



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

8-2004

Hugh Borton: His Role in American-Japanese Relations.

Hitomi Kinuhata

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Cultural History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kinuhata, Hitomi, "Hugh Borton: His Role in American-Japanese Relations." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 911.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/911>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Hugh Borton:
His Role in American-Japanese Relations

A thesis
presented to
the faculty of the Department of History
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in History

by
Hitomi Kinuhata
August 2004

Dr. Ronnie M. Day, Chair
Dr. Emmett M. Essin III
Dr. Henry J. Antkiewicz

Keywords: East Asian Institute, Japanese Studies, United States Department
of State, Quaker, World War II

ABSTRACT

Hugh Borton: His Role in American-Japanese Relations

by

Hitomi Kinuhata

This study proposes to examine Hugh Borton's role in American-Japanese relations. Three aspects will be explored: his work as a Quaker missionary, as an American government official, and as a leader in the development of Japanese and Asian studies.

In addition to Borton's *Memoirs*, the study is based on his papers at American Friends Service Committee Archives National Office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Columbia University Oral History Collection in Butler Library in New York, Haverford College Quaker and Special Collection in Magill Library in Haverford, Pennsylvania, and the United States Department of State Records at the National Archives in College Park, Maryland. A good number of secondary sources both in English and Japanese were also used to supplement the archival sources.

This study concludes that Borton's missionary experience was decisive in shaping his career, the policies he advocated for postwar Japan, and the influence he had on Asian studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Ronnie Day, my thesis chair, who provided suggestions and insight into the thesis. Thanks also go to Dr. Emmett Essin and Dr. Henry Antkiewicz, the other committee members. Another professor who helped me a lot is Dr. Fumiko Fujita at Tsuda College in Japan, an authority on American-Japanese relations, who led me to the topic of my thesis. Credit goes to my family and friends both in the United States and Japan who provided great encouragement and support. Finally, I would like to thank the History Department at East Tennessee State University for providing me an assistantship and for making me feel at home in the department.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
2. THE QUAKER MISSIONARY.....	11
Quakerism in Japan.....	12
Hugh Borton and his Activities in Japan from 1928 to 1931.....	13
3. THE GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL.....	29
Hugh Borton’s Entrance into the United States Department of State.....	30
Hugh Borton and the Postwar Programs Committee.....	34
Hugh Borton and the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee.....	38
4. THE JAPANESE SCHOLAR.....	44
History and Development of Japanese studies in the United States.....	44
Hugh Borton and his Presidency of Association for Asian Studies.....	50
Hugh Borton and his Involvement in the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange.....	54
5. CONCLUSION.....	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	63
VITA.....	67

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Before the outbreak of World War II, there were few experts on Japan in the United States. According to one survey in 1933 conducted by Yasaka Takagi who was a professor at Tokyo Imperial University, there were only thirteen American scholars who understood Japanese well enough to carry out Japanese studies at universities.¹ One of these individuals was Hugh Borton whose knowledge about Japan was used not only for the academic world but also for the American government policy-making decisions about postwar Japan. As a missionary, professor, writer, and American government official, he contributed to building good relationships between the United States and Japan as well as to introducing both countries to both peoples.

The publication history of Borton's memoirs, which is one of the major sources for this thesis, is a legacy of the relationship he helped to create. Although Borton wrote the manuscripts in English, the memoirs, with a forward by Makoto Iokibe and arranged by Borton's wife, Elizabeth Wilbur Borton, and son, Anthony Borton, through The English Agency (Japan) Ltd., were first translated and published in Tokyo, Japan as *Sengo Nihon no Sekkeisha: Borton Kaisoroku*, (Spanning Japan's modern century: the memoirs of Hugh Borton).² It was not until 2002 that the memoirs in English came out with a forward by James W. Morley, Professor of Government and Political Science and Director of the East Asian Institute at Columbia University.

Iokibe, a professor in the Graduate School of Law at Kobe University, visited

the United States in the fall, 1977 in order to collect materials about the American occupation policy of Japan. When he visited the United States National Archives for his research, he found a number of materials that included the initial of “HB” which stood for “Hugh Borton”. This was the first time that Iokibe knew about the existence of Borton, and he was amazed by his opinions and proposed policies because of his good understanding of Japanese culture.³

In 1977, three years after his first visit to the United States, Iokibe got a scholarship from the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) to study American occupation policy of Japan at Harvard University. There, he met Edwin Reischauer who was a specialist on Japan and knew Borton well. Reischauer introduced Iokibe to Borton, and Iokibe succeeded in interviewing Borton in middle November 1977 for three days. While Iokibe was at Borton’s home in Conway, Massachusetts, Borton told him that he had been thinking about writing his memoirs and hoped for Iokibe’s assistance. This was the beginning of Borton’s memoirs. During his stay at Harvard, Iokibe sometimes visited with Borton to read and to comment on the work in progress.⁴

In March 1991, when Iokibe visited Harvard again, he contacted Borton whose wife confessed that her husband was suffering from Alzheimer’s disease. Iokibe became worried about the memoirs and urged Borton to publish them in Japan soon after. This was the last time that Iokibe saw Borton. One year after Borton died in 1995, Morley contacted Iokibe to consult about the publication of Borton’s memoirs because Elizabeth was eager to carry out her husband’s wish that they be published.⁵ Therefore, under Iokibe’s supervision, Borton’s memoirs were published.

When Iokibe asked Borton about who had a great influence on him thoughtfully and intellectually, Borton gave three answers; the Quakers, Sir George B. Sansom, a member of the British consular service, and James T. Shotwell, a historian at Columbia University. Because of the belief of Quakerism, he promoted peace toward American-Japanese relations. In the field of Japanese studies, his meeting with Sansom was decisive; and in the fields of history and international relations, he learned a lot from Shotwell. Therefore, it is worthwhile to discuss Borton's contribution to the several fields.

From the time when Borton and Elizabeth were sent to Japan in September 1929 as members of American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) in Philadelphia, their involvement with Japan lasted until they became old. During their three-year stay in Tokyo, they worked very closely with Japanese Yearly Meeting, a Quaker organization throughout Japan for building peaceful connections between the United States and Japan. Through the local Quaker meetings in Tokyo as well as in its suburbs, friendships with Japanese students, and the girls' Quaker high school in Tokyo, the Friends Girls School where Elizabeth taught English, the Bortons cooperated with the wider Christian movements such as the peace and temperance campaigns as well as the missionary campaign to reform Japanese society.⁶

Coming back to the United States from Japan in 1931, Borton decided to study religious education at Columbia University's Teachers College because he and AFSC had agreed that the Bortons would return to Japan again as AFSC representatives after one year's studies. But what did attract him was Japanese history and culture. Before the Bortons left Japan, George Sansom had advised Borton that he should take some courses in Japanese language and history at

Columbia University and continue to study Japanese history and culture. As for Borton, making use of what he had learned in Japan, studying Japanese and its history was more important and attractive; therefore, he decided to concentrate on Japanese studies in pursuing a Ph.D. degree.⁷ Then, in addition to studying in Columbia's Department of History, he also attended the summer seminar for Ph.D. students in Chinese and Japanese studies at Harvard University.⁸

In the first half of the 1930s, compared with the universities in Europe, the universities in the United States did not have adequate Asian studies programs; therefore, students who would like to take Ph.D. degrees tended to go to Europe for their work.⁹ Borton was one of them and went to Leyden University in Holland because Professor J.J.L. Duyvendak who had been a visiting professor of Chinese studies from Leyden to Columbia University recommended Leyden to him where he could study Chinese with Duyvendak and Japanese with Professor Johannes Rahder. After that, Duyvendak advised that Borton should go to Tokyo Imperial University to continue his study.¹⁰ After spending about two years in Leyden, Borton left for Tokyo in 1935 to continue his studies, and during his stay, he mainly spent his time to collect Japanese materials for his doctoral dissertation about "Peasant Uprising in Japan of the Tokugawa Period." Receiving his Ph.D. degree from Leyden in 1937, he became a lecturer and later an assistant professor of Japanese Language and History in the Department of Chinese and Japanese at Columbia until 1942.

Borton got a position of teaching Japanese history and did not doubt that he would spend his life in the occupation he loved; however, with the beginning of World War II, the American government needed experts on Japan for the war and postwar plans. Responding to the offer from the government, Borton worked in the

Department of State from 1942 to 1948 while he was on leave from Columbia. He became the chief of its division of Japanese affairs and special assistant to the director of Far Eastern Affairs for postwar planning. Borton decided to work as a government official for making postwar peace although he was against the war on principle as a pacifist.

After his resignation from the Department of State, he mainly worked as Associate Professor and Assistant Director of the East Asian Institute at Columbia from 1948 to 1950, and for the following seven years, was a Professor of the Japanese studies and Director of the East Asian Institute.^{1 1}

Borton was satisfied with his teaching position at Columbia because his desire was to spread his knowledge about Japan to the Americans and to contribute to making peaceful relations between the United States and Japan. Nevertheless, in the fall of 1956, he had an offer to become President of Haverford College, a Quaker school located in the suburb of Philadelphia where he had obtained a Bachelor of Science degree in 1922. He decided to take on the position on 1 July 1957 because he wanted to challenge his ability to take over the job.^{1 2} Even in his presidency, however, he continued with Japanese studies and after he retired as President, returned to the East Asian Institute at Columbia University.

As can be seen from this brief overview, Borton's life was devoted to the understanding of Japanese life, thought, and culture and promoting mutual understanding and peaceful relations between his own country and Japan. This thesis will discuss his three main contribution in this regard, his work as a Quaker, as an American government official, and as a leader in the development of Japanese and Asian studies.

¹ Yui Daizaburo, *Mikan no Senryo Seisaku* (Unfinished American occupational policies toward Japan) (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1989), 56.

² Hugh Borton, *Sengo Nihon no Sekkeisha: Boton Kaisoroku* (Spanning Japan's modern century: the memoirs of Hugh Borton) (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1997).

³ Hugh Borton, *Spanning Japan's Modern Century: The Memoirs of Hugh Borton*, with a foreword by James W. Morley (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002), 349, hereafter, Borton, *Memoirs*.

⁴ Borton, *Memoirs*, 351-52.

⁵ Borton, *Memoirs*, 353-57.

⁶ Hugh Borton "A Greeting to the Young Friends Conference: From the Delegate Farthest Away, With Tokyo Students" American Friends Service Committee Archives (AFSCA) in National Office in Philadelphia.

⁷ Borton, *Memoirs*, 41-43.

⁸ In the seminar, Borton first met Reischauer who was studying at Harvard at the time, and who also became an expert on Japan and American ambassador to Japan from 1961 to 1966. Since then, their friendship continued for fifty years. In their memoirs, both often mentioned the other. See Edwin O. Reischauer, *My Life Between Japan and America*. (New York: HarperCollins, 1986).

⁹ Hugh Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi (The Pioneers of Japanese Studies)." Translated by Makoto Saito, in *Washington Taisei to Nichibei Kankei* (The Washington Treaty System and American-Japanese relations), Chihiro Hosoya and Makoto Saito, eds. (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1986), 563.

¹⁰ Borton, *Memoirs*, 42.

¹¹ Hugh Borton, Oral History Collection, Butler Library, Columbia University.

¹² Borton, *Memoirs*, 250.

CHAPTER 2

THE QUAKER MISSIONARY

Hugh Borton was born on 14 May 1903 and raised in a very strict Quaker family in Moorestown, New Jersey, a suburb of Philadelphia. His parental ancestors were “Ship Quakers” who had journeyed in 1677 from Kent in the southeast part of England to the south bank of the Delaware River, ten miles north of Philadelphia.¹ His father, C. Walter Borton, worked as a banker in Philadelphia and was active in the local Friends Meeting in Moorestown and in the missionary and peace work of the Society of Friends.

