

Beata Bochorodycz
.....
Adam Mickiewicz University

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/8088-376-5.06>

Political Leadership and the Security Policy: Negotiations on the US Military Bases in Okinawa under the Murayama and Hashimoto Cabinets

The problem of the US military bases, including the relocation of the Futenma military air station and a construction of a Futenma replacement facility (FRF) in Okinawa, has been a difficult and contested issue in Japanese domestic and foreign affairs for decades. In November 1995 Prime Minister Murayama and Vice President Al Gore established a Special Action Committee on Okinawa for deliberation on the reduction and realignment of the military bases. In April 1996 President Clinton and PM Hashimoto decided on the relocation and construction of the FRF in the prefecture within five to seven years. As of 2015 the prospects for implementation seem dim, especially after the electoral victory of the anti-base governor Onaga Takeshi in November 2014. This article focuses on the decision-making process under two consecutive prime ministers, Murayama and Hashimoto, since it was during their premierships that the issue was set on the agenda and decided upon. The article argues that on one hand PM Murayama made several important decisions, but lacking enough experience and power as a minor coalition member, as well as due to short term in office, was not able to supervise implementation of his decisions. On the other hand, PM Hashimoto did exercise strong leadership in regard to Futenma Air Base, but as the LDP president his decisions run along the general policy of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who is in charge of the foreign policy formation on daily base. Furthermore, the American side agreed to the relocation since the benefits – a new and technologically advanced facility for the US army, entirely paid by the Japanese government, outweighed the hardship of the transfer. In the entire process, the Okinawan community,

demanding removal of the bases outside the prefecture, was not consulted and hence the ongoing opposition to the US bases and FRF.

Keywords: *Foreign and defense policy, Futenma, military bases, decision making, prime minister role*

1. Introduction

With the election of the new Okinawa governor in November 2014, Onaga Takeshi, who opposes the construction of a new American military base in Henoko to replace the existing US Marine Corps Air Station Futenma (MCAS Futenma), the issue of military bases in Okinawa once again surfaced in Japanese politics, antagonizing local–central relations. The new prefectural government and local citizens stage protests and block national government's decisions, preventing construction of the new base, the Futenma replacement facility (FTR). On Sunday May 17, 2015, which marked 43rd anniversary of the Okinawa reversion to Japan, 35,000 people gathered in Naha to express opposition to the national government's policies toward Okinawa (*Okinawa Times*, 2015.5.18). The situation, with the anti-base governor and mass protests, bring back memories of the events in 1995–1996, which resulted in the establishment of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) and decision to relocate the Futenma airbase. The consequences of the present situation are to be seen, but in order to deepen the understanding of the problem, as well as to allow some predicaments for the future, this article aims to analyze the decision-making process on the US military bases and the return of the Futenma Air Station under the Murayama and Hashimoto cabinets in 1995 and 1996, since it was during their premierships that the issue was set on the agenda and decided upon. Furthermore, the analysis might shed some light on later developments on the same issue under Hatoyama and following cabinets. This historical analysis is to allow answers to following research questions: Who are the main actors and factors influencing the decision-making process? What is the role of prime ministers, who historically have shown leadership in foreign policy, and what institutional tools have prime ministers used in the process under investigation? And furthermore, what was the role of other actors (coalition partners, bureaucrats)? The main focus is placed on the domestic institutions and practices, while the American influence is analyzed through specific effects it had on Japanese actors.

2. Outline of the Problem

The problem of the US military bases in Okinawa, including the Futenma Air Station, located in the densely populated area in Ginowan city, has been a difficult and contested issue in Japanese domestic and foreign affairs for decades, but in September 1995 it gained a new momentum. On September 4, a 12-year old schoolgirl was abducted on her way back from school and raped by three US servicemen, who escaped later back into their base. The news about the rape and later reports about problems of the Japanese police to get a hold of custody of the suspects led to an outburst of protests by local citizens, escalating into demands not only to revise the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), the second most important document after the Japan–US Security Treaty, which stipulates conditions of operation of the American military bases and the army on Japanese territory, but also to close and move the US military bases outside Okinawa. The scale and intensity of the protests made both governments, political commentators and the media fear that the alliance itself might be at stake, as epitomized by such expressions as “alliance adrift” (*dōmei hyōryū*).

For both governments, the Okinawa situation was of the utmost importance because the prefecture hosts close to 74% of the exclusive-use US military bases, which occupy over 18% of the main island of Okinawa, and 70% of the American forces (Okinawa Ken 2013, pp. 1–3), while at the same time Okinawa constitutes only 0.6% of Japanese territory. The density of the military facilities and personnel have posed serious dangers to local citizens, resulting in accidents, noise and environmental pollution, assaults, rapes and other problems, and most importantly to the perception of discrimination in comparison to the rest of the country.

When the rape happened in September 1995, the national government was led by Socialist Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi (April 30, 1994 – November 1, 1996), the first head of the Socialist Party of Japan (SPJ, renamed in January 1996 to Social Democratic Party of Japan, SDPJ) to hold this position since 1948. What was more remarkable is the fact that the Socialists created the cabinet in coalition with their long-standing archrival, the Liberal Democratic Party, presided over at that time by Kōno Yōhei, and since October 1995 by Hashimoto Ryūtarō. On the other hand, on the local level the government of Okinawa was in the hands of the progressive and anti-base governor Ōta Masahide (December 10,

1990 – December 9, 1998), who after the rape began a legal battle with central government by refusing to sign a land lease for the American bases (Bochorodycz 2010, pp. 93–97).

Under the pressure of local protests, Vice-President Al Gore on behalf of President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Murayama announced the establishment of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) in November 1995, which by April the following year prepared the interim report with proposals of realignment, reduction and closure of US bases in Okinawa. Along the lines President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister (PM) Hashimoto Ryūtarō, who replaced Murayama in January 1996 (in office till July 30, 1998), announced in April of that year the relocation of the Futenma base within five to seven years. Later, to the surprise of local citizens, it was clarified that the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) was to be located within the prefecture.¹ After more deliberation the site was selected in Henoko, located in the north-western part of the main island of Okinawa. The situation got further complicated when in December 1997 citizens of Nago city voted against the FRF construction in a non-binding referendum, after which the city mayor Higa Tetsuya decided nevertheless to accept the governmental proposal and resigned soon after. Thousands of millions of yen in subsidies were poured subsequently into the northern area of the Okinawa island for economic development to compensate for the construction of the base, while the newly elected mayor in February 1998, agreed to the FTR construction under certain conditions. In February 1998, almost two years after the agreement on the Futenma relocation, governor Ōta announced his objection to the relocation within the prefecture, and in November 1998, lost the election to Inamine Keiichi, who gave his consent for the construction, although again under certain conditions. In the end, the local community was split even deeper between the proponents (beneficiaries of subsidies, political and business elites, construction companies) and opponents of the bases. In 2010 anti-base mayor Inamine Susumu was elected in Nago city and in 2014 reelected, while in national elections in the same year all seats from the Okinawa district to the Upper House were taken by candidates opposing the bases. Finally, in November 2014 the anti-base candidate Onaga Takeshi became a governor and the stalemate continues still. As of Autumn 2015, all Okinawa related municipal

1 Ota supposedly knew about the transfer within the prefecture from the beginning (Funabashi 1999, p. 3).

and prefectural governments are in the hands of people opposing the construction of new military bases in the prefecture. Summing up, over the period of almost twenty years, the overall resistance against the bases remained strong among the general public, while the local authorities, both prefectural and municipal, have been changing their stance, depending on the outcomes of the election, which became a battlefield between the opponents and proponents, the latter strongly supported by the central government.

