the United States & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 203-204.
[58] Arnold G. Fisch, *Military Government in the Ryukyu Islands 1945-50* (Washington D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1988), 100; Warner, op. cit., 27.

policy even afterward. Yamauchi Susume argues that the military clearly intended for English to be taught as "the second official language" on Okinawa, not as a mere foreign language.[59] Okudaira Hijime concludes that the U.S. military forced indigenous people to enact a bilingual language policy.[60] Considering the fact that English was a required subject even in elementary schools until 1957, it is clear that the U.S. military kept an interest in English education.

In hindsight, however, the military vision of how to establish English education on the conquered islands was beyond the army's capacity. The U.S. military initially planned to occupy Taiwan as its outpost for the invasion of mainland Japan. In preparation for establishing a military government in Taiwan, the military offered civil affairs courses about Taiwan to its reserve officers. The majority of the military government officers who landed on Okinawa, therefore, did not know anything about it, and any information they received about Okinawa was old and distorted by Japanese prejudices. Although some bilingual officers or Nisei soldiers played the role of instructors, most soldiers could not conduct a simple conversation with the indigenous people.[61]

In addition to this ill-preparedness, a confusing series of vacillations between the U.S. Army and Navy over responsibility for governing Okinawa delayed reconstruction of the educational system. In July 1946, authority over Okinawa was transferred to Army control, but this event brought no major changes to the Ryukyu Islands. On the contrary, the Navy wondered whether the Army could provide capable personnel comparable to theirs, because the demand for such personnel existed in Japan and Korea as well.[62] It did not take long before the Navy's assumption

[59] Susumu Yamauchi, "The U.S. Military Government's Language Education Policy in Postwar Okinawa," in Teruya Yoshihiko and Yamazato Katsumi ed., *Sengo Okinawa to Amerika* (Naha: Okinawa Timus sha, 1995), 519.
[60] Okudaira, op. cit., 23-24.
[61] Dingman, op. cit., 152-154; Fisch, op. cit., 13-14.
[62] G-3 Plan for Organization of a Military Government for the Ryukyus, box 1, Record Group 260.

turned out to be correct. Even after the Truman administration officially decided to retain the facilities at Okinawa on a long-term basis and declared that the Army would be responsible for administering the Ryukyu Islands, the Military Government of Okinawa encountered a chronic shortage of human resources.[63] The main reason for this shortage was rapid demobilization. In addition, MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo practiced a policy of "salutary neglect" toward the military government in Okinawa.[64] This lessening of administrative interest from official headquarters paralleled the slowdown of civil affairs activities. While schools in mainland Japan were gradually recovered and developed, Okinawan teachers still did not get enough school equipment.

Some Okinawans realized that the transfer of power from the Navy to the Army would have a negative impact on civil affairs activities in Okinawa. Kabira Choshin, Chief of the Okinawan Civil Administration Education Department, recalled that "although the Army continued the Navy's [civil affairs] policy, the Army seemed not to pay much attention to the quality of officers as the Navy considered"[65] According to Kabira, it was good for him that his American boss was a highly educated person. In his understanding, many civil affairs officers in the Naval Military Government were also intellectuals, such as former professors, and thus they understood that cultural and educational rehabilitation would be important for the future of the Ryukyu Islands. This expectation became less possible under the subsequent Army Military Government.

[63] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Key Stone: The American Occupation of Okinawa and U.S.-Japanese Relations* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press. 2000), chapter 2; Revised Paragraph 5 of NSC13/1 (October 26, 1948), *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1948, 6, 877-878.
[64] Fisch, op. cit., 77.
[65] Kabira Choshin, *Syusengo no Okinawa bunka gyoseishi* (Naha: Gekkan Okinawa Sha, 1997), 56.

In spite of the many burdens on civil affairs activities, the military government still believed that the United States could democratize Okinawan society. They kept emphasizing that "English could serve as a common bond between the American and Ryukyuan peoples, as well as a conduit for American ideals."[66] To maintain this ideal, the military government expanded their teacher training commitments to the University of the Ryukyus, establishing programs to train English language teachers. Despite this, a military civil affairs report noted a shortage of qualified instructors and supplies as late as 1952. The quality of education also became unstable for financial reasons. Prior to 1952, the university was maintained through Government and Relief in Occupied Area (GARIOA) and other aid funds.[67] After 1954, the financing of the university shifted gradually from GARIOA funds to tax revenues from the indigenous people. Within the education budget, financial aid from the United States covered only thirteen percent, while tax revenues accounted for eighty-five percent.[68] Okinawans have always faced a budgetary crisis in higher education. The University of the Ryukyus needed to maintain decent faculty members and administrative skills in order to meet the Army's excessive expectations.

The University of the Ryukyus and the Origin of Cold War Education

The University of the Ryukyus is a symbol of the partnership between Okinawa and the United States. Few modern scholars criticized this partnership, but the history of the university reveals how higher education was once entangled with the military occupation. As educational activities played an important role remaining in the Ryukyu Islands on a long-term basis, USCAR resolved to tackle the shortage of trained educators. The military government first tried

[66] Fisch, op. cit., 100-101.
[67] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, 1 No.1, 183-186.
[68] Bunkyo Tomo no Kai, op. cit., 118.

to send a large body of Okinawan students to mainland Japan for college training. However, schools there were already overcrowded and the cost of sending students was expensive.[69]

Moreover, MacArthur disliked these activities because he thought that studying in Japan might strengthen the linkages between the Ryukyu Islands and mainland Japan. For the sake of maintaining a permanent military base in Okinawa, MacArthur exaggerated the cultural and racial differences between the mainland Japanese and Okinawans.[70] According to MacArthur, "Okinawa is under a different situation from mainland Japan and thus education for islanders must become different from the one for Japanese. In other words, Okinawans must go to the university in Okinawa."[71] This statement represented the military government's high expectation that the establishment of the University of the Ryukyus would be a breakthrough solution, not only for democratization but also for colonization of the Ryukyu Islands.

In addition to the role of a repository for the future elite, the university became an important target of cultural diplomacy. As recent studies reveal, the United States focused its propaganda activities toward the elite class worldwide due to their influence on the societies.[72] In Okinawa, USCAR counted the students of the university as a future elite group, and the Department of the Army provided scholarships for outstanding students to study in the United States. Nine hundred students studied in the United States, and fifty-eight of them received Ph.D. degrees before the scholarship program ended. Many alumni of the University of the Ryukyus are included in these numbers. While each student had a different experience in the United States, it is evident that

[69] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, op. cit., 181.
[70] Kimie Hara, *Cold War Frontiers in the Asia-Pacific: Divided Territories in the San Francisco System* (London: Routledge, 2007), 166-167.
[71] Okinawa ni Daigaku wo Setsuritsu, ed. Nakano, op. cit., 30.
[72] Osgood, op. cit., 114, 130; Yoshimoto, op. cit., 215.

many people dedicated their specialty to developing Okinawan society.[73] During the military occupation era, study abroad groups occasionally became a victim of slander from anti-American groups, but Okinawan student contributions toward developing Okinawan society are clear.

Yamazato Katsumi describes the idea of creating a university for Okinawans as being rooted in several movements.[74] Long before the military government began the University of the Ryukyus Project, Okinawan educators aspired to establish a university in Okinawa. Governor Shikiya Koshin and the Director of the Okinawan Civil Administration Education Department, Yamashiro Atsuo, submitted a written statement to the Japanese Imperial Government in 1939, but their statement was ignored as World War II affected all aspects of Japanese society. Once the war was over, people once again requested permission to establish a local university. In 1947, Okinawan high school student associations started fundraising campaigns and donated 85,575 yen to the military government along with a written statement. In Hawaii, Americans of Okinawan descent began a lobbying campaign to support the university building project in Okinawa.[75]

On the military side, the idea of creating a university went back to 1947, when the U.S. Military Government Director of Education Colonel Stuart proposed the first formal plan. After this plan was approved by Far East Command in Tokyo in 1948, the new director of the Ryukyu Military Government Chief Civil Information and Education Division, Dr. Arthur E. Mead, led this university building project. In 1949, construction of the new university began on the grounds of the former Shuri Castle.[76] Brigadier General John H. Weckerling chose this site because "this

[73] GARIOA, Fulbright Okinawa Dosokai, *GARIOA Ryugakusei no sokuseki* (Haebarucho: Naha Syuppansha, 2008).
[74] Yamazato, op. cit., chapter one and two.
[75] Okinawa-ken Kyoiku Iinkai, op. cit., 567-568.
[76] Warner, op. cit., 79.

place was deeply related with politics and education of the Ryukyus Kingdom."[77] Okinawan educators committed to the establishment of this new university claimed that the project, backed by the U.S. military, aimed to emphasize the indigenous identity and dilute Japanization.

Yamashiro Atsuo recalled having complicated feelings when the first university in Okinawa was named the University of the Ryukyus by the military government. He preferred "Okinawa" to "Ryukyu" for the name of the university, as "Ryukyu" reminded the indigenous people about their history of discrimination with the Imperial Japanese government.[78] Until the late nineteenth century, Okinawa maintained its status as an independent kingdom between Japan and China. As the power of Imperial Japan rose in East Asia, however, the government formally established Okinawa as a Japanese prefecture and enacted political and social reforms to assimilate to the natives to Yamato Japanese culture. Due to the delay of political and social modernization compared to that of the mainland, the Yamato Japanese treated Okinawans as second-class citizens.[79]

This de-Japanization process was promoted in the university's curriculum. John G. Chapman, Director of the University of the Ryukyus, played a significant role in developing this curriculum. Chapman was one of few educators in the military government who had professional experience in a Japanese high school, having worked as an English teacher before the Pacific War. The vice president of the University of the Ryukyus, Asato Genshu, recalled that Chapman requested to abolish the Department of Japanese Language and Literature in 1950. According to Chapman, students had already studied Japanese and thus they did not need to learn more

[77] Yamazato, op. cit., 110.
[78] Ogawa, op. cit., 87-88.
[79] Stele Rabson, "Assimilation Policy in Okinawa: Promotion, Resistance, and Reconstruction," in Chalmers Johnson ed., *Okinawa Cold War Island*, (Cardiff: Japan Policy Research Institute, 1999), 134.

Japanese at university. Although Asato stressed the necessity of Japanese studies, the military government rejected his appeal. Finally Japanese studies were retained, but only as an optional subject.[80]

According to Asato, the U.S. education policy appeared more radical and paternalistic after the outbreak of the Korean War.[81] In fact, his assumption corresponded to the military's official occupation policy. The military government's attempts to install American higher education in Okinawa were no longer a temporal project and became embroiled in the Cold War international education mission. In his congratulatory telegram following the foundation ceremony of the university, MacArthur used Cold War rhetoric and warned students of wily communism. He wrote that the university was born as "the champions of freedom" and rallied students to defend its heritage against "those forces that would enslave the mind of men."[82] Within this Cold War context, the University of the Ryukyus was permitted to provide democratic education, including "freedom of speech, assembly, petition, religion, and the press," as long as these activities were consistent with the military occupation.[83]

It is clear that many Okinawan faculty and students at the university became increasingly uncomfortable with this limited democracy. Tensions between the ideal of democratic education and the reality of military occupation could be seen through the struggles within the university administration. The power of the military government over the university administration was guaranteed not only for its political power in appointing members of the educational council, but also for its financial power to organize the university budget. Although the military handed over

[80] Yamazato, op. cit., 128-130.
[81] Ogawa, op. cit., 166.
[82] Yamazato Katsunori, *Ryudai Monogatari* (Naha: Ryukyu Sinpo Sha, 2010), 155.
[83] Yoshida, op. cit., 44.

authority of the budgetary process to the educational council in 1953, most of the university's finances still came from USCAR. In addition, the military government established the University of the Ryukyus Foundation and provided the supervisory authority for this new institution.[84] When the Education Department offered to transfer the supervisory authority to the Okinawan Civil Administration, USCAR rejected this idea. According to an Okinawan official, the Director of the Chief of Civil Information and Education Division, Henry E. Diffenderfer, left a short message that stated only, "we could not give the authority to you, Okinawans."[85] Unlike Hanna and Watkins, Diffenderfer was infamous for his paternalistic behavior and anti-Communist ideology. For many Okinawan educators, Diffenderfer became an icon of higher education in the military occupation era and he represented the negative impression of Okinawans that the university could not decide anything without military permission.

As the University of the Ryukyus was expected to play multiple roles in the military occupation, the military eventually realized the limitation of their abilities to handle educational problems. In contrast with high expectations to the new university, there were only one permanent and nine temporary buildings on campus in 1951.[86] The Army requested from Congress an increase in the budget for military occupation, and officials also sought assistance from non-governmental sectors. In regard to activities in developing countries, private foundations were a reliable partner with a great deal of experience in educational project development. In Okinawa, the Ford Foundation spent almost $32,000 to invite eminent scholars from all over the world. The Asia Foundation also provided funds for many programs such as

[84] Okinawa-ken Kyoikui Iinkai, op. cit., 575-577.
[85] Bunkyo Tomo no Kai, op. cit., 42.
[86] Michigan State University and the University of Ryukyus: An Experience in International Cooperation 1951-1986. Kart T. Wright Papers, box 5808, folder 6. University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing.

vocational education and research grants.[87] The Rockefeller Foundation contributed to efforts to upgrade the contents of the university library by providing $50,000 in grants.

With financial support from these private foundations, the military government embarked on a large-scale educational program to modernize the University of the Ryukyus. However, the military did not intend to establish an "ivory tower" type of educational system focusing on exploring the academic frontier in Okinawa. Rather than developing knowledge of theories, the purpose of assisting USCAR was "helping people to help themselves.[88] While retaining ultimate control of the Ryukyu Island, the U.S. military

endeavored to halt the spread of Communism and bolster political stability in Okinawa. To ensure these goals, the military would bear the burden of costs to feed and support Okinawans with their own money. However, a more preferable approach for the military was to educate Okinawans for working out their own safety and salvation.[89] Under this consideration, it is natural that he military placed great importance on the concept of a land-grant philosophy. After consulting with USCAR, the Department of Army asked the American Council on Education to select an excellent American university in order to provide a model to which University of the Ryukyus could "adopt".[90]

USCAR often used the word "adoption" to explain the purpose of the University of the Ryukyus Project. Okinawans considered that this word represented the Army's expectation of reeducating the indigenous people in a paternal fashion. It became a puzzle for Okinawans to

[87] Okinawa-ken Kyoiku Iinkai, op. cit., 578.
[88] Personal, FY 54 Michigan State College Contract, 6 March 1953. Records of University of Ryukyu Project, box 279, folder 49. University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing.
[89] Mire Koikari, *Cold War Encounters in US-Occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity, and Transnationalism in East Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 72; Fisch, op. cit., 102.
[90] Letter from Frank C. Abott to John A. Hannah, 17 May, 1951. Records of University of Ryukyu Project, box 279, folder 44. Ibid.

understand how the university could contribute to democratic education and the principles of freedom of speech, assembly, petition, religion, and the press while under permanent military occupation. However, the American side showed little anxiety, as this project coincided with the rise of the global Col War. The American Council on Education simply explained that the University of the Ryukyus was consistent with other military occupations as well as the liberties of democratic countries.[91]

On June 12 1951, the American Council on Education notified John Hannah, the President of Michigan State University (MSU, named Michigan State College at that time) that the Advisory Committee had selected MSU to assist in the planning of the new university. USCAR notified Hannah of the many duties necessary to facilitate the development of the fledgling university. USCAR's priority was placed on following subjects: English, agriculture, home economics, government, education, and public finance. At this stage, the University of the Ryukyus Project also represented a new phase of military occupation. This project had become a litmus test to prove the capabilities of the military-academic complex. MSU had high confidence in its ability to complete its duties, as university administrators had already proclaimed the excellence of their programs in the above subjects.[92] Hannah believed that the future of the United States would depended largely on what happened to underdeveloped countries and he encouraged MSU faculties and students to engage in this overseas project.[93] The military believed that the United States should play a leading role as the guardian of liberal democracy in the world. However, both MSU and USCAR underestimated the strong feelings of the indigenous people that democratic education and military occupation could not be compatible.

[91] Memorandum of Information Concerning a Cooperative Project with the University of the Ryukyus, *Paper of James T. Watson IV*, box 5.
[92] Letter from Milton E. Mead to Arthur E. Mead, 8 June 8, 1951, Ibid; Ogawa, op. cit., 106-107.
[93] John A Hannah, A Memoir (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1980), 129, 135.

Conclusion

Social rehabilitation of Okinawan society in the postwar period was not inseparable from the rise of the Cold War in East Asia. The military faced many difficulties in civil affairs activities. The lack of a long-term military occupation plan meant that many civil affairs activities were improvised. The military government also suffered from a chronic shortage of funding and human resources. Under these circumstances, infrastructural improvement and social rehabilitation depended on the quality of cooperation between military personnel and the indigenous people. Although some positive relationships did exist, most cases were not harmonious, as many GIs held deep racial prejudices and demonstrated a paternalistic attitude toward Okinawans. While Okinawans realized their new rulers' arrogance, they put the highest priority on the economic and social rehabilitation of their war-devastated society. In fact, very few officials, such as Watkins and Hanna, achieved earn respect from the Okinawans and deepened understandings about Okinawan culture.

As the rise of the Cold War shaped the character of the Ryukyu Islands, the process of social rehabilitation was deeply involved with military strategy. The Army Military Government and USCAR embarked on new types of cultural activities that stressed specific political goals. First, the United States highlighted Okinawan nationalism in postwar education. As Eisenhower's statement reveals, the United States decided to remain in the Ryukyu Islands as long as the East Asian political environment was unstable, and thus the rise of the Japan restoration movement was to be suppressed using the Okinawan identity. Second, the Cold War positioned the Ryukyu Islands as part of the global ideological battle between the United States and the Soviet Union. For this political reason, the Army expected that the University of the Ryukyus would become a symbol of American democracy in the Ryukyu Islands. In particular, the United States expected

that the university would consistently educate new pro-American elite groups who would be able to communicate with U.S. military personnel in English.

With the scope of U.S. cultural diplomacy widening, the Army was forced to handle the many issues of the indigenous people. The State Department and the former military civil affairs officers doubted the administrative skill of the new military government. They believed that the Army underestimated the importance of cultural activities, and complaints about the military occupation increased as time progressed. However, even Americans who criticized the Army's policy on cultural activities cast little doubt on the supremacy of American culture and ideology. The solution of the Army to overcome the limitations of their cultural activities was to obtain assistance from outside sectors such as private foundations and educational institutions. In the end, the military occupation of Okinawa changed the military-academic project in the Cold War.

The University of the Ryukyus Project became a litmus test of the next phase of cultural diplomacy in Okinawa. John Hannah realized the importance of international educational projects in the Cold War era. MSU's involvements in these projects were inseparable from Hannah's understandings of the Cold War. The next chapter examines how MSU deepened involvements in the Cold War and the U.S. occupation of Okinawa.

CHAPTER 3: MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLD WAR EDUCATION IN AMERICAN-OCCUPIED OKINAWA

Introduction

On February 12, 1951, Brigadier-General James M. Lewis read a congratulatory telegram from General Douglas MacArthur during the foundation ceremony of the University of the Ryukyus. Given the intensifying Korean War, MacArthur's message used Cold War rhetoric and warned students against the wiliness of communism. MacArthur wrote in his message that the university was born out of "the champions of freedom," and rallied listeners to defend its heritage against "those forces that would enslave the mind of men."[1] MacArthur never missed an opportunity to impress on people his achievements, and he always radiated a self-assured assessment of the military occupation of Okinawa.[2] In this message, however, MacArthur erroneously predicted that educated Okinawan university students would become sympathizers of the United States. Many American servicemen stationed in Okinawa also shared, to some degree, high expectations for the future of this new university. Three months later, John G. Chapman, Director of the University of the Ryukyus, stated during the formal opening ceremony that "the university would play a significant role as the dynamo of civilization which spread power and light of education into every part of the Islands of the Ryukyus." [3]

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze how the University of the Ryukyus intertwined with the discourse of democratic education and the Cold War in 1950s. The United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR) manifested huge progress towards democratic education under their tutelage. In hindsight, however, the pedagogy of democracy in Okinawa

[1] Yamazato Katsunori, *Ryudai Monogatari* (Naha: Ryukyu Sinposha, 2010), 155.
[2] Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 20-25.
[3] Yamazato, op. cit., 135.

could not be completed without the painstaking endeavors of civilian educators. During the early occupation stage, military officers had little guidance regarding the staggering task of educational rehabilitation in Okinawa. They also had their hands full carrying out regular military responsibilities.[4] Even before the official opening of the University of the Ryukyus, the U.S. Army asked the American Council on Education, a higher education organization, to select an excellent academic institution to assist in the development of the new university in Okinawa. The American Council on Education nominated seven academic institutions, and the Army chose Michigan State University.[5] The military government expected the University of the Ryukyus to become an agent for assisting with certain tasks in the field of education. The Army's first goal for this new university was to train future teachers who would transform the Okinawan educational system from the prewar Japanese pattern to an American democratic one.[6] The next goal was to provide professional training programs for able youth who would contribute to the social and economic development of Okinawa. On this war-devastated island, reconstruction of higher education meant not only complementing the pedagogy of democracy, but also providing practical programs such as English, agriculture, home economics and engineering. Among others, the military government initially focused on the development of the Department of Agriculture in order to resolve food shortage problems on the island.[7]

Founded as the Agricultural College of the State of Michigan in 1855 and developing into a leading land-grant institution in the United States, MSU was the ideal planning director for this fledgling university in Okinawa. The philosophy of land-grant universities aimed to reinforce the

[4] Gordon Warner, *History of Education in Postwar Okinawa* (Tokyo: Nihon Bunka Kagakusha, 1972), 25.
[5] The other six applicants were: Brigham Young University, University of Hawaii, Louisiana State University, Southern University and A&M College, Oregon State University, and Washington State University.
[6] Milton E Muelder, The University of Ryukyu—A Report. Records of University of Ryukyu Project. Box 279, Folder 46. University Archives & Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing
[7] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, Vol.1 No.1, 182.

vision of an independent and educated free citizenry as the foundation of free societies in the world. During its 18-year mission from 1951 to 1968, 58 MSU faculty members participated in developing the school. During this time, the University of the Ryukyus grew from six departments, 29 faculty members and 759 students to four colleges, 28 departments, 219 faculty members and 3,413 students.[8]

It is indisputable that MSU played a significant role in the social reform of Okinawan society. However, few scholars have actually examined the story of the MSU overseas university-building project in Okinawa. By shedding light on this mostly forgotten but highly important project, this chapter attempts to enrich our understanding of the American occupation of Okinawa. Over the past two decades, a new generation of experts has closely examined the cultural, racial and imperial discourse of U.S.-Okinawa relations.[9] Influenced by the increasing saliency of this methodological shift, the story of educational reform in postwar Okinawa has also gradually been reexamined. For the American occupiers, education of the indigenous people was conducted with two different goals: spreading images of benevolent Americans, and "civilizing" the islanders. As Miyagi Etsujiro argues, the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR) adroitly interwove educational reforms with cultural diplomacy, aiming at propagating favorable images of American culture and foreign policy.[10] Distinctive

[8] Ogawa Tadashi, *Sengo beikoku no Okinawa bunka senryaku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012), 215-216; David A. Thomas, *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008), 225.
[9] See, for example, Miyagi Etsujiro, *Okinawa senryo no 27-nenkan:Amerika gunsei to bunka no henyo* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992); Laura Hein and Mark Selden, eds, *Islands of Discontent: Okinawa Responses to Japanese and American Power* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC, 2003); Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946-1965* (New York: New York University Press, 2007); Chris Ames, "Marginality and Agency among Okinawan Women in Relationships with U.S. Military Men, in Maria Hahn and Seugsook Moon, eds, *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010); Johann O. Zulueta, "Living as Migrants in a Place That Was Once Home: The Nisei, the US Bases, and Okinawan Society," *Philippine Studies* 60, no. 3 (2012).
[10] Miyagi, op, cit., 34-46.

approaches included the study abroad program, U.S. cultural centers, and Voice of America (VOA). As the Cold War developed in the late 1940s, the occupation of Okinawa increasingly encompassed another goal: the containment of Communism. According to Mire Koikari, American higher education was related to the Cold War mentality, and MSU was no exception. The president of MSU, John A. Hannah, held governmental educational posts in both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, and he concurred with the U.S. government's demands to emphasize the significance of international aid for developing countries for the sake of containing communism. Focusing on Cold War visions of gender and race, Koikari reveals the imperialistic aspects of U.S. educational policy in the era of American occupied Okinawa. Home economic movements in Okinawa also contained an aspect of Westernizing or "civilizing" indigenous women, and MSU home economists' advisors emphasized the importance of modern and scientific techniques and technologies of homemaking and home management in the United States.[11]

This argument positions itself at the intersection of two historiographical trends in the study of the American occupation of Okinawa: diplomatic history and social history. Rather than reiterate the triumphalism of military discourse, which tends to emphasize the rapid progress of social rehabilitation in Okinawa, this chapter focuses instead on the considerably paternalistic attitudes of educational reformers. In fact, many American educators as well as many U.S. military personnel had little doubt whether Okinawans needed the guiding principles for higher education from the occupiers.[12] By exploring the active roles of MSU advisory group, this chapter also advances the study of American cultural diplomacy in Okinawa, a relatively new

[11] Mire Koikari, "The World is Our Campus: Michigan State University and Cold War Home Economics in US-occupied Okinawa, 1945-1972." *Gender & History* 24 (April 2012): 74-92.
[12] Ogawa, op. cit., 105.

discipline explored by scholars as mentioned above. Finally, this chapter highlights the fact that democratization of education in postwar Okinawa was a byproduct of the military-academic complex that embodied the Cold War ideology of modernization.

American Universities and the Cold War

The Cold War had a great impact on American university structure and the content of academic disciplines. Although cooperation between the federal government and academia had deepened during World War II, the universities' role in the nation's political economy increased throughout the Cold War era. The federal government spent billions of dollars on research at many universities and federal support for science was particularly generous. According to Rebecca S. Lowen, some private universities were uncomfortable conducting research using public funds because the federal government might have interfered with academic freedom on campus.[13] With the Cold War well underway, however, political opportunism and public fear of Communism stimulated the demand for a coalition of the military, industrial and academic worlds. The Korean War only deepened the relationship between universities and their military patrons. Large research projects with massive funding led many universities to hire non-faculty researchers. At the same time, university administrators and faculty struggled with the imbalance between teaching and research and the fundamental philosophy of academic institutions.[14] The fear of Soviet technological and scientific challenges climaxed with the Sputnik Shock in 1957. Anxiety about the future of American science urged Congress to pass the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). By the end of the 1950s, national leadership considered education not

[13] Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1997), 72, 99.
[14] Ibid., 120, 150.

only as necessary for building human capital for economic growth, but also as a weapon in the Cold War.[15]

Some scholars have called any universities with massive federal grants "The Cold War University."[16] Escalation of military expenditures provided a shelter for research grants, fellowships and the cultivation of new fields of study in higher education.[17] Universities made room for these new fields of study, such as Nuclear Engineering, Russian Studies, and Southeast Asian Studies.[18] For example, the Russian Research Center was founded in 1947 as a result of a fruitful collaboration between an intelligence agency and Harvard.[19] Intellectual zeal for global conflict developed modernization theory in American academia. Modernization theory represented Americans' belief that exporting U.S. technology and training would improve underdeveloped nations.[20] As Norm Chomsky argues, however, the increased jingoism rallying around the flag of the Cold War demonstrated a sense of self-righteousness and narrowness of perspective.[21] In many overseas university projects, many American faculty members dismissed demands of indigenous people as irrational opinions.

