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**Romanisation of Japanese words and ordering of Japanese names**

Japanese names, when written in Japanese, use the order surname and given name. An example of this is Shinzō Abe, the name of the current Prime Minister of Japan: 安倍晋三 (Abe Shinzō). This thesis writes Japanese names in the Western way, namely given name first, then surname: Shinzō Abe. The names of Japanese objects, companies etc. which are not well known in the West are italicised (for example, the Okinawan newspaper Ryūkyū Shinpō). This thesis will use macrons to indicate long vowels in Japanese words and names (for example, Shinzō Abe). The system used to romanise Japanese words is Modified Hepburn.

**Notes on Referencing**

This paper uses Chicago 16th edition as its referencing style. There are mainly three cases where there have been issues with referencing in this thesis: international agreements such as treaties, articles from [http://japanfocus.org](http://japanfocus.org) (Japan Focus or *The Asia-Pacific Journal*) and sources cited in secondary sources. Whenever there have been issues regarding referencing, a note has been attached in the Bibliography.

This thesis cites treaties such as the US-Japan Security Treaty accessible on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (MOFA). As the pre-1960 US-Japan Security Treaty does not appear to be available on MOFA’s website, this thesis has cited a copy available on the Database of Japanese Politics and International Relations of Tokyo University’s Institute of Oriental Culture (IOC). The source used by the IOC is listed on the website, but the author was not able to obtain a copy.

Most articles published after 2009 on Japan Focus/*The Asia-Pacific Journal* contain information regarding volume, issue and number. Those posted before 2009 do not, however. Where there is not enough information to create a complete citation according to Chicago rules, all information available is included. In any case, one can simply access the articles via the URLs provided in each entry. In other cases where there is not enough information given about a source quoted in a secondary source, this thesis provides as much information as possible, occasionally in the way it appears in the secondary without modification to satisfy Chicago citation conventions. This is why some citations may deviate slightly from what may be considered standard Chicago citation norms. This also applies to objects for which Chicago does not specify how one should cite them, such as public letters.

Even in cases where the original “incomplete” citation has been given “as is” or has been modified as much as possible to satisfy Chicago conventions, macrons have been added to long vowels in the original title if there are macrons missing.
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Introduction

Okinawa is an island which is home to roughly 1.4 million people. It is situated around 1,600km southwest of Tokyo, Japan, Asia-Pacific (refer to 1.1 in Appendix). It is closer to Taiwan than to mainland Japan. Okinawa, which has officially been a part of Japan since 1879, is very different to the rest of Japan. First of all, there are many US military bases there. Second, whilst mainland Japan was only under Allied occupation for seven years after the end of World War II (WWII), Okinawa remained under US military control for 27 years. Third, Okinawa has a unique culture, several dialects which are very different to standard Japanese and pristine beaches. Fourth, Okinawa was the site of the Battle of Okinawa, perhaps the bloodiest battle of the Pacific War (the Pacific theatre of WWII). Fifth, for decades, Okinawans have displayed incredible resistance towards these US military bases, almost solely using non-violent means to express their opposition. Okinawa feels very different to Japan due to the aforementioned reasons, but also because things appear to move slower there. The pace at which things move and occur on Okinawa is much slower than in Tokyo. For these reasons, when one visits Okinawa, one can get the impression that neither Okinawa nor its people are Japanese.

The northern part of Okinawa is known as Yanbaru. Yanbaru is a jungle region which has an extremely rich and diverse ecosystem. According to the World Wildlife Fund Japan, there are over 4,000 different species of animals there, hundreds of them being endangered in some form.¹ In Yanbaru there is a hamlet called Takae, located in Higashi Village. Takae is home to 160 residents who are mainly self-sufficient, with roughly 90% of households engaged in farming activities. Takae is also located right next to the 78km² Jungle Warfare Training Center (JWTC)², the only US military installation of its kind in the world (refer to 1.2 and 1.3 in Appendix).³ Here US Marines train in a unique environment. One can find videos on YouTube of Marines doing very demanding training there.

Since 2007 the Okinawa Defense Bureau (ODB) has been constructing new helipads in the JWTC for the US military to use. These helipads are being constructed so as to effectively encircle Takae (refer to 1.3 in Appendix). These are helipads to replace those which are located in the section of the JWTC (3,987 hectares: roughly half of the JWTC) which is set to

---

be returned to Japan, as stipulated in the 1996 Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) Final Report. Two of six helipads have already been built, and the ODB is moving to construct four more helipads. To protest the construction of these helipads, residents from six households in Takae have conducted a sit-in demonstration since July 2007. They call themselves the *Heripaddo Iranai Jūmin no Kai* (Association against Helipads, hereafter called Anti-Heli).

Since July 2007, the members of Anti-Heli have been conducting a sit-in demonstration outside of the entrances of some of the helipad construction sites, attempting to prevent ODB workers from entering each site. In November 2008, the ODB took the matter to court, filing a provisional disposition (similar to a preliminary injunction in the US) against 15 of the protestors for obstruction of traffic (*tsūkō bōgai*). As Yasushi Ikeo and Akihiro Ogawa point out, this is the first time that the Japanese government has prosecuted a peace movement.

The members of Anti-Heli are not radical Socialists or Communists who are protesting simply for the purpose of protesting. They are protesting because they want to protect their way of life and Yanbaru, but also because they feel there is no other way for them to express their opposition to the helipads being built. Just during the period of July 2014 to April 2015, they have been to the ODB four times to try to have some dialogue about the construction of the helipads. Each time they have been to the ODB’s head office, they have been met with insincerity. As the author of this thesis experienced first-hand during one such meeting in February 2015, the ODB head simply repeats long-winded pre-arranged statements in response to questions asked by participants in the Takae movement. The head shows no interest in sincerely listening to what they have to say. Considering this, it certainly is surprising that members and supporters of Anti-Heli have been able to protest since July 2007 without giving up. It appears that the righteousness they feel in their cause, their identity as Okinawans, their anger fuelled by the ODB ignoring their opposition as well as their desire to protect their lifestyle and Yanbaru are some factors which give them the energy to continue protesting.

---

Thesis Aim, Research Questions and Thesis Statement

The aim of this thesis will be to explore this movement, both from the perspective of the US military and Okinawans, in the context of Okinawa’s postwar history and the US-Japan security relationship. The Takae movement has received very scant attention in academia, both in Japanese and English, as well as in media outlets not based in Okinawa. Whilst *Resistant Islands: Okinawa Confronts Japan and the United States* does provide an overview of the residents’ movement in Takae, it is only eight pages long and does not take into account developments during the past three years. This constitutes the first major significance of this thesis. The second major significance is that it includes first-hand accounts of Marines at the JWTC, including its Commander, Major Tim Kao. These first-hand accounts provide a very different perspective towards the Takae movement and the issue of helipads being constructed there. This is significant because the overwhelming majority of texts on Okinawa only consider the views of Okinawans, providing just one side of the story, so to speak.

**Research Questions**

This thesis will attempt to answer the following questions: What are some of the motives of the Takae residents and their supporters protesting? What are the features of the Takae movement? How does the United States Marine Corps (USMC) view the Takae movement and the role of US bases in Okinawa? What factors relating to history, culture and identity help explain the long-lasting Okinawan resistance towards US bases? In order to make it easier to understand the context of these questions, this thesis will examine several anti-base movements on Okinawa and the evolution of the US-Japan security relationship.

**Thesis Statement**

This thesis makes two main arguments. The first is that historical events such as the Battle of Okinawa, the occupation of Okinawa by the US military for 27 years, the rape of an Okinawan girl by 3 members of the US military in 1995 etc. have had a large impact on the consciousness of Okinawans. Furthermore, both Tokyo and Washington have constantly ignored the opposition of the majority of Okinawans towards US bases in Okinawa. Having one’s feelings and opinions being completely ignored for decades is naturally insulting. This consciousness of Okinawans towards their history and identity acts as a catalyst for the

---

resistance movement in Okinawa, and helps to explain why the Henoko and Takae movements have lasted for so many years. The second argument is that there is a tremendous gap in how the Marines at the JWTC and participants in the Takae movement view the movement and base issues in general. This disparity in views is caused by prejudices on both sides and a lack of understanding of both parties towards each other. These are in turn caused by a lack of open communication, which itself is in turn caused by language and cultural barriers. This is significant to understand, as prejudices and misunderstandings are normally two major reasons why conflicts occur between two parties. So long as these prejudices and misunderstandings exist between the two parties, relations will surely never improve between the protestors and the USMC.

History

Okinawa 1945 – 1989

The Battle of Okinawa (March-June 1945) brought death and destruction on an unthinkable scale to Okinawa. During this battle over 240,000 people lost their lives, including almost 150,000 Okinawans. Almost 130,000 civilians perished, roughly one-third of the island’s population. Furthermore, as Daikichi Irokawa points out, Emperor Hirohito in 1947 made it known to Douglas MacArthur that he wanted the US to station military forces on Okinawa “for 25-50 years or longer”. According to Gavan McCormack and Satoko Norimatsu, Hirohito essentially handed over Okinawa to the US military, even though under Japan’s new constitution Hirohito was only supposed to be a symbol with no political power. Japan regained its sovereignty once the San Francisco Peace Treaty came into effect in 28 April 1952, but Okinawa remaining under US control was a condition for this. Forceful seizure of Okinawan land by the US military began during the Battle of Okinawa but became most prominent after the end of WWII. Land was forcibly taken literally by bulldozers and bayonets; Okinawa was essentially a US colony. Masaaki Gabe emphasises that sovereignty over Okinawa was returned, at least nominally, to Japan on 15 May 1972, amidst a strong pro-reversion movement on Okinawa, increasing criticism of the Vietnam War in Japan and

---

10 Ibid., 150.
increasing nationalistic demands in Japan to have its territory returned. The Cold War came to an end in 1989, but by that stage US military facilities had only shrunk by 13% in terms of area since 1972.

**Overview of the US-Japan Security Relationship**

Together with the San Francisco Peace Treaty, the Security Treaty Between Japan and the United States of America (known by the Japanese contraction Anpo, hereafter called Anpo (old)) was signed in 1951. This treaty obliged Japan to provide land and facilities for the US military to use, and in return the US would station forces in Japan “in the interest of peace and security”.

Acquisition of land for US military bases caused much friction between mainland residents and the US military. This lead to several anti-base movements and increased anti-US sentiment on the mainland. As Tetsuo Maeda points out, the US government and the US military realised that this social unrest negatively affected their general strategy in East Asia. As a result, the US military moved two divisions to Korea and one to Okinawa, thereby greatly reducing their presence in mainland Japan. The Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America (Anpo), a revised version of Anpo (old), was steamrolled through the Japanese Diet on 19 May 1960 amongst tremendous social opposition; more than 200,000 people participated in protests outside of the Diet.

With the reversion of sovereignty of Okinawa to Japan in 1972, Japan became responsible for maintaining and providing military facilities to the US military in Okinawa. Furthermore, as Moriteru Arasaki indicates, since 1978 Japan has willingly been paying costs associated with stationing US troops which the US is supposed to pay. The Japanese government increased several-fold the fees paid to owners of land used for US bases from 1972 to appease landowners who otherwise might not have leased their land. Additionally, the Japanese government has continued to use “carrot” and “stick” ways of coercing Okinawa

---

22 Ibid., 34.
to go along with Japan’s policies on US military bases. The way Tokyo uses money to subdue a “rebellious” Okinawa is evident of what Arasaki calls “structural discrimination against Okinawa”. Furthermore, Japan prioritising Washington’s interests in the case of Okinawa is symbolic of what Japan has become according to Gavan McCormack: a “client state”.

\textit{Okinawa 1989 – 2015}

With the end of the Cold War, Anpo and the US military presence in Japan had to be justified anew. A large-scale reduction in the Okinawan base burden was not envisioned. Rather, the US-Japan alliance was to be “redefined” and strengthened. One single event, though, put a temporary stop to this. On 4 September 1995 two US Marines and one US Navy sailor kidnapped a 12-year-old Okinawan girl and gang-raped her. This was the spark that set off an explosion of anger in Okinawa towards the US-Japan Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), which gives US soldiers certain extraterritorial rights, and the US military. As Miyume Tanji states, this crime lead to a mass rally where more than 85,000 Okinawans gathered to express their anger. These events rattled the US-Japan alliance to its core.

In order “to reduce the burden on the people of Okinawa” the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) was established in 1995, the final report being released in 1996. Tokyo and Washington decided that Marine Corps Air Station Futenma (MCAS Futenma) would be returned and replaced by a similar facility in Henoko, Nago City, Okinawa. MCAS Futenma is located in the middle of Ginowan City, amongst educational facilities and residential areas, and has been described by former US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld as the “world’s most dangerous base”. On 13 August 2004, a US military CH-53 helicopter crashed into Okinawa International University, located adjacent to MCAS Futenma. This crash seems to validate Rumsfeld’s concern.

As writer and environmentalist Etsuko Urashima demonstrates, resistance has been strong in Henoko for many years towards the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) being built there. From April 2004 locals went out to sea on boats, forcing Tokyo to postpone ocean

\begin{footnotes}
\item 23 Ibid., 7, 11.
\item 24 Gavan McCormack and Satoko Oka Norimatsu, “Ryukyu/Okinawa, From Disposal to Resistance.”
\item 25 Arasaki, \textit{Közöteki Okinawa Sabetsu}, 40-1.
\item 26 Miyume Tanji, \textit{Myth, Protest and Struggle in Okinawa} (New York: Routledge, 2006), 156.
\end{footnotes}
surveys for the FRF in September 2005. Yukio Hatoyama disappointed Okinawans when he was unable to fulfil his pledge as Prime Minister to have the FRF moved outside of Okinawa Prefecture. Former Okinawan Governor Hirokazu Nakaima enraged Okinawans by giving the Japanese government permission to reclaim some of the ocean off Henoko for the FRF in December 2013. Since 1 July 2014, the Japanese government has aggressively taken steps to finally have the FRF built, despite massive opposition in Okinawa (80% in August 2014). With the election of anti-base former Naha Mayor Takeshi Onaga in November 2014, the FRF’s future has become even more unclear.

Literature Review

This section will provide a brief overview of some of the major researchers in the field of Okinawan Studies. As far as the author of this thesis knows, all of the researchers noted below are still continuing their research in one form or another in their respective fields.

Moriteru Arasaki is without a doubt one of the largest contributors to Okinawan Studies. Since the mid-1960s, he has documented and analysed Okinawan social movements. He is the researcher behind the concept of there being three “waves” in the history of Okinawan social movements: the first wave taking place from the release of the 1956 Price Report and the Shimagurumi Tōsō (island-wide struggle) which followed; the second wave taking place leading up to reversion; the third wave taking place following the rape of a 12-year-old schoolgirl by three members of the US military in 1995. From his recent work on the similarities between anti-base movements in South Korea and Okinawa, as well as on Okinawa’s potential as a “catalyst for peace” in the Asia-Pacific, Arasaki has conducted very comprehensive study on Okinawa for decades.

Miyume Tanji, currently at the Australian National University has also provided interesting accounts of these three “waves,” building on Arasaki’s work. Another active researcher is former Okinawan Governor Masahide Ōta. One of his largest contributions to Okinawan Studies is his work on the Battle of Okinawa which, with impressive visual evidence, describes how the battle played out and how civilians were affected. Hiroshi Hayashi has done important research on the history of US bases in the Asia-Pacific, but also on the postwar history of the US military in Okinawa.

31 Arasaki, Kōzōteki Okinawa Sabetsu, 7-9.
Hiromori Maedomari and Tomohiro Yara are two other researchers whose works this thesis references. Maedomari has conducted groundbreaking research into fundamental aspects of the US-Japan security relationship, including the US-Japan Special Forces Agreement and research into more recent developments, such as the plan to move thousands of US Marines from Okinawa to Guam. On the other hand, Yara delves into the history of the US Marines in Okinawa and brings to light how US Marines were originally stationed (and continue to be stationed) on Okinawa, largely for political reasons. Masaaki Gabe has conducted extensive research on the history of the US-Japan security relationship, but also provides convincing criticism of one of the main pillars of the relationship, namely the US-Japan Security Treaty. Gavan McCormack’s work mainly focusses on the deception on which the US-Japan security relationship is based, stating that Japan is a “client state,” namely a state which intentionally allows itself to be subordinate to another state.

In regard to Takae and the sit-in demonstration taking place there since July 2007, there is very little research on it. McCormack does mention Takae in his book *Resistant Islands* together with Satoko Norimatsu, as discussed above, but the section on Takae is very brief and does not take into account events which have taken place since 2012. Yasushi Ikeo has conducted research on Takae, but he has mainly done so from local governance and peace studies perspectives, focussing greatly on the trial which took place between the Takae residents and the Japanese government.

There are several gaps which this research fills. First of all, there is virtually no research on how US Marines view Okinawan anti-base movements. The interview between Major Tim Kao, Commander (at the time) of the JWTC, and the author of this thesis, provide a unique insight into a powerful US military officer’s frank views towards US bases on Okinawa and the Takae protestors. Second, this thesis helps explain why the people in Takae are protesting. This is important because the interviews with the protestors provide counterweight to suggestions made by the Major that people are protesting because they are “paid,” and show how many of the Major’s views differ from reality. Furthermore, it highlights the wide range of motives of people protesting, as well as the fragmentations which exist within the movement. Third, this thesis shows how people living on the periphery of the periphery (Okinawa is on the periphery of Japan, and Takae is on the periphery of Okinawa) interact with a “democratic” government which has refused for almost eight years (since the birth of the movement) to sincerely engage in talks with them.
Theoretical Framework

The foundation of the theoretical framework of this paper will be constructivism, however with a slight twist. This thesis will analyse how Japan interacts with foreign countries (mainly the US), but also how Japan (the mainland) interacts with Okinawa and its people and how Okinawans interact with both the Japanese and US governments. This is because, as will be mentioned later, states are similar to humans, so it is appropriate to apply a constructivist framework to relationships which do not just involve two states.

Before explaining what constructivism is, it is important to discuss the reason for the choice of this theory. Choosing a theoretical framework for this thesis was difficult for three reasons. The first reason is that this thesis is not limited to one discipline. The disciplines used to conduct research on the Takae movement include history, sociology, ethnography and international relations. The second reason is that despite the interdisciplinary nature of this research, core concepts of constructivism, such as identity, are very useful in explaining why Okinawans have protested for so many decades and on various scales. Had this been a doctoral thesis, a theoretical framework including theories pertaining to civil society and how individuals interact with central governments would have been interesting to include. The third reason is that the author could by no means foresee that he was going to meet important members of the US Marine Corps during his stay in Takae. The encounter with Major Kao convinced the author that it would be very interesting from a scholarly perspective to focus on how the USMC views the Takae movement, as well as analyse the Takae movement from the perspective of the protestors.

Constructivism is fundamentally different from mainstream theories such as neorealism and neoliberalism. As Ronald Jepperson, Alexander Wendt and Peter Katzenstein point out, neorealists suggest that the behaviour of states is essentially unaffected by context (such as history and culture), that states are generic.\textsuperscript{33} On the other hand, as Sorpong Peou indicates, neoliberals do not adequately consider the impact of domestic politics on the behaviour of states in the international arena.\textsuperscript{34} Then again, constructivism does not wholly reject these two schools of thought, as they do provide some explanations for the way states interact. Paul Kowert and Jeffery Legro explain that constructivism essentially considers the importance of factors which neorealists and neoliberals pay little attention to, such as identity, culture and

\textsuperscript{34} Sorpong Peou, \textit{Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific: Theory and Practice} (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2010), 63.
norms. Naturally, just as states are not generic, humans are by no means generic in the way they interact with other humans and states.

Past events form a part of the identity of states, as Katzenstein argues. A convincing argument could be made that Japan’s complicated history during the 20th century of industrialism, imperialism, its defeat in WWII and its incredible post-war recovery have greatly affected its identity, but also the way other actors have interacted with Japan. This is in line with the argument of Jepperson, Wendt and Katzenstein, namely that “variation in state identity […] affects the national security interests or policies of states”. Each state has an identity which is not only affected by the cultural environment in which it finds itself, but also by historical events, both domestic and international, such as war. The identity of each state is not only formed from within the state, however. Jepperson, Wendt and Katzenstein demonstrate how the identity of a state is influenced by how the state perceives itself in relation to others and is formed through a state’s interactions with its neighbours. All of these factors can be applied to humans, hence it is appropriate to consider how identity, history etc. influence how humans act towards each other and towards central governments.

It is only natural that Japan has an identity which is different to that of, for example, Sweden. This is because the countries which Japan has interacted with in its cultural environment, the Asia-Pacific, differ markedly to those of Sweden. Many of the countries which are located in the Asia-Pacific have been touched in some way by Japanese imperialism, whilst Sweden has been a neutral country for the past two-hundred years. Okinawans have their own unique Ryūkyū dialect, literature and customs, and have gone through a series of shobun (disposals, punishments) from exterior forces for centuries.

As Gavan McCormack points out, these exterior forces include Satsuma (a powerful Japanese clan) in 1609, Japan from 1879 (when the Ryūkyū Kingdom was assimilated into Japan as Okinawa Prefecture) until 1945 (WWII and the Battle of Okinawa), the US military from 1945 until 1972 (occupation by the US military), and arguably Japan and the US from 1996 to the present (the plan to replace MCAS Futenma with a base in Henoko). The experiences of Okinawa as a whole are different from those of the rest of Japan, and its perception of itself in the Asia-Pacific differs from the rest of Japan. This helps explain why

---

35 Katzenstein, The Culture of National Security, 496.
36 Ibid., 23.
37 Ibid., 60.
38 Ibid., 60.
39 Ibid., 69.
40 Gavan McCormack and Satoko Oka Norimatsu, “Ryukyu/Okinawa, From Disposal to Resistance.”
the majority of Okinawans have resisted US bases for several decades mostly via non-violent means.

Method
The majority of data collection has a qualitative characteristic, apart from sources such as those which table statistics. This thesis includes analyses of observations made by the author in Takae and interviews with people living there and Marines stationed at the JWTC during his time in Takae, namely 1-16 February 2015. Fieldwork mainly consisted of observations, unstructured interviews (including conversations) and one sub-structured interview. As Martyn Denscombe states, sub-structured interviews allow the researcher to prepare some questions which will then serve as a starting point for the interview, and also because it gives the interviewee more freedom to express and develop their ideas during the interview.41 Unstructured interviews and conversations allowed the author to ask questions on the spot to participants in the Takae movement as topics of interest arose during conversations with them.

The author observed the movement at three sites of the sit-in demonstration (N-4, N-1 Front and N-1 Reverse42), in the guesthouse where the researcher was staying, during outings with people involved in the sit-in demonstration etc. He conducted a lot of observation in Takae because, as Zina O’Leary states, seeing for oneself a movement in action is nothing like reading an article or an essay about that movement.43 Through his observations, the author gained a greater understanding of the rich wildlife of Yanbaru, how loud American military aircraft sound close to Takae and how the USMC and participants in the movement interact with each other. The author reflected on these observations during his time in Takae, but also after he had left Takae, especially after he had had the opportunity to interview US Marines in Takae.