3. Main Actors

Let us begin with the analysis of the main actors involved and their interests. There are basically three groups on the Japanese side that should be considered in relation to foreign and defense policy: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Ministry of Defense (MOD, Defense Agency, DA, till 2007), and PM with his entourage referred to in Japanese usually as Kantei. The fourth external actor in the case of Okinawa is the US. Each of these actors can further be subdivided into subgroups, representing different structures, priorities and interests.

The Prime Minister and Kantei

It has been assumed that generally Japanese PMs, with some exceptions, have played a limited role in policy making, including foreign affairs, which was dominated by the bureaucracy, as epitomized by such term as “bureaucracy cabinet system” (Iio 2008, pp. 29–34; Hayao 1993, pp. 3–27; Shinoda 2004, p. 5; Zakowski 2015, pp. 16–21). One of the reasons was a lack of institutional tools, namely the limited number of staff working directly under the PM and personally loyal to him², and furthermore, relatively small impact of international issues on electoral results and weak interest groups domestically in this area. Nevertheless, PMs did exercise a leadership in regard to chosen issues, such as the often quoted PM Tanaka Kakuei in 1972 in the case of the normalization of diplomatic relations with the People’s Republic of China, or PM Koizumi Jun’ichirō in case of North Korea. The administrative reforms initiated by PM Hashimoto under a slogan of increased efficiency of the public admin-

2 All prime ministers in Japan have been men so far, and hence the use of a pronoun “he.”

istration to be achieved through a decrease of its size and cost, was among other aims also to strengthen the position of the PM, and particularly of the Kantei vis-à-vis the bureaucrats and their ministries. Kantei is an abbreviation of the “Prime Minister’s Residence” (Naikaku Sōri Daijin Kantei), which includes the PM’s personal office and the Cabinet Secretariat (Naikaku Kanbō). Formally the PM’s Office (Sōrifu) and the Cabinet Secretariat had approximately 200 staff, although the problem was that a great majority of them were dispatched from other ministries, to which they usually stayed loyal³. International affairs were handled by the Cabinet Office on External Affairs (Gaisei Shingishitsu)⁴ in the Cabinet Secretariat, which personnel again were dispatched from MOFA. A great majority of Kantei’s staff were therefore bureaucrats. Under PM Murayama, the post of the Chief Cabinet Secretary was held by Nosaka Kōken (1924–2004), while under PM Hashimoto, by Kajiyama Seiroku⁵. At the same time, the post of the administrative deputy chief cabinet secretary was in hands of Furukawa Teijirō, who remained there for eight years and seven months between February 1995 and September 2003, much longer than that of any of the political appointees, which is quite symbolic for the power and influence the bureaucrats exercise in Japan. Furukawa was in touch with the Vice-Governor Yoshimoto Masanori, who was the main channel of communication between Ota and the central government (Funabashi 1999, pp. 134–136).

PM Hashimoto was perceived as a strong leader and a skillful player both within his own party, the LDP, and in dealing with bureaucrats, having held the most important ministerial and party positions (Tamura, ed. 1998; Funabashi 1999, p. 8; Takenaka 2006, pp. 45–46). In June 1996, PM Hashimoto created three posts of special advisors to the PM (*naikaku sōri daijin hosakan*)⁶ for support in policymaking (which in 2001 was increased to five). In the period discussed, Okamoto Yukio was formally

3 The PM was supported directly by a small number of assistants, including the (a) chief cabinet secretary (*naikaku kanbō chōkan*), (b) deputy chief cabinet secretaries: one administrative (*jimu fukuchōkan*) and one politically nominated (*seimu fukuchōkan*), and (c) five prime minister’s private secretaries (*naikaku sōri daijin hishokan*), of which only one was political and four administrative, which means that the four were bureaucrats.

4 Under the 2001 administrative reforms it was incorporated under the Assistant Chief Cabinet Secretary (Naikaku Kanbō Fukuchōkanho).

5 According to Moriya, Kajiyama was the key player in negotiations with the US on the return of Futenma, although he does not specify in what regard (Moriya 2010, p. 5).

6 The function actually existed informally since 1993, created by PM Hosokawa.

appointed a special advisor on Okinawa to PM Hashimoto in November 1996, a post he held till March 10, 1998. Okamoto was an ex-bureaucrat, who served in MOFA's North American Bureau before becoming an independent political commentator and an analyst. Interestingly, even before the formal establishment of the post, PM Hashimoto used another person as his special envoy to Okinawa, who without any formal powers served as a mediator and coordinator between the PM and local government (*Ryūkyū Shinpō*, 1996.9.11, 1996.11.2). It was Shimokōbe Atsushi, the high ranking ex-bureaucrat, who at the end of the 1970s served as the administrative vice minister (*kokudo jimujikan*), the highest bureaucratic post in the National Land Agency (NLA), and was involved not only in the formulation of national land development plans (*Zensō*),⁷ but also in the Okinawa Promotion and Development Plans, having thereby broad connections in Okinawa. Shimokōbe was asked by the PM to become his advisor as soon as in February 1996, soon after the formation of the Hashimoto Cabinet, but he refused on the grounds that he wanted to participate in the process taking "the perspective of the Okinawan side" and not the national government (Shimokōbe Ākaibusu 2014, p. 29). He visited Okinawa on several occasions to meet with Governor Ōta Masahide, Vice Governor Yoshimoto Masanori, and other persons. At the same time, the chief cabinet secretary, Kajiyama Seiroku, although trusted by PM Hashimoto, was not the closest aid but rather a strategically appointed party member (Mikuriya and Makihara, eds. 2012, p. 204; Funabashi 1999, p. 133). For the specific tasks and negotiations, Hashimoto used his private advisors.

On the other hand, PM Murayama also appointed three special advisors (*shushō tokubetsu hosa*) in October 1994 without any legal basis, all of whom were members of parliament (MPs): Hayakawa Masaru (SPJ), Nishikōri Atsushi (Shintō Sakigake), and Nakagawa Hidenao (LDP), who resigned in September 1995 and was replaced by Toida Saburō (LDP). None of them, however, served as a mediator in regard to Okinawa policy, and as can be seen by the party affiliation, they were chosen to balance the coalition partners' influence on the PM.