Borton was brought up under the strict moral code of Quakerism which formed his personality. Smoking and the use of alcoholic beverages even for cooking were forbidden. Every Sunday, the whole family went to Bible class and Friends Meeting. During the meeting, they sat on benches for an hour of silent worship which was common in Quaker gatherings, or listening to religious message delivered by older Friends. At the outbreak of World War I, following the Quaker peace principles against all wars, his parents were against American participation in it. Borton often saw his grandparents and relatives wearing the traditional plain Quaker costumes. People whom Borton communicated with were mostly those who believed in Quakerism or came from Quaker families. His friends were his classmates in the local Friends school sponsored by the Moorestown Friends Meeting. The visitors who stayed in his house were exclusively fellow Quakers.²

Borton remembered the day when the Gilbert Bowles family visited his house one weekend when he was a child. They had temporarily come back to the United

States from Japan where Gilbert directed the Friends Mission. At this time, Borton just wondered “why anyone would want to live that far from their native land.”³ He never expected that he would be working in Japan in the near future under the guidance of Gilbert.

In 1918, like his father, sister, and brother, Borton entered Westtown School, a Quaker boarding school in Pennsylvania. He learned history and foreign languages for the first time. Then attending Haverford College, he was inspired by philosophy and psychology classes by Professor Rufus Jones and his preaching in the weekly Friends Meetings for Worship which he was required to attend. Professor Jones was a cofounder of the AFSC as well as distinguished Quaker leader.

Borton’s Quaker upbringing and education made him interested in the reconstruction and relief work of the AFSC organized by Professor Jones and other Quakers. Therefore, after teaching for two years from September 1926 to 1928 in Friendsville Academy, a boarding school founded by Quakers in the 1850s in Friendsville, the Westside of the Smoky Mountains in Tennessee, he and his wife, Elizabeth volunteered for the pilot program by AFSC which sent Quaker representatives to foreign countries in order to promote world peace through improved American understanding other peoples.⁴ Actually, the Bortons were asked to go to Tokyo, capital of Japan, for a three-year assignment.

Quakerism in Japan

Quakerism was introduced in Japan in 1885 when the first emissaries of the Women’s Foreign Missionary Association of Friends of Philadelphia, Joseph and Sarah Ann Cosand, left for Japan. For three years, the members of the association

had been eager to share their joy and satisfaction in it with their friends in non-Christian lands. In the association meeting on 28 June 1885, two young Japanese men who came to the United States and became Quakers, Inazo Nitobe and Kanzo Uchimura, encouraged the association to believe that the door was open in Japan for such religious teaching as that of the Friends.⁵ The association built Friends Girls School in 1887 and a meeting house in 1890 in Hijirizaka, Tokyo. This was the beginning of Quakerism in Japan.

Actually, because of the *Meiji Ishin*, restoration of imperial power in 1868 and the growing popularity of Western culture, Christianity and its missionaries were getting popular at the time when the Cosands visited Japan. In 1878 there were 44 churches and 1617 believers in Japan; in 1885, there were 168 churches and 11,000 believers.⁶

After the Cosands returned to the United States, Gilbert and Minnie P. Bowles who were to supervise the Bortons in Japan, came to Japan to serve in the Friends Mission from 1901 to 1941.⁷ In addition to Quaker missions and services, Gilbert, the head of the Friends Mission in Japan, engaged in some social activities such as temperance and the peace movement. He especially concentrated on working for peace and formed the Japan Peace Society in 1906.

Hugh Borton and his Activities in Japan from 1928 to 1931

On 14 March 1928 Gilbert Bowles wrote to AFSC that Seiju Hirakawa, the Secretary of the Japan Yearly Meeting of the AFSC, had concluded, in his close connection with Longstreth Memorial Dormitory in Daimachi, that it should have a foreign associate at it. Japanese Friends emphasized the importance of not putting

a new worker into the actual work at the dormitory until the associate had opportunities to study the language and become acquainted with the situation and the work. According to the letter, the duties of the Daimachi worker included:

(1) In the earlier stages—should be two years' full language study and engage in a few hours' teaching. In addition, the worker would have opportunities for contact and fellowship with young men in play, and social life. The study included not only Japanese language but also Japanese history, religion, and so on. Also the new worker would need to communicate with the young students at the dormitory.

(2) Works after the period of language study—the worker hopefully would be ready to become a head resident of the Dormitory. His works would depend mainly on character and personal influence. If he needed a part-time teaching position, he should teach English at Keio University; however, the teaching should not be done for financial necessity but for opportunities for service and actual educational experiences and communication with students.

(3) The worker should actively take part in the local Friends Meeting and a variety of social and international service.⁸

In addition to these duties, Borton was requested to assist Bowles, to report to AFSC in Philadelphia on current conditions in Japan, to make contacts with Japanese leaders, and to report if possible on their views on American-Japanese issues. Elizabeth was to teach English at Friends Girls School in Tokyo. The Bortons thought that they had no particular qualifications for such an assignment, but they considered it an interesting challenge. Therefore, they decided to go to Japan for three years.⁹

Learning the Bortons' acceptance, the Japan Yearly Meeting was very glad to

receive them. Hirakawa mentioned that there was a “great need of world-wide services for the new social order, international good understanding and world Christianization” because the world was “facing social and spiritual unrest, being threatened by industrial disputes and racial conflicts.”^{1 0}

On the other hand, Wilbur K. Thomas, Executive Secretary in AFSC, wrote to Gilbert about what the committee wanted the Bortons to do in Japan and asked Gilbert to advise them. First, rejoicing that they came with “open minds and open hearts” for their work, Gilbert pointed out that they should not come out as missionaries but go out as “missionary work.” What Thomas meant was that those missionaries should also engage in the development of peace and international service with Gilbert, since such works would be useful in cultivating a better understanding between the United States and Japan. AFSC was eager to establish closer communication between both countries and asked the Bortons to send periodic circular letters to report current situations in Japan.^{1 1} AFSC also expected that they would send information about Japan to several papers in the United States.^{1 2}

In addition, Thomas wrote down as an ultimate purpose that the Bortons should be sent to give a further new interpretation of the Christ Message by developing the spirit of friendship and good will. Because Gilbert had been working in Japan about thirty years when the Bortons arrived, his work for AFSC had stayed almost the same; therefore, AFSC hoped that the Bortons would bring expansion and renewal of the activities of AFSC. In the letter, therefore, Thomas clearly mentioned that AFSC hoped the Bortons would strengthen Gilbert’s work to meet the new situation that had arisen in the world and to make their Christian

testimony more effective in Japan.^{1 3}

After their arrival, the Bortons wrote the AFSC about their first impression of Japan. Some Japanese in the United States told them that Japanese cities would be worse because of rising militarism and the great Tokyo earthquake in 1923; however, in spite of bad weather on their first day just after they arrived at Yokohama, they saw many Japanese with typical spectacular Japanese costumes and rickshaws which made them think that it was a lively place.^{1 4}

The Bortons also mentioned two outstanding but typical events in Japan which they considered strange. The first one was a Buddhist festival in order to celebrate the sect of Buddhism in a temple. In it, young men with special costumes carried paper lanterns, beat their drums, and danced. The festivities struck the Bortons as strange, and they described the celebration as a “weird and ancient procession.” They continued that the drumming and dancing made them feel “strangely removed from the modern world and transported back through the ages to the time when man was a childlike creature, credulous and savage” and dancing men seemed “half creature, half men, gay, untiring, and unmoral.”^{1 5}

The second event was their visit to the Zojoji Temple in Tokyo. The Bortons wrote that through Westerners’ eyes the architecture was “unusual.” Looking upon the outside of the temple, it appeared to them, “decaying, belonging to another time” and “so ancient.” The Bortons began to notice the ancestor worship of Japanese which was popular in Japan and linked with the respect for the past and the old although such worship was rarely found in the United States.^{1 6}

As for typical Japanese things such as its architecture, custom, and tradition, the Bortons paid attention to the difference between Japan and the United States in

the first letter and emphasized the backwardness of the former compared with the culture of the latter. Respect and a sense of affinity toward the Japanese way of life can not be found in early letters. It took some time for the Bortons to accept and appreciate the difference.

From his early days in Japan, Borton was curious about a traditional Japanese system, the Emperor system, although he still did not have a special feeling about it. When he later entered the United States Department of State, he came to wrestle with the problem about whether the United States should leave the Emperor system in Japan after World War II. Borton described in detail of the Enthronement Ceremonies of Emperor Hirohito in the fall of 1928. He explained how the ceremony took place, the origins and the reason why it was done.¹⁷

Despite their initial lack of interest in typical Japanese things, their relationship with Sir George Bailey Sansom of the British embassy who had entered the British Consular Service and been in Japan since 1904 totally changed the Bortons' attitudes. While the Bortons learned Japanese and attended lectures about Japanese history, economics, religion, and archeology, Sansom offered an exciting weekly seminar on Japanese cultural history. He was fascinated with Japanese history and culture, especially Buddhism, and was willing to share his knowledge about Japan in a seminar open to any interested people. Because of the demands of the seminar, however, only the Bortons remained as the regular members of the class. As a result, a deep friendship between the Bortons and Sansom developed, which influenced Borton's decision to become a specialist in Japanese studies.¹⁸

Sansom was focused on Japan's early cultural and religious achievements, which inspired the Bortons to go to Nara, the Japanese old capital of the eighth

century, during their first Christmas vacation in Japan in 1928. Only a few months before, they had not been interested in old Japanese traditions such as temples and festivals; because of Sansom's impact, however, they decided to go to Nara to see the old capital, temple, and Japanese arts. In his second circular letter just after the Christmas vacation, praising the old province of Nara, temples, Buddhas, and statues over 1,000 years old, he mentioned "what a marvelous past Japan has!" Sansom's lecture and the trip to Nara caused Borton to accept and to respect Japanese tradition and the difference between the United States. He further wrote that such old things were the "beginning of many present days' Japanese customs, forms of worship, and morals."¹⁹

Coming back to Tokyo fascinated with Japanese traditions and culture, the Bortons took part in Sansom's history seminar more enthusiastically. In fact, Borton was now considering returning to the United States to teach Japanese history. In a letter to her parents in the United States, Elizabeth wrote that he had a great opportunity to study Japanese history and now hoped to get a Masters of Arts degree to teach.²⁰ This was the genesis of Borton's quest to become a Japanese specialist.