The nature of the observation which the author conducted during his time in Takae sometimes had a participant aspect, a non-participant aspect, and sometimes both. Overall, however, the observation conducted was mainly participant observation. O’Leary describes participant observation in the following way:

42 See Appendix for the sites chosen for helipad construction. As stated in 1.3 in the Appendix, N-4 and N-1 are the names of the sites given by the Japanese government. The US government uses different names: LZ (Landing Zone) 17 and LZ N-1 respectively.
Researchers are, or become, part of the team, community, or cultural group they are observing. The goal is to preserve the natural setting and to gain cultural empathy by experiencing phenomena and events from the perspective of the observed. Participant observation is often aligned with a less structured, often ethnographic, process.\(^{44}\)

The author was there to observe the movement and to learn about Takae and Yanbaru, but in order to do that he needed to live in a guesthouse with protestors and build trust with them via interacting with them. All members were aware of the fact that the author was in Takae in order to research their movement for his Master’s thesis. Most participants in the Takae movement were rather open when the author interacted with them, such as when he asked them about their views towards the movement, their reasons for protesting etc. Others showed less interest in the author, only speaking with him when spoken to by him. Those who spoke with the author presumably did so either because they found it interesting that a non-Japanese was researching the movement, but perhaps also because he was spending so much time in Takae studying their movement. The author adapted to his surroundings and interacted with the residents whilst maintaining an objective stance, so as to avoid “going native”.\(^{45}\) For example, he translated from Japanese to English various placards which the protestors used to convey their point of view to the US military. He did this for two reasons. First, if he had refused to do so, this would have been a big blow to the author’s efforts to establish trust between himself and the protestors. The protestors would surely then have questioned why the researcher was there if he was not going to interact with them at all. Second, he felt that providing translations was one way of showing his appreciation to the protestors for allowing him to study their movement. The author, however, only translated the text of the placards. The protestors used that text to create new placards using their own handwriting. The author asked them to rewrite the placards as he wanted to maintain his objective position as a researcher to the greatest extent possible. This is an example of the paradoxical nature of the author’s method of observation, which included both participant (living with the protestors) and non-participant (merely providing translations, not translating for the purpose of supporting the movement) aspects.

Finally, the purpose of this thesis is not to call for support for the movement. Furthermore, the researcher did not go to Takae to support the movement in the sense of being actively involved in the movement by protesting the construction of the helipads. Doing so

\(^{44}\) Ibid., 210.
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would have defeated the purpose of writing this thesis. The purpose of the author conducting research and writing this thesis has been for him to have the opportunity to hear “both sides of the story” and to have his prejudices questioned. The author had, and still has, his personal views towards the US military in Takae and Okinawa in general. By allowing his prejudices to be questioned, however, the author gained a more balanced view of the current situation in Takae. This thesis hopes to provide greater insight into this movement based on facts, not on emotion.

Comments on Sources Cited in this Thesis
Documents and works which the author has thoroughly analysed as part of his research include the following:

- Relevant statistics, such as those found in Okinawa no Beigun Kichi;
- Secondary sources by researchers both written in English and Japanese, such as works by Moriteru Arasaki, Masaaki Gabe, Peter Katzenstein and Gavan McCormack;
- Interviews conducted in Takae with members of the USMC and with people both directly and not directly involved in the Takae movement;
- Observation notes taken in Takae by the author.

The majority of books (both primary and secondary sources) were brought from Sweden to Japan and then back to Sweden. The author accessed most other documentary material relating to the governments of Japan and the US via the Internet. The author covered all expenses relating to his research, including airfares and accommodation.

Two main points of criticism need to be made towards current literature on postwar Okinawa. The first is that there is very, very little research on how the US military perceives the role of US bases on Okinawa, Okinawan anti-base movements and how to improve relations between the US military and Okinawans. As mentioned in the Conclusion, this could be due to a variety of factors. For those researchers who do not have English as their mother tongue, it could be due to a lack of English ability. For those who speak English fluently and who are vocal about their views on the US-Japan security relationship and Okinawa, such as Gavan McCormack, it might simply be difficult for such researchers to gain exclusive access to members of the US military. This is because any “damaging” comments about Okinawans made by a member of the US military would certainly negatively affect their career. One final factor, which can be shared by all researchers, is that they either have no interest in getting to
know the other “side of the story,” unwilling to question their prejudices towards the US military in Okinawa.

The second point of criticism is that some researchers, including Moriteru Arasaki, portray the Okinawan opposition as being united, that all Okinawans are against US bases. One example is the Nago referendum which this thesis touches on in the main body. Even though the majority who voted against the FRF being built in Nago did not win by a triumphantly huge margin, Arasaki portrays this opposition as if all people living in Nago were against the FRF being constructed there. It is a fact that not all Okinawans are against the FRF being built in Okinawa, even if a large majority of them may be. Ignoring those who are not part of the majority leads to a biased description of Okinawan social movements.
Okinawa 1945-1991

The Battle of Okinawa

The Japanese government ordered the evacuation of Okinawan women and children to the mainland and Taiwan (then a Japanese colony) in July 1944 after the fall of Saipan, which had been under Japanese control until then. Despite the sinking of ships such as the Tsushima-maru, where 1482 people (780 schoolchildren) died after the ship was hit by a US torpedo, many people sought to evacuate after 10 October 1944. Large-scale bombing on the island commenced on this day, with 90% of Naha City, Okinawa’s capital, being reduced to rubble. Miyume Tanji points out that the Japanese government cared little about the defence of Okinawa, and the military and government did not cooperate in drawing up a plan in advance of the US invasion of Okinawa. In essence, as Tetsurō Takahashi explains, the main aim of the defence of Okinawa was to buy as much time as possible to prepare for an eventual invasion of the mainland by Allied forces. Okinawa and its people were essentially sacrificed for the protection of the mainland.

The Battle of Okinawa started with the US attacking the Kerama Islands, 20-40 kilometres west of Naha, on 26 March 1945. So-called “group suicides” (shūdan jiketsu) were carried out throughout the island, the Japanese military coercing citizens into killing each other. It did this by telling people that the “savage Americans” would slaughter Okinawan men and rape Okinawan women taken prisoner. Survivor Shigeaki Kinjō tells of how the military actively distributed grenades to citizens for the purpose of making them commit suicide, and as the grenades ran out, people started killing each other with scythes or clubs. After successfully capturing the islands, the US moved on to invade the main island of Okinawa on 1 April 1945.

The Battle of Okinawa was one of the bloodiest battles fought during the Pacific War. During this battle over 240,000 people lost their lives, including almost 150,000 Okinawans.
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Almost 130,000 civilians perished, roughly one-third of the island’s population.⁵⁴ Miyume Tanji describes how bullets from American ships tore through whatever they passed through and how this was similar to a “typhoon of steel”, a phrase which is also used to describe the Battle of Okinawa. Japanese forces were outnumbered more than 5 to 1, and the US had 1,500 warships at its disposal, meeting little resistance from the virtually inexistent Japanese Navy.⁵⁵

The Japanese soldiers took the safest spots in caves called *gama*, killed crying babies and murdered Okinawans for speaking in any language or dialect other than standard Japanese, accusing them of being spies.⁵⁶ As former Okinawa governor Masahide Ōta explains, more than 80% of the 130,000 civilians who perished in the battle did so during June, and that for the civilians the events which took place in June were like “hell on Earth”.⁵⁷ Coordinated Japanese resistance effectively ended on 22 June 1945 when General Mitsuru Ushijima and Lieutenant General Isamu Chō committed suicide. Japanese military violence towards Okinawans continued even during the late stages of and after the end of the Battle of Okinawa. On the island of Kumejima, about 100 km west of Naha, two residents who had been kidnapped by the US military but returned on 26 June to the island were bayonetted by Japanese navy garrison members for “spying”. This was because their return had not been reported to the garrison amongst the chaos of the final stages of the battle.⁵⁸

The Battle of Okinawa left a deep scar on Okinawans, who suffered greatly during the battle. Okinawans had been forced to assimilate and become “Japanese” following Okinawa forcefully becoming a Japanese prefecture in 1879. They were sacrificed for the protection of the mainland and Emperor Hirohito during WWII. What followed was 27 years of direct US rule in Okinawa. Hirohito’s responsibility for this situation is also evident, as he told Douglas MacArthur that he wanted the US to station military forces on Okinawa “for 25-50 years or longer,” supposedly to protect Japan from the USSR.⁵⁹ Hirohito and the Japanese government, thus, treated Okinawa as a disposable object both during and after WWII.

In the case of Takae, the father of Masatsugu Isa is a survivor of the Battle of Okinawa. He spoke to the author of this thesis, but it was very difficult for the author to understand what he was saying. In any case, Isa’s father and his stories serve as a constant reminder of the horror of the Battle of Okinawa to those participating in the Takae movement. Furthermore,
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naturally those participating in the Takae movement are aware of what took place during the battle and what followed it. Isa told the author in June 2014 that “armies do not exist to protect civilians.” This makes it clear that, as mentioned in the section on theory, the consciousness of humans is greatly influenced by their perception of past events. The Battle of Okinawa certainly lives on in the memories of those involved in the movement, even if the majority of them did not experience it directly.

Okinawa After the End of World War II

While Okinawans were kept interned in camps after WWII, the US military secured 45,000 acres (182km²) of land for use in constructing military bases. Furthermore, it considered any land that it seized to be its rightful property, and it justified its actions by emphasising Okinawa’s geopolitical significance. As a result, many people who had lost relatives and most of their possessions returned to find their homes and land occupied by the US military. This was especially the case for farmers, as flat farmland is desirable for shooting ranges and airfields. The case of Iejima, an island a few kilometres off the coast of Okinawa, serves as an example of how the US forcefully took land from Okinawans, but also of how the local farmers resisted. This paper will explore the Iejima movement later in this chapter.

Mainland Japan following the end of WWII was occupied by the Allied forces, which were in reality led by the US. Moriteru Arasaki delves into great detail about how Okinawa was situated in the US-Japan-Okinawan relationship after WWII and how it was vital to Japan regaining its “sovereignty” in 1952. He shows, for example, how Emperor Hirohito was an active participant in the separation of Okinawa from Japan via his “Emperor Message”. Hirofumi Hayashi elucidates how the US military and the US State Department were at odds over what should be done with Okinawa after WWII. The former wanted to secure Okinawa as a military fort whilst the latter wanted to return Okinawa to Japan. The division of Korea and the proclamation of the People’s Republic of China in October 1949 were factors which spurred the US government to support the long-term possession of Okinawa.

Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) Douglas MacArthur formally separated Okinawa from Japan in January 1946. This meant that the US military could keep occupying Okinawa as if the US was still at war, in accordance with the Hague Convention of
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The first few years on Okinawa were turbulent for the US military, partly because until 1949 there was no long-term plan for the island. Life was very tough for Okinawans during this period. Most Okinawans were dependent on the US military for food as agriculture provided barely any food for them after the war. The black market flourished as a result, and Okinawa was neglected to the extent that it was called “the forgotten island”. On 1 February 1949, however, President Harry Truman approved NSC 13/3, a document which stated that the US should occupy Okinawa on a long-term basis and begin developing bases there. The United States Civil Administration for the Ryukyus (USCAR) was established in December 1950, replacing the military government. As Hayashi points out, the Government of the Ryukyu Islands (GRI) was established in April 1952. It was only, however, an autonomous organisation of Okinawan politicians to the extent that the USCAR allowed it to be. Hayashi with good reason states that the situation that Okinawa found itself in amounted to that of a “colony”. Thus, democracy did not eventuate from the creation of these “democratic” institutions.

73 years have passed since the creation of the USCAR. Whilst the USCAR does not exist anymore, it has essentially been replaced by the Japanese government. That is to say, democracy still does not exist in Okinawa. In regard to national security policies, it is understandable that central governments only allow prefectures to be autonomous to a certain extent. Even though Okinawa Governor Takeshi Onaga is against the construction of the FRF in Henoko and helipads in Takae, however, Tokyo completely ignores his views. For Okinawa to be considered an area where democracy functions, Tokyo should at least earnestly take this opposition into consideration. In regard to Takae, the ODB appears to place very little value on the views of the members of Anti-Heli and their supporters. Here one can see similarities between Okinawa under US occupation and the present-day Takae movement.

San Francisco Peace Treaty, Anpo and the US-Japan Status of Forces Agreement
Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida signed the San Francisco Peace Treaty and Anpo (old) on 8 September 1951, the former allowing Japan to regain its sovereignty. Both came into force on
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28 April 1952. The US-Japan Administrative Agreement (USJAA), which essentially detailed the rights of US forces in Japan, was signed in Tokyo on 28 February 1952. These three texts, as well as the descendants of the latter two documents, form the foundation of both US-Japan relations as a whole, but more importantly, the framework of Japan’s servility towards the US and its military.

The San Francisco Peace Treaty, on the surface, was rather generous towards mainland Japan. For example, on the subject of war reparations, Article 14 takes into consideration the fragility of the Japanese economy. The Treaty, however, was not generous in any way to the Nansei Islands (including Okinawa); these were formally separated from the rest of Japan at the treaty-level in Article 3, allowing the US “the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and its inhabitants…” Article 6(a) is arguably the most significant part of the Treaty from a security perspective, as it gave “one or more of the Allied Powers” (namely, the US) a legal basis to sign a security treaty with Japan. Those who had suffered the most under Japan’s militaristic rampage across Asia, Korea and China, were not invited to sign the treaty, and the Soviets refused to sign it, stating that “the aim of the treaty is for the US to station troops in Japan.”

USSR representative Andrei Gromyko’s statement appears to have been justified, considering the fact that US troops remain in Japan to this day. Anpo (old), briefly put, obliged Japan to allow US military forces in Japan (Article 1), allowed the US to use those forces “in and about Japan” (Article 1), and excluded all other militaries apart from that of the US from using bases, having extraterritorial rights etc. without US permission (Article 2). There were several problems with this treaty, however. One of these problems was, as Gabe explains, that Anpo (old) did not impose any obligations on the US. As stated in Article 1, “such forces (US land, air and sea forces) may be utilized to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East and to the security of Japan…” (italics added by author). The US could utilise those forces to simply “contribute” to Japan’s security. What “contribute” meant, of course, was not clear.

The US government kept secret from the Japanese delegation heading to San Francisco right up until the night before the Peace Treaty was to be signed where and when Anpo (old) would be signed. As Aketagawa and Yabe suggest, this was because the US knew how
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unreasonable the special rights given to US forces stated in Anpo (old) were.\textsuperscript{72} The US wanted neither friend (the UK) nor foe (the USSR) to intervene and prevent the treaty from being signed. The ultimate goal of the US was to "get the right to station as many troops in Japan as we want where we want and for as long as we want".\textsuperscript{73} These are the words of John Dulles, policy advisor to the Department of State at the time, who was responsible for negotiating the peace treaty and Anpo (old) with Yoshida.\textsuperscript{74} Yoshida signed the treaty, creating the foundation of the US-Japan security relationship which continues to this day.

The USJAA detailed the extraterritorial rights which US soldiers and their relatives enjoyed in Japan, and was signed in February 1952 in Tokyo. Since it was not a treaty but an administrative agreement, the US government could sign it with Japan without getting approval from the US Senate. This is significant because the US government could put the most controversial articles of the three treaties and agreements in the USJAA.\textsuperscript{75} It gave the US military full rights to do whatever it wanted within the facilities provided by Japan (Article III) and exempted it from compensating Japan for any costs associated with restoring facilities to their original state (Article IV). It also gave the US military the right to essentially withhold its servicemen suspected of having committed a crime outside of US military facilities from Japanese authorities (Article XVII, subsections 3 and 4).\textsuperscript{76} Article XVII is a good demonstration of the unfairly superior legal position in Japan which the US military is in. These articles still apply to US forces today, as the US SOFA, which replaced the USJAA in 1960, essentially has the same content as its predecessor.

Tarō Terasaki, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the first Yoshida cabinet, provided brilliant insight into the heart of the “San Francisco System”, which these three treaties and agreements form. He stated that the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed so that Anpo (old) could be signed, which in turn was signed so that the USJAA could be signed.\textsuperscript{77} This is because had some of the particularly colonial elements of Anpo (old) been present in the San Francisco Peace Treaty, the signing of this treaty may not have gone smoothly.\textsuperscript{78} Therefore,
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on 28 April 1952, when all three of these agreements and treaties came into effect, Japan’s foreign policy of servility towards the US became set in stone.

This thesis discusses the San Francisco System in such detail in this section because without this knowledge, it is difficult to understand the foundation of the US-Japan security relationship. Knowledge of the San Francisco System provides a strong explanation for how the relationship is structured and where Okinawa is located within it. It also demonstrates how the intent of the US having bases in Japan was not to protect Japan, but rather to be able to station US troops there for as long as possible. Considering this, it is not surprising that the majority of Okinawans are against US bases, partly because they appear to realise the true intent of the US military operating bases on their island.

Resistance towards the Forceful Seizure of Okinawan Land by the US Military

Due to the need for a legal basis on which to keep using land acquired after WWII, the USCAR announced Ordinance No. 91 “Authority to Contract” (Keiyakukunen). The aim of this ordinance was to secure 20-year contracts which had a retrospective start date of 1 July 1950 for civilian land; the GRI was to sign this contract with landowners, and it would sublease it to the US. 79 Landowners were retrospectively offered 1.81 yen per tsubo (3.3 m²) as compensation for the use of their land from 1 July 1950 until April 1952, and 6% of the value of their land (determined by the US) each year onwards. Only 900 of 40,000 landowners (roughly 2%) signed the contracts, which eventually led to the issuance of Ordinance No. 109, “Land Acquisition Procedure,” which in turn would shock Okinawans. 80

Ordinance No. 109, issued on 3 April 1953, in essence allowed for the forced appropriation of land which the US felt it “needed.” Simply put, the US would select land it wanted and take it, regardless of whether the civilian landowner agreed to their land being acquired by the US or not. In this way, as Yoshio Shimoji and Arasaki explain, from April 1953 until July 1955, the US military went in with armed soldiers and bulldozers and forcibly acquired land in places such as Aja, Mekaru (both in Mawashi Village, now part of Naha) and Maja (Ie Village, Iejima). 81 These forceful appropriations of land is where the expression
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“bulldozers and bayonets” comes from, which is commonly used in Okinawan discourse. As Hayashi states, after the events in Aja and Mekaru, the Legislature of the GRI on 5 May 1953 voted unanimously against “heavy-handed state measures in confiscating land.” The US military, however, ignored the Legislature’s protest.82 The US military encountered intense resistance from civilians when they went to seize land at gunpoint. Nonetheless, they flattened farmland and settlements, depriving people of their livelihood.83

Reflecting US President Dwight Eisenhower’s message in his 1954 State of the Union Address that “we shall maintain indefinitely our bases in Okinawa,”84 the USCAR announced in March 1954 that it planned to pay lump sums for Okinawan land. The USCAR would pay 16.6 years’ worth of the annual fee set by the US military for a plot of land (6% of its value), the full value of the land according to the latter, in order to obtain the right to perpetually rent the land.85 The US military justified this to the US Secretary of the Army as being necessary “because landowners did not get enough money from the current system of yearly payments to buy replacement land plots.”86 As Hayashi points out, however, it was simply a means by which to perpetually use land whilst avoiding the hassle of having to renew contracts with landowners.87 Furthermore, the US would have benefited financially from paying one lump sum, as it would have avoided paying annual fees which would have increased year by year.88

On 30 April 1954, the Legislature of the GRI passed the resolution “the Four Principles (to Protect Land)” (tochi o mamoru yongensoku). The four principles were the following:

- Opposition to the lump sum payment plan;
- Appropriate and fair compensation (the raising of yearly fees paid by the US to landowners which were too low);
- Indemnity for damage caused to property;
- Opposition to new seizures of land.89

Furthermore, the Executive Branch of the GRI, the Legislature of the GRI, the Association of Heads of Cities, Towns and Villages (Shichōsonchō Kai) and the Land Association (Tochi Rengōkai) organised the Quadripartite Council (QC) and tried to negotiate
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with the USCAR. The attitude of the USCAR towards the Legislature is telling in Deputy Governor David Ogden’s message to the Legislature on 1 November 1954. He stated that the Four Principles were “unrealistic propositions” and, essentially, that the US would continue to acquire land as it pleased for public use so long as it had jurisdiction over Okinawa. As the QC made no progress with the USCAR, it decided to negotiate directly with the US government, sending a delegation in June 1955 to Washington DC. What resulted from the visit by this delegation was the sending of Congressman Charles Melvin Price to Okinawa by the US House Committee on Armed Services during 23-26 October 1955. This thesis will discuss the Price Report later in this chapter.

The aforementioned series of developments lay the foundation for the anti-base movement in Iejima, off the coast of Okinawa. This is a classic case study in non-violent Okinawan social movements. This movement was a struggle between Okinawan landowners and the US military. Both the Henoko and Takae movements are bound to go down in history as having as big or an even greater significance than the Iejima movement. This is why it is important to know what took place during this classic Okinawan anti-base movement.

Iejima: The Struggle of Farmers Against the US Military

Iejima is a small 22.7 km² island located approximately 5 km northwest of Motobu Peninsula, in the northern-central part of Okinawa. 1000 US soldiers engaged in a battle of attrition with Japanese forces on 16 April 1945, claiming 4706 lives (1500 of them local residents who had been mobilised) during the week-long struggle. Almost all of the residents of the island who survived the battle were sent to the Kerama Islands, but were not permitted to return to their homes until March 1947. The residents returned to an island which they found hard to recognise as their home. This is not surprising, considering that even by the end of the Battle of Okinawa, 25 June 1945, three out of four airstrips on Iejima which had been built and then destroyed by the Japanese military were almost fully repaired and in use by the US
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According to Shōkō Ahagon, a farmer who later stood at the vanguard of the Iejiima anti-base movement, 63% of Iejiima had been occupied by the US military by the time the residents returned to their home. Ahagon himself was deeply touched by the war; he lost his only son.

During the month of July in 1953, a team of American land surveyors visited Maja in Iejiima. In Ahagon’s words, “the people of Maja still trusted the Americans,” so seven villagers and the village head Ōshiro cooperated and showed their land to the surveyors. At the end of the survey, these eight people were presented with English documents, and the surveyors asked them to affix their hanko (personal seal) to them. The surveyors claimed that the residents would receive financial compensation for their cooperation during the day, but in fact the villagers had unwittingly signed their own voluntary evacuation notices.

In June 1954, four families on the island were given five days to leave their homes to move to places close to their homes which the US military had specified. Ahagon states that the reason why the families cooperated was because they were “naive” and trusted the Americans, and because they did not want to do anything to displease the USCAR and have their rations cut off. They received a meagre 20,000 yen (whether each or in total is not specified) as “generous compensation” for moving. The truth is, however, that the US had ordered the evacuation to see how much resistance they would meet when ordering the residents to move from their homes. Naturally the US must have been pleasantly surprised by the docility of the residents. The US, however, underestimated the resistance they would meet when they tried to get more residents to vacate their properties.

On 4 October 1954, the US military returned to Iejiima to inform the villagers of Maja and Nishisaki that it was going to construct an aerial bombing training ground in the two villages. All 78 households of Maja and half of Nishisaki (74 households) were to be evicted. Residents together with Village Head Ōshiro went to Naha to deliver a petition to USCAR to halt the evictions on 15 October 1954. This petition simply ended up in a drawer in a GRI office, receiving no attention whatsoever. In November, a number of Iejiima residents drew up what Douglas Lummis has translated as “petition regulations” (chinjō kitei, 97
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according to Arasaki\textsuperscript{104}, namely principles to abide by when interacting with US soldiers. Examples include: do not wield anything in your hands when talking with US soldiers, do not raise your voices and sit down when speaking during meetings with them.\textsuperscript{105} These “regulations” highlight the non-violent nature of the Iejima struggle which takes a serious turn the following year, but also the non-violent nature of Okinawan resistance towards US bases ever since 1945.

Arasaki provides a detailed yet concise account of what happened on 11 March 1955 when the US military visited Iejima with 300 uniformed soldiers. Via bayonets and bulldozers, 13 farming households were destroyed, and the farmland of 81 households (around 3.3 km\(^2\)) was cut off for use in firing and bombing exercises.\textsuperscript{106} Mitchell describes how the farmers were offered compensation for their land, how the farmers refused based on principle and how the farmers entered the firing range to till their land during the month of May.\textsuperscript{107} It is true that the US military allowed farmers to use their land outside of military exercise hours (mornings, evenings and Sundays). As Arasaki mentions, however, one cannot tend to one’s land on such an intermittent basis.\textsuperscript{108} This was not an age where there seemingly is a convenience store on every corner of every block like in today’s Japan. It was an age and an area where the farmers were dependent on their farmland to grow food in order to survive.