It is important to note that in spite of the lack of formal tools such as the posts of special advisors, both PMs were able to use the informal means to influence the process. And it is not certainly a coincidence that

7 Abbreviation of Zenkoku Sōgō Kaihatsu Keikaku (All-Japan Comprehensive Development Plans), which were formulated between 1962 and 2005.

both special advisors of PM Hashimoto were former ex-bureaucrats. Furthermore, both PMs were very much interested in the Okinawa issue, having strong personal ties, and “deep sentiments” (*atsui omoi*) toward Okinawa, as in fact many of the cabinet and party members had at that time.⁸ Murayama, the Socialist PM, was also an old friend of Vice Governor Yoshimoto Masanori, the policy brain of Governor Ōta, from the Jichirō, shared the critical stance toward the US–Japan security treaty and the stationing of the US military on Japan’s territory. Hashimoto on the other hand, was deeply engaged in the Okinawa problem, partly due to his political mentor, former PM Satō Eisaku, who negotiated the return of Okinawa to Japan in 1972,⁹ and other reasons, including his general interest in security issues (Okimoto and Miyagi, eds. 2013). As the PM and party president, he declared the resolution of the so-called “Okinawa problem” as a “mission” not only for himself but also for the LDP during a ceremony, commemorating the party’s 40th anniversary (Tamura, ed. 1998, pp. 118–119).

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MOFA has been pointed out as the key actor responsible for foreign policy formulation (Yakushiji 2003, pp. 197–207), characterized, as all other ministries, by a strong sectionalism, secretiveness, protection of its privileges, and loyalty toward their home ministry. MOFA bureaucrats, both from the elite and non-elite tracks, recruited from graduates of Japan’s top universities, and usually continued working in the ministry till their retirement, with the ultimate goal of obtaining the ambassadorial position (Imazato 2002, p. 211). MOFA officials are said to be characterized by high self-esteem, coming from their proficiency in foreign languages, as well as their division into separate schools, representing different countries, strategic for Japanese diplomacy. The most important has been the American school due to the relevance of the Japan–US alliance, others include the China and Soviet/Russian schools, the latter more influential

8 The Okinawa sympathizers (*Okinawa shinpa*) or Okinawa experts (*Okinawa tsū*), including Hashimoto Ryūtarō, Kajiyama Seiroku, Nonaka Hiromu, Yamanaka Sadanori etc., referred to as persons with a long history of involvement with the Okinawan issues, with a deep understanding of local characteristics, and positive attitude towards the prefecture (Bochorodycz 2010, pp. 36–37).

9 Hashimoto supposedly even kept a photograph of Satō Eisaku on his desk (Tamura ed. 1998, p. 118).

during the Cold War. The bureaucrats in charge of those areas not only spoke the language, knew the culture, history and political system, but also personally sympathized with those countries as well as their political ideologies (Imazato 2002, pp. 187–189).

Due to the importance of the US for Japan, it is not surprising that among MOFA's ten bureaus, five in charge of different regions (Asia, North America etc.), and five divided functionally: Foreign Policy, Economic Affairs, International Cooperation, Treaties (International Legal Affairs from 2001), and the Intelligence and Analysis Service, until the administrative reforms in 2001 the most influential were the North American Affairs Bureau (Hokubei Kyoku) and the Treaties Bureau (Jōyaku Kyoku). The former was in charge of relations with the US, while the latter with legal issues related to all diplomatic relations of Japan. During PM Murayama, the post of foreign minister went to Kōno Yōhei, the LDP president, who also acted as the deputy prime minister, while under PM Hashimoto to Ikeda Yukihiko (1937–2004). During that period of the two cabinets, the post of the administrative vice minister (*gaimu jimujikan*) was in the hands of Hayashi Sadayuki, and the North American Bureau, Orita Masaki, while the North American Bureau was led by Tanaka Hitoshi (1996–1998), one of the best known diplomats in Japan, particularly in regard to the relations with North Korea.¹⁰

The Ministry of Defense

The situation of MOD was quite different from MOFA and other administrative units. Until 2007, it was not a full-fledged ministry, but an agency, the DA under the PM's Office, staffed mostly with civil servants dispatched from other ministries, Ministry of Finance (MOF) and Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI, later METI). The situation of the DA, regarded as the "management agency" rather than the "policy agency," started changing after the Cold War, and particularly after the Gulf War and increased demands for Japan's participation in international military operations. The most important unit within MOD is the Defense Policy Bureau with the Defense Policy Division (the Japan-US Defense Cooperation Division was separated from the Defense Policy Di-

10 According to Yakushiji, Tanaka played the major role in the negotiations on the Futenma return (Yakushiji 2003, p. 15), although Funabashi, not denying his skills, shows his role differently (Funabashi 1999, pp. 39–42).

vision a few months after the ministry upgrading). Compared with other ministries and agencies, it is relatively low in esteem and staffed with junior personnel.

In the discussions on Japan's defense policy, for a long time the role of the bureaucrats from the DA/MOD was mentioned only slightly, while the focus was placed on the role of MOFA, PMs or the international environment (Blais 2010, loc. 404).¹¹ During the period discussed in this paper, the ministry was still an agency, and the important posts of DA director-general was held by Etō Seishirō (August 1995 – January 1996), Usui Hideo (January 1996 – November 1996), and Kyūma Fumio (November 1996 – July 1998), who played a relatively small role in the decision-making process on Futenma. On the other hand, the negotiations were greatly influenced by the DA director general of Defense Bureau, Akiyama Masahiro (1995–1997) and the director of the Defense Policy division, Moriya Takemasa (1994–1995), both of whom continued their activities related to Futenma on different posts, Akiyama as the administrative vice minister in the DA, and Moriya as a counselor in the Cabinet Secretariat. Moriya, the DA/MOD administrative vice minister from 2003 to 2007, who was eventually found guilty by the court of a bribery, wrote several books disclosing information on the behind the scene negotiations on military bases, shading some light on the process (Moriya 2010).¹²

4. Institutional Arrangements for Decision Making Over the US Bases in Japan

Until the end of the Cold War the issue of the US military bases in Japan was predominantly in the hands of the US government. The situation started to change with the end of the Cold War. In 1990, the US side agreed to upgrade the “unequal” level of participants of the Security Consultative Committee (SCC, Nichibeī Anzen Hoshō Kyōgi Iinkai) on the American side¹³, which is established under the Article IV of the US–Ja-

11 (loc.) refers to the location in a Kindle edition of books.

12 Moriya writes about a period between 2004 and 2007, but his references and description of processes and mechanism of the decision making on the Futenma issue, can be regarded as representative for a much longer period of time.

13 The proposition came from Abe Shintarō, former Japanese Foreign Minister in June 1990, but was ignored until the new administration of Bill Clinton picked it up in March 1994 (Sunohara 2011, pp. 111–114).

pan Security Treaty, as the highest inter-governmental organ on the US–Japan security issues (Armacost 1996, p. 95; Yoshida 2012, pp. 298–303). The new members were to include the Secretaries of Defense and State, instead of the US Pacific Commander and US Ambassador to Japan. The first meeting took place in 1994, and since then the Committee has been also known as 2+2 Meeting due to the fact that it consists of four top representatives, two from each country, Foreign and Defense Ministers on the Japanese side, and the Secretaries of State and Defense on the American side. The four members are elected politicians, making the final decisions, but on the day to day basis, since the 1990s the negotiations and decisions are made by two sub-committees: Security Sub-Committee (SSC, Nichibeï Anzen Hoshō Kōkyū Jimu Reberu Kyōgi) and Sub-Defense Committee (SDC, Bōei Kyōryoku Shoiinkai), which comprise high-level officials from both governments, the former of vice-ministers and under-secretaries, the latter of chiefs of bureaus and deputy assistant secretaries.