In his circular letters, Borton often worried about the rising Japanese militarism and hoped for peace. Although Japan had been powerful since winning the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars, it was not until his visit to Japan that Borton realized the growing nationalistic pride among the Japanese society. He said that Japan was not only an Asiatic but also a world power whose interests in the affairs of the East were unquestionable and dominant. While he appealed for peace in Japan, he faced a moral dilemma because Japan had learned imperialism and modern military techniques as the route to great power status from the Christian

Western countries such as the United States. He could not blame rising militarism completely on Japan itself for he thought that the West also had some responsibility for the situation in Japan.^{2 1}

In analyzing his weekly letters, about a half year after his arrival in Japan, Borton had come to like Japan, to have sympathies with Japan, even to favor Japan. For example, as to Japanese militarism, he criticized the West for Japan's military expansion because Japan imitated the West and tried to have strong military power. Besides defending Japan, he mentioned that the Japanese military became powerful because Japan was suspicious of the operations of the Soviets along their new Turkistan railroad paralleling the Russian-Chinese border. Further, he mentioned that it was the duty of the Americans to pursue peace rather than confrontation between the United States and Japan because many Japanese organizations for peace such as the League of Nations Association of Japan were formed.^{2 2}

Working almost one year in Tokyo, Borton was gradually getting worried that he was doing very little. He worked to assist Bowles, but he preferred more challenging tasks. He continued to teach English as a part-time job and to study Japanese; however, he questioned the effectiveness of his work and began to consider whether he should be doing something useful for Japanese society.^{2 3} Before Bowles managed very well to take care of AFSC's duties by himself, Borton even thought that there would be no need for him in Tokyo. There was a large amount of actual mission work that he would like to do, but he never felt himself qualified to do the work.^{2 4}

In spite of such trouble, he considered that his most important duty was to mentor Japanese students for Japan's future at the Longstreth Dormitory and some

university students such as Keio University through English lessons, services, and some entertainment. In the school year of 1929 to 1930, the dormitory which Ellen W. Longstreth of Bryn Mawr founded in November 1922 for the young Japanese in memory of her husband had nine students— one Chinese, one Korean and seven Japanese— with the Bortons as resident assistants. The Bortons and their students tried to live peacefully together by understanding their different opinions although their governments had difficulty in getting along well with each other. Borton mentioned that if the youth of three countries can see a peaceful future in the Pacific, then there surely would be peace. He kept insisting that if they could overlook their differences, appreciate their respective viewpoints, and respect an individual as such, then surely the possible future misunderstandings in the Pacific would be lessened.^{2 5}

The Bortons sent reports to AFSC on their work at the end of each year. Having been in Japan for nine months, in their first annual report to AFSC the Bortons roughly divided their works into two parts: that definitely connected with studying, and that only indirectly connected with it. As for the field of studying Japanese language and its history, they plugged away doggedly since they knew that such studies were the only way for them to understand Japan and the Japanese. In reference to work besides studying, Borton mainly engaged in the night school work at Hijirizaka Meeting House and tutored students from Keio University. Although he hoped to teach more, AFSC and Bowles denied his proposal because they thought he should concentrate on his studies. At the end of their first year, the Bortons felt as if they had gained much more personally than they had given. Hoping to have more teaching opportunities and more specific works, their purpose for the second

year was to build more friendships with the Japanese and to increase their effectiveness as “ambassadors of good-will.”^{2 6}

In their second annual report to AFSC in 1930, the Bortons categorized their work into four areas: teaching, studies in Japanese history and language, student hostel and general student work, and general peace and good-will work. Borton taught English in several schools as a part-time teacher and suggested that any future worker in Tokyo should have a definite teaching position. As for his studies, he attended classes about Japanese history and politics as well as Japanese language although Elizabeth’s heavy workload left no time for her to keep studying Japanese. During the second period, he concentrated on working with young students since he at last became a head resident of the Longstreth Dormitory under the help of an old resident, Yasukuni Suzuki.^{2 7}

One of their aims was to build friendship between the United States and Japan; therefore, in his circular letters, Borton often discussed the problems and situations related to both countries. In addition, when he mentioned relationships between both countries, he expressed his opinions which often leaned toward the Japan side. In the circular letter on 21 July 1929, he said that he could see increasing understanding between the two countries during the past four years; especially, their trade relations that were going well as 95% of Japan’s silk exports went to the United States and 40% of the raw cotton manufactured in Japanese mills came from the United States.^{2 8}

As for militarism, even after he stayed in Japan for a year, he emphasized that the United States should not be afraid of the Japanese militarism because Japan tried to have international collaboration by establishing several peace organizations and

was a member of the League of Nation. For the purpose of showing the Japanese attitude toward peace, he quoted the speech of Prince Chichibu in the ceremony of the America-Japan Society in Tokyo to celebrate the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Using Lincoln's words, "of the people, by the people and for the people," Prince Chichibu expressed his hope for "peace on earth and good-will to men."²⁹

Borton pointed out some present problems which Japan suffered. One serious problem he mentioned was the growing economic crisis of the world depression and resulting unemployment of students which he really worried about. Even of the students who would graduate from Tokyo Imperial University, one of the most famous in Japan in 1930, only forty percent of them would be able to find a job, as the Tokyo YMCA worker in the Department of Student reported.³⁰ This situation led to students resorting to walk-outs and strikes similar to those in the United States.³¹

Until the economic distress and unemployment, nationalism in Japan which had been strongest at the time around the Russo-Japanese war had grown weaker because the Japanese noticed nationalism was just idealistic and would not remove them from social unrest. Therefore, looking for new solutions, some Japanese gradually came to embrace Western humanism, liberalism, and Christianity. But Borton thought that the unemployment might possibly stimulate young people further to a belief in the power of Marxism, socialism, and Communism which would promote the revival of nationalism. He feared that Christianity had not yet found its solution of the economic problem and explained that he himself did not know what to do. Although he said he saw no solution to the problem, he hoped that there was some way the West could help Japan. He thought a revolution was

not coming, but it was time for East and West to unite in solving the economic and social problems.^{3 2}

Finishing their third (final) year in Japan from the summer 1930 to the spring 1931, the Bortons reported what they had done during the period. According to the report, they mentioned their summer activities, teaching, general work, and publicity during their last year in Japan. They first mentioned their summer trip to Manchuria and Korea. As a result of the trip, they could now compare Japanese culture with that of other Asian cultures. They got further knowledge of the social and economic problems that the Far East needed to solve.^{3 3}

As an English teacher and a head resident at the Longstreth Dormitory under the assistance of Yasukuni Suzuki, Borton was really satisfied with his connection with the young students at the dormitory as well as students whom the Bortons taught or who visited their quarters. He liked the experiment of having a Korean, a Chinese, and Japanese live together in the dormitory. The Bortons had been active in establishing three separate co-educational groups of young people at a time when coed groups for the young were very rare in Japan. They were the World Outlook Club for discussing international problems and peace, the conversational Keio University student group for improving English, and the Tokyo Young Friends group for entertainment and worship to expand Quaker service among young Japanese. In his third year, through the activities for Japanese students, he attempted to do some definite work by himself.^{3 4}

In his third period, in addition to supporting Bowles and managing the work which he was expected to do, Borton actively carried out the things which would be helpful for the Japanese and AFSC. The biggest project he engaged in was to write

the prospectus of Friends' work in Tokyo in the future with Yasukuni Suzuki. Borton and Suzuki suggested that Tokyo Friends center and institute should be established in Tokyo in order to coordinate the existing work. Mainly for their worship and meeting, there was a Hijirizaka Meeting house; however, they insisted on the need of some type of educational institution to train Friends' members throughout Japan. They thought the building of the Langstreth Dormitory which included accommodations should be used for the institution. There, they proposed that several coed courses for liberal arts and night school for English learning should be held. If AFSC would employ the Japanese as the staff of the institute, Borton thought it would provide good opportunities to communicate with the Japanese and the Americans.^{3 5} Assuming that he would be going back to Japan after a few years' studies in the United States, he wrote the proposal.

In spite of Borton's effort, however, Bowles and representatives in AFSC rejected it although they mentioned that they would think about his going back to the United State. The Bortons worried about financial problems, but they mentioned the barriers of distance and language in Japan. In addition, the main reason of disagreement was his lack of experience to engage in such a big project. In the letter to Clarence E. Pickett, Executive Secretary of AFSC, Bowles pointed out that Borton should start working in a similar institute such as Pendle Hill in Pennsylvania.^{3 6}

Borton did not clearly mention even in his memoir why he decided not to go back to Japan or why the plan for the institution failed. In spite of several disagreements, the educational institute might have been founded if Borton had been willing to work with other educational institute in the United States first and then

move to the establishment of one in Japan. The fact of the matter seems to be that Borton was bored with religious education and was more attracted to the study of Japanese history. Consequently, he did not go back to Japan as a representative of AFSC and gave up his project of building the Quaker center.

Just before finishing his three-year duties in Japan, Borton wrote his opinions on the future of AFSC work in Japan. He was critical of both the AFSC and Bowles. In regard to the AFSC, he felt that it was much more interested in the work of Europe than that of Japan. This being the case, Bowles, who had long run his one man establishment in Tokyo with a great deal of independence, would be sufficient to carry on the work their. For as long as Bowles was in Tokyo, Borton wrote, their home— and not the office of the AFSC— would be the Friends center in Japan.³⁷ It meant that as long as Bowles stayed in Tokyo, other workers had little to do because Bowles would do almost everything by himself.

Borton also insisted that AFSC should not send a worker in the future to Japan until a definite part time teaching position could be obtained for that worker. Considering his experience, he kept saying that one year of freedom might be allowed for language studies but for the second year a definite teaching position or other work should be assured.³⁸ Because he could not get a definite teaching job or other work, he always suffered from the thought that he would not accomplish anything.

Many people in Japan appreciated what the Bortons had done and when they decided to go back to the United States sent letters to AFSC praising their works and asking for their reappointment. For example, appreciating AFSC's decision to send the Bortons to Japan for three years, Elizabeth J.S. Binford in Friends Foreign

Mission Committee (FFMC) in Japan wrote that the Bortons had endeared themselves to all, without distinction of race, and found a real place of service in the Quaker movement in Japan. She further commented that they had laid before the staff in the FFMC their concern for future service and pointed out problems which should be improved.^{3 9}

A member of the World Outlook Club which Borton had helped to establish and had served as the first chairman also hoped for his return. The member's letter said that the outstanding success of the club, in promoting international friendship and world peace, owed to the Bortons. The letter continued that their absence from Japan would be a great loss to the club, but they had left a legacy of friendship and good will which would grow to bring international peace in the future.^{4 0} Esther B. Rhoads in Friends Girls School also commented that she hoped that they would tell their experiences in Japan to the Americans.^{4 1}

After staying in Japan for three years, the Bortons went back to the United States. Looking back on his life in Japan, Borton mentioned that the most wonderful thing was that he could see the development of the Friends' community.^{4 2} Actually, these three years were to be very important for his future. His stay in Japan became a turning point for him to become a specialist on Japan. In addition, he met a lot of Japanese people, learned their characteristics, and how they thought about American-Japanese relations which would be very useful during his work in the Department of State. Especially, it would be useful for his future work to know how the Japanese considered the Emperor system. He also attained fluency in Japanese, respect for Japanese tradition, and friendship with Japanese. He could not contribute to the AFSC works so much because he could not get

definite challenging work. Although he obtained many more things than he gave, — this was just his assessment— he tried to contribute to Japanese society and American-Japanese relationships such as his outline for establishing Friends institution and communication with young students under the words of friendship and good will.

¹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 2; This group was one of the first Quakers who came to the United States.

² Borton, *Memoirs*, 2-3.

³ Borton, *Memoirs*, 3.

⁴ Borton, *Memoirs*, 10.

⁵ Edith F. Sharpless, "Quaker in Japan: A Brief Account of the Origins and Development of the Religious Society of Friends, 1885 – 1943," Tokyo Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. <http://www2.gol.com/users/quakers/quakerism_in_Japan.htm>, hereafter, Sharpless, "Quaker in Japan."

⁶ Sharpless, "Quaker in Japan."

⁷ Minnie Bowles also stayed in Japan from 1893 to 1998 because she taught in Friend School.

⁸ Letter from Gilbert Bowles to AFSC, 14 March 1928, AFSCA.

⁹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 10.

¹⁰ Letter from Seiju Hirakawa to AFSC, 30 June 1928, AFSCA.

¹¹ The Bortons sent letters to AFSC about once a week during their stays in Japan. On the other hand, Secretary of AFSC replied about every two weeks.

¹² Letter from Wilbur K. Thomas to Gilbert Bowles, 17 August 1928, AFSCA.

¹³ Letter from Thomas to Bowles, 17 August 1928, AFSCA.

¹⁴ Letter from the Bortons to AFSC (no date), AFSCA.

¹⁵ Letter from the Bortons to AFSC, AFSCA.

¹⁶ Letter from the Bortons to AFSC, AFSCA.

¹⁷ Letter from the Bortons to AFSC, AFSCA.

¹⁸ Borton, *Memoirs*, 18.

¹⁹ Circular Letter #2 from the Bortons to AFSC, 7 January 1929, AFSCA.

²⁰ Borton, *Memoirs*, 25.

²¹ Letter from the Bortons to AFSC, AFSCA.

²² Borton, "Need for Continued Peace Work in Japan," 25 February 1931, AFSCA.

²³ Borton, *Memoirs* 32.

²⁴ Circular Letter #18 from the Bortons to AFSC, 29 April 1929, AFSCA.

²⁵ Borton, "The Longstreth Dormitory in Tokyo," 16 October 1929, AFSCA.