By 13 June the US military had had enough. US soldiers arrested 80 farmers who were tilling their fields within the firing range, 32 receiving various sentences from 3-month imprisonment to suspended sentences from a military court. When the farmers returned and continued tilling their fields, the US military burned 300 acres (1.2 km\(^2\)) of farmland with petrol, thereby destroying the crops and whatever food the farmers could have harvested from their own land.\textsuperscript{109} With no other options available to them, the villagers of Maja, including Ahagon, decided to go on what became known as the “beggars’ march.” They took a boat to Motobu Peninsula (on the main island of Okinawa) and walked to Itoman in the south over the course of seven months.\textsuperscript{110} They are said to have marched with a banner which had the following message written on it: “It is shameful to beg. It is even more shameful, though, to make somebody beg.” Arasaki indicates that the villagers managed to spread the message of
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what was taking place on Iejima, and that the march was one factor which led to the Island-wide Struggle (Shimagurumi Tōsō) mentioned later in this chapter.

Iejima serves as an important case study of the Okinawan anti-base movement and its history. Also, as Arasaki states, Iejima encapsulates the Okinawan paradox as a whole: it is an island which has been deeply touched by war and its populace is against war, yet there are US military installations there. This is particularly the case of Takae. Many of the people there or their family members have been touched by war and they are against war and the helipads being constructed there. Despite this, there are helipads there, and six more are being constructed to this day, despite almost eight years of constant opposition on the part of the members of Anti-Heli and their supporters. Time will reveal whether the participants in the Takae movement will in the end be able to prevent all six helipads from being built. As this thesis has shown, the farmers in Iejima were not able to prevent their land from being taken away.

The Price Report and the Shimagurumi Tōsō

The Price Report brought great disappointment to Okinawans when it was made public to them on 9 June 1956. It essentially rejected the Four Principles, labelling them as “extreme,” supported the lump sum payment scheme and stated that “the acquisition of additional lands be kept to an absolute minimum.” Hayashi points out that the annual rent paid for each tsubo of private land used by the US military had increased since 1952, but during the financial year of 1956 it planned to only pay 2.19 yen per tsubo. Considering a packet of cigarettes cost 7.20 yen in 1955, one can see how little value the US military placed on the rights and interests of landowners.

As the Price Report essentially advocated the maintenance and even the expansion of the status quo in Okinawa, the reaction in Okinawa was one of fury in the form of the Shimagurumi Tōsō, as mentioned above. On 20 June 1956, there were mass gatherings held at 56 of Okinawa’s 64 towns, cities and villages. Estimates of the number of people who participated range from 160,000 to 400,000 (20% and 50% of the island’s population, respectively). Shūhei Higa, the Chief Executive of the GRI, together with other politicians made known their intention to resign, and the QC joined forces with the Municipal Assembly
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Speakers Association to form the Five-Power Council (FPC) on 16 July to show their determined opposition to the Report. Despite Japan officially having sovereignty over Okinawa during the US occupation of Okinawa, Tokyo did nothing to offer support to Okinawa, “viewing the land problem as a ‘domestic problem’ of the US”.\(^{115}\) Okinawa was an important part of Japan only when it suited Japan (i.e. during WWII and the Battle of Okinawa), but not otherwise. This was naturally both infuriating and insulting for Okinawans.

Riffs began to appear within the FPC and the landowners in due course, however. On the same day that the FPC was formed, Naha Mayor Jūgō Tōma stated that he was “not necessarily against the lump sum payment (plan),” and landowners in Henoko (the site where the present-day Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) is supposed to be built) decided to lease around 2.54 km\(^2\) of mostly non-arable land in exchange for a lump sum payment.\(^{116}\) The Americans felt that there was no complete unity amongst the various opposition groups after the Henoko deal,\(^{117}\) which may have been true, but they still faced overwhelming opposition on the issue of lump sum payments. According to one survey, only 0.019\% of landowners were in favour of the plan.\(^{118}\)

In the end, the US submitted: the lump sum payment plan was scrapped, fees paid to landowners were increased (to 80\% of the landowners’ demands, according to Yanagi,\(^{119}\) and “special areas” such as Naha and Koza were created where rates were increased even more\(^{120}\)), fees would be paid each year and the value of land would be reappraised every five years.\(^{121}\) This brought a close to the Shimagurumi Tōsō, but as Arasaki importantly notes, the relationship between the US and Okinawans, or rather, how the US decided to deal with Okinawans, changed from that point onwards. Namely, until the breakout of the Shimagurumi Tōsō in 1956, the US military had been unyielding in its policies and implemented them with force (such as the forceful seizure of private land), but from this point on it would employ a carrot-and-stick method (ame to muchi in Japanese).\(^{122}\) This is significant because this structure caused a rift between landowners with the appearance of landowners who benefited financially from the US military using their land and paying rent. Furthermore, it created a


\(^{116}\) Ibid., 71, 74, accessed 13 December 2014.

\(^{117}\) “Status of Implementation of the Price Report, for Hon. William G. Bray,” in Ibid., 82. Please see Bibliography regarding referencing.


\(^{120}\) Ibid., 93, accessed 14 December 2014.


system of dependency where those landowners or communities that opposed the US military and did not take the carrot (money) were hit by the whip (had funds cut off).

US Marines in Okinawa, Anti-Base Movements in 1950s Mainland Japan and the Revision of Anpo (old)

A thesis on Okinawa is not complete without a brief description of the US Marines stationed there. US Marines make up the largest share of troops in Okinawa (15,365, or 57.2%, as of June 2011) and their facilities occupy the greatest amount of land (175km², or 75.7%, as of March 2013). As Tomohiro Yara explains, the Marines were sent to Japan in 1953 to support US troops in South Korea and were stationed in Camps Gifu and Fuji (Gifu and Yamanashi Prefecture respectively, both located between Tokyo and Kyoto). The Marines were soon met with fierce resistance from locals in Yamanashi when they commenced rifle drills, however, with wives making their way into Camp Fuji and clinging to the Marines’ rifles.

Amongst the growing anti-US sentiment in mainland Japan and these events, it was difficult for the Marines to conduct drills. Yara suggests that the US started moving the Marines from the mainland to Okinawa in 1956 out of necessity for practical and political reasons, as the Marines could train with fewer restrictions on Okinawa, which was under its direct control. Yara makes the interesting point that moving ground forces from Japan (including Marines to Okinawa) was like hitting two birds with one stone for the US. Reducing ground troop numbers on the mainland would help solve the issue of local resistance to bases, and it would encourage Japan to rearm by making people feel that Japan was in danger without US ground troops being there.

Revision of Anpo (old)

The US was initially reluctant to suggestions from Nobusuke Kishi (Prime Minister from 31 January 1957 until 19 July 1960) that Anpo (old) be revised. The main criticisms of Anpo (old) in Japan at the time were that it did not specify that the US had an obligation to protect Japan, and that the US could militarily intervene in riots in Japan. The latter criticism was seen as meaning that Japan was not an independent country. As Shigeaki Iijima points out,
however, the US could not turn a blind eye to the steadily growing anti-base and anti-US sentiment on the mainland. As a result, it started negotiating with Japan in October 1958.\(^\text{128}\)

One major point of contention was whether the sphere of the revised treaty should include Okinawa. In the end Okinawa was not included. This is because Japanese politicians merely wanted to make sure that the US would protect the mainland if US bases there were attacked. They were afraid that if US bases on Okinawa were attacked and that if Okinawa was included in the scope of the new treaty, the mainland would be dragged into a war.\(^\text{129}\)

As Eiji Oguma points out, Okinawa was not part of the national solidarity movement even at the level of protestors. When it was announced that President Eisenhower’s planned trip to Japan had been cancelled due to the civil unrest in Japan, protestors in Tokyo are said to have rejoiced, saying “we have won! Eisenhower’s visit to Japan has been cancelled! That scoundrel has run off to Okinawa!” This made university student Isamu Nakasone, originally from Okinawa and who himself felt was “fully Japanese,” realise that Okinawa was not “Japan”.\(^\text{130}\) As Yara says, Okinawa was used as a scapegoat for Anpo (old) and Anpo.\(^\text{131}\) This is because without Japan being able to fulfill its treaty obligations to provide the US military with facilities, the US-Japan alliance would become very unstable and potentially collapse.

Kishi rammed the revised treaty through Parliament on 19 May 1960, leading to protests on an unprecedented scale. The amended treaty, as well as the US-Japan SOFA (the amended agreement which replaced the USJAA) had both been signed in Washington on 19 January 1960. On 26 May, it is said that 540,000 people protested across the whole country.\(^\text{132}\) According to an editorial article in the 22 May 1960 edition of the Asahi Shim bun, what enraged people most was the “contemptible way” in which Kishi had rammed the treaty through Parliament.\(^\text{133}\) It was argued at the time, however, that the new treaty specified in Article 5 that the US did have an obligation to protect Japan, a view which Iijima appears to take.\(^\text{134}\) That is not necessarily the case, however, and one needs only to look closely at Article 5 itself to see why:
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Each Party recognizes that an armed attack against either Party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes… (italics added by author).\(^{135}\)

As Aketagawa and Yabe elucidate, the US Congress will decide how the US military should act so as to benefit the interests of the US. Therefore, Article V essentially states that the US may help militarily, making no promises.\(^{136}\) This is why Kumao Nishimura, Director of the Treaties Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) at the time claimed that Anpo (old) and the amended version looked different but were essentially the same. He used the following metaphor: “if Anpo (old) is an egg, Anpo is an egg put into a nice box which has been nicely wrapped.”\(^{137}\)

The aforementioned movements on the mainland during the 1950s and in 1960 are significant in the context of Okinawa and Takae. When mainland Japanese were directly affected by the presence of US bases, they protested against them, and the Marines were moved to Okinawa. When Okinawans protest for decades, however, Tokyo does all that it can to keep Marines there. As argued in the theory section of this thesis, this lack of regard for Okinawan sentiment has left a large imprint on the consciousness of Okinawans. When people are ignored for decades, it is natural that they react in a way to try to make their voice heard.

In Takae, two of the six helipads have been built, with one being just 400 metres from one of the households participating in the movement. It is not strange that people in Takae are protesting against these helipads, since mainland Japanese protested when US bases were in their “back yard”. Protesting against the presence of the US military is not just an Okinawan phenomenon; as demonstrated above, it was once a strong mainland phenomenon as well.

Reversion Movement on Okinawa
The next section of this chapter will discuss the reversion movement and Okinawa’s reversion to Japan. As the reversion movement is not the major theme of this thesis, this thesis will not juxtapose the reversion movement from 1960 with similar pre-war movements on Okinawa.

\(^{137}\) Ibid., 166. Researcher’s rough translation.
Early Stages of the Reversion Movement

The core of the reversion movement was the Okinawa Teachers’ Association (OTA) which formed, together with progressive political parties, the organisation known as the Okinawa Prefecture Council for Reversion to the Home Country (Okinawa-ken Sokoku Fukki Kyōgi Kai, abbreviated as Fukkikyō) on 28 April 1960. This date was significant as it was the eighth anniversary of Anpo (old) coming into effect, 28 April 1952 being known as the “Day of Humiliation” (kutsujoku no hi) in Okinawa when it was severed from Japan.

Arasaki notes that whilst the reversion movement of the 1950s had ingenuous nationalism as its driving force, the nature of the 1960s movement was more complicated. Two kinds of nationalism defined the movement during the first half of the 1960s. Firstly, as Tanji points out, a wave of nationalism and independence was sweeping the world at the time, with African colonies becoming independent. Generally speaking, Okinawans felt that they were being occupied by a colonial power. The second kind was a yearning to return to Japan, which according to Tanji mainly came from members of the OTA. Teachers were seen as particularly nationalistic, Oguma indicates, having actively promoted the teaching of standard Japanese in schools since the 1950s. This was to establish their own identity, but also to distinguish themselves from the US.

Rise and Gradual Decline of the Reversion Movement

The movement and its goals, however, were to take a turn during the second half of the 1960s. Adherents to the movement became more and more antagonistic towards Japan when the US intervened militarily in Vietnam, when the US used Okinawan bases for daily bombing raids. Antagonism also grew, however, when Prime Minister Eisaku Satō made clear his support for the war. Adherents emphasised more and more that they were against war in general, and Tanji points out that the almost ingenuous “reversion nationalism” of the OTA was widely criticised.

Another reason why this “reversion nationalism” waned even amongst teachers was two education bills which were based on mainland laws. What infuriated teachers the most was the way that the bills, if enacted, would limit their ability to demonstrate their political views
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and would prohibit industrial action. As Oguma points out, over 20,000 people (including teachers) conducted a sit-in demonstration outside of the Legislature of the GRI and clashed with police. The bills were subsequently abandoned.\(^{144}\) Oguma is accurate in his assessment that these events had two major effects: a definitive rift eventuated between the OTA and conservative political parties in Okinawa (the parties behind the bills), and the OTA became aware that they had had an overly rosy understanding of what reversion to Japan would entail.\(^{145}\) The OTA was thus forced to ask itself the following question: what do we want to achieve via this movement, and can we achieve that via reversion to Japan?

Organisations with *Fukkikyō* as the central actor staged more and more protests as the US military used military bases in Okinawa to carry out bombing raids in Vietnam. Tomokazu Takamine points out that as the war progressed, military activity on Okinawa became more intense, galvanising people to protest against the US military. The reversion movement became an even greater force to reckon with when *Zengunrō*, the union representing workers on US bases in Okinawa, joined *Fukkikyō* in 1967.\(^{146}\) Strikes did occur on bases, and as can be imagined, this was not something the US military wanted, as it was fighting in the Vietnam War. On 24 April 1968, 23,000 base workers (18,000 of them being *Zengunrō* members) staged a strike, effectively paralysing bases on Okinawa.\(^{147}\) After the crash of a B-52, an aircraft used in bombing missions, in Kadena Air Base (the largest air base in the Asia-Pacific), *Zengunrō*, other unions such as *Zenokirōren* and ordinary citizens proposed conducting a general strike to have the B-52s removed.\(^{148}\)

In the end, the strike was called off by Chōbyō Yara, the first Chief Executive of the GRI to be elected democratically in 1968. Upon meeting Prime Minister Satō several times, Yara was afraid that if he did not intervene, reversion would be delayed. Accordingly he requested that the strike be called off, and the majority of protestors appear to have listened to his request because, as Tanji mentions, they too understood that neither Tokyo nor Washington would respond favourably to such a strike.\(^{149}\) Tanji, with all fairness, calls the decision that Yara and the protestors had to make “unfair”, namely either to continue expressing their opposition to their island being used as a launchpad for warfare, or to have Okinawa revert to Japan. To the dismay of adherents to the reversion movement, the calling off of the strike had
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an unintended consequence: the movement lost direction, and fragmentations occurred within it.\textsuperscript{150}

The aforementioned fragmentation taking place is significant. This is because there certainly exists some degree of fragmentation in the Takae movement. Hypothetically speaking, if some members of the movement were to resort to violence in the heat of the moment, the movement would surely disintegrate. It is unlikely that members would resort to violence. This is partly because there are no people with apparent violent tendencies involved in the movement, but also because protesting without resorting to violence is a key characteristic of Okinawan identity, as explained in the theory section. With that said, it is interesting to see whether the Takae movement will continue being able to maintain the relative cohesion it currently has. As seen above, whilst Okinawa did achieve reversion, the reversion movement was unsuccessful in maintaining unity as one strong force.

\textit{Political Process of Reversion}

When the US government started seriously considering the impact of reversion, around December 1965, the military was against the idea of reversion. It is common knowledge that militaries prefer having as few restrictions as possible on their freedom to act. The military feared that if it did not have administrative power in Okinawa that it would not be able to act freely, and in line with this thought, it stressed the importance of Okinawan bases in the Vietnam War.\textsuperscript{151} The rationale in Tokyo for having Okinawa revert to Japan appears to have mainly been one of egoism. Japan’s economy at the time was booming, and Japan had hosted the 1964 Summer Olympics. As Arasaki argues, it was difficult for Japan to stomach that it had some of its territory under the direct control of its “ally”.\textsuperscript{152}

In May 1969 the US government made clear internally what its four basic aims were with reversion and Okinawa:

(i) negotiations regarding the use of military bases would be complete by the end of the year;
(ii) to be allowed to use military bases with as much freedom as possible;
(iii) retain nuclear weapons in Okinawa;
(iv) to get Japan to commit to additional things regarding Okinawa in the future.\textsuperscript{153}
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Prime Minister Satō and President Richard Nixon officially announced in November 1969 that reversion would occur, and so it did on 15 May 1972. There are two main reasons why the US agreed to the reversion: the fierce opposition that it was facing in Okinawa from citizens was making authoritarian rule unfeasible, and it did not want to jeopardise the renewal of Anpo, which had a 10-year limit.\footnote{Arasaki, Kōzōteki Okinawa Sabetsu, 30.} Takamine makes the insightful observation that the US essentially wanted to put Japan between itself and Okinawans so as to stabilise the US-Japan security relationship.\footnote{Takamine, “Fukki Undō to Kichi,” 45.} In the end, the US essentially achieved the aforementioned objectives through secret agreements or mitsuyaku, namely backdoor diplomacy.

**Anti-War Landowners**

Following Okinawa’s reversion to Japan, the Japanese government had to rent land forcibly acquired during the US occupation from the landowners and lease it to the US military.\footnote{Arasaki, Kōzōteki Okinawa Sabetsu, 34.} It gave the landowners good incentives to not oppose this policy, more than doubling the rent paid for the land from 1972 until 1977, and has raised this rent every single year until at least 2011.\footnote{Okinawa-ken Chiji Kōshitsu Kichi Taisaku-ka, ed. Okinawa no Beigun Kichi, 137.} Another reason for this was to deal with those landowners, so called “anti-war landowners” (hansen jinushi), who refused to sign lease agreements with the Japanese government. These numbered around 3000 in 1972.\footnote{Arasaki, Kōzōteki Okinawa Sabetsu, 36.} Whilst different sources give conflicting numbers, according to official statistics published by Okinawa Prefecture, in March 2012 there were 3,870 people who refused to sign contracts to lease their land to the Japanese government to be used by the US military.\footnote{Okinawa-ken Chiji Kōshitsu Kichi Taisaku-ka, ed. Okinawa no Beigun Kichi, 145.} Whether this includes the so-called “one-tsubo anti-war landowners” (people who bought one tsubo (3.3 m\(^2\)) from these landowners and refused to lease this land) is unclear.

The way the Japanese government managed to provide the land of anti-war landowners was via the legal system. It enacted laws which allowed for land which had been used by the US military to be used as “public land” (kōyōchi) for five or ten years at a time, regardless of what the landowners thought. The Japanese government has continually renewed these five-year and ten-year periods since then.\footnote{Arasaki, Kōzōteki Okinawa Sabetsu, 36-37.} In order to understand why these anti-war landowners do not lease their land, one needs to consider their respective identity. Only those who have had their identity formed by their experiences on Okinawa, such as the Battle of Okinawa, the
US occupation etc. could surely find the courage to stick to their anti-war beliefs in the face of pressure from the central government.

*Omoiyari Yosan*

The Japanese government did not only try to give incentives to the aforementioned landowners to lease their land. In fact, since 1978 the Japanese government has covered some of the costs associated with running US bases which the US is actually supposed to cover. This system is normally referred to by the name *Omoiyari Yosan* (Sympathy Budget). This started with Japan covering the costs associated with benefits for Japanese employees on US bases. This was gradually expanded, however, to include all costs related to hiring Japanese employees, the electricity, gas, water etc. which the US military uses. The total figure of this generous gift from Japan peaked 275.6 billion yen in 1999, but gradually fell to 189.9 billion yen in 2015 (about 1.60 billion USD). On top of this, the Japanese government will pay for the construction of the FRF which is set to cost billions of dollars. The Japanese government has tried to create parties, including the US military and landowners, who benefit from the status quo.

Interestingly enough, the Japanese government has not been able to create parties within Takae or within members of the Takae movement who would benefit from the helipads being built. The emergence of such stakeholders would certainly serve a damaging blow to the already small-scale Takae movement. Then again, most of the members of Anti-Heli are people who have moved to Takae to lead simple lives in the middle of nature. Whilst humans are generally weak when it comes to resisting the lure of money, money does not appear to be of great importance to the members of Anti-Heli. Their conviction in the righteousness of their cause, their knowledge of the aforementioned events such as the Iejima movement etc. appear to give them the determination to resist no matter what “treat” may be offered. In this way, they are similar to the anti-war landlords mentioned above.

---
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**Okinawa 1991-2015**

The US-Japan Security Relationship after the Cold War

The end of the Cold War in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was a blow to the US-Japan alliance. This is because one of the main reasons why the US-Japan alliance had been formed was to contain communism and the Soviet Union. Therefore, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the *raison d’être* for the US-Japan alliance naturally came into question. The US reduced military expenditure by around 27% during the period of 1989 to 1994, greatly reducing troops stationed in Europe.\(^\text{163}\) As Makoto Konishi suggests, however, instead of calling for similar measures to be taken in Japan, the mass media called for Japan to “contribute to the international community”.\(^\text{164}\) In the case of Okinawa, only 3 out of 45 US military installations were returned to Japan, and the land used by the US military was only reduced by 2% during the same period.\(^\text{165}\)

In February 1995 the US government released the “United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region”, known as the “Nye Report”. The Nye Report suggests that development and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region is due to 100,000 US troops being there, equating this US presence and the security it provides to being like “oxygen” for the region.\(^\text{166}\) As Konishi points out, the Report admits that the US does not have an “enemy” in the form of the Soviet Union anymore. At the same time, it justifies its continued presence there by repeatedly emphasising the threat posed by North Korea and by the potential for instability in the region.\(^\text{167}\) This thesis will detail later in this chapter why threats such as the North Korean threat are not direct threats to Japan.

The Report openly admits that the US presence in the Asia-Pacific is part of the global strategy of the US and that 100,000 troops should be stationed there to “enable us to respond to global security contingencies, in the Middle East and elsewhere”.\(^\text{168}\) Again, Konishi is poignant in his analysis of this report, pointing out that the Nye Report essentially states that the scope of US forces in the region is not contained to that region.\(^\text{169}\) This goes against
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Article VI of Anpo. The treaty clearly states that US forces are allowed to use facilities and areas in Japan “for the purpose of contributing to the security of Japan and the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East” (italics added by author).\footnote{“Japan-U.S. Security Treaty (Anpo),” accessed 7 March 2015.} Regardless, the Nye Report laid the foundation of how the US-Japan security relationship would be redefined moving forward. Okinawans who had hoped for a reduction of the burden of US bases were left disappointed, just as in 1972. One event a few months later, however, would rattle the alliance to its core.

Rape, the SACO Final Report and the Redefinition of the US-Japan Security Relationship

Crimes committed by members of the US military on Okinawa had been a cause for concern for locals for decades. What occurred on 1995 was unprecedented, though. On 4 September 1995, a 12-year-old Okinawan girl was abducte and gang raped by three members of the US military. As McCormack and Norimatsu indicate, Admiral Richard C. Macke, Commander of the United States Pacific Command inadvertently angered Okinawans even more. He suggested that the rapists could have bought a “girl” (prostitute) for the money they used to rent the car which they used to abduct and rape the schoolgirl.\footnote{Chalmers Johnson, “The 1995 Rape Incident and the Rekindling of Okinawan Protest against the American Bases,” in Chalmers Johnson, ed., Okinawa: Cold War Island (Cardiff: Japan Policy Research Institute, 1999), 109–129, in McCormack and Norimatsu, Resistant Islands, 91.} What angered Okinawans the most was the way that the US-Japan SOFA made it difficult for the alleged rapists to be prosecuted by Japanese authorities. According to Article XVII, Clause (5)(c) of the Agreement, anyone who can be charged by a Japanese prosecutor and currently in the hands of the US military (i.e. who has escaped to a US base after committing a crime) will be held by the US military until he or she is charged.\footnote{“Agreement under Article VI of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America, Regarding Facilities and Areas and the Status of United States Armed Forces in Japan,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, accessed 7 March 2015, \url{http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/usa/sfa/pdfs/fulltext.pdf}.} It is difficult to prosecute suspects if you are not able to question them, as you need evidence to prosecute them. Therefore, when US authorities initially refused to hand over the three suspects, anger erupted on the island.