Formally though, problems induced by the bases and the implementation of the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) falls under the jurisdiction the US–Japan Joint Committee (Nichibeï Gōdō Iinkai), established under the Article XXV of SOFA, while on the day to day basis it was the Defense Facilities Agency (DFA), the outer bureau of the Defense Agency that handled matters related to the American army facilities, land, Japanese base workers, noise reduction countermeasures, accidents and incidents caused by the US Army service members and their families. The US–Japan Joint Committee manages the widest range of problems and comprises several permanent sub-committees created for a specific purpose.¹⁴ At present the committee includes a large group of participants from the directors' general rank on the Japanese side, with the Director General of the North American Affairs Bureau in MOFA, and not MOD, as should be noticed, supervising the committee.

The big institutional changes came again in November 1995, when under the Murayama Tomiichi Cabinet, two new bodies were established: on November 17, Okinawa Base Problem Council (Okinawa Kichi Mondai Kyōgikai), and two days later on November 19, the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO). The latter was the result of the inter-governmental agreement between PM Murayama on his initiative and Vice President Al Gore during their meeting in Tokyo. On the other hand,

14 The subcommittees include: the Facilities Sub-Committee (FSC), Joint Planning Committee (JPC), and Joint Interoperability Coordinating Committee (JICC).

the Okinawa Base Problem Council, composed of the Chief Cabinet Secretary, Foreign Minister, Director General of the DA, and the Governor of Okinawa, was to create a forum for the local government to deliver opinions and requests, and for the central government to grasp the reality of bases in order to reflect them in the national policy. The council was the first ever such arrangement to include local representatives, and in that sense was revolutionary. At the same time, however, the council was not meant as a forum for discussions on plans for base closures and relocations, had no discretionary powers over the bases or included administrative representatives from the important ministries, such as MOFA and DA bureaucrats, nor the American side.

On the other hand, SACO was the intergovernmental institution, established with the purpose to develop recommendations on ways to realign and reduce US facilities in Okinawa after the outburst of protests against the rape of a schoolgirl by the US Army servicemen. The agenda of SACO was to include: “planning for realigning, consolidating, and down-scaling the facilities and areas in Okinawa; second, problems, such as training, noise, safety and the environment, relating to the facilities and the areas of United States Forces stationed on Okinawa” (MOFA 1995). Importantly, SACO was established directly under the competence of the Security Consultative Committee (SCC, 2+2), and not the US–Japan Joint Committee, that is under political leadership, and not the routine bureaucratic management, due to the significance of the issue at the time. SACO was the first of such committees ever established outside the existing framework. Nevertheless, the representatives of the local government were not included, and all the other members were in fact bureaucrats.

5. Murayama Cabinet

The issue of the US military bases in Okinawa surfaced during the term of Murayama Tomiichi, the Socialist PM, and hence one could expect strong initiative on the part of the PM in this regard. And initially it did seem as the case. Murayama declared that he would risk “the life of his cabinet to resolve the Okinawa problem” (*Ryūkyū Shimpō*, 1995.11.4), and even established two aforementioned important institutions for deliberation on the military bases. Murayama was also the one who brought up the issue of the US military bases in Okinawa during his first meeting with President Bill Clinton in January 1995, that is before the rape

incident, presenting several demands, including transfer of the live-fire artillery training over the Prefectural Route 104 and others (Yakushiji, ed. 2012, p. 244). However, lacking political resources in the coalition, as well as generally feeling uncomfortable with foreign affairs, as he confessed years later (Yakushiji, ed. 2012, pp. 248–249), Murayama left the matter of the Okinawa bases almost entirely to Foreign and Deputy Prime Minister Kōno Yōhei. Kōno, the LDP president at that time, was a strong supporter of the Japan–US alliance and hence his efforts concentrated on limiting adverse effects of local protests on the alliance. The Socialist Party of Japan (SPJ) soon after becoming the ruling party in 1994 changed its policy dramatically, accepting the Japan–US alliance, nuclear power, constitutionality of Self Defense Forces, and then altering its name to the Social–Democratic Party of Japan (SDPJ) in January 1996. The party supported the Okinawan claim to reduce and return the US military bases, but its position in the coalition government with 70 seats against 223 of the LDP in the Lower House was very weak. Furthermore, Murayama had never held any ministerial position before becoming PM, and hence his knowledge of and experience in dealing with bureaucrats was very limited.

SOFA Revision

The rape of the schoolgirl took place on September 4, 1995, but the Police did not want to go public to protect the girl's identity, and it was not until September 8, when the *Ryukyu Shinpō*, one of two influential local newspapers, ran the story about the rape. The newspaper informed that the three men were held in custody by the US's Naval Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS), while the prefectural police had requested the Americans to be handed over to Okinawan custody. Further news about the refusal to hand over the suspects due to Article 17 of SOFA led to criticism of the "unequal" provision, which stipulates that the accused person should remain under the US authorities, if it is in the hands of the US, until the person is charged by Japan. The protest against the rape and the military bases continued escalating from demands for a complete review of SOFA, through demands for the reduction and closure of the bases up to demands for withdrawal of the Marines.

From the beginning, US authorities, and particularly the Department of Defense, were alarmed of possible adverse consequences of the protests. The US position (the Defense and State Departments, the US Embassy in

Japan) was firmly against SOFA revision, as expressed by Professor Joseph Nye, the Assistant Secretary for Defense, in the words: "We will not touch one letter of the text. We will deal with it as a question of Article 17 interpretation and implementation" (in Funabashi 1999, p. 306). The US side argued that in fact SOFA was not disadvantageous to Japan, fearing that in case of revision the question of balance with other countries, especially South Korea, already voicing their dissatisfaction with SOFA, would become an issue. To handle the situation apologies were offered on different levels, and later a stand-down of the Marines announced for a day of reflection. On September 11, the US Consul-General in Okinawa, Aloysius O'Neill visited Governor Ota Masahide at the prefectural office to offer an apology for the incident. On September 21, Ambassador Walter Mondale met the Governor in Tokyo, and apologized to the victim, her family, and the Okinawan people, while on the same day in the US, President Clinton expressed deep regret in a radio address (*Ryūkyū Shinpō* 1995.9.11, 21). Furthermore, upon complaints from Foreign Minister Kōno Yōhei, the Americans also agreed to late-night questioning of the suspects, which speeded up the process of evidence gathering. As a result, the three marines were charged by the Naha district court on September 29, eight days after the papers had been forwarded from the prefectural police, and on the same day the three marines were handed over into Japanese custody. The Americans showed that they were eager to cooperate but only as far as the problem of the SOFA Article 17 was treated as a question of "interpretation and implementation."