While the formation of the military-academic complex created a kind of financial benefit, political collaboration with the paranoid anti-communist crusade known as McCarthyism eroded

---

[15] Richard Ohmann, "English and the Cold War," in Norm Chomsky et al, *The Cold War & The University: Toward An Intellect History* (New York: New Press, 1997), 88; Audra J. Wolfe, Competing with the Soviet: Science, Technology, and the State in Cold War America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2013), 23.
[16] See Lowen, op. cit.; Chomsky et al, op. cit.
[17] Ibid., xix.
[18] Lowen, op. cit., 3.
[19] Laura Nader, "The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology," in Chomsky et al, op. cit., 112.
[20] The logic of the modernization process is rooted in the discourse of white supremacy. However, the Cold War provided case studies for social scientists to prove the accuracy of their theories. See Michael E. Lathan, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
[21] Noam Chomsky, "The Cold War and the University," in Chomsky et al, op. cit., 176.

the moral integrity of the university. The American Association of Universities declared that "the main threat to academic freedom was 'world Communism'."[22] Yale University president Charles Seymour stated that Yale refused to employ communists and even made one campus administrator liaison with the FBI. The fear of witch-hunts soon spread into academia. In 1950, the University of California required a loyalty oath in their employment contract. Some faculty were fired, while others left the campus on their own accord.[23] In retrospect, this widespread fear of communism created an atmosphere that restricted academic freedoms, and many administrators and faculty members could not prevent the suspected communists in the academy from having their careers ruined. Until the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam War ignited a flame of activism, there was no real challenge on campuses to the discourse of the Cold War.[24] Most Americans believed that communist activities were a global menace, and thus they had little doubt about conducting Cold War educational programs for the sake of American interests in other countries.

Many scholarly works on the topic of relations between American universities and the Cold War focus mainly on the limited number of prestigious universities, such as Harvard, Yale, MIT, and Stanford. However, other academic institutions were also actively involved in anti-communist campaigns and federally sponsored projects. Although not all overseas activities were government-financed projects, 27 land-grant institutions made 53 contracts with 26 foreign countries until 1962. Two land-grant universities, Kansas State University and MSU, were viewed as distinctive institutions in the realm of improving global education. In the case of

[22] David Montgomery, "Prosperity under the Shadow of the Bomb," ibid., xxii.
[23] Nader, op. cit., 110-111.
[24] Ellen W. Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 340-341.

MSU, Herman R. Allen pointed out four projects: work with the National University of Colombia in the development of two agricultural schools; education in business administration at Brazilian universities; two village aid programs in Pakistan; and establishment of the new University of Nsukka in Nigeria.[25] In addition to these projects financed by U.S. private foundations, MSU engaged in U.S. military-sponsored projects in South Vietnam and Okinawa.

The prominent role of MSU in the field of overseas projects was owed to the political skill of the university president, John A. Hannah. His administration style was far from perfect, but even Hannah's critics admitted his great contributions to the university. John Ernst writes that Hannah was no scholar, but rather an "institution builder" who accessed both private and public funds.[26] During Hannah's tenure, MSU became one of the largest public universities in the United States. Hannah mobilized his patriotic attitudes and political connections to assist the federal government with financial rewards for enlarging the university system. Hannah actively supported the federal government for financial and patriotic reasons. According to Ernst, "Hannah came to know every president from Herbert Hoover to Gerald Ford."[27] As president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Hannah assisted Truman's Point Four Program and served as a member of the International Development Advisory Board. In 1953-1954, Hannah served as Eisenhower's Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel. In 1969, Hannah was appointed head of the Agency for International Development (AID) under President Richard Nixon.[28]

---

[25] Herman R. Allen, *Open Door to Learning: The Land-Grant System Enters Its Second Century* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963), 41-43, 56.
[26] John Ernst, *Forging a Fateful Alliance: Michigan State University and Vietnam War* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998), 4-5.
[27] Ibid., 6.
[28] Ibid., 6-7.

Like other university presidents, Hannah demonstrated ardent anti-communist attitudes and decided to expel the members of the Communist Party from the school faculty in the early 1950s. While student activists criticized the university administrators after MSU's involvement with the federal government helped infamous South Vietnam dictator, Ngo Dinh Diem, few people at the time questioned Hannah's commitments.[29] The Cold War consensus of the 1950s was so powerful that there were few controversies regarding working with the federal government under the name of anti-communism. Like Hannah, many people at MSU believed the menace of communism was ubiquitous; thus, they were at times merciless, even in their own neighborhood. In the fall of 1953, Arnold Williams, a professor in MSU's English Department, was accused of former membership in the Communist Party. With the support of his colleagues, Williams was forced to demonstrate his loyalty and continual value to the university. Even after the Red Scare fervor of the 1950s died down, the issue of communists on campus remained. In May 1962, the MSU Board of Trustee denied a request from the university's Young Socialist Club to invite an ex-convict and member of the U.S. Communist Party as a guest speaker.[30]

Michigan State University experienced controversy regarding tensions between the moral integrity of academic freedoms and jingoism in the name of anti-communism during the Vietnam War. This controversy was not unusual in the case of the South Vietnam Project, and MSU considered its other projects as successes that proved the rightness of the land-grant philosophy and spreading American ideology to the world.[31] In the minds of many Americans, the two goals of containing communism and serving local communities throughout the world were compatible.

---

[29] Ibid., 129-134.
[30] David A. Thomas, *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008), 433-435.
[31] Ernst, op. cit., 7-8.

From the viewpoint of the other side, however, these two goals were not as convincing as Americans expected. As the South Vietnam Project revealed, the United States could never achieve these two goals as long as they were regarded as untrustworthy.[32] The University of the Ryukyus Project in Okinawa also provides an excellent lesson that the U.S. paranoia of world communism overshadowed the goodwill of the land-grant university philosophy.

The Great Challenges of MSU

After the first survey trip on July 1951, Dr. Milton E. Muelder, head of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at MSU, recognized that the university-building project in Okinawa would be difficult but a great challenge.[33] He was surprised by the circumstances of war-devastated society in Okinawa and the plight of indigenous people whose property had been confiscated by the U.S. Army. Muelder also reported to Hannah that the faculty members of the University of the Ryukyus lacked "appropriate dress and attire, including shoes of proper size and fit." Despite these miserable conditions, Muelder was confident that MSU would succeed in creating a similar land-grant institution in Okinawa. According to Muelder, Okinawans would not complete university-level education without appropriate support, but they were not lacking in "native intelligence"; thus, sincere support for higher education would develop "a valid institution which may be worthy of the name 'University'."[34]

While he predicted a rather optimistic future of the university, Muelder pointed out problems with the military occupation policy. Most troublesome was the absence of affinity between the

---

[32] Robert Scigliano & Guy H. Fox, *Technical Assistance in Vietnam: The Michigan state University Experience* (New York: Fredrick A. Praeger Publishers, 1965), 12.
[33] Muelder, Milton E. Letter to President John Hannah. 11 July 1951. Records of University of Ryukyu Project. Box 279, Folder 45. op. cit.
[34] Muelder, Milton E. Report of Observations of Problems and Conditions on Okinawa: Relative to Michigan State College "Adaption" of University of the Ryukyus, ibid.

U.S. personnel and indigenous people due to the military's mistreatment of Okinawan natives. According to Muelder's report, roughly 25% of the arable land along the areas stretching from Naha to Kadena had been taken for military installation purposes, and bulldozers had run over traditional monuments such as large ancestral tombs.[35] The U.S. government also recognized problems caused by the imprudent behavior of American occupiers, which ignored Okinawan culture. In 1953, Secretary of State John F. Dulles stated that "the administration of Okinawa still carried a heavy wartime flavor and character, with the result that 90 percent of Okinawans hated the United States." [36] Because of the importance of the military bases in Okinawa, Dulles realized that Okinawa should be maintained under the U.S. administration. At the same time, he hoped that USCAR would play more attention to the indigenous people.

Unlike U.S. military personnel, faculty members at MSU knew how important it was to gain the respect and obedience of Okinawans in order to sustain this mission for a long time. MSU also carefully considered how to maintain relationships with the military in Okinawa. When the American Council on Education offered the University of the Ryukyus Project in May 1951, Muelder had already wondered if MSU members should be given an appropriately "free hand."[37] This demand for a "free hand" resulted from the philosophy of land-grant universities. In letters to Professor Russell E. Horwood, chief of the first MSU mission in Okinawa, Hannah reiterated that land-grant institutions were independent of direct governmental administration. In his view, "if extension services and research were carried on directly by the government, either by-passing or competing with land-grant institutions that these institutions could never have developed into

[35] Ibid.
[36] Memorandum of Discussion of the 151st Meeting of the National Security Council, 15 June 1953. *Foreign Relations of the United State 1952-1954* 14, 1441.
[37] Sent for the Information of Dr. Milton E. Muelder. 27 May 1951.Box 279, Folder 44, op. cit.

the great institutions they now are and many important services rendered to people would be denied."[38] Hannah advised members of the MSU mission to know the wants and needs of Okinawans and thus have direct contact with people of all professions.

Considering Hannah's jingoism as a Cold War soldier and his close relationship with the U.S. government, this advice appears strange. In fact, Hannah showed little concern about the military occupation continuing on a fairly permanent basis. At the same time, he had few doubts that Okinawans would be cooperative with Americans. In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Hannah pointed out that the Okinawan leaders had a great fear of communism, and he claimed that if the United States pulled out of Okinawa, the Okinawans would not be able to successfully resist the Soviet Communists. According to Hannah, Okinawans' desire for the reversion to Japan was not really deep, and thus the United States should provide an alternative for defending Okinawa.[39] In addition, Hannah was a pragmatic administrator with the vision that military funding would financially benefit his university's campus, all the while believing in the land-grant philosophy. Even after MSU students and faculty increasingly denounced U.S. intervention in Vietnam and argued that institutions of higher education should not serve to assist the federal government in other counties, Hannah considered using federal aid to expand university facilities.[40] Regarding the MSU project in Okinawa, Hannah would not be caught in the dilemma between the land-grant philosophy and U.S. military intervention as in other counties. In a letter to Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, Hannah argued:

> There is an opportunity for the United States to make a really significant contribution to our cause in Asia by doing an intelligent job of helping the people in Okinawa to develop

[38] Letter from John Hannah to Professor Russell E. Horwood. 7 November 1951, Box 279, Folder 47, op. cit.
[39] The Honorable Dean Acheson, July 1, 1951, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 42, Folder 22, University Archives & Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing.
[40] Ernst, op. cit., xiv.

> programs that will help themselves, and the success of this depends pretty largely upon the basic philosophy of the total educational system there.[41]

In Hannah's understanding, the University of Ryukyus Project was in U.S. national interest and in keeping with the land-grant philosophy.

In September 1951, members of the first MSU mission arrived in Okinawa. This advisory group was composed of five members: Russell E. Horwood, a professor of agriculture, Guy H. Fox, an associate professor of economics, Edward Pfau, an assistant professor of education, Eleanor Densmore, an instructor of home economic, and Horace C. King, an instructor of vocational training. The function of these visiting professors was primarily to train Okinawan faculty members in a wide variety of matters needed for a quality university. These pertained to "teaching methods, curriculum, research, extension, and general administration." [42] Considering the appallingly shabby conditions of the university, however, MSU mentors could not smoothly engage in these expected functions. In addition to shortages of equipment and laboratories, the University of the Ryukyus opened without sufficient desks, chairs, blackboards or textbooks.[43] The Natural Science Department and Department Faculties of Mathematics and Agriculture used chairs handmade by students. MSU advisors held conferences with individual faculty members to discuss anticipated teaching and research needs in lecture and laboratory classes, as well as office areas. Among other things, the shortage of Japanese-language textbooks was one of the most serious problems. As Yamazato Katsunori argues, the library possessed many English books donated mainly by Okinawan communities in Hawaii, but there was a lack of Japanese books. An Okinawan professor of physics recalled that he only had an American elementary

[41] Letter from the President John Hannah to Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, February 13, 1956. Box 61 of RG 319.
[42] Allan Tucker, Four Years as Science Advisor to the University of the Ryukyus 1953-77, 1957-1959. RG 260, "Records of the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR)," Box 277 of HCRI-HEW Folder 5.
[43] Yamazato, op. cit., 134.

level textbook, and therefore his students always brought English dictionaries. The following example of one unfortunate student is indicative of the kinds of problems the shortage of text books posed. In an educational psychology class taught by an American teacher, this student had considerable trouble with the English materials. In the final exam, she struggled with her English dictionary, and time ran out before she was able to interpret the meaning of the questions. As for the shortage of educators, the university sought out substitutes who were able to teach courses. Many American missionaries responded to this call, but it was not easy for students to overcome language barriers.[44]

Facing the difficulty of foreign language education, MSU embraced its mission to improve its students' English language skills. The most talented students received an opportunity to study in the U.S. and took English seminars under the direction of MSU members before they left for the United States.[45] Yamaguchi Eitetsu, a retired professor of East Asian Language and Literature at Yale University, recalled that the method of teaching English began on the campus of the university, and that this was a positive thing for the students. In his view, "the presence of the MSU mission was equal to that of European foreign specialists hired by the Imperial Japanese government in the early Meiji Era" who contributed to the modernization of Japan.[46] In April 1957, the university launched the largest bilingual program in the Far East. In this program, the MSU mission cooperated with Japanese linguist Imaruma Shigeo, from Ehime University, and the English Department of the University of the Ryukyuus. The students studied, spoke, and listened to English for approximately 120 hours over ten days, and they were completely isolated

[44] Ibid., 158-161.
[45] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.1 No.3, 111.
[46] Yamaguchi Eitetsu, *Ryukyu-ko kara no hisyo* (Ginowan; Yozyu Shorin, 2001), 102.

from Japanese, their native language. USCAR determined that this bilingual program made remarkable progress.[47] During the 27 years of occupation, the U.S. military often highlighted the development of English language education in Okinawa.

With the notable exception of top performers, however, bilingual education did not bear fruit among most students as the military had expected. Interestingly, Muelder cast doubt on the future of bilingual education in Okinawa before this program began. As far as he knew, bilingual programs that were mandatory for every student had not been successful in any foreign university.[48] For most students, English was not actually a communication tool but rather something they were forced to use only in classes. In addition, many people pointed out the atmosphere wherein students learning English seriously were labeled as too Americanized.[49] Ogawa Tadashi remarked that anti-Americanism on campus became a factor in Okinawan students having the lowest English test score averages across all prefectures of Japan.[50]

Student responses to American language programs at the University of the Ryukyus reflected the ambiguous identity of Okinawans between Japan and the United States. While Okinawans were legally categorized as Japanese citizens, Eisenhower proclaimed a perpetual occupation as long as U.S. national security was threatened in the region. Under these conditions, the question arose about the Japanese right to rule the Ryukyu Islands and the meaning of learning Japanese. In fact, USCAR was anxious that Japanese textbooks would be a useful tool for the rise of Japanese nationalism and anti-U.S. feelings in Okinawa. As the Japanese

[47] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.5 No.1, 92-94.
[48] Letter from Milton E. Muelder to Professor C. David Mead, 18 June 1956, Box 279, Folder 51, op. cit.
[49] Okinawa Taimus-sha, *Ryudai fudoki: Kaigaku yonzyunen no sokuseki* (Naha: Okinawa Taimus-sha, 1990), op. cit.,166-167.
[50] Ogawa, op. cit.,156.

government enacted conservative educational policies such as centralization of teachers and control and nationalization of textbook selection and production, USCAR realized that these movements would not be without a profound influence on Okinawans. [51] As an educator, Muelder pointed out that basic policies should be determined regardless of whether "they should be prepared through positive steps by us for an eventual reversion to Japan or whether they should be helped in the direction of a better and closer understanding of American programs and policy."[52] While the MSU mission avoided sensitive political matters with the stance that these issues should be resolved at the highest level, MSU members realized that USCAR offered this mission of perpetual occupation. When United States Ambassador John M. Allison suggested the possibility of returning Okinawa to Japan in July 1956, Hannah sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense Wilson to make sure that "the objective (of this mission) is to move in the direction of orienting the people of Okinawa to our basic American concepts and philosophy."[53] In his corresponding letter, Wilson confirmed that "the United States will continue to exercise its powers and rights in the Ryukyu Islands as long as conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East."[54] This correspondence reveals that MSU mission was blind to the U.S. occupation policy in Okinawa.

Aside from the subject of English, the quality of university education in Okinawa gradually and generally improved. Equipment was secured through financial assistance from the MSU Project, GARIOA fund, and the regular university budget.[55] In February 1952, Professors King,

[51] Letter from H. Earl Diffenderfer to John A. Hannah, September 29, 1955, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 42, Folder 27, op. cit.
[52] Report of Trip of Dean C.E. Erikson and Milton E. Muelder, Box 61 of RG 319.
[53] Letter from John A. Hannah to the Secretary of Defense, C.E. Wilson, July 11, 1956. Box 61 of RG319.
[54] Letter from the Secretary of Defense, C.E. Wilson to Dr. John A. Hannah, August 9, 1956. Ibid.
[55] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.1 No.2, 58.

Fox and Densmore left for Tokyo to obtain Japanese textbooks with a budgetary limit of almost $1700. Densmore handled the procurement of materials for home economics; King for business administration and economics; and Fox for social science and geography. Another purpose of this mission was to establish a channel for the future procurement of books and other materials.[56]

Within any university, the library functions as the center of learning, and decent academic institutions generally have a great collection of books. The first president of the University of the Ryukyu, Shikiya Koshin, realized the necessity of the university library accumulating books. In keeping with scholastic spirit, Shikiya requested to rebuild the library instead of erecting a gigantic statue of him when the university council offered a memorial event at the retirement of the honored president. USCAR exploited Shikiya's request to create an impression of the friendship between Okinawa and the United States. According to Yamazato, Henry E. Diffenderfer, the new director of the Chief of Civil Information and Education Division, engaged most seriously in fundraising activities for the Shikiya Memorial Library. In a letter to Hannah, Diffenderfer remarked that donations from MSU students were a political symbol of the friendship between the two universities.[57] In order to defray the shortage of construction expenses, Diffenderfer also sold a great number of raffle tickets to Okinawans.[58]

On December 11, 1955, the memorial library was completed and a dedication ceremony was held. At the cost of ¥21,750,000, the five-story reinforced concrete library became a reality. The ceremony was a part of the fifth anniversary program at the university, and the guest speaker was General Lyman Lemnitzer, Governor of the Ryukyu Islands.[59] The expansion of its book

[56] Memorandum to President Shikiya and Mr. Mead, 17 March 1952, Box 279, Folder 48, op. cit.
[57] Yamazato, op. cit., 193-195.
[58] University of the Ryukyus: Serial Article 1, Box 63 of RG 319; Okinawa Taimus-sha, op. cit., 130-131.
[59] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.3 No.2, 115.

collections also continued. Many groups, such as The Rockefeller Foundation and the Asia Foundation, cooperated with book donations from Japanese universities. By the early 1957, the library held more than 65,000 volumes and subscribed to over 240 American academic and professional journals.[60] The library also acted as a primary information center by opening to all people in the Ryukyu Islands.[61]

The installation of a "dependable electric service on campus" in 1953 was a remarkable event for the field of science.[62] The procurement of electricity ensured that training and guidance for students, in other words, classes, could actually start. In March 1954, the renovation of the chemistry and physics laboratory classrooms was completed. The chemistry laboratory had two classrooms, and the larger one had facilities for a maximum of 24 students. Construction of the laboratory building made it possible for Okinawan faculty to employ non-lecture-based methods and to conduct classes based on curricula from MSU advisors. In the same month, the university held its first commencement: a total of 122 students received a Bachelor's Degree, and 162 students received certificates for having completed short two-year courses.[63] The MSU mission also assisted with graduate programs. In 1958, MSU Science Consultant Dr. Allan Tucker became concerned about financial difficulties for many graduate students, discussing this issue with the Asian Foundation representative. He recommended establishing a system of part time assistantship for graduate students who did not receive scholarships. In April 1959, the graduate program operated with financial support from the Foundation and other sources.[64]

[60] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.5 No.1, 99; Tucker, op. cit.
[61] Okinawa Taimus-sha, op. cit., 124.
[62] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.1 No.3, 110.
[63] Tucker, op. cit.; Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.2 No.1, 100-101.
[64] Ibid.

Reflecting on the development of the university system, MSU advisory group also made positive self-assessments. Before she left Okinawa in 1953, Professor Densmore, a specialist of Home Economics, remarked:

> Conditions on the island are constantly improving. The pioneering has been done in so far as living condition are concerned. The discomforts are more than balanced by the new interests and experiences. I can truly say this has been the most rewarding experience of my entire life.[65]

Other members did not overestimate the results of MSU missions outside of home economics, however. Pfau, the specialist for administration, wrote that the Natural Science and Mathematics Departments did not have a mission representative at that time. The Social Science Department faced a severe shortage of staff members from the United States. According to one report, help was needed not only in social science, but also in economics and sociology.[66] Although many reports pointed out the deficiencies of the first MSU mission, none of them concluded that the present problem could not be resolved if the MSU mission continued. On the contrary, Prau suggested to Horwood that MSU mission members should play other roles in addition to instructors. In his view, instructor responsibility was only a part of service, and thus MSU should supervise the entire university administration.

However, aspirations for more contributions to the University Project sometimes prevented the MSU mission from maintaining good relations with USCAR. Specifically, Diffenderfer often stood against MSU advisory group. The new chief of the MSU mission, Roy J. Alexander, leveled blistering complaints against Diffenderfer to MSU. The main point of contention was that Diffenderfer ignored MSU's contributions to the University of the Ryukyus Project.

---

[65] Michigan State College Mission Comments, Miss Eleanor Densmore, Box 279, Folder 49, op. cit.
[66] Memorandum for the Chief, MSC Mission, 29 January 1953, ibid; Recommendation Concerning the 1953-1954 Michigan State Contrast from the Social Science Member, ibid.

According to Alexander, while USCAR published a semi-annual report called the CAMG Reports for Washington, "MSU has never rated a heading in this report although CAMG monies support our program."[67] Worse, MSU activities were contained within the section of the Education Department of USCAR. Alexander asked Diffenderfer to include the MSU mission along with the University of the Ryukyus, but Diffenderfer refused his request. Their relationship remained bitter until Diffenderfer resigned his post in September 1957.

Because the MSU mission was financially dependent on the U.S. Army, the military always had upper hand over MSU. In addition to this structural handicap, the University of the Ryukyus Project was challenged by the Bureau of the Budget (BOB). Before the Department of the Army renewed its contract with MSU, the BOB questioned the intention of the Army to continue financial aid for the University of the Ryukyus. As an informal opinion, the BOB suggested that "the project aid should be reduced for FY 57" and that the mission should be supported by the Government of the Ryukyus (GRI).[68] However, while there was critique about the University of the Ryukyus Project, the Army did not always belittle the role of the MSU mission in Okinawa. In a letter to Hannah, Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker remarked:

> I want you to know that everyone in the Department of the Army is generally interested in the operation and development of the University of the Ryukyus and is deeply concerned, as you are, in the progress and accomplishment of the men and women from Michigan State who have contributed so much to the stabilization of infant university of the Ryukyus. I assure you that there is neither opposition nor dragging of the feet by anyone in the Pentagon as far as I know or can learn.[69]

[67] Letter from Roy J. Alexander to Dean Glen L. Taggard, 1 August 1957, Box 279, Folder 51, ibid.,
[68] Department of the Army Summary Sheet, 12 July, 1955, Box 61 of RG 319.
[69] Letter from Secretary of Army Wilber M. Brucker to the president John Hannah, 2 March 1956, op. cit.

Following this praise, Brucker requested that the MSU mission work on the development of a long-range economic plan. One of the main reasons the Army trusted MSU was that Hannah recognized the strategic value of Okinawa in the Cold War. As early as 1953, Hannah remarked:

> If we are to regard Okinawa as our Far Eastern defense bastion for an indefinite period, the University can be operated to be a most useful agency. If this is to be our policy there must be a different conception in the minds of our Civil Affairs people there.[70]

Hannah further strengthened ties with the Army. When there was a move by USCAR to transfer sponsorship of the university from the Army to GRI, Hannah urged the high-ranking officials of the military not to make a change to the present contract. GRI was a subordinate organization of USCAR under the name of Okinawan self-government. In a letter to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, Hannah wrote that the transfer of sponsorship was tantamount to cancellation of the MSU mission; the concepts of the land-grant philosophy were new to Asia, and the University of the Ryukyus was not firmly established enough to develop by themselves.[71] In order to protect the MSU mission, Hannah supported the Army's view that "the U.S. will continue to exercise its present power and rights in the Ryukyu Islands."[72]

While Hannah was dissatisfied with the limited amount of funding from the Army, he did not give up on the University of the Ryukyus Project, as it was an excellent opportunity to achieve dual purposes: exportation of the land-grant philosophy and contribution to American foreign policy in East Asia.[73] In Hannah's words, MSU could make a significant contribution to the Cold War cause in Asia by helping the people in Okinawa develop programs that would let

[70] Memorandum for Mr. Frank C. Nash Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, 6 March 1953, Box 279, Folder 49, ibid.
[71] Letter from John Hannah to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, 16 June 1955, Box 279, Folder 51, ibid.
[72] Letter from Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson to John Hannah, 9 August 1956, ibid.
[73] The amount of money for the University of the Ryukyu Project in the early stages was: $59,150 from 1951 to 1952; $58,961 from 1952 to 1953; $59,000 from 1953 to 1954; and $74,870 from 1954 to 1955. Letter from John Hannah to Secretary of Defense C.E. Wilson, 16 June, 1955. Box 61 of RG 319.

them help themselves.[74] Hannah was confident that the MSU mission was gradually making progress. In a letter to Wilson, Hannah wrote:

> We will continue to assumes that the objective is to move in the direction of orienting the people of Okinawa to our basic American concepts and philosophy….It is our feeling that the faculty and the students in Okinawa must prefer the present objective to one that would look forward to the early re-integration of their peoples in the Japanese complex.[75]

Most Americans shared this rosy picture of the U.S. occupation in Okinawa. In 1959, Ferris Hartman of the Worldwide News Service reported that "Perhaps the most appreciated American activity here is the help of Michigan State University to establish Okinawa."[76]

It is clear that MSU's University of the Ryukyus Project was an outstanding achievement. In 1960, the new president of the University of the Ryukyus, Asato Shugen, published a message that the university had finally ended "babyhood" and become "full-fledged."[77] Although the first decade of the university saw a host of achievements, many indigenous people never forgot the dark side of the university's history. Teacher and student activists could not avert their eyes from the reality of military occupation, and USCAR was never tolerant of them. Members of the MSU mission were also inseparable from anti-American movements and the Cold War mentality.

Cold War Education vs. Teacher and Student Protests

In Okinawa, the development of the Cold War in Asia had a great impact on the main aspects of Okinawan society. The most remarkable result was the escalation of militarization of the Ryukyu Islands. As a consequence of the establishment of a communist regime in China, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson declared that the United States would establish funding for

[74] Letter from John Hannah to Wilber M. Brucker, 13 February 1956, op. cit.
[75] Letter from John Hannah to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, 11 July 1956, ibid.
[76] Thomas, op. cit., 225.
[77] Yamazato, op. cit., 210.

permanent bases in Okinawa. The North Korean invasion into South Korea in June 1950 reinforced the commitment to U.S. bases in the Ryukyu Islands.[78] In accordance with the fortification of the Islands, the military government also shifted the style of governance from authoritarian to limited autonomy. Under the guidance of Major General Joseph R. Sheetz, the military government also engaged in "the first organized effort to cope with the Okinawan problem."[79] The centerpiece of this new policy was to promote political, economic and social rehabilitation. Among others, the most striking example of these polices was the onset of democratic elections at the municipal and provincial levels.

While the people of Okinawa responded positively to this opportunity to vote, the military government began carefully monitoring anti-American activities: "Commander in Chief, Far East (CINCFE) G-2 Intelligence concentrated on reporting any possible leftist activities."[80] The Okinawa Teachers' Association (OTA), established in 1952, became regarded as one of these leftist groups. USCAR argued that the OTA was not a professional agency to improve child education but rather was "a labor union to fight for higher salaries and better working conditions for its members."[81] Considering the wretched working conditions of teachers, it was reasonable for those organizing them to call for collective bargaining. A number of teachers quit their poorly paid posts to work U.S. military-related jobs. A primary school teacher remembered that:

> My salary was 300 yen per month. In those days, one dollar was 120 yen…. A pack of cigarettes was just 300 yen. My salary was so low that I sold my belongings as haoris (Japanese traditional coats) because Americans wanted to buy those like a souvenir… Many able Okinawans got a job related to military installations, although salary was not so good.[82]

---

[78] Miyazato Seigen, *Amerika no Okinawa tochi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966), 24; Alvah, op. cit., 169.
[79] Frank Gibney, "Forgotten Island," *Time*, November 28, 1949.
[80]Arnold G. Fisch, *Military Government in the Ryukyu Islands 1945-50* (Washington D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1988), 115.
[81] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.1 No.1, 175.
[82] Saki Ryuzo, *Kiroku shogen Okinawa zyumin gyakusatu* (Tokyo: Shin Zinbutsu Ouraisha, 1976), 177.