²⁶ Annual first Report from the Bortons to AFSC received 15 July 1929, AFSCA.

²⁷ Annual second Report from the Bortons to AFSC in 1930, AFSCA.

²⁸ Borton, "Recent Tendencies in Japan's Relations with Foreign Countries," received 21 July 1929, AFSCA.

²⁹ Borton, "Recent Tendencies," AFSCA.

³⁰ Borton, "A Japanese Problem," 31 March 1930, AFSCA.

³¹ Borton, "Student Demonstrations," November 1930, AFSCA.

³² Borton, "A Japanese Problem," AFSCA.

³³ Third Annual report from the Bortons to AFSC in 1931, AFSCA; The Bortons visited Manchuria just a few months before the Manchurian Incident.

-
- ^{3 4}Third Annual report from the Bortons, AFSCA.
- ^{3 5}Borton and Yasukuni Suzuki, "Prospectus of Friends' Work in Tokyo and especially at Mita-Daimachi, Tokyo," February 1931 (revised May 1931), AFSCA.
- ^{3 6}Letter from Gilbert Bowles to Clarence Pickett, 10 July 1931, AFSCA.
- ^{3 7}Circular Letter #84 from Borton to AFSC, 13 November 1930, AFSCA.
- ^{3 8}Circular Letter #76 from Borton to AFSC, 1 July 1930, AFSCA.
- ^{3 9}Letter from Elizabeth Binford and Esther B. Rhoads to AFSC in 1931, AFSCA.
- ^{4 0}Letter from World Out Look Club to AFSC, 25 May 1931, AFSCA.
- ^{4 1}Letter from Esther Rhoads to AFSC, 6 July 1931, AFSCA.
- ^{4 2}Third Annual report from the Bortons, AFSCA.

CHAPTER 3

THE GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL

After 7 December 1941, the American military needed Japanese language—interpreters and those who had an understanding Japanese culture. Borton got several requests to recruit him for the military, but he kept refusing their proposals because his Quaker conscience of pacifism made it difficult for him to accept work in the government where he might promote the war.¹

Listening to the report of the Pearl Harbor Attack by Japan, Borton thought, “Japan’s misguided leaders had made a horrendous mistake; their nation would surely reap a whirlwind created by an aroused America determined to crush the three Axis powers.” Even though the war was just beginning, he was already convinced that the United States would beat Japan.²

With the America’s participation in the war against Japan, Borton came to think about the possibility of a civilian appointment. Even though he would be employed by the Department of War, he thought that his duties were “to instruct the future officers of civil affairs on the background of the Japanese people and what to expect when Japanese territory was occupied.” He, therefore, asked for and received an indefinite leave of absence from Columbia University where he had been a lecturer, and started to work in the headquarters of the School of Military Government at the campus of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. There he taught Japanese history and society for the purpose of teaching Japan’s main characteristics.³

Because the United States concentrated on the war in Europe, almost all early graduates of the military school went to Europe to serve and few of them ever used

their knowledge of Japan; however, Borton later recalled that the teaching experience in Charlottesville gave him two useful pointers for his future work in the Department of State on postwar planning. First, he could gain knowledge from the officers who had returned from the war about the practical problems which really had happened on the battlefields. Subsequently, when he was asked to prepare policy papers on the problems that might arise after Japan's defeat, he was able to anticipate many questions which would need to be answered.⁴ Second, as a result of his work at the school, he made many personal contacts and friendships with the personnel in the Civil Affairs Division of the Department of War which was responsible for the planning and supervision of military government in the occupied areas. As a result, when he had questions on his postwar-policy papers about Japan, his old colleagues in the school sometimes answered them even in private meetings.⁵ These relationships were extremely valuable because the Department of State and the Department of War often disagreed on matters pertaining to policy making and specific policy decisions.

Hugh Borton's Entrance into the United States Department of State

The postwar planning in the Department of State originated when Dr. Leo Pasvolksy, Special Assistant to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, proposed that a special research division be established to analyze the current international developments in order to form American foreign policy. Relations between the United States and Japan were deteriorating rapidly, and month by month the crisis deepened.⁶ As a result, the Division of Special Research (SR) was founded on 3 February 1941. The division and its immediate successors became the center for

postwar planning, especially for postwar policies toward Japan.⁷

With the outbreak of the Pacific War, one of the first responsibilities of SR was to prepare papers for a presidential advisory committee which had been set up in February 1942 known as the Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for preparing recommendations for President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The committee appointed various subcommittees, and one of the most important one was the Territorial Subcommittee that was charged with considering problems connected with the restoration of independent nations, the reestablishment of stable governments, and all possible postwar territorial problems. The subcommittee was formed on 7 March 1942 and held a total of 59 meetings until its dissolution on 13 December 1943.⁸ Direct contact between the SR and the Territorial Subcommittee was provided by Pasvolsky who served both as the Chief of the Division of SR and as a member of the subcommittee, by Harley Notter, and later Philip E. Mosley, all of whom served as officers in the SR and research secretaries of the subcommittee.⁹

The East Asian group in the SR was responsible for the material on Japan of the Territorial Subcommittee while the SR concentrated on the policies toward Europe. Because Europe dominated American postwar planning at the time, the East Asian group tended to be undervalued. It was not until August 1942 that attention started to be paid to the East Asian group. George H. Blakeslee, a specialist on international law and relations with a concentration on East Asia, became part of the group, and the SR appointed several Asian experts to the staff. The East Asian group then concentrated on preparing papers on postwar policy for Asia, especially Japan.¹⁰

Borton was one of the new staff members.^{1 1} Mosley sent a letter to Borton to say that he had concluded that the work in the East Asian group was “the most important job on which some of the scholars could be employed as part of the war effort.... Japan, as part of the Far East and Pacific problems is so important in this type of work that [the group] must have the best possible knowledge and ability....” In the last part of the letter, Mosley said that Borton should consider the possibility of joining the group. Borton immediately went to Washington D.C. to meet with Mosley. Their meeting was successful and Charles W. Yost appointed Borton to the Department of State as a research associate to work in the East Asian group.^{1 2}

One of Borton’s first assignments was to prepare the lists as to the problems that the East Asian group would discuss, how it should begin its work, and to give the topics and questions which would arise later. Because no postwar policies toward Japan had been decided, there were many questions which Borton needed to consider. For example, what should be the composition of the forces to occupy Japan after the war? Would it be only the American forces or would the Allied forces be involved as was to be the case in Germany? How long would the occupation continue? There were a number of questions Borton and other members needed to consider and he made drafts to discuss these questions.^{1 3}

Until its dissolution, the Territorial Subcommittee submitted 588 documents (from T1 to T588), and Borton wrote parts of many of these documents. In the summer of 1942, Borton began to prepare two documents: the first draft was T358, “Japan: Recent Political Developments.” Examining Japan’s prewar situation, he emphasized the increasing power of the military leaders.^{1 4}

The second document by Borton was T381, “Japan: Postwar Political

Problems,” on 6 October 1943. Based on his experiences in Japan and conversations with his former colleague in military school, Borton urged that “Japan’s internal political structure must be reorganized so that the military oligarchies cannot again gain ascendancy, and Japan must abandon the philosophy of aggression” since he really worried about the centralization of power by military leaders. In addition, he continued, “any future Japanese government must respect its international obligations and be capable of enforcing them,” and he supported the idea that Japan “should be given economic opportunity which will allow for the improvement of its standard of living and eventual entrance into the family of nations on terms of equality.”¹⁵

Another topic that Borton strongly emphasized in the document (T381) was the Emperor system and Emperor Hirohito.¹⁶ This issue was one of the most controversial of postwar policy toward Japan, and Borton always supported the idea that the Emperor system should exist after the war. In T381, he defended the system, “as the loyalty and devotion of the Japanese subject for the Emperor is deeply ingrained and is not necessarily identical with obedience to the military.” He advocated that the Emperor system should be “one of the most permanent aspects of postwar political Japan. As such, it may be a valuable factor in the establishment of a stable and moderate postwar government.”¹⁷ Although American public opinion and a majority of the staff in the Department of State wanted to abolish the Emperor system, Borton was one in a small group that did not, and that historian John W. Dower characterized as “moderate and conciliatory [in their] appraisals of the Japanese....”¹⁸

Hugh Borton and the Postwar Programs Committee

On 15 January 1944, because of the reorganization of the Department of State, Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State founded a new committee for long-range plans for postwar policy called the Postwar Programs Committee (PWC). The committee was to assist the Secretary of State “in formulating postwar policies and in making the appropriate international arrangements for their execution.”¹⁹ The establishment meant that the Department of State would take responsibility for postwar policy. As a result of the PWC, the Territorial Subcommittee finished its role, and the staff who had worked for papers for the committee including Borton then supplied the PWC with the documents for postwar policy.²⁰ One of the subcommittees of the PWC was called Interdivisional Country and Area Committees on the Far East which mainly discussed the areas which Japan had occupied. As a part of the reorganization, the East Asian group changed its name to the Office of Far Eastern Affairs and Stanley Hornbeck was appointed to the Chief Director.

The Civil Affairs Division of the War Department and the Occupied Area Division of the Navy Department were convinced that they also needed answers to numerous problems which would arise with the occupation of Japan and Korea. On 18 February 1944, Major General J.H. Hilldring, Director of the Civil Affairs Division and Captain H.L. Pence, Officer-in-Charge of the Occupied Area Division, asked James C. Dunn, Director of the Special Political Affairs and that of the office of European Affairs in the Department of State to provide guidelines for postwar policy.²¹

In the “Memorandum Prepared in the War and Navy Departments,” the questions of the Departments of the War and Navy ranged over such various matters

as the implementation of the occupation, the Emperor system, Japan's mandated islands and so on. In addition to Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and French Indo-China were also included in the paper.^{2 2}

Because of the request, Dunn asked the Office of Far Eastern Affairs to discuss anticipated problems as well as solutions, and Borton and other members in the office engaged in the work. In preparing for them, Borton said it was an easy task because "many of the questions asked by the Departments War and Navy Departments were identical to those on which the research staff had already prepared papers." Furthermore, these questions had previously been considered by the CAC, and some policies by the committee had received approval from PWC.^{2 3}

It was significant that the military asked the Department of State to help. First, this was the initial step for State, War, and Navy to cooperate with each other. Before that, each had worked individually for discussing war planning and postwar policy. After that, however, the following framework was set up: the Department of State provided the general guidelines for the policies for Japan and war planning, and the Departments of War and Navy implemented the plans.^{2 4} Second, the military's action influenced the direction of Department of State in the postwar planning. Heretofore, the department had tended to emphasize making policy toward Europe. Borton and other research staff had often stressed the significance of Japan; however, the officers in the department had paid them little attention. The memorandum of 18 February 1944, however, promoted the officers in the department to focus more on the importance of the policy toward Japan and Asia.^{2 5}

For the purpose of answering the questions from the Departments of War and Navy, the research staff in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs prepared twenty

documents. Among them, the initial paper of PWC108b (CAC116b), “Japan: The Postwar Objectives of the United States in Regard to Japan,” on 4 May 1944 by George Blakeslee, was perhaps the most important since it became the guideline for the occupation of Japan.^{2 6} In this paper, two fundamental objectives of American occupation of Japan were established. First, it stressed that, “Japan must be prevented from being a menace to the United States and the other countries of the Pacific area.” Second and following logically from the first objective, it stated that, “American interests require that there be in Japan a government which will respect the rights of other states and Japan’s international obligations.”^{2 7}

In order to achieve these two objectives, PWC108b insisted that postwar policies toward Japan should be implemented separately in three distinct phases. In the first, the paper recommended that, “Japan’s military and naval forces are to be disarmed and disbanded, its military and naval installations destroyed, and the country placed under military occupation and government.”^{2 8} The mission of the period should be short because it would be ended as soon as the occupation forces succeeded in Japan’s disarmament. In the second, the aim was focused on domestic administration and measures to prevent Japan from returning to militarism. Mainly, the occupation forces would execute: (1) military inspection; (2) economic controls to prevent the development of a war potential; (3) freedom of thought through the press, radio, and schools; and (4) rooting out of ultra-nationalistic societies. During this period, Japan was to be permitted to share in the world economy as that would be necessary in order to pay the required reparations.^{2 9} In the third and last, the PWC108b, taking note of the difficulty at this time of predicting exactly how long this phase would take, recommended that the “new Japan” be acclimated to accept

the “permanent adjustments of fundamental importance.”³⁰ In PWC108b, American policy on the occupation of Japan was conceptualized for the first time. Later, based on this document, almost all policies toward Japan were decided.

