ARCHITECTS OF OCCUPATION

American Experts and the Planning for Postwar Japan

Dayna L. Barnes

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS ITHACA AND LONDON

1

FLIP-FLOPPER WITH THE FINAL SAY

Roosevelt and Japan

Discerning the foreign policy intentions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is a notoriously difficult task. The president made conflicting statements and rarely gave clear indications of his postwar aims to his advisers. Roosevelt was also not an expert on East Asia, and Japan was not at the top of his agenda. Nonetheless, FDR considered identifying goals for the postwar world during the war to be "a very valuable thing."[1] Roosevelt explained in 1942 that he hoped the State Department planning project would provide him a basket of plans into which he could reach to find postwar policy at the end of the conflict.[2] Planning and speculation about postwar Japan in the government, media, and informed circles all fit neatly into this metaphor. Wartime discussions were meant not to set a definite course but to build a framework and make future decisions easier. As Roosevelt saw it, during the previous war victors had been left without clear agreed aims because not enough postwar planning had taken place. Instead, the participants of the Versailles peace conference that followed World War I had been like ladies packing at the last minute for a husband's trip. Every one, Roosevelt recalled, was "rushing around, grabbing things out of closets and throwing them into suitcases."[3] His new basket approach would be more orderly than the ill-considered frenzy that had created a failed peace in 1919.

Roosevelt's simple picture of the planning process was complicated by his own administrative style. The president was reluctant to consult or inform his official experts and advisers, creating a deep rift between the White House and the State Department. This rift in turn meant that Asia experts in the State Department, who would frame postwar actions, were isolated from actual policy made during

the war. Casually made commitments, preconceived ideas, irregular consultation with experts, and rivalry between would-be advisers marred long-range planning in the Roosevelt era.

Because FDR was expected to have the final word in deciding policy, any plans for the future developed by experts accommodated his decisions and opinions. It is a challenge to divine which policies Roosevelt considered pulling from the policy basket before his death. In the absence of clear evidence, the president's thinking can be pieced together from his favored sources of information and management of advisers, his postwar plans for Germany and China, his comments on Japan, and the commitments he made at international conferences.

Lack of communication between the president and bureaucratic planning groups led to divergence between the president's aims and policy drafts. However, Roosevelt supported the planner's work to provide him with a diverse set of options, and in so doing he allowed for the development of a policy-creating network during the war. After Roosevelt's unexpected death, his successor inherited the policies created by that network.

Sources of Information and Analysis

Roosevelt's management created an atmosphere of policy confusion that characterized postwar planning. Roosevelt rarely spoke frankly with his advisers, who as a result could not incorporate his feedback into their work. In 1940 Ambassador Joseph Grew requested information on the president's thinking on Japan. The country, Grew wrote, had veered toward militarism, waged a war of aggression in China, and appeared to be on a collision course with the United States. The ambassador needed to understand his president's views in order to calibrate American policy on the ground. In his understated manner, Grew wrote that without this information, he "at times . . . felt just a little out on a limb here."[4] Roosevelt replied to this reasonable request with vague platitudes. "The problems we face," Roosevelt informed his ambassador, "are so vast and interrelated that any attempt even to state them compels one to think in terms of five continents and seven seas."[5] While perhaps true, such a comment left America's ambassador to Japan with very little in the way of guidance from Washington.

The president's relationships with official experts were also strained by his desire to find information through unusual channels. As Secretary of War Henry Stimson reflected in his diary, FDR's "ardent" enjoyment of getting "firsthand news . . . in an irregular way" was a "great mixture of good and bad qualities." This enthusiasm kept him engaged and supplied with fresh information. However, his preoccupation with getting an inside scoop caused him to undervalue

and even ignore the sort of "mature and solid information which comes from orderly processes through the regular channels." Stimson believed that this was an unfortunate habit that "we shall never be able to cure."[6] Officials exploited the president's ad hoc style of decision making and fascination with "outsider" information by sending him articles and reports, as well as making personal appeals in an attempt to shape Roosevelt's opinion. For example, Lauchlin Currie, the president's economic adviser and a China hand, wrote to a colleague that he had been "pushing, scheming, wrangling, bluffing and pleading all the time" to get support for the Chinese Nationalists.[7] Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau also privately resolved to "continue to feed the President suggestions" even when it appeared they would not be heeded.[8] Others asked the president's secretaries to "slip [documents] into his bag" and requested that aides forward items on to him.[9] While the approach of collecting bits of information informally gave the president varied information on the issues, his opinion was necessarily colored by the process. Roosevelt was vulnerable to novel ideas presented by enthusiastic favorites, and his sources lacked the context and thoughtfulness provided by formal processes.

With no clear channel between the president and his diplomatic corps at the State Department, the president was more likely to receive lengthy field reports from his personal envoys than from stationed embassy officials. Roosevelt had a habit of appointing personal ambassadors when he wanted "inside" information about situations in Europe and Asia. He encouraged foreign leaders to consider these men his "personal representatives" and to "to talk to them frankly." The presence of unofficial "ambassadors" with the mandate and ear of the president undermined the authority and mission of official ambassadors.[10] Although ambassadors and field officers in Asia sent reports back to Washington, these needed to pass from the chief of the division of Far Eastern affairs to the secretary of state and from there on to the president.[11] For such a document even to reach Roosevelt through normal channels, it needed to suit the interests of both the division chief and the secretary of state, which was no easy task. The former ambassador to Japan later recalled that "reporting to our Government was like throwing pebbles into a lake at night; we were not permitted to see even the ripples."[12] Although after December 1941 the point was moot for the embassy in Japan, this structural bias remained important to Roosevelt's understanding of the complicated issue of the internal situation in China. The president's predilection for sending personal ambassadors provided him with observations from brief visits abroad instead of reports from officials with more experience in the region. This gave him an understanding of distant countries based largely on anecdotal observations rather than expert analysis.

The president's support of favorites and his tendency to play staff members against each other left his advisers frustrated and confused.[13] FDR on occasion enthusiastically adopted new policies that he "handed down" as ready-made decisions "that brooked no rebellion."[14] He also encouraged rivalry. His decision-making process often consisted of setting up a quarrel and then deciding the best course after hearing both sides, a practice that drove officials "absolutely stark, staring mad."[15] Roosevelt so preferred Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles to Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the former was widely recognized as the unofficial secretary until the end of his career.[16] As a result of such behavior, Hull openly considered resignation at least twice, complaining that he was "constantly affronted and made unhappy by having . . . somebody . . . spring a fast diversion in foreign policy over his head, and finding out that the President stood by some favorite."[17] In an egregious example of this, Roosevelt in 1944 suddenly adopted Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau's radical plan to transform postwar Germany into an agrarian society after lunching with him. The president maintained his support for the plan over vocal protests from his cabinet and in spite of the fact that the plan contradicted a consensus on postwar Germany created by years of planning. Hull considered this "a repudiation." A colleague reported that the secretary was "worried sick and had not slept for two or three nights" as a result of the president's poor management.[18]

Although Roosevelt abandoned Morgenthau's plan as quickly as he had adopted it, the incident illustrated the "chaotic" nature of the administration because Roosevelt would easily "sign any paper . . . presented to him by one of his advisers without waiting for the criticism and counsel of the others."[19] Later, when Hull did resign, the president selected the younger and weak-willed Ed Stettinius to replace him. Roosevelt informed Stettinius that he had considered James Byrnes, a powerful and well-qualified senator, for the position but that he had decided on Stettinius because "Jimmy might question who was boss." Stettinius agreed to take the position, tactically conceding that the president had sole decision-making power in the realm of foreign policy, on the condition that Roosevelt keep the State Department better informed of his plans.[20] There is little evidence that even this small promise was kept.

Roosevelt's management of his advisers in Washington caused confusion and uncertainty. The president viewed the foreign policymaking process as selecting among the recommendations of his advisers, both formal and informal, as he saw fit. This practice caused problems within the administration. FDR's refusal to consult and collaborate led to a disconnection between official planning and his own thinking. As Hull dryly observed, "The President runs foreign affairs. I don't know what's going on."[21] Dean Acheson, assistant secretary of state during the war, later argued that by excluding the secretary of state from his formulation

of strategy, Roosevelt created a State Department whose planning process was "theoretical and unreal . . . absorbed in platonic planning of a utopia."[22] While this book argues that the postwar planning process for Japan did create a solid set of useful and flexible postwar aims, it is certainly true that planners worked in a vacuum, unaware of executive thinking or the relevant international commitments into which the president had entered. Without any assurance that the policies resulting from the bureaucratic planning process would not be cast aside by presidential prerogative after the war, planners must also have felt they were casting stones into a lake at night.