Statistics displayed that by the end of 1950, 1568 teachers had changed their vocations.[83]

Despite these low salaries, many teachers never lost enthusiasm for US-led educational rehabilitation. While the OTA proclaimed that one of the main goals of this association was to enhance the political, economic and social status of members through the force of their solidarity, the charter highlighted another purpose: that OTA aimed at constructing a democratic education system.[84] In 1953, the OTA and other associations such as the Okinawa Youth Association initiated school reconstruction projects. As mentioned above, the shortage of school facilities was a serious issue until the United States outlined a long-range occupation plan. The president of the OTA, Yara Chobyo, explained that his group started school reconstruction campaigns because the military government showed no interest in this project. After the U.S. military refused, Yara decided to seek financial help from mainland Japan. Because USCAR disliked any kind of campaigns which might stimulate restoration of Okinawa to mainland Japan, Yara hid the true purpose of his trip to the mainland and started his campaign there. Yana applied for an entry permit in order to observe educational institutions in the mainland. Within six-months, this fundraising campaign accumulated 60 million yen. However, USCAR censured Yara for this fundraising attempt and banned his school construction campaign. Finally, Yara was forced to resign his post.[85]

Facing the OTA's betrayal, USCAR increased the alert level against restoration campaigns, where its cautions extended to the University of the Ryukyus. In 1952, Prau warned:

[83] Yoshida, op. cit.; Kyosyokuin taishoku zyokyo, in Nakano Yoshio ed., *Sengosiryo Okinawa* (Tokyo: Nihon Hyoronsya, 1969), 30.
[84] Okudaira, op. cit., 46.
[85] Yara Chobyo, *Yara Chobyo kaikoroku* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1977), 8-9, 20-33; Miyagi, op. cit., 29-30.

> Mr. Yara, President of the Okinawa Teachers Association, and former Education Department Director, has been most vocal in his attempts to promote the issue of reversion to Japan, and has tended to use the University somewhat as a "political football."[86]

The United States worried about the OTA's activities because they believed that communists were agitating reversion movements.[87] In particular, USCAR suspected that there were links between the OTA and Okinawa Peoples Party (OPP). The ideological orientation of its members varied initially. In the early days, the OPP welcomed U.S. military rule, as they thought that it might be an opportunity to free Okinawa from Japan. As U.S. occupation suppressed the democracy of the people, however, the OPP strengthened links with the Japan Communist Party and became enthusiastic about reversion.[88] Some USCAR officials openly called the OPP a communist party. As a matter of course, USCAR showed no mercy when students became involved with OPP.

On May 9, 1953, four students were expelled from the university because they joined May Day, a OPP celebration, and "talked about reversion, peace movement, and criticizing of the University."[89] This incident was later named Daiichi Ryudai Jiken (the First University of Ryukyu Incident). The university administration had already given these four students a suspension from the university because they held an Atomic Bomb Exhibition on campus without the university's permission. For these students, the May Day speech was a protest against this suspension. Participants in the May Day meeting proclaimed that these four students had been punished even though they only engaged in a peace movement. On the other hand, the university administration justified the suspension of those four students because they had

[86] Ed Prau Jr., Progress Report of the Michigan State College Mission June 20 to September 20, 1952, Box 279, Folder 48, op. cit.
[87] Miyagi, op. cit., 29.
[88] Tanji, op. cit., 56.
[89] Letter from Russell E. Horwood to Dr. Milton E. Muelder, 21 June 1953, Box 279, Folder 49, op. cit.

behaved as representatives of the student body and engaged in political activities.[90] While the university administration criticized the students' participation in the May Day meeting, they did not want prompt punishment and sought a negotiated solution with students. As negotiations continued without any results and labor groups agitated some student groups, however, the administration finally decided to expel the four students. In turn, the students tried to make a speech in the general assembly of the student council, but their appeal was refused by the assembly. The students argued that they had not intended to be involved with the OPP, asserting that the May Day event was the only place where they openly criticized the university.[91] In fact, they only approached the OPP when the university and USCAR ostracized them.

USCAR and the MSU mission members grew irritated over this slow approach by the administration. In a letter to Muelder, Horwood reported that "the difficulty of the Oriental to make a decision became apparent." [92] The MSU mission stayed in the background and acted in an advisory position throughout this incident. However, Diffenderfer directly advised the administration to take decisive action. After the expulsion, Horwood recognized that this crisis was over for the university. In a letter to Muelder, he reported that:

> They (four expelled students) apparently came to a realization that this was being sponsored by Communists Party and other well recognized groups did not approve the(ir) action.[93]

Horwood was confident that the university would be much better able to handle a similar situation in the future. Three years later, however, his predication was proven incorrect when students were expelled yet again.

---

[90] Okinawa Taimus-sha, 3 May 1953.
[91] Ryukyu daigaku kyosyokuinkai & Daigakujin kyuzyo no kai ed., *Ryudai jiken toha nandatta no ka* (Okihana: Deigo insatsu, 2010),126, 172.
[92] Letter from Russell E. Horwood to Dr. Milton E. Muelder, 13 May 1953, Box 279, Folder 49, op. cit.
[93] Letter from Russell E. Horwood to Dr. Milton E. Muelder, 21 June 1953, Box 279, Folder 49, op. cit.

The Daini Ryudai Jiken (the Second University of Ryukyu Incident) occurred after "[the] Japanese Literature Club published an unauthorized magazine bitterly attacking the United States as a nation of oppressors and imperialists." [94] USCAR suspected the students' commitment because the magazine made repeated communist attacks. The Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC) investigated both students and faculty and ordered the advisor of the club, Kimida Soei, to suspend publication of the journal for six months. In June 1956, the United States Congress published the Price Report, which justified the permanent possession of military lands. After this, angry Okinawans launched the first massive land struggle. Inspired by this land struggle, Literature Club members decided to publish anti-American content. The Okinawan people shared the understanding of punishing the students after the first incident, because they viewed the radical students as violating the autonomy of university.[95] After the second incident, however, Okinawans believed that USCAR had endangered the academic freedom of the university.

Although USCAR stopped the circulation of this magazine, it was impossible to assuage the animosity that students felt toward the military bases. The OTA and OPP took this opportunity to develop a restoration campaign. In July, 500 students from the university participated in a demonstration parade against the Price Report. They held placards reading "Down with the Oppressors" and chanted "Yankee Go Home." [96] As a countermeasure, USCAR declared the center areas of Okinawa "off limits" in August and contained the student demonstrations. USCAR was so infuriated that the Chief Civil Administrator Vonna F. Burger upbraided the

[94] Letter from C. D. Mead to Milton E. Muelder, 22 August 1956, Box 279, Folder 51, op. cit.
[95] Okinawa Taimus-sha, op. cit., 57-58.
[96] Letter from C. D. Mead to Milton E. Muelder, 22 August 1956, Box 279, Folder 51, op. cit.

board of the university. In a meeting with the Vice Governor of the Bank of the Ryukyus, Burger reported that the board members had old-fashioned ideas and had not punished the students who wrote anti-American articles months prior.[97]

After protestors lost their momentum, USCAR urged the university administration to take action against the student leaders. The new chief of the MSU mission, Carl D. Mead, advised President Asato to "draw a line to indicate to the students what was permissible and what was not permissible in their actions."[98] However, Asato desired not to expel the students and thus tried to settle the situation by suspending them from the university. Eventually, negotiations between USCAR and the university collapsed. According to Mead's report:

> Burger was waiting for the Board and Mr. Asato like a hungry bear. He told them that he had been very patient, but they had shown their inability to administer the university. Their report was entirely unacceptable. We were going to have a university for the Ryukyuan people, and it was not going to be run by communist agitators. He gave them two days to report that the student agitators were permanently expelled and that there would be no further demonstrations.[99]

USCAR also attempted to financially squeeze the University of the Ryukyus in order to make Asato punish the student leaders. Diffenderfer addressed this in a letter to Asato:

> The school's foundation withholding all funds until you can honestly assure us that anti-American and pro-Communist personnel of your student body and faculty have been removed.[100]

The faculty of the University of Ryukyus criticized USCAR's approach. Young faculty members demanded that even if the university were to be destroyed, the academic freedom of the university should be protected. The president and the board of trustees were caught in a double bind between USCAR and the liberal faculty members.

---

[97] *Okinawa Taimus*, 12 August 1956.
[98] Letter from C. D. Mead to Milton E. Muelder, 22 August 1956, Box 279, Folder 51, op. cit.
[99] Ibid.
[100] "Okinawa: The Agitators," *Time*, 3 September 1956

On August 18, 1956, the board finally decided to expel six students from the university. In a speech for student, Asato explained that the University of Ryukyus was facing a major crisis that could destroy the university; thus, the board decided to expel the students who committed political actions for the sake of the future survival and prosperity of the university.[101] Asato apologized to the students in person, but his behaviors looked like a kowtow to American influence. Yamazato argues that this incident embodies one of the most imperialistic aspects of educational policy in Okinawa.[102]

After this punishment, student protests lost momentum and did not regain it until the early 1960s. Interestingly, Diffenderfer approached one of the expelled students, Kanda Yoshimasa, and offered him the opportunity to study in the United States. According to Kanda, Diffenderfer said that "I had a sympathy with your situation because I also grew up without a father and thus I could imagine how tough you kept studying now on."[103] It is impossible to know the intentions behind this offer, but, as an ardent anti-communist warrior, Diffenderfer might have believed that feelings of anti-Americanism in some Okinawan youth would disappear once they experienced the supremacy of American democracy.

For the United States, expulsion of students showing anti-Americanism appeared to be a victory for the occupation. On March 1, 1957, at the university's fifth commencement ceremony, General James E. Moore, Deputy Governor of the Ryukyu Islands, stated that as future leaders in a democratic society, the graduates took responsibility for "removing the mask that covers the deceptive promises of communists."[104] As this Cold War rhetoric suggests, USCAR regarded the

[101] Okinawa Taimus-sha, op. cit., 84-85.
[102] Yamazato, op. cit., 208.
[103] Okinawa Taimus-sha, op., cit., 91.
[104] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, Vol.5 No.1, 92.

university as a vanguard of anti-communism. In reality, however, the university was not the stronghold as USCAR anticipated. Ironically, the University of the Ryukyus, having grown into a full-fledged entity, would openly stand up to its authoritative adoptive father, the United States, again and again.

Conclusion

The history of the University of the Ryukyus cannot be separated from the discourse of anti-communism and the U.S. occupation of Okinawa. After the brutal battle for Okinawa was over, both the victor and the vanquished directed their attentions toward educational rehabilitation. Although they anticipated establishing a democratic education system, the rehabilitation process was much harder than anyone had anticipated. For the United States, Okinawa was initially on the periphery of its global strategy, and thus the military government trudged along with reconstruction of Okinawa with a very limited budget and human resources. Interestingly, English became the centerpiece of postwar education even before the U.S. government outlined the future of Okinawa. With the rise of the Cold War in East Asia, the strategic importance of Okinawa increased remarkably, and a long-term educational policy for indigenous people began.

The University of the Ryukyu Project was a centerpiece of Cold War educational policy in Okinawa. The Army expected that the university would play a significant role in the dynamic of civilizing Okinawa. In the United States' view, the graduates would serve as experts in their respective fields and reconstruct Okinawa society. To accelerate the efficiency of the reconstruction process, the Army sought assistance from outside experts. MSU was selected because of its excellent curricula covering the Army's two main requirements: to provide the pedagogy of democracy, as well as practical programs such as English, agriculture, and home

economics. MSU faculty members regarded this project as an opportunity to export the concept of land-grant philosophy and to contribute to U.S. foreign policy. MSU President John Hannah encouraged the university's mission to cooperate with the indigenous people and to provide what was most needed, while also orienting students to American culture and philosophy. With assistance from the MSU mission, the infant university grew to be a full-fledged institution of higher learning.

However, the history of the university is not a wholly positive narrative. The efficiency of the MSU mission created friction with USCAR. To protect the university-building project, Hannah attempted to strengthen ties with the U.S. Army and supported the idea of a perpetual occupation of Okinawa. In addition, the U.S. cared less about what Okinawan viewed them in relation to the military occupation in the 1950s. The presence of the military base and the paternalistic behavior of many Americans provoked the Okinawans' antipathy. In the context of the Cold War, however, USCAR often confused anti-Americanism with Communist attacks. USCAR investigated links among the OTA, OPP and student protesters. The First and Second University of the Ryukyus Incidents demonstrated that the United States was never able to compromise with student protesters, who were regarded as communist sympathizers. The MSU mission was also inseparable from the United States' Cold War mentality. Although the MSU mission was not directly involved in these incidents, both Horwood and Mead recognized that student protesters must be expelled from the university. USCAR declared the triumph of democracy over Communism when they expelled these students. This anti-Americanism did not subside with these punishments, however; the student agitators were not always communist, but they nearly always complained about U.S. occupation and its paternalistic methods. The United States needed local consent or at least acquiescence in order to rule its colony. As early as the

1950s, an alarming signal could be seen over the U.S. rule in Okinawa. The next chapter reveals how the development of restoration movements affected the University of the Ryukyus Project.

CHAPTER 4: THE COLLAPSE OF COLD WAR DISCOURSE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Introduction

USCAR's suppression of anti-American activities at the University of the Ryukyus damaged the legitimacy of American democracy in Okinawa to Okinawans. The more USCAR highlighted the danger of communism, the wider the credibility gap between USCAR and Okinawan society on education. However, USCAR still continued to neglect the Okinawans' desire for political autonomy. A quarterly report published by USCAR states, "the period from 1 October 1959 through 31 March 1960 was marked by no serious controversies concerning the attainment of educational goals mutually established by the Government of the Ryukyus (GRI) and USCAR."[1] According to this report, one difference of opinion arose concerning the efficacy of the Japanese teacher consultants program. While USCAR was displeased with the involvement of the Japanese government, the GRI Education Department and the Okinawa Teachers Association (OTA) were interested in the continuation of the consultant service.

Although USCAR wanted to maintain absolute power over the Okinawans, the future position of the Ryukyu Islands became began to critically affect U.S.-Japan relations in the 1960s. This chapter reveals how the momentum toward reversion highlighted the many problems evident in the Okinawan educational system. In 1959, a review report for the Committee on Foreign Relations predicted that it would be difficult to keep the island under U.S. authority. The report noted, "all elements in Japan are fully committed to the thesis that Okinawa is Japanese territory and that Japanese sovereignty should be restored."[2] While the report suggested the

[1] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, Vol. 8, No. 1, 161.
[2] Conlon Associates LTD, *United States Foreign Policy: Asia* (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1959), 104.

possibility that American-Okinawan relations would be improved if economic and political development were to continue, it concluded that "Okinawan leaders are generally convinced that their chances of being accepted as Japanese are infinitely better than their chances of being accepted as Americans."[3] This comment crushed the military's confidence that the American modernization approach was always the best way to appeal people in the developing world.

Many MSU members committed to international educational projects cast doubt on the belief that the United States had been the best mentor for the world. For example, the dean of international studies and programs, Ralph H. Smuckler, recalled that, "many became alert to the fact that progress in the developing countries was more complex than originally perceived, more difficult to achieve, and sometimes yielded unpredicted outcomes."[4] Later, MSU reconsidered the importance of international programs after people criticized its involvement in South Vietnam. However, the University of the Ryukyus Project had already provided support to Okinawa's authoritarian regime, USCAR, and in doing so had caused controversy. On September 19, 1962, the chief of the MSU advisory group, Raymond Hatch, reported that "we had the endorsement of the University administrators, in fact the entire University, because we really represent the lesser of two evils."[5] According to Hatch, Okinawans were well aware that if MSU resigned the advisor's position, USCAR would take over and dictate higher education policy.

As the restoration movement considered more Okinawan students in the 1960s, MSU became uncertain about its future position. By exploring student commitments to the restoration

[3] Ibid., 104–105.
[4] Ralph H. Smuckler, *A University Turns to the World* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003), 57.
[5] *Report from Dr. Hatch*, Records of University of Ryukyu Project, Box 280, Folder 18.

movement, this chapter examines how military-academic cooperation with the Cold War discourse broke up in Okinawa. As many recent scholarly works reveal, the momentum of restoration disrupted American cultural policy in Okinawa.[6] During the Kennedy administration, Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer considered Okinawa a major obstacle to improving the partnership between the United States and Japan. Although Reischauer did not insist on the reversion of Okinawa to Japan, he believed that it was not the sole option to continue the United States' administrative authority.[7] In contrast, the Pentagon was obstinate about not losing administrative power over Okinawa. At the time, Okinawa was under the control of an American commissioner, Lieutenant General Paul Caraway. Caraway regarded the Japanese government as the primary challenger for control of Okinawa.[8] The political debate between Reischauer and Caraway resembled a proxy war between the State Department and the Department of Defense on the future status of Okinawa. Thanks to Reischauer's painstaking work, the Kennedy administration permitted the Japanese government to provide Okinawa with economic aid.[9] However, as the Japanese role increased, the presence of American cultural power in Okinawan society shrank. By examining the eventual demise of the University of Ryukyu Project in 1968, this chapter will reveal that international education programs were dependent on the course of U.S.-Japan relations, and these relations disintegrated as the reversion process accelerated.

[6] See, Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Keystone: The American Occupation of Okinawa and U.S.-Japanese Relations* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000); Fintan Hoey, *Sato, America and the Cold War: US-Japanese Relations, 1964-72* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
[7] A Memorandum from Reischauer to Secretary of State, September 3, 1962, National Security Files Countries Japan, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library.
[8] Edwin O. Reischauer, *My Life between Japan and America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1986), 204.
[9] Sarantakes, *Keystone*, 127.

A Short-Lived Euphoria

On 1 March 1957, at the fifth annual commencement of the University of the Ryukyus, the Deputy Governor of the Ryukyus, James E. Moore, delivered a speech filled with Cold War rhetoric. Moore urged the graduates to take the responsibility for "removing the mask that covers the deceptive promises of communists."[10] Even after the Daini Ryudai Jiken, USCAR still regarded the university students as future leaders in a democratic society and guardians of the American way of life in Okinawa. In fact, USCAR, MSU, and the University of the Ryukyus shared the perception that the university should contribute to the development of the Ryukyuan economy. USCAR and the MSU Advisory Group met to discuss an upgrade of the entire educational program of the islands, and the president of the university agreed to discuss its educational problems. For example, the MSU Advisory Group pointed out many problems with engineering education such as the lack of modern curriculum standards, adequate laboratory facilities, and contact between local industry and the university.[11] With funding from the United States, USCAR planned to build a new engineering building furnished with new laboratory equipment in the early 1960s.[12]

In addition, USCAR and MSU highlighted the importance of English education. Starting in 1955, the MSU Advisory Group sent an English consultant who advised USCAR and the university. Karl Wright, the consultant in 1959, recommended that USCAR provide schoolteachers with English training programs in the United States. While USCAR realized the inefficiency of the English language programs in Okinawa, it turned down Wright's idea because of financial issues. One report for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, produced in

[10] Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Island, Vol.5, No.1, 92.
[11] Michigan State University, 1961 Third Quarter Report Michigan State University Groups at the University of Ryukyus, October 1961, 8.
[12] Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Island, Vol.9 No.1, 173.

the early 1960s, asserted that "the English language programs for Ryukyuans on Okinawa has always been an amorphous and incidental one, lacking cohesion, integration and a financially underwritten organized approach."[13] According to the report, although many English teachers in the junior and senior high schools could read and write a little, only a small percentage had any conversational ability. The consultant's suggestions for the further development of Ryukyuan English skills was forwarded to the university,[14] and in 1963, the English Language Center was established at a cost of $85,171 to give students intensive training in spoken English.[15]

Overall, the USCAR and MSU reports emphasize the progress of the University of Ryukyus Project. The University met its primary goals of educating the local people and undertaking agricultural and engineering researches of long-term importance. However, the project was unable to achieve its more advanced goals, which many American social scientists expected in the 1960s. For example, a report on the Rockefeller Foundation's University Development Program suggests that the well-being of indigenous people would improve when "health, education, increased productivity and cultural enrichment moved together."[16] In Okinawa, however, recurrent base-related social issues such as land confiscation, and land pollution prevented Okinawan from going back to Okinawan traditional culture, which have clung to patrimonial estates.

In addition, improvements in educational programs did not sweep away the anti-Americanism on display in student affairs because USCAR neglected democratization in favor of

[13] Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Island, Vol 10, 254.
[14] Hiyame Teruo, "Amerika tochi to sengo Okinawa: Ibunka no shogeki,"in *Kagaku kenkyuhi hozyokin kenkyu keika hokokusho* (March 2001), 46–47; Michigan State University, 1962 Third Quarter Report Michigan State University Groups at the University of Ryukyus, October 1962, 10–11.
[15] Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Island, Vol.12, Vol. 185-186.
[16] Ralph K. Davidson, "Evolution of the Foundation's University Development Program," November 1972, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 63, Folder 350.

military operations. When President Dwight D. Eisenhower visited Okinawa in 1960, a small minority of students attended a protest march against the presence of military bases.[17] In spring of the following year, as the MSU advisory group pointed out, there were inappropriate political activities.[18] For example, some radical students attempted to hand in their petitions directly to Eisenhower by surrounding his car.[19] The group concluded, however, that these activities did not rally increased support from the student body.

According to a MSU report, the activities aiming to curtail off-campus political activities by small groups needed to develop "more constructive University-centered activities," but the University of Ryukyus faculty and administration avoided committing to these disciplinary actions.[20] In a meeting with the MSU group, the president of the University of Ryukyus, Yonamine Matsusuke, said that after the Ryudai Jiken, the relationship between the faculty and the students had become critical. According to Yonamine, "the annual University festival was canceled because of this."[21] When the students decided to protest the University administration through passive resistance in the Ryudai Jiken, the administration realized that "the Okinawan public sympathized with the students who had been disciplined."[22] As Yonamine explains, the public's criticism resulted from the impression that "the military had played a role in putting the University in an awkward relationship with the Ryukyuan public."[23] In order to recover the sound relationship between the people and the university, Yonarime asked MSU to be a liaison

[17] Nahashi Rekishi Hakubutsukan, ed., *Sengo wo Tadoru: Amerika yo kara Yamato yo he* (Naha: Ryukyu Shinposya, 2007), 220.
[18] Michigan State University, *1961 First Quarter Report Michigan State University Group at the University of the Ryukyus*, April 1961, 20.
[19] Okinawa Taimus-sha, *Ryudai fudoki: Kaigaku yonzyunen no sokuseki* (Naha: Okinawa Taimus-sha, 1990), 232,
[20] Michigan State University, *1961 Second Quarter Report Michigan State University Group at the University of the Ryukyus*, July 1961, 9–10.
[21] Transcript of Discussion with President Yonamine and Group about Current Educational-Administrative Issues at the University of the Ryukyus, RG319, Box 61, Fol. 29, 61.
[22] Ibid., 61.
[23] Ibid., 72.

between the military and the school. The conversation between MSU and the University of the Ryukyus reveals that Yonamine was urged to strike a political balance between Okinawans and the U.S. military, and he hoped MSU would function as a buffer against the more demanding USCAR.

MSU members in Okinawa realized that it was becoming more difficult to resolve the problems between USCAR and the university, and they began reassessing the future relationship between the latter and MSU. Most advisors recommended the United States give the university greater administrative freedom. The vocational advisor of the MSU advisory group, Richard C. Fell, reported that the university no longer needed such a group. According to Fell, "the reference often made by GRI and local politicians that the University of the Ryukyus is a 'Colonial' institution because of the influence of MSU Advisory Group would be eliminated."[24] While Fell recommended that the transfer of responsibility should occur as soon as possible, other members pointed out that it would be difficult for the university to execute this expeditiously. For example, the advisor of student affairs, Rowland R. Pierson, believed that administrative burdens might result in delays in various developmental plans.[25] Pierson recalled that the growing confidence of Okinawans for the greater administrative freedom was influenced by the increasingly strong support for the reversion to Japan.[26] However, Wright, the chief of the MSU advisory group and the English consultant, reported that the university administration was capable of managing the institution, but USCAR would not permit the transfer of

[24] Future Planning for MSU/University of the Ryukyus Cooperation and Relationships, Records of University of Ryukyu Project, Box 279, Folder 55.
[25] Proposed Revision of Advisory Services for the University of the Ryukyus, ibid.
[26] The MSU/University of the Ryukyus Project-Some Recollections July 1959-June 1961 Rowland R. Pierson, Kart T. Wright Papers, box 5808, folder 6. University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing.

responsibility.[27] Wright's report highlighted a significant aspect of the relationship between USCAR and MSU. While MSU was clearly more knowledgeable about educational programs, the army was its employer, and the employer always determined the value of the employee.[28]

The army was very proud of how it conducted itself in the Ryukyu Islands. For example, USCAR pointed out in their propaganda magazine, *Konnichi no Ryukyu* [Ryukyu Today], that the United States greatly subsidized educational activities as well as social infrastructure.[29] However, it became obvious that the benefits of the American occupation of Okinawa had not been passed onto the islanders as USCAR believed. In contrast with other prefectures on mainland Japan, Okinawans were ranked at the bottom of many surveys in areas such as average income, quality of social welfare service, and percentage of students entering higher levels of education. The huge gap in the quality of life between Okinawans and mainland Japanese also stimulated Okinawans' desire for restoration to Japan. In addition, recurrent base-related social issues such as land confiscation, noise pollution, and crimes committed by U.S. military personnel damaged the image of the United States. In fact, Okinawans often made official complaints when U.S. military personnel disrupted other aspects of island society. For example, when students became victims of military-related accidents or crimes, Okinawan teachers and parents submitted petitions to USCAR.[30] However, such petitions were not enough to prompt USCAR to reconsider the importance of military activities. Then, in 1959, an F-100 crashed into Okinawa's Miyamori Elementary School, killing eleven students and six others in the

[27] MSU Advisory Group Consultant Karl T. Wright to the Dean of International Program, Glen L. Tsggart, Records of University of Ryukyu Project, Box 279, Folder 55.
[28] Report from Dr. Hatch, Records of University of Ryukyu Project, Box 280, Folder 18.
[29] *Konnichi no Ryukyu*, November 1964, 3–4.
[30] Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, *Okinawa no sengokyoikushi siryohen* (Naha: Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, 1978), 34, 39.

neighborhood and injuring 210 people. The prolonged negotiations about compensation disappointed Okinawans, and contributed to the call for reversion to Japan.[31]

American military activities had always been considered a social problem in Okinawa, but they worsened when the islands became involved in the Vietnam War. The crash of the B-52 bomber near an urban area in 1968 rekindled Okinawans' antagonism toward the U.S. military.[32] The increase of war-related accidents reminded the islanders that they could be casualties of military operations. For the people living near military bases, the Vietnam War was not just a fire across the sea.

"The Okinawa Problem" and the Winding Road to Reversion

In October 1960, "The Broken Dialogue with Japan," by Edwin O. Reischauer, the future ambassador to Japan, appeared in *Foreign Affairs* and attracted considerable attention. Although Reischauer's main concern was the Security Treaty incident, his thesis that misunderstandings and flawed communication between the United States and anti-American groups in Japan would damage U.S.-Japan relations could also be applied to the Okinawa problem.[33] As historian Walter LaFeber describes, the new president, John F. Kennedy, became entangled in complicated economic policy as the United States preached that Japan must alleviate its balance of payments problem though trade liberalization and higher payments for U.S. military assistance in the mainland and Okinawa. However, the Kennedy administration realized that the Japanese government would not pay such costs because internal Japanese politics had become more

[31] *Ryukyu Shinpo*, June 30, 1959; *Okinawa Taimmus* June 30, 1960
[32] Arasaki Moriteru, *Okinawa gendaishi shinban* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005), 27–29.
[33] Edwin O. Reischauer, "The Broken Dialogue with Japan," *Foreign Affairs*, (Oct 1960), 11–26.

sensitive to U.S. base-related problems.[34] The ruling political group, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), understood that the presence of U.S. bases was the core of national security policy in Japan. Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato criticized the diplomatic policy of the Social Democratic Party of Japan, "unarmed neutrality," and proclaimed that his government acted "as a member of the Free World."[35] Even so, the LDP could not ignore the increasing possibility that Japan might be involved in a war with the United States. Such an idea triggered the 1960 riots. In Okinawa, some groups actively committed to reversion movements. For example, the OTA started a campaign using the Japanese national flag as a symbol, claimed that Okinawa was a part of Japanese territory. OTA also complained that the high commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands compromised educational freedom, which the Japanese Educational Act guaranteed.[36]

Like the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration realized that poor economic and social conditions had contributed to the dissatisfaction of the Ryukyuans. The new administration faced rising pressure to resolve the Okinawa problem. After talks with Prime Minister Ikeda in June 1961, Kennedy established a task force to reexamine U.S. programs in the Ryukyus Islands. The task force reaffirmed the three primary goals of American policy on Okinawa: maintaining Okinawa as a military base, continuing friendly relations with Japan, and requiring American responsibility to the people of the Ryukyus under the peace treaty with Japan.[37] In March 1962, Kennedy announced his administration's policy on Okinawa, which followed the guidelines of the task force. In this statement, Kennedy admitted that while the

[34] Walter LaFeber, *The Clash: U.S.-Japanese Relations throughout Histor*y (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997), 334–335.
[35] Yoshitsugu Kosuke, *Ikedaseikenki no nihongaiko to reisen* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009), 20–21.
[36] Okinawaken kyoikuiinkai, *Okinawa no sengokyoikushi siryohen*, 31–32, 35.
[37] National Security Action Memorandum No. 680 (August 11, 1961), *Foreign Relations of the United States* (*FRUS*), 1961–63, vol. 22, 704.