Some of the land used by US forces in Okinawa is used against the will of the landowners due to a law known as the US Military Special Measures Law (Beigun Tokubetsu Sochihō). This law allows village heads, mayors etc. to sign on behalf of uncooperative landowners, such as the anti-war landowners. The Governor at the time, Masahide Ōta, chose to show his anger on 28 September towards the rape incident and the extraterritorial
protection offered to the alleged rapists by refusing to sign these land lease contracts.\textsuperscript{173} This paper will go into more detail about this refusal at a later stage.

On October 21, 85,000 people attended the Okinawan Prefecture Citizens’ Rally to make it known to both the US and Japanese governments that this was an incident which they would not allow to be ignored.\textsuperscript{174} Considering the population of Okinawa Prefecture in 1995 was around 1.27 million,\textsuperscript{175} a gathering of this size demonstrates how infuriated Okinawans were by the rape incident. Arasaki attributes the anger to the rape incident itself, but also to the frustration felt by many Okinawans that despite the Cold War having ended, the US-Japan alliance and the situation with military bases (most of which are still on Okinawa) had barely changed.\textsuperscript{176} The governments of the US and Japan had to do something to pacify Okinawans. Okinawa has been the foundation of the US-Japan security relationship for decades. They decided to act.

\textit{SACO Final Report}

The Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) Final Report was presented on 2 December 1996. That MCAS Futenma, located in the middle of Ginowan City, would be returned had been hinted at a few days earlier, and was made official in the Final Report, but with a catch: a replacement facility had to be built. This would be a “sea-based facility” and MCAS Futenma was expected to be returned “within five to seven years” upon completion of the facility.\textsuperscript{177} Most Okinawans were not favourable of the condition that a replacement facility had to be built for MCAS Futenma.\textsuperscript{178} Many sites for the FRF were presented both before and after the SACO Final Report was published, but in 1997, Washington and Tokyo agreed that it would be built on the coast of Henoko, a small coastal hamlet in Nago City. Interestingly enough, the US had considered building a similar facility in Henoko 30 years earlier when it had had total administrative control over Okinawa. As McCormack and Norimatsu point out, though, the point of the SACO was supposedly to reduce the burden on
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Okinawans, so it was neither in Tokyo’s nor Washington’s interest to make this fact widely known.\textsuperscript{179}

\textit{1997 Henoko Referendum}

As previously mentioned in this paper, Henoko is a hamlet where public opinion towards bases has been clearly divided for decades. One reason is surely due to the lack of employment in the area. According to one Henoko resident, there are not many jobs except within the construction industry and on Camp Schwab, a USMC base located in Henoko.\textsuperscript{180} Regardless, residents of Henoko moved to form two associations in 1997, the main one being \textit{Inochi o Mamoru Kai} (Association to Protect Life), and pushed for a referendum to be held in the city of Nago on the location of the FRF.\textsuperscript{181} In the end the referendum was held on 21 December 1997, and those opposed to having the FRF constructed in Henoko got 52.8\% of the vote, as opposed to those in favour (either with or without conditions attached) who got 45.3\% of the vote.\textsuperscript{182} Whilst the margin was not massive, those against the FRF won. Considering the fact that key figures of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP, a conservative party which has governed Japan almost nonstop since 1955) visited Nago before the referendum to essentially support those in favour of the FRF, this victory was significant.\textsuperscript{183}

In a democracy, at least some consideration would be paid to this expression of will by the people. Regardless, Tetsuya Higa, Mayor of Nago at the time, informed the Japanese government that he would accept the FRF being built in Henoko and promptly resigned. At the next mayoral election held in February 1998, the pro-base candidate Tatsuo Kishimoto won by a slight margin.\textsuperscript{184} Governor Ōta, however, was not going to give in as easily as Higa to pressure from Tokyo.

The 1995 rape case showcases how one event can cause anger simmering below the surface to suddenly explode. The rape case would not have caused such a reaction amongst Okinawans if they did not feel discontent about the US presence in their prefecture. As of May 2015, there is immense tension on Okinawa due to the heavy-handed measures Tokyo is taking to have the FRF built in Henoko and the helipads built in Takae. If someone’s life were to be claimed or if someone were to be brutally assaulted in Henoko or Takae, there is no
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telling what the reaction would be. Gerald Curtis goes as far to say that such an event, or even a major accident, would have “explosive consequences” for the US-Japan security relationship.\(^{185}\) Considering the current Governor, Takeshi Onaga, is clearly anti-base and was elected in 2014 by a decisive margin, the reaction might even surpass that of the 1995 rape case.

**Governor Ōta Stands up to Tokyo and Washington**

As previously mentioned, Governor Ōta was unwavering in his refusal to sign land leases on behalf of the aforementioned landowners whose land Tokyo was leasing to the US military without their consent. Prime Minister Murayama decided to sign the land leases against the will of the landowners, and sued Ōta for not performing his public duties.\(^{186}\) As Tanji points out, both the Fukuoka High Court and the Supreme Court ruled against Ōta. In September 1996, Ōta finally gave in. This was after Tokyo had given him the “carrot” of a 5 billion yen “special adjustment budget” for Okinawa.\(^{187}\) After this trial, the Japanese government changed the US Military Special Measures Law so that it would not be possible for future governors to refuse to sign.\(^{188}\)

Ōta, in light of the result of the Henoko referendum, decided in February 1998 that he would not accept the FRF to be built within Okinawa Prefecture.\(^{189}\) This time the Japanese government froze funds for the “Okinawa Development Fund” (ODF); Naha and Tokyo ended up in a stalemate situation, according to Ken Miki.\(^{190}\) Ōta was ousted from power after what McCormack and Norimitsu call “illegal and unconstitutional intervention” on the part of the Japanese government in the December 1998 gubernatorial election. He was replaced by Keiichi Inamine, who ran on improving the economy and accepting the FRF.\(^{191}\) This “acceptance” was in essence, however, not an acceptance, as Inamine called for the FRF to be a joint-use facility between civilians and the US military, and for the FRF to have a 15-year lease.\(^{192}\) Regardless, Inamine was rewarded by Tokyo for being less aggressive than Ōta, receiving twice the amount of ODF as Ōta had received, as one example. The Japanese
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government essentially tried to influence Okinawan politics by rewarding those who would advance the will of Tokyo and Washington, as opposed to try to realise the significance of Ōta’s drastic actions.

Helicopter Crash at Okinawa International University: Comparison between Okinawa and Italy

In 2004, yet another incident occurred which stirred up a lot of negative sentiment towards the Marines in Okinawa. On 13 August 2004, a CH-53 belonging to the USMC crashed on the campus of Okinawa International University. This university is located right next to MCAS Futenma. Thankfully, nobody was killed. Almost immediately after the helicopter crashed, Marines with guns poured over the fence from MCAS Futenma, cordoned off the site and forced citizens to leave the scene. The Marines transported the helicopter away from the scene, denying Okinawan Police access to evidence associated with this incident which occurred on property not under the jurisdiction of the US military. The US military resumed flights with CH-53 helicopters on 22 August 2004, just nine days after the incident.¹⁹⁴

Glenn Hook et al appear to echo the rhetoric of the US government in saying that the USMC secured the area in accordance with the US-Japan SOFA.¹⁹⁵ This cannot be true, however, since as Douglas Lummis points out, there is no clause in SOFA which justifies the actions of the Marines.¹⁹⁶ To be specific, the Marines prevented Japanese police from entering the site and conducting their own investigation, and even the mayor of Ginowan City, Yōichi Iha, was denied access. Marines and Military Police can only exercise police powers outside of US facilities towards US servicemen, and this must be done “in liaison with Japanese authorities”.¹⁹⁷ Major Nathan C. Hurst in a discussion with Douglas Lummis uses the threat posed by Chinese spies as a way to justify the actions of the Marines, saying that “it is possible that some police are paid informants.” This statement highlights the rampant paranoia and strong distrust amongst the US military towards the local population in Okinawa.

Douglas Lummis goes so far as to say that the Marines cordoning off the university the way they did amounts to an “incursion”.¹⁹⁸ He is not alone in his thinking; Yara also states

---

¹⁹³ CH = Cargo Helicopter.
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that the Marines “occupied” private land (the university is private), in the sense of an army occupying foreign territory.\textsuperscript{199} As an Okinawan police officer at the site stated, it is unimaginable that the Japanese government would have acted the way it did (that is to say, not act at all) had the incident taken place in Tokyo, for example at Yokota Air Base.\textsuperscript{200} The police officer would not have said that if he did not feel that Okinawans were being discriminated against. These may be the words of one police officer, but naturally Okinawans know of how the Marines treated the crash site as if it was US government property, with no regard for Japanese sovereignty of the land used by the campus. As explained in the theory section, with the memory of this relatively recent event in the minds of Okinawans, it is only natural that they feel discriminated against. The helicopter crash is just one of many events which have formed this consciousness which many Okinawans have.

\textit{Aviano Air Base, Italy}

Yara has conducted very interesting research into US forces in Italy, in particular a comparison between the 2004 incident in Okinawa and an incident in Italy, which this paper will examine below.

On 3 February 1998, a USMC fighter aircraft cut the rope of a ropeway at a ski resort in the Alps whilst conducting a low-altitude training flight, leading to the death of 20 people. The aircraft made it back to Aviano Air Base, 100km from the scene of the incident. Italian Military Police then seized the aircraft, which was full of military secrets, as evidence in the investigation into the accident, despite protests from the US military. Through their investigation, the Italian Military Police discovered that the pilot had deleted footage taken at the time of the accident. The US government then stated that it would fully cooperate with the investigation. Prosecutors took the pilot to court on the charges of murder and destruction of evidence. In accordance with the NATO SOFA, in the end the US tried the pilot by court-martial, dismissing the murder charge as the ski resort was not listed on the map given to the pilot, but giving him a dishonorable discharge for having destroyed evidence. One week after the incident, the Italian Minister of Defense forbade the US military from performing training flights in the area where the incident occurred, increased the lowest altitude at which US military aircraft can perform drills, amongst other measures.\textsuperscript{201}
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Two completely different responses by the USMC in Italy and in Japan

As can be seen from this comparison, the way that the Italian authorities responded to the incident and the way the US cooperated with them was completely different to what happened in Okinawa in 2004. There the Japanese police were banned from entering the scene of the accident, the USMC removed evidence from the scene without consulting local authorities, the USMC exercised police powers towards citizens on the campus and flights involving the same aircraft resumed nine days later. Then again, the US and Japanese governments deserve some credit for agreeing on the “Guidelines Regarding Off-Base US Military Aircraft Accidents in Japan” on 1 April 2005. The Guidelines provide the framework for greater involvement by local Japanese authorities in accidents such as the aforementioned accident of 2004, they detail which authorities will be informed when a US military aircraft has crashlanded outside of a US base etc.²⁰²

The Guidelines are a good start to improving how the US-Japan SOFA is used, which MOFA proudly lauds in its press release about the Guidelines.²⁰³ Japan is nowhere near Italy, however, when it comes to being able to assert its sovereignty towards the US military. Furthermore, the SOFA itself should be amended, as the SOFA has been at the core of several incidents involving US troops in Okinawa, such as the 1995 rape and the 2004 accident at Okinawa International University.

Japan’s Intentional Subordination towards its “Ally” the United States

Judging by how the Japanese government has constantly prioritised the interests of the US military over those of Okinawans, a bigger issue appears to exist. Namely, the issue appears to be that Japan does not want to assert its sovereignty, as opposed to it not being able to do so. This was made clear during Prime Minister Shinzō Abe’s meeting with President Barack Obama in the USA on 28 April 2015. PM Abe informed President Obama that Governor Onaga is against the FRF being built in Henoko. He quickly added, however, that Tokyo’s position that Henoko is the “only solution” has not in the least been affected by Onaga’s opposition.²⁰⁴ Tokyo, as one can see both in the foregoing and following paragraphs, essentially teams up with Washington in this standoff versus Okinawa. This is also clear in

Takae. The ODB should be an agency where Takae residents can have their opposition heard and acted upon. Instead, the ODB prioritises the US military and its interests. This is what we see both in Takae, but also in the 2004 helicopter crash. Therefore, it is not surprising that Okinawans feel that both the governments of Japan and the US are against them, and that this in turn influences how they view themselves in regard to these two governments.

The Henoko Plan, the Roadmap and Deception from Tokyo and Washington

As previously mentioned, Keiichi Inamine as the Governor of Okinawa accepted the FRF being built in Henoko, albeit with conditions which were unpalatable to Washington in particular. This can be seen in the fact that the Japanese government passed a resolution approving the plan, whilst the US government did not. Tokyo eventually scrapped the plan, though.

The main reason for this is the resistance movement against the FRF which played out during 2004 and 2005 in Ōura Bay, the bay surrounding Camp Schwab where the FRF will be built. In April 2004, the Naha Bureau of Defense Installations (Naha Bōei Shisetsu Kyoku, predecessor of the ODB) tried to perform boring surveys in the bay in preparation for construction of the FRF. This was also the time when the well-known Henoko sit-in camp was set up close to Camp Schwab; people from all walks of life and areas participate in this sit-in demonstration to this day. People, such as the environmentalist Etsuko Urashima, went out to sea in canoes and protested without using violence. The crash of the US military helicopter in August 2004 at Okinawa International University only encouraged people to show their opposition towards the construction of the FRF. In September 2005, the ODB abandoned its plans to conduct boring surveys and presented a new plan with the US government the following month.

Initially, the US and Japanese governments in October 2005 presented a new plan for the FRF, but this plan was scrapped for a new plan in May 2006, detailed in the “United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Operation (hereafter called “The Roadmap”)).” Instead of there being one runway there would be two, each being 1800 metres in length including overruns. The Roadmap makes clear that the FRF would require some of Ōura Bay to be reclaimed. The Nature Conservation Society of Japan has demonstrated that this reclamation would wipe out a large part of the sea grass feeding ground of the endangered Okinawa Arasaki, “Okinawa ga Chokumen Suru Genjitsu to Shōrai Tenbō,” 84.

206 Author’s translation.

dugong, potentially causing dugongs not to be sighted in Okinawa in the future. \(^{208}\)

Additionally, the Roadmap confirmed that approximately 8,000 Marines and approximately 9,000 of their dependents would be moved from Okinawa to Guam by 2014, and that Japan would pay for $6.09 billion of the $10.27 billion supposedly required for the construction of new facilities on Guam. The US would cover the rest, including $1 billion for “a road”. \(^{209}\)

As was revealed later in May 2011 by Wikileaks, however, the $1 billion for “a road” was not actually needed and the figures of 8,000 and 9,000 has been “deliberately maximized to optimize political value in Japan,” both governments knowing, for example, that 9,000 dependents did not live in Okinawa. The same Wikileaks cable also mentions how the Japanese government unilaterally ratified the “Guam International Agreement” in 2009, based on the Roadmap, as a treaty whilst the US did not, thereby binding future governments in Tokyo to abide by the Roadmap. The US Embassy in Tokyo openly states the significance of this, namely that this action “significantly reduces the risk that local politics in Okinawa or a change in government in Tokyo will result in the unraveling of the May 1, 2006 realignment package”. \(^{210}\) The Japanese government essentially wanted to prevent the democratic process from hindering progress being made on the Roadmap. What Tokyo and Washington had decided was final, and the opinions of Okinawans were irrelevant.

The Election of Nakaima

Another important event took place in 2006. In November 2006 Hirokazu Nakaima, backed by the LDP, defeated the staunchly anti-base Keiko Itokazu. Annmaria Shimabuku observes that Nakaima was successful as he remained vague on the issue of US bases and the FRF whilst making bold promises about revitalising the Okinawan economy. These are typically the two most important issues in Okinawan gubernatorial elections. \(^{211}\) Tsuyoshi Watanabe shows via his research that the Japan Defense Agency (JDA, currently the Ministry of


Defense) considered Nakaima to be “flexible” on the issue of the FRF, and that the JDA was desperate for Nakaima to be elected.\footnote{Tsuyoshi Watanabe, 《Ame to Muchi: no Közu : Futenma Isetsu no Uchimaku》 (Naha: Okinawa Taimusu-sha, 2008), 131-132.}

The main reason why Nakaima was not clear on his stance towards the FRF was certainly because he had been named the successor of Governor Inamine, who had stated that he was against the 2006 Henoko plan.\footnote{Ibid., 131.} Another reason, however, is where he got most of his backing from: the LDP, which would benefit from a “flexible” governor being elected. It is significant that Itokazu was not elected, as her passionate opposition towards the FRF would have created a huge rift between Tokyo and Naha. The true significance of Nakaima’s election and his time in power, however, became clear in 2010 and 2013, when he openly pledged to have the FRF moved outside of Okinawa Prefecture and then broke this promise.

Hatoyama, the Coup d’État by His Own Ministers, and the Election of Inamine

The Hatoyama cabinet was formed on 16 September 2009, ending the almost uninterrupted decades-long domination of Japanese politics by the conservative LDP. According to the news agency Kyōdō Tsūshin, support for the cabinet peaked at 72% on that day, with most of those supporting him saying that they had hopes for political reform.\footnote{“Hatoyama Naikaku Shijiritsu 72%  Koizumi, Hosokawa ni Tsuzu Kōsuijun,” 47 News, 17 September 2009, http://www.47news.jp/CN/200909/CN2009091701000597.html.} Some of his pledges were to make the US-Japan alliance more even by Japan being more autonomous in its foreign policy, to at least move the FRF outside of Okinawa Prefecture (namely, possibly even outside of Japan) and to create an “East Asian Community” (Higashi Ajia Kyōdōtai) to promote friendly relations between Japan and its neighbours.\footnote{John Dower and Gavan McCormack, Tenkanki no Nihon e: 《Pakkusu ・ Amerikāna/ ka 《Pakkusu ・ Ajia/ ka, trans. Tōru Aketagawa and Fusako Yoshinaga (Tokyo: NHK Shuppan, 2014), 142.}

Shin Chiba argues that Yukio Hatoyama had a very good opportunity to review the US-Japan security relationship, with Japan’s overly big focus on the US in its foreign policies, and to take the initiative in Asia towards gradually reducing troop numbers in all of East Asia.\footnote{Shin Chiba, “Posuto ・ Demokurashii no Jidai na no ka: Futenma Mondai, Seiji no Meisō, Jānarizumu no Rekka,” in Futenma Kichi Mondai kara Nani ga Miete Kita ka, ed. Ken’ichi Miyamoto, Osamu Nishitani and Seiji Endō (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010), 74-75.} Hatoyama was elected at a time when politicians in the US were once again questioning the role of Marines, which make up the largest proportion of US troops in Okinawa. As the Wall Street Journal reports, Barney Frank, a former Democrat who was a member of the House of Representatives for 32 years, openly stated that “15,000 Marines are
not needed”, and that “the Marines on Okinawa are a hangover from a war that ended 65 years ago”.217 Hatoyama certainly seemed to have been elected with great timing if he really wanted to revolutionise Japanese foreign policy, especially in terms of security issues.

There exists a saying that if something is too good to be true, then it probably is so. This could also be said for Hatoyama and his vision of redefining the US-Japan security relationship. Naturally Hatoyama and his supporters, which at the time appears to have included his ministers, were going to encounter resistance trying to change the relationship. When Secretary of Defense Robert Gates visited Japan in October 2009, he made it clear that the US was not willing to redefine the relationship, at least in the way Hatoyama wanted, stating that “the current (2006) plan is the one and only realisable plan”. Gerald Curtis is critical of the United States government sending Gates so soon after Hatoyama’s election, saying that it was “counterproductive” putting so much pressure on Hatoyama.218

The Interior Rebellion Begins

Arasaki points out that this is when two of Hatoyama’s key ministers, Minister of Foreign Affairs Katsuya Okada and Minister of Defense Toshimi Kitazawa, started to go against Hatoyama. They joined in calls by Washington’s “Japan Handlers” (bureaucrats in the State Department who provide advice on foreign affairs policies towards Japan) and the mainstream Japanese media that Hatoyama should stop “damaging the alliance”.219 In this way, Hatoyama was accused of damaging the US-Japan alliance by trying to adopt a foreign policy where Japan was not completely servile towards the US.

Documents released by Wikileaks show that high-ranking bureaucrats, including the Senior Vice Minister of Defense Akihisa Nagashima and MOFA Director General for Asia and Oceanic Affairs Akitaka Saiki making statements as if they were the PM of Japan. These include statements that the US-Japan relationship was central to Japan’s foreign policy and that Japan would not improve relations with its Asian neighbours at the expense of its relationship with the US. These comments were made in response to US concerns over Hatoyama stating during his visit to Beijing on 10 October that Japan placed too much emphasis on its relationship with the US over its Asian neighbours.220

This is just one example of how bureaucrats undermined the authority of the democratically elected Japanese PM, similar to the 47 Republican senators who sent an open letter to Iranian leaders about the US-Iran nuclear negotiations on 9 March 2015, effectively saying that a deal not approved by Congress could be scrapped by a Republican President. In the Japanese case, these bureaucrats were part of the DPJ, Hatoyama’s political party. It was subversive and immoral of these and other bureaucrats to act as dictators of Japan’s foreign policies behind the Prime Minister’s back. One can also wonder how they could have any pride as bureaucrats, employed to serve the Japanese government and hence the people of Japan, when they took actions which would suggest that they work to serve US interests.

This paper will briefly discuss Susumu Inamine’s election victory in Nago City in January 2010. Despite Nago residents having repeatedly made clear their opposition to the FRF, for thirteen years Nago had mayors who were of the conservative and base-accepting camp. Typically such candidates run on the platform of stimulating the local economy by receiving development funds from Tokyo in exchange for not obstructing the Henoko plan. One example of this is Yoshikazu Shimabukuro, who won the 2006 Nago mayoral election.

\textit{Inamine: A Turning Point in the US-Japan Security Relationship}

On 24 January 2010, anti-base Inamine defeated the incumbent Shimabukuro, obtaining 52% of the vote (77% turnout rate). Inamine during the election advocated that the FRF not be built in Henoko and that the way the city was run needed to be reformed, namely it should not be dependent on development funds from Tokyo. In an interview with Inamine after his victory in the election, Urashima asked him when he became so passionate about the anti-base cause. He told of how he was moved when he spoke with elderly people who participated in the sit-in demonstration which had continued for over 2000 days at that stage. He asked them why they had been protesting for so long, and they said they were doing so for their children and grandchildren. His philosophy was (and continues to be) simple: the task of city councillors is to determine whether a certain bill will benefit the people living in the electorate.

\begin{footnotesize}
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or not. 225 Inamine thus places great importance on what is actually good for the people of Nago City, and he is unwavering in his opposition towards the FRF. Tokyo and Washington encountered yet another hurdle in their plans to realign US forces in Japan with the election of Inamine.

The Collapse of the Hatoyama Administration

Inamine’s victory took place roughly halfway through Hatoyama’s term as Prime Minister. President Obama would not even meet Hatoyama to discuss the latter’s vision of a new relationship with the US. McCormack is right to criticise Obama for this, saying that even though Obama had been elected on the premise of bringing change to how politics works, he would not allow change to take place in Japan. 226

After another six months in office, the Hatoyama administration eventually fell apart. On 23 May 2010 Hatoyama visited Okinawa essentially to announce that he had not been able to keep his promise of moving the FRF at least outside of Okinawa Prefecture. He revealed a few days later on 27 May that it is possible to move US Marines from Okinawa to the mainland, but that it is not realistic (due to political reasons). 227

This is the Prime Minister who had given Okinawans hope that Tokyo would finally take their opinions regarding the FRF into consideration. As McCormack, Norimatsu and Wikileaks cables reveal, key figures of the government such as Seiji Maehara (the minister responsible for Okinawan affairs, amongst his many roles) informed the US in December 2009 that if no alternatives were found, the Henoko plan would be adopted. 228 Another cable reveals that Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary Yorihisa Matsuno informed the US Embassy in Tokyo on 26 January 2010 that Hatoyama would have to look for an alternative to Henoko “for form’s sake”. 229 Therefore, when Hatoyama went to Okinawa in May, he was announcing something he knew several months before that he was going to announce; he had
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deceived Okinawans and mainland Japanese alike. Hatoyama announced on 28 May that the Guam International Agreement would be reinstated, and resigned on 2 June.