China as Great Power and Ally

Roosevelt was more vocal about his hopes for postwar China than about his thoughts on Japan. Because it was assumed that China would take on the role of leading Asian power and would cooperate with American interests, postwar Japan could be marginalized. From 1942, the administration supported the idea that a collective security system maintained by an international police force should be created after the war.[23] President Roosevelt took this idea a step further. As he explained in the spring of 1943, he hoped to achieve the goal of disarmament that had failed after the First World War. To his way of thinking, America, Britain, Russia, and China would act as a "world police" while the other powers disarmed, with the eventual goal of universal disarmament.[24] The president was a vocal advocate for China's future place as a member of the "big four." In 1943 Roosevelt stated in a closed meeting that he "thought that China might become a very useful power in the Far East to help police Japan and that he wanted to strengthen China in every possible way." Such support was crucial, as Roosevelt was opposed to the idea of long-term expensive American military commitments abroad.[25] This plan limited the potential role that Japan might play in the postwar world and explains why Roosevelt so rarely discussed Japan's future.

Roosevelt's personal connections to China help explain his faith in the future of US-China relations. His maternal grandfather, Warren Delano, had made his fortune in trading tea and opium as a businessman in Canton in the previous century.[26] Indeed, the president's mother had lived in Hong Kong for several years as a young girl. As a child, young Franklin was treated to stories about his mother's life there, and the house in which he grew up was decorated with artifacts from his grandfather's period in China.[27]

Roosevelt's adult views were likely influenced by the pro-China sentiment prevalent in the popular media in the 1920s and 1930s and American support for the Open Door policy.[28] In 1923, he admitted that it was often difficult for

Americans (a group in which he presumably included himself) to see the Japanese perspective on international events because of a widely held pro-Chinese attitude.[29] It was believed that the Nationalist regime (KMT) had a deep affinity with American interests and values. The KMT defined itself in opposition to three other domestic political forces: the imperial dynasty that had collapsed in the revolution of 1912, the chaos and warlordism that the party had overcome to assume power in 1926, and its major political rival, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Thus, Nationalist China tied its political legitimacy to the idea of a unified China marked by a stable, rule-based political system that was opposed to "despotism" and communism. This model of modernism seemed to harmonize with the American ideals of democracy and free trade, especially given the significant number of American-educated Chinese officials within the party.[30] The Roosevelts also enjoyed a good relationship with China's first couple, the Chiangs, who were popular Westernized figures in the United States.[31] Finally, Allied portrayal of China as a great power could provide "rhetorical compensation" against Japanese wartime propaganda depicting the war as a struggle for Asian liberation from foreign domination.[32] Such factors were reinforced by the pro-Chinese bias held by many of Roosevelt's close advisers, including Lauchlin Currie; the State Department's most powerful Asianist, Stanley Hornbeck; and Secretary of War Henry Stimson. For example, in 1943 Roosevelt was assured by an adviser that Chiang would "follow your leadership" because China favored "democracy and liberty . . . [as] opposed to the principals of imperialism and communism."[33] China seemed a natural ally to the United States.

Roosevelt's support for China and the KMT remained a driving force for the country's inclusion on the list of great future powers throughout the war. In 1942, at an Anglo-American meeting on postwar problems initiated by the president, FDR sought to build a consensus on China's future status as "one of the four controlling powers after the war."[34] Although an agreement was reached at this and other meetings, the British were never fully convinced of China's viability as a great power, which the prime minister referred to as "the great American illusion."[35] Roosevelt and his top advisers continued to support China as one of the four great powers even as it became increasingly unstable.[36] At the Tehran Conference in fall 1943, Roosevelt qualified his support for China in conversation with the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin. He explained that he understood the current weakness of China but continued support out of consideration for the long-term potential of the country.[37] Thus, even while troubles in China became apparent, the United States remained its champion among the Allies.

Roosevelt's administration began to consider working with rivals to Chiang's leadership in the face of mounting evidence of corruption and incompetence within China's Nationalist government. Reaching out to Chiang's rivals within the

KMT and to leaders in the Communist Party would provide the basis for continued Sino-American relations in case of a coup, civil war, or the collapse of Chiang's regime. In 1944 and 1945, officials had a remarkably ambivalent attitude toward Chinese communism, and many reports crossed the president's desk that frankly enumerated the faults of the ruling party.[38] Chinese communists were often described as having strong morale and solid public support gained through practical reforms.[39] As a result of the failure of the KMT to absorb the competing political forces into a unified government, American officials began to stress a more flexible approach to the Chinese leadership. As early as May 1944, officials suggested showing "a sympathetic interest in the Communists and liberal groups in China" because the present leadership rendered China "too weak to serve as a possible counter-weight to Russia." Communist and leftist groups would be an important force in any democratic China and, it was believed, would "naturally gravitate" to the United States.[40] Shortly before his death, Roosevelt demonstrated both his frustration with the KMT and his willingness to consider alternatives to Chiang by writing a cordial letter to the leader of the Communist group, Mao Tse-tung.[41]

In practice, rather than abandoning support for Chiang's regime, Americans approached the conflict between the KMT and CCP with a mix of aid and good offices. Policymakers such as Roosevelt and Hull argued that solid American backing, rhetorical and financial, was the best chance for stabilizing Chiang's leadership.[42] China's continued resistance to Japan was vital to America's war effort in the Pacific. Beyond its value in fighting the Japanese, Chinese cooperation with Western powers undermined Japanese war propaganda about ending European imperialism and creating an "Asia for Asiatics."[43] This was particularly important after Japan granted rhetorical independence to former British, American, and Dutch territories. It would have been a severe blow to the Allies had China surrendered or allowed the creation of a puppet state as France had done in Europe.[44] A strong, politically unified China was the best safeguard against such an eventuality and a compelling reason to sideline Chiang's rivals, none of whom offered the hope of a legitimate alternative to the current government.

China's role as a military ally became less important as the American island-hopping campaign built up momentum in early 1944.[45] By summertime, attacks on the central Pacific islands had put the Allies within bombing range of Japan proper using B-29 aircraft. American troops could close in on Japan through islands in the Pacific, shifting the focus of strategic plans away from mainland Asia.

This new situation corresponded with a low ebb in US-China relations, as American generals voiced criticism of Chiang's commitment to and value in the present war. American army planners argued that the war with Japan would be over before the Chinese army was properly trained and equipped through aid

FIGURE 1.1. Franklin D. Roosevelt in conference with General Douglas MacArthur, Admiral Chester Nimitz, and Admiral William D. Leahy, while on tour in the Hawaiian Islands, September 1944. Courtesy of US Navy, Wikimedia Commons.

and lend-lease.[46] China was thus marginalized in wartime military plans. However, the existing consensus and lack of support for any alternative resulted in policy inertia over the China issue. Although forced to consider the real possibility of China's descending into civil war, Roosevelt maintained his faith and support in Chiang's regime and a strong postwar China that could share the burden of building peace and stability in the region. The position of the United States in regard to China at the end of the war thus remained one of cautious but committed support.[47] Until the end of his life, Roosevelt argued that despite its current weakness, China would unite and modernize to assume leadership of the entire area that Japan had tried to seize.[48]

The Case of Germany

For President Roosevelt and others, learning the supposed lessons of the First World War was the key to the prevention of future conflict. Roosevelt tied the

treatment of Japan to his ideas about Germany. Europe, and by extension Germany, was culturally and geographically closer to the frame of reference of the president, whose Dutch heritage was tied to his identity.[49] Roosevelt had a further connection that was important to his thinking on Germany. As a boy he had taken a bicycle trip around the country and often cited this as evidence of his deep understanding of the German people.[50] He had little such firsthand experience to ground his impressions of the Japanese. In a 1944 speech Roosevelt linked the postwar occupations of Germany and Japan to "the 1918 situation," in which Germany had avoided occupation through surrender. Because Berlin had successfully "dodged" occupation and had gone on to create a new conflict, after the current war Germany and Japan would be occupied by Allied troops "regardless of when or how they surrendered."[51] Japan's fate was thus sealed by the imagined lessons learned from the behavior of the Germans after the Great War, a war in which Japan had fought against Germany alongside the United States and Great Britain.[52]

The president's adoption of the Morgenthau plan was another link between Japan and Germany. As noted above, in August 1944 Roosevelt suddenly embraced his treasury secretary's enthusiasm for inflicting punishment on the German, and by extension the Japanese, people. This was a radical shift from existing policy. Up to that point, postwar planning for Germany had been similar to the planning for Japan discussed in the next chapter. It was assumed that postwar Germany, with its large and productive population and strong industrial capacity, would play a part in rebuilding Europe, and similar plans were developed for Japan in Asia.[53] Under the new plan, Germany would be stripped of its industrial potential, reducing the country to an agricultural economy and removing it from future economic or political power in Europe. This entirely contradicted the consensus created in the planning groups but had some precedent in Roosevelt's thinking. In 1943 Roosevelt, ignoring the debate within bureaucratic planning groups about whether heavy industry would be needed to sustain the Japanese economy, drew up his own memorandum on postwar aviation. Policing would be needed to make sure that neither the Germans nor the Japanese were able to "fly anything larger than one of those toy planes that you wind up with elastic."[54] Japan experts believed that crushing industry and impoverishing the country would undermine future security by fueling desperation and radicalism. A Japan reliant on trade, by contrast, would be tied into the regional system and would support postwar rehabilitation throughout the region.[55] Roosevelt did not agree.