Okinawa bases were vital, because they provided security for a number of countries in Asia, the Okinawa problem was a matter of great concern to the Japanese and talked immediately with the Japanese government regarding this issue.[38] The Kennedy administration signaled progress on reversion by enlarging the role of the Japanese government in alleviating economic and social problems on Okinawa.

The Japanese government requested that the United States exert every possible effort to improve the situation in Okinawa. While the Ikeda cabinet did not refer to Kennedy's mention of the military base, the Japanese expressed their gratitude that his statement "recognizes the fact that the people of Okinawa are Japanese nationals" and "makes clear the American interest to work closely with Japan on Okinawan matters in preparation for the day when the islands will eventually be returned to Japan's full sovereignty."[39] However, U.S.-Japanese cooperation on Okinawa did not improve.

As many Okinawans recalled, it was ironic that an authoritarian individual, General Caraway, was serving as the high commissioner at the time when the U.S. and Japanese governments were considering the expansion of Okinawan autonomy. In response to the Kennedy message, Caraway revealed that he interpreted it as reconfirming the importance of Okinawan bases to the Far East. He also stated, "the high commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands has absolute power and I will exercise this power if necessary."[40] Caraway's statement was indicative of the army's perspective on the Okinawan problem. The army reiterated that Japan

[38] Okinawa mondai ni kanshite daitoryo teireishiseihoshin no kennikanshite, *Okinawa zyumin no kenrikakudai*, A30007–1.
[39] Statement by Secretary of General of the Cabinet regarding the Announcement of the U.S. President on Okinawa Problem, ibid.
[40] *Yomiuri shinbun*, March 1, 1962.

had "residual sovereignty" but no administrative rights in Okinawa. The army felt that Okinawa was so strategically significant that the United States could not relinquish absolute power there unless international tensions in East Asia were reduced or removed.[41] In the army's view, it was a mistake that high ranking American officials spoke of reversion of the Ryukyu Islands to Japan because these statements opened the door for sympathy for such a process.[42]

As Reischauer had anticipated, the Okinawa issue had become more critical. The Kennedy administration realized that they could not fill the widening gap between the hawkish opinions of the army and the Okinawans' desire for reversion. Coordinating these incongruent ideas, the administration highlighted that the road to reversion was gradually approaching. According to Reischauer, it seemed progress and greater mutual understanding had been established between the United States and Japan, but Okinawans were left behind.[43] After 1952, only the Okinawa Prefecture remained under the direct control of the United States. As Miyazato Seigan points out, Okinawans had expected that the Kennedy administration would change the situation of Okinawan society; accordingly, the gradual approach to reversion was too conservative to mitigate Okinawan agonies.[44] In 1960, the Okinawan Prefecture Council for Reversion to the Home Country, called *Fukkikyo*, was organized by OTA, the Okinawa Prefecture Youth Group Council, the Council for the Okinawa Public Office Workers' Union, and progressive political parties.[45] The *Fukkikyo* claimed that Okinawans had a strong desire to establish a democratic

[41] *Mainichi shinbun*, March 4, 1962.
[42] Report of President John A. Hannah's Visit to Okinawa and the University of the Ryukyus, October 18, 1965, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 42, Folder 38.
[43] Memorandum from Reischauer to the Secretary of State, September 3, 1962, National Security File, Countries Japan.
[44] Miyazato Seigen, *America no Okinawatochi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966), 212.
[45] *Ryukyu Shinpo*, April 30, 1961; Yuichiro Onish, *Transpacific Antiracism: Afro-Asian Solidarity in 20th-Century Black America, Japan, and Okinawa* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 138.

society but USCAR had deprived them of their civil rights by means of ordinances that contravened "the principle of equality under the law" and "due process of law."[46] Dissatisfaction with the rate of progress toward autonomy caused another incipient political crisis, which precipitated a split in the Okinawa Liberal Democratic Party.[47]

Many opinion polls showed that Okinawans preferred immediate reversion rather than a gradual one. In June 1966, a local newspaper, *Ryukyu Shinpo*, reported that 42.8 percent favored immediate reversion, while 32.9 percent chose the gradual approach. Ota Masahide argues that many Okinawans chose the gradual approach because they considered immediate reversion to be politically unrealistic. On the other hand, according to his research, the rise of Japanese nationalism among Okinawans was the most popular reason people wanted immediate reversion.[48] In fact, some groups struggled to instill Japanese identity in Okinawa. One of these groups, OTA practiced the Japanese identity movement in classrooms.[49] In addition to the rise of Japanese nationalism, the failure of occupation in many realms of civil affairs was a strong motivation to support reversion. At the same time, many Okinawans worried that the huge economic gaps between the mainland and Okinawa negatively affected the pace of development in Okinawan society. As Ota's research shows, many Okinawans displayed greater emotional instability as the date of reversion approached.[50] Many Okinawan teachers were anxious about whether unification would improve educational standards in Okinawa. The reversion process

[46] Meeting with Representative of the Reversion Council (*Fukkikyo*) and Co-chairman of 16th December Prefectural People Rally, December 21, 1965, Records of USCAR, Box. 105, Folder 1; Resolution Protecting the Deprivation of Civil Rights, ibid.
[47] James C. Thomson, Jr., of the National Security Council Staff to Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, memorandum, August 21, 1964, *FRUS*, 1964–68, vol. 19, 33.
[48] Ota Masahide, "Fukkigo niokeru Okinawazyunin no ishiki no henyo", *Kagaku kenkyuhi hozyokin kenkyu keika hokokusho*（Mar 1983）96–97.
[49] Okinawa Taimusu sha, *Gekido no hanseiki: Okinawa Taimusu sha gozyunenshi* (Naha: Okinawa Taimusu sha, 1998), 115–116.
[50] Ibid., 94–95.

revealed that twenty-seven years of occupation had left Okinawa behind mainland Japan; even so, Okinawans were forced to fit into Japanese standards.

Re-Japanized Okinawa and the End of the University of the Ryukyus Project

On August 19, 1965, Prime Minister Sato Eisaku visited Okinawa to give what would become an historic speech, declaring, "until Okinawa is returned with the fatherland, the post-war era will not be over."[51] On this visit, Sato also stated that a medical school would be established on Okinawa. As Japanese and U.S. governments conducted painstaking negotiations about the national security of Japan and the presence of military bases, Sato's statement demonstrated that the Japanese were exerting more influence on Okinawa.[52] Two years later, the amount of Japanese aid to Okinawa had surpassed that of American economic assistance to Okinawan.[53] As the date of reversion approached, however, it became clear that, like the USCAR, Okinawans did not completely trust the Japanese government. According to an opinion poll, Okinawans believed that, due to the reluctance of the Japanese government, reversion should not occur.[54] Many Okinawans felt Sato had substituted economic aid for reversion. Before Sato's visit, the reversion council criticized Sato and Lyndon B. Johnson for considering maintaining military bases in Okinawa and their lack of will in resolving the Okinawa problem.[55] When Sato decided to visit Okinawa, the council split into pro- and anti-Sato groups. While the former thought compromises with Sato would be necessary to achieve reversion, the

[51] Naikaku soridaijin kanbo, ed., *Sato Eisaku soridaijin enzetsushu dainishu* (Tokyo: Naikaku soridaijin kanbo, 1970), 111-112.
[52] Hoey, *Sato, America and the Cold War*, 18–19; Taira Yoshintoshi, Se*ngo Okinawa to beigunkichi: "Zyuyo" to "kyozetu' no hazamade 1945–1972* (Tokyo: Hoseidaigakushuppankyoku, 2012), 211.
[53] Okinawa taimus sha, *Gekido no hanseiki*, 149.
[54] Asato Genshu, "Fukkimondaikenkyukai no ayumi," *Fukkimondaikenkyu* 3, (May 1969): 165.
[55] Okinawa no sokokufukki ni kansuru youseiketsugi, February 23, 1965, Record Groups of USCAR, Box 138, Folder 12.

latter believed that the Japanese government would never seriously consider the Okinawans' frustrations without a visible demonstration.[56] The radicals on the reversion council mobilized students, workers, and activities for an anti-Sato march. University students also attended this demonstration. While the radicals insisted that Okinawa should be returned to Japan without military bases, Sato considered them necessary for the security of the country. Because reconciliation with the radicals was impossible, conservative groups on both the mainland and Okinawa utilized their economic power to obscure the negative aspects of military bases with huge amounts of subsidies. Ironically, this method was similar to USCAR's rhetoric that complaints about military occupation would diminish if the United States enhanced the peace and welfare of the Okinawan people.

The Johnson administration felt that Japan would continue to rely on the Security Treaty with the United States for military protection, but Sato would remain sensitive to public concerns regarding Vietnam and continue to oppose the use of Okinawan bases for direct bombing attacks.[57] The Okinawa problem centered on the need to harmonize the strategic necessity of military bases with the Okinawans' desire to live without them. Yet the army persisted with the argument that the United States should not abandon administrative power in the Ryukyu Islands because the Okinawans' frustrations would be mitigated by a thriving economy. While the successor to Caraway, Lieutenant General Albert Watson II, promised to cooperate closely with the Japanese government on economic and social problems, he continued to demonstrate USCAR's adamant opposition to the reversion process. Such opposition was evidenced by UNCAR's denial of travel requests from supporters of reversion in Japan.[58]

[56] Yagi Senjin, *Okinawa no nihonfukkitoso anokoro* (Naha: Okinawa colony insatsuzho, 1985), 19–21.
[57] National Intelligence Estimate, November 26, 1965, FRUS, 1964–68, 29, 132.
[58] Travel Request, January 4 and 10, 1961, Record Groups of USCAR, cp., cit.

An alternative plan, one that appeared to be able to reconcile the strategic needs of military bases with Okinawans' desire for reversion, was put forth by the Johnson administration, involving separating the military and civil functions on Okinawa.[59] The State Department believed that the political cost of military occupation of the Ryukyu Islands outweighed the military interest in the bases, but expected Watson might ease some of difficulties by developing good relations with the American embassy in Tokyo, Japanese officials, and the Okinawan leadership.[60]

The Sato cabinet also hoped to get back one of their administrative rights before the restoration. In August 1966, the director-general of the Management and Coordination Agency, Mori Kiyoshi, made contact with High Commissioner Watson to suggest the return of educational administration to Japan. The Japanese explained that educational administration was not directly related to base politics and thus the return of this right would not cause serious political friction with the United States. In addition, the Sato cabinet noted that because almost half of Japanese aid to Okinawa had been spent on educational support, the country was already familiar with the Okinawan educational system.[61] To better consider the Japanese request, the GRI set up a special committee on educational rights to prepare for the reversion.[62]

[59] Letter From the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs (Johnson) to the Ambassador to Japan (Reischauer), April 12, 1964, *FRUS*, 1964-1968, 11.
[60] James C. Thomson, Jr., of the National Security Council Staff to Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, memorandum, August 21, 1964, *FRUS*, 1964–68, 29, 33.
[61] Yara Chobyo, ed., *Okinawa kyosyokuinkai zyurokunen: Sokokufukki, Nihonkokumin toshiteno kyoiku wo mezashite* (Tokyo: Rodo syunposha, 1968), 245–248.
[62] Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, *Okinawa no sengokyoikushi* (Naha: Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, 1977), 220–223.

Although Watson expressed a more lenient attitude than his predecessor did, he refused to surrender USCAR's administrative rights to the Ryukyu Islands. At a reception in Hawaii, General Watson stated:

> There are considerable numbers of people in the Ryukyus and Japan who advocate the slogan, "Separate the administration of the islands from the bases." By this, they mean that the bases should remain, but administrative authority should be returned to Japan. I must say that I have never heard a plausible or convincing explanation of just how this should be accomplished without serious impairment of the ability of the United States to utilize Okinawa in pursuance of its treaty commitment.[63]

Watson admitted that the Ryukyu Islands were part of the Japanese homeland and that ultimately their administration would be returned to Japan. In his view, however, the timing was not right, as United States forces could not be removed due to the existing threats in East Asia. Watson also mentioned that President Johnson and Prime Minister Sato agreed that there had not been a specific date set for the return of administration.[64]

The controversy surrounding educational administrative rights suddenly ended when Sato denied the possibility of separating civil and military affairs in early 1967. However, this denial did not signal a retreat from reversion. The Prime Minister believed that the Japanese people would no longer be satisfied with the gradual approach, and thus the Japanese government sought the return of all administrative rights at once.[65] In Okinawa, local leaders in business, journalism, academics, and other areas set up an informal study group, the *Fukkimondaikenkyukai*, to discuss the necessary steps for reversion. The president of the University of the Ryukyus, Asato Genshu, represented the Okinawan intellectuals. The group

[63] An Address Prepared for Delivery by the United States High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, April 14, 1965, Zaioki beigawayozin kisyakaiken, koen, A30007–1.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, *Okinawa no sengokyoikushi*, 229.

stated that while the U.S. and Japanese had not clarified the timetable for reversion, it should be completed around 1970.[66]

Intergovernmental negotiations advanced as the Johnson administration concluded that the United States was facing a more self-assured Japanese nation, and many within the administration came to believe that it would be wise to remove avoidable irritations in U.S.-Japan relations.[67] In November 1967, Sato and Johnson issued a joint communique saying, "an agreement should be reached between the two Governments within a few years on a date satisfactory to them for the reversion of the [Ryukyu] Islands."[68] While this communique reaffirmed that the U.S. bases in Okinawa continued to play a vital role in the security of Japan and other free nations in East Asia, its significance lay in its mention of the date of reversion in the near future. Soon after, the Japanese, Americans, and Okinawans established the Advisory Committee for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, aiming to smooth the unification process. On February 16, 1968, the three governments announced the appointment of their representatives: Laurence C. Vass from the United States, Takase Jiro from Japan, and Senaga Hiroshi from the Ryukyu Islands. Vass became the chairman of the committee.[69]

Meetings of the advisory committee revealed the gap in perception between the United States and Japan regarding the military occupation. The Americans emphasized that the post-war development of Okinawa owed its success to the interdependence of the American military and

---

[66] Asato, "Fukkimondaikenkyukai.," 164.
[67] Letter From Secretary of State Rusk to Secretary of Defense McNamara, September 25, 1965, *FRUS*, 1964-68, 29, 128; National Intelligence Estimate, November 26, 1965, ibid, 132.
[68] Joint Statement of Japanese Prime Minister Sato and U.S. President Johnson, November 15, 1967, in *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), 1033–1037.
[69] A Report by the Advisory Committee of the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Island on Its Progress During the Period 1 March 1968 to 16 October 1968, RG260 Records of the Former Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner, Box 3.

local communities, while the Japanese noted that Okinawa had many social problems that needed to be resolved before unification.[70] For example, one subcommittee report describes similar Japanese and Okinawan laws relating to the welfare of mothers and children, but "Okinawa falls considerably behind as compared with Japan proper."[71] The committee also revealed many imperfections in the Okinawan educational system. It admitted that Okinawa was a developing society and that the islands were short of facilities at the senior high school level. The report concluded, "it is necessary to ease quickly the difficulty of entering a high school in Okinawa and to work out a plan to develop upper-secondary education to the level of Japan proper."[72] It was revealed that gaps in teachers' salaries had not been fully resolved, although the U.S. government had noted this issue from the initial stage of occupation.[73]

The committee also remarked on the shortcomings of the University of the Ryukyus. According to the report, "there is considerable lags behind on educational installations and equipment, preparing for academic studies, and strengthening the quality of education" and thus "there is an urgent need to promote the strengthening of the University of the Ryukyus in order to eliminate the educational gap and to unite educational policy between Japan proper and Okinawa."[74]

[70] Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Laurence C. Vass, Chairman, Advisory Committee for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, September 17, 1968, *Nichibeiryu shinon iinkai 3*, A30007-1.
[71] Recommendation for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, Subject: Improvement and Strengthening of Child Welfare Measure, September 24, 1968, ibid.
[72] Memorandum for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, Subject: Expansion of Upper-Secondary Education, September 11, 1968, ibid.
[73] Memorandum for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, Subject: Progress Report for March 1 1968 to June 28 1968, June 28, 1968, RG260 Records of the Former Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner, Box 4.
[74] Memorandum for the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, Subject: Strengthening the University of Ryukyus, August 21, 1968, *Nichibeiryu shinon iinkai 3*, A30007-1.

USCAR was irritated by recommendations regarding the unification processes. In an interview with a New York Times correspondent, Watson commented, "it was not the intention of the American Government to relinquish any administrative control over the Ryukyu Islands now or in the foreseeable future."[75] Meanwhile, MSU President John A. Hannah remarked that Japan should not participate in Okinawan educational system. He worried that if Okinawa was reverted to Japan, the Okinawans would be treated as second-class citizens as the Japanese had looked down on them in the past.[76] In a meeting with Watson, Hannah explained his educational philosophy: if the educational system was controlled by the wrong person, such as "Adolf Hitler," a country would be under his or her hand. Considering the increasing cost of education due to the University of the Ryukyus' new medical school, Watson and Hannah concluded that it was acceptable to use Japanese funds for education, but it would be a mistake to allow Japan to control Okinawan education before the philosophy of land-grant universities was deeply rooted in the university students.[77] In other words, they wondered if the Japanese had returned to the prewar educational system. In their view, the Japanese educational system was still bureaucratic and thus there was a possibility that Okinawan schools was controlled by an Anti-American political leader.

No matter how much they distrusted the Japanese educational system, no one could overturn governmental agreements on reversion. Faced with increasing pressure from both Japanese and the U.S. government, USCAR toned down their anger as reversion approached. In a message to the legislature of the Ryukyu Islands, Watson's successor, Lieutenant General Ferdinand

[75] Report of President John A. Hannah's Visit to Okinawa and the University of the Ryukyus, October 18, 1965, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 42, Folder 38.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Report of Meeting between the High Commissioner and Dr. John A. Hannah, President of Michigan State University, ibid.

Thomas Unger, stated, "I pledge to you [Okinawans] the greatest degree of cooperation in working toward a goal we can attain—increased authority for the Government of the Ryukyu Islands."[78] According to Unger, the joint communique was significant because it harmonized the desire of the Okinawans and Japanese with the necessity of security for the people of Japan, the United States, and Asia.[79] Unger's statement revealed that USCAR had finally accepted that reversion was an unavoidable event.

As many researchers have outlined, the American and Japanese governments continued the reversion process in order to maintain their alliance.[80] Therefore, inter-governmental negotiations focused more on the problems related to utilization conditions of military bases after administrative control of the Ryukyu Islands had been granted to the Japanese. In addition, High Commissioner Unger and Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson were more adroit than their predecessors were at balancing military and political issues, which positively affected reversion. According to Sarantakes, Unger and Johnson exchanged reports and struggled to maintain a stable and political climate in which the missions of all military services could be performed without local interference.[81]

As the U.S. and Japanese governments prepared to return administrative control of the islands to the Japanese, the MSU mission for the University of the Ryukyus was forced to change many aspects of its plan. In 1966, the University of the Ryukyus became a governmental university of GRI. One MSU group mentioned the fear that this transfer would prompt a decrease

[78] High Commissioner's Message to the Legislature, February 3, 1967, Zaioki beigawayozin kisyakaiken, koen, op. cit.
[79] Opening Statement Prepared for Delivery at News Conference by High Commissioner F.T. Unger, December 17, 1967, ibid.
[80] See generally Sarantakes, *Keystone*; Hoey, *Sato, America and the Cold War*; Taira, Se*ngo Okinawa*.
[81] Sarantakes, op. cit., 147.

in the quality of staff employed by the University. Extension Service Consultant Harold J. Foster reported that the Ryukyuan people did not understand the United States land-grant system.[82] Some faculty members felt that there was a possibility that the GRI might hamper their academic freedom.[83] The fears of Okinawan educators were realized when the legislature of the Ryukyu Islands attempted to enforce legal restrictions that outlawed educator activism.

Unfortunately, MSU had little time to consider the future of higher education in Okinawa because USCAR, focused on maintaining the strategic options of military bases and nuclear weapons, had lost interest in higher education. In early 1960, MSU was informed that the army would terminate the University of the Ryukyus Project. Hannah was surprised at this because MSU had prepared a two-year plan for the project. In a letter to High Commissioner Unger, Hannah expressed his disappointment that there were a few MSU recommendations that the army had not implemented.[84] According to the army, the cooperative project with the University of the Ryukyus was cancelled because visiting professor programs, which invited American professors from various universities to the University of the Ryukyus, were more cost-effective than an institution-to-institution program that furnished academic assistance.[85] The total cost of the eighteen-year program was more than 1.5 million dollars. Considering the influence of the inflation, 1.5 million dollars in 1968 had the almost same buying power as 10.7 million dollars. After the termination of the project, a new program began in 1969. A study abroad program for Ryukyus faculty members was administrated by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and

[82] End of Tour Report of the Extension Service Consultant to the University of the Ryukyus, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 43, Folder 39.
[83] Ryukyudaigaku kaigaku sanzyusyunenkinenshi hensyuiinkai, *Ryukyudaigaku sanzyunen* (Naha: Daiishihoki syupan, 1981), 1116.
[84] From President John A. Hannah to Lieutenant General F. T. Unger, March 5, 1968, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 43, Folder 40.
[85] From Unger to Hannah, letter, February 7, 1968, John A. Hannah Papers, Box 43, Folder 40.

Welfare. In addition, American professors from various universities were invited to the University of the Ryukyus to serve as consultants and conduct lectures and seminars in subjects such as engineering, law, and psychology.[86]

Exchange programs between MSU and the University of Ryukyus continued after the army gave up administrative rights to the Ryukyu Islands. Yet the conclusion of the University of the Ryukyus Project marked the end of an epoch in postwar Okinawa.[87] It is difficult to evaluate the success of the eighteen years of this project. MSU helped further the quality of higher education in Okinawa. By 1968, there were 6,500 alumni and almost half were working in teaching positions. The primary goal, to reconstruct the educational system, which had been completely destroyed by the battles in the Pacific, was achieved. However, it is an unavoidable truth that the mission was a part of a military occupation. USCAR often violated freedom of education with the fear of communist interventions in the university. USCAR's heavy-handed attitude damaged the ideology of democratic education and facilitated the restoration movement in Okinawa. A 1981 book on the university's history remarks that, while the school developed through the cooperation of the faculties, USCAR, GRI, and other institutions, USCAR often prioritized military operations over the peace and welfare of Okinawans.[88]

The army was confident in their state-building project in Okinawa. For example, Unger stated that reversion occurred because the Okinawans did not want a foreign power administrating them, no matter how benevolent it was.[89] It is obvious that people dislike foreign domination. However, Unger's comment reveals a sense of arrogance of the ruler, as he believed

[86] Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, Vol. 17, 166.
[87] Ryukyudaigaku kaigaku rokuzyunen kineshi hensyu iinkai ed., *Kokuritsugaigakuhozin Ryukyu daigaku Rokuzyunenshi* (Naha: Kokusai insatsu, 2010), 32.
[88] Ryukyudaigakukaigaku sanzyusyunenkinenshi hensyuiinkai, *Ryukyudaigaku sanzyunen*, 59.
[89] Sarantakes, op. cit., 153.

that the ruled should have appreciated their alms. Despite the fact that the military had attempted to create a benevolent image of Americans, Okinawans did not believe that the new conqueror was benign as their rhetoric suggested. Although Okinawans showed their hostility toward Americans, USCAR did not believe that the United States had treated them poorly by disregarding their basic human rights.[90] Instead, USCAR considered that "reversion to Japan," "stabilization of livelihood," and "military bases" were the primary problems facing Okinawa.[91] USCAR finally responded to the most urgent request from Okinawa by abandoning its administrative power. However, as long as military bases remain on the Ryukyu Islands, Okinawans will remain convinced that the reversion occurred in order to preserve the U.S.-Japanese alliance system, not to promote the welfare of those on the Islands.

Conclusion

With the reversion of Okinawa to Japan in 1972, the University of the Ryukyus became the southernmost institution in the Japanese public university system. The history of the university embodies the complexity of postwar Okinawa. The university was established with the aim of developing democratic education in a war-devastated society. The United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands considered increasing the quality of higher education on Okinawa to be a necessary goal, and many Okinawan educators appreciated that the United States helped establish the island's first university. At the same time, however, the reality of the military occupation called into question the greatness of American democracy. Okinawans were

[90] Okinawa Public Opinion Survey, December 1958, RG306 Country Project File Japan 1958, Box 63.
[91] Okinawa Islands Public Opinion Survey August 1969, RG260 Records of Former Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner, Box 3.

able to enjoy the blessings of democratic education as long as their activities did not violate U.S. occupation policies.

When USCAR's authority was challenged, its leaders responded by trying to crush the voice of Okinawans. USCAR, believing that the University of the Ryukyus should develop according to their guidelines, showed little mercy to student protesters. The project undertaken in cooperation with Michigan State University is an excellent example of Americans playing the role of benevolent mentor. While President Hannah never doubted the morality of this project, MSU members recognized the incongruity of democratic education under the military occupation. As the advisor of student affairs, Rowland R. Pierson recalled, Okinawan students demanded for the greater administrative freedom was influenced by the increasingly strong support for the reversion to Japan. Their counterparts in Okinawa were keenly aware that Okinawans called their institution a "colonial university." By obeying their employer's power, MSU members ignored those in Okinawa.

However, the momentum of reversion could be no longer suppressed by claiming the priority of military strategy over the autonomy of residents. The army still insisted that Okinawans' frustrations could be tempered as long as the United States facilitated peace and the welfare of the Okinawan people. USCAR was confident that the role United States played in democratic education was superior to that of Japan. As a matter of fact, many Okinawans preferred reversion to their former ruler, mainland Japan. As the country had rapidly recovered from its devastation, the Japanese government could afford to assist the development of Okinawan society. In addition, some groups such as OTA adroitly emphasized cultural ties with the Japanese, while the fear that Okinawans might become involved in the American war in Vietnam also provided momentum to the reversion movement.

The U.S. government considered the increasing financial cost and political risk of occupation. Since the Truman administration, each administration had balanced the strategic value and political damage to the U.S.-Japan relations of the Okinawa problem. As the Japanese government began to bear a greater share of the financial burden in Okinawa, it became hard to deny its administrative rights. The Japanese government also realized the difficulties inherent in the Okinawa problem, because the military bases were the keystone of national security. Prime Minister Sato acknowledged the reality of international politics, but he was forced to take action on behalf of the Okinawans as his political enemy utilized this issue. Sato finally counted reversion among the most significant items on his political agenda and announced his intentions in public.

Reversion revealed the limitations of foreign occupation. While the U.S. Army proclaimed that they had achieved great success in Okinawa, their accomplishments did not outnumber those of the Japanese. The Japanese members of the advisory committee highlighted the many problems evident in the Okinawan educational and social welfare system. Watson and Hannah were irritated by these recommendations for the unification processes. Putting aside their own activities, USCAR expressed anxiety over whether the Japanese government would continue to uphold principles of academic freedom. In fact, some Okinawans educators expressed similar anxieties regarding the principle of academic freedom in Japanese educational system.

Despite this distrust of the Japanese educational system, no one could reverse the reversion process. The army decided to abandon administrative control of Okinawa as the military put more focus on ensuring they would maintain control of the military bases after reversion. Once the army lost their interest in educational policy in Okinawa, USCAR did not hesitate to abandon the University of the Ryukyus Project. MSU was disappointed by this approach, because the

army seemed to discard the importance of international education. The history of the University of the Ryukyus Project could be considered a story of friendship between two educational institutions, but it was also a part of larger tale, that of occupation by a foreigner who restricted the rights of Okinawans.