In order to explain more specifically PWC108b, Borton prepared PWC152b (CAC185b), “Japan: Abolition of Militarism and Strengthening Democratic Processes,” on 9 May 1944.³¹ The paper was “to determine what measures the United Nations may take during the period of military government to abolish militarism and to strengthen democratic tendencies and processes in Japan.”³² Borton insisted on reforms that would uproot the old system that had provided fertile ground for militarism and especially reforms in the political system that would allow a liberal Japan to emerge. He also took the position of respecting Japanese views; however, the priority would always be American and global security.

In addition to PWC152b, Borton presented several papers to the PWC and CAC. There were mainly two programs he dealt with. One issue was whether the occupation of Japan should be carried out directly or indirectly. As to Germany, the Allied forces had already decided to adopt direct occupation which abolished German centralized government and the Allied forces governed the country by creating their own framework to control the country. Many suggested that the direct way should also be used in Japan; Borton, however, insisted on indirect occupation of Japan which allowed Japan to have its own centralized government and the United States would control Japan through a Japanese government. The other was whether the Emperor system should be abolished. Borton analyzed these two issues in several papers. For example, in his paper originally entitled “Military Government and the Institution of the Emperor,” he insisted that the terms of

surrender for Japan would be set up on the assumption that the Emperor system would be permitted to continue. It recommended, however, that after the surrender the Emperor should be placed in protective custody and that he should command his subordinates to carry out what the occupation commander ordered.^{3 3}

Borton advocated the policy of indirect occupation and the Emperor system for several reasons. First, the United States had only a limited number of trained persons who could operate the Japanese government or who could speak Japanese: the help of Japanese officials, therefore, was essential to prevent disorder. Second, even after the beginning of the occupation, the Emperor could be dethroned if the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) decided that the Japanese were no longer loyal to Emperor. While the Emperor could be deposed by order, the occupation force would dethrone the Emperor if the Japanese still believed in the Emperor. Third, the Japanese had always had a special attitude of reverence toward the Emperor that still lasted. Any action by the occupation forces against the Emperor would promote anti-American feeling toward occupying forces. Last, if the occupation forces came to believe that the Emperor system would disrupt the postwar policy, the Civil Affairs Administrator (later to be designated SCAP, Douglass MacArthur) could suspend the functions of the Emperor.^{3 4}

Hugh Borton and the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee

As the research staff in the Department of State proceeded in making postwar policies, difficulty arose in interdepartmental communications. Although the questionnaire from the Departments of War and Navy to the Department of State made their contact closer, it was only temporary. It was essential to establish a new

committee which would replace PWC. On 29 November 1944, therefore, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, proposed to Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, that a committee should be founded “to represent the three Secretaries in formulating recommendations to the Secretary of State on questions having both military and political aspects, and in coordinating the views of the three departments in matters of common interest.”^{3 5}

The newly established committee was called the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC), and the first meeting was held on 19 December 1944. It was decided to consider the postwar policies in regard to Germany, Austria, Korea and Japan. On 5 January 1945, the committee appointed a Subcommittee on the Far East (SFE) to prepare for policy papers for the approval of SWNCC. Basically, the SFE was composed of the same members who had worked for PWC.^{3 6}

Borton consequently continued to work in the Department of State. On 12 January 1945, Blakeslee was appointed as the Assistant Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and Borton was assigned to it as a “country” specialist, that is, Japanese expert while both men were also the members of SFE.^{3 7} Their duties were to continue to work on postwar Far Eastern policies, especially, for SWNCC. Borton continued in the position as Japanese specialist until 13 November 1945 when he became the Assistant Chief of the Division of Japanese Affairs. Then he became Acting Chief on 11 February 1946 and Chief on 4 November 1946 until 5 October 1947 when he quit the Department of State.^{3 8}

The problem of the Emperor system was a continuous major issue. At the time, SWNCC had approved Borton’s recommendation that the Emperor “should be told to direct his subjects to obey the instructions of General MacArthur and order

his officials to implement them.” The majority of Americans, even in the government, however, insisted that the Emperor system “had been one of the main causes of Japan’s ultranationalism, which had culminated in the attack on Pearl Harbor.” Furthermore, they insisted that the system should be abolished. Many officials in Washington as well as the public believed that Hirohito should be tried as one of the war criminals. Borton as well as other Japanese experts in the Department of State’s Office of Far Eastern Affairs, however, insisted that, “neither Emperor Hirohito nor the imperial institution per se was the cause of Japan’s prewar ultranationalism and expansionism.” In their view, the basic cause was in the provision of Japan’s prewar constitution which enabled the military leaders and ultranationalists to use the Emperor system for their own objectives.³⁹ Actually, in the constitution, several military officers became members of the cabinet in the Japanese government and controlled its politics.

For the purpose of explaining his opinions about the Emperor system, Borton submitted two papers, SWNCC55 (SFE126), “The Treatment of the Person of the Emperor,” and SWNCC209 (SFE141), “The Treatment of the Institution of the Emperor.” In these papers, he first said that the authority of the Emperor was subject to SCAP who would exercise his authority through Japanese governmental machinery including the Emperor, to the extent that it would satisfactorily further American objectives. Then he suggested three alternatives. First, he pointed out that the resigning Emperor should be remitted as a war criminal and that no attempt should be made by the occupation forces to remove him from the throne. Second, when Hirohito could be removed without endangering the satisfactory accomplishments of American objectives in Japan, he could be arrested. Last,

Borton wrote that if Hirohito did not abdicate and in the judgment of SCAP the evidence warranted that he should be held for trial, SCAP should report that to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Throughout these two papers, Borton's opinions were that Hirohito had been used by Japanese military leaders for their own objectives. If Hirohito would order the Japanese to obey SCAP, therefore, Borton thought that the Japanese would willingly do so. He concluded that if the occupation forces tried Hirohito as a war criminal, the action would make SCAP's task more difficult to execute.⁴⁰

Since entering the Department of State, Borton, as one of the few specialists on Japan, submitted a number of documents for postwar Japan. While these had gone to various committees at various times, his view on post-war policies remained consistent. He always thought from the Japanese side as well as American side and made a point of what would be better for future Japan's development. For example, throughout his work in the Department of State, he emphasized that the United States should adopt indirect occupation and keep the Emperor system for future Japan.

Borton wrote two papers regarding the two important American occupation policies toward Japan, the Emperor system and indirect occupation. In spite of severe objection outside and inside the Department of State, he emphasized the importance of these two policies and finally his proposals were admitted in spite of several small changes.

Borton was called in the Department of State at the age of 39 and came "to become one of the principal architects of the United States policy toward Japan."⁴¹ During the war, the Japanese experts like Borton and Blakeslee were regarded as "special pleaders for the conservative causes of their Japanese contacts and

acquaintances,” as to important positions. In the Department of State, however, criticism of the Japanese experts called the “Japanese crowd” increased especially among the “China crowd,” those who specialized in China.^{4 2}

After the war, the positions of experts on Japan got weaker and weaker because of the rising power of experts on China and SCAP’s onemanship. For example, Dean Acheson, a Chinese specialist, replaced Grew as Undersecretary of State on 11 August 1945. In addition, as a political adviser to General MacArthur, SCAP appointed George Atcheson, Jr. a Chinese specialist. SCAP did not select any senior Japanese experts such as Grew and Blakeslee although they had been engaged in policies as to Japan.^{4 3}

Because of this change, Borton found his influence waning. His “responsibilities were no longer challenging,” he wrote down. In addition, six years’ absence from his teaching position made him eager to return Columbia University to teach Japanese history again. He resigned from the Department of State on 30 June 1948.^{4 4}

¹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 74.

² Borton, *Memoirs*, 78.

³ Borton, *Memoirs*, 82.

⁴ Borton, *Memoirs*, 83.

⁵ Borton, *Memoirs*, 83.

⁶ For the crisis between the United States and Japan, see Waldo Heinrichs, *Threshold of War: Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Entry into World War II* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

⁷ Hugh Borton, *American Presurrender Planning for Postwar Japan*, Occasional Papers of the East Asian Institute (New York: Columbia University, 1967), 5, hereafter, Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*.

⁸ Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*, 5-6.

⁹ Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*, 6.

¹⁰ Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*, 8.

¹¹ In addition to Borton, Cabot Coville a Foreign Service Officer who knew the Japanese language and had formerly worked in the American Embassy in Tokyo, and Robert A. Fearey, who served as personal secretary to American Ambassador to Japan, Joseph P. Grew, joined the East Asian group.

¹² Borton, *Memoirs*, 84.

¹³ Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*, 8-9.

-
- ¹⁴ Borton, *Memoirs*, 94.
- ¹⁵ The Records of Harry A Notter, 1939-1945, Box 65, "Japan: Postwar Political Problems," (T381) 6 October 1943, RG 59, General Records of the Department of State, National Archives in College Park, Maryland (NARA).
- ¹⁶ For the Emperor system issue in the events leading to Japan's surrender, see *Richard B. Frank, Downfall: the End of the Imperial Japanese Empire* (New York: Random House, 1999), 214-21.
- ¹⁷ The Records of Harry Notter, Box 65, RG 59 NARA.
- ¹⁸ John W. Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986), 55.
- ¹⁹ The committee was composed of the Secretary of State, the Undersecretary, and the Assistant Secretaries, and considered as one of two high-level committees in the Department of State.
- ²⁰ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 14.
- ²¹ *United States Department of State. Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers (FRUS), The Near East, South Asia, Africa, and the Far East, 1944*, vol.5, (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1965), 1190.
- ²² *FRUS*, 1944, vol.5, 1191-94.
- ²³ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 14.
- ²⁴ Makoto, Iokibe, *Beikoku no Nihon Senryo Seisaku: Sengo Nihon no Sekkeizu* (American Occupation of Japan: A Plan for Postwar Japan), 2 vols, (Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1985), 22, hereafter, Iokibe, *Beikoku no Nihon Senryo Seisaku*.
- ²⁵ Iokibe, *Beikoku no Nihon Senryo Seisaku*, II, 22-23.
- ²⁶ The document was first set up as PWC108 (CAC116) 14 March 1944, and became PWC108b (CAC116b) after some modification.
- ²⁷ The Records of Harry A Notter, 1939-1945, "Japan: The Postwar Objectives of the United States in Regard to Japan," (PWC108b/CAC116b), 4 May 1944, Box 142, RG 59, NARA.
- ²⁸ The Records of Harry Notter, Box 142, RG 59, NARA.
- ²⁹ The Records of Harry Notter, Box 142, RG 59, NARA.
- ³⁰ The Records of Harry Notter, Box 142, RG 59, NARA.
- ³¹ First draft was submitted on 4 May 1944 and revised as PWC1 52b (CAC185b) which was based on his document, T358.
- ³² The Records of Harry Notter, Box 144, RG 59, NARA.
- ³³ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 15.
- ³⁴ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 16; As for the discussion if the Emperor system should be left, see John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999).
- ³⁵ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 18.
- ³⁶ Borton, *American Pressureender Planning*, 18.
- ³⁷ Country specialist was the position which concentrated on researching specific area in Department of State. Borton as a country specialist specialized in the Far East.
- ³⁸ Borton, *Memoirs*, 124.
- ³⁹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 147-48.
- ⁴⁰ Borton, *Memoirs*, 148-49.
- ⁴¹ Borton, *Memoirs*, ix.
- ⁴² John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 221, hereafter, Dower, *Embracing Defeat*.
- ⁴³ Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 222-24.
- ⁴⁴ Borton, *Memoirs*, 218.