FDR's support of the Morgenthau scheme lasted only a few weeks, during which time he signed up to the policy, brought Morgenthau to an international conference in Quebec to push for British support, and just as quickly denounced the plan after it received a negative response in the press.[56] However, the administrative

changes made in this brief window altered the planning process for Germany until the end of the war. The German bureaucratic planning subcommittee was replaced by a new group, the Informal Policy Committee on Germany (IPCOG), in order to include the Treasury Department in planning. Because Japan was not as pressing an issue for Morgenthau, the move to include Treasury in postwar planning for Japan did not come until much later and was successfully contained by officials in the State Department.[57]

Although the bureaucratic planning structure for Japan was not affected by Morgenthau's intervention into Germany policy, as long as Roosevelt supported the plan for Germany, he considered that it applied to Japan too. Without consulting other officials, he allowed his enthusiasm for the new German plan to override the recommendations of other advisers and experts on both countries. Morgenthau recorded the president's passionate support for a punitive peace in his diary. "You either have to castrate the German people," Roosevelt told him, "or you have to threaten them in such a manner that they can't just go on reproducing people who want to continue the way they have in the past." Morgenthau left the meeting with no doubt about FDR's support of the plan, even if the president's other advisers violently opposed it.[58] Roosevelt was convinced of the inherent militarism of the German people, arguing that uniforms, parades, and "marching of any kind" ought to be banned in postwar Germany to avoid future aggression.[59] The president also "used some example about Japan" to illustrate his support for the plan by "showing how tough he is going to be."[60] Without consulting Asia experts or other advisers, Roosevelt tied the Japanese to Morgenthau's plan for Germany.

Unwilling to devolve decision making to area specialists, Roosevelt based his plans for both countries on irregular sources of analysis and what he thought he knew about German people and history. Roosevelt was content to attach Japan to his prescriptions for Germany, despite the fact that Japan's rapid population growth and comparatively low agricultural output made the Morgenthau plan impossible to implement without the threat of mass starvation. Roosevelt, however, may not have been aware of the unsuitability of the Morgenthau plan for Japan. Although a report on the question had been approved and was the basis of further official planning for Japan's economy, Roosevelt did not read or request many reports from the bureaucratic planners. He would have been informed had he consulted the Asia specialists before adopting Morgenthau's plan.[61] Roosevelt's plans to strip Japan of its colonies, discussed below, would make it particularly vulnerable. Unlike Germany, which had a rich agricultural base, Japan's arable land was insufficient to feed its population.[62] It is clear from this that the president's policy direction for Japan, though not clearly articulated during the war, was based firmly on his mercurial and ill-suited plans for postwar Germany.

Defining Japan

Several factors suggest that racial bias was involved in Roosevelt's thinking about Japan. The president certainly believed that set characteristics were carried in the blood of peoples and races. His racial thinking on the Japanese began with his views on mixing that population and other races in the 1920s. Roosevelt supported the 1924 exclusion act, which had caused friction between the American and Japanese governments by banning Japanese immigration. He argued in a published column that such restrictions were justified because Japanese nationals could not assimilate with white Americans. "Mingling of Asiatic blood with European or American blood," he wrote, "produces in nine cases out of ten, the most unfortunate results." This was not, however, intended as a slight against "pure" Japanese, who he imagined would feel the same "repugnance" that he did at intermarrying or mixing populations.[63] His columns made a distinction between European immigrants, who were deemed to be useful in revitalizing American communities, and Asian immigrants, whose genetic influence would be detrimental to the future American population.[64] This idea that Europeans were able to assimilate, while Asians were not, demonstrated the perceived distance in culture and blood between Americans and Japanese. These were long-held beliefs, reflected in Roosevelt's writings over a period of years. A decade later, he privately observed that aggression was "in the blood" of the Japanese leadership.[65]

During the war, Roosevelt ordered funding for research on postconflict relocation for displaced groups around the world. This research, known as the M Project, considered "problems arising out of racial admixtures" resulting from moving populations. FDR was a product of a time in which scientific racism and the idea of a yellow peril held significant currency in American thought. As part of the project, he wrote an involved professor and asked him to consider whether the "less developed skulls" of the Japanese might explain their racial characteristic of "nefariousness."[66] Craniometry, which attempted to identify and explain behavioral traits by examining the shape of the head, was a trend within nineteenth-century scientific racism. If Japanese militarism was caused by racial flaws, rather than the social, political, or economic factors considered by Asia experts, peace could not be assured by social engineering. In such a case, a "hard peace" of repression and monitoring would be necessary.

Roosevelt's actions toward Japanese Americans provide a more mixed picture. Roosevelt considered the treatment of Japanese Americans during the Second World War in two different contexts, internment and military service. In 1936, fully five years before the United States and Japan went to war, FDR wrote to his chief of operations in Hawaii about identifying Japanese and Japanese Americans to be put on a list as "the first to be placed in a concentration camp in the event

of trouble."[67] Shortly after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt responded to a request by the secretary of navy to remove "people of Japanese blood" from the strategically important island of Oahu to another island "where they can be made to work for their living and produce much of their own food." Roosevelt agreed and added that he did "not worry about the constitutional question." Neither man referred to the Americans of Japanese ancestry as American citizens in this correspondence beyond Roosevelt's reference to constitutionalism but instead called for the evacuation and supervision of "Japanese."[68] When considering the question of Japanese American military service, however, Roosevelt took an entirely different position. He argued that any loyal American ought to be allowed to serve his country, as "Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry."[69] These two examples indicate that his treatment of Japanese Americans was a matter of expediency rather than moral conviction. Race was certainly an important issue in Roosevelt's thinking on Japan. However, his treatment of Japanese Americans and support for China suggest that racism was not an insurmountable feature ingrained in his thinking but could be overcome as a matter of convenience.

Roosevelt's personal knowledge of individual Japanese was to a great extent limited to his relationship with two men, Kichisaburo Nomura and Otohiko Matsukata. When Roosevelt wrote in 1925 that his position against Japanese immigration was not anti-Japanese, he noted that he knew "a great many cultivated, highly educated and delightful Japanese."[70] This is likely a reference to Matsukata and Nomura. Roosevelt met socially with Nomura, the Japanese naval attaché in Washington, during his service as assistant secretary of the navy. Nomura later became foreign minister and ambassador to the United States. Although the two maintained occasional correspondence until the mid-1930s, the relationship did not appear to affect Roosevelt's thinking on Japan as a nation. Otohiko Matsukata was more influential. He was a former classmate of Roosevelt's at Harvard, at the time the only Japanese national enrolled there. Although Matsukata had been a personal friend, the connection ironically helped to harden Roosevelt's later perception of Japanese foreign policy. As university students in 1902, Matsukata and Roosevelt had had a conversation about Japanese expansionism and plans for the conquest of Asia. After Japan's shift toward militarism in the 1930s, Roosevelt repeatedly recalled this discussion in private conversations, remarking that the Japanese "seem to be carrying out this plan."[71] Thus, speculative conversation between two young people came to serve an American president as evidence of a Japanese conspiracy for domination.