On the Japanese side, MOFA and the DA also expressed strong opposition to SOFA revision under a slogan of not opening Pandora's Box. Foreign Minister Kōno, with a sense of mission to save the bilateral relationship with the US, in the first meeting with Governor Ōta in Tokyo on September 19, obstinately refused revision, which led to a further escalation of protests in Okinawa. The same stance was also taken by the PM's closest aide, the Chief Cabinet Secretary, Nosaka Kōken (*Ryūkyū Shinpo*, 1995.9.20). Kōno was unmoved, fearing that revision of SOFA might lead to the withdrawal of US forces from Japan (Funabashi 1999, p. 304). MOFA bureaucrats supported Kōno's stance, while he faced opposition from the coalition partners, the SPJ and New Party Sakigake.¹⁵ In the end, the Japanese government agreed not to revise SOFA. Prime Minister Mu-

15 Even some LDP members, such as Ono Yoshinori, chairperson of LDP's Defense Caucus, were in favor of the revision.

rayama himself refrained from commenting on the matter saying that it was under the foreign minister's jurisdiction. Within the ruling coalition, the demand for SOFA revision was voiced openly by Kubo Wataru, the secretary general of the SPJ, who argued that not doing it would complicate the base issue even more, while the leader of New Party Sakigake and Finance Minister, Takemura Masayoshi, posed a provocative but rather rhetorical question whether Japan was in fact independent. In Okinawa the protests escalated even further. On October 21, a crowd of 85,000 Okinawans gathered to protest against the rape and SOFA in Okinawa, the biggest such rally since the land struggle in the 1950s.

Nevertheless, the question of SOFA revision was settled down as an implementation review of SOFA, in accordance with the position of top decision makers on both sides, the US State and Defense Departments, and Japan's MOFA and DA. On October 25, in a US–Japan meeting in Tokyo, it was formally agreed that in case of violent crimes such as murder and rape, “the United States will give sympathetic consideration” to any request for the transfer of suspects into Japanese custody before indictment (*The New York Times*, 1995.10.26). As for the Japanese government, the internal conflict was mediated by Hashimoto Ryūtarō, elected the LDP president in October 1995, during a meeting of coalition party leaders on November 2, and so the Japanese government maintained the official stance of not revising SOFA in spite of the intra coalition disagreement.

Bases

The second issue of military bases became particularly pertinent after Governor Ota announced his refusal to sign proxy for lease of land for US military bases on August 28 (Bochorodycz 2010, pp. 93–95). This time the conflict ran along ministerial and not national lines. From the start, the US Department of State and Japanese MOFA were strongly against handling the issue of the bases, while the US Defense Department and Japanese counter partners, the DA, strongly in favor, as were the political leaders PM Murayama and PM Hashimoto, not to mention the governor of Okinawa.

According to Funabashi (1999), the *Asahi Shinbun* journalist, who conducted extensive interviews with all major actors involved in the process, over a long period of time, it was actually two high level officials

from the DA, Akiyama Masahiro, director general of Defense Bureau, and Moriya Takemasa, a counselor (*shingikan*) for the Defense Bureau division, who took up the initiative in regard to the bases. Their main concern was the preservation of the alliance itself and limitation of the impact of the refusal for proxy signing over the land use by Governor Ōta. Akiyama contacted Nye directly proposing to set up a joint commission on returning the bases, and sent Hirasawa Katsuei, DA counselor (a parliament member from October 1996) to Washington, who discussed the situation with Curt Campbell, deputy assistant secretary of defense. Nye drafted a proposal about conveying a new forum for discussion and Secretary of Defense William Perry added requirements of bilateralism and involvement of both military and civilians, and preparation of a proposal with a specific deadline (Funabashi 1999, pp. 308–309).¹⁶

In the other camp, MOFA bureaucrats against SACO revision and handling of the bases, were arguing that there already was a forum to discuss such issues (the US–Japan Joint Committee), and furthermore that SOFA was under the jurisdiction of MOFA and not the DA. The DA top officials counter argued that MOFA had not been able to assess operational functions of the bases and incorporate them into demands toward the US, which was the reason the issue of the bases had been unresolved for years (Funabashi 1999, pp. 318–319).¹⁷ The turf battle continued between ministries, while the political leaders of both institutions shared views of the bureaucrats under their jurisdiction. SACO became a chance to establish a new mechanism for the two institutions to cooperate on the base issue.

On November 1, 1995, DA Director–General Etō Seishirō and Defense Secretary William Perry, who arrived in Tokyo, in a joint press release announced the “realignment, consolidation and reduction” of the US bases, emphasizing at the same time that the overall US troop strength in the Asia–Pacific would remain at 100,000 with 47,000 in Japan, which was compatible with the US policy announced in January 1995, known as the Nye Initiative.¹⁸ On November 20, Prime Minister Murayama and Vice President Al Gore, at the APEC meeting in Japan, announced the estab-

16 In the end, the proposal for inclusion of local representatives was not implemented.

17 On the other hand, some bureaucrats within JDA were reluctant to tackle the issue of bases, seeing it as new and difficult task, first of negotiating with landowners, and also finding new relocation sites.

18 It is a name of a report, officially known as *The United States Strategy for the East Asia Pacific Region*, prepared by the Assistant Secretary of Defense John Nye and released in February 1995.

ishment of SACO,¹⁹ which was to investigate ways to reduce the impact of the US military bases in Okinawa. On the following day in Tokyo, the first meeting of SACO was held with Orita Masaki of the MOFA North American Bureau and Akiyama Masahiro of the DA Defense Policy Bureau, and their US counterparts, Winston Lord, the US Assistant Secretary of State for Asian and Pacific Affairs, and Joseph Nye, the US Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs. The inaugural session was also attended exceptionally by Foreign Minister Kōno Yōhei, DA Director-General Etō Seishirō and the US Ambassador to Japan Walter Mondale, who were not formally members of SACO.²⁰ The SACO interim report was ready by April 1996, and the final report announced in December 1996. It proposed a return of 21% of the bases in 11 military facilities. The final report outlined the requirements of land return, adjustment of procedures for training and operational procedures, noise abatement and changes of SOFA. The changes looked substantial, but many of the items included were part of earlier petitions and agreements, and so the question was rather of the implementation than the planning (Funabashi 1999, pp. 24–25; Bochorodycz 2005; Moriya 2010, loc. 4214). The SACO deliberations took place and the reports were submitted under the next Hashimoto Cabinet. While leaving office Murayama supposedly said to Hashimoto that “Okinawa is my greatest regret. It’s the only thing I ask of you,” to which Hashimoto responded with assurance that it was also his greatest concern (in Funabashi 1999, p. 29). Both were probably indeed concerned about the issue, but both perceived the solutions most probably quite differently.

6. Hashimoto Cabinet

The cabinet of Hashimoto Ryūtarō was formed on January 11, 1996, still in coalition with the SPJ, renamed few days later to SDPJ, and New Party Sakigake (Shintō Sakigake). As a result of the Lower House election

.....
 19 The members were to include director-general of the Defense Bureau and the chairman of the Joint Staff Council from JDA, and North American Bureau director-general from MOFA, while US participants came from the State Department, the Defense Department, the Joint Chief of Staff, the Pacific Forces and the high command of the US forces in Japan.