International education project was a significant part of cultural diplomacy. Okinawans devoted their energies to the ideal of democratic education, but they became disillusioned with American democratic principles because undemocratic practices and wide-spread racial and economic discrimination raised uncomfortable feelings about American occupation. As the gaps between an idealized concept of democratic education and the colonized island's reality became widening, Okinawan teachers and students realized the hypocrisy of USCAR. They criticized that the idealized democratic education was existed only in propagandized media. The next chapter examines how images of American democracy affected the University of the Ryukyus project and the restoration movement.

CHAPTER 5: AMERICAN IMAGES OF DEMOCRACY IN OKINAWA

Introduction

Before the Truman administration decided on the future status of the Ryukyu Islands, *The New York Times* reported the voice of Okinawans who refused to be ruled by their new occupiers: "Thank you very much for all you've done for us, but please go away as soon as we are able to stand on our own feet economically."[1] Since the end of the Battle of Okinawa, the islanders' lives had been closely intertwined with U.S. military bases. Okinawa was caught in an American-Japanese struggle to retain the island as a key pacific defense strategy. Disputes between islanders and the U.S. military were provoked by land seizures, noise, pollution, and violence. Various protest activities were organized in the name of an all-Okinawa protest rally. According to Miyume Tanji, Okinawans sought national identity in order to unify protesters in the 1950s.[2] A more appropriate definition for some Okinawan activist groups in the 1960s would be anti-American because they blamed Americans in Okinawa for their involvement in the Vietnam War.[3]

These massive protests were an indicator of antipathy to U.S. military bases. In the long history of protest in Okinawa, anti-American riots tended to monopolize the attention of policy makers and scholars. Many scholars highlight how accidents or crimes of U.S. military personnel triggered mass mobilizations. As James Scott points out, however, it took a long time before

[1] "Oinawans Prove American to Rule: Island's People Remain Docile, but Are Ready to See Us Go," *New New York Times*, April 1, 1946.
[2] Miyume Tanji, *Myth, Protest and Struggle in Okinawa* (London: Routledge, 2006), 75-76.
[3] Yonakuni Noboru, *Okinawa hansenheiwoishiki no keisei* (Tokyo: Shinsensya, 2005), 82-83; Arasaki Moriteru, *Mikan no Okinawa toso* (Tokyo: Gaihusha, 2005), 145-158.

frustrations burst into action.[4] Before a large protest took place, protesters complained about violations of human rights and attempted to persuade policymakers to heed their demands.[5] The leaflets and newspapers published by the Okinawa Teachers Association (OTA) and the student organization of the University of the Ryukyu shed light on the process of mass protests in Okinawa. As mentioned in earlier chapters, the OTA and university students played a significant role in anti-base movements, but it is a misunderstanding to see them as a monolithic group.

Hostilities toward the United States may have risen for political, economic, social, or cultural reasons, or due to a combination of these factors. As many scholars reveal, anti-Americanism is neither a uniform nor a unifying phenomenon, and thus it is possible that the indigenous people harbored no serious resentment to Americans and their culture but still attended anti-base movements.[6] As James Sparrow points out, formal politics is the domain of organized elites but the course of politics often depends on the economic and cultural aspects of the society.[7] This chapter will enrich perspectives and interpretations of anti-Americanism in Okinawa by explicating the views of teacher and student activist groups before mass demonstrations.

The impact of simplified antagonisms between occupiers and the occupied also had a great influence on Okinawans' interpretation of USCAR's diplomacy. While protesters explained how USCAR ignored their demands, it is an inappropriate conclusion that the United States had never

[4] See James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1987).
[5] Yuko Kawato, *Protests Against U.S. Military Base Policy in Asia: Persuasion and Its Limits* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015), 4-9.
[6] See, McPherson, op. cit.; Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War* (New York: New York University Press, 2007).
[7] James T. Sparrow, *Warfare State: World War II Americans and the Age of Big Government* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 11.

paid attention to Okinawan political demands. As discussed in previous chapters, the U.S. government attempted to reduce Okinawan resentments by combining coercive approaches, such as economic sanctions, with seductive incentives such as economic and educational assistance. USCAR also utilized the influence of American culture to smooth frictions with the indigenous people. The ultimate goal of this chapter is to analyze the images of occupation in published materials such as newspapers, journals, magazines, and leaflets. By contrasting different images between USCAR and Okinawan activist groups, this chapter reveals how complicated the processes of adjusting for the gap between an idealized concept of democratic education and the colonized island's reality. As mentioned below, Okinawan school teachers played a leading role in activist groups for the reversion. Contrast between Okinawans teachers' enthusiasm for democracy and their apathy toward USCAR represented the hypocrisy of democratic education system in postwar Okinawa.

American cultural influences served as a powerful weapon in the battle of the global Cold War. American values such as democracy, liberal capitalism, and a modern way of life attracted the hearts of people throughout the world. There is no doubt that the legacy of American culture remains strong in the lives of ordinary people, but public diplomacy covers not only official advertising campaigns but also covert activities. In the Cold War era, American experts in psychological warfare devised a propaganda model that contrasted the coercive and dogmatic nature of communism with the liberal and open democratic values of America.[8] In addition to contrasting images between the United States and the Soviet, USCAR conducted their cultural diplomacy using censorship system curtailing the proliferation of anti-American propaganda and

[8] John Allen Stern, *C.D. Jackson: Cold War Propagandist for Democracy and Globalism* (Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., 2012), 32-34.

activities. As a matter of course, many Okinawans criticized USCAR's censorship. Protesters regarded censorship system as violations of human rights and demanded the freedom of speech.

For most people, propaganda denotes some negative connotations. Many Americans, for example, believe that a democratic society should maintain free access to all information and resist any manipulation of that information.[9] Even though there is a general antipathy to political propaganda, recent scholarship reveals that many Americans did, in fact, accept covert propaganda activities until the power of the Cold War consensus declined in the 1960s.[10] The U.S. government allied with multiple institutions such as the media, churches, and universities in order to spread images of the evil of communism all over the world. Hollywood produced many ideological films which characterized Soviet society in terms of slavery, autocracy, and totalitarianism.[11] The scene of brainwashing American prisoners of wars in Korean War remained a stereotypical image of the menace of communism in American society.[12]

We now know that the propaganda strategy of the American government was more complicated than these stereotyped images portray. Psychological operations including propaganda, information operations, public diplomacy, and public relations were an inexpensive weapon that enabled the American government to undermine the enemy's cause and advocate

[9] Kristin Matthews, "The Medium, the Message, the Movement: Print Culture and New Left Politics," in Greg Barnhisel and Catherine Turner, ed., *Pressing the Fight: Print, Propaganda, the Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010), 41.
[10] See Nancy E. Bernhard, *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda 1947-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); John Fousek, *To Lead the Free World: American Nationalism & The Cultural Roots of the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Takeshi Matsuda, *Soft Power and Its Perils: U.S. Cultural Policy in Early Postwar Japan and Permanent Dependency* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007); Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2008); Laura A. Belmonte, *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).
[11] Tony Shaw, *Hollywood's Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 3.
[12] Paul G. Pickowicz, "Revisiting Cold War Propaganda: Close Readings of Chinese and American Film Representations of the Korean War," *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 17 (2010): 364.

their own.[13] These images of the enemy were not tied to a real object but to a set of constructed cultural beliefs. As Margaret Peacock describes, politicians and propagandists legitimized policies of containment, juxtaposing, for example, images of thriving children against communist deprivation. These images represented the battle of two sociopolitical systems—liberal democracy and communism.[14] Even though these psychological operations were inexpensive and maneuverable, they could prove politically risky for the U.S. government if foreign policies did not follow the rhetoric of propagandas. In fact, the American psychological propaganda offensive often became nuanced at the high tide of an enemy political crisis, such as the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. By the time of Hungarian uprising was repressed, American propaganda outlets such as *Voice of America* and *Radio Free Europe* stopped aggressive propaganda warfare and became more careful about what they broadcasted.[15]

The belief that propaganda was effective to educate people was not limited to Americans but U.S. allies also engaged in the dissemination of propaganda. As scholarship reveals, psychological operations in foreign countries were to impose American values.[16] Although these operations highlighted partnership in the free world, anti-communist campaigns were often entangled with disciplinary measures such as reprimands and warning, which implied the supremacy of American culture. The United States recommended that developing countries

[13] Christopher Hemmer, *American Pendulum: Recurring Debates in U.S. Grand Strategy* (Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2015), 66.
[14] Margaret Peacock, *Innocent Weapons: The Soviet and American Politics of Childhood in the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 8, 31.
[15] Walter L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and Cold War 1945-1961* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1997), 86.
[16] See Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht, *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Postwar Germany 1946-1955* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999); Julio Moreno, *Yankee Don't Go Home! Mexican Nationalism, American Business Culture, and the Shaping of Modern Mexico, 1920-1950* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Victoria de Grazia, *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2005).

imitate the path of American modernization. Facing resistance from indigenous societies in South Korea, American protagonists of modernization regarded cultural diversities as an obstacle for economic and social development.[17] In South Vietnam, Michigan State University (MSU) played a key role in modernization, but many MSU members disregarded Vietnamese history.[18] When postwar Japanese intellectuals debated how Japan could develop into a modern nation, American counterparts highly recommended that Japan follow America's ideology of modernization.[19] The result of these actions is that American cultural hegemony served to develop a "structure of feelings."[20]

As in South Korea, South Vietnam, and Japan, semi-colonized Okinawa represented a perfect test case for enforced and paternalistic psychological operations. As outlined in previous chapters, twenty-seven years of occupation policies in Okinawa ended in a fiasco in 1972. Despite some progress in Okinawan society, USCAR's achievements were far lower than the Okinawans' expectations. It is crucial to disentangle the reality from the rhetoric of propaganda. Because the effects of propaganda are so complex, we should avoid the dichotomy that one can simply accept or reject American culture wholesale. As a political tool of occupation, American propaganda aimed to reformulate cultural boundaries and identity to democratize Okinawa. The Okinawans, however, were not passively obedient to these efforts. They considered how to react

[17] Greg Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea: Korean, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 173-175.
[18] Jessica Elkind, *Aid Under Fire: Nation Building and the Vietnam War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2016), 59-64.
[19] Victor Koschmann, "Modernization and Democratic Values: The 'Japanese Model' in the1960s" in David C. Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele and Michael E. Latham ed., *Staging Growth: Modernization Development, and the Global Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 225-237.
[20] Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2003), 7.

to USCAR's propaganda activities and sought to adopt, adapt, and reject aspects of American culture for themselves.[21]

In addition, the chapter will reveal that even USCAR's propaganda magazines could not always broadcast utopian images of American society as the presence of American social problem such as the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War attracted Okinawans notices. As mentioned below, however, this does not mean that USCAR realized the importance of the impartiality in journalism. The true intent of propaganda magazines was to show how American society endeavored to overcome these social problems. American social problems were also associated with problems in Okinawa and these magazines attempted foster cooperation between Americans and Okinawans. The analysis of USCAR's published magazines highlights the fact that propaganda activities were an educational tool for Cold War education in Okinawa.

Seducing Okinawans

The rise of the Cold War raised the stakes in the global propaganda war. In 1948, the U.S. Congress enacted the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, which aimed to promote better understanding between the United States and other countries.[22] The Truman administration considered this international and educational program a part of national defense, including military and economic programs. Advocates of the information program recommended a shift in strategy from a "full and fair picture" of America to a propaganda offensive about American intentions and foreign policies. This strategy would serve as a counteroffensive against

[21] Heide Fehrenbach and Uta G. Poiger ed., *Transactions, Transgressions, Transformations: American Culture in Western Europe and Japan* (New York: Berghahn Book, 2000), xiv.
[22] The United States Information and Educational Act of 1948, HR 3342, 80th Congress, 2nd session, RG306 General Record 1953-1957, Box 1.

the "big lie" of Russian propaganda.[23] The Eisenhower administration reinforced the concept of aggressive propaganda. Secret funding for anti-communists groups and politicians, as well as covert actions to topple anti-American regimes in many foreign countries, were named as black propaganda activities.[24] In Okinawa, USCAR put political pressure on anti-American groups such as the Okinawan People's Party (OPP) and the Okinawa Teachers Association (OTA). The Deputy Governor of Ryukyu Islands, General Robert S. Beightler, denounced OPP as a communist party. Challenging USCAR's political authority, OPP was suspended the party's newsletter, *Jinminbunka* (*People's Culture*), and was repealed Ryukyu Island Legislative Election and Naha Mayor Election.[25]

At the beginning of the Cold War, the United States considered Japan the most important player in Asia and believed it was necessary to maintain their bases in Japanese territory, including the Ryukyu Islands, for purposes of national security. The U.S. government concluded that withdrawal from Japan would strengthened the position of the USSR and Communist China.[26] Since Japan has remained in the alliance system with the United States, scholars could determine that American cultural activities played an important to counteract communist propaganda. As James R. Vaughan remarks, historians realize the effectiveness of propaganda activities, but many scholars focus on the formation rather than reception of propaganda activities.[27]

---

[23] Six Semiannual Report of United State Advisory Commission on Information, ibid.
[24] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle of Home and Abroad* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006), 93, 146.
[25] Sakurazawa Makoto, *Okinawa gendaishi* (Tokyo: Chuokoronsha, 2015), 59-61; Monna Naoki, *Amerika senryozidai Okinawa genrontoseishi* (Tokyo: Yuzankakusyuppankabushikigaisya, 1996), 115-126.
[26] Consideration Affecting U.S. Policy with Respect to the Two China, June 15, 1953, 0-1.4/2, *Confidential U.S. State Department Special Files Japan 1946-1957*, National Archives, College Park MA.
[27] James R. Vaughan, *The Failure of American and British Propaganda in the Arab Middle East, 1945-1957* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 4-5.

Public opinion surveys demonstrate that the Japanese had a more positive image of the United States and American culture than the USSR and Communist China. For example, a survey supported by United States Information Agency (USIA) funding in 1955, showed that while 57 percent of Japanese people had a very good or good opinion of the United States, only 9 percent had a good impression of the USSR.[28] A similar survey of feelings about various countries conducted in Okinawa showed the same pattern. It revealed that 51 percent of Okinawans had a positive impression of the United States, while only 8 percent had a positive impression of communist countries.[29]

As long as U.S. cultural activities were intertwined with the politics of the Cold War, they aimed to cultivate pro-American and anti-communism feelings in the Japanese.[30] From public opinion surveys, it is clear that American propaganda activities succeeded in broadcasting better images than communist countries. However, these data are of little use to analyze whether Okinawans were, in fact, satisfied with USCAR's occupation policies. Unlike the image that public diplomacy requires the propagation of messages, the assessment of public diplomacy must be shaped through the process of transnational communications.[31] The United States described public diplomacy as more positive, informational, cultural, and educational forms of engagement with indigenous people, but it is very difficult to ascertain how the Okinawan people understood the political meaning of American culture. For example, when the U.S. government used jazz as part of a heroic Cold War struggle for democracy, Okinawans' understandings of American jazz music was shaped though their own political, social, and personal experiences. Micheal Molasky

[28] Japan Public Opinion Survey, RG306 Country Project File Japan 1955-1956, Box 58.
[29] Okinawa Public Opinion Survey, December 1958, RG306 Country Project File Japan 1958, Box 63.
[30] Matsuda, op. cit.
[31] Georgy M. Tomlin, *Murrow's Cold War: Public Diplomacy for the Kennedy Administration* (Lincoln: Potomac Book, 2016), xxii.

argues that while most people enjoyed jazz music without considering the political context of jazz, some described it as a symbol of freedom beyond the propaganda of the Cold War. The latter believed that jazz music could represent the voice of anarchists.[32]

Okinawan rock 'n' roll is another example to evaluate the impact of cultural activities. Many Okinawan rock musicians grew up around base towns where bars and restaurants played American music. Their adolescences were inseparable from American occupation. For example, a forerunner Okinawan rock band, *Murasaki* made a living by playing rock 'n' roll in military bars as well as local ones. Decadence of Okinawan base towns in the Vietnam War era stimulated Okinawan musicians' creativities. The economic boom around military bases also brought huge money to Okinawan rock music industry. For many Okinawan rock musicians associated with this boom, however, social stability was more precious than money.[33]

USCAR's cultural activities were part of occupation policy and thus other factors such as political and economic policies could offset their success. In addition, the influence of cultural activities themselves were multilayered. For example, Michael R. Auslin places U.S.-Japanese cultural activities in the following three categories: semi-official organizations supported by governmental agencies, intellectual and grass-root activities, and popular cultural importations.[34] For this reason, this chapter does not consider American cultural activities as a monolithic policy.

[32] Micheal S. Molansly, *Sengo nihon no jazzbunka: eiga, bungaku, angura* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2017), 140-41.
[33] See Okinawa-shi ed., *Rock to Goza* (Nanbaru-cho: Nahashuppan, 1994).
[34] Michael R. Auslin, *Pacific Cosmopolitans: A Cultural History of U.S.-Japan Relations* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2011), 170.

It was clear that the American government realized the complexity of U.S.-Japanese cultural activities as early as January 1951, when the Truman administration sent John Foster Dulles to negotiate a peace treaty. As a member of Dulles' mission, John D. Rockefeller III visited Japan to explore ways to strengthen the cultural relationship between the United States and Japan.[35] Rockefeller realized that "any program for cultural relations between the United States and Japan must be looked at as an aspect of the broader development of cultural relations between all of the countries of the free world."[36] In the reports to Dulles, Rockefeller explained three points that promoted the goals of U.S. cultural activities in Japan. According to Rockefeller,

> The long range of objectives in cultural interchange between the United States and Japan would appear to be three-fold: to bring our peoples closer together in their appreciation and understanding of each other and their respective ways of life, to enrich our respective cultures through such interchange and to assist each other in solving mutual problems.[37]

Rockefeller also pointed out that mutual respect would become the basis for cultural activities, and thus unilateral and patronizing behavior should not be allowed.

In Rockefeller's view, U.S. military personnel and their families had the most contact with the Japanese, and thus had a great responsibility to show the Japanese a fair example of the American way of life.[38] Contrary to Rockefeller's expectations, military personnel and their families could not completely abandon their paternalistic view of the Japanese. MacArthur's testimony before Congress in 1951 highlights American racial prejudice toward the Japanese. He described the Japanese like a 12-year-old boy compared to a developed American of forty-five

[35] Statement by Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3rd, January 25, 1951. RG III 2-D, *Office of Messrs, Rockefeller Record*, Box 59, Folder 372. Rockefeller Archives Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.
[36] United States-Japanese Cultural Relations Report to Ambassador Dulles, April 16, 1951, ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.

years.[39] While many soldiers did not have an anachronistic, racial view of social Darwinism, it was difficult for them to abandon their experience during occupation when they played the role of schoolmaster to delinquent Japanese students.[40] In semi-colonized Okinawa, U.S. military personnel played a similar role for much longer than those in mainland Japan.[41] Through their contacts with military personnel, Okinawans had both favorable and unfavorable impressions. While USCAR organized many events for international cultural exchanges, few American GIs and Okinawans socialized with each other in their private lives. As the presence of military bases became permanent, the experience of occupation made cultural exchange activities in Okinawa more complicated. In contrast, non-physical cultural activities such as media broadcasting and magazines embodied highly idealized notions of the American way of life.

According to a 1958 survey, the Okinawans were highly favorable toward some aspects of American life, such as sports, scientific developments, living conditions, and industry in general. American films were very useful to broadcast the affluence of American life. Through exposure to Hollywood films, 82 percent of Okinawans answered that they had a favorable or very favorable impression of American life.[42] In the early 1950s, American cinema, as well as Samurai Drama, attracted the hearts of many Okinawan youth. They became avid fans of Hollywood celebrities such as Gary Cooper, John Wayne, Ingrid Bergman, and Marilyn Monroe.[43] However, USCAR censored films that inspired anti-Americanism and studios from communist countries were prohibited from importing and broadcasting in Okinawa.[44]

---

[39] John H. Miller, *American Political and Cultural Perspectives on Japan: From Perry to Obama* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014), 95-97.
[40] Ibid., 100.
[41] See Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946-1965* (New York: New York University Press, 2007).
[42] A Public Survey Opinion Survey on Current Problems vol. 2, April 1958, ibid.
[43] Yamasato Masato, *Anyatasa: Sengo Okinawa no eiga 1945-1955* (Naha: Niraisha, 2001), 146.
[44] Ibid, 24; Kabira Choshin, *Syusengo no Okinawa bunka gyoseishi* (Naha: Gekkan Okinawa Sha, 1997), 207.

Based on the opinion poll, USIA concluded that Okinawans had positive attitudes toward the United States, but there were also some negative impressions, for example, regarding racial issues. For Okinawans as well as the Japanese, American racial issues were inherent to the occupation of Okinawa. The survey showed that Okinawans and the Japanese had negative feelings about U.S. treatment of the Okinawan people, only twenty percent of respondents had a positive opinion for this question. Those who had a negative opinion about US treatment of the Okinawan people mentioned the following reasons: "discrimination," the "disregard of basic human rights," the selfish attitudes of the United States, and the colonization of Okinawa.[45] In hindsight, these opinions predicted the reversion of Okinawa to Japan. However, USIA underestimated these issues because they expected that social and economic conditions, as well as the behavior of U.S. soldiers, would improve. In addition, research revealed that Okinawans were concerned about Americans attitudes toward them and thus hid their true feelings. According to Miyagi Etsujiro, Okinawans have been historically sensitive to prejudice of the rulers, but they affiliated with American who perceived them as a backward and childlike people.[46]

USIA also overlooked other omens for the reversion. A 1958 survey of Okinawan public opinion mentioned the presence of land confiscation, restoration movement, and economic problems, which led to the reversion of Okinawa in 1972.[47] Eleven years later, USCAR's survey demonstrated that the United States could not resolve the most important issues for Okinawans such as the reversion to Japan, the improvement of living conditions, and confiscated land for

[45] Okinawa Public Opinion Survey, December 1958, ibid.
[46] Miyagi Etsujiro, *Senryosyanome* (Haebarucho: Nahashuppan, 1982), 55-57.
[47] A Public Survey Opinion Survey on Current Problems vol. 1, April 1958, RG306 Country Project File Japan 1958, Box 63.

military bases.[48] Critics of American occupation concluded that ignorance of Okinawan problems resulted in the reversion in 1972. As mentioned in earlier chapters, it was nevertheless clear that the U.S. government, as well as USCAR, understood these problems from the beginning of occupation, but made maintaining military bases their priority, rather than the social and economic conditions of the islanders.

In addition to diplomatic papers, USCAR's propaganda activities reveal the islanders' anxiety about the problem of Okinawa. It is no coincidence that mass circulation of propaganda magazines started with the upheaval of anti-American movements. The remainder of this chapter explores the relationship between occupation policy and propaganda activities, focusing on USCAR's monthly propaganda magazine, *Syurei no Hikari* (*The Light of Shurei*) and *Konnichi no Ryukyu* (*Ryukyu Today*).

Imagined Democracy in Okinawa

In October 1957, USCAR published the monthly propaganda magazine, *Ryukyu Today*. One hundred and forty-six volumes were issued until the magazine ceased publication. *Ryukyu Today* and *The Light of Shurei* became two major propaganda magazines in Okinawa. These two magazines had a circulation of over 100,000.[49] While the United States started propaganda activities immediately after the Battle of Okinawa, freedom of speech was restricted under the censorship system in 1945. For example, the Okinawan Democratic Alliance published its newsletter, *Jiyu Okinawa* (*Okinawan Freedom*) in 1948, but the military government suspended

[48] Okinawa Public Opinion Survey, December 1969, ibid.
[49] Kano Naomasa, "Konnichi no Ryukyu wo Toshitemita Zaibeigun no Bunka Seisaku," *Nihon Rekishi* 375 (Aug 1978): 1.

publication because the newsletter promoted democracy as a necessity and criticized the Okinawan Civilian Administration (OCA). Criticism of the OCA was viewed as an indirect attack on the military government that controlled Okinawan society.[50] Likewise, the publication of OPP's *People's Culture* was banned for the same reason. The party's newsletter claimed that democratic elections existed only in name, because the wealthy received high-ranking government jobs through nepotism.[51] With the rise of the Cold War, USCAR propaganda activities stressed the moral obligation of the free world and the global strategic importance of the Ryukyu Islands in light of the Cold War.

In addition to censorship, USCAR established information centers to bolster pro-American impressions. These information centers owned propaganda leaflets as well as Japanese and English books. Information centers also organized many events such as American movie nights and American music café.[52] In the early 1950s, these centers were renamed as the U.S. -Ryukyu Cultural Center to extend public diplomacy activities. Cultural centers had modern architecture with air-conditioning, a rarity in those days. The stark contrast between modern American cultural centers and wooden Okinawan libraries symbolized the balance of power between the colonizers and the colonized.[53] Many Okinawans came to these facilities because they had many services such as libraries, community centers, movie theaters, and tea houses. The youth especially enjoyed visiting these facilities to study English and listen to American music.[54]

[50] Miyagi Kosuke, "Shuppanbutsu no kenetsu" in Nahashi Rekishi Hakubutsukan ed, *Sengo wo Tadoru: Amerika yo kara Yamato yo he* (Naha: Ryukyu Shinposya, 2007), 166-167.
[51] *Jinmin bunka* 8 (Aug 1950): 5-7.
[52] Yoshimoto Hideko, *Beikoku no Okinawa senryo to zhohoseisaku* (Yokohama: Shunpu Sha, 2015), 250-51.
[53] Okinawa no toshokan henshuiinkai, ed., *Okinawano toshokan* (Tokyo: Kyoikusiryo Syuppankai, 2000), 68-80.
[54] Miyagi Etujiro, *Okinawasenryo no nijushichinenkan* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992), 34-38.

The late 1950s were another turning point for American propaganda activities in Okinawa. In response to mass protests triggered by land confiscation for military purposes, USCAR created two magazines to promote pro-Americanism. *The Light of Shurei* targeted the general population and described American occupation as a necessity since the Ryukyu Islands became entangled in the Vietnam War. In its opening message, the editor explained that the mission of the United States Armed Force was "the maintenance of peace in the Far East for the free world."[55] According to the editorial, *Light of Shurei* focused on cultural exchanges between Americans, the people of the Ryukyu Islands, and the Ryukyuan workers employed by the U.S. military, in addition to everyday life on the Ryukyu Islands. However, this magazine often reported interviews from U.S. military officers about occupation policies, which, as a matter of course, reiterated the U.S. mission in Okinawa and denied that the military was stationed there to colonize the Ryukyu Islands.[56]

In addition, the magazine explained why the U.S. was attractive to many developing countries, contrasting a closed communist society with a more open American one. The articles stated that the decision-making processes of communist societies were designed to destroy traditional norms and approaches, which often decreased economic growth. The lack of consensus in communist politics focused on the prospect of immediate gain and ignored the welfare of the people.[57] Another article pointed out the problems of a closed society and concluded that the true intent of the communists was to make people slaves.[58]

[55] *Shurei no Hikari* 1 (Jan 1959), 3.
[56] *Shurei no Hikari* 9 (Sep 1960), 2-3; *Shurei no Hikari* 11 (Nov 1960), 1.
[57] *Shurei no Hikari* 2 (Feb 1962), 2-3; *Shurei no Hikari* 3 (Mar 1962), 2-3.
[58] *Shurei no Hikari* 8 (Aug 1962), 1.

In contrast to USCAR's expectations, however, Okinawan hostilities toward military bases continued to escalate. In the 1950s, Okinawan protesters mainly focused on agendas such as restoration to Japan and the violation of the human rights in Okinawa. In the 1960s, the Vietnam War gave the protesters the best opportunity to link these agendas with the global anti-war movement.[59] In response to these criticisms, USCAR contended that some had confused the meaning of democracy, and thus believed the rhetoric of totalitarianism was the true call of democracy.[60] Moreover, USCAR highlights how Okinawa moved forward toward to become a democratic society with comparisons to American society. For example, USCAR mentioned the adaption of the jury system in Okinawa for protesting the human rights as American citizens were protected by American judicial system.[61] It is a cliché to highlight the improvement of Okinawan society by following American customs. Another article points out that Okinawan labor leaders could not agitate their members with communist ideology, because Okinawan laborers had legal rights like Americans.[62]

Ryukyu Today employed more sophisticated propaganda techniques on the middle and upper classes to impress upon them the success of the American occupation.[63] It emphasized that "The magazine was composed of articles based on people's perspective and thus these are not intended to represent USCAR's official stances and opinions."[64] In fact, *Ryukyu Today* cited many articles from Okinawans that detailed or even praised USCAR's achievements in the Ryukyu Islands. These articles were roughly categorized into the following four types: economic development in

[59] Yonakuni Noboru, *Okinawa hansen ishiki no keisei* (Tokyo: Shinsensya, 2005), 82-83.
[60] *Shurei no Hikari* 3 (Mar 1961), 2-3.
[61] *Shurei no Hikari* 7 (Jul 1963), 33.
[62] *Shurei no Hikari* 6 (Jun 1964), 32-33.
[63] Kano, op. cit.
[64] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 1, no.1 (Oct 1957), 1.