A people capable of holding on to secret plans made decades in advance would be a great threat to the postwar world, unlikely to be neutralized by military defeat alone. The president presented such a picture of Japanese history in

a speech before Congress in 1942. "Japan's scheme of conquest," he informed them, "goes back half a century. It is not merely a policy of seeking living room, it was a plan which included the subjugation of all the peoples in the Far East and in the islands of the Pacific."[72] In apportioning blame for Japan's aggression, Roosevelt made no distinction between leadership and the people. A study by the Office of War Information (OWI) found that the president differentiated between German leadership and the German people about 75 percent of the time, referring to "Hitler" and the "Nazis" as the enemy. By contrast, Roosevelt referred almost exclusively to "Japan" as a whole when mentioning the enemy. Other important figures in the administration, the secretary and undersecretary of state, and Harry Truman's predecessor as vice president, Henry Wallace, were more inclined to draw a distinction between the Japanese people and military leadership than was Roosevelt. They did so in about half of their references.[73]

In a campaign speech made in late summer 1944, Roosevelt specifically linked the acts of the Japanese government to the people. The Japanese could not be trusted, he informed a crowd of reporters, because "whether or not the people of Japan itself know and approve of what their warlords have done for nearly a century, the fact remains that they seem to have been giving hearty approval to the Japanese policy of acquisition of their neighbors and their neighbors' lands and military and economic control of as many other nations as they can get their hands on." Shortly before adopting the Morgenthau plan for Germany, Roosevelt publicly stated that after its surrender Japan must be "sealed off" from the rest of the world until it proved "willing and able to live with peaceful nations."[74] The question of separating ordinary people from their leaders was important in handling postwar treatment of enemy countries. "Indiscriminate hatred may be a mighty weapon," the report stated, "but it is likely to be impeding to a satisfactory peace."[75] Roosevelt's conflation of the Japanese people and government, along with his suspicions about Japanese racial characteristics, indicates that he supported a hard peace to punish and restrain the Japanese people after the war.

Wartime Conferences and International Agreements

While these ideas on postwar plans have been inferred from conversations, statements, and publications, Roosevelt's record on wartime commitments is clearer. He took direct control of policymaking at conferences and international agreements with America's allies, often to the exclusion of the State Department and other agencies.[76] Publicized announcements on the results of these conferences were the major source of popular understanding about postwar plans. Bureaucratic

planners, largely isolated from presidential thinking or approval, adjusted their recommendations to incorporate the public commitments made at international conferences. Although planners were unaware of some of the secret outcomes from these conferences, Roosevelt's international commitments became his biggest contribution to postwar planning. They formed the basis of public and world expectations.

The first such major contribution to postwar planning came while the United States was still neutral. The Atlantic Charter, signed by the American president and Britain's prime minister on August 14, 1941, publicly committed both countries to a set of common principles for the postwar world. Several of these principles would later be significant for the treatment of postwar Japan and the disposition of its territories. The section on international trade and resources was incorporated into bureaucratic planning and became an issue of contention among officials. The first and second of the Atlantic Charter principles rejected territorial aggrandizement and stated that any territory changes would be made in accordance "with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."[77] As seen below, these commitments would sit uncomfortably with Allied plans later in the war.

On occasion, the president made commitments privately without the knowledge of anyone in Washington. Shortly before the attack on Pearl Harbor, Allied leaders anticipated the failure of US-Japanese negotiations to prevent conflict and assumed that Japan would strike out in order to gain access to new supplies. It was generally believed that the Japanese would press farther into Dutch or British possessions in Southeast Asia in search of oil. What the American response to such a move would be was unknown. In view of the strong isolationist and anti-imperialist sentiments in popular opinion, would the United States be reluctant to provide military support or declare war on Japan in defense of European colonies? The question was handled in a particularly Rooseveltian manner. On December 2, 1941, during a conversation with the British ambassador, the president "threw in an aside" that "we should obviously all be together" fighting Japan in case of an attack.[78] Roosevelt repeated this pledge to the ambassador two days later, but it appears that he never informed the members of his cabinet or other high-level officials that he had committed the country to war.[79]

Just over a year later, in January 1943, Roosevelt made a spur-of-the-moment commitment during an Anglo-American meeting in Casablanca that would have a great impact on the final days of the war. The president announced to the press that the Axis powers—Italy, Germany, and Japan—would be made to accept unconditional surrender to Allied forces. British prime minister Winston Churchill claimed the announcement was the first he had ever heard about the idea, and Roosevelt later explained that "the thought popped into my head" during the conference.[80] This was characteristic of Roosevelt's decision-making style;

the unconditional surrender concept had been discussed in a State Department report by the Subcommittee on Security Problems, which the president may have read. The idea had many critics in the State Department and later the military because rejecting the possibility of negotiated surrender could, and in the event did, prolong the conflict against each of the Axis powers. Had Roosevelt consulted with his advisers before making a public commitment, he might have been dissuaded. However, the unconditional surrender demand did have advantages. It served a valuable domestic goal in strengthening morale and gave a clear common goal to the Allied governments. Roosevelt's successors would consider abandoning this evocative and rhetorically powerful term in the summer of 1945, a debate ended only by the advent of the atomic bomb.[81]

The heads of the three major powers engaged in war against Japan met at Cairo in December of that same year. At this summit, the United States, China, and Britain considered concerted plans for postwar East Asia. While the secretaries of state, war, and navy, and lower-level regional experts had a difficult time getting the president's ear in the run-up to Cairo, the ideas FDR brought to the summit were developed gradually and in conversation with representatives of Britain and China. In March 1942 Roosevelt invited Britain's foreign secretary, Anthony Eden, to meet with him and the secretary and undersecretary of state to discuss the future of East Asia. The principles Roosevelt proposed in this meeting match the key points agreed at Cairo a year and a half later. The president suggested returning Manchuria and Formosa to China, creating an international trusteeship for Korea, and "internationalizing" Japan's mandated islands for the purpose of keeping peace. Eden indicated approval of Roosevelt's proposals.[82]

In the Cairo Declaration, the United States, Great Britain, and China declared that Japan would be "stripped" of the Pacific islands it had occupied since 1914, and Korea would be administered by the Allies until fit for self-governance. The return of Manchuria and Formosa to China was also agreed on at the conference.[83]

The Chinese, too, were included in executive thinking before Cairo. Chiang's regime was kept informed about the outlines of these plans through the personal emissaries sent by Roosevelt to China's wartime capital, Chongqing, and the subject was discussed at high-level meetings in Washington.[84] In 1942, Roosevelt sent both Lauchlin Currie and his defeated campaign challenger, Wendell Willkie, on missions to China. Currie and Chiang discussed the reversion of Manchuria to Chinese sovereignty after Japan's defeat, which Chiang insisted must go ahead in spite of potential objections from the Soviet Union, Japan, or Chinese communists.[85] Owen Lattimore, a respected if opinionated expert on the Far East and Roosevelt-appointed adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, also kept the Chinese informed on Roosevelt's postwar plans.[86]

FIGURE 1.2. President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the Cairo Conference in Cairo, Egypt. Seated in the picture (from left to right) are Chiang Kai-Shek, FDR, Winston Churchill, and Madame Chiang Kai-Shek. Courtesy of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum.

Occupation Forces

The Chiang-Roosevelt meeting at Cairo also briefly covered unformed ideas on an occupation of Japan. Both sides were interested in a substantial Chinese role in an Allied military occupation. On the American side, the presence of Chinese troops would weaken the perceived connection between Allied policy and European imperialism while reducing the costs and manpower burden of the project for the United States. China was interested in asserting its place as a new great power and demonstrating its value as a partner in the region. In 1942 the quasi-official Chinese delegation to a conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) recommended "Allied Asiatic troops" occupy Tokyo after Japan's defeat. This position was repeated for a domestic Chinese audience in April 1943 through a government-approved lead newspaper editorial.[87] Although there is no record of discussion between Roosevelt or his emissaries and Chinese officials on an occupation before the Cairo meeting, he may well have known about China's interest in participation through Currie or Welles, who had been present at the

IPR conference.[88] However, when Roosevelt proposed that China should take the leading role in the occupation of Japan, Chiang refused, stating that China was unprepared for such "considerable responsibility."[89] Although eager for recognition as a great power, China imagined itself in an auxiliary role supporting American-led management for postwar Japan.

Dividing Territory

President Roosevelt, the State, War, and Navy Departments, and the Allies largely agreed on plans to dismantle Japan's empire after the war.[90] This was partly because of anti-imperialist sentiment in the United States and China and partly because, regardless of statements to the contrary in the Atlantic Charter and Cairo Declaration, the Allies had territorial interests in Japan's possessions. Major prizes included island chains in the north and south of Japan and the Pacific islands that had been granted to Japan as mandates after the Great War. The declaration established that Formosa and Manchuria would be returned to China.