Once again, Tokyo had ignored the will of the Okinawan people; on 31 May, opposition to the FRF being built in Henoko was over 84%. By the day before, 30 May, support for the Hatoyama administration had collapsed from its September 2009 high of 72% down to 19%. Voters expected change in Japan’s relationship with the US and did not get any. These two opinion polls reflect not only the disappointment of Okinawans but of the Japanese as a whole towards the poor performance of the Hatoyama administration. This also applies to Takae. For the first time since starting their movement, the protestors had a PM in power who was not completely pro-base. When Naoto Kan replaced Hatoyama, this was certainly a small setback for the protestors, as to this day (May 2015), each PM has been strongly in favour of prioritising US interests over Okinawan opinions. This is why Hatoyama’s time in power and the collapse of his government are relevant to the Takae movement.

What Would a War in Asia Achieve, and Do Real Threats Exist to Japan?
First of all, this thesis will consider the case of North Korea in regard to whether direct threats exist to Japan. North Korean leaders must be aware that there are roughly 47,000 US troops in Japan and around 28,500 in South Korea. Despite this, as Ikeo shows, North Korea performed missile tests in 2006 and 2009, and North Korea shelled the South Korean island of Yeonpyeong in 2010, killing two South Korean soldiers and injuring many others.

Furthermore, North Korea launched several missiles into the Sea of Japan 18-20 May 2013. The main point of US forces, it seems, is to deter North Korea from performing such acts. North Korea has on several occasions launched missiles, as well as performed nuclear tests. Obviously, the presence of US forces in the Asia-Pacific has not deterred North Korea from performing these tests. In any case, the North Korean leadership has no incentive in actually starting a war. This is because North Korea’s backward economy would be unable to support a sustained war effort, and because North Korea’s defeat would lead to the demise of the Kim
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Dynasty. Hence, it is natural to question the deterrent effect of US forces both in Japan and the Asia-Pacific in general.

In regard to China, one could make the argument that since China has not performed similar nuclear tests or invaded Japan that US forces act as a deterrent. China, however, has no real incentive to attack Japan. China is Japan’s second-largest export market, and Japan’s largest import market is China.\(^{235}\) As Ikeo points out, China is more focussed on integrating its economy into our current global system where economies are dependent on one another, as opposed to achieving its national objectives via its military.\(^{236}\) Long gone are the days when countries with great armies invade other countries to increase their territory and plunder resources. Even Christopher Coker, who believes that there is a real possibility that another great war could occur, says that the economic argument, namely that the economies of our world are too interconnected for war to occur, is “inconclusive”. That is to say, despite his pessimistic views towards the likelihood of another global war occurring, he acknowledges the economic argument is valid by not attempting to rule it out.\(^{237}\)

As this paper demonstrates, war between North Korea and Japan or China and Japan would not benefit any party. More specifically, the costs would infinitely outweigh any perceived benefits. Since there is no real incentive for any of these parties to go to war, one is once again justified in questioning the “deterrent” role of the US military in South Korea, Japan and Okinawa. As an extension of this, one would also be right in questioning why new helipads need to be constructed in Takae if war breaking out in the Asia-Pacific is so unlikely.

It Goes against Common Sense and Military Strategy to Station Marines in Okinawa

This paper will next consider whether US troops, especially Marines, need to be stationed in Okinawa. First of all, it is important to consider how many Marines there are in Okinawa. According to the US Department of Defense (DoD), at the end of 2014 there were 15,870 Marines in Japan.\(^{238}\) Considering there are roughly 2,600 Marines stationed at MCAS Iwakuni


in Yamaguchi Prefecture on the mainland, one can deduce that there are roughly 12,000 or 13,000 Marines in Okinawa.

Marines stationed in Okinawa are regularly deployed to different parts of the Asia-Pacific. Marines stationed in Okinawa regularly go to countries such as Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, South Korea, Cambodia and Malaysia to perform training exercises, as demonstrated by Yara and sporadic articles released by the USMC. Marines stationed in Okinawa cannot act as a deterrent if they are actually not there when a contingency takes place. There may be some who would then make the argument that Marines would be able to respond to such a contingency even when they are conducting these drills. If that is true, this just further proves that the “geographically superior position” of Okinawa is not that superior after all.

As Yara demonstrates, the USMC is unique in the sense that the functions of a group of Marines is determined by the size of the group. The three most important groups are Marine Expeditionary Forces (MEF), Marine Expeditionary Brigades (MEB) and Marine Expeditionary Units (MEU). Units belonging to the 3rd MEF are spread across Okinawa, MCAS Iwakuni and Hawaii. There is no MEB on Okinawa, but there is an MEU known as the 31st MEU. It is not clear how many troops belong to the 31st MEU as statistics vary, but the Council on Foreign Relations gives the figure of 2,200 for a typical MEU. The USMC itself describes a MEU as “being capable of conducting amphibious operations to respond to crisis [sic!], conduct limited contingency operations, introduce follow on forces, and support designated SOF (Special Operations Forces).” The 31st MEU can only conduct a limited contingency operation if it can get to the scene in time. As this paper will demonstrate, that is highly unlikely.

Where are the Ships which Transport Marines on Okinawa?
Surprisingly enough, the ships used to transport the 31st MEU are not located in Okinawa. They are located in Sasebo, Nagasaki Prefecture, on the mainland. This is because there is no
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harbour in Okinawa which can support large US warships, and this will not change unless the FRF is built in Henoko.\textsuperscript{246} To see how effective the 31\textsuperscript{st} MEU can be in the event of a contingency, it is important to consider the time it would take for ships designated to transport Marines to arrive in Okinawa.

The distance from Sasebo to Henoko is roughly 750km. Assuming that these ships will travel at 20 knots (roughly 37km/h), it will take around 20 hours of non-stop cruising to reach the FRF. The necessary supplies, soldiers, helicopters etc. must be loaded onto the ships, and the ships must then head back out to sea. If the 31\textsuperscript{st} MEU were to head towards the Senkaku Islands, a group of islands disputed by Japan, China and Taiwan, they would have to travel more than 13 hours by ship to cover the roughly 500km trip there.

Some may argue that the 24 Osprey aircraft on Okinawa, which will be discussed later in this thesis, could fly directly to the Senkaku Islands with 24 troops onboard each aircraft in the event of a contingency there. This is not possible, however, as the Osprey can only fly 722km with 24 troops onboard without refuelling; the aircraft would run out of fuel on the return journey. Besides, even if it were possible to send 24 troops on each of the 24 Ospreys stationed at MCAS Futenma\textsuperscript{247}, totalling a force of 576 troops, what these troops could do against an opposing army without backup is questionable. It would simply be suicide to send them in without support.

Therefore, on top of the fact Marines on Okinawa are not always there, what the Marines there can actually do in the case of a contingency is very limited, especially due to the fact that the ships which transport them are located hundreds of kilometres away.

\textit{The Benefits of Moving the USMC from Okinawa to Kyushu}

As Yara points out, from a military perspective, it would make much more sense to move US Marines from Okinawa to Kyushu on the mainland.\textsuperscript{248} There are several reasons for this:

- There is much more open space in Kyushu than in Okinawa. The USMC could either train together with the Ground Self Defense Forces (GSDF) at the roughly 50km\textsuperscript{2} Hijūdai Training Centre in Oita Prefecture, or have their own training centre in the middle of nowhere, essentially;

\textsuperscript{248} Yara, Gokai Darake no Okinawa, 24-25.
• This extra space in the countryside would allow the Marines to train with few restrictions due to few residents living in the area. The houses which tightly surround MCAS Futenma act as an impediment on how freely the USMC can operate there;
• Kyushu, including Oita, Saga, Nagasaki and Fukuoka Prefectures, are much closer to the Korean Peninsula than Okinawa;
• The fleet used to transport the USMC in the case of a contingency is located in nearby Sasebo (Nagasaki Prefecture);
• Removing at least a substantial part of the USMC from Okinawa would make it easier politically for the US to maintain key non-USMC installations in Okinawa, such as Kadena Air Base;
• Bringing the USMC to Kyushu would make it easier to coordinate with the Marines based at MCAS Iwakuni in relatively nearby Yamaguchi Prefecture.

These are merely a handful of reasons why it would make more sense to move US Marines from Okinawa to Kyushu from a military perspective.

This thesis has discussed the Marines in Okinawa because understanding how they operate is essential to having an informed discussion on base issues and social movements in Okinawa. Considering that Okinawan Marines could only respond in a very limited capability in a contingency in Okinawa’s environs, one is right in questioning why helipads need to be built in Takae. If it was the case that the JWTC and Takae were of extreme geographical significance and if war was imminent, perhaps one could somewhat understand Tokyo’s disregard of the opposition of the movement’s supporters. As this thesis demonstrates, however, at least for strategic reasons, US Marines do not need to be in Okinawa, let alone in Takae. They would actually benefit from not being in Okinawa. Logic fails to explain why helipads must be built in Takae and why the US military needs to be in Okinawa, at least in its current capacity.

“Okinawans are too lazy to grow gōya”
Kevin Maher is the former Consul General in Okinawa and former head of the Japan Department of the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs. It was revealed in March 2011 that during a presentation in December 2010 to students at American University about to head to Japan and Okinawa for two weeks, he made comments which were questionable, to say the least. These comments deserve mentioning because they provide an insight into how some
top-level US officials view Okinawans and the base problems there. The Ryūkyū Shinpō summary is based on notes taken by students present during the presentation, and the veracity of the contents has been confirmed.249

Maher puts the blame on Okinawans for MCAS Futenma being surrounded by residential buildings, saying that they “allowed urbanisation and population growth to surround United States facilities”. Here we see a complete disregard of the fact that the US military stole Okinawan land to build MCAS Futenma in the first place. What is also evident is Maher’s colonial-era attitude, namely that Okinawans should have allowed their land to be taken away, accepted that and moved their settlements away from US facilities. Regarding the Henoko plan, whilst saying that he was confident that Tokyo would implement the plan, Maher stated that “Tokyo needs to tell the Okinawan Governor, ‘if you want money, sign it [agree to the relocation plan].’” Not only does he appear to not care at all about whether Okinawans are for or against the Henoko plan, but he suggests that the Okinawan Governor (at the time, Nakaima) could be bought off. Naturally, both these points are insulting to Okinawans. He then went on to say that Okinawans are too lazy to grow gōya (bitter melon, an Okinawan specialty) and that they are the masters of extortion and manipulation of Tokyo to get money.

These are just a small selection of his derogatory comments towards Okinawans. Maher was sacked, but temporarily kept serving the US government in Japan following the aftermath of 11 March 2011 due to his expertise in Japan-related matters. The point of presenting Maher’s comments here is to show that at least some members within the US government have very discriminatory views towards Okinawans. If one looks down on another, naturally they are not going to pay much attention to what they think or feel. Namely, not only does Tokyo appear to disregard the opposition displayed by Okinawans towards US bases there on countless occasions, but some top US officials seem to do the same. As detailed in the section on theory, these comments and Okinawans’ anger towards them help explain why Okinawans have resisted the presence of the US military for so many decades. As will be shown in the analysis of an interview with Major Tim Kao, Commander of the JWTC, the USMC both lacks understanding of and has discriminatory views towards the protestors in Takae.
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Ospreys: Another Symbol of the Disregard of Okinawan Opposition

This paper will now look at the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted as part of preparations to build the FRF at Henoko, the deployment of MV-22 Ospreys to Okinawa and statements by important Japanese bureaucrats relating to these two events. The EIA was submitted to Okinawa Prefecture in the middle of the night on 28 December 2011. Apart from the strange time at which it was submitted, noteworthy is how this EIA has been slammed by the Nature Conservation Society of Japan as being so poor in scientific value as to not meet the requirements to be called an EIA. Furthermore, this is the first time that the Japanese government specified that Osprey aircraft would be deployed to Okinawa, despite years of denial.

Startling Comments by ODB and Ministry of Defense Officials

The head of the ODB at the time, Satoshi Tanaka, had an off-record meeting at a Japanese izakaya (kind of tavern) with a Ryūkyū Shinpō journalist on 28 November 2011. When asked why Defence Minister Yasuo Ichikawa would not specify that the EIA would be submitted before the end of the year, he responded with the astonishing statement “when you are about to rape someone, do you tell them ‘I’m going to rape you?’” Whether intentional or not, his statement reminds one of the 1995 rape case. Not only was this statement extremely insensitive towards Okinawans and women in general, but it suggested that the EIA contained something which Okinawans would react strongly towards, such as Ospreys being deployed there.

Adding insult to injury, Ichikawa himself stated in the Japanese Diet on 11 December 2011 that he “did not know in depth the precise details” of the 1995 rape case. Two days later he called it an ”orgy case” (shōjo rankō jiken), possibly implying that the 12-year-old girl may have willingly participated in the incident. As Hajime Takano points out, Ichikawa was ignorant of even the basic details of the rape case, which serves as the foundation of the whole push to have MCAS Futenma returned. Naturally Okinawans were disgusted by Ichikawa’s comments. Nakaima, for example, said that the comments were “an affront to the dignity of Okinawans”, and former Governor Ōta stated that “if you look down on Okinawans, you
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make those kinds of statements”. This is an example of how yet another couple of powerful bureaucrats involved in maintaining the US-Japan alliance were disdainful of Okinawans and their views. Furthermore, being aware of the discriminatory views which these bureaucrats have, it is only natural that Okinawans stand up to resist having the FRF imposed on their land. It is one way of showing that they will not accept being treated as second-class citizens.

24 Aircraft with “Huge Safety Holes” to Fly in Okinawa
On 13 June 2012, the Ministry of Defense (MoD) submitted to the relevant parties a translation of the “Environmental Review for Basing MV-22 Aircraft at MCAS Futenma and Operating in Japan” compiled by the USMC. The Ospreys were to be deployed to replace the ageing CH-46E helicopter fleet which had been in use since the 1980s. Not only does the report openly state where the 24 Ospreys will fly in Okinawa, but also that they will fly via six routes to mainland Japan and also in the skies over the mainland. What concerns many Okinawans is the poor safety record of the Osprey. There have been several crashes involving the Osprey, including two in 2012, the year they were deployed to Okinawa. It is not surprising, thus, that Okinawans were alarmed when they learned of these crashes, but also when the former chief analyst of the Osprey aircraft Arthur “Rex” Rivolo said that “there is a huge hole in the safety of the aircraft”.

In the weeks following the release of the Japanese translation of the USMC report, the Okinawan Prefectural Assembly and all of Okinawa’s 41 assemblies at village, town and city-level passed resolutions in opposition of the deployment of Ospreys to Okinawa.

9 September 2012 Rally
Okinawans had had enough. On 9 September 2012, 101,000 people gathered at the Ginowan Seaside Park to show their anger and opposition towards the Ospreys. For an island with a population of 1.4 million people, this is a very significant number. Their opposition can also
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be shown in a survey done by the *Ryūkyū Shinpō* 5-6 May 2012, where 90% of respondents in Okinawa said that they were opposed to the deployment of Ospreys.\(^{260}\)

The editorial of the *Ryūkyū Shinpō* the day after the rally on 9 September did not mince its words, saying that the US clearly applies a double standard to Okinawa and its people by ignoring this opposition. It highlighted that plans to commence practice flights for Ospreys in Hawaii had been scrapped due to an EIA and that flights had been postponed in New Mexico due to demands from local residents.\(^{261}\) If 90% of residents in a US state were opposed to the Osprey being deployed in their state, the USMC would most certainly hesitate to deploy them due to the public backlash. In the case of Okinawa, however, the USMC apparently did not give any consideration to the backlash in Okinawa. Once again, the voice of Okinawans fell on the deaf ears of bureaucrats in Tokyo and Washington. This treatment of Okinawans certainly constitutes a double standard, and Okinawans appear to be well aware of that.

This thesis has touched on the deployment of Ospreys to Okinawa for two reasons. Firstly, it galvanised the anti-base movement on Okinawa in a way not seen since 1995. Second, the deployment of Ospreys directly impacts residents living in Takae, as Ospreys have flown in the skies of Takae since being deployed. The author of this thesis witnessed Ospreys flying in the skies of the JWTC on more than one occasion. Third, as detailed above, the deployment of Ospreys is yet another episode where the Japanese government ignores public opinion in Okinawa. The Japanese government does not just ignore the concerns of residents of Takae and supporters of the Takae movement, but evidently also those of Okinawans in general.

**Nakaima’s Betrayal of the Okinawan People**

Nakaima, Governor of Okinawa at the time, initially expressed doubt towards the aforementioned EIA, mentioning in 2012 that it would be “impossible” to preserve the environment in Henoko’s Ōura Bay should the FRF be constructed there.\(^{262}\) For the FRF to be constructed, 160 hectares of Ōura Bay needs to be reclaimed, a process during which pristine coral will be destroyed.\(^{263}\) Okinawa Prefecture is the authority responsible for issuing
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reclamation permits. The Abe administration put pressure on him to give up his resistance, applying in March 2013 for a reclamation permit.

Nakaima went to Tokyo in December to discuss with the Abe administration policies relating to Okinawa. Nakaima returned to Okinawa after having secured slightly more money for Okinawa’s budget. Just a few days later, on 27 December, he approved the reclamation permit, saying that all measures that can be taken to protect the environment had been considered, and that it (the EIA) meets the required standards. The government had cleared a major hurdle in the construction of the FRF in Henoko with Nakaima’s flip-flop. The Ryūkyū Shimpo heavily criticised Nakaima’s claim that he “had not reneged on his campaign promise”, and on 10 January 2014 the Okinawan Prefectural Assembly passed a resolution calling for Nakaima’s resignation. This betrayal by Nakaima only added fuel to the resistance movement on the island to prevent the FRF from being imposed on Okinawans.

Four Very Important Elections in 2014 and Collective Self-Defence

The resistance movement in Okinawa received a further boost when the incumbent Susumu Inamine won the 2014 mayoral election in Nago City, where Henoko is located. Inamine received 19,839 votes to win by 4,155 votes over the LDP-backed Bunshin Suematsu on 19 January 2014. Inamine would go on in September 2014 to maintain a majority in the Nago City Council. Nago citizens effectively expressed on two occasions in 2014 via their votes that the majority of them are against the Henoko plan.

On 1 July 2014, Abe made one of the largest changes ever to postwar Japanese foreign policy. His cabinet did this by altering its interpretation of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, the “peace clause”, to allow for collective self-defence (CSD). As Maher states, Japan has not been able to interfere when, for example, US ships are attacked, or shoot down missiles heading to the US passing through Japanese airspace. This alteration of the government’s interpretation did not mean that Japan could suddenly exercise CSD if, say, a US ship were attacked and that attack posed a threat to Japan. As David Fouse points out, it
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merely provides a framework in which Abe can enact laws specifying when Japan can exercise CSD.\textsuperscript{270}

This event highlights Abe’s eagerness to try to make the alliance between Japan and the US more equal by facilitating interoperability of SDF and US forces. Via its reinterpretation of Article 9, the Abe administration has laid out the foundation for a great alteration to Japan’s postwar order. Despite this, Abe did not decide to ask the people what they thought about this via a referendum. The results of an Asahi poll conducted 3-4 days after the reinterpretation show that 50% of respondents said they were against it and 30% said they were for it.\textsuperscript{271} Considering this, Abe must have known that the only way to make this change would be through a reinterpretation via a cabinet resolution. Not bringing this question to the people shows that the Abe administration is more concerned with advancing its own agenda than the agenda which reflects the will of the Japanese people. Naturally, both Takae residents and Okinawans in general are included in the group “Japanese people”.

\textit{Two important elections in Naha and Tokyo}

This thesis will now discuss two other very important elections which took place in 2014: the Okinawa gubernatorial election and the snap Lower House election. The Mayor of Naha, Takeshi Onaga, ran on an anti-base platform against the incumbent Nakaima. On 16 November 2014, Onaga confidently defeated Nakaima by almost 100,000 votes to gain 360,820 votes\textsuperscript{272}, which Douglas Lummis describes as being an “unprecedented margin”.\textsuperscript{273} Naturally, Tokyo was less than pleased with the results of the election. Tokyo cut Okinawa’s budget by 4.6% after the election and Prime Minister Abe and Chief Cabinet Secretary Suga refused to meet him when he first came to Tokyo.\textsuperscript{274} Suga also stated after the election that since Tokyo had received the reclamation permit from Nakaima, it would go ahead with the Henoko plan. Essentially, he said that the results of the election were irrelevant.\textsuperscript{275}

Just two days after Onaga’s victory, Abe called for a snap election and moved to dissolve the Lower House. Abe’s main agenda is to remake the Japanese state, mainly by revising

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{274} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Japan’s peace constitution, but he can only do that effectively if he has public support. By 23 November 2014 public support for his cabinet had fallen to 45%, down from the high of 68.8% 19 months earlier.\footnote{Victory in this election would give him more time to enact legislation relating to CSD and constitutional revision. In the end, Abe’s LDP and its coalition partner New Kōmeitō secured 290 seats, more than two-thirds of the seats of the Lower House.}

Two facts can be seen from the election which demonstrate that few people actually support the Abe Government and its policies. First of all, 72% of voters voted for the LDP because they saw no attractive alternative.\footnote{Essentially, they did not necessarily support the LDP, but voted for it anyway, perhaps from a sense that there is nothing to do but vote for them. Second, only 52.66% of eligible voters cast their vote in this election, a number far below the previous postwar low of 59.32%.} Furthermore, in Okinawa’s four electoral districts, LDP-backed candidates failed to be elected.\footnote{What these facts demonstrate is the malfunctioning of democracy not only in Okinawa but also in Japan as a whole, and that even mainlanders are not necessarily supportive of Abe’s agenda. Voting for a party simply because there are not any other attractive alternatives can hardly be interpreted as a demonstration of democratic will.}

This thesis has analysed the aforementioned four elections and the issue of CSD for several reasons. First, they showcase that opposition towards the FRF being built in Henoko is showing no signs of weakening. Second, the fact that Tokyo is pushing ahead with construction of the FRF in Henoko despite the election of Inamine and Onaga is solid proof that Tokyo cares little about Okinawan sentiment. Third, as the governments of Japan and the US revealed on 27 April 2015, the US-Japan alliance is a “global” alliance, and they are pushing to increase interoperability between their military forces.\footnote{Considering this, it is not surprising that the ODB is so disinterested in what participants in the Takae movement feel about the construction of the helipads in Yanbaru. Several victorious elections in Okinawa in
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2014 for anti-base candidates, non-violent resistance in Takae etc. would certainly lead Tokyo to rethink its policies if it was interested in representing the people of Takae and Okinawa.

As this chapter has shown, the opinions of people in Takae, Henoko and Okinawa are of minimal value to the Japanese government. Being ignored by the central government, all that people in Takae and Henoko can do to get their message across is to protest peacefully. The Japanese and American governments ignoring Okinawan views for well over half a century has, in this way, had a large impact on the identity and consciousness of Okinawans, spurring them to show that they too are human beings who will not tolerate being ignored and insulted.
The Takae movement and the United States Marine Corps

This chapter will discuss the sit-in demonstration in Takae taking place since July 2007. First, it will touch on the court cases involving the ODB (by extension, the Japanese government) and the protestors, as well as other attempts by the ODB to make it difficult for them to protest. Second, it will attempt to give an insight into the mentality of some of the protestors and others who support them by analysing several interviews conducted during the author’s time in Takae. Third, it will analyse the contents of an interview with Major Tim Kao, Commanding Officer of the JWTC, an interview with another JWTC Marine and interactions with other Marines by the author. These interviews are undoubtedly of great interest to both academics and non-academics alike, providing valuable insight into the Takae movement, its characteristics and the huge disparity in how the protestors and Marines view the US military presence on Okinawa. The terms “protestors” and “participants” (in the Takae movement) will be used interchangeably to refer to those taking part in the Takae movement.