Okinawan society, encouragement of anti-communism, fraternity between Americans and Okinawans, and Okinawa nationalism.[65] In many articles, however, these topics were clearly meant to legitimize American occupation. For example, an article emphasized the economic impact of occupation by stating that "The affluence of the (Okinawan) people is linked to the U.S. military bases"[66] Focusing on the importance of base-related economics, the article concluded that reversion was a completely unrealistic option if the islanders wanted to maintain their current quality of life. Even though the author denied that he disagreed with reversion, the article suggested that communists were actually behind the reversion movement. Another article legitimized the occupation by defending the statement that American had a moral obligation to the Free World to spread democracy. According to the author, liberal democracy respected the principle of free will and thus Okinawans had no limitations on freedom of speech under U.S. occupation. This article even suggested that Okinawans should express their gratitude to the United States for its assistance.[67] To summarize, these articles aimed to persuade the islanders of the importance of the American occupation. In addition, these magazines claimed that reversion movements were not connected with burgeoning Japanese nationalism, but rather with communist agitations that would ruin Okinawan prosperity.

The articles about economic assistance were connected with images of progressive Americans. *Ryukyu Today* detailed meetings about economic issues between USCAR and Okinawans, describing USCAR officials as advocates of modernization. Articles covered many aspects such as water supply, electricity, transportation, agriculture, fishery, public sanitation,

[65] Kano, op. cit., 5-7.
[66] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 4, no.3 (Feb 1960), 3.
[67] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 2, no.11 (Nov 1958), 24-25.

and international commerce.[68] The magazine also reported how military assistance was allotted to facilitate the quality of life in Okinawa. For example, an article explained that American aid for the Ryukyu Islands would reach its peak in the 1965 fiscal year and the top two categories of expenditure would be investment for water supply facilities and educational support.[69] Another article justified military occupation by casting doubt on the capabilities of local politicians. As noted, Okinawans regarded the 3rd High Commissioner, Paul W. Caraway, as an incarnation of paternalistic occupation policies. However, this article interpreted Caraway as a kind of liberal reformer and regarded local politicians, as well as entrepreneurs, as stereotypical traditionalists who opposed modernization.[70] The magazine often categorized reversion activists and those in the labor movement as anti-modernists, stressing that because of the political privilege of these leaders, their arguments did not promise economic development. As a preventive measure against such political demagogues, USCAR suggested they could enlighten Okinawan laborers.[71]

As Donna Alvah points out, Americans viewed the Okinawan as a primitive, victimized, dependent child, and this conception served as justification for maintaining military bases.[72] The picture of the American Santa Claus, who delivered gifts to the Okinawan children, is an excellent example of such propaganda activities.[73] USCAR also advertised their donations of school equipment for children, such as books and science experiments with colorful pictures. Cultural activities between American and Okinawan children provided great opportunities to demonstrate American fraternity. The discourse of benevolent Americans sought to transform the

[68] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 3, no.8 (Aug 1959), 30-34; *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 4, no.3 (Mar 1960): 24-25; *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 5, no.9 (Sep 1961): 16-17.
[69] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.11 (Nov 1964), 3-4.
[70] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.5 (May 1964), 3.
[71] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 5, no. 4 (Apr 1961), 26-27.
[72] Alvah, op. cit., 168.
[73] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 3, no.2 (Feb 1959), 4.

imperialistic view of Caraway into a good American father.[74] For example, some articles described Caraway's school inspections and his communications with kids. They emphasized his kindness with an episode where many students attempted to play the trumpet for a welcome reception, and Caraway gently patted each child who played it well on the head.[75]

Intercultural activities were a popular topic of magazines, and sports festivals and cultural events were also an opportunity to broadcast American friendship with indigenous people. The shared love of sports helped to reconstruct close U.S.-Japan relations after the Pacific War.[76] While soldiers' relationships with the Okinawan people became more complicated than their relationships with the mainland Japanese, group photos in *Ryukyu Today* attempted to demonstrate an Olympic spirit of friendship, solidarity, and fair play. USCAR held a variety of sports festivals, including baseball, volleyball, swimming, tennis, and table tennis.[77] The picture section of the magazine covered cultural activities such as a beauty contest, a dance party, a cultural festival, and so on. Open seminars where American teachers taught English for Okinawan high school students were also popular intercultural activities in the occupation era. In addition to high-ranking military officials and prestigious intellectuals, American military spouses played an important role as American cultural ambassadors.[78] USCAR believed that spouses had a dual role as the model of American benevolence and the guardian of the domestic sphere. The stereotypes of good wives and wise mothers served to develop wholesome homes and conscientious societies.[79]

---

[74] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.2 (Feb 1964), 32.
[75] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.1 (Jan1964), 4-5.
[76] Sayuri Guthrie-Shimizu, *Transpacific Field of Dreams: How Baseball Linked the United States and Japan in Peace and War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 243.
[77] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 2, no.7 (Jul 1958), 17-23.
[78] See Alvah, op. cit.; Mire Koikari, *Cold War Encounters in US-Occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity and Transnationalism in East Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
[79] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.2 (Feb 1964), 10-11.

USCAR also broadcast images of educational rehabilitation to demonstrate the process of democratization. The University of the Ryukyus was portrayed as a hallmark of the new Okinawan society. An article explained that, while education was typically controlled by the privileged class, postwar democracy would bring education into the hands of the people. While the author claimed that the Okinawan educational system was established after the university was opened, his emphasis was that the future of Okinawan education relied on mutual understanding between Americans and Okinawans.[80] USCAR also linked the development of the university with the rise of Okinawan identity. Instead of stressing historical relations with Japan, articles described the motto of university as, bridging western and eastern cultures, creating a new Okinawan culture, and increasing Okinawans' contribution to humanity.[81] Propaganda to remove Japanese cultural influences was promoted by appealing to the American educational system. As noticed earlier, USCAR reiterated the importance of learning English to improve the effect of occupation policies. Cultural activities provided opportunities to communicate and learn about American culture. For example, USCAR's English advisor stated "Teaching English in class is not enough, because teaching the American way of life and thinking is also very important."[82] For this reason, *Ryukyu Today* utilized Okinawans abroad as their spokespersons. However, the portrait of American society through the eyes of Okinawans was not as commendable as USCAR expected.

[80] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 1, no.2 (Nov 1957), 5-6.
[81] Ibid., 2.
[82] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 8, no.1 (Jan 1964), 11.

Ideal American Society in Okinawan Magazines

U.S. propaganda magazines were a useful tool to market American values and ideals to the world. According to Laura A. Belmonte, USIA's booklet, *My America* highlighted the following themes: cultural diversity, political freedom, and social mobility. America's propaganda campaign was designed to offset Soviet allegations of racism, cultural materialism, and parochialism.[83] USIA created Russian magazines, such as *Amerika* and *America Illustrated*, to directly target the Russian people. In addition to national values, U.S. printed propaganda increasingly focused on the positive aspects of modern American life. Considering the vigorous Soviet effort to stop circulation of these magazines, it is obvious that propaganda activities played more than a nominal role in the Cold War.[84]

The combination of philosophical values and economic prosperities displayed in magazines were persuasive. To defeat communist propaganda, however, American print media often imbued articles with images of an impeccable society. When the media portrayed America's domestic problems to foreign audiences, this damaged the credibility of American propaganda by showing a less than idyllic picture of American social problems. While the Left had a number of grievances about American society, the United States was particularly anxious about the accusations of racism and imperialism.[85] For example, when USIA released pictures of racial harmony immediately after the Little Rock Incident in 1957, communist propaganda exploited this opportunity.[86] As Elizabeth C. Hoffman remarks, John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps also

[83] Belmonte, op. cit., 3, 5.
[84] Andrew L. Yarrow, "Selling a New Vision of America to the World Changing Messages in Early U.S. Cold War Print Propaganda," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 11, no. 4 (Fall, 2009), 13-14.
[85] See Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2001).
[86] Belmonte, op. cit., 79-80.

intended to show that the United States was not a racist nation.[87] The U.S. government attempted to prove that American international projects were conducted in an atmosphere of racial harmony.

Many articles in *The Ryukyu Today* expressed utopian views of American society, but these were mentioned by voluntary indigenous voices. Okinawan reports from the United States were typical patter about the supremacy of American society. An Okinawan high school student who participated in the 1957 World English Debate Contest stated that,

> Our Okinawan team was invited to a party at the home of an American high school student. Blacks and whites, men and women were in attendance. As the party was in full swing, no one stood on the sidelines. Everyone danced and sang in chorus together…. I thought they were relaxed and confident. I understood that their behavior embodied the confidence and prosperity of American society.[88]

Through the eyes of this Okinawan student, readers had the impression that there was no racial or gender segregation in American high schools. The article also introduced American prosperity by comparing it with the conditions in Japan and Okinawa. Descriptions of skyscrapers in New York City boasted the advancement of American science and technology.[89] Another report by an Okinawan correspondent in New York described a similar positive view, noting that even though New York City is literally the center of multiracial America, the gap between the rich and poor is not as severe as in Okinawa. According to this report, everyone lived in a similar type of dwelling, wore a similar type of clothing, and drove their own car. The author regarded the United States as the most civilized country because of its material prosperity.[90]

---

[87] Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, *All You Need Is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s* (Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 28.
[88] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 2, no.2 (Feb 1958), 9.
[89] Ibid., 7.
[90] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 3, no.10 (Oct 1959), 9.

The presence of censorship made it possible to publish any kind of pro-American propaganda in Okinawa. According to David Welch, however, censorship had little value unless it could selectively blend facts and opinions to deceive its audience.[91] Critics of U.S. propaganda activities in Okinawa note that the inefficaciousness of printed propaganda activities was rooted in unrealistic contexts. Monna Naoki points out that "People who realized (USCAR's political) context seem to not enjoy reading 'Shuri no hikari' and 'Konnichi no Ryukyu.'"[92] Boycotts of these two magazines by left-wing groups at the University of the Ryukyus symbolized the failure of U.S. propaganda.[93] As critics remarked, because these magazines were free, the circulations numbers did not demonstrate their popularity.

By examining Okinawan reports on American society, however, it is clear that some referred to racism in the United States in order to bolster propaganda activities. For example, one report by an Okinawan who studied at Boston University mentioned that there were racial tensions in American society. While Boston, like New York City, was portrayed as a multi-racial city, this report mentioned the separation of ethnic groups. For example, Italian immigrants had an Italian radio station and Chinatown was like its own city, where residents almost always communicated in Chinese. Whereas the report liked the remnants of foreign languages and the rise of multiculturalism, the author admitted that there were racial problems in the southern states.[94] Like the Boston report, other authors mentioned problems in American society, but their focus was to explain that Americans had made tremendous progress to overcome many social problems. One article cited statistical data to prove that poverty had been reduced since the Great

[91] David Welch, *Propaganda: Power and Persuasion* (London: The British Library, 2013), 25.
[92] Monna, op. cit., 224-225.
[93] Ogawa Tadashi, *Sengo beikoku no Okinawa bunkasenryaku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012), 177-181.
[94] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 2, no.7 (Jul 1958), 10-11.

Depression. Without referring to racial or gender disparities, this report explained that most Americans enjoy recreational activities such as traveling on vacation, which was a privilege for the upper class in the 1930s.[95] In fact, some Okinawan students in the United States recalled that while they observed the problem of racial disparity and the Vietnam War on campus, the prosperity of American society overwhelmed these negative images.[96]

For USCAR, comments about social problems in American history had a different political message— that Okinawans had better follow the American experience so that they could overcome similar social problems. In many articles, American social problems were associated with problems in Okinawa and, thus, improving interracial relations could be a means to foster cooperation between Americans and Okinawans. Descriptions of American materialism were broadcast as the goal of Okinawan modernization. The bottom line is that articles about American society in propaganda magazines were not only for advertising the American way of life, but also for stratifying Okinawans in a class behind Americans. In *Ryukyu Today,* the United States was portrayed as a utopia where community provided a strong safety net for the vulnerable.[97] The articles implied that USCAR envisioned the Okinawans as also vulnerable and weak and thus gave alms to them. In the propaganda magazine, there was no scenery of military occupation in Okinawa.

While scholars have examined how USCAR developed its psychological operations and how it controlled American images through censorship in Okinawa, analyzing how Okinawans accepted the messages from U.S. military personnel presents a conundrum. Even though print media had political messages to inform locals of U.S. foreign policy, many Okinawans were

[95] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 3, no.10 (Oct 1959), 14-15.
[96] Kinzyo Hiroyuki, *Kinmon curabu: Mouhitotsu no Okinawa sengoshi* (Naha: Hirugisha, 1988), op. cit., 71.
[97] *Konnichi no Ryukyu* 5, no.9 (Sep. 1961), 28-29.

attracted by portraits of American prosperity. As noted earlier, opinion surveys revealed that Okinawans generally had positive images of American culture. Although Okinawan elites were keenly sensitive to the paternalistic behavior of their rulers, they studied English very hard to climb up the social ladder.[98] Ordinary Okinawans accepted some parts of American culture too. American music became the backbone of Okinawan jazz and rock and roll, and Okinawa produced many world boxing champions.[99] However, this did not mean Okinawans accepted the morality of occupation. Okinawan encounters with American culture caused ambivalent feelings between the ideology of open democracy and the reality of authoritarian military occupation. As USCAR chose what they imported to Okinawans, the islanders, in turn, chose what aspects of American culture they received. Many Okinawans admired the idealized images of economic prosperity and democratic society, but they lived with U.S. military personnel who did not match those images. Okinawans liked American people, culture, and ideology, but they rejected military bases and racial segregation.

The Myth of Anti-Americanism

In recent years, scholarship has analyzed Okinawan anti-Americanism closely. Massive protests in the 1950s and the 1960s were an indicator of antipathy to U.S. military bases. This anti-Americanism resembled many places such as Diego Garcia and South Korea, where U.S. military bases symbolized American imperialistic power.[100] The very pessimistic view explained

[98] GARIOA, Fulbright Okinawa dosokai, *GARIOA ryugakusei no sokuseki* (Haebarucho: Naha Syuppansha, 2008), 102-118.
[99] Miyagi Etsujiro, "Amerika bunka tono sogu" in Senryo to bungaku heishu iinkai, ed., *Senryo to bungaku* (Tokyo: Orijin syuppan center, 1993), 242-243.
[100] See David Vine, *Island of Shame: The Secret History of the U.S. Military Base on Diego Garcia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); David Straub, *Anti-Americanism in Democratizing South Korea* (Stanford: The Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, 2015).

the stubbornness of anti-American sentiments. Since the tragedy of September 11, Americans take sentiments of anti-Americanism more seriously. According to Alan McPherson, "In newspapers and magazines, the word appeared roughly five times more often after September 11 than it had before."[101] Almost one year after the tragedy, the State Department held a conference to ponder the question, "Why do they hate us?" The conference categorized three types of anti-Americanism: "the first an antipathy toward capitalism, the second a form of nationalism, and the third a rage against modernity."[102] U.S. policy makers had regarded criticism or complaints about America as psychological resentment associated with feelings of backwardness, inferiority, or weakness. While there was a tendency in liberal intellectual groups in the United States to pay more attention to the injured feelings of non-Americans, until September 11, many Americans failed to consider what caused the rise of anti-Americanism and how to prevent the escalation of terrorism.

Research on the concept of anti-Americanism could help the United States to better understand and prevent anti-Americanism in the world. Studies on public diplomacy examine specific measures to control images of the United States in the world.[103] Many scholars mention that even though anti-Americanism has always existed, this antipathy toward the United States has not always led to brutal terrorist attacks. The cause of anti-Americanism may be founded principally in U.S. actions are intolerable to other nations or individuals. Historical and

[101] Alan McPherson, *Yankee No! Anti-Americanism in U.S.-Latin American Relations* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2003), 1.
[102] Andrew Ross and Kristin Ross, ed., op. cit., 17.
[103] See William A. Rugh, *Front Line Public Diplomacy: How US Embassies Communicate with Foreign Publics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

contemporary relations with the United States are a key factor to analyze why antipathy escalated into massive resistance in some counties.[104]

One of the most enduring myths about anti-Americanism is that those who have antipathy toward Americans have a fundamental hostility toward democracy, freedom, and modernity.[105] The reality is, however, far more complex. Defining anti-Americanism with this ideological dichotomy prevented U.S. decision makers from accurately assessing the views and policies of foreign nations. In the Cold War era, the myth of anti-Americanism was fused with the rhetoric of communist agitation against the United States. Although the Okinawa reversion movement in the 1960s was more than simple anti-Americanism agitated by leftist groups, USCAR was afflicted with communist conspiracy theories.[106] Because U.S. policy makers believed that the fundamental cause of anti-Americanism was distortion or misinformation about the United States, it is natural that the United States Information Agency focused on correcting these misunderstandings and providing accurate information.[107]

In semi-colonized Okinawa, however, U.S. public diplomacy became concerned with more than merely correcting information. No matter how USCAR claimed that the United States associated with the principle of democracy in Okinawa, U.S. military base policies violated the norms of national sovereignty and human rights and made maximum efforts to water-down the reality of military occupation. The U.S. Army tried to create a semblance of autonomy for the Ryukyu Islands by establishing a local government, the Government of the Ryukyu Islands. To

[104] Stephen Brook, *Anti-Americanism and the Limits of Public Diplomacy: Winning Hearts and Minds?* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 13-15.
[105] Max Paul Friedman, *Rethinking Anti-Americanism: The History of an Exceptional Concept in American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 19-20.
[106] Kawato, op. cit., 58.
[107] Brook, op. cit., 14.

downplay the image of the American empire, USCAR avoided using words like "the military government" and "occupation," and chose instead, "civil administration" and "governance."[108] The U.S. occupation authorities also used censorship as a manipulation technique to control images in Japanese media and to enforce the press code. Under this code, Japanese media avoided publishing articles and broadcasting programs that could inspire anti-Americanism or Japanese militarism. In the early stages of American occupation, the press code prohibited the broadcasting of crimes and misbehavior of American soldiers.

With the rise of all-Okinawa protest rallies, Okinawan journalists finally won an uphill battle against USCAR. According to Monna Naoki, the occupation authorities never revealed clear guidelines for Okinawan media, forcing Okinawans to always wonder whether their articles would be suspended.[109] This ambiguous publishing license system contributed to the endurance of self-censorship, which USCAR deemed the appropriate method to protect the civil administration. Because Okinawan journalists assumed that USCAR suggested they follow this press code in Japan, many forms of media served as a mouthpiece for the occupation authorities.[110] A pro-American newspaper, *Okinawa Mainichi Shinbun* (*Okinawa Daily*) proclaimed that people should obey the occupation authorities to maintain social order.[111] While most pro-American media were forced to cease publication due to unpopularity, the publishing license system was so powerful that the right to freedom of speech was curtailed until military censorship was officially abolished in 1965.

---

[108] Yoshimoto Hideo, *Beikoku no Okinawa senryo to zyoho seshisaku: gunji syugi no muzyun to kamofurazyu* (Yokohana: Syufusya, 2015), 14-21.
[109] Monna Naoki, *Okinawa genron toseishi: genron no ziyuhe no tatakai* (Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1996), 51.
[110] Ibid., 67-72.
[111] Tsujimura Akira and Ota Masahide, *Okinawa no genron: Shinbun to hoso* (Tokyo: Nanpo doho yogokai, 1966),14.

As mentioned before, most Okinawans lived in poverty until the U.S. reconstruction process in the late 1940s. During this difficult time, Okinawan media could not point out the problem of American occupation because the U.S. military facilitated images of benevolent Americans. In deference to the rulers' preferences, Okinawan media promulgated the narrative that Okinawans should appreciate Americans' support, but should not depend on their mercy. For example, *Okinawa Taimus* (*Okinawa Times*) reported that although the United States had supported them, Okinawans must depend on themselves to achieve economic prosperity.[112] The occupation authority punished Okinawan journalists when their articles deviated from the tacit press code. In 1951, two journalists from *Ryukyu Nippo* (*Daily Ryukyu*), whose article openly criticized that the prosperity of the United States was built on the victimization of poor Okinawans, were accused of libel in military court.[113]

After the U.S. government decided to retain Okinawa permanently, USCAR was dissatisfied with any activities to promote the restoration movement and developed a new strategy for media control. Because they admitted that Japan had a claim of "residual sovereignty," USCAR did not officially deny the possibility of restoration to the mainland, but instead highlighted the advantages of American tutelage over and against Japanese tutelage in the prewar period.

In addition, USCAR invented the narrative that communists had manipulated the restoration movement for their own political aims. For example, one USCAR leaflet claimed that the goal of communism was to overthrow the Japanese government, and thus their support of restoration was merely a means to oust the U.S. military from East Asia.[114] It was convenient for USCAR to arrange advocates of restoration in a line that they were leftist groups. In fact, many

[112] *Okinawa Taimus*, 2 March 1949.
[113] Tsujimura and Ota, op. cit., 65-66.
[114] Monna, op. cit., 128-129.

leftist organization played a leading role in restoration movements. Under this context, USCAR legitimized the suppression of many political activities of the Okinawa Peoples Party (OPP) and targeted other restoration advocate groups for surveillance, such as OTA and the student organization of the University of the Ryukyu.

Because of the strict control of free speech, major Okinawan newspapers, such as *Okinawa Taimus* (*Okinawa Times*) and *Ryukyu Shinpo* (*Ryukyu Newspaper*), were reluctant to publish in favor of restoration.[115] Okinawan journalists did not disclose their true voices to USCAR until the late 1950s. In contrast, Okinawan teachers and students became the vanguard against the occupation authorities. Teachers imparted the essence of democracy and human rights to students in their classrooms. Because of their tragic experience under the Imperial Japanese Government, teachers and student were naturally more sensitive to the disconnects between ideology and reality in postwar Okinawa.

Responses of Teachers' Associations Against American Occupation

Okinawan teachers and students became zealous advocates for educational rehabilitation and restoration. Teachers organized activities as early as the late nineteenth century, long before the U.S. military occupied the Ryukyu Islands. Although each local association had different problems based on the diversity of their communities, they had common agendas, which represented the shortcomings of the Okinawan educational system through modern history. One of the general aims for many Okinawan teachers' associations was to enrich welfare benefits. Because Okinawa ranked as the poorest prefecture in Japan, Okinawan teachers requested

[115] Tsujimura and Ota, op. cit., 97-99.

improved working conditions such as higher income.[116] In addition to social welfare, they fought against other causes such as gender discriminations and juvenile delinquency.[117]

Immediately after the war, Okinawan teachers reorganized their associations. In 1947, they established a prefecture-level association, the Okinawa Educational Federation (OEF), which focused on educational rehabilitations and the improvement of teacher welfare rather than restoration to the mainland. According to Chair of the OTA, Yara Chobyo, teachers believed that Okinawa would be returned to Japan with the end of American occupation in the mainland.[118] For this reason, Okinawan teachers prepared to unify the educational system in the mainland. Because they knew that they trailed behind Japan in educational rehabilitation, OEF invited eminent educators from the mainland.

It is natural that restoration became a major agenda for the Okinawan teachers' associations only after the mainland achieved independence from the United States in 1952. In the same year, the OEF reorganized as the OTA and became more active in political activities. For educational rehabilitation, Okinawan teachers started a fund-raising campaign to reconstruct war-devastated school facilities. With the rise of restoration movements in the early 1950s, OTA became a vanguard of demonstrations, mobilizing its members to protest American occupation after students became victims of military-related crimes and accidents.[119] The OTA reported disasters,

---

[116] Fujisawa Kenichi and Sakurazawa Makoto, "Senryoka no Amami, Ryukyu niokeru kyoikudantai oyobi sonokikanshi: Soshiki, shoshi, naiyo" in Fujisawa Kenichi ed., *Senryoka no Amami, Ryukyu niokeru kyoikudantai kankeisiryo syusei betsusatsu* (Tokyo: Fuji Shuppansha, 2016), 7-39.
[117] Female teachers established their own association to improve their status in 1954. See Okudaira Hajime, *Sengo Okinawa kyoiku undoshi* (Naha: Boda Inku, 2010), 73-75. The struggle for equal salaries between male and female teachers made some progress. The Government of the Ryukyu Islands decided to pay compensation in 1965. *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, June 1, 1965.
[118] Yara Chobyo ed., *Okinawa kyosyokuinkai zyurokunen: Sokokufukki, Nihonkokumin toshiteno kyoiku wo mezashite* (Tokyo: Rodo syunposha, 1968), 23.
[119] See Seki Hironobu, *Okinawa kyosyokuinkai* (Tokyo: Sanichi Syobo, 1968); Yara, op. cit.; Arasaki, op. cit.

such as the 1959 Okinawa F-100 crash, in detail and complained about prolonged negotiations for compensation from the United States.[120] As a matter of course, USCAR disliked the OTA's political activities and thus reiterated warnings not to be involved in anti-American sentiments. In 1954, the Deputy Governor of USCAR, David Odgen, remarked that the OTA had become a front for communist espionage activities.[121]

While the OTA had increased hostility toward USCAR until the end of the occupation, demonstration was not the only way that Okinawan teachers could raise their complaints. In 1954, USCAR gave the OTA permission to publish its bulletin, *Kyouiku Shinbun* (*Educational Newspaper*). It was different for Okinawan teachers to publicly criticize under the eyes of USCAR. USCAR emphasized that the bulletin should report only educational matters and made clear that if it played up the restoration movement, it would be suspended.[122] However, scholars focused on anti-Americanism as the central element in the restoration movement suggest that even under strict censorship, OTA resisted the occupation authority. Acoording to Sakurazawa Makoto, Okinawan teachers wrapped their critiques within a petition for aid that implied poverty in Okinawa.[123] It is natural that many Okinawan activist groups required to safeguard their demands from censorship system. By revealing the difficult plight of Okinawan teachers and students, the bulletin implied the failure of occupation policies without describing USCAR's activities. In fact, many articles mentioned the poverty of Okinawan teachers. One article reported that many teachers had to make ends meet by borrowing money from a teachers' mutual aid association. This article did not complain about USCAR's educational policy, but rather

[120] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, March 20, 1960.
[121] Yara, op. cit., 84-85.
[122] Monna, op. cit., 133.
[123] Sakurazawa Makoto, *Ritsumeikan daigaku kenkyukiyo* vol. 90 (Mar 2008), 178-179.

remarked that USCAR showed sympathy for impoverished teachers and had agreed to increase their salaries by twenty-five dollars.[124] No matter how well censorship hid the influence of USCAR, Okinawans realized that USCAR was responsible for the failure of educational rehabilitation.

As the quality of Okinawan education lagged behind Japan, comparison between the mainland and Okinawa elucidated the failure of educational rehabilitation in Okinawa. The OTA's bulletin explained that student academic standards were declining because Okinawa's educational budget was almost half of Japan's. Thus, increasing educational revenue was one of the most urgent issues. In addition to improvements for teachers' social welfare, teachers requested subsidies for school equipment and school meals.[125] The bulletin suggested that returning the right of educational administrations to Japan would be necessary if Okinawan teachers did not have improved working conditions.