When discussing Japanese-controlled territories with Chiang at Cairo, Roosevelt brought up the Ryukyu Islands in southern Japan, inquiring "more than once whether China would want" them.[91] The Ryukyu Islands had historically been an independent kingdom but were formally incorporated into Japan proper as Okinawa Prefecture in 1879. Because the offer was made without consultation with Japan experts, this was likely the result of the president's ignorance rather than an attempt to partition the Japanese home islands.[92] Unsurprisingly, Chiang refused the offer, which would have involved the complicated task of annexing a part of Japan proper with a significant civilian population.[93] As publicly stated later, it was agreed that Formosa and Manchuria would both be returned to China.[94] The United States was inclined to support the reversion of Formosa to an ally, and insistence on Chinese rights in Manchuria had been a sticking point in prewar negotiations between America and Japan.

The United States also had interests in Japan's League of Nations mandate islands. Though these islands, collectively known as Micronesia, were small in terms of landmass and population, they spread out as points covering an ocean area nearly the size of the continental United States.[95] Both Washington planners and the president agreed that the United States should use these Pacific islands as bases, through either international trusteeship or direct control, to increase American power in the region and to deny them to potential future aggressors. It was important, however, that the annexation of bases across the Pacific would appear to be motivated by peace and collective security rather than imperialism and territorial expansion, which had been explicitly rejected by the Atlantic Charter and Cairo Declaration.

This tension is apparent in Roosevelt's explanation to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the summer of 1944. Although stating that the country was "seeking no additional territory as the result of this war," Roosevelt noted that the as-yet-uncreated United Nations organization could ask the United States to "act as a trustee for the Japanese mandated islands." This would give it the "military authority to protect" the populations of these islands, which would justify building fortifications.[96] While the trusteeship solution exposed the United States to accusations of hypocrisy, it also prevented an open scramble for territorial spoils.[97] Americans sought to use strategic bases and free trade as an alternative to traditional colonialism. Independence for the US colony in the Philippines, for example, was predicated on the assumption that the United States would be invited to continue its military presence there.[98] During the war, this thinking was applied to Japan's empire, and it would later be applied to the country itself.[99]

The dismemberment of Japan's empire, announced in the Cairo Declaration, was confirmed by the Allies in 1944. This time the Soviet Union was included in the discussions. Stalin had been supportive of American base ambitions at Tehran in 1943, stating that the victors must "occupy strong points" in the area in order to prevent Japan from becoming aggressive again. Roosevelt, naturally, "said he agreed 100%."[100] Just before Yalta, Chiang and Stalin agreed on the key points of the Cairo Declaration—that Japan would be stripped of her possessions, and, as the United States wanted, that "necessary air and naval bases" would be created so that the United Nations could police the western Pacific. Stalin accepted that Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores would be returned to China, and he agreed that a tutelage period was needed for Korea.[101] At the same time, as seen below, Russia was negotiating with the United States over claims to Japanese islands to the north as a price for entering the war with Japan. Thus, the interests of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States converged in the carving up and reapportioning of Japan's empire.

Outcomes and Responses to Cairo

The format for the discussion between Chiang and Roosevelt at Cairo on the evening of November 23, 1943, led to secrecy and confusion. In an unusual move, Roosevelt objected to keeping records from the three-hour meeting. As a result, no records were made on the American side. The only people present were the president, his adviser Harry Hopkins, and Chiang Kai-shek and his wife. Because of objections from Chiang, an agenda for the meeting was not agreed on beforehand.[102] During talks that evening, Roosevelt made a "vague and loose" commitment to arm ninety Chinese divisions at the end of the war in an effort to modernize the Chinese army, a massive undertaking. The agreement was not

written down, and Hopkins could not later recall whether it had been made unconditionally or whether military aid was contingent on the stabilization of the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The agreement came to light only in September 1945, five months after the president's death and one month after the war ended, when the Chinese Nationalist government demanded supplies to make good on this promise.[103] The incident highlights Roosevelt's lack of regard for his advisers, whom he neither consulted nor informed of major decisions. It also demonstrates the confusion caused by his private initiatives in foreign policymaking.

The most important aspect of the Cairo Declaration, which was released to the public on December 1, 1943, was that it seemed to guarantee cooperation between the Allies for postwar security. In addition to the declaration itself, which laid out the basis for dismantling Japan's empire, planners had access to media sources for analysis and information. The statement in a *New York Times* article covering the conference that "Tokyo's co-prosperity sphere, which gingerly commenced with the seizure of Formosa in 1895, will be entirely scrapped," for example, was quite accurate. Likewise, the article's prediction that a "new and greater China" would rise "from the ashes" of a Japan-dominated Pacific is in line with Roosevelt's expectations for both nations.[104] Other sources of policy ideas and planning had to adapt their positions to match this new reality of commitments made at Cairo. But the bureaucrats tasked with drafting American policy were not aware of secret agreements such as Roosevelt's promise to arm Chinese troops or his offer of the Ryukyu Islands.

Soviet Entry and Yalta

The issue of Russia's entry into the war against Japan was one on which the American president, the State Department, and China's leadership were particularly far apart. The Soviet Union had signed a nonaggression pact with Japan in 1941, and was therefore not involved in the Pacific theater. However, Roosevelt's plans for postwar East Asia assumed a major role for the Soviet Union.[105] The Chinese, by contrast, hoped for a Pacific sphere controlled by the Americans and Chinese alone. As Chiang explained to one of Roosevelt's emissaries, the influence of Great Britain in postwar Asia ought to be limited because it was an imperialist power, while the Soviet Union presented a communist threat to the region.[106] Given the civil war brewing between Chiang's Nationalist regime and the Chinese Communist Party, the threat to the KMT of an ascendant and ideologically opposed Soviet Union was real. Competing territorial aims were a second reason for China's reluctance to accept a major role for Russia. Before

Cairo, both Chiang and his brother-in-law, the well-regarded diplomat and financier T.V. Soong, expressed concern to American officials that Russia might challenge the reversion of Manchuria to China in light of its past rivalry with Japan for influence in the area.[107] Indeed, Stalin was interested in reclaiming rights in Manchuria, particularly over the southern section of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Dairen, which had in the nineteenth century given Russia access to a valuable Far East warm-water port.[108] Roosevelt and Welles were sympathetic to Russian interests in northern China, counseling Soong that the country would have to recognize the Soviet Union's legitimate commercial interests in Manchuria.[109]

American Far East experts in the State Department were also skeptical about Russia's future role in the region. They were shocked to hear about Roosevelt's aim of involving the Soviet Union in the Pacific theater of the war and his willingness to give concessions that would increase Russia's postwar strength in the region in order to reach this aim. As one planner explained, "We saw no reason why the U.S.S.R. should have been paid for entering the war against Japan, when it would have served our interests better to have the Soviet Union stay out."[110] They were not consulted on the subject, however. The State Department drew up detailed briefs to prepare Roosevelt ahead of Yalta, but the president did not read them.[111] Unbeknownst to the State Department, FDR had personally encouraged Soviet participation from at least July1943, using the carrot of territorial gain. At that time, Roosevelt proposed a meeting with Stalin, informing the Soviet charge d'affaires through his own representative that he "would surprise Stalin by how far he, Roosevelt, is ready to acknowledge our [Soviet] rights, in particular, on territorial issues." At this point, the Soviets expected Roosevelt would bring up the issue in any meeting between the heads of state, but they were not yet prepared to abandon their neutrality pact with Japan.[112]

A year and a half later, at Yalta, Roosevelt finally secured a commitment from the Soviets to enter the war against Japan two to three months after the defeat of Germany.[113] This agreement was conditioned on territorial gains for Russia at the expense of both Japan and China. From China, Russia would regain leased control of Port Arthur, which had been lost after the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, have its preeminent interests recognized in an internationalized Dairen, and gain a measure of control over Chinese railways in these areas. Japan would lose islands to the north along its border with Russia—namely, all of Sakhalin and "islands adjacent" to it and the Kurile Islands.[114] As a price for Soviet entry into the war against Japan, Franklin Roosevelt approved what was essentially a reversal of one of the key achievements of his cousin and hero, former president Teddy Roosevelt, who had been awarded a Nobel Prize in 1906 for brokering the peace treaty after the Russo-Japanese War.