The Japanese Government Takes Protestors to Court

Both residents and non-residents of Takae have participated in a sit-in demonstration since July 2007. It was brought to their attention that whilst half of the JWTC would be returned, the helipads in the half which would be returned had to be replaced in the remaining half. These six new helipads would effectively encircle the hamlet, the closest one being only 400 metres away from the home of some of the residents (see 1.3 in Appendix). There are two main groups participating in this anti-base movement. Anti-Heli is a group made up of members from six or seven households in Takae. The other group is the Heripaddo Kensetsu ni Hantai Suru Genchi Ködō Renraku Kai (Takae Renraku Kai) (roughly translated, “Takae Liaison Association against the Construction of Helipads”, here shortened to “Anti-Heli Support Group”). This group was formed in June or July 2007 and has around 50 members, both from Okinawa and from the mainland. Accounts from both members of Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group as well as non-members will be included in this thesis.

In 2008, 15 people, including an 8-year-old girl who had barely been at the scene (charges later dropped against her) were prosecuted by the ODB for obstruction of traffic. Specifically, the ODB filed a provisional disposition: those who would be found guilty in this trial would move on to the “main trial”. The ODB had for more than a year not been able to perform much work at the front entrance of the site N-1, where two helipads are planned to be constructed, due to the protestors blocking access to the site. In a democracy, if there is strong opposition towards a project, especially in the form of a sit-in demonstration, authorities
would surely at least consider suspending the project. The ODB, however, disregarded this opposition, instead deciding to take them to court. It is obvious that the ODB aimed to intimidate the protestors, most of them farmers leading relatively simple lives.

In the end, Masatsugu Isa and Gentatsu Ashimine were the only two out of the fourteen taken to court to be found guilty by the Naha District Court. As a result, they proceeded to the “main trial”. The Fukuoka High Court parroted the Naha District Court, saying that "the aim of this trial should be considered as (the State) trying to secure authority/control over the land in question." The court openly dismisses the claim that the State brought the residents to trial in order to try to suppress or restrict the protest movement. As Tatsushi Yokota (one of the lawyers representing the residents) points out, when the State takes dissidents of state policy to court, ordinary people will not know what degree of protest is allowed by the law. Thus, ordinary citizens will be reluctant to make public their opposition by protesting. As a result, it should have been clear that the trial could have a suppressing effect on the movement in Takae.

It is either naive or disingenuous of the Court to argue that "the result of the trial will probably not have a suppressing effect on the movement since the protestors will still be able to protest in ways which do not amount to obstruction of traffic." The Court appears blind to the huge disparity in power between the two parties and how intimidating it could be for a resident to suddenly be prosecuted by the State. Regardless, the Court focussed far too much on the issue of property rights over the right to free speech and assembly, deciding that the State taking the residents to court did not amount to an abuse of state power. It dismissed charges towards Ashimine, but not towards Isa in June 2013 when it handed down its verdict.

Isa applied to have his case heard in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, curtly dismissed his appeal, stating that “claims regarding the unconstitutional nature (of the 2013 appeal) have been made, but these claims are based on the misunderstanding of facts, or they are statements which claim that a law has been broken.” In summary, via these series of trials, Isa was essentially ordered not to obstruct ODB workers from entering the construction sites of the helipads. He was not put in jail or given a suspended sentence, so one may perhaps question the actual significance of the series of trials.

The main significance of the trials lies in the fact that the ODB, instead of even trying to consult with the participants of the sit-in demonstration, decided to take them to court. The government, which is theoretically supposed to be of the people, by the people, for the people,
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used its power to try to discourage participants from exercising their democratic rights. To be fair, whether all of the actions of the participants constitute free speech or not is certainly debatable. Then again, the central government does not pay any attention to the opposition of these participants, even though the lives of Takae residents will be impacted by the construction of these helipads and the increased activity by the US military in the JWTC. Considering this, without resorting to violence, there are virtually no other means for the participants to express their opposition. In light of this, one can understand the strong yearning by the participants to have their voices heard.

_Tactics Employed by the ODB after June 2014_

By the end of July 2014, a few weeks after Isa had been informed that his case would not be taken up by the Supreme Court, two helipads had been built in the zone N-4 (refer to 1.3 in Appendix). The sit-in demonstration had severely delayed the construction of the helipads; it took seven years just to build two out of six. The ODB had intended to provide the six helipads to the US military once they had all been built. Supposedly due to the delay in construction, however, in August 2014 the ODB made it known that it was considering providing these two helipads in advance.\(^{282}\) Several months later, in January 2015, the US-Japan Joint Committee agreed that the two helipads would be handed over to the US in advance.\(^ {283}\) The Japanese government emphasises that it needs to advance the construction of the FRF at Henoko in order to reduce the base burden on Okinawans. One is right to question the sincerity of this argument, considering Tokyo effectively agreed to increase the base burden for the residents of Takae.

By this stage, the main tent of the sit-in demonstration had been moved four kilometres north from the site of the first two helipads, namely from the entrance to the two N-4 helipads to the front entrance of the site called N-1. This was to block the entrance to the site of the construction site of the next two helipads. The tent is located on the side of a road known as Route 70. The road essentially runs through the JWTC in the sense that the jungle which appears on either side of the road is part of the JWTC. As a result, Route 70 and its shoulders are deemed “joint-use areas” by Japan and the US military.

The ODB revealed in September 2014 that it had another strategy to deal with the protestors. By classifying the road shoulders as being areas which only the US military may


use, it would be illegal for the protestors to have tents there blocking the entrance to the construction sites. The ODB as of May 2015 has yet to make clear whether it actually intends to go through with this. If it does go through with it, it will severely limit the ability of the protestors to prevent the next two helipads from being constructed. The helipads will be built, regardless of what the protestors and residents feel, it seems.

**Interviews with Protestors**

Those who participate in the sit-in demonstration come from various regions and walks of life. In trying to understand this peace movement, it is important to consider the reasons for which participants are protesting. The author of this thesis had the opportunity to interview several participants from Okinawa during his stay in Takae. The views which participants have towards the USMC and the US, as well as the motives for protesting, are of particular interest. This thesis has given all interviewees pseudonyms except for Masatsugu Isa and Gentatsu Ashimine.

**Mr Satō**

Mr Satō has been participating in the movement since July 2012. He lives in Tomigusuku City, to the south of Naha. He makes the over 3-hour drive to Takae each week to be there five days a week. He is not the only pensioner to do this: Mr Suzuki, another pensioner from Shuri, in eastern Naha, drives frequently to Takae. Mr Satō was born on Kumejima, an island 90km northwest of Naha in 1947 and has lived in the Naha area since the age of three. When the author asked Mr Satō whether he was afraid of being arrested in the event that Okinawa Police were to go to Takae en masse, he said that he was not afraid. According to Mr Satō, he and the other participants would not clash with police in such an event because they do not want to be arrested. In his own words, “we do not want any trouble”.

Mr Satō emphasised how important it was for him that the flora and fauna of Yanbaru be protected. During his conversation with the author, he went outside of the tent where they were sitting and found a “Japanese warty newt” (*Echinotriton andersoni*, in Japanese: *Iboimori*). This is an endangered salamander which Okinawa Prefecture has designated as a prefectural treasure. He picked it up with his fingers, making sure not to hurt it, and brought it into the tent to show the author. In the tent there was a collection of pictures which appeared
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to have been compiled by the environmental non-government organisation (NGO) *Yanbaru no Shizen o Ayumu Kai* (roughly, “Yanbaru Environment Association”). Furthermore, Mr Satō sits in this tent for hours on end, sometimes alone, to make sure that no ODB workers try to enter the N-1 site from the rear. If he did not have an extremely strong affection for Yanbaru and a strong passion for protecting it, he surely would not be able to handle the solitude. It appears that it is Yanbaru which gives him the most inspiration to take part in this movement.

*Mr Suzuki*

Mr Suzuki, a pensioner from Nakijin, about an hour by car from Takae, was not afraid to make his views known when the author spoke with him. Constantly smiling, he candidly spoke about who he was, his reasons for participating and his beliefs. He has been participating for four years and goes to Takae at least twice a week.

His main reason for protesting is that he does not want there to be any military bases left on Okinawa when he passes away. This appears to be linked to three points: his aversion towards the US military, his strong yearning for peace and his love for nature. He is very critical of US foreign policy, saying that the US is a warring country and that it uses war as a means to expand its market. As has been mentioned in this paper, the US military actively used military bases in Okinawa during the Vietnam War. This was not a war which threatened Japan or Okinawa, but a war of aggression. Furthermore, as a part of the “war on terror”, it seems like the US military will be in the Middle East for many more years to come.

Mr Suzuki felt that Japan should not try to emulate US foreign policy where war is a big component, especially towards China. In his own words, Japan is in the same cultural sphere as China, so it should try to resolve issues with China via diplomatic means such as negotiation. Furthermore, in regard to Japanese foreign policy, he echoes the view of this thesis, namely that it is outdated. In line with this, he was also critical of how the SDF is trying to improve its ability to operate with the US military.

The author asked Mr Suzuki, as he had asked Mr Satō, whether he was afraid of being arrested for his participation in the movement. Mr Suzuki said that if he were to be arrested, he would simply go to court and argue his case. This is a significant statement, because it shows that the Japanese government prosecuting participants in the movement has not in the least deterred people from participating. It seems to have galvanised them to stick to their ideals and fight to protect their way of life and the flora and fauna of Yanbaru.
Mr Suzuki also mentioned that Okinawa should be independent. He felt that Okinawa has an abundance of resources (presumably in terms of its pristine beaches and forests) and that Okinawans do not need to oppose independence for economic reasons like the Scottish in 2014. He appears to have good reason to believe this, with research showing that revenue from Futenma alone being returned would reach 5.6 billion USD, 35.8 times the current amount of 158 million USD.  

Ms Kawasaki

On 11 February 2015, several people visited the small tent outside of N-4 set up by Anti-Heli to learn more about what is happening in Takae. The USMC had by that time set up a barricade outside of the entrance to N4 and were guarding it 24 hours a day, as they had commenced training exercises at N-4. On this day, a lieutenant and 1-2 young soldiers (presumably around corporal rank and around the age of 20) at a time guarded it. Later in the afternoon an Okinawan lady came with a couple of placards containing messages advocating for peace and the return of US bases to Okinawans. As she did not speak English, she used gestures to try to get her message across.

The author decided to be brave and offered to be an interpreter. Ms Kawasaki, a member of the Spirit of Jesus Church and holding a copy of the Bible, then attempted to get the author to explain one of the teachings of the Bible to the Lieutenant. This did not go very well as the author is not well versed in those teachings. The Marines appeared more willing to speak and appeared more relaxed as they interacted with the author and Ms Kawasaki. Ms Kawasaki was genuinely curious about the Marines, asking them what they were planning to do after their time in the USMC. A couple answered that they had jobs lined up, whilst the Lieutenant said that he wanted to advance his career in the military. Ms Kawasaki then responded: “Your lives are precious. I don’t want you to die. How about leaving the military and leading normal lives in Okinawa?” The statement “Your lives are precious” tells us two things about Ms Kawasaki and those who share her views: first, she does not appear to bear any hatred or ill-feeling towards US Marines as soldiers; second, she strongly yearns for peace as expressed in the famous Okinawan saying nuchi du takara (life is precious).

She spoke passionately to the author for at least 90 minutes about a variety of topics relating to base issues and the anti-base movement on Okinawa. For example, in regard to armies, she said that there is absolutely no need for any kind of military force in Okinawa, and
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even suggested that United Nations Forces are unnecessary. She shares similar views to Mr Suzuki on how Japan’s foreign policy should be, saying that Japan is in the same cultural sphere as its Asian neighbours. She goes slightly further, though, by saying Okinawa should essentially represent Article 9 of the Constitution and that it should incorporate nuchi du takara in the way it interacts with foreign nations. She elaborated on her views towards soldiers, stating the following: “militarism turns people into akuma (demons, ogres). Armies are akuma since they use violence and destroy things. We Okinawans do not hate soldiers as they are affected by militarism. There are good and bad people in armies.”

Some of the aforementioned views, including the view that war is a terrorist act which states engage in, may at first appear extreme to many people. Then again, Ms Kawasaki’s vision of Okinawa being an island where there are no military bases is revolutionary and provides a unique alternative to the current situation where many US bases occupy Okinawan land. Furthermore, this interview with Ms Kawasaki demonstrates yet again that most Okinawans do not dislike US Marines as individuals. They appreciate that most Marines in Okinawa are there because they have been stationed there and that they are not the ones who make decisions regarding US bases in Okinawa.

Mr Suzuki’s main reason for supporting Okinawan independence appears to be that Okinawa would survive economically without US bases. Ms Kawasaki, on the other hand, has two main reasons: The right wing in Japan is gaining more and more power, and because Okinawa, according to her, has been a joint US-Japan colony since 1945. What appears to form the core of her negative views towards the mainland is that Japan, in her words, has previously robbed Okinawans of their land. The author also asked Ms Kawasaki about her view of the Takae movement, as she is not a resident and does not appear to be a member of any of the two Anti-Heli groups. According to her analysis, people are protesting because they feel that their land, originally belonging to the Ryūkyū Kingdom, should be returned.

Mr Yamamoto

The author had several opportunities to speak at length with one of the two chief representatives of Anti-Heli Support Group, Mr Yamamoto. Mr Yamamoto was present almost every day at the morning meetings which were held at the main tent, located at N-1 Front, and Mr Yamamoto spent several hours a day on average in Takae. Being Okinawan, he was very knowledgeable about Okinawan history and thought and the US military.

Through his conversations with Mr Yamamoto, the author felt that the following were important reasons from Mr Yamamoto’s perspective to participate in the movement:
Protection of the environment;
US bases on Okinawa are the result of a war which ended 70 years ago;
The double standard applied by the US towards Okinawa and its people;
The personal experiences of Mr Yamamoto and his family during and after the US occupation of Okinawa from 1945 until 1972.

60% of Okinawa’s drinking water comes from the dams in Yanbaru, so Mr Yamamoto is justified in feeling concerned about potential environmental degradation or pollution from the activities of the US military there. In regard to the second point, US bases are definitely a result of the Pacific War, and they formed a part of the Cold War strategy of the US in East Asia. Considering that the Pacific War ended 70 years ago and the Cold War 26 years ago, it is natural that Okinawans question why the bases need to be in Okinawa. As already discussed in this thesis, the US clearly applies a different standard, for example, to the opposition of Okinawans towards Osprey aircraft than to the same opposition by mainland US citizens. It is natural that Okinawans be insulted by this double standard. Finally, Mr Yamamoto spoke of how his mother had been raped by a member of the US military during the US occupation.

Considering these points, especially the last one, it is surely not surprising that Mr Yamamoto told the author that he genuinely dislikes US Marines, even if he was the only one to openly say so. Even though the US Marines currently serving in Okinawa were not the ones who violated his mother, that painful emotional experience would without a doubt greatly influence his views towards Marines. Naturally, even if it may not have been rape, many other Okinawans have suffered emotional distress both during and after the US occupation. These painful experiences form part of their identity and influence their views towards the US military.

Masatsugu Isa
Masatsugu Isa is arguably one of the most well-known protestors in Anti-Heli. This is because he is the one who ended up losing his series of court battles with the Japanese government, but also because he was elected to the Higashi Village Council in September 2014 on his third attempt. Apart from working as a village politician representing the Japanese Communist Party (JCP), he has his own workshop where he does woodwork together with his son.

Isa spoke with the author about several topics, including the series of court battles and the movement in Takae. Firstly, in regard to the trial, Isa feels that the Japanese government
tried to contain the “problem” of the existence of the movement to Takae. In fact, as Isa points out, the trial had the opposite effect. It led to many people hearing about Takae, especially through the popular 2012 documentary *Hyōteki no Mura* (The Targeted Village). This documentary provides footage from the sites of the protests, giving those who have never heard of Takae the opportunity to see what has been happening there since 2007.

Second, for Isa, both Takae and Henoko are not simply issues which affect people living in those two areas. The facilities which the Japanese government builds for the US military, the police officers and Japan Coast Guard staff employed to counter the protestors at Henoko etc. are paid for with Japanese taxpayer money. Therefore, what happens in Henoko and Takae is an issue which should be of concern to Japanese taxpayers, that is to say, all Japanese, according to Isa. Japan continues to run large budget deficits (18 trillion yen or 24.8% of the budget in 2014 Financial Year) and finances large parts of its annual budgets with loans via issuing government bonds (41.3 trillion yen or 43% of the budget for the 2014 Financial Year). Considering this, Japanese taxpayers should ask themselves whether taxpayer money is being effectively utilised.

Third, Isa mentioned how important it is for the movement to stick to its non-violent principles, as well as for all participants to respect the views of others. In regard to the former, as Isa himself said, “if we resort to violence, it will be easy for the government to shut us down”. This is most certainly true. If any of the participants were to resort to violence, that would give the authorities the perfect excuse to detain them, and the mainstream media could brand the participants as violent left-wing troublemakers.

Finally, Isa also mentioned that there are two big issues regarding the movement: people simply do not know about Takae, and Takae is very far away from the mainland. Even within Okinawa, Takae is very isolated. The isolation of Takae is certainly an issue, but the fact that relatively few people know about Takae is without a doubt one reason why the mainstream media can get away with not reporting on it. If there were as many people participating in the movement at Takae as at Henoko, this would place much more pressure on the Japanese government to enter into talks with members of Anti-Heli. Spreading awareness of the movement is without a doubt one of the most pressing issues facing the movement.

Gentatsu Ashimine

Gentatsu Ashimine is one of the two people, together with Isa, who proceeded to the “main trial” after the provisional disposition. He is a very laidback man who is very simplistic in a good way.

After becoming rather famous from appearing in the documentary Hyōteki no Mura, Ashimine “fled” from Takae as he is rather shy. Ashimine, however, together with Isa spoke with the author in the guesthouse where the author was staying. Naturally Ashimine cares deeply about the environment and is concerned with how the flora and fauna will be impacted by the construction of six helipads in the JWTC. What clearly angers him, however, is the way the ODB together with the Japanese government has not consulted with residents in Takae regarding the construction of the six helipads. In his own words: “People are living here. Even if we ask them (the ODB) to listen to us, they completely ignore us. If they were to explain things to us, I might actually support it”. He went on to say later on in the conversation that he “does not understand all the complicated things (such as the SACO Final Report), but it is common sense that you explain something to someone (in this kind of situation).”

From his interaction with members of Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group, the author felt that the protestors feel both angry and a sense of despair or powerlessness. This is because despite the fact that their lives and the flora and fauna in Yanbaru will be impacted even more by the construction of the helipads, they have not been consulted about the construction or its impact. Essentially, for the ODB the views of the residents have no value.

It is not very relevant whether one is well aware of the contents of the SACO Final Report and the rationale stated in it for the construction of the helipads, namely that the helipads are being constructed to replace the ones in the half of the JWTC which is to be returned. This is because it is insulting to have one’s feelings or opinions ignored despite one being greatly affected by the construction of the helipads. Therefore, it is natural that even people such as Ashimine, who claim to not be well versed in “complicated things” such as inter-governmental agreements, fight to protect their right to a peaceful way of life.

The USMC and How It Views the Takae Movement

Simply put, the USMC in the JWTC views things very, very differently to members of Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group. The author came to realise this through his interaction with two prominent Marines working at the JWTC. The first is a member of staff, Mr Walker (pseudonym), who controls the airspace over the JWTC, and Major Tim Kao, the Commander
of the JWTC. This section will detail how the author received the rare opportunity to interact with these people, the contents of the interviews with them and the media frenzy which took place a few days after.

On 5 February 2015, the author was in a small tent set up by the protestors outside of N-4. Some of the protestors were at the boundary which indicated which grounds were for exclusive USMC use and which ones were not. Suddenly, a Marine appeared and said to the protestors in English “you guys aren’t causing any trouble are you?” Since the protestors do not speak English, they called the author over and asked him to talk with the Major. The author explained that he was researching the movement and spoke with Major Kao for about 20 minutes. He made statements suggesting that the protestors were being paid to protest and made statements regarding the JCP which the author did not fully understand. The author, as a result, asked the Major whether he would have anything against being interviewed, as it is important to hear both sides of the story, so to speak. The Major agreed to being interviewed the following day.

*Mr Walker*

The author went to the main entrance of the JWTC. He was informed by the security guards that he would have to wait an hour. Soon after, Mr Walker came out and spoke to him for roughly thirty minutes. He said that he felt bad that the author had to wait, but the question he wanted to ask was without a doubt a bigger factor which drove him to speak to the author.

In the words of Mr Walker: “Why are these people (Anti-Heli, Anti-Heli Support Group etc.) protesting?” This was very surprising to the author. When the author told him two reasons, such as the protection of Yanbaru and not being consulted at all about the construction of the helipads, Mr Walker did not say very much. He did state, however, that the USMC would lose a lot of land by returning roughly half of the JWTC. It is certainly true that the JWTC will be substantially smaller once the land to be returned is returned. What is significant here is the connotations of Mr Walker’s statement. It appears that the USMC feels that the JWTC is their property and that they are essentially giving a gift to the residents of Takae by returning half of the JWTC. If you feel that you are giving a gift to someone and they complain, it is natural to feel saddened. The JWTC, however, was created during the US occupation, so the US military essentially stole the land it uses in the JWTC from the residents of Takae and Okinawa. If Mr Walker is not aware of the history of the JWTC, one might say that it is natural that he does not understand the concerns of the protestors.
Mr Walker mentioned to the author that he found it hard to understand what the protesting by Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group achieved. He made the argument that it does not make sense for the protestors to block access to the helipads when they are protesting against the aircraft flying over the JWTC. In his own words, “it (their protesting) doesn’t achieve anything”. One can interpret this statement as meaning “the aircraft are going to fly the skies regardless of this protest movement and the feelings of opposition harboured by the protestors”. It would be erroneous to say that these protests do not achieve anything, since if no protests had taken place, all six helipads would surely have been built by now. Then again, as two helipads have been built despite their protests, it is also natural for the protestors to feel a sense of despair or powerlessness.

Mr Walker during the interview went as far as to call the protestors “peaceful insurgents”. If one does not understand why they are protesting, one might jump to such a conclusion. Mr Walker initially highlighted an unwillingness to negotiate with the protestors, saying “who wants to negotiate with them (peaceful insurgents)?” As the author explained several reasons why they are protesting and explained that the majority of them do not dislike Marines as people, Mr Walker conceded that the USMC is open to having discussions with the protestors. This is significant, because it indicates that there is a will on the part of Mr Walker to try to see things from the perspective of the protestors and to question his prejudices towards them and their movement.

Major Tim Kao

About 45 minutes after his conversation with Mr Walker, the author was greeted by Major Kao outside of the JWTC. The Major agreed to having the audio of the conversation recorded. Major Kao has served in the USMC for 19 years and has been posted four times to Okinawa and three times to the JWTC.

As the interview was sub-structured, the Major had the opportunity to change the topic after answering each question and give additional information on related topics which interested him. The interview provides a unique insight into the mentality of the USMC and greatly deepened the author’s understanding of the situation in Takae. This section of this chapter will present the five main questions as well as other questions asked by the author. The Major’s responses have in some cases been slightly paraphrased for the sake of brevity.

Question 1: Are Marines in Okinawa given a brief overview of the history of Okinawa and the bases there before they are posted there?
Major Kao: “They are sometimes given an overview before they arrive, but definitely after they arrive. They sit through two hours of so-called “Okinawan Cultural Awareness Training” (OCAT) and get an overview of what’s been happening in Okinawa the past 70 years. They do get to learn a bit about the US occupation, for example, but there is only so much you can learn in one or two hours.”