20 The regular members included: Director-General of MOFA’s North American Bureau, JDA’s Director-General of the Bureau of Defense Policy, Director-General of the Defense Facilities Agency, and Chairman of the Joint Staff Council of the Japan Self-Defense Forces.

in October 1996, however, the position of the LDP in the coalition was strengthened even further, while the SDPJ's weakened to the point of marginalization: the SDPJ decreased its seats from 70 to 15, while the LDP increased its share from 223 to 239. By the time Hashimoto took up the post, the issue of SOFA and the bases was already set on the negotiation agenda, the SACO committee was preparing proposals, although the details were to be decided yet.

Before going into detailed analysis of the decision process under PM Hashimoto, it is instructive to look at an article from the *New York Times* titled "U.S. Will Return Base in Okinawa" published on April 13, 1996, one day after the public announcement of the Futenma return, which is representative of the understanding of the issue at the time by the public.

In a landmark move to scale back the intrusiveness of the American military presence in Japan, the United States agreed tonight to return a major American air base to Japan in five to seven years. [...]

"We will be relocating some critical defense capabilities, not only within Japan, but some back to the United States," the official said.

The announcements, just four days before President Clinton is to arrive in Tokyo for a state visit, are expected to ease the hostility among Okinawans to the American military bases, which now take up 20 percent of their island. [...]

The Futenma Air Base, the Marine base on Okinawa that was the subject of today's announcement, is a major American military installation and a symbol of the American presence on Okinawa.

The Defense Department apparently concluded that the gains it offered in security were outweighed by the antagonisms it bred among Okinawans who lived nearby.

Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto and the American Ambassador to Japan, Walter F. Mondale, who made the announcement about Futenma in a joint news conference televised live across Japan, emphasized that virtually all of the functions of Futenma would be transferred to other bases in Japan. [...]

If it had not been for that rape, the agreement to return Futenma and other land on Okinawa almost certainly would not have happened. [...]

Mr. Hashimoto had asked President Clinton to return Futenma at their meeting in California in February, and today's announcement represents a major triumph for the Prime Minister's Administration. [...]

The United States presumably felt that Futenma is more dispensable than some other sites, in part because it is a smaller operation than other well-known American bases.

Summarizing the main points of the article, we could say that the Futenma return 1) was PM Hashimoto's initiative, who made the request towards the US president, 2) the decision was made under pressure of the local protests in Okinawa, 3) the US government agreed in order to a) lift the burden of the Okinawans, and because b) the base was strategically

of relatively small importance, and 4) Futenma's functions were to be transferred outside the prefecture. All of these points, at least partially, are subjected to debate.

The decision to return the Futenma Air Base was announced on April 12, 1996, at the joint press conference of PM Hashimoto and US Ambassador to Japan, Walter Mondale, as described above. The negotiations of the process obviously started much earlier. In preparation for the PM's official visit to the US and meeting with President Clinton, Hashimoto convened a meeting in regard to Futenma Air Station with all bureaucrats in charge of the issue, including Deputy Cabinet Secretary Furukawa Sadajiro, Hirabayashi Hiroshi – Chief Cabinet Counselor for Foreign Affairs, Tanaka Hitoshi – Deputy Director General of MOFA's North American Bureau, Akiyama Masahiro – Director General of the DA's Defense Policy Bureau. The officials were generally against the idea of the PM asking the US President for the Futenma return, arguing that the issue was too sensitive for the Americans, that it would undermine Hashimoto's authority as a leader (since he would be forwarding the demands of the Okinawans), and that it would have an adverse effect on future discussions on the military bases (Funabashi 1999, pp. 6–8).²¹ Hashimoto agreed with them, although as he admitted later, he was hesitating until the very last (Iokibe & Miyagi, eds. 2013, pp. 63–66). During PM Hashimoto's meeting with President Clinton in Santa Monica in February 1996, Hashimoto nevertheless touched upon the issue of Futenma invited by the President, who initiated the topic. Hashimoto's statement in response to the President's question about Okinawa is worth quoting because it portrays his state of mind at that time:

To tell you the truth, I'm in an awkward position myself. Were I to pass on the demands of the Okinawan people, it would be for the complete return of Futenma. However, bearing in mind the importance of U.S.–Japan security and maintaining the functionality of the U.S. armed forces, I realize that that is extremely difficult. (Funabashi 1999, p. 21).

The statement greatly confused the Americans because of its vagueness, and so it was up to high-level officials, Tanaka Hitoshi and Moriya Takemasa, who stayed in the US longer, to clarify the statement after-

21 Some of the LDP "defense tribe" (*bōeizoku*) members were also against it, arguing that it is unreasonable under the unstable the situation on the Korean Peninsula (Tamura ed. 1998: 119).

wards in private talks with the US counter partners. The clarification was that the Japanese did ask in fact for the return of Futenma. In the end, it was concluded that the Futenma return was the result of Hashimoto's initiative. The main role of PM Hashimoto, as the initiator of the process was also emphasized by President Bill Clinton in his speech in the Japanese Diet on April 18, 1996.

The American people profoundly regret the horrible violence done to a young school girl there. [...]

In the months since this incident, we have worked with the government of Japan to minimize the burden of our military presence on the Japanese people. The Joint Action Plan we announced this week calls for the consolidation of our bases in Okinawa and a major reduction in inconveniences to the people who live there, like noise and training and exercises. [...]

I want to say again how much I appreciate the leadership of the Prime Minister and his government and the opportunity the United States has been given to do something we probably should have done some time ago. I thank you for that (MOFA 1996.4.18).

The "reluctant initiative" of PM Hashimoto was picked up by the American side. After the meeting with Hashimoto in California, President Clinton ordered the Secretary of Defense William Perry to explore the possibility of returning the base. A few days later Washington informed Tokyo secretly of such a possibility if only a replacement site could be found (Woodall 2014, p. 204).²²

On April 15, 1996, that is three days after PM Hashimoto and US Ambassador Walter Mondale's press conference, the SACO interim report was approved at the meeting of the Security Consultative Committee (2+2), which confirmed the return of Futenma although the question of the relocation site was to appear in the final SACO report published in December of the same year. It stipulated that Futenma Air Base will be relocated to an off-shore facility in the northern part of Okinawa island. After years of negotiations, the FRF plan was agreed on and incorporated into the "United States–Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation," announced and approved by PM Koizumi Jun'ichirō on May 1, 2006, which is the latest up to date (2015) official agreement on the issue. In the final version of the plan, the new base with the V-shape runways is planned to be built by a landfill method over the coral reef shallows of

22 It is interesting to note that the first information about the possibility of the Futenma return appeared in local newspapers as early as November 1995 (*Ryūkyū Shinpō*, 1995.11.1, evening edition).

Henoko and the seafloor slopes in Ōura Bay, while 8,000 marines are to be relocated to Guam, and the cost of transfer entirely covered by Japanese government.