Roosevelt had good reason for his differences with the State Department on the issue of Soviet involvement in the war. Bureaucratic planners believed that the initiative for planning and policy in postwar Asia ought to be held by the United States, which had borne the brunt of fighting in the Pacific. The postwar situation could be more easily handled without the Russians. By contrast, Roosevelt and the War Department were eager to encourage Soviet involvement, which would make Allied victory more likely and shorten the war. The Japanese Kwantung Army in Manchuria was believed to be very strong, and military planners expected the Japanese would draw on it in case of an Allied land invasion of Japan's home islands, the dominant end-of-war scenario before the atomic bomb was successfully tested. The Soviet Union, which bordered Manchuria, could tie up the Japanese there and limit potential reinforcements ahead of a land invasion. In addition, Stimson pragmatically argued that the Allies were in no position to prevent the Soviets from simply taking whatever territories they coveted after the war and so might as well collect a price for them.[115]

FDR was less concerned than his planners were about American predominance in postwar policy. In addition to strengthening the Russian hand, he sought to include China in decision making and hoped the country would take on a major role in occupying and monitoring Japan. During his talk at Cairo with the Chinese leader, he asked Chiang's position on the retention of the emperor after Japan's defeat, which was an issue of huge symbolic value. As discussed above, he also offered China Japanese territory and suggested China take the leading role in the military occupation of Japan, burdensome honors that Chiang politely refused.[116] Roosevelt dealt with this difference in opinion on the Soviet question by simply ignoring and excluding the side with which he disagreed. Even senior members of the State Department were denied records from the Yalta conference. Bureaucratic planners were kept in the dark about the secret agreement with the Soviets, although the pact was significant to postwar planning, having territorial implications and giving the Soviets an unexpected stake in postwar Japan.[117] Thus, although all known Roosevelt commitments were incorporated into any policy proposals, secret agreements left wartime planners to draw up their plans while lacking significant information.

Roosevelt's health declined rapidly in the last year of his life and presidency. By early spring 1944 he had become, in the words of historian Christopher Thorne, a "part time president."[118] Although he remained active on the issues most important to him, this limitation touched every aspect of the administration. There was no clear line of policy approval apart from presidential sponsorship of ideas, and Roosevelt's ability to make agreements or change course without consultation

was still a wild card for planners. Roosevelt's mixed management of Far East policy left uncertainty about the future of the postwar plans for Asia.

Even as FDR held the policy reins and his intentions close, his actions and ideas set parameters for postwar planning. This was particularly true in the case of territorial issues. The outlines of future action were set by the public commitments and international agreements made by Roosevelt during and immediately before the war. All plans from any quarter of government would need to reflect the commitments made by the president to Allied governments and in the Atlantic Charter, the Casablanca Declaration, and the Cairo Declaration. Further, because presidential approval was needed to turn recommendations into official policy, proposals had to incorporate Roosevelt's ideas and interests to the extent that these were known by the planners.

President Roosevelt showed little interest in the work of official experts working on postwar issues, preferring to find analysis from outside official channels. As a result, planners sometimes worked in a vacuum, without a voice in wartime agreements and uncertain of their president's plans. Had he lived to see Japan's surrender, FDR might have rejected the recommendations of his planners. He might well have impulsively adopted suggestions from advisers outside the planning process without consulting experts, as with his temporary championship of the Morgenthau plan. Certainly, he was sympathetic to the idea of a tough peace for Japan. The approach to Japan that emerged from the bureaucratic planning process did not reflect Roosevelt's thinking on the subject. Harry Truman, not Roosevelt, made a selection from the policy basket, and Roosevelt's role in shaping that selected policy was limited to parameters set by his wartime actions and the ideas he did make known. By supporting planning groups to fill a basket of ideas, however, Roosevelt encouraged the development of a policy network that could respond to postwar questions during the war.

in War and Peace, 1919–1945 (London: Routledge, 2002); Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

14. The significance of this moment has been considered with reference to the onset of the Cold War and US policy toward the Soviet Union in Wilson D. Miscamble, *From Roosevelt to Truman: Potsdam, Hiroshima, and the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Frank Costigliola, *Roosevelt's Lost Alliances: How Personal Politics Helped Start the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, *Racing the Enemy: Stalin, Truman, and the Surrender of Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); and Marc Gallicchio, *The Cold War Begins in Asia: American East Asian Policy and the Fall of the Japanese Empire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

15. "Frank Costigliola. *Roosevelt's Lost Alliances: How Personal Politics Helped Start the Cold War*," *H-Diplo Roundtable Review* 14, no. 8 (November 2012): 33, http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables.

16. Gregory McLauchlan, "World War II and the Transformation of the U.S. State: The Wartime Foundations of U.S. Hegemony," *Sociological Inquiry* 67, no. 1 (February 1997): 6 (emphasis in original). John Ikenberry, "Creating Yesterday's New World Order: Keynesian 'New Thinking' and the Anglo-American Postwar Settlement," in *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*, ed. Judith Goldstein and Robert Owen Keohane (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 59.

17. Leon Gordenker, "American Post-war Planning: Policy Elites and the New Deal," in *The Roosevelt Years: New Perspectives on American History, 1933–1945*, ed. Robert Garson and Stuart Kidd (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), and Jeffrey W. Legro, "Whence American Internationalism," *International Organization* 52, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 253–89.

1. FLIP-FLOPPER WITH THE FINAL SAY

1. Press conference no. 888, 30 March 1943, in *The Roosevelt Reader: Selected Speeches, Messages, Press Conferences, and Letters of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, ed. Basil Rauch (New York: Rinehart, 1957), 323–25.

2. Advisory committee initial meeting, 12 February 1942, file 548–1, Post–World War II Foreign Policy Planning, State Department Records of Harley Notter, 1939–1945 (Bethesda, MD: Congressional Information Service, 1987), microfilm.

3. Press conference no. 888.

4. Joseph Grew to Stanley Hornbeck, 25 February 1941, MS Am 1687 (111), letters A–K, 1941, Joseph C. Grew Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

5. Franklin Roosevelt to Joseph Grew, 21 January 1941, box 3, Stanley K. Hornbeck Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

6. Henry Lewis Stimson Diaries, 163, 20 October 1942 (microfilm ed.), reel 7, Henry Lewis Stimson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

7. Lauchlin Currie to John Carter Vincent, 18 September 1941, box 1, Lauchlin Currie Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

8. John Morton Blum, ed., *From the Morgenthau Diaries* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), 4:1390.

9. See, for example, Lauchlin Currie to Grace Tully, 17 September 1942, box 1, Lauchlin Currie Papers, and T. Y. Wickham to Henry Wallace, 27 March 1941, box 88, reel 41, Henry Wallace Papers, Roosevelt Study Center (RSC).

10. For example, Henry Wallace to Franklin Roosevelt, 10 July 1944, reel 6, FDR Office Files, part 2, RSC. In 1944, Roosevelt's ambassador to China resigned over the personal emissary issue. "Reminiscences of Joseph Ballantine," 50, Columbia Oral History Project.

11. Stanley Hornbeck served as special adviser to the secretary of state during the war but retained his influence in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs and his place on the information chain. His personal biases in regard to Asia are discussed in chapter 2.

12. Joseph Grew, as quoted in John K. Emmerson, *The Japanese Thread: A Life in the U.S. Foreign Service* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978), 102.

13. For the reasons described below, Frank Costigliola's observation that Roosevelt's "manipulations made administration politics emotional, competitive, and unstable" is entirely accurate. Costigliola, "Broken Circle: The Isolation of Franklin D. Roosevelt in World War II," *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 5 (November 2008): 689. This interpretation is shared by Michael Hopkins, "President Harry Truman's Secretaries of State: Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall and Acheson," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 6, no. 3 (2008): 290.

14. Jim Bishop, *FDR's Last Year: April 1944–April 1945* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), 41.

15. "Reminiscences of Walter Lippmann," 220–21.

16. Welles was forced to resign, much to the resentment of Roosevelt, after political enemies threatened to create a scandal around his sexual orientation and misconduct. For more on Welles's work on postwar planning, which particularly focused on Latin America, see Christopher D. O'Sullivan, *Sumner Welles, Postwar Planning, and the Quest for a New World* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008).

17. *The Adolf A. Berle Diary* (Hyde Park, NY: Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, 1978), 211 (7 November 1940), microfilm.

18. Ibid., 376 (26 September 1944). The position of Morgenthau and his Treasury Department in postwar planning will be considered again in the next chapter.

19. Henry Lewis Stimson Diaries, 207–10, 29 March 1945, reel 9, Henry Lewis Stimson Papers.

20. Calendar notes, 27 November 1944, in Thomas M. Campbell and George C. Herring, *The Diaries of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., 1943–1946* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975), 184–85.