In addition to the aspiration for equality with Japanese education, the leadership of Yara Chobyo and Kyan Sinei, the President of Fukkikyo (the Okinawan Prefecture Council for Reversion to the Home Country) galvanized the restoration movement. Yara and Kyan were shocked by the rapid deterioration of the educational system in the mainland and mobilized schoolchildren and parents for their restoration campaign.[126] Okinawan teachers struggled to strengthen Japanese identity in in their land. For example, the OTA asked USCAR to clarify Okinawa's status under the new educational code. The OTA and USCAR agreed that education should be based on democratic principles, but they had different perspectives on the meaning of

[124] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, October 20, 1958.
[125] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, April 20, 1959.
[126] Tanji, op. cit., 57-58; Mori Yoshio, *Sengo Okinawa minshushi: Gama kara henoko made* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2016), 149-150.

those principles. While USCAR preferred to rely on abstract concepts, such as the trend of public opinion, Okinawans requested the Japanese constitution as an appropriate guideline for democratic education in Okinawa. In 1958, the new educational code stipulated that "as Japanese citizens," Okinawans would endeavor to promote democratic society.[127] In the classrooms, the OTA recommended that teachers "teach Japanese history and geography and talk about news broadcasted on Japanese television."[128]

After the publishing license system was abolished in 1965, the OTA's bulletin openly called for Okinawans to attend restoration movements. Now the bulletin remarked that "The human rights and freedom of 950,000 Okinawans were restricted under the USCAR's administration, which made military operations a priority."[129] While the bulletin reported growing support for restoration in Okinawa, a critique of the Japanese government appeared in some articles. For example, an article mentioned that the Japanese should pay more attention to educational problems in Okinawa. The article regarded Okinawans as victims of U.S.- Japanese politics and pointed out the responsibility of the Japanese government to make amends for the educational disadvantages on the islands.[130] The OTA's ambivalence toward the Japanese government was made clear when Prime Minister Sato Eisaku visited Okinawa in August 1965. Like the Reversion council, the OTA was split into pro- and anti-Sato groups.[131] As the Sato cabinet became entangled in the Vietnam War, the OTA linked the restoration campaign with the antiwar movement. For example, their bulletin claimed that both the United States and Japanese

[127] Okudaira, op. cit., 95-101.
[128] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, January 30, 1963.
[129] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, October 25, 1965.
[130] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, October 25, 1965.
[131] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, August 25, 1965.

government engaged in "militaristic and colonial policies"[132] As the process of restoration moved forward, the antagonism between the OTA and Japanese government widened the chasm between conservative Okinawan politicians and radical Okinawan teachers. The fear of the Democratic Party in Okinawa facilitated legislation that restricted teachers' political activities.[133] As the era of American occupation came to an end, the OTA prepared for battle against a new nemesis—conservative Okinawan politicians who were strongly supported by the Japanese Ministerial Party.[134]

The Occupation Through the Eyes of Okinawan Students

The University of the Ryukyus demonstrated the irony of American occupation in Okinawa. As mentioned before, USCAR expected the university to be a bulwark of democracy. Because USCAR believed that communists were the nemesis of liberty, future Okinawan intellectuals and elites compromised on military bases as a means to support the noble cause of the global Cold War. The American educational system might have become more attractive if the university administrators had actually embodied the ideology of liberal education by allowing students to be more active participants in their own education and acquire knowledge through discussing opposing viewpoints. In the eyes of Okinawan students, however, the occupation authorities betrayed these principles of democracy. Students challenged USCAR and the university administration because they did not permit free inquiry about base-related political issues. The impact of student movements became more visible as they demonstrated their demands in public.

---

[132] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, April 13, 1967.
[133] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, May 25, 1966; Sakurazawa, op. cit., 179-187
[134] *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, June 17, 1966; *Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun*, April 13, 1967.

Student activism included not only direct actions like protest rallies, but also criticism of the occupation through the power of the pen.[135] In addition to protest rallies, Okinawan students criticized the occupation with the power of pen. Student literary magazine, *Ryukyu Bungaku* (*Ryukyu Literature*), was the most well-known medium for young literary enthusiasts of Okinawan society.[136] Even though it took a long time for student artists to see the results of their creative activities, their endeavors extolled freedom of expression in the university.

In one prominent case, *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun* (*Student Paper of the University of the Ryukyus*) confronted the authorities in Okinawan society and the university from a journalistic standpoint. The student newspaper was published in 1950, the same year the University of the Ryukyus was established. It started as a club activity but developed to represent students' voices in the mid-1950s. Because of its popularity, the student paper could collect subscription fees and thus gain a measure of financial independence from the university administration.[137] However, student correspondents were not protected by freedom of speech laws. As mentioned in chapter five, student protests erupted when USCAR suspended the circulations of student journals after they published anti-American articles. In 1953, the university administration suspended an unauthorized student journal, *Jiyu* (*Liberty*), whose aim was not to criticize American occupation but to promote the restoration campaign and peace movements in Okinawa.[138] The student paper also attempted to boost student energy for political

[135] Betty S. Anderson, *The American University of Beirut: Arab Nationalism & Liberal Education* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), 5, 17.
[136] Komatsu Hiroshi, *Nihonfukki to hanfukki: Sengo Okinawa nationalism no tenkai* (Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppankai, 2015), 132-135.
[137] Gabe Satoshi, "Ryukyu daigaku niokeru hyogen to kenetsu: 1950nendai 'Ryukyu daigaku gakuseishinbun' wo tsushinni," *Okinawa bunka kenkyu* 38 (2012): 509-510.
[138] Monna, op. cit., 160; Tsujimura and Ota, op. cit., 75.

activism. After this violation of free speech, the student newspaper challenged the university and occupation authorities by pointing out the hypocrisy of "academic freedom."

The *Daini Ryudai Jiken*, the second University of the Ryukyu incident, was the climax of antagonism between students and the authorities. With the rise of military land-related issues such as confiscation and permanent possession, *Ryukyu Literature* bitterly attacked the United States as a nation of oppressors and imperialists.[139] Even though USCAR stopped the circulation of this magazine, it was impossible to assuage the animosity students held for the military bases. In fact, five hundred students participated in a demonstration parade against U.S. military bases. USCAR forced the university administration to punish the student who played the leading role in this incident. Four of the six students expelled from the university were committed to publishing Ryukyu Literature.[140] As a matter of course, the student correspondents stood by protesters and thus the university authorities suspended publication of the student newspaper, blaming student protesters for their decision to expel.[141] After the incident, the university administration revised the regulations for student publications. The modified guidelines requested an investigation by both a faculty member and the vice president before publishing articles.[142]

While the university administration more strictly supervised student magazines and newspapers, the student writers reported the issues affecting their academic lives for their own convictions. On July 14, 1958, the student newspaper clashed again with the authorities regarding freedom of expression in the university when the student newspaper mentioned the student council's opposition to docking a nuclear submarine in Okinawa and rated teachers'

[139] Letter from C. D. Mead to Milton E. Muelder, 22 August 1956, Records of University of Ryukyu Project. Box 279, Folder 51, University Archives & Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing.
[140] Monna, op. cit., 163.
[141] Tsujimura and Ota, op. cit., 78.
[142] Gabe, op. cit., 523.

efficiency on the front page. The strange thing in this volume is that there were suppressed passages on the front page. According to the editor of the student newspaper, university administration admitted they did not publish the statement the statement and thus the newspaper reported only issues that were discussed in the general meeting of the student council.[143]

The university administration justified their supervision. In another student newspaper article, *Ryudai Taimus* (*The University of Ryukyu Times*), the administration explained that there was no censorship for student magazines and newspapers and that the administration supervised the student writers when their article had strong bias.[144] While student writers did not need supervision, administrative interference with the student newspaper continued after the 1958 cases. On October 15, 1960, the university administration ordered *Ryudai Taimus* not to publish part of an article about the mission of MSU. While it is impossible to know the context of the article, as Gabe Satoshi points out, it is highly probable that the article criticized the mission of MSU.[145] Some students called the University of the Ryukyus "the colonial university,"[146] and saw little difference between governmental and non-governmental actors. Student distrust for MSU grew when, in 1956, an accidental fire in the library was started in the MSU faculty room.[147]

As the student council revealed a more confrontational stance against USCAR, it became clear that the radicalization of some student groups deterred many students from political activism. In 1960, the student council held a special conference to discuss the participation of the

[143] Ibid, 524; *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, July 14, 1958.
[144] *Ryudai Taimus*, January 1, 1960
[145] Gabe, op. cit., 536; *Ryudai Taimus*, October 15, 1960.
[146] *Ryukyu Gakusei Shinbun*, June 21, 1953.
[147] Irei Takashi, *Okinawazin nitotteno sengo* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1982), 84.

Okinawan Prefecture Council for Reversion to the Home Country (Fukkikyo). After a three and half hour debate, moderate groups denounced radical approaches, including armed struggles, to achieve restoration.[148] A 1960 survey represented the split of the student council. While forty-nine percent of students agreed that the student council was run on democratic principles, thirty-four percent believed the council was undemocratic and disregarded student voices.[149]

Despite the cacophony within student movements, frustration with military occupation made it possible for the student council to mobilize many students for political rallies. The tragedy of the 1959 Okinawa F-100 crash and Eisenhower's visit to Okinawa in 1960 provided motivation for protest marches.[150] The student newspaper supported these student rallies and, according to an editorial note, the editors published in conjunction with Eisenhower's visit.[151] When the student newspaper sympathized with notions of radical communist revolution, however, ideological conflicts between student groups came to the surface.[152] The student newspaper denounced the moderates as hypocrites. According to the radical viewpoint, a revolutionary struggle was inevitable to achieve peace and the moderates only prolonged the occupation because they were afraid of social disorder.[153]

No matter how much the student newspaper emphasized the importance of social revolution, this radical approach did not gain popularity in the university. In 1961, the president of the university, Asato Genshu, resigned after Marxist student groups broke into a government

[148] Okinawa Taimussha ed., *Ryudai fudoki: Kaigaku yonzhunen no sokuseki* (Naha: Okinawa Taimussha, 1990), 228-229.
[149] *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, May 22, 1960.
[150] Okinawa Taimussha ed., op. cit., 231-232.
[151] *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, June 17, 1960.
[152] Okinawa Taimussha ed., op. cit., 235-236.
[153] *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, December 1, 1960.

building and clashed with police officers. The university administration finally expelled thirteen students and suspended five more. After this incident, the student council elected a new president who advocated for restoration to Japan, rather than social revolution.[154] As restoration movements entangled with other political issues, such as the Vietnam War and Japanese national security, the divisions among student activist groups became more complicated.

The student newspaper developed pro-communist arguments that social movements must be linked with class struggle. Marxist student writers denounced restoration movements because many groups promoted Japanese nationalism. Because they adhered to the principles of communism, they could not get along with many groups in the Okinawan Prefecture Council for Reversion to the Home Country. For these students, even leftist parties such as the OPP were not socialist groups but pragmatists who feared involvement in the Vietnam War.[155]

Ironically, the unpopularity of Marxist student groups revealed the spurious nature of USCAR rhetoric, which claimed that students who participated in anti-American movements were communist sympathizers. Although USCAR believed that the United States was the guardian of democracy in the world, the Cold War mentality disgraced the nobility of ideology. It is clear that USCAR assisted to build democratic educational system in postwar Okinawan society. However, USCAR could not become the guardian of democracy as long as the U.S. military occupation continued. During the twenty-seven years of occupation, moderate student activists were the true guardian of Okinawan society.

[154] Okinawa Taimussha ed., op. cit., 236, 240. The student newspaper called the student council an incompetent group. *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, July 20, 1962.
[155] *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, August 10, 1961; *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, April 28, 1964; *Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun*, April 28, 1965.

Conclusion

American cultural activities had a significant impact in the world, but psychological experts could not figure out how U.S. cultural activities and propaganda would be accepted positively in all locales. The U.S. government expected that psychological operations would break down counterpropaganda from communist countries. When communists denounced America as an amoral country whose politicians seduced people to be greedy, racist, and imperialist, the U.S. government developed counter-narratives to these adverse images. In U.S. print media, consumerism had no negative meaning, but rather simply implied the development of social and economic prosperity. In contrast to poverty in communist countries, U.S. propaganda explained that American affluence created a surplus to take care of the vulnerable. As a matter of course, American propaganda avoided the racial issue as much as possible and broadcast activities that showed interracial harmony as a means to discredit communist claims. The same logic was used to justify violating the sovereignty of a foreign country. Overseas military bases were interpreted as bulwarks against communist intervention in U.S. allied countries.

Although the rise of the civil rights movement and the quagmire of the Vietnam War challenged these causes, USCAR advocated U.S. justification for occupation under the Cold War consensus. In U.S. allied countries in Asia, American racial consciousness was deeply intertwined with the global Cold War against communism. U.S. military personnel, as well as intellectuals, paid little attention to indigenous culture, and thus judged the progress of modernization according to the standard of American society. Modernization theory justified this American-centered approach in the world. Thus, semi-colonized Okinawa became an excellent laboratory to enforce paternalistic psychological operations.

Under the censorship system, USCAR controlled media activities in the Ryukyu Islands. USIA carefully supervised activist groups and often suspended publication of their propaganda leaflets. In addition, USCAR circulated two major monthly propaganda magazines in Okinawa, *Konnichi no Ryukyu* (*Ryukyu Today*) and *Syurei no Hikari* (*The Light of Shurei*), whose circulation reached over 100,000. While USCAR developed cultural activities in the early 1950s with the rise of the Cold War, the late 1950s were another turning point for American propaganda activities as the confiscation of land for military purposes triggered mass protests.

In contrast to other propaganda publications, *Ryukyu Today* used more adroit propaganda techniques to boast of the success of the American occupation. Although USCAR manipulated the context of these magazines, most articles were portrayed as the personal voices of Okinawans. *Ryukyu Today* highlighted the following topics: economic development, the cause of anti-communism, fraternity with Americans, and Okinawa nationalism. These topics were mutually linked in order to sress the importance of American occupation. While American propaganda operations rejected the rhetoric of communism, which regarded Okinawans as the victims of American occupation, they carefully developed a logical explanation for why reversion to the mainland would not be beneficial for Okinawans. The magazine emphasized American efforts to reconstruct postwar Okinawan society and asked proponents of reversion whether Okinawans would enjoy the current level of economic prosperity under the protection of the Japanese government.

This logic was corroborated by reports from Okinawans abroad, which lauded how, under the American social justice system, no one experienced racial, gender, or class segregation. These reports, however, were too utopian to persuade people of how wonderful American society was. More accurate reports mentioned American social problems, such as racial tensions

and the existence of vulnerable people. The U.S. government used these "more accurate reports" for propaganda purposes, implying that they could serve as a model for how Okinawans might overcome similar problems. The bottom line is that American social would overcome racial problems, and thus propaganda activities functioned to structure American supremacy above indigenous culture.

Opinion surveys clearly revealed that American culture became popular in occupied Okinawa. Okinawan youth loved to watch Hollywood cinema and listen to jazz and rock and roll. However, this does not mean that Okinawans accepted the reality of American occupation. The islanders selected what they wanted during the twenty-seven years of American occupation. The postwar history of Okinawa is inseparable from American military bases. While Okinawans enjoyed the American way of life, they staged massive protest marches and rallies against the U.S. military since the start of American occupation.

USCAR attempted to block the eruption of Okinawans resentments in many ways, by combining coercive approaches such as censorship and economic sanction with seductive incentives such as economic and educational aids. As Okinawans saw the rapid economic growth of mainland Japan, however, they lost the incentive to depend on American aid for reconstructing their war-devastated society. The censorship system tried to conceal the failures of occupation, especially the publishing license system without clear guidelines that enabled self-censorship to endure. Major media sources like *Okinawa Taimus* (*Okinawa Times*) and *Ryukyu Shinpo* (*Ryukyu Newspaper*) were reluctant to blame the occupation authorities until various protest activities made Okinawan resentment clear.

No matter how sophisticated their media control, it was impossible for USCAR to assuage Okinawan frustrations over base-related issues. Because they had already experienced military

censorship and were forced to obey emperor worship, teachers and students were most sensitive to enforced educational policies and became zealous advocators for educational rehabilitation and restoration. The OTA's bulletin compared and contrasted educational problems in Okinawa with the great achievements in the mainland. It also encouraged members to spend more time enhancing Japanese identity in classrooms. After the publishing license system was abolished, the OTA criticized American occupation more widely. Okinawan students also confronted the occupation authorities with the power of the pen. Despite censorship, student correspondents often wrote critiques of the occupation and the university administration subsequently suspended their publications. Under these conditions, it is not difficult to verify the presence of censorship in student publications, because the university administration allowed them to publish problematic newspapers after omitting unacceptable material.

Long battles in regard to censorship naturally intensified the antagonism between the local media and the occupation authorities. Base-related issues triggered periodical massive protest and the protests displayed images of Okinawans marching and saying "Yankee, Go Home!" In fact, Okinawans' reaction to American occupation was not simplistic and there were struggles among the various protest groups. As the end of the occupation approached, the chasm between the moderates and radicals could not be concealed under the cause of restoration. Like USCAR, conservative Okinawan politicians attempted to control the political activities of Okinawan teachers, forcing the OTA to battle against both the local as well as the occupation authorities. As momentum for restoration to the mainland increased, Marxist groups emphasized the principles of international communist revolution. As these groups clung to this ideology, however, they were left behind the mainstream social movement. Finally, publications from left-

wing student newspapers labeled other kinds of activism as a narrow-minded, nationalist movement.

Communist ideology did not become a powerful weapon to rally people against the United States in Okinawa. USCAR equated antimilitarism with anti-Americanism and villainized protesters as communist sympathizers. In reality, few people really believed in communist ideology. A close look at the process of mass demonstrations in Okinawa reveals the complexity of Okinawan society, which was divided by ideology, class, gender, and sexuality. Okinawans disregarded these discrepancies in their society for a time because they were traumatized by base-related tragedies. Ongoing protests prove that the momentum of Okinawan activism was mainly based on violations of human rights by the U.S. military force. During the twenty-seven years of occupation, Okinawans desired peace and prosperity. Thus, the root of the problem was not ideological differences between capitalism and socialism but the presence of military bases. The reversion to mainland Japan represented the rejection of American occupation, and the history after the reversion proved that Okinawan society could prosper without U.S. tutelage.

CONCLUSION

American occupation of Okinawa was a large-scale social engineering project undertaken to modernize a war-devastated society. Through twenty-seven years of occupation, the Unites States invested huge amounts of capital into the Ryukyu Islands in order to construct military installations. The global Cold War solidified the need for permanently retained military bases, but the goals of occupation expanded to demonstration of the model case of democratic social development against the communist model of modernization. Reflecting those strategic realities, military funds flowed into projects related to social and economic rehabilitation. At the same time, military funds led the island to depend on a base-centered economy. The flow of military funds also promoted the processes of school constructions because education was necessary to facilitate democratization as well as to continue economic development.

The occupation authority often overstated the benefits of occupation, but the reality of the garrison colony was not as rosy as public statements indicated. Okinawans recall the everyday plight of living with minimum wages and food. Even the elite groups engaged in menial jobs related to military installation construction. Under these conditions, the military government could not improve Okinawan social welfare. Many civil affairs activities were improvised because of a chronic shortage of human resources. Some educated civil affairs officers understood the importance of cultural diplomacy and earned respect from the Okinawans. However, most relationships were not harmonious because many GIs held deep racial prejudices and demonstrated a paternalistic attitude toward Okinawans.

The United States attempted to assuage Okinawan resentment with incentives such as economic and educational aid. Among these numerous projects, many people put the highest

priority on educational rehabilitation. The collapse of the Japanese empire meant the end of the prewar educational system based on emperor worship. It was a favorable omen for the occupation authority that many Okinawans considered democracy the ideology of postwar educational policy. In the early stages of occupation, the United States indoctrinated islanders with American democracy in order to abolish Japanese militarism. Weakening Japanese influence and nurturing Okinawan identity became a hidden military goal to perpetuate the occupation of Okinawa where the Japanese government had "residual sovereignty."

As the rise of the Cold War shaped the character of the Ryukyu Islands, postwar educational rehabilitation was positioned as the basis of an ideological battle between the United States and the Soviet Union. Among educational rehabilitation projects, the University of the Ryukyus Project was a centerpiece of Cold War educational policy. The U.S. military expected that the university would consistently educate new pro-American elite groups. In the U.S. view, graduates were also useful for resolving a chronic shortage of human resources by serving as experts in their respective fields. On a war-devastated island, USCAR put priorities on practical programs such as English, agriculture, and home economics. With the scope of education policy expanding, however, the military was forced to handle many issues which required advanced academic skill. To accelerate the reconstruction process, the Army sought assistance from outside experts. MSU was selected as the mentor of the University of the Ryukyus because its excellent curricula satisfied the Army's requirement of practical programs.

Like other modernization projects in the world, the democratization of education in postwar Okinawa was a byproduct of the military-academic complex, which embodied the Cold War ideology of modernization. MSU president John Hannah was a typical figure who combined the liberal ethic of international development projects with the realistic view of Okinawa as the

keystone of the Pacific defense. Other MSU faculty members regarded this university building project as an opportunity to export the concept of land-grant philosophy, as well as to contribute to U.S. foreign policy. With assistance from the MSU mission, the infant university developed into a full-fledged institution of higher learning.

While USCAR and MSU were satisfied with the growth of the university, the military base presence and paternalistic behavior provoked Okinawan antipathy against the United States. Student complaints about American occupation led to two incidents which led to the expulsion of some student protesters from the university. In the high tide of 1950s McCarthyism, USCAR and MSU paid little attention to distinguishing anti-Americanism from communist agitations. USCAR had never compromised with student protesters and declared the triumph of democracy over communism when they expelled the students. As a matter of course, anti-Americanism did not subside with these punishments because most student protesters were not communist sympathizers. It is an irony that the islanders supported the noble aim to develop democratic education in their war-devastated society, but the reality of military occupation stained the greatness of American democracy.

As the Japanese recovered from the tragedy of Pacific war and achieved rapid economic growth, most Okinawan educators and students leaned toward reversion to the mainland for the accomplishment of democratic education. USCAR was still confident that the United States would play the best role in democratic education, but Okinawans called their institution the colonial university. Through daily exchanges with Okinawan students, some MSU members realized the incongruity of democratic education under military occupation. The growing confidence of Okinawans for the greater administrative freedom was influenced by the increasingly strong support for the reversion to Japan. However, MSU members turned a blind

eye to the voice of Okinawa because their mission was financed by the Army. Facing difficulty in resolving various problems between USCAR and the University of the Ryukyus, MSU stayed away from political debates and concentrated on upgrading the entire educational program. The rise of the restoration movement finally dismantled military-academic cooperation in the age of the Cold War.

The increased connections with the mainland through restoration movements revealed to Okinawans that their living standards were behind those of other prefectures in Japan. The Truman and Eisenhower administrations realized that poor economic and social situations had contributed to the dissatisfaction of Okinawans. After the Kennedy administration, the U.S. government encouraged progress to reversion by enlarging the Japanese government's role in the realm of social and economic problems. While USCAR was irritated because of the increasing Japanese influences on Okinawa, the momentum of reversion could not be reversed, as the cost of the Vietnam War strained budgets for international development projects. The Johnson administration finally decided to return administrative rights of the Ryukyu Islands as long as the Japanese government permitted discretionary power in military bases. While U.S. and Japanese governments proceeded with the reversion process in order to maintain their alliance, the military focused more on maintaining the strategic options of military bases and nuclear weapons in Okinawa. Under this situation, USCAR lost interest in higher education in the islands. In early 1968, MSU was suddenly informed that the Army terminated the University of the Ryukyus Project. Although two universities have continued exchange programs, the end of the Army-sponsored project marked an epoch in postwar Okinawa.

As many scholars have already explained, U.S.-Okinawan relations could not be described without the presence of U.S. military bases. It is natural that base-centered narratives have

portrayed antagonism between the U.S. military and indigenous people. Recurrent accidents and crimes related to military bases have stimulated Okinawans to organize massive protests. Even the narrative of cultural activities, which focused more on mutual friendships, could not ignore the occupation experiences. In fact, USCAR enacted censorship to suppress the rise of anti-Americanism in Okinawa. The fear of a publication ban forced major Okinawan media to have a voluntary censorship scheme. As a method of media manipulation, USCAR also prompted circulation of their propaganda magazines in Okinawa. USCAR intended their magazines to educate Okinawans on how to understand American occupation. One major U.S. propaganda magazine in Okinawa, *Konnichi no Ryukyu* (Ryukyu Today), used adroit propaganda techniques to convey the success of American occupation. Although USCAR manipulated the context of the magazines, most articles were portrayed as Okinawans' personal voices. Many reports described how wonderful American society was. The utopian images emphasized the economic prosperity and racial harmony of the multi-ethnic society.

Opinion surveys revealed that American culture became popular in occupied Okinawa. Topics related to the American way of life scored high favorability ratings. Okinawan youth loved to watch Hollywood cinema and listen to jazz and rock 'n' roll. No matter how much American culture had the power to attract the minds of people, however, U.S. cultural diplomacy could not erase the racial hierarchy. Under many narratives of fraternity between Okinawans and Americans, the unequal relationship between ruler and ruled functioned to structure American supremacy above indigenous culture. In addition, many Okinawans recognized that American society had similar social problems. Okinawans understood the civil rights movement and Vietnam War through their own occupation experiences.

Among a variety of activist groups, Okinawan teachers and students had a strong insight that USCAR had betrayed the noble cause of education in democracy. Although USCAR justified the limitation of Okinawan human rights in the context of the Cold War, Okinawan teachers and students resisted to gain freedom from want and freedom of speech. For many students and teachers, the rise of restoration movements provided a great opportunity to promote an Okinawan civil rights movement. At the same time, discrepancies among Okinawan activist groups became clear as the end of American occupation approached. The alienation of leftist radical groups from mainstream anti-base movements meant misunderstandings of Okinawan occupation through the context of the Cold War.

A close look at twenty-seven years of occupation in Okinawa reveals how easily policymakers ignored the local society's voice. The United States decided to maintain Okinawa because of the importance of the islands as a keystone of Pacific defense, but they underestimated the necessity of a stable political situation to conduct military operations. Considering the tragic experiences after the Battle of Okinawa, it is clear that Okinawans opposed to be involved in new military operations. Disputes between islanders and the U.S. military were provoked by land seizures, noise, pollution, and violence. Even after the reversion, there was little progress to resolve these base-related social problems. Leftovers of military occupation prevent many Okinawans from looking toward their desired future.

When a twelve-year-old Okinawan girl was abducted and raped by three U.S. soldiers in 1995, Okinawan resentment sparked toward military personnel. Because of indignation over this incident, Governor Ota Masahide decided not to renew the lease of Okinawa's land for U.S. military use. The rape incident in 1995 was a crucial turning point in post-reversion Okinawan history and the girl who was the victim of this crime became a symbol to reunite Okinawan

resistance to U.S. military bases. Various protest activities were organized in the name of an all-Okinawa protest rally, reminiscent of the massive land struggle in the 1950s. The discourse of activists could not constitute a homogenous social movement, but the 1995 rape incident revealed that the presence of U.S. forces was an ongoing problem to rally the ordinary people. Okinawans still adhere to the principle of anti-militarism. The United States still maintains its military installations in Okinawa without local consent or acquiescence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives

Gaiko Shirokan, Tokyo.

Heisei nizyuicni nendo daiikkai gaikokiroku koukai: A3007-1.

National Archives, College Park, MD.

Record Group 59: Records of offices responsible for Far Eastern and Pacific affairs.

Record Group 218: Joint Chiefs of Staff Files.

Record Group 260: Records of the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Island (USCAR).

Record Group 273: National Security Council Records.

Record Group 331: Records of Allied Operational and Occupation Headquarters, World War II.

Record Group 389: Records of the Information Branch.

Okinawa Prefectural Archives, Naha.

White House Central Files. (Original in Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library)

John Foster Dulles Papers. Dwight D. (Original in Eisenhower Presidential Library)

National Security Files Countries Japan. (Original in John F. Kennedy Presidential Library)

The Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

Rockefeller Foundation records, projects, RG 1.2: Japan.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd Papers.

Charles Burton Fahs Papers.

University Archives & Historical Collections, Michigan State University Library, East Lansing, MI.

Records of University of Ryukyu Project.

John A. Hannah Papers.

Kart T. Wright Papers.

Milton Muelder Collection

Published Documents

Conlon Associates LTD, *United States Foreign Policy: Asia*. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1959.

Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United State, 1948, Vol. 6.*

----------. *Foreign Relations of the United, 1949, Vol. 7.*

----------. *Foreign Relations of the United State 1952-1954, Vol. 14.*

----------. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1961–63, Vol. 22.*

----------. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1964–68, Vol. 19.*

----------. *Policy Planning Staff Papers, 1947-1949, Vol.2 1948.* New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1983.

Gaimusho. *Nihongaikobunsyo: San Franciscoheiwazyoyakutaibeikosyo*. Tokyo: Gennandoshoten, 2007.