It would be interesting to see how much emphasis is put during OCAT on how Marines should interact with Okinawans and postwar Okinawan history. Naturally the Marines in the JWTC are not sent there to become experts in Okinawan Studies. Then again, you cannot learn a lot during a one-off lecture which only lasts one or two hours. Considering the fact that the US occupation was less than democratic and that opposition to US bases is a major feature of postwar Okinawa, one can understand if the USMC does not want their troops to know too much about Okinawa’s history. Being aware of the social movements against US bases would certainly lower morale and make Marines question why they and US bases should be in Okinawa. It is much easier for the USMC to control soldiers if they do not question the information which they feed them.

Question 2: 24 years since the collapse of the Soviet Union, what purpose do the bases in Okinawa serve? Do you feel that they are an essential element of Japan’s national security?

Major Kao: “Obviously Japan still feels the US-Japan security relationship is important beyond the Soviet threat. There are still plenty of adversaries out there in this region which would wish for harm to come to this country, which is why there is a US-Japan mutual security agreement. Should the need for one no longer exist, I would say then probably Japan would choose to terminate that agreement. Anyone who isn’t looking through the world through rose-tinted glasses recognises there are evil and threats out there that have certainly both openly and clandestinely targeted Japan. The issue of the Senkakus have not been very clandestine […] I would argue the clandestine piece is probably smaller terrorist groups whether it’s the recent ISIS events (in reference to Kenji Gotō who was beheaded by ISIS in early February 2015) or the other various terror groups in Japan.”

Major Kao appears to believe that the US has bases in Japan in order to protect Japan. It would be more accurate to say that the US has bases there as part of its global strategy and its containment policy towards China. Japan appears to support this policy as Japanese foreign policy towards China is backward and outdated, promoting tension over reconciliation.

The Major’s logic relating to terrorist groups is faulty. The US-Japan Security Treaty did not prevent Gotō from being beheaded. In fact, ISIS itself states that Japan’s involvement in
the US-led “war on terror” is one of the reasons why Gotō was beheaded. Major Kao also mentioned the 1995 Tokyo subway sarin attack where the cult group Aum Shinrikyō killed more than 10 people and injured over 1000 as an example of a threat to Japan. Firstly, the US military in Japan did not prevent the attack from happening. Second, the likelihood of a terrorist attack occurring in Japan is remarkably lower than in the 1970s when several attacks occurred. Besides, domestic terrorism is an issue which the SDF and its roughly 250,000 troops should be able to face together with Japanese Police. Finally, in the hypothetical case that a country wishes to attack Japan, it will most likely target US military bases in Japan. Since over 70% of US facilities are concentrated in Okinawa, Okinawa and its people would be put in danger precisely due to the presence of those facilities.

Question 3: Do you think that the Marines would intervene militarily if the Chinese were to seize the Senkaku Islands? The author pointed out that the US has stated that it adopts a neutral position towards the sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands.

Major Kao: “I think the US would honour the US-Japan mutual strategic alliance. Whatever the stipulations in that are, then yeah, I think that we’ll honour our agreement (italics added by author). There is one nation that has agreed to die for Japan besides Japan itself, namely the United States. It’s in writing. That’s something that can’t be lost. There are plenty of friends of Japan in the region but none that have an agreement like the US and Japan do.”

From this statement, one gets the impression that the Major is unaware of even the basic contents of Anpo, which the author found both surprising and concerning. The Major stated that there are friends of Japan in the Asia-Pacific who do not have a relationship like Japan and the US do. Whether this simply slipped the mind of Major Kao or not is unknown, but as is well known, South Korea hosts US bases. Finally, the US has agreed to contribute to the peace and security of Japan, but not to sending its soldiers to die for Japan. For any action on behalf of the US military to take place to protect Japan, congressional approval would be necessary. It would surely be difficult to convince Congress and the American public that it is in the interest of the US to send troops to die for Japan.

Question 4: Do you feel that US bases in Okinawa hinder or support the Okinawan economy?

Major Kao: “Statistics can be whatever you want them to be. Some studies might suggest that bases on Okinawa only account for 5% of Okinawa’s GDP. I think those figures are very

misleading. That figure can be altered however you want, however. For example, you could add to that figure the amount we spend on toll fees and commuting to and from work, the money relatives visiting members of the USMC in Okinawa spend during their time here etc. It would also be misleading to count these relatives as tourists. I would argue that there are many benefits from having the bases here, whether economic or not. In regard to what you could do with land once it has been returned, would you be able to generate more revenue? I don’t know. In some of these areas, what are you going to do, like here (Takae, Higashi Village)? They already got the nature centre up the road. How many nature centres are you going to build? Certainly around MCAS Futenma or Camp Kinser, sure. You know, location is everything in real estate. But in other parts, maybe not.”

What the Major says is true: statistics can be presented in many ways. Even the Okinawa Prefectural Government admits that it is difficult defining what counts as “base-related revenue”. The figure of around 5% presented by Okinawa Prefecture mainly includes the following:

- Income earned from rent paid by the Japanese government to land owners who lease their land which is then used by the US military;
- Incomes of Japanese workers who are employed by Japan and work on US bases;
- Services and assets provided to the US military (by Okinawans and the revenue, income, profit etc. generated from providing these activities, presumably). Listed as Beigun nado e no zai, sābisu no teikyō in the prefectural government’s publication Okinawa no Beigun Kichi.

Certainly one could factor in the money spent on petrol and toll fees by members of the US military commuting to and from work, as well as the money spent in Okinawa by relatives visiting US soldiers stationed there. The sum of money counted as base-related revenue was 209 billion yen (1.75 billion USD on 16 April 2015). Even if the aforementioned factors (toll fees etc.) were to be included, they would certainly have a minimal effect on the final percentage figure due to the size of the numbers in question.

Major Kao is right in questioning the economic value which could be generated if half of the JWTC were to be returned. Developing the area would mean that large parts of the forest would have to be cleared, and relatively few people live in Higashi Village and Kunigami Village, the other village which hosts parts of the JWTC. Economic development is not the reason why people in Takae want the JWTC to be returned. Then again, it is interesting how
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Major Kao admits that there is an economic incentive for Okinawans to have the land in MCAS Futenma and Camp Kinser returned. This means that he understands that US bases are indeed hindering the development of the Okinawan economy.

Question 5: *What is the best way to improve relations between the Marines and the residents of Takae?*

Major Kao: “Going back to pre-construction, pre-SACO, relations were very good. If you ask the Higashi Mayor [sic!] he won’t tell you that on the record due to the political fallout if he does. Marines used to play baseball, we used to do dragon boat racing (with people in Takae, presumably) […] there were a lot of good community relationship opportunities. There are about 150 people in Takae and about 70 in the JWTC. That should theoretically make it easy for us to interact with one another. It would be great if there was a vendor or something similar closer to the JWTC. We work with the Coffee Farm (Hiro’s Coffee Farm, a cafe-like place in Takae) and the store three miles down the road, but they’re tough to get to on foot. A barbershop would be fantastic (close to the JWTC) if we could do that, but it’s hard to establish those relationships when everything is negative. We used to have a couple of employees from Takae. There are always openings being posted. Of my 70, almost 15 are Japanese employees, which would equate to about 10% of the population of Takae if they were from there. You know, it would probably be huge for them if they were interested in doing that (working at the JWTC in some capacity). I don’t think they can do that without being hypocritical to whatever cause they think they’re representing, which is unfortunate.

It would be great (for us) if they wanted to work here. My barber only comes up once a week for three hours. The Marines would love more flexibility, some food options such as soba or ramen. There’s only one place for them to eat on base, the chow hall, which doesn’t have a lot of variety. They would be excited to have that opportunity as would I. But again, every time I’ve tried to engage with the Takae or Higashi personnel, “sounds great, but we can’t do it”, whether it’s the principal of the school, whether it’s the Mayor or the city [sic!] councilmen, there’s no interest due to the political fallout which would be associated. Like I said, we had our Open House in October (2014) and invited both Higashi Elementary and Junior High Schools and Takae Elementary and Junior High Schools to come, but the principals declined. Unfortunate for their kids because they missed out on a pretty good time. There were a lot of kids that had fun. I have a nine-year-old and a twelve-year-old myself, and they had the best time they’ve had so far on Okinawa. The biggest thing is probably the mystery behind the gate. Some of the protestors made it on base. They probably won’t admit
that they had a good time, but I have pictures of them smiling. Things like that in the future would be fantastic, exchanges and cultural interaction.”

Employment on the base would surely be a way for some of the residents to earn more money than they do farming. Then again, as the Major points out, it would be hypocritical of those within either Anti-Heli or Anti-Heli Support Group to work on the base. This is because they are making great personal sacrifices to participate in this movement in order to prevent the construction of the helipads. Takae residents, whether part of Anti-Heli or not, working at the JWTC would also create great division within the hamlet, as some residents would then be dependent on the JWTC for their livelihood. Then again, for those who do not want to or are not able to engage in farming, there are not many other ways of making a living apart from running a small store or café.

Two things become clear when analysing the Major’s statement “I don’t think they can do that without being hypocritical to whatever cause they think they’re representing…” First, the statement shows that the Major is unaware of why people are protesting. Second, the condescending attitude prevalent in this statement shows both the little value the Major attaches to their opposition to the construction of the helipads. One gets the impression that he looks down on the protestors and that they are radical leftists who are just there to make trouble.

This condescending attitude and an apparent lack of will on the part of the Major to really see things from the perspective of the protestors are definitely two factors which have led to the current sour state of relations between the two parties. Then again, there is definitely a lack of will on the part of members of Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group to try to understand how Marines view their movement and the construction issue. For example, members of these two groups regularly emphasised when talking with the author and others that the Marines in the JWTC are training to kill people. This is unfortunate, as Marines do not just learn how to kill people and blow up buildings, as the Major pointed out to the author. They learn teamwork skills and how to act in the event of a natural disaster. Coupled with cultural differences and the fact that Major Kao and the protestors do not have a common language in which they can communicate, it is only natural that relations between the two parties remain sour.

About the JCP (Part 1)

Major Kao: “The local city [sic!] councilman (Isa) is a JCP member; that’s no secret. They (the JCP) have never been pro-democracy, pro-freedom or pro-liberty. Naturally I would
suspect he’s an anti-base guy. He has a good following, and they (the JCP) were able to form a coalition and successfully unseated the former governor. That’s politics, that’s democracy in action. It’s odd that it’s the Communist Party that is able to do that, because that is NOT (emphasis in audio) what they represent.”

The author appreciates Major Kao’s honesty. Then again, here one sees yet again the ignorance of Major Kao towards the protestors and why they are protesting. He does not appear to know anything about Isa apart from the fact that he is a JCP village politician. It does not seem like he is aware of the fact that Isa was taken to court by the Japanese government and that he is mostly protesting because he wants to protect his way of life.

In this statement one also sees the lack of awareness that the Major has towards the JCP. He appears to believe that the JCP is no different to that of the former Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Reading about the JCP’s party platform, one sees that the JCP is nothing like the CPSU. The JCP is very critical of the CPSU and denounces how the CPSU used “socialism” as an excuse to oppress people and rob them of their democratic rights.292 Whereas the Soviet Union invested great sums of money into maintaining a huge military force, the JCP is clearly anti-war. The only similarity between the two is the fact that the two parties have “Communist Party” in their names. The Major would benefit from doing some research into the JCP or even from talking to one of its members, such as Isa. He would then realise that his views of the JCP being anti-democracy, anti-liberty and anti-freedom are misinformed.

Views on the Takae Movement

Major Kao: “There certainly is a huge gap in communication between the Marines and the residents of Takae. Toko-san (supposedly a supporter of Anti-Heli who speaks English) and I have spoken several times about this (the helipad issue). But every time I talk with her it’s like she has no idea about the fact that so much land is going to be returned […] And she sometimes asks “Why are you off-base?” when I’m not off-base, she’s on my base. They don’t even know where the boundaries are. So it’s hard for them to understand why we are so frustrated. They are sitting on base boundaries blocking our access. I mean, really, if we parked in front of their driveway, they would be OK with it? No. Would they let me sit in their driveway for eight years unobstructed? No. You know, we have been very patient and tolerant. I don’t think they see it that way.

They say “you don’t live here”, but we do. We don’t live here as long as you (the Takae residents) do, but we’re here for years at a time […] You (the Takae residents) are talking to the wrong audience here. We Marines are not going to make change from the bottom up. This is a top-down decision from the highest levels of the US and Japanese governments. They’ve decided that this security agreement is in the best interest of both countries. At our level, sure you can always start a grassroots campaign, but it’s going to take someone at the highest level of government to make the decision. I think they are trying to lobby that level of government, but again, doing it here does nothing, except create all sorts of problems for me who can really do nothing for them.”

Since the author has not met Toko-san (“san” being a Japanese suffix added to names), he cannot verify what the Major said about her. If Toko-san truly is unaware of the basic contents of the SACO Final Report, it would be in her interest to read it. The same applies to members of Anti-Heli. This is because it is important to try to understand why the helipads are being constructed.

The author appreciates that the Major is frustrated with the protestors. He cannot do that much to prevent them from protesting. He does not have any legal basis to prevent them from protesting in areas which are designated as joint US-Japan use (such as the shoulders of Route 70), and the Okinawan media would erupt in anger should a Marine lay a finger on a protestors. Then again, the manner in which he likens the entrances to the JWTC which the protestors are blocking as his “driveways” is surprising. This suggests that Major Kao feels that the JWTC and the land which the JWTC occupies are the property of the USMC. Whilst Major Kao recognises that the USMC in the JWTC does not have the same “stature” as residents living in Takae, he still argues that Yanbaru is the home of the Marines in the JWTC. This is a fair argument, as some Marines surely spend tens of hours a week at the JWTC. The land used in the JWTC, however, was originally taken by the USMC without the consent of the Okinawan people and originally belonged to them. Through his interaction with protestors, the author got the impression that for them, the land in the JWTC belongs to Okinawans, so it is natural that the land should be returned to its rightful owners with no conditions attached.

The Major’s comments about the power structure of the USMC are very interesting. Decisions cannot be made from the bottom up in the USMC, and this highlights the somewhat futile nature of the protests. Ultimately, decisions regarding operations at the JWTC are made far, far away from Takae by people who surely have never been there and who prioritise the interests of the US and Japan over those of the Takae residents. Furthermore, the residents are in a significantly less powerful position than organisations such as the USMC and the
Japanese government. The USMC, for example, has exclusive access to the facilities that it uses, and the Japanese government has infinitely much more money and power than the residents. The residents appear aware that there is only so much that they can do to prevent the helipads from being built.

It must be incredibly disheartening deep down to both have one’s opinion and opposition ignored by the USMC and the Japanese government, but also to be powerless to prevent undesirable change from taking place in Yanbaru. Then again, considering they have been protesting since July 2007, it seems like being ignored by the Japanese government fuels the determination of the protestors to make their voices heard. There is certainly a very strong spirit of resistance in those Okinawans who are anti-base. This spirit of resistance, as will be touched on again in the Conclusion, has partly been formed due to the will of Okinawans being ignored and treated as insignificant. Even if it is true that major changes at the JWTC cannot be made from the bottom up, the protestors will surely continue protesting, as they feel they have a duty to protect Yanbaru and the way of life of the residents of Takae.

Concessions that the USMC Can Make and about the JCP (Part 2)

Author: When I spoke with Mr Walker, he suggested that there are concessions that the Marines can make, and that there are ways to arrive at a solution which benefits everybody.

Major Kao: “(sigh) I think the Marines have made a lot of concessions over the years. Agreeing to move Marines off the island (assumingly in reference to the 2009 Guam International Agreement), agreeing to give back a lot of land, agreeing not to conduct conditioning hikes on the roads which we used to do. They (the protestors) block our gates so I have to dismount my Marines so they can walk on the base, and then of course it gets painted (by the Okinawan media, presumably) “oh, you’re doing a conditioning hike.” There are a lot of concessions. Can we make more? Maybe, but that’s not me (who decides that). That would be my boss’ boss’ boss. What can we do at the local level? Certainly we can open up dialogue, but are they (perhaps Higashi officials) going to get all the protestors to move their vehicles? Probably not, especially since some of them (the protestors) are paid.”

Author: So, they are paid by the Communist Party did you say?

Major Kao: “I don’t know if it’s the Communist Party, but from what I understand, there are elements in Tokyo that will help fund them. So whether it’s a fundraising group or a non-profit or a political party that’s subsidising a lot of these “watchstanders and/or troublemakers” or whatever “sit-in protestors” you want to call them…”
It appears that Anti-Heli does receive some donations from those who want to go to Takae and support them directly but who cannot make the long journey there. There are also those who deliver fruit and other food to the participants. It is very disingenuous of the Major to suggest, however, that there are protestors who are being paid in order to protest. As one participant told the author, “people are not protesting because they want to or because they think it is fun.” The time people spend monitoring entrances to the construction sites of the helipads is time which participants are not spending with their families. That is time where they are unable to work and earn an income. That is time where, especially at night or at one of the smaller tents, they sit alone, sometimes for hours on end in the cold, in order to make their opposition known towards the construction and to protect Yanbaru. Going even further and calling them “troublemakers” shows both the lack of understanding and compassion which the Major has towards the participants and their cause.

*Conditions for and the Difficulty of Having Discussions with Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group*

Author: *Would you be interested in setting up an event where you and the protestors can bounce ideas of each other on how to improve the situation?*

Major Kao: “We’ve tried to engage via the Mayor [sic!] of Higashi and town hall (meetings) as he holds regular town halls. I’ll say “I’ll be happy to go to the town hall and be happy to talk there” and he’s like “don’t come to the town hall. I don’t want you to come to the town hall and you don’t want to come to the town hall” type thing. Certainly, if we can have civil dialogue, that’s one thing. At least our immediate experience with the protestors has not been civil. They’re banging on our vehicles, they’re kicking the vehicles, they’re trying to lie in front of the tyres, you know, just silly stuff. We need to have an adult conversation […] Am I opposed to it? No. Am I open to it? Under conditions. I just can’t have the childish behaviour […] Then I would need to talk to someone that can actually make a decision, because the problem is it’s such a disjointed and fragmented group; you’re not necessarily always talking to people who are passionate about the cause. They’re there because they’re paid to be there.

The problem is, we have engaged before, but the Marine Corps is such a transient population. My predecessor may have talked to them. His predecessor may have talked to them. I’ve talked to them. But in three months (May 2015) I’ll be leaving and you’ll be starting over with a new guy. It’s hard to maintain that level of continuity.”
Major Kao is right in saying that the group is fragmented. The only main guidelines which Anti-Heli tries to get participants to follow are the following:

- Nobody is to use violence when protesting. We don’t want to hurt anybody, neither physically nor verbally;
- We are protesting on our own accord. Nobody will be forced to anything they do not want to do;
- Always have a sense of humour and love.

During the author’s time in Takae, the protestors did not resort to violence by banging on cars or anything similar, nobody was forced to do anything and they made sure to keep their spirits up. As far as he could observe, no protestors used profanity when making their opposition known to Marines. Even if that is the case, Isa mentioned to the author that it would be wrong to set up other rules and force other participants to follow them, as they are not part of Anti-Heli. Each protestors has their own reason for protesting, and Isa said that it is important to respect that. Furthermore, as an example of the fragmentation of the group, there are no general rules regarding how each participant should interact specifically with Marines. Some stated that they had no intention of speaking with Marines, whilst the wife of Isa gave the Marines guarding the entrance to N-4 coffee and cake on more than one occasion.

It is important for all participants to realise, however, that each individual Marine is there because they have been ordered to train at the JWTC. Furthermore, individual Marines are not the cause for the JWTC still being open; that has been decided by Tokyo and Washington. Finally, being antagonistic towards Marines who know little of the movement will only give the Marines the impression that the participants are unreasonable and just want to cause trouble. One young Marine approached the author one day outside of N-4 and asked him, just like Mr Walker, why the participants were protesting. It is important that each participant remember the aforementioned three principles, even if the sense of powerlessness many of them surely feel may be extremely frustrating. It is also important that they remember the lack of understanding the USMC has towards their movement at all levels.

*The Interview which Made Headlines*

The Ryūkyū Shinpō published a large article on the front page of the 13 February 2015 edition of its newspaper. It claims that Major Kao said that the protestors are receiving money from the JCP. In fact, at least during the aforementioned recorded interview, he does not specifically state that it is the JCP which is “funding” the protestors. As this misinformation
has been cited in other works, it is important to explain what happened leading up to the publication of this article.

As previously mentioned, Major Kao suddenly appeared close to the entrance to N-4 and spoke to the protestors in English on 5 February 2015. The protestors asked the author to come speak to him as they do not speak English. Even during this conversation, the Major clearly said that the protestors were being paid to be there. Since the author was not recording the conversation at that moment, the author does not remember whether the Major specifically said that they are being “funded” by the JCP. This is one of the main reasons why the author asked if he could interview the Major the following day. The author interviewed him the following day, recorded the interview with the consent of the Major, summarised the interview in Japanese and reported the contents to Anti-Heli and Anti-Heli Support Group the following morning. The author did this because it is important that they have the opportunity to see how the USMC views the helipad construction issue and their movement. It clearly states in the author’s Japanese notes that the Major does not specify that it is the JCP which supposedly “funds” the protestors, and this was made clear to the people present at the meeting. On a side note, the author was a little disappointed that the only reaction or comment he received after providing this summary was “yes, we must try to reduce the misunderstandings (between us and the USMC)” by Isa.

Mr Shima (pseudonym) is a reporter at the Ryūkyū Shimpō who was at the time responsible for reporting on issues in the Takae area. The participants appear to regularly contact Mr Shima and the Ryūkyū Shimpō whenever events take place in the JWTC, such as when Marines come to survey the participants. Around 10 February, Mr Shima came to the tent outside of N-4 and spoke with the author. It appears that he heard from Mr Takahashi (pseudonym), a member of Anti-Heli who does not speak English and who was present on the 5th, that Major Kao had made comments about the participants receiving money from the JCP. As the author had not listened to the recording for a few days, he may have by accident confirmed that the Major did say that they are being paid by the JCP. The author provided his notes in Japanese, where it clearly says that the Major did not specify the JCP as the source of funding (but did somewhat suggest it), and the recording of the interview. Despite this, it appears that Mr Shima neither listened to the recording nor had a look at the author’s notes.

Journalists have tight deadlines, and Mr Shima may have wanted to get the “scoop” out as fast as possible. The author, as well as Mr Takahashi, do bear some responsibility for the misinformation which was reported. Mr Shima bears a lot of the responsibility, however, as
he had both the audio recording and the author’s notes in Japanese to use as sources for the article.

**Reaction by the Okinawan Media**

The day the article was published, both *Okinawa Taimusu* and *Ryūkyū Asahi Hōsō* (an Okinawan broadcasting station) contacted the author, and the author provided his Japanese notes and the recording. This was to ensure that the Major’s statements would not be incorrectly reported on, the same reason for which the author had given the notes and recording to *Ryūkyū Shinpō*. Thankfully, both *Okinawa Taimusu* and *Ryūkyū Asahi Hōsō* correctly reported the Major’s statements about the protestors being paid.

The reaction by the Okinawan media towards Major Kao’s statements was one of strong criticism. The contents of the interview featured in an *Okinawa Taimusu* editorial alongside comments made in January 2015 by Deputy Public Affairs Officer for the Marine Corps Installations Pacific Captain Caleb Eames. The Captain had stated that people at Henoko were essentially faking their injuries. The editorial points out that the Major is mistaken in believing that the protestors are being “funded” by the JCP and in believing that the JCP is not pro-democracy. It is critical of both Captain Eames and Major Kao, saying that they criticise the movements at Henoko and Takae based on their “prejudiced” and “misinformed” views, and that these statements carry with them “extremely serious issues.”