21. As quoted in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 113.

22. Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: Norton, 1987), 88.

23. "Summary of U.S. Authoritative Statements on War Aims and the World," 9 November 1942, box 1850, *RG 44*, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

24. Cordell Hull, *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948), 2:1642.

25. In February 1944, the advisory committee noted that the "President does not want any plan under which the U.S. would be bound to send troops on the Western Hemisphere and perhaps in the Pacific." Passages in the minutes of advisory committee and its subcommittees reflecting consultation with the President, 8 February 1944, file 548–1, Post–World War II Foreign Policy Planning, State Department Records of Harley Notter, 1939–1945.

26. T. Y Wickham to Henry Wallace, 27 March 1941..

27. For an overview Roosevelt's early life and family background, see Patrick Maney, *The Roosevelt Presence: The Life and Legacy of FDR* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 1–11.

28. For more on positive American views on China, see T. Christopher Jespersen, *American Images of China, 1931–1949* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).

29. Franklin Roosevelt, "Shall We Trust Japan?," *Asia*, 23 July 1923, as quoted in Greg Robinson, *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 11.

30. Christopher Thorne uses the presence of American-educated officials to explain the KMT's pro-American, as opposed to pro-British, orientation. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 80.

31. Chiang Kai-shek and his wife were named "Man and Wife of the Year" by *Time* magazine in 1937, a symbol of the popularity the couple enjoyed. The press made much of the American education and accent of Madame Chiang and the couple's Christian faith. "Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek," *Time*, 3 January 1938.

32. Liberating Asia from the yoke of Western imperialism was a major justification for Japanese expansionism. Akira Iriye, *Power and Culture: The Japanese-American War, 1941–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 53.

33. Patrick Hurley to Roosevelt, as cited in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 307.

34. Memorandum of conversation, 27 March 1943, reel 30, Cordell Hull Papers, Library of Congress (LoC).

35. Edward Stettinius to Harry Truman, 18 April 1945, reel 15, Truman Office Files, part 3, RSC.

36. Gary Hess, *The United States' Emergence as a South East Asian Power, 1940–1950* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), 124.

37. Robert Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 618n27.

38. For more on diplomatic field reports from China and response in Washington see Hannah Gurman, "'Learn to Write Well:' The China Hands and the Communist-ification of Diplomatic Reporting," *Journal of Contemporary History* 45, no. 2 (April 2010): 430–53.

39. For example, Harry Hopkins to FDR, 6 September 1944, reel 6, FDR Office Files, part 2. This reel contains several reports on the strength of the communists, describing them in a positive light.

40. "Memorandum on Current News Items in China," William Donovan to FDR, 4 May 1944, reel 3, FDR Office Files 1943–1945, part 1, "Safe" File.

41. Roosevelt did not reply to a letter from Mao that he received in November 1944 until March 1945, following four months of frustration at Chiang's unwillingness to compromise with the powerful Chinese communists in his country. FDR to Mao Tse-tung, 10 March 1945, reel 6, FDR Office Files, part 2.

42. Henry A. Wallace to FDR, 10 July 1944, reel 6, FDR Office Files, part 2, Diplomatic Correspondence; memoranda of conversation, foreign policy, 24 July 1944, Subject File, Japan, Cordell Hull Papers.

43. This concern was common among the Allies. For example, British Joint Intelligence Committee reports, 7 June 1942 and 4 January 1943, as cited in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 192.

44. Hull made this point about the importance of China's continued resistance, with the unspoken contrast to France, in an NBC radio address in 1943. "Text of Radio Address By Secretary Hull Outlining Policies of the State Department," *New York Times*, 12 September 1943.

45. Walter La Feber, "Roosevelt, Churchill, and Indochina: 1942–45," *American Historical Review* 80, no. 5 (1975): 1288.

46. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 428.

47. As noted above, the depiction of the Roosevelt administration offered here is broadly in line with that of Christopher Thorne. However, there is good reason to take a more sympathetic view of Roosevelt's China policy than does Thorne, who calls the policy "ill-conceived, inefficient and irresponsible." China had great potential value as a postwar ally and very real value in the present conflict. In addition, as we have seen, there was a broad range of possible shared interests between the US and Chinese Nationalist governments.

48. For example, memorandum of conference with the President, 2 January 1945, in Campbell and Herring, *The Diaries of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.*, 210.

49. Roosevelt's temper was often described as "getting his Dutch up": see, for example, Hubert Kay, "Wendell Willkie," *Life*, 13 May 1940, 100.

50. "Reminiscences of Walter Lippmann," 219. The crippling polio that made it impossible for Roosevelt even to stand without leg braces did not strike until 1921, at which time he was already building his career. Robinson, *By Order of the President*, 33.

51. "Foes Won't Escape Occupation Again, President Asserts," *New York Times*, 18 August 1944.

52. For more on Japan in World War I, see Frederick Dickinson, *War and National Reinvention: Japan in the Great War, 1914–1919* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001).

53. On Germany, see "Secretary of War's Comments on Suggested Recommendations of Treatment of Germany from the Cabinet Committee," 5 September 1944 (microfilm edition), reel 128, Henry Lewis Stimson Papers. On Japan, see1-B-18, "Japanese Post-War Economic Considerations," 21 July 1943, in *The Occupation of Japan: U.S. Planning Documents, 1942–1945*, ed. Makoto Iokibe (Bethesda, MD: Congressional Information Service, and Tokyo: Maruzen Publishing Co., 1987), microfiche.

54. Memorandum of conversation, aviation policy, 11 November 1943, in *Foreign Relations of the United States [FRUS]: Diplomatic Papers. The Conferences at Cairo and Tehran, 1943* (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1961), 177.

55. The idea of Japan as an engine of regional recovery entered the public discourse after Dean Acheson's famous 1947 speech calling Japan the workshop of Asia, but it was a familiar line of argument in wartime planning circles. Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson, "The Requirements of Reconstruction," 8 May 1947. Text of the speech is available at http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/nss/documents/acheson-reconstruction.html.

56. The story is recounted by Henry Stimson, who was frustrated and angered by Roosevelt's support of the plan over the objections of his other advisers. Henry Lewis Stimson Diaries, 207–10, 29 March 1945. The British, eager to garner further American aid through an extension of the lend-lease program, accepted this plan at the Quebec conference. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 389.

57. As will be explained in chapter 2, by the time Morgenthau made his request for involvement in planning for Japan, FDR had died and the treasury secretary's influence had waned. This allowed Joseph Grew, a former ambassador to Japan deeply interested in the country's future, to use his position as acting secretary of state to block Morgenthau's request.

58. 19 August 1944, in Blum, *From the Morgenthau Diaries*, 4:1387–88.

59. Roosevelt, as quoted in Blum, *From the Morgenthau Diaries*, 4:1422–25. Cited in Steven Casey, *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion*, and *the War against Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 177.

60. 19 August 1944, in Blum, *From the Morgenthau Diaries*, 4:1387–88.

61. For example, 1-B-18, "Post-war Economic Considerations."

62. This was made apparent in 1946, when a severe food crisis followed occupation-era agricultural disruption and the loss of Korea as Japan's "rice basket." See Christopher Aldous, "Contesting Famine: Hunger and Nutrition in Occupied Japan, 1945–52," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 17, no. 4 (2010): 230–56.

63. Franklin Roosevelt, "The Average American and the Average Japanese Have Very Cloudy and Often Erroneous Points of View about Each Other," 30 April 1925, in *F.D.R., Columnist: The Uncollected Columns of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, ed. Donald Carmichael (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1947), 57–58.

64. Franklin Roosevelt, "We Lack a Sense of Humor If We Forget That Not So Very Long Ago We Were Immigrants Ourselves," 21 April 1925, in Carmichael, *F.D.R., Columnist*, 38.

65. Robinson, *By Order of the President*, 49.

66. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 159.

67. Franklin Roosevelt to Chief of Operations, 10 August 1936, reel 33, FDR Office Files, part 3.

68. Correspondence between Frank Knox and Franklin Roosevelt, 23 and 26 February 1942, reel 5, FDR Office Files, part 1.

69. Franklin Roosevelt to Henry Stimson, 1 February 1943, box 88, reel 41, Henry Wallace Papers, RSC.

70. Franklin Roosevelt, "The Average American and the Average Japanese Have Very Cloudy . . . Points of View."

71. Robinson, *By Order of the President*, 11 and 49.

72. FDR speech to Congress, 6 January 1942, as quoted in "The Nature of the Enemy," 11 August 1942, OWI, Reports and Special Memoranda, RG44, MLR: 171, loc. 130: 41/40/1–4, box 1849, NARA.