In the end, the blame for the failure of the negotiations on military bases and particularly on Futenma has been put by the ruling elites in Japan and the US on “the Head of the Ryūkū Kingdom” (*Ryūkyū Ōkoku no shuseki*), as phrased by Nonaka Hiromu (Miokuriya and Makihara, eds. 2012, pp. 234–235), namely on Governor Ōta, who announced his objection to the idea of relocation within the prefecture in February 1998, almost two years after the agreement on the return (Tamura ed. 1998, p. 121, 134; Funabashi 1999, p. 319). In the meantime, PM Hashimoto made several decisions, which were to show his determination to solve the Okinawa problem. First of all, Hashimoto met in person with Governor Ōta 16 times, which was unprecedented in itself for the PM to meet in person with a governor of one prefecture, of which the first time was just 12 days after taking up the premiership. Hashimoto prepared also a complex institutional framework for the realization of the Futenma relocation, including establishment of several institutions: (a) Countermeasures Headquarters for All Futenma Air Station Return (Futenma Hikōjō Zenmen Henkan Tō Mondai Taisaku Honbu) in DFA on May 1, (b) Task Force for Resolution of Issues Related to Futenma Air Base Return (Futenma Hikōjō Tō no Henkan ni Kakawaru Shomondai no Kaiketsu no Tame no Sagyō Iinkai), known as the Task Force for the deliberations on Futenma between the government and the prefecture on May 8, (c) Special Investigative Committee on Comprehensive Development Countermeasures for Okinawa Prefecture (Okinawa Ken Sōgō Shinkō Taisaku ni Kan Suru Tokubetsu Chōsa Kai) within the LDP directly under his jurisdiction as the LDP president, chaired by an influential LDP member Katō Kōichi on June 18, (d) Discussion Group on Okinawa Municipalities with US Military Bases (Okinawa Beigun Kichi Shozai ni Kan Suru Kondan Kai) in the form of the Chief Cabinet Secretary’s (Kajiyama Seiroku) private advisor committee on August 19. On behalf of the PM, Director General of the DA, Usui, negotiated the transfer of the live-fire artillery training over Prefectural Route 104 to other municipalities outside Okinawa with heads of local governments. Furthermore, Hashimoto announced the “Prime Minister’s Statement on Okinawa Problem” on September 10, in which he promised several special measures for Okinawa’s development, and what is more important, secured a budget for the Futenma reloca-

tion and the economic policies demanded by Governor Ōta under the Okinawa Cosmopolitan Formation Concept, which included all Okinawa Free Trade Zone (Okinawa Kokusai Toshi Keisei Kōsō). And finally he established the Okinawa Policy Council (Okinawa Seisaku Kyōgikai) on September 17, which was to include local representatives and supervise the implementation of economic plans.

The long list of Hashimoto's decisions clearly demonstrated his involvement in the issue, and at the same time his knowledge of the functioning of different bodies of the government, and also the ability to push and coordinate the actors for the implementation of those decisions. In other words, he used all formal and informal institutional tools by setting up various bodies, which gathered representatives of all agencies involved, as well as his party members. Importantly, as should be stressed anew, he also secured the budget for all those decisions by closely working with the Ministry of Finance.²³ Both private advisors to PM Hashimoto, Okamoto and Shimokōbe, participated in negotiations with the Okinawan government officials on specific economic and military issues. Nevertheless, in spite of all those arrangements, Hashimoto took up the initiative and made the decision to relocate Futenma, which followed the general lines of MOFA's and the DA's policy, that is, the prioritization of the Japan–US alliance and the maintenance of the “operational readiness” of the US army, while the local demand for the relocation outside the prefecture was not even set on the deliberation agenda.

The question as to why Governor Ōta decided to announce opposition to the FRF construction so late is complex. While opposing relocation and construction of military bases within the prefecture, Ōta tried to use the issue of military bases as a bargaining card vis-à-vis the central government to implement local economic policies (Okinawa Cosmopolitan City Concept, FTZ), which were to make Okinawa economically independent from the central government (Bochorodycz 2010). The local community has been deeply divided over the issue of the military bases, the gap, which widened especially after financial and other benefits were poured in by the national government (Inoue 2007, pp. 186–193). Nevertheless, the opposition among local citizens to any solution involving relocation

23 Funabashi reports that one of the first calls after the decision on the Futenma relocation was made by Hashimoto and Komura Takeshi, general director of the Budget Bureau at the Ministry of Finance to secure the budget for his decision (Funabashi 1999, p. 5).

within the prefecture or a construction of new bases has been strong. For the Okinawans, the Futenma problem is just a part of the bigger problem of the military bases, while both governments present it as *the* problem, putting the blame for the stalemate on the local side. Interestingly, in the discourse, Ōta and the local groups are criticized for being “ungrateful” for all the efforts done by the central government (Funabashi 1999, p. 154).

7. Conclusion

Prime Minister Murayama although initially showed strong initiative in regard to a solution of the US military bases (SACO etc.), devolved almost all responsibility to Foreign Minister Kōno Yōhei, the president of the LDP (till October 1995). Murayama was lacking experience with ministerial posts and interest in foreign relations, as well as political resources as the minor coalition partner. The issue of SOFA revision was handled according to the stance of Kōno–MOFA policy, namely of no revision, only interpretation and implementation of the agreement. Both sides, foreign minister and MOFA’s top officials shared the same stance toward the issue. This ran along the policy lines of the US Department of Defense and State.

On the other hand, the issue of the bases presented a different case, and the conflict ran along the institutional, and not the national lines. Japanese MOFA and US Department of State were strongly against tackling the base issue. The initiative actually came from DA bureaucrats (Akiyama, Moriya) with strong support from the US Department of Defense (Nye, Perry), who acknowledged the problematic aspect of the military base concentration in Okinawa. The Department of Defense was fully aware of the necessity to redefine the US–Japan alliance after the end of the Cold War, and the deliberations in this regard were undertaken, but due to Japanese MOFA’s negative stance, the US State Department followed the line. For MOFA, the US bases in Japan were the strongest bargaining card in bilateral security discussions (Funabashi 1999, p. 316). Nye took up the initiative preparing a policy proposal to be known as the Nye Initiative in January 1995, but not until the rape incident and domestic upheavals surfaced would the MOFA–US State Department’s inertia be overcome. The rape incident provided the US Department of Defense and Japanese DA with a window of opportunity for a policy change. The issue of the “American factor” in the decision–

making process has been analyzed in this article only selectively as far as it was necessary for explaining the actions of the Japanese actors. It would be therefore also enlightening to see the political dynamics on the US side, while remembering that the “American factor” or “foreign pressure,” referred to in Japanese as *gaistsu*, has been used by Japanese political actors (e.g., MOFA vs. DA/MOD) to justify and push the policies against which objections are expected.