Merrill, Dennis ed. *Documentary History of the Presidency Truman Vol. 5*. Bethesda: University of Publications of America, 1996.

Naha-shi kikakubu shishi hensyushitsu. *Nahashishi Siryohen Vol. 2 No.2*. Naha: Nahashiyakusho, 1969.

Naikaku soridaijin kanbo, ed. *Sato Eisaku soridaijin enzetsushu dainishu*. Tokyo: Naikaku soridaijin kanbo, 1970.

Nakano, Yoshio ed. *Sengosiryo Okinawa*. Tokyo: Nihon Hyoronsya, 1969.

Nanpodohoyogokai. *Okinawamondaikihonsiryoshu*. Tokyo: Nnpodohoyogokai, 1968. Okinawa-ken, *Okinawa kenshi*. Tokyo: Gennando Shoten, 1974.

Okinawaken kyoiku iinkai, *Okinawa no sengokyoikushi*. Naha: Akatsuki insatsuzyo, 1978.

Ryukyuseihu bunkyokyoku kyoikukenkyuka. *Ryukyu siryo Vol. 3, Kyoikuhen*. Naha: Naha Shuppansha, 1988.

U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, Civil Affairs Activities in the Ryukyu Islands, 1952-1960.

U.S. Office of the Federal Register. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Watkins, James T. Papers of James T. Watkins IV Vol. 1-4. Okinawa: Ryokulindo Shoten, 1994.

Memoirs and Diaries

Bunkyo tomonokai ed. *Sengo Okinawakyoiku no kaikoroku: bunkyokyoku omoide no ki*. Naha: Bunkyo Tomonokai, 1993.

Hannah, John A. *A Memoir*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1980.

Matsuoka, Seiho. *Beikoku no Okinawatochi nizhugonen: haranto gekido no kaiso*. Ginowan: Kyoeiinsatsu, 1972.

Reischauer, Edwin O. *My Life Between Japan and America*. New York: Harper & Row1986.

Senaga, Kamejiro. *Senaga Kamejiro kaikoroku*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1991.

Taira Tatsuo. *Sengo no seikai uramenshi: Taira Tatsuo kaikoroku*. Naha: Nanhosha, 1963.

Truman, Harry S. *Memoirs, Volume I: Year of Decisions.* New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955.

Wakaizumi, Kei. *Tasakunakarishi wo shinzizemu to hossu*. Tokyo: Bungeishunzyusha, 2009.

William S. Triplet. *In the Philippines and Okinawa: A memoir, 1945-48.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Yamaguchi Eitetsu, *Ryukyu-ko kara no hisyo*. Ginowan; Yozyu Shorin, 2001.

Yara, Chobyo. *Yara Chobyo kaikoroku*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1977.

Newspapers & Magazines

Konnichi no Ryukyu

New York Times

Okikyoshoku kyoiku shinbun

Okinawa Taimus

Ryudai Taimus

Ryukyu Daigaku Gakusei Shinbun

Ryukyu Gakusei Shinbun

Shurei no Hikari

Time

Uruma Shinpo

Washington Post

Theses and Dissertations

Tull, James N. "The Ryukyu Islands, Japan's Oldest Colony—America's Newest: Analysis of Policy and Propaganda" MA thesis, University of Chicago, 1953.

Articles and Books

Adams, Walter. *Is the World Our Campus?* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960.

Allen, Herman R. *Open Door to Learning; the Land-Grant System Enters its Second Century*. Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Alvah, Donna. *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War 1946-65*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

Amamiya, Shoichi. *Senryo to kaikaku*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Appleby, Joyce, Hunt, Lyee & Jacob, Margaret. *Telling the Truth about History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994.

Arasaki, Moriteru. *Okinawa hansen jinush*. Tokyo: Kobunsha, 1986.

----------. *Okinawa gendaishi shinban*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005.

Arima, Manabu. *Teikoku no showa*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 2002.

Aspinall, Robert W. *Teachers' Unions and the Politics of Education in Japan*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Auslin, Michael R. *Pacific Cosmopolitans: A Cultural History of U.S.-Japan Relations.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Barnouw, Erik. "Iwasaki and the Occupied Screen", *Film History* Vol. 2 No.4 (Nov.- Dec. 1988).

Belmonte Laura A. *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Bernhard, Nancy E. *U.S. Television News and Cold War Propaganda 1947-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Bix, Herbert P. *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan*. New York: Harper Collins, 2000.

Bonnel, Victoria E. & Hunt, Lynn ed. *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Brands, Hal. "Who Saved the Emperor? The MacArthur Myth and U.S. Policy toward Hirohito and the Japanese Imperial Institution, 1942-1946" *Pacific Historical Review* 75 (2006).

Brazinsky, Gregg. *Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Brooks, Peter. *Anti-Americanism and the Limits of Public Diplomacy: Winning Hearts and Minds?* New York: Routledge, 2016.

Brownlee, Jason. "Can America Nation-Build?" *World Politics* Vol. 59 (Jan 2007).

Brigham, Robert K. *Iraq, Vietnam and the Limits of American Power.* New York: Public Affairs, 2006.

Burke, Peter. *What is Cultural History?* Cambridge: Polity, 2008.

Cameron, Craig M. *American Samurai: Myth, Imagination, and the Battle in the First Marine Division, 1941-1951*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Caprio, Mark E. & Sugita,Yonesuke ed. *Democracy in Occupied Japan.* London: Routledge, 2007.

Cha, Victor D. *Powerplay: The Origins of the American Alliance System in Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Chomsky, Norm et al. *The Cold War & The University: Toward An Intellect History*. New York: New Press, 1997.

Cohen, Theodore. *Remaking Japan: The American Occupation as New Deal*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.

Cooley, Alexander. *Base Politics: Democratic Changes and the U.S. Military Overseas*. Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2008.

Dobbins, James. *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*. Santa Monica, CA : RAND, 2003.

Dingman, Roger. *Deciphering the Rising Sun: Navy and Marine Corps Codebreakers, Translators, and Interpreters in the Pacific War*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2009.

Dower, John W. *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878-1954*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press, 1979.

----------. *War without Mercy*. New York: Pantheon, 1987.

----------. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999.

----------. *Cultures of War: Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, 9-11, Iraq*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

Eguchi, Keiichi. Futatsu no senso. Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1993.

Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Eldridge, Robert D. *The Origins of the Bilateral Okinawa Problem: Okinawa in Postwar U.S.-Japan Relations, 1945-1952*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 2001.

----------. "Showa tenno to Okinawa," *Chuo Koron*, Vol. 114 (Mar, 1991).

Ernst, John. *Forging A Powerful Alliance: Michigan State University and the Vietnam War*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998.

Eto, Jun. "An Undercurrent in Modern Japanese Literature," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 23, No.3 (May 1964).

----------. *1946 nen kenpo: sono kousoku*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju, 1989

----------. *Tozasareta gengo kukan: senryogun no ken'etu to sengo Nihon*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju. 1989

Field, Norma. *In the Realm of a Dying Emperor*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Finn, Richard B. *Winner in Peace: MacArthur, Yoshida, and Postwar Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Fisch, Arnold. *Military Government in the Ryukyu Islands 1945-50*. Washington D.C: Center of Military History United States Army, 1988.

Ford, Clellan S. "Occupation Experience on Okinawa, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol. 267 (Jan, 1950).

Fousek, John. *To Lead the Free World: American Nationalism & The Cultural Roots of the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Fujihara, Akira. *Senryo to minsyu undo*. Tokyo: Sanseido. 1975.

Fujita, Ayako. *Amerika bunkagaiko to Nihon: Reisenki no bunka to hito no koryu*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2015.

Fujita, Hideo. *Okinawa no sakebi*. Tokyo: Choryu Shuppansha, 1967.

Fukuchi, Hiroaki. *Kyoikusengoshikaifu*. Naha: Kakubunsha, 1995.

Gabe, Masaaki. *Nichibeikankei no naka no Okinawa*. Tokyo: Sanichi Shobo, 1996.

----------. *Okinawahenkan toha nandattanoka: Nichibeisengokoshoshi no nakade.* Tokyo: Nihonhosokyokai Shuppankai, 2000.

Gabe, Satoshi. "Ryukyu daigaku niokeru hyogen to kenetsu: 1950nendai 'Ryukyu daigaku gakuseishinbun' wo tsushinni," *Okinawa bunka kenkyu* 38 (2012).

GARIOA Fulbright Okinawa Dosokai. *GARIOA Ryugakusei no sokuseki*. Haebarucho: Naha Syuppansha, 2008.

Genshu, Asato. "Fukkimondaikenkyukai no ayumi." *Fukkimondaikenkyu 3*, (May 1969).

Gienow-Hecht, Jessica C. *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Postwar Germany 1945-1955*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999.

Gillem, Mark L. *America Town: Building the Outposts of Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Gordon, Andrew. *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa Times to the Present.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Goto-Jones, Christopher. *Modern Japan: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Grazia, Victoria de. *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance Through Twentieth-Century Europe*. Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Guthrie-shimizu, Sayuri. *Transpacific Field of Dreams: How Baseball Linked the United States and Japan in Peace and War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Hahn, Maria and Moon, Seugsook eds. *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Hart, Justin. *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Hara, Kimie. *Cold War Frontiers in the Asia-Pacific: Divided Territories in the San Francisco System*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Hein, Laura and Selden, Mark. eds., *Islands of Discontent: Okinawa Responses to Japanese and American Power*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefied Publishers, 2003.

Herring, Geroge G. *From Colony to Super Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Higa, Mikio. "Okinawa Recent Political Development" *Asian Survey* Vol. 3, No. 9 (Sep 1963).

Higa, Mikio. *Kyoiku gozyunen no ayumi* .Kita-chu Zyoson: Hirayama Insatsu, 1999.

Hirano, Kyoko. *Tenno to seppun: America senryo ka no eiga ken'etsu*. Tokyo: Soshi Sha. 1998.

Hixson, Walter L. *Parting the Curtain*. New York: St. Martin"s Press, 1998.

Hoey, Fintan. *Sato, America and the Cold War: US-Japanese Relations, 1964-72*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Hoffman, Elizabeth. *All You Need Is Love: Peace Corps and the Sprits of the 1960s*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hohn, Maria and Moon, Seugsook, eds. *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present*. Durtham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Igarashi, Yoshikuni. *Bodies of Memory: Narratives of War in Postwar Japanese Culture, 1945-1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Imanishi, Mitsuo. *Senryoki no Asahi Shinbun to senso sekinin*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2008.

Inoue, Kyoko. *The MacArthur's Japanese Constitution: A Linguistic and Cultural Study of Its Making Author*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Inoue, Masamichi S. *Okinawa and the U.S. Military: Identity Making in the Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Iokibe, Makoto. *Senso, senryo, kowa: nihon no kindai 6*. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Shinsya, 2001.

----------. *Nitibei senso to sengo nihon*. Tokyo: Kodansha. 2005.

Israel, Fred L ed. *The War Diary of Breckinridge Long.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Irei, Takashi. *Okinawazin nitotteno sengo*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1982.

Johnson, Chalmers ed. *Okinawa Cold War Island.* Cardiff: Japan Policy Research Institute. 1999.

Kaneda, Takeshi. J*iron, Hyoron: Vietnam, Okinawa*. Osaka: Shiimu Shuppan, 2015.

Karasik, Daniel D. "Okinawa: A problem in Administration and Reconstruction," *The Far Eastern Quarterly* Vol. 7 No.3 (May, 1948).

Kano, Masanao. *Sengo Okinawa shisozo*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1987.

Kayo, Yasuharu. *Okinawa minseifu: Hitotsu no jidai no kiseki*. Tokyo: Kume Shobo, 1986.

Keyso, Ruth Ann. *Women of Okinawa: Nine Voices from A Garrison Island*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Kerr, George H. *Okinawa: The History of an Island People Revised Edition*. North Clarendon: Tuttle Publishing, 2000.

Kersten, Rikki. *Democracy in Postwar Japan: Maruyama Masao and the Search for Autonomy*. London: Routledge, 1995.

----------. “Revisionism, reaction and the ‘symbol emperor’in post-war Japan,” *Japan Forum* 15 No.1 (March, 2003).

Kitamura, Hiroshi. *Screening Enlightenment: Hollywood and the Cultural Reconstruction of Defeated Japan*. Ithaca: Cornel University Press, 2010.

Kinzyo, Hiroyuki. *Kinmon curabu: Mouhitotsu no Okinawa sengoshi*. Naha: Hirugisha, 1988.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkley: University of California Press, 2003.

Kobayashi, Bunjin & Taira, Kenishi, ed. *Minsyu to syakaikyoiku: Sengo Okinawa syakaikyoikushi kenkyu*. Tokyo: Eideru Kenkyuzho, 1988.

Koikari, Mire. *Pedagogy of Democracy: Feminism and the Cold War in the U.S. Occupation of Japan.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 2008.

----------. “The World is Our Campus: Michigan State University and Cold War Home Economics in US-occupied Okinawa, 1945-1972*.” Gender & History* 24 (April 2012).

----------. *Cold War Encounters in US-Occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity, and Transnationalism in East Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Kono, Yasuko. *Okinawahenkan wo meguru seizi to gaiko: Nichibeikankeishi no bunmyaku*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1994.

Koseki, Shoichi. *Nihonkoku kenpo no tanjo*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009.

Koshiro, Yukiko. *Trans-Pacific Racism and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government; Race Empire, the United States & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 2006.

Kristol, William & Kagan, Robert, “Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy” *Foreign Affairs* 75 (Jul/Aug: 1996).

Kubo, Yoshizo. *Senryo to shinwa kyoiku*. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1988.

Kyogoku, Junichi. *Seiji ishiki no bunseki*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan Kai. 1968.

LaFeber, Walter. *The Clash: U.S.-Japanese Relations throughout History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Latham, Michael E. *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Ledbetter, James. *Unwarranted Influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Military-Industrial Complex*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Lewis, Adrian R. *The American Culture of War: The History of U.S. Military from World War II to Operation Enduring Freedom 2nd Edition*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Loo, Tze May. *Heritage Politics: Shuri Castle and Okinawa's Incorporation into Modern Japan, 1879-2000*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Mark E. Caprio, Mark E. & Sugita, Yonesuke ed. *Democracy in Occupied Japan*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Masuda, Hiroshi. *MacArthur*. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Shinsha. 2009.

Matsuda, Takeshi. *Soft Power and Its Perils: U.S. Cultural Policy in Early Postwar Japan and Permanent Dependency*. Stanford: Stanford University Press 2007.

Matsuda, Yoshitaka. *Sengo Okinawa shakaikeizaishikenkyu*. Tokyo: Tokyodaigaku Shuppankai, 1981.

Matsumoto, Wendy. *The Limits of Okinawa: Japanese Capitalism, Living Labor, and Theorizations of Community*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

McCormack, Gavan. *Client State: Japan in the American Embrace*. London: Verso, 2007.

McCormack, Gavan & Norimatsu Satoko O. *Resist Islands: Okinawa Conflicts Japan and the United States*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, Inc. 2012.

McCoy, Alfred W. *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance States*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.

McPherson, Alan. *Yankee No!: Anti-Americanism in U.S.-Latin American Relations.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Miller, John H. *American Political and Cultural Perspectives on Japan: From Perry to Obama.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014.

Miller, Paul D. *Armed State Building: Confronting State Failure*, 1898-2012. Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 2013.

Miyagi, Etsujiro. *Senryosya no me.* Haebaru-cho: Naha Shuppan, 1982.

----------. *Okinawa senryo no 27-nenkan:Amrtika gunsei to bunka no henyo*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Miyazato, Seigen. *America no Okinawatochi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966.

----------. *NichibeiKankei to Okinawa 1945-1972*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2000.

Molasky, Micheal S. *The American Occupation of Japan and Okinawa: Literature and Memory*. London: Routledge. 1999.

----------. *Sengo nihon no jazzbunka: eiga, bungaku, angura*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2017.

Monna, Naoki. *Amerika senryozidai Okinawa genrontoseishi*. Tokyo: Yuzankaku 1996.

Moore, A. Ray and Robinson, Donald L. *Partners for Democracy: Crafting the New Japanese State under MacArthur*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Moral, Solsiree del. *Negotiating Empire: The Cultural Politics of Schools in Puerto Rico 1898-1952*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2013.

Moreno, Julio. *Yankee Don't Go Home!: Mexican Nationalism, American Business Culture, and the Shaping of Modern Mexico, 1920-1950*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Mori, Yoshio. *Okinawa sengominshushi: gama kara henoko made*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2016.

Morita, Toshio. *Amerika no Okinawakyouikuseisaku*. Tokyo: Meijitosho Shuppan, 1966.

Naha-shi, *Sengo wo tadoru.* Okinawa: Ryukyu Sinposha, 2007.

Nakajima, Takuma. *Okinawahenkankosyo to nichibeianpotaisei*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 2012.

Nakamura, Masanori, ed. *Sengo Minshushugi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005.

Nakano, Yoshio & Arasaki, Moriteru. *Okinawa sengoshi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976.

Nanao, Kazuaki. *Okinawasen to minkanshuyozho: Ushinawareru kioku no rupotazhu*. Tokyo: Hara Shobo, 2010.

Nishimura, Sey. "Medical Censorship in Occupied Japan, 1945-1948," *The Pacific Historical Review* 58 (Feb 1989).

Nye Jr, Joseph S. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

Ogawa, Tadashi. *Sengobeikoku no Okinawabunkasenryaku*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012.

Oguma, Eiji. *Minshu to aikoku*. Tokyo: Shinyo Sha, 2002.

Okahara, Iku. *America senryoki no minshuka seisaku*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2007.

Okinawa Taimusha. *Watashi no sengoshi Vol. 1*. Naha: Okinawa Taimususha, 1980.

----------. *Shomin ga tsuzuru Okinawa sengo seikatsushi*. Naha: Okinawa Taimususha, 1998.

----------ed. *Ryudai fudoki: kaigaku yonnzhunen no sokuseki*. Naha: Okinawa Taimususha, 1990.

----------. *Gekido no hanseiki: Okinawa Taimusu sha gozyunenshi*. Naha: Okinawa Taimusu sha, 1998.

Okudaira, Hajime. *Sengo Okinawa kyoikuundoshi*. Naha:Boderinkum. 2010.

Olson, Lawrence. *Ambivalent Moderns: Portraits of Japanese Cultural Identities*. Maryland: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, 1992.

Onish, Yuichiro. *Transpacific Antiracism: Afro-Asian Solidarity in 20th-Century Black America, Japan, and Okinawa*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.

Osgood, Kenneth. *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008.

Ota, Masahide. "Fukkigo niokeru Okinawazyunin no ishiki no henyo," *Kagaku kenkyuhi hozyokin kenkyu keika hokokusho* (Mar 1983).

----------. *Minikui nihonjin*. Tokyo: Saimaru Shuppan Kai, 1995.

----------. *Okinawa no teioh: Kotobenmukan*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1996.

Payne, James L. “Does Nation Building Work,” *The Independent Review* (Spring 2006).

Peacock, Margret. *Innocent Weapons: The Soviet and American Politics of Childhood in the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Reischauer, Edwin O. “The Broken Dialogue with Japan,” *Foreign Affairs*, (Oct 1960).

----------. *My Life Between Japan and America*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1986.

Robin, Ron. *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Rosenberg, Emily S. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

Ruoff, Kenneth J. Ruoff. *The People’s Empire: Democracy and the Japanese Monarchy, 1945-1995*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Ryukyu daigaku kyosyokuinkai & Daugakujin kyuzyo no kai ed. *Ryudai jiken toha nandattanoka*. Okihana: Deigo insatsu. 2010.

Ryukyudaigaku kaigaku rokuzyunen kineshi hensyu iinkai ed. *Kokuritsugaigakuhozin Ryukyu daigaku Rokuzyunenshi*. Naha: Kokusai insatsu, 2010.

Ryukyudaigaku kaigaku sanzyusyunenkinenshi hensyuiinkai, *Ryukyudaigaku sanzyunen*. Naha: Daiishihoki syupan, 1981.

Ryukyu ginko chosabu. *Sengo Okinawa keizaishi*. Naha: Ryukyu ginko, 1984.

Sandler, Mark. *The Confusion Era: Art and Culture of Japan during the Allied Occupation, 1945-1952*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997.

Sakamoto, Yoshikazu & Ward, Robert E. ed., *Nihon senryo no kenkyu* Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan Kai, 1987.

Saki, Ryuzo. *Kiroku shogen: Okinawa zyunin gyakusatsu*. Tokyo: Shin binbutsu Ourai Sya, 1976.

Sakurazawa, Makoto. *Okinawano fukkiundo to hokakutairitsu:Okinawa chiikishakai no henyo*. Tokyo: Yushisha, 2012.

----------. *Okinawa gendaishi*. Tokyo: Chuokoron Shinsya, 2015.

Sarantakes, Nicholas Evan. *Keystone: The American Occupation of Okinawa and U.S- Japanese Relations.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000.

----------. ed., *Seven Stars: The Okinawa Battle Diaries of Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr. and Joseph Stilwell*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press. 2004.

Sato, Hideo. "United States-Japanese Relations: A Japanese View," *Current History* 68 (Apr 1975).

Scalapino, Robert A. "The American Occupation of Japan-Perspectives after Three Decades." *Annual of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 428 (Nov 1976).

Schadlow, Nadia. *War and the Art of Governance: Consolidating Combat Success into Political Victory*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2017.

Schaller, Michael. *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

----------. *Douglas MacArthur: The Far Eastern General*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

----------. *Altered States: The United States and Japan since the Occupation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Schonberger, Howard B. *Aftermath of War: Americans and Remaking of Japan, 1945-1952*. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1989.

Schrecker, Ellen W. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism & the Universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Scigliano, Robert & Fox, Guy H. *Technical Assistance in Vietnam: The Michigan state University Experience*. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger Publishers, 1965.

Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Seki, Hironobu. *Okinawa kyoshokuinkai*. Tokyo: Sanichi Shobo, 1968.

Selcraig, James Truett. *The Red Scare in the Midwest, 1945-1955: A State and Local Study*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982.

Shaw Tony. *Hollywood's Cold War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

Shibusawa, Naoko. *America's Geisha Ally: Reimaging the Japanese Enemy*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press. 2006.

Shiga, Yoshio. "Hanseiki ni wataru tennosei to no tatakai," *Gendai no Riron* 9 (Oct 1972).

Shimizu, Sayuri. *Creating People of Plenty: The United States and Japan's Economic Alternatives, 1950-1960*. Kent: Kent State University Press, 2001.

Smuckler, Ralph H. *A University Turns to the World*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2003.

Sneider, Vern. *The Teahouse of the August Moon*. New York: Putnam, 1951.

Snow, Nancy. *Propaganda, INC: Selling America's Culture to the World*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 1998.

Sodei, Rinjiro. *MacArthur no nisennichi*. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Sha, 1976.

Sparrow, James T. *Warfare State: World War II Americans and the Age of Big Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Straub, David. *Anti-Americanism in Democratizing South Korea*. Stanford: The Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, 2015.

Taira, Yoshitoshi. *Sengo Okinawa to kichimondai: "Zhuyo" to "Kyozetsu" no hazamade 1945-1972*. Tokyo: Hoseidaigaku Shuppankai, 2012.

Takahashi, Hiroshi. *Showa Tenno 1945-48*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Takeda, Kiyoko. T*enno kan no sokoku*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2001.

Takemae, Eiji. *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and Its Legacy*. New York: Continuum. 2002.

----------. *Senryo sengo shi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.

Takeyama, Shoko. "America senryoki masumedia no tennosei rongi," *Mediashi Kenkyu* 5 (Nov 1996).

Tamaki, Tsuguhisa. *Okinawa senryo seisaku to Amerika no kokyoiku*. Tokyo: Toshindo, 1987.

Tanikawa, Takeshi. *America eiga to senryo seisaku*. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppan Kai, 2002.

Tanji, Miyume. *Myth, Protest and Struggle in Okinawa*. London: Routledge. 2006.

Teruya, Yoshihiko & Yamazato, Katsumi ed. *Sengo Okinawa to Amerika*. Naha: Okinawa Timus sha. 1995.

Thomas. David A. *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. 2008.

Tomiyama, Ichiro. "The Critical Lmits of the National Community: The Ryukyuan Subject," *Social Science Japan Journal,* Vol. No. 2 (Oct, 1998).

Tomlin, Gregory M. *Murrow's Cold War: Public Diplomacy for the Kennedy Administration*. Lincoln: Potomac Books, 2016.

Toriyama, Atsushi. *Okinawa: kichisyakai no kigen to sokoku 1945-1956*. Tokyo: Keiso Shobo, 2013.

Toyoshita, Narahiko. *Anpozyoyaku no seiritsu: Yoshidagaiko to tennogaiko*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

----------. *Showa tenno, makkasa kaiken*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Tsuchiya, Yuka. *Shinbei Nihon no kochiku: Amerika no taibeizyoho, kyoikuseisaku to nihonsenryo*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2009.

Tsuda, Takashi. "Goshaku no sake to tenno," Minshu Bungaku 250 (Sep 1986).

Tsujimura, Akira & Ota, Masahide. *Okinawa no genron: shinbun to hoso*. Tokyo: Nanpodohoengokai, 1966.

Watanabe, Akio. *The Okinawa Problem: A Chapter in Japan-U.S. Relations*. Clayton: Melbourne University Press, 1970.

Watanabe, Yasushi & McConnell L. David. *Soft Power Super Powers*. Armonk: M. E.Sharpe, 2008.

----------. *American Center: Amerika no kokusaibunkasenryaku*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Warner, Gordon. *History of Education in Postwar Okinawa*. Tokyo: Nihon Bunka Kagakusha, 1972.

Wilford, Hugh. *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*. Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Wolfe, Audra J. *Competing with the Soviet: Science, Technology, and the State in Cold War America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2013.

Wood, Gordon S. "The purpose of the past: Reflections of the Uses of History," *Historically Speaking* (Jan 2009).

Woodward, Bob. *The War Within*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2008.

Yagi, Senjin, *Okinawa no nihonfukkitoso anokoro*. Naha: Okinawa Colony Insatsuzho, 1985.

Yakabi, Osamu. *Okinawasen, beigunsenryoshi wo manabi naosu: kioku wo ikani keisyo suruka*. Kanagawa: Seori Shobo, 2009.

Yamaguchi, Eitetsu. *Ryukyuko kara no hisyo*. Ginowan; Yozyu Shorin, 2001.

Yamamoto, Taketoshi. *Senryoki media bunseki*. Tokyo: Hosei Daigaku Shuppan Kyoku. 1996.

----------. "Senryoki GHQ no shuppanbutsu boshu to toshokan," *Mediashi Kenkyu* 1 (March 1994).

----------. "Sekinin wa towarenakatta" *Chuokoron*, January, 2005.

Yamazaki, Masato. *Anyatasa!: Okinawa sengo no eiga 1945-1955*. Naha: Niraisha, 2001.

Yamazato, Katsunori. *Ryudaimonogatari 1947-1972*. Naha: Ryukyu Shinposha, 2012.

Yara, Chobyo., ed. *Okinawa kyoshokuinkai zyurokunen: Sokokufukki, nihonkokumin toshiteno kyoiku wo mezashite*. Tokyo: Rodosyunposha, 1968.

Yonaguni, Noboru. *Okinawa hansenheiwaishiki no keisei*. Tokyo: Shinsensha, 2005.

Yoneyama, Lisa. "Liberation under Siege: U.S. Military Occupation and Japanese Women‟s Enfranchisement," *American Quarterly 57* (Oct 2005).

Yoshida, Kensei. *Democracy Betrayed: Okinawa Under U.S. Occupation*. Bellingham: Center for East Asian Studies Western Washington University, 2002.

Yoshida, Yutaka. *Showa tenno no shusen shi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. 1992.

Yoshimi, Shunya ed. *Reisen taisei to sihon no bunka*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.

----------. S*hinbei to hanbei: sengo Nihon no seigiteki muishiki*. Tokyo: Iwanami

Shoten, 2007.

Yoshimoto, Hideko. *Beikoku no Okinawa senryo to zyoho seshisaku: gunji syugi no muzyun to kamofurazyu*. Yokohana: Syufusya, 2015.

Yoshitsugu, Kosuke. *Ikedaseikenki no nihongaiko to reisen*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009.

Zuleueta, Johann O. "Living as Migrants in a Place That Was Once Home: The Nisei, the US Bases, and Okinawan Society," *Philippine Studies* Vol. 60, No. 3 (2012).