73. Ibid.

74. "Foes Won't Escape Occupation Again, President Asserts," *New York Times*, 18 August 1944.

75. "The Nature of the Enemy" 11 August 1942.

76. Of the wartime conferences, those taking place at Cairo and Tehran (November–December 1943), Quebec (September 1944), and Yalta (February 1945) were most relevant to Japan planning and are discussed here.

77. The text of the Atlantic Charter is available at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/wwii/atlantic.asp.

78. Halifax Diary, 2 December 1941, CAB 65/20, as cited in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 77.

79. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 88.

80. Franklin Roosevelt, as quoted in Elena Agarossi, *A Nation Collapses: The Italian Surrender of September 1943* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003), 21.

81. Agarossi, *A Nation Collapses*, 21–25.

82. "Mem-con, Post-war Problems," 27 March 1942, Subject File, Japan, reel 30, Cordell Hull Papers. The idea of "internationalization" for Japan's island mandates would be presented at Cairo as UN-appointed American trusteeship of the islands for bases in the Pacific.

83. Cairo Declaration, 1 December 1943, in *FRUS: Cairo and Tehran*, 448–49.

84. Sino-American diplomacy in this period is treated in detail in Ronald Heiferman, *The Cairo Conference of 1943: Roosevelt, Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek and Madame Chiang* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2011), chaps. 1–3.

85. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 107.

86. For example, a 1942 letter from Lattimore to Chiang sketched out Roosevelt's concept of the "big four" powers—the United States, Soviet Union, China, and Great Britain—as "policemen," guaranteeing peace in the postwar world. The United States, Russia, and China were to be the three big powers in the North Pacific. Lattimore's insight into Roosevelt's thinking came from Currie, who discussed Asia issues with the president. Final draft letter from Owen Lattimore to Chiang Kai-shek, 28 December 1942, box 5, Lauchlin Currie Papers.

87. Translated summary, "On the Report of the Institute of Pacific Relations," *Ta Kung Pao [Independent]*, 9 April 1943, series A989, 1943/650/1, part 2, National Archives of Australia.

88. As stated above, Currie was particularly interested in China and often discussed the subject with the president, and Welles was a Roosevelt favorite.

89. Liu argues that Chiang was surprised by Roosevelt's proposal and that his hesitation was a ploy to secure further American military aid. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 134. Neither of these points is convincing. China had previously expressed interest in providing troops for an occupation and, as seen below, did receive a commitment for substantial postwar military aid during this meeting.

90. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 371.

91. Chinese summary record, Roosevelt-Chiang dinner meeting, 23 November 1943, *FRUS: Cairo and Tehran*, 323–24.

92. Marc Gallicchio argues that Roosevelt's offer of Japanese Okinawa was not an error but part of a larger plan, discussed below, to surround the former belligerent with Allied "strong points" to maintain postwar security. Gallicchio, "The Kuriles Controversy: U.S. Diplomacy in the Soviet-Japan Border dispute, 1941–1946," *Pacific Historical Review* 60, no. 1 (February 1991): 77. If so, it would be the only Chinese involvement in a plan discussed between the Americans and Russians.

93. Liu offers a different explanation for Chiang's response to Roosevelt's offer of the Ryukyus. He suggests that Chiang rejected the offer as "gesture of self-denial," possibly to ease American concern over Chinese expansionism. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 137.

94. Formosa had become Japan's first colony in 1895 in the settlement that followed the first Sino-Japanese War.

95. D. Michael Green, "America's Strategic Trusteeship Dilemma: Its Humanitarian Obligations," *Texas Law Journal* 9, no. 19 (1974): 19.

96. As quoted in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 491.

97. Green, "America's Strategic Trusteeship Dilemma," 33.

98. For example, a Council on Foreign Relations War and Peace Studies Project report declared that the United States would likely need to retain bases and "use" of the Philippines in an uncertain postwar situation. However, the report insisted that political leaders there would "certainly agree" to a continuing American military presence. Post-war United States- Philippine Relations (preliminary draft), 18 August 1942, call no. 104.3, box 299, folder 3, Council on Foreign Relations Records, Seeley Mudd Library, Princeton University.

99. The 1952 peace treaty that ended the Allied occupation of Japan was negotiated simultaneously with a US-Japanese security treaty allowing for American retention of bases in Japan.

100. Bohlen minutes, Roosevelt-Stalin meeting, 29 November 1943, in *FRUS: Cairo and Tehran*, 532.

101. Minutes of a meeting of the Pacific War Council, 12 January 1944, in *FRUS: Cairo and Tehran*, 868.

102. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 127–30.

103. This agreement, but not its 1945 reappearance, is mentioned in Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 428. The situation was explained in James Byrnes to Harry Truman, 3 September 1945, reel 25, Truman Office Files, part 3.

104. C. L. Sulzberger, "Conferences Fixed the Shape of World to Come," *New York Times*, 12 December 1943.

105. From 1942 Roosevelt imagined that the United States, Soviet Union, and China would be the dominant postwar powers in the North Pacific. Final draft letter from Owen Lattimore to Chiang Kai-shek, 28 December 1942, box 5, Lauchlin Currie Papers.

106. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 108–10, 121.

107. Ibid., 107, 113–14.

108. Yee Wah Foo, "Fu Bingchang, Chiang Kai-shek and Yalta," *Cold War History* 9, no. 3 (2009): 395.

109. Soong responded to Roosevelt's support for Russia's railway claim by challenging its historical basis, which Roosevelt avoided by stating that he was not well informed on the issue. Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder*, 113–14.

110. Memoirs of Joseph Ballantine, 266, box 1, Joseph Ballantine Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

111. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 509.

112. Telegram from Charge d'Affaires of the USSR to the United States to the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of the USSR," n.d, classified on 30 July 1943, reprinted in Amos Perlmutter, *FDR and Stalin: A Not So Grand Alliance, 1943–1945* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 255.

113. "Agreement on Terms for Entry of the Soviet Union into the War against Japan," 11 February 1945, in Edward Stettinius Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians, the Yalta Conference* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1949), app.

114. Sovereignty of these islands had been a matter of contention between imperial Russia and Japan in the nineteenth century but had been resolved in 1905. Marc Gallicchio argues convincingly that Roosevelt's secret Kuriles commitment was not, as some have argued, the result of his misunderstanding of the long history of sovereignty disputes over the islands between Russia and Japan but rather a knowing compensation for the Soviet Union in return for its entry into the war. Gallicchio, "The Kuriles Controversy," 70–76.

115. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 526.

116. Chinese summary record, Roosevelt-Chiang dinner meeting, 23 November 1943.

117. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 509.

118. Ibid., 120. This point is also the main thrust of Bishop, *FDR's Last Year.*

2. ELBOW PATCHES AND ORIENTALISTS

1. Hugh Borton, *American Presurrender Planning for Postwar Japan*, Occasional Papers of the East Asian Institute (New York: Columbia University East Asian Institute, 1967), 67.

2. For example, Grew noted that he had reservations about "any discussion of this problem" because there were too many "imponderable factors" to set views on future courses of action. Grew to Vera Dean, 9 August 1943, MS Am 1687 (115), Joseph C. Grew Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

3. Borton, *American Presurrender Planning*, 82.

4. Index, in Iokibe, *The Occupation*, and Report on the Work of the Inter-divisional Area Committee on the Far East, 14 February 1944, box 164, Stanley K. Hornbeck Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

5. Joseph Ballantine memoir, 237, box 1, Joseph Ballantine Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

6. 1-A-5, "Passages in the Minutes of Advisory Committee and Its Subcommittee Reflecting Consultation with the President," 20 May 1942, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*

7. 1-A-5, "Indications of Contact with President on Post-war Matters," 17 November 1942, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*

8. 1-A-5, "Passages in the Minutes of Advisory Committee and Its Subcommittee Reflecting Consultation with the President," 22 February 1943, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*

9. 1-A-5, "Passages in the Minutes of Advisory Committee and Its Subcommittee Reflecting Consultation with the President," 19 June 1943, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*

10. 1-A-5, "Passages in the Minutes of Advisory Committee and Its Subcommittee Reflecting Consultation with the President," 31 March 1943, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*

11. 2-A-54, "Security Policy vis a vis Japan: Economic Aspect," 30 April 1944, in Iokibe, *The Occupation.*