CHAPTER 4

THE JAPANESE SCHOLAR

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the outbreak of World War II made Japan and Japanese studies important in the political field as well as academic field. At Columbia University, for example, the rising tension between the United States and Japan during the war had led to doubling the budget for Japanese studies.¹ Many Americans decided to specialize in Japanese studies because experts on Japanese studies were in demand in the United States.² This trend carried over into the postwar era as well.

After resigning from the Department of State on 30 June 1948, Borton returned to Columbia University to help develop the new East Asian Institute and to restart his career teaching and writing about Japanese modern history. In this chapter, after an explanation of the development of Japanese studies in the United States, his contribution to the development of Asian studies in the United States and his efforts on behalf of American-Japanese scholarly cooperation will be discussed.

History and Development of Japanese Studies in the United States

The attempt to offer Japanese studies in the United States began in California when Edward Tompkinson, the senator in California, contributed about 50 acres of land close to the University of California at Oakland in 1876 for building facilities to house Japanese and Chinese studies. It was not until 1896, however, that Professor John Fryer who was born in Britain and stayed many years in China was appointed to the position of teaching Chinese. The university could not find an American

who could teach Asian studies at the time and decided to assign the Englishman. Another fifteen years passed before the teaching of Japanese started in the university: Yoshi S. Kuno was assigned to teaching Japanese language and history in 1911.³

The first appointment of a professor of Japanese in the United States, however, was actually Professor Kanichi Asakawa at Yale University in 1906. Borton considered Asakawa to be the first adequate professor who taught Japanese studies in the United States.⁴ During his study at Yale University for a Ph.D. degree of history, Asakawa wrote that his purpose in life was “bringing mutual understanding between the Occident and Orient which will bring the advance of history.”⁵ He also wanted to enlighten the Americans about Japan and to make Japanese history an essential field in world history. Borton commented that while Asakawa was a fine scholar and his studies about Japanese feudalism had a great impact on later researchers, he was not, however, good at training his students.⁶

Another boost to Japanese studies before World War I was the establishment of the Japan Society in New York in 1907. It was created as a result of the increasing commercial and financial exchanges between the United States and Japan.⁷ The aim of the society was to promote greater understanding and cooperation between two countries and to reflect a broader Asian and global context in American-Japanese relations.⁸

After World War I, the development of Japanese studies made little progress in universities in the United States. Outside academia, however, a major event in Asian and Pacific studies occurred: the establishment of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Before the foundation of the IPR, there were no mechanisms for

the systematic study for Asia and the Pacific, and IPR became the most prominent organization for that purpose from the late 1920s to the mid 1950s. John King Fairbank, a leading scholar of Chinese studies who taught at Harvard University for more than fifty years, said that the IPR was a kind of “great grandfather” of Asian-Pacific studies.⁹

The origins of the IPR started in 1919 when the American YMCA selected Honolulu, Hawaii as the site of a conference to “explore the fundamental and universal elements of Christianity that contributed to a common basis of understanding and motivation for the Pacific peoples,”¹⁰ In 1922 when Frank C. Atherton, a business and civic leader in Honolulu, became responsible for the conference, he suggested that the IPR should be a permanent, independent, and international association of influential Pacific people devoted to consultation and research directed at reducing conflict. In addition, he would introduce the Pacific into the perspective of the Eurocentric world and first proposed the round-table discussion of a full range of Asian and Pacific issues in the planned conference. The organization was important because it made people inside as well as outside Asia and the Pacific notice the importance of the areas as early as in the 1920s.¹¹

The main efforts of the IPR were devoted to collecting information, elucidating the international significances and promoting the development of Asian and Pacific areas. Borton also contributed to the IPR and published his book, *Japan since 1931: Its Political and Social Developments*, in order to make recent Japanese information available to the Americans.¹²

Another big event in the development of Japanese studies was the foundation of the Harvard-Yenching Institute at Harvard University in 1928, with Serge

Elisseeff who had been teaching at the University of Paris and was the leading professional scholar in Japanese studies at the time, as the director. The institute was established by funding from the estate of Charles M. Hall, the inventor of an electrical process for refining aluminum from bauxite ore.^{1 3}

Wallace B. Donham, the Dean of the Harvard Business School, and J. Leighton Stuart, the President of Yenching University, a missionary school in Peking, China, decided that the new institute should concentrate on the development of Chinese historical and cultural studies at the Christian colleges in China under the joint names of their two universities. According to their plans, Yenching University was to be a center for graduate training in the field while Harvard University would create a center of Chinese studies to help train scholars and students. In the early years, the institute concentrated on research activities in China, Central Asia, and Indo-China and did not pay much attention to Japanese studies.^{1 4} Some of the grant to the institute, nevertheless, was used to support those who hoped to specialize in Japanese studies. For example, Borton and Edwin Reischauer, who was a graduate student at Harvard at the time, both got a fellowship from the institute to attend a special six-week summer seminar on the Far East at Harvard.^{1 5}

In addition to Harvard, Columbia University also prepared to establish Japanese studies. Since 1935, Professor Evarts B. Greene who was a senior member of the Department of History at Columbia and who encouraged Borton to keep studying Japanese had tried to get financial support for an expanded Japanese studies program.^{1 6} According to Borton, Greene's failure in getting financial aid resulted from the fact that the chief executive officers in larger foundations and corporations undervalued the non-Western world and did not see any need for

American universities to develop graduate programs for training scholars in non-Western culture.¹⁷

Greene, however, did not give up on the expansion of Japanese studies at Columbia. He was determined to establish Japanese studies on a more permanent basis and asked George Sansom about accepting a permanent appointment because Greene was impressed with Sansom's teaching and knowledge and thought that with him on the faculty Japanese studies at Columbia would be assured a position of distinct leadership among American institutions. But Sansom replied that he needed to continue to work for the government service because the international situation was becoming worse. Despite this setback, Greene got satisfaction from the trustees of Columbia who approved the establishment of the Institute of Japanese Studies for the further promotion of Japanese studies and research, and appointed him as a first chairman.¹⁸

In the 1930s, compared with the European countries, the United States did not have excellent Ph.D. programs for Japanese studies; however, Japanese studies as one of the academic fields gradually became established and eventually became recognized as a result of World War II. The United States government, as we have seen, needed to train Japanese experts to translate Japanese messages and military codes, to teach in American military school, to deal with Japanese military in the field, and to participate in the occupation of postwar Japan. Because of these needs, Japanese programs in the United States increased.¹⁹ Ironically, the conflict between the United States and Japan led to the United States becoming a leader in the field of Japanese studies.

After World War II, the boom in Japanese studies continued, and Robert B.

Hall's establishment of the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan promoted the development of the Japanese studies in the 1950s and 1960s. During these years, several East Asia programs were founded mainly at the universities that had trained military personnel during World War II.²⁰

Funding for the establishment of new programs came from the Ford Foundation and the United States government. For example, because of the concerns of the Cold War, the United States government passed the National Defense Education Act in 1958 in order to stimulate the advancement of education such as modern language and area studies as well as mathematics and science. For Japanese studies, the Ford Foundation founded two separate programs. One, the Foreign Area Fellowship Program made it possible for researchers to travel and to stay abroad for research. The other, the International Training and Research Program, made it possible for several universities in the United States to found or expand Japanese studies especially in the late 1950s and early 1960s.²¹

After World War II, despite several problems Japanese studies slowly but gradually kept developing. In 1958, the Asia Society which was founded in 1956 by John D. Rockefeller III to promote understanding between Americans and Asians released a report called "The Treatment of Asia in American Education: An Exploratory Background Paper," in order to show the recent Asian Studies' situation in the United States.²² According to the report, American education was still Europe-centered and provided inadequate treatment of the non-Western fields. In 1955, for example, a survey of American colleges and universities concerning an undergraduate education showed that forty percentages of the answers pointed out the lack of opportunities for the study of Asia.²³ The report concluded, therefore,

that the ultimate objective to further efforts in Asian studies should be to eliminate the bias against the non-Western world in American education and to make the study of Asian studies an “integral part of the educational process in proportionate relation to the total educational responsibilities” of American educational institutions of all levels.^{2 4}

Hugh Borton and his Presidency of the Association for Asian Studies

Throughout his life, Borton became involved in several organizations devoted to Japanese and Asian studies. Not only did he hold the position of the Director of the East Asia Institute at Columbia University from 1954 to 1957, he also served as the President of the Association for Asian Studies from 1957 to 1958 which sought to facilitate contact and an exchange of information among scholars through publications, meetings, and seminars to increase their understanding of entire Asia.^{2 5} After leaving the Department of State, he was also interested in Asian studies in general as well as in Japanese studies. In addition to Japan, among Asian countries, he was interested in problems in Korea, and wrote several reports on postwar American-Korean relations.

Thinking about the “Annual Report of the Secretariat, 1957-1958”, it is clear to see what kind of association it was during Borton’s presidency era. The main business of the association since 1941 was to publish *the Far Eastern Quarterly*.^{2 6} A comparison between 1949 and 1958 showed that the association had been growing and changing a great deal under Borton as the president. For example, the membership had grown from 606 in 1949 to 1,022 in 1958 and the total circulation of the journal increased from 1,104 in 1949 to 1,984 in 1958.^{2 7}

As the records above show, the association had been increasing its business during Borton's presidency; however, Borton was not satisfied with the result. He tried to promote the association and Asian studies more and held the meetings of the Research Committee for the Development of Asian Studies on 6 April 1956 in Philadelphia and on 14 December 1956 at Columbia University. Borton and the other five members attended both meetings.²⁸ In the meetings, the members confirmed the following four objectives: (1) consider plans for requirements of Asian studies in the immediate future; (2) look for joint sponsorship for projects of research, teaching, and so on; (3) act as a liaison agent between the government and the association and universities to assure training programs; and (4) act as an advisory committee.²⁹

In order to promote these four objectives, several proposals were suggested, mainly to create new organizations and to facilitate new activities. For example, the plan for a national conference on Asian studies in the colleges was offered. The committee considered the problem of Asian studies in the liberal arts colleges, including the question of how coverage of Asia in the curriculum would be increased and what the most effective courses should be. In addition, hoping to promote cooperation between American and Asian scholars in their research, the committee suggested a conference on joint Asian-American research.³⁰

The proposal for summer institutes for secondary school teachers was raised which Borton worked hard to make come true during his presidency. The summer plan was envisioned as the creation of a faculty group of six to eight Asian specialists in different disciplines from various universities. Each summer, the faculty group would move to a new university. In order to expedite this plan, the

committee recommended that a special subcommittee should be organized to see if it could be useful for Asian studies.

Borton established several summer programs to develop Asian studies and to increase employment for history teachers. For example, in addition to the summer program for secondary teachers, he and the association supported summer programs for non-specialists. Because of the latter, the Ad Hoc Action Committee of Summer Programs for the Non-Specialist was authorized by the Board of Directors of the association at its meeting 1 April 1957. The seven members of the committee included Borton, and Paul C. Sherbert served as the chairman.^{3 1}

Actually, prior to the committee meetings, Borton had already suggested several points for the summer program for non-specialists by submitting a memorandum to the Executive Committee of the association on 8 April 1957. In the letter, he said that the ad hoc committee's focus should be to consider the whole question of the summer institutes including the suggestions as to what steps should be taken to obtain funds and who should take part in the committee. He recommended the committee members which would subsequently be appointed. He also emphasized that the summer program should be held in several institutions and universities rather than just one.^{3 2} Because he was the president of the association and had authority over the association, all of his suggestions were later accepted.