Unfortunately the 14 February editorial of the *Ryūkyū Shinpō* reported the statement in the same way as the article on the 13th. What is more significant, however, is the anger which permeates the editorial article. Not only Captain Eames’ statement but that of Major Kao really hit a nerve, so to speak. The editorial article is extremely critical of their statements, but also the US military’s so-called “good neighbour” policy. It says that the US military acts like a “good neighbour” to those who support it being in Okinawa, but openly displays contempt towards those who dare question its presence. The article goes as far as to say that the US military should withdraw from Okinawa.

**Dealing with the Fallout of the Publication**

Major Kao contacted the author soon after the news broke about his statements. He accused the author of lying to the *Ryūkyū Shinpō*. The Major claimed that he did not say that the

---

protestors were being funded by the JCP and told the author to listen to the recording. As previously mentioned, whilst the Major does suggest that the JCP could be giving them money, he does not explicitly say so. The author apologised for the Ryūkyū Shinpō having incorrectly reported his statement on this issue. The author suggested that the Major or another person in the US military contact the Ryūkyū Shinpō to have the article corrected. The author contacted Mr Shima himself and even asked Mr Hattori (pseudonym), former CEO of Ryūkyū Shinpō, who visited Takae on 15 February 2015, if he could contact the newspaper. Despite these efforts on the part of the author, the newspaper has been reluctant to correct the misinformation contained in the original article.

It was important that the author provided his notes and the audio recording to the Okinawan media, even though he did not go out of his way to give Ryūkyū Shinpō the aforementioned material by contacting the newspaper himself. Firstly, the Major agreed to the interview being recorded. Second, since this thesis will be accessible to researchers, the author considered the information contained in the recording as belonging to the public domain. Third, the Okinawan people had the right to be provided an insight into how the Major views the helipad construction issue and the Takae movement. Fourth, the author did not want the Major to be misquoted, which is why he provided the information when requested.

The Major did the author, as well as the Okinawan people, a large favour by being honest. Even if many Okinawans were surely angered by his views, it is important to acknowledge that the Major was brave in being honest about his views. It will be interesting to see how the Major’s successor deals with the Takae movement and which views he or she develops towards it. The author hopes that the Major’s successor will continue to attempt to improve relations with Anti-Heli and their supporters.
Conclusion

After having examined postwar Okinawan history and the Takae movement, it is important to revisit the research questions of this thesis, which are:

- What are some of the motives of the Takae residents and their supporters protesting?
- What are the features of the Takae movement?
- How does the United States Marine Corps (USMC) view the Takae movement and the role of US bases in Okinawa?
- What factors relating to history, culture and identity help explain the long-lasting Okinawan resistance towards US bases?

Whilst these four questions have been answered in the main body, this thesis will attempt to provide brief conclusions to these four questions.

What Are Some of the Motives of the Takae Residents and Their Supporters Protesting?

From the interviews above, one can see that participants in the Takae movement mentioned the following reasons for participating in the movement:

- Flora and fauna – 3
- Not wanting bases in Okinawa/critical of US and Japanese foreign policy/aversion towards war – 3
- Okinawa should be independent – 2
- Double standard applied to Okinawa/residents etc. not being part of the consultation process – 2
- Personal experiences by family members during the US Occupation – 1
- Okinawans having been robbed of their land – 1

The two frequently most mentioned reasons are protecting Yanbaru and opposition to US bases. Then again, it is important to note two things. Firstly, the interviewees on other occasions during the author’s stay mentioned some of these motives and others but may not have mentioned them during the interview. Second, participants not touched on in this thesis also mentioned some of the motives listed above. Through interactions with many people during his time in Takae, the author got the impression that protection of Yanbaru was the strongest reason for most participants to protest. Another reason shared by most participants is opposition specifically to the JWTC, opposition to helipad construction and opposition to Ospreys flying in Takae. Particularly for those living in Takae, many Anti-Heli members stated that they wanted to protect their way of life. Since many participants are both from Okinawa and are pensioners, the personal experiences of the participants and their families before, during and after the US occupation are without a doubt a strong common reason.
Features of the Takae Movement

Various reasons for participating
As can be seen, whilst there are some reasons to protest which are shared by the majority of participants, each participant has their own reason(s) for participating. Whilst the main common reasons include preventing the construction of the helipads and protecting Yanbaru, the other reasons are rather diverse. It is definitely possible that some protestors have motives which are unknown to the author. This is one feature of the Takae movement.

Lack of Consensus
This first feature is linked to the second feature of the movement which the author observed. The second feature is that there is a lack of consensus amongst the protestors, for example regarding how to interact with Marines. Some protestors in the morning refused to greet Marines guarding the entrance to N-4, some gave them tea and cake and a couple once or twice yelled phrases such as “go home Marines”. Major Kao’s statement that the movement is fragmented is somewhat true for this reason. Isa himself, however, says that he does not want to impose a kind of Code of Conduct on all participants beyond the guidelines listed at the main tent. He says that it is important to respect the reasons which individual protestors have to protest.

This is one of the issues facing Anti-Heli. They could try to establish themselves as the vanguard of the group and make all other participants follow their orders. Another option would be for them to continue allowing the movement exist as it does today. Namely, they could continue giving participants a substantial degree of autonomy in deciding where and when to protest and how to behave, so to speak. Since the movement is not a political movement, it probably is not in Anti-Heli’s interest to try to create a top-down decision-making system. Whilst such a system might create more cohesion in the movement and make it more efficient, it might deter some people from participating as the movement would lose its reputation of being open to anybody. Then again, having no control over the actions of people associated with the movement could allow impassioned participants to bring disrepute to the movement. Anti-Heli and the movement as a whole would benefit most from a kind of amalgamation of the two options, but achieving this fine balance is certainly an issue for them.

Complicated Feelings towards Marines
The impression that the author got during his time in Takae is that many protestors have a generally negative image towards Marines. This is understandable; if they approved of the
Marines training at the JWTC, they would not be protesting. The protestors, however, appeared uninterested in trying to question their prejudices towards the USMC. For example, on many occasions, both prominent and less prominent members of the movement deplored the training which JWTC Marines conduct as being “training to kill people”. Certainly, the training which Marines do without a doubt involves how to kill people, both pre-emptively and in self-defence. It is cynical, however, to think that such training is all that Marines do. As Major Kao pointed out in the interview with the author, Marines conduct training to learn skills which can both be used in combat and in disaster relief operations.

On the other hand, most of the protestors appeared to feel sorry for Marines at the JWTC. This is particularly the case for the Marines who guarded the barricade set up outside of N-4. Most of them appeared to be 19-22 years old, some appearing to be African American, some Hispanic. Many protestors deplored how it was so sad that people so young were training to one day head to the battlefield to kill people. They also touched on how many of those of minority background were probably in the Marines because they had no other way to afford college fees or because serving in the military would make it easier to get their Green Card.

There is a recruitment centre for the US Army in Monticello, New York. When the author was there in 2012, his uncle who lived there told him that recruitment centres were generally found in poor communities, Monticello being one such community. Whilst many protestors do not necessarily like Marines as they symbolise what they are protesting against, they feel sad that these young people are serving in the USMC. This feeling surely reinforces the anti-war sentiments felt by many of the participants.

The only effective way to gain a greater understanding of US Marines and to question one’s prejudices is to talk with Marines. In the case of the author, speaking with Major Kao was a very enlightening experience. Unfortunately, there exist two walls between the US Marines in the JWTC and the protestors: one of language, and one of culture. None of the protestors the author spoke with speak English, and Okinawan culture is different to American culture. These are some of the major reasons why animosity will surely continue to exist between the protestors and Marines moving forward.

**Other Features of the Movement**

Some other features which also serve as issues for the Takae movement include the following:

- First of all, the movement is rather small. During the author’s time in Takae, on some days there were only two to three people outside of the entrance to N-4, two to five people at the main tent and one
person at N-1 Reverse. This is mainly because those who are not pensioners or who do work on farms need to attend to their fields during the day to make a living;

- Second, it is difficult getting to Takae. Takae is 3-3.5 hours by car from Naha, so even for Okinawans it is not in an area which is easily accessible. People living in Naha need to dedicate their whole day to travelling to and from Takae if they are not going to stay overnight at a resident’s house or in Nago City;

- Third, as of March 2015 there is nowhere in Takae for participants to stay. The guesthouse which the author stayed at appears to have been rented by residents in Takae, but was purchased from its landlord in late 2014. Members of Anti-Heli have found another guesthouse, but it is roughly 30 minutes by car from Takae. This is a big blow to the movement, as it prevents those who do not live in Takae from going to and from the various sit-in demonstration sites;

- Fourth, relatively few people know about Takae. The movement is never reported on in the mainland media, and three years have passed since the documentary *Hyōteki no Mura* was released.

These are constraining factors which are preventing the Takae movement from gaining more momentum and attention than it currently has.

**Views of the USMC towards the Takae Movement and the Role of US Bases in Okinawa**

In this section, this thesis will comprehensively analyse the statements Mr Walker and Major Tim Kao made during their interviews with the author. Due to their respective positions of importance (instructor/person in charge of JWTC airspace and the Commander of the JWTC), their views can be said to representative of the USMC in the JWTC towards the Takae movement.

**Mr Walker**

Mr Walker did not appear know why participants in the Takae movement were protesting until he spoke with the author. For him it was strange that they were protesting, because they will have half of the JWTC returned upon the completion of the construction of the six helipads. Going so far as to call them “peaceful insurgents”, he was critical of the way in which they were protesting, showing little compassion or understanding of why they were protesting. This is serious, because there is no way that relations between the USMC and participants can improve if people such as Mr Walker do not know why the participants are protesting.

What was very interesting, however, was the fact that Mr Walker said that Marines want to get to know the protestors better. He mentioned that he wanted to go talk with them, but he was afraid of being framed as a sympathiser of their movement, which would certainly
negatively affect his career in the US military. Whilst there is a will on the part of Mr Walker and other Marines at the JWTC to improve relations with the protestors, their lack of knowledge of their concerns or movement prevents them from communicating with them. What further impedes this are the same language and cultural barriers discussed above.

**Major Tim Kao**

This thesis will present four conclusions about the Major and his views towards the Takae movement and US bases on Okinawa.

In regard to US bases, Major Tim Kao believes that they are in Okinawa because there are countries which are threats to Japan. He also believes that US bases bring economic benefits which are much larger than Okinawan statistics suggest, as well as other benefits. What is surprising, however, is the Major’s apparent lack of knowledge of the content of Anpo, as detailed in the interview with him. Therefore, whilst Major Kao feels that US bases benefit Okinawa and will protect Okinawa and Japan in the event of a contingency, he does not know the legal rationale which would allow US bases to defend Japan.

Major Kao is critical of the movement. He questions what the participants would gain from having half of the JWTC returned in terms of economic benefits. He also highlights the futility of the protestors attempting to bring about change in the JWTC by protesting outside of it, saying that change will not come from the bottom up in the USMC. Therefore, he appears to believe that people are partly protesting so that they can have the land returned for their economic benefit, which is not the case. Also, he appears to feel that the protestors are simply causing trouble for him when he is unable to do anything to help them. As a result, it would be wrong to say that the Major views the movement and its members with complete animosity, as he shows a small degree of sympathy towards them.

Through statements made in the interview with the author, it is clear that Major Kao has very little knowledge of the movement and its key members. For example, saying that Isa is “probably an anti-base guy” strongly suggests that Major Kao is unaware that Isa was prosecuted by the Japanese government. As he does not seem to know much at all about the protestors and why they are protesting, he appears to view them as troublemakers who are protesting for no particular cause. By suggesting on several occasions that some of the protestors are being paid to protest, one can see both how Major Kao looks down on the protestors and that he has strong prejudices towards them.

As mentioned in the paragraph preceding the paragraph above, it would be wrong to say that Major Kao completely hates the protestors. He appears to be very frustrated with the
deadlocked situation in Takae between the protestors and the JWTC Marines. For example, he mentions in the interview that he has tried several times to reach out to political and education officials in Higashi Village to promote cultural exchange, but apparently to no avail. If what Major Kao is saying is true, Higashi politicians and education officials have prevented him from promoting interaction between people of Higashi (including Takae) and the USMC. If so, Higashi politicians are also to blame for the current deadlocked situation between the USMC and the Takae protestors.

Whilst Major Kao appears to want to improve relations with the protestors, there are several issues. Firstly, he does not appear to speak Japanese well, which hinders his ability to communicate effectively with the protestors. Second, his lack of knowledge of the movement prevents him from questioning his prejudices towards it and its members. Third, suggestions to improve relations would surely be met with suspicion by most members of the Takae movement. Therefore, it is not surprising that Major Kao has not been able to improve relations between the USMC and members of the Takae movement.

The Impact of History, Culture and Identity on the Long-lasting Okinawan Resistance towards US Bases

Just as the identity and (perhaps to a lesser extent) culture of a state is impacted by historical events, so are the identity and culture of groups of people affected by history. As Linus Hagström and Karl Gustafsson point out, identities are created by a kind of “emotional allegiance” that give a group of people a sense of belonging. Due to page limitations, this thesis has limited its historical analysis to the Battle of Okinawa and beyond. Just analysing this part of history, however, one sees events which shocked, traumatised and humiliated Okinawans and even claimed countless Okinawan lives. A sense of anger towards these events and the fact that US bases are still concentrated on Okinawa is clearly shared by many Okinawans. This feeling of having to stand up to Tokyo and Washington using non-violent means has been forged by this anger, which in turn has constructed a central part of the identity of Okinawans.

Even if the Battle of Okinawa occurred 70 years ago, the memory of the battle which claimed 130,000 Okinawan civilian lives for a war Japan was fighting lives fresh in the memory of Okinawans. Even if many present-day Okinawans did not experience the battle directly, many Okinawans who are alive today experienced the US Occupation of Okinawa,

which was a result of the Battle of Okinawa. People had their land forcibly taken away from them, many of whom had already lost many family members and had been through years of hardship during the Pacific War.

US bases in Okinawa, including the proposed FRF to be built in Henoko, serve as constant reminders of how war has scarred Okinawa and its people and impacted their lives for decades. These bases also serve as symbols of the indifference of Tokyo towards Okinawan sentiment. This constant exposure to bases on the island is a significant reason why the anti-base movement on Okinawa has been able to maintain significant momentum for years at a time, as seen in the case of Iejima, Henoko and Takae. When someone is constantly exposed to an emotion, that emotion naturally becomes deeply ingrained in their identity. This anger is an “emotional allegiance” which unites Okinawans.

Even though US bases are supposed to be in Okinawa to protect Okinawa and Japan, members of the US military were the cause for a 12-year-old girl being kidnapped and gang-raped in 1995. This was incredibly humiliating for Okinawans and highlighted that the US military actually poses a danger to Okinawans. Instead of returning MCAS Futenma without replacing it, the US and Japanese governments tried to soothe angry Okinawans by suggesting that MCAS Futenma essentially be moved to Henoko. Since then, both Tokyo and Washington have kept trying to push the Henoko project ahead, despite constant opposition by an overwhelming majority of Okinawans.

In the case of Takae, the residents of Takae have been left out of the consultation process regarding the construction of helipads in the JWTC. This is despite their lives being noticeably impacted by this construction and the use of Ospreys which have followed the completion of two of the helipads. Their many letters such as to the US Consulate in Naha and the USMC appear to have yielded little, and their meetings with the ODB have mainly involved the ODB head constantly repeating prepared statements. The only way for the residents and their supporters to show their opposition is to do as Okinawans have done throughout most of the postwar period: protest without using violence.

Anti-Heli members and their supporters must at times feel a sense of despair when their opposition and pleas for dialogue go ignored. Each time the head of the ODB insincerely answers their questions or each time their letters go ignored, however, they are without a doubt reminded of one of the reasons why they are protesting: to have their voices heard and to not be treated as second-class citizens.
As seen in the discussion above, history, as well as its influence on the identity of Okinawans, greatly help explain why Okinawans have managed to resist US bases using non-violent means for decades.

**Non-strategic Reasons for Alleviating the Base Burden on Okinawans**

Some may mistakenly believe that Okinawa’s “geopolitical significance” is the reason why US bases must be there, and that the issue of national security should not be decided by a prefecture. Certainly, the latter argument has some validity. Apart from Okinawa not being in a geopolitically significant place, however, moving at least some US bases from Okinawa to the mainland or abroad is in part an issue of morality and respect. Surely in no other self-proclaimed democratic country would a central government be able to ignore the sentiments of the majority of people in a particular region for decades. Both Japanese politicians and citizens can only accept the fact that so many bases are on Okinawa if they look down on Okinawans. It is morally wrong that Okinawans are virtually unable to have any say in issues regarding US bases on their island, especially since US bases are not there for strategic reasons. Moving at least some bases would both acknowledge that Okinawans are first-class citizens and that they have born a huge burden of US bases for decades against their will.

Beyond the issues of morality and respect is the issue of viability. As the eruption of anger in Okinawa in 1995 showed, the US-Japan security alliance is in fact rather unstable, as it is so dependent on bases being located on Okinawa and on Okinawan sentiment being ignored. Moving the bases away from Okinawa would make it much easier politically for the US to maintain some kind of military presence on Okinawa, including key facilities such as Kadena Air Base. It does not make sense politically to take the great risk of another explosion of anger amongst Okinawans by continuing to force so many bases upon them. Anger towards the Henoko plan, for example, has built up over the past decade. Just one spark is needed to ignite a demonstration of anger on an epic scale. If this spark were to eventuate, the US may not be able to host any bases at all. On top of the FRF at Henoko taking an additional number of years to be built (if it does get built), the risk of maintaining so many bases against the will of Okinawans is another reason why it would be in the interest of the US military to substantially reduce its footprint on Okinawa.

**Thoughts on the Future of Okinawan Anti-Base Movements**

Since nobody can tell what will happen in the future, it is not possible for this thesis to say with certainty whether the Takae protestors will be able to prevent all six helipads from being
built. In addition to the issues facing the movement discussed in this conclusion, one needs to consider that fatigue will surely set in on most participants sooner or later. As much as protesting peacefully may be an integral part of the Okinawan identity, there are limits (financial, psychological, physical and legal) to how and how long they can protest.

Yonaguni Island
On the island of Yonaguni, Japan’s westernmost island and just over 100km from Taiwan, a referendum took place on 22 February 2015 on the construction of an SDF base for 150 soldiers. 632 residents voted for the construction, whilst 445 voted against. Gavan McCormack attributes this result to two factors: fatigue from several years of struggle within the island community, and despair from Tokyo stating that it would push ahead with construction regardless of the outcome of the referendum.296

Yonaguni and Henoko Going Forward
The Japanese government appears to have succeeded in overcoming most hurdles regarding base construction on Yonaguni. Resistance in Henoko and across the main island of Okinawa towards the Henoko project is still rather strong. Governor Onaga has actively conveyed his staunch opposition to the Henoko project in private meetings with Chief Cabinet Secretary Suga, Prime Minister Abe and Defense Minister Gen Nakatani. Onaga is also planning to go to Washington on 27 May 2015 to convey the same message. Since the protests at Henoko and Onaga’s opposition have even featured on the national news, resistance will surely continue at Henoko for a lengthy period of time.

Takae Going Forward
Resistance will also continue in Takae, but the aforementioned issues make it seem unlikely that the protestors will prevent all six helipads from being constructed. Put simply, there is only so much that they can do. They can cause delays in the construction, but since their aim is not to use violence to prevent construction, they can surely not prevent the helipads from being built. Furthermore, the pro-base Village Head of Higashi, Seikyū Iju, was re-elected on 26 April 2015.297 Simply put, the odds are stacked against the Takae protestors. With that said, an incident involving a protestors being manhandled or injured at one of the protest sites, or

another unpredictable event, may bring a lot of attention to Takae in the way that the documentary *Hyōteki no Mura* did in 2012.

**Importance of Continued Research**

More research is needed on the Takae movement to see how it develops moving forward, but also to compare and contrast it with the struggles at Henoko and Yonaguni. These three places may be on the periphery in terms of Japan’s borders, but they are at the centre of developments taking place within the US-Japan security relationship. They deserve much more attention both in Japan and elsewhere because they symbolise the dysfunction of democracy in Japan.

Equally important is the need for more research into how the USMC and even other branches of the US military view these movements. The overwhelming majority of literature on anti-base movements in Okinawa only focusses on what Okinawans feel and think. This is most likely either due to a lack of English proficiency, an inability to see the importance of both sides of a story, a lack of interest in seeing both sides of a story, or all of these.

When one reads article after article, book after book on Okinawan anti-base movements which are merely focussed on the Okinawan perspective, one can sympathise with Okinawans and feel angry. This is natural, considering what Okinawans have been through both before and after the Pacific War. If one’s objective is to learn more about the truth of the Takae, Henoko or Yonaguni movements, however, one needs to detach oneself from these emotions. Emotions hinder people from being objective. Any research conducted on anti-base movements in Okinawa must consider both sides of the story, as that is the only way research free from pre-drawn conclusions will be born. Doing so is neither anti-Okinawan nor pro-American. The more balanced research there is available on Okinawan anti-base movements and the US military in Okinawa, the better.
Summary
This thesis has analysed the social movement taking place in Takae, Okinawa, Japan, against the construction of six new helipads to be used by the United States Marine Corps (USMC). In February 2015 the author of this thesis went to Okinawa for fieldwork which spanned nineteen days, sixteen of which were spent in Takae. He observed the movement and its defining characteristics, interviewed participants in the movement both from Takae and elsewhere, and interviewed members of the USMC, including Major Tim Kao, Commander of the Jungle Warfare Training Centre (JWTC). This thesis not only highlights the features of an Okinawan anti-base movement which has hitherto received scant attention, but also gives an insight into how USMC officials view this movement and base issues on Okinawa in general.

The first chapter of this thesis gives an introduction to Takae and Okinawa and presents the method and theoretical framework, namely a modified version of constructivism, used to research this movement. The second chapter gives an overview of Okinawan history mainly from a sociological perspective and an overview of the development of the US-Japan security relationship, both from 1945 until 1991. The third chapter builds on the foregoing chapter by analysing the realignment of US forces in Okinawa since the end of the Cold War, and various events which are key to understanding Okinawa in the context of the US-Japan security relationship. The fourth chapter goes into more detail about Takae, the movement there, the series of trials involving Takae residents and the Japanese government, and interviews with participants in the Takae movement and members of the USMC. The conclusion chapter provides answers to the following research questions:

- What are some of the motives of the Takae residents and their supporters protesting?
- What are the features of the Takae movement?
- How does the United States Marine Corps (USMC) view the Takae movement and the role of US bases in Okinawa?
- What factors relating to history, culture and identity help explain the long-lasting Okinawan resistance towards US bases?

These conclusions include the following: The participants in the Takae movement share some common motives for protesting, including protecting the flora and fauna in Takae; the movement is somewhat fragmented and some of its members have been prosecuted by Tokyo; the USMC does not understand why people are protesting and has a very different view towards base issues in Okinawa than the protestors; Okinawans partly protest because Tokyo ignores their opposition to US bases, but also because events such as the 27-year US occupation of Okinawa have made resistance a key characteristic of the Okinawan identity.
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Appendix
1.1 Okinawa in Asia

Source: University of Texas Libraries. Okinawa is located in the Ryūkyū Island chain between south-western Japan and Taiwan, between the East China Sea and the Pacific Ocean.
1.2 Map of Northern Okinawa

Source: Google Maps (modifications made by author).

The dark grey area represents all of the Jungle Warfare Training Centre (JWTC). Takaе is located on the side of the JWTC.
1.3 Location of Helipads around Takae

The main hamlet of Takae is located east-south-east of Landing Zone 17 (LZ 17).

The red triangles represent helipads planned for construction (LZ 17 and LZ 17B have been built). The yellow triangles represent helipads which already exist. The US and Japanese governments have different names for several helipads: LZ 17 (US) = N-4.1 (JP), LZ 17B (US) = N-4.2 (JP), LZ N1-A (US) = N1.2 (JP), LZ N1-B (US) = N1.3 (JP), LZ G (US) = G-chiku (JP - Section G) and LZ H (US) = H-chiku (JP - Section H).