Summing up, PM Hashimoto, who took the post in the midst of the ongoing negotiations on the US military bases, showed strong initiative in regard to Futenma, picking up the issue from the fixed agenda, and under conditions that were satisfactory to DA officials and the US counter partners from the Pentagon – that is, the transfer within the prefecture that would not actually alter the situation of the US bases but rather enhance it by providing a new and upgraded facility, paid entirely by the Japanese government. But the solution was not satisfactory for the local government or the majority of local citizens. In negotiations between central and local governments, PM Hashimoto relied strongly on formal and informal tools, such as special advisors (Shimokōbe, Okimoto), but only to determine the specifics of the agreement, which the general agenda (Futenma relocation within the prefecture) had already been set up. Moreover, the local protests seem to have had effects only on the rhetorical aspect and finances. The bigger the protest, the more often officials expressed their remorse and gratitude to Okinawa and larger budgets were assigned for Okinawa development. Nevertheless, Hashimoto seems to have come the closest to the ideal type of a leader capable of solving the problem of Okinawa military bases, possessing: first, political will to solve the problem; second, political resources (his own position within the LDP, and the LDP’s position in the coalition and the Diet); third, managerial skills and experience to use and cooperate with bureaucrats; and fourth, ability to use formal and informal institutions for the realization of his decisions. The only missing element, which might have led to the resolution of the issue in a satisfactory manner also for the majority of Okinawans, was, as it seems at the moment, the will to move the bases outside Okinawa. One can assume, given the present international situation, that only a leader with similar skills and resources as Hashimoto, and in addition with the will to move the bases outside the prefecture, might be able to bring a solution to the long-standing deadlock.

Acknowledgements

This article is a result of research conducted as a part of a project financed by the Polish National Science Centre based on decision No. DEC-2013/11/B/HS5/04005.

References

- Armocost, Michael 1996, *Friends or Rivals? The Insider's Account of U.S.-Japan Relations*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Blais, Christopher 2010, *Who is in Charge? Defense Policy Formation in Japan*, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, Kindle edition.
- Bochorodycz, Beata 2005, "Amerika no Gunji Shisetsu no Genjō to Tembō: Zaioki Beigun Kichi no Henkan Mondai o Chūshin ni" [Status Quo and the Future of the American Military Facilities in Japan: The Problem of the US Military Bases in Okinawa], in Kimura Akira (ed.) *Kaku no Jidai to Higashi Ajia no Heiwa: Reisen o Koete* [The Era of Nuclear Weapon and East Asia: After the End of the Cold War], Hōritsu Bunkasha, Kyōto.
- Bochorodycz, Beata 2010, *The Changing Patterns of Policy Making in Japan: Local Policy Initiative of Okinawa Prefecture in the 1990s*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań.
- Hamilton, Robert V 1999, "The Futenma Problem," *JPRI Critique* Vol. VI No. 5 (May), viewed January 25, 2015, http://www.jpri.org/publications/critiques/critique_VI_5.html.
- Hayao, Kenji 1993, *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy*, University of Pittsburg Press, Pittsburg.
- Funabashi, Yoichi 1999, *Alliance Adrift*, Council on Foreign Relations Press, New York.
- Iio, Jun 2008, *Nihon no Tōchi Kōzō* [Structure of Government in Japan], Chūō Kōron Shinsha, Tōkyō.
- Inoue, Masamichi S 2007, *Okinawa and the U.S. Military: Identity Making in the Age of Globalization*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Imazato, Yoshikazu 2002, *Gaimushō no "Shippai" no Honshitsu* [The Essence of MOFA's "Failure"], Kōdansha, Tōkyō.
- Iokibe, Makoto & Miyagi, Taizō (eds.) 2013, *Hashimoto Ryūtarō Gaikō Kaikoroku* [Memoirs of Hashimoto Ryūtarō on Foreign Policy], Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō.
- Kawabe, Ichirō 2002, *Nihon Gaikō to Gaimushō* [Japanese Diplomacy and Ministry of Foreign Affairs], Kōbunken, Tōkyō.
- Kirk, Donald 2013, *Okinawa and Jeju: Bases of Discontent*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mikuriya, Takashi & Makihara, Izuru (eds.) 2012, *Kikigaki Nonaka Hiromu Kaikoroku* [Records of Memoirs by Nonaka Hiromu], Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō.
- MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) 1995, "Press Conference by the Press Secretary 22 November 1995," viewed January 25, 2015, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/1995/11/1122.html#2>.
- MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) 1996, April 18, "Remarks by President Clinton to The Diet," viewed February 20, 2015, http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/relation/visit_C/kokkai.html.

- Moriya, Takemasa 2010, “*Futenma*” *Kōshō Hiroku* [Secret Records on Negotiations on “Futenma”], Shinchōsha, Tōkyō.
- Moriya, Takemasa 2013, *Nihon Bōei Hiroku* [Secret Records of Japan’s National Defense], Shinchōsha, Tōkyō, Kindle edition.
- New York Times* 1996, April 13, “U.S. Will Return Base in Okinawa,” viewed January 25, 2015, <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/04/13/world/us-will-return-base-in-okinawa.html?pagewanted=1>.
- Okinawa Ken 2013, *Kichi no Jōkyō* [Situation of the Bases], viewed January 25, 2015, http://www.pref.okinawa.lg.jp/site/chijiko/kichitai/documents/h25-2_2.pdf.
- Ryūkyū *Shinpō* 1996, Archive: “Remarks by President Clinton to The Japanese Diet, Tokyo, Japan, April 18, 1996,” viewed January 25, 2015, <http://ryukyu-okinawa.net/pages/archive/18496.html>.
- Shinoda, Tomohito 2004, *Kantei Gaikō* [Kantei Diplomacy], Asahi Shinbunsha, Tōkyō.
- Shimokōbe Ākaibusu 2014, *Archives Report, Shimokōbe Atsushi Shozō Shiryō kara Miru “Okinawa”* [Archives Report, “Okinawa” as Seen in Documents Owned by Shimokōbe Atsushi], Vol. 10, viewed August 9, 2015, <http://www.ued.or.jp/shimokobe/QuarterlyReport/vol10.pdf>.
- Sunohara, Tsuyoshi 2011, *Zainichi Beigun Shireibu* [The US Army Command], Shinchōsha, Tōkyō.
- Takenaka, Harukata 2006, *Shushō Shihai, Nihon Seiji no Henpo* [Prime Minister’s Control: Changes in Japanese Politics], Chūō Kōronsha, Tōkyō.
- Yakushiji, Katsuyuki 2003, *Gaimushō – Gaikō Kyōka e no Michi* [Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Path towards Strengthening Japanese Diplomacy], Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō.
- Yakushiji, Katsuyuki (ed.) 2012, *Murayama Tomiichi Kaikōroku* [Memoirs of Murayama Tomiichi], Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō.
- Woodall, Brian 2014, *Growing Democracy in Japan*, The University Press of Kentucky.
- Yoshida, Shingo 2012, *Nichibei Dōmei no Seidoka* [Institutionalization of the Japan-US Alliance], Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, Nagoya.
- Zakowski, Karol 2015, *Decision-Making Reform in Japan. The DPJ’s Failed Attempt at a Politician-Led Government*, Routledge, London and New York.