Two meetings, on 9 and 31 May 1957, were held for the purpose of the development of summer programs on Asia for in-service teachers and other non-specialists and preparation for a proposal for the development of these programs under the direction of the association. This task was completed in August 1957,

and on 5 September 1957, Borton circulated a document, “A Proposal for the Planned Development of Summer Programs on Asia for Non-Specialists” to the directors of the association for their approval.^{3 3}

In the proposal, the committee clearly defined the summer programs for non-specialists and their purposes. The objective of the program was to expand the study and teaching about Asia not only at higher-education levels but also at all levels of American education with particular emphasis on secondary schools. The latter was based on the experience provided by summer programs on Asia for secondary school teachers which had been recently held at universities throughout the United States. The plan called for assistance to about 65 cooperating institutions in organizing programs. Primary emphasis was to provide substantive background in the major Asian civilizations for their teaching and other professional activities.^{3 4} The summer program was a long-range plan and did not have results during his presidency; however, it was implemented after his resignation and developed into a successful program.

Borton’s other big contribution to the association was the participation in the Sixth National Conference for UNESCO at San Francisco from 6 to 9 November 1957 because Max McCullough, Executive Secretary of the American Commission for UNESCO, asked the Association for Asian Studies to help the session concerning with “Education.”^{3 5} The theme of the conference was “What the U.S. Citizen can do to promote mutual understanding and cooperation,” and the attention of the participants was focused on a study of the means for increasing mutual understanding and cooperation between the United States and Asia.^{3 6}

In regard to McCullough’s request, Borton insisted that his association should

accept because it was an honor as well as recognition of status which the association could not ignore.^{3 7} He thought that its participation might enhance the reputation of the association and promote the interests in Asian studies among Americans.

In response to Borton's urging, the association decided to undertake the responsibility. The conference was divided into six sections and the association supervised one section, "Educational Problems of Asia, and the Study of Asian-American Understanding and Cooperation."^{3 8} In a day-long session, the Association for Asian Studies came up with six major recommendations.

Therefore: (1) a more balanced treatment of Asian culture in the curriculum of all American schools at all levels with better coverage in textbooks and courses in the lower levels of education, and more courses specializing in Asia at the university level; (2) more exchanges of students and intellectual leaders between the United States and Asia; (3) better orientation of American representatives of all kinds going to Asia; (4) rapid and substantial increase in the production of resources for teaching Asian culture such as art, music, literature, and so on, and the establishment of "material centers" regionally distributed throughout the United States for use by teachers and students; (5) support of an expanded program of training Asian specialists and technologists in their own countries; and (6) support of the proposal of the Association for Asian Studies for an expanded program of summer workshops in Asian studies for teachers.^{3 9}

Hugh Borton and his Involvement in the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange

Another of Borton's significant commitments to American-Japanese

relationships was the participation in the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange (CULCON). Because of Edwin Reischauer's effort, the American ambassador to Japan, President John. F. Kennedy and Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda agreed to establish CULCON in 1961 in a joint communiqué, 22 June 1961.^{4 0} CULCON was organized as a high-level forum for meetings of American and Japanese leaders in government, academia, the arts, business, and the media. The primary purpose was to strengthen cultural and intellectual ties between the two countries. The weakest link in the exchange was considered to be the lack of understanding between the intellectuals of Japan and those of the United States, and both countries hoped that the conference would bring further ties and better understanding between these intellectuals. Because of Reischauer's recommendation, Borton who had already been the President of Haverford College, was appointed the chairman of the United States delegation.^{4 1}

The first CULCON conference was held in Tokyo on 25 January 1962. The main purpose of the first conference was to have an opportunity for both countries to suggest subjects to be considered and to find out how much the two countries really had known of each other and how they could learn more for building good future relationships. The main members from Japan were Japanese intellectuals predominantly from the academic world while the Americans were mainly those who had engaged in education and cultural affairs in the Department of State and had knowledge of Japan.^{4 2}

Actually, in the conference, most of the time was spent discussing the detailed report on the history of exchanges between the two countries since 1951 that had been co-authored by Dr. Robert Shwantes of the Asia Foundation and Prof. Kenichi

Nakaya of Tokyo University.^{4 3} The discussions based on the report focused on seven topics: exchanges between American and Japanese people, exchanges of books and materials, exchanges of art, area studies, language education, the activities of private and public organizations in both countries as to cultural and intellectual exchanges, and future cultural exchanges.^{4 4}

Throughout the discussion, the delegates from both countries mainly talked about the problems and criticisms of the exchange programs between the two countries. For example, the American delegates said that a lack of Japanese books and books in English about Japan made it difficult for the Americans to understand Japanese and urged the Japanese delegates to work on translating Japanese books into English. In addition, both groups of delegates pointed out the difficulty in communication because of the difference of their native languages. In Japan, it was hard to learn “real” English because of the lack of native English teachers. The delegates agreed that the language was just the means to communicate because language ability was not the same as substantive understanding, but language was essential to promote cultural and intellectual exchanges.^{4 5}

Throughout the conference, the mood was very friendly and cooperative and without any conflicts. Even if both sides had different opinions, they tried to seek a compromise and to share with each other on every point. In the fields of politics and economics, the United States still had priority over Japan; however, as to cultural exchanges, there was no such difference.^{4 6}

As for the purpose of CULCON, Borton pointed out as follows in his lecture in Asahi Auditorium, Tokyo. He said that Americans knew much less about Japan than Japanese knew about the United States; therefore, throughout the conference

and the activities in CULCON, the specialists on both countries noticed the needs to educate their fellow citizens. He continued that American-Japanese relations were high at the time and that the Japanese should take advantage of the American good will to build even better relations.^{4 7}

For Borton, the conference had a special meaning far beyond serving as a chairman. He met both Reischauer and Burton Fars who was in charge of cultural affairs at the American embassy in Tokyo for the first time since they studied together in Europe and Japan.^{4 8} Such friendships made it easier for conference attendees to move forward and to get agreement on policies.

The second CULCON meeting was held in Washington D.C. in late October in 1963, and Borton still served as chairman of American delegates. Before the opening, he and Tatsuo Morito, chairman of Japanese delegation, had an opportunity to meet President Kennedy in White House. Kennedy showed a personal interest in the success of CULCON, emphasized the importance for the United States and Japan of developing close relationships, and expressed his hope that the meeting would be an effective means of achieving that end.^{4 9}

In addition to the organizations that are mentioned in this thesis, Borton took part in several lesser organizations, sometimes as a director, other times just as a member. As a Japanese scholar who also knew well about the situation of whole Asia, his participations in such organizations were very precious. He could equally comment from both positions: view from Japan and the United States since he understood both very well.

¹ Masao Takahashi, "The Intellectuals in Japan and America," *Japan Quarterly* 8 (Fall 1966): 323.

² Those who specialized in Japanese studies were called the second generation of Japanese studies while Hugh Borton and other specialists who took active role in

Japan and its studies during World War II were called the first generation.

³ Hugh Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi (The pioneers of Japanese Studies)," in *Washington Taisei to Nichibei Kankei* (The Washington treaty system and American-Japanese relations), trans. Makoto Saito, eds. Chihiro Hosoya and Makoto Saito (Tokyo: Tokyodaogaku Shuppankai, 1986), 545, hereafter, Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi."

⁴ Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi," 545.

⁵ John W. Hall, *Asakawa Kanichi: Land and Society in Medieval Japan* (Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkokai, 1969), 25, quoted in Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi," 546; Kanichi Asakawa's title of his dissertation was "The Early Institutional life of Japan, A Study in the Reform of 645 A.D."

⁶ Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi," 546-47.

⁷ Borton, "Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi," 548.

⁸ Webpage of Japan Society, New York, <<http://www.japansociety.org/about/>>.

⁹ Paul F. Hooper, "The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Origins of Asian and Pacific Studies," *Pacific Affairs* 61 (Spring 1988): 98-99, hereafter, Hooper, "The Institute of Pacific Relations."

¹⁰ *Institute of Pacific Relations: Honolulu Session, June 30-July 15, 1925* (Honolulu: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1925), 8, quoted in Hooper, "The Institute of Pacific Relations," 99.

¹¹ Hooper, "The Institute of Pacific Relations," 99-100.

¹² Hugh Borton, *Japan since 1931: its Political and Social Developments*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1940.

¹³ Edwin O. Reischauer, *My Life between Japan and the United States* (New York: HarperCollins, 1986), 38, 42-43, hereafter, Reischauer, *My Life between Japan and the United States*.

¹⁴ Reischauer, *My Life between Japan and the United States*, 39.

¹⁵ Borton, *Memoirs*, 42.

¹⁶ Professor Greene also helped Borton to become a lecturer in Japanese on 1 September 1937.

¹⁷ Borton, *Memoirs*, 68.

¹⁸ Borton, *Memoirs*, 68.

¹⁹ Rudolph Janssens and Andrew Gordon, "A Short History of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies," Social Science Research Council. <<http://www.ssrc.org/programs/japan/publicatons/japanstdhis.pdf>>, hereafter, Janssens and Gordon, "A Shorthistory of the JCJS."

²⁰ Janssens and Gordon, "A Short History of the JCJS," 2.

²¹ Janssens and Gordon, "A Short History of the JCJS," 3.

²² Webpage of the Asia Society, <<http://www.asiasociety.org/about/mission.html>>

²³ A recent research of the treatment of Asia in elementary and secondary school textbooks sponsored by UNESCO also indicated that an average of less than 20% of their content was devoted to Asia.

²⁴ The Asia Society, "The Treatment of Asia in American Education: An Exploratory Background Paper," 28 January 1958. Box 7: Papers of Hugh Borton including Association for Asian Studies Material, 1954-1957, Haverford College QSC in Magill Library in Haverford, Pennsylvania (QSC).

²⁵ Webpage of The Association for Asian Studies, <<http://www.aasianst.org/aboutaas.htm>>; Borton was the vice president before his presidency.

²⁶ Today, the *Far Eastern Quarterly* has changed its name and is called the *Journal of Asian Studies*.

²⁷ The Asia Society, "The Treatment of Asia in American Education," QSC.

²⁸ "Report to Association of Asian Studies for the Research Committee for the

Development of Asian Studies,” Box 7: Papers of Borton, QSC.

²⁹ “Report on Association of Asian Studies for the Research Committee,” QSC.

³⁰ “Report on Association of Asian Studies for the Research Committee,” QSC.

³¹ Association for Asian Studies, “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Programs for Non-Specialists to the Board of Directors,” QSC: The Committee members were Borton, John Fairbank, William Henderson, Hyman Kublin, Douglas Overton, Paul Sherbert and Joseph Yamagiwa.

³² Hugh Borton, “Memorandum to the Executive Committee of the Association of Asian Studies,” 8 April 1957, QSC.

³³ “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Programs,” QSC.

³⁴ “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Programs,” QSC.

³⁵ Hugh Borton, “Memorandum to the Executive Committee of the Association of Asian Studies,” 24 April 1957, QSC.

³⁶ “Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies,” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, July 1957, QSC.

³⁷ Borton, “Memorandum to the Executive Committee of the Association of Asian Studies,” QSC.

³⁸ The other five sections were (1) the Mind and Spirit of Asia: Achieving Understanding through philosophies and Religions; (2) the Creative Arts in Asia: Literature, Architecture, Painting, Sculpture, Music, Dance, and the Theater; (3) science and Technology in Asia and their Social Impact; (4) economic Relations in Asian-American Understanding and Cooperation, and (5) Asian-American Understanding and Misunderstanding: the Problem of Effective Communication; *The Journal of Asian Studies*, “Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies,” January 1958, QSC.

³⁹ “Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies,” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, January 1958, QSC.

⁴⁰ CULCON is the last in a series of three conferences created by Kennedy and Ikeda: the other two meetings to solve the problems of scientific and economic problems were held in 1961.

⁴¹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 258.

⁴² A.M. Rosenthal, “U.S. and Japanese Intellectuals Will Meet in Tokyo This Week,” *New York Times*, 22 January 1962.

⁴³ *New York Times*, 22 January 1962.

⁴⁴ Kenichi Nakaya, “Nichibei Kyoiku Bunka Kaigi no Seika (Results of CULCON),” *Nichibei Forum* 8 (April 1962): 42-47, hereafter, Nakaya, “Nichibei Kyoiku Bunka Kaigo no Seika.”

⁴⁵ Nakaya, “Nichibei Kyoiku Bunka Kaigo no Seika,” 44-47.

⁴⁶ Nakaya, “Nichibei Kyoiku Bunka Kaigo no Seika,” 69.

⁴⁷ Hugh Borton, ““Nichibei Bunka Kankei no Kako Genzai Shorai (Thinking about past, present, and future American-Japanese relationships),” *Nichibei Forum* 8 (April 1962): 6-7.

⁴⁸ Borton, *Memoirs*, 258.

⁴⁹ Borton, *Memoirs*, 259.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Looking back on his own life, Borton said, “Having decided to enter a new field of study and set for myself a high standard of intellectual and personal integrity, I was fortunate to have done so when my special knowledge was useful both for the academic world and for our government in determining its postwar policies toward Japan.”¹ In that sentence, he summed up his life’s work. But as one would expect from a man with Quaker humility, he was being modest. His accomplishments were extraordinary and had an influence far beyond the halls of academia.

Today, many universities in the United States offer a wide range of courses as to Japan such as Japanese language, history, and culture. It is also impossible to count how many experts on Japan are in the United States. When Borton, however, became interested in Japan and its studies since his first visit to Japan in 1928 as missionary of AFSC, there were few experts on Japan, and Japanese studies were rare in the United States. Even after he went back to the United States and started to study about Japan, Japanese studies was still minor, and he became one of the “pioneers of Japanese studies.” As a pioneer, he took an active role in popularizing Japan and its studies. In the academic area, he contributed to the expansion of Japanese studies by teaching courses about Japan especially in Columbia University and its East Asian Institute.

Even in the Department of State, Borton, as an expert on Japan, guided the American government to make policies toward postwar Japan and the Far East by

using his knowledge on Japan and experiences that he had got during his stay in Japan. Especially, in spite of strong opposition, his contributions to making SCAP keep the Emperor system and adopt the indirect occupation of Japan were remarkable.

Even after he resigned from the Department of State in 1948, he quickly returned to his academic life, teaching Japanese courses in Columbia. Because of World War II, the students who hoped to learn about Japan sharply increased, and the need for Japanese studies and scholars also rose. Before the war, it was very difficult for the Japanese teachers to make most Americans take an interest in Japanese studies; however, ironically, the war against Japan brought heightened interest of Japan. As a result of the popularization of Japan, Columbia University succeeded in establishing the East Asian Institute as a result of a special Rockefeller Foundation grant, and Borton became the Associate Director of it while George Sansom became the Director.

As a graduate student, Borton was interested in traditional Japan and medieval history; however, it seems that his research in the Department of State gave him a new field of Japanese history: after 1948, he energetically worked on Japanese modern history. He, in addition, was asked to write extended accounts of Japan under Allied occupation and of Korea under American and Soviet occupation for one volume on the Far East.² In addition to his interest in Japan, he came to be curious about Korea under American and Soviet occupation and the Pacific trusteeship. By this time, his interests included the whole Pacific rim. Taking part in several organizations committed to Asian as well as Japanese studies, he further helped bring about better between the United States and Japan.

While relations today between Japan and the United States are relatively smooth, such has not always been the case. Because of a number of factors— race, cultural differences, and imperial ambitions— American-Japanese relations have had a tumultuous history since Commodore Mathew C. Perry came to Tokyo Bay in 1853 and forced Japan to open its doors. From 1853 to the end of the Russo-Japanese War, for example, the two countries got along well with each other, for they were attracted to each other by common interests in opening China, working with Great Britain, and checking Russian colonialism.³ After the war, however, their relationship turned from friendship to rivalry because of the problems of race and colonialism.⁴ They even began to consider and plan that the other would become an enemy. And this came true. Even if the Japanese were not solely at fault, the fact remains that they started the Pacific War with a surprise attack on the American naval base in Hawaii in 1941. From the 1930s to the 1950s when Borton was active as an expert on Japan, therefore, relationships between the two countries were not good; however, he tried his best to promote good relationships and actually, succeeded in improving their relations. Unfortunately, not many Americans and Japanese know about what he has done for both countries— this thesis, it is hoped, will perhaps help to set the record straight.

¹ Eric Pace, “Hugh Borton, 92, Expert on Japan and Ex-College President, Dies,” *New York Times*, 9 August 1995.

² The book was published in 1955 as follows: F.C. Jones, Hugh Borton, and B.R. Pearce, *The Far East, 1942-1946*, ed. Arnold Toynbee (New York: Oxford University Press).

³ Walter LaFeber, *The Clash: American Japanese Relations throughout History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997), 63, hereafter, LaFeber, *The Clash*.

⁴ LaFeber, *The Clash*, 64.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Papers of Hugh Borton, American Friends Service Committee Archives National Office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Columbia University Oral History Collection in Butler Library in New York.

Haverford College Quaker and Special Collection in Magill Library in Haverford, Pennsylvania.

The United States Department of State Records, RG 59, National Archives in College Park, Maryland

Primary Sources: Works by Hugh Borton (Chronological Order)

“A Survey of Japanese Historiography.” *The American Historical Review* 43 (April 1938): 489-99.

“United States Occupation Policies in Japan since Surrender.” *Political Science Quarterly* 62 (June 1947): 250-57.

Borton, ed. *Japan*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1951.

“Past Limitations and the Future of Democracy in Japan.” *Political Science Quarterly* 70 (September 1955): 410-20.

Borton, Jerome Cohen, William Jordern, Donald Keene, Paul Langer, and Martin Wilbur. *Japan between East and West*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

“Asian Studies and the American Colleges.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (November 1958): 59-65.

“Nichibei Bunka Kankei no Kako Genzai Shorai (Thinking about past, present, and future American-Japanese relationship).” *Nichibei Forum* 8 (April 1962): 1-9.

“Preparation for the Occupation of Japan.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 25 (February 1966): 203-12.

American Presurrender Planning for Postwar Japan. Occasional Papers of the East Asian Institute. New York: Columbia University, 1967.

“Nihon Kenkyu no Kaitakushatachi (The pioneers of Japanese Studies.” In *Washington Taisei to Nichibei Kankei (The Washington Treaty System and American-Japanese Relations)*. Translated by Makoto Saito, ed. Chihiro

Hosoya and Makoto Saito. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1986.

Spanning Japan's Modern Century: The Memoirs of Hugh Borton. With a forward by James W. Moreley. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002.

Primary Sources: Published

Nakaya, Kenichi. "Nichibei Kyoiku Bunka Kaigi no Seika (Results of CULCON)." *Nichibei Forum* 8 (April 1962): 42-47, 69.

Office of Government Reports. *United States Government Manual*. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1942-1947.

Reischauer, Edwin O. *My Life between Japan and America*. New York: HarperCollins, 1986.

United States Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States; Diplomatic Papers*. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1964-1970.

United States Department of States. *Occupation of Japan: Policy and Progress*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

_____. *The Far Eastern Commission, A Study in International Cooperation: 1945 to 1952*. Far Eastern Series 60. Washington D.C.: Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs.

_____. *The Far Eastern Commission, Second Report by the Secretary General: July 10, 1947- December 23, 1948*. Far Eastern Series 29. Washington D.C.: Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs.

Secondary Sources

Ara, Takashi. *Nihon Senryoshi Kenkyu Josetsu* (Studies about the American occupation of Japan). Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1994.

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

_____. *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986.

Frank, Richard B. *Downfall: the End of the Imperial Japanese Empire*. New York: Random House, 1999.

Hardacre, Helen, ed. *The Postwar Development of Japanese Studies in the United*

- States*. Brill's Japanese Studies Library Vol.8. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1998.
- Heinrichs, Waldo. *Threshold of War: Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Entry into World War II*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Iokibe, Makoto. *Beikoku no Nihon Senryo Seisaku: Sengo Nihon no Sekkeizu* (American Occupation of Japan: A Plan for Postwar Japan). 2 vols. Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1985.
- _____. *Nichi-Bei Senso to Sengo Nihon* (American-Japanese war and Japan after World War II). Osaka: Osaka Shoseki, 1989.
- Iriye, Akira. *Power and Culture: The Japanese-American War, 1941-1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Janssens, Rudolph and Andrew Gordon. "A Short History of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies." Social Science Research Council. <www.ssrc.org/programs/japan/publications/japanstdhis.pdf>. [Accessed 10 April 2004].
- Katagiri, Nobuo. *Taiheiyo Mondai Chosakai no Kenkyu: Senkanki Nihon IPR no Katudo wo Chushin to Shite* (Studies about Institute of Pacific Relations, especially Japanese activities between World War I and II). Tokyo: Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai, 2003.
- LaFeber, Walter. *The Clash: American-Japanese Relations throughout History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Masao, Takahashi. "The Intellectuals in Japan and America." *Japanese Quarterly* 8:3 (Fall 1966): 319-329.
- Miner, Richard H. "Cross-Cultural Perception and World War II: American Japanists of the 1940s and their Image of Japan." *International Studies Quarterly* 24 (December 1980):555-80.
- Momose, Takashi. *Jiten Showa Sengo no Nihon: Senryo to Kaikaku* (Japan after World War II: American occupation and its reforms). Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1995.
- Moore, Ray A., and Donald L. Robinson. *Partners for Democracy: Crafting the New Japanese State under MacArthur*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Morita, Hideyuki. *Tainichi Senryo Seisaku no Keisei: Amerika Kokumusho 1940-44* (Formation of American occupation of Japan from 1940 to 1944 in the United States Department of States). Tokyo: Ashi Shobo, 1981.
- Nishi, Osamu. *Nihonkoku Kenpo ha Koushite Umareta* (The record of how the

Constitution of Japan was made). Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 2000.

Nishi, Toshio. *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan 1945-1952*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.

Sharpless, Edith F. "Quaker in Japan: A Brief Account of the Origins and Development of the Religious Society of Friends, 1885 – 1943." Tokyo Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. <http://www2.gol.com/users/quakers/quakerism_in_Japan.htm>. [Accessed 10 April 2004].

Shirane, Haruo. "Attraction and Isolation: The Past and Future of East Asian Languages and Cultures." *Association of Department of Foreign Languages Bulletin* 34 (Winter 2003): 15-19.

Senryoshi Kenkyukai, ed. *Senryoshi Kenkyukai Nyusu* (Collection of news letters of occupational policies). Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1993.

Schaller, Michael. *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Sharpless, Edith F. "Quaker in Japan: A Brief Account of the Origins and Development of the Religious Society of Friends, 1885-1943." Tokyo Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.<http://www2.gol.com/users/quakers/quakerism_in_Japan.htm>. [Accessed 10 May 2004].

Toda, Tetsuko. "Firaderufia • Furendo to Nihon Nen kai 1900-1947 (Philadelphia Friends and Japan Yearly Meeting 1900-1947)." *Yamanashi Kenritsu Joshi Tanki Daigaku Kiyō* 36 (March 2003): 11-22.

Wolfe, Robert. *Americans as Proconsuls: United States Military Government in Germany and Japan, 1942-1952*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984

Yui, Daizaburo. *Mikan no Senryo Sesaku* (Unfinished American occupational policies toward Japan). Tokyo: Tokyo Daibaku Shuppankai, 1989.

Newspaper

New York Times (1939-1995)

VITA

HITOMI KINUHATA

- Personal Data: Date of Birth: 7 April 1977
 Place of Birth: Hyogo, Japan
- Education: Amagasaki Oda High School, Hyogo, Japan
 Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan; Literature, B.A., 2000
 Tsuda College, Graduate School of English Literary
 Studies, Tokyo, Japan; American Studies, M.A.,
 2002
 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City,
 Tennessee;
 History, M.A., 2004
- Professional
Experience: Event Planner, JTB Corporation, ICS Convention
 Design, Inc., Tokyo, Japan
 Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University
 Department of History, 2002-2004
- Honors and Awards: Member, Honor Society of *Phi Kappa Phi*
 Member, Japanese Association for American Studies