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The occupation of Japan commenced immediately upon the cessation of hostilities in August 1945 and concluded upon the ratification of the peace treaty in April 1952.¹ The primary purpose of the occupation was to transform the defeated Japanese military dictatorship into a peaceful democracy through the means of an extensive demilitarization and democratization program. According to Davies, this in itself represented a departure from the traditional definition of an occupation as a “continuation of war by other means.”² Both Passin and Beasley assert that the occupation was, in all respects, a solely American undertaking.³ Attributed largely to the paramount role the nation exercised in all matters pertaining to the Pacific region in this period, America certainly did attain a pre-eminent role in Japan. American troops were the first to enter the nation and remained the sole force of occupation for the first six months but more significantly, America alone controlled the formulation and administration of basic policy for the duration of occupation.⁴ This should not, however, undermine the equally

² Davies, *The Occupation of Japan*, p.xv
valuable contribution of the British Commonwealth Occupation Force, a military force composed of a dual brigade British Indian division, an Australian infantry brigade, a New Zealand brigade and a British air component.⁵

Numbering 40,000 servicemen and women at its height of which 11,500 were Australian, the BCOF were initially assigned responsibility for the Hiroshima prefecture under the overall command of the United States Eighth Army but this area was subsequently expanded to include the island of Shikoku as well as the five western prefectures of Honshu.⁶ According to Grey, the role of Australia was central within this multi-nation force not least because the initial Commander-In-Chief, Sir John Northcott, and his successors, Lieutenant General H.C.H. Robertson and Lieutenant General E.W. Bridgeford, were Australian themselves.⁷ The responsibilities assumed by the force included the protection of allied installations and Japanese installations awaiting demilitarization, the demilitarization of Japanese installations and armaments, the surveillance of the Japanese civilian population and the military control of the BCOF area with the exception of military government.⁸ Carter contends that the exclusion of the BCOF from exercising any such authority in the determination of basic policy reinforced the subordinate status of the force but more significantly, incited tension and resentment amongst troops and detracted from the impressive image the British Commonwealth governments wished to project in Japan.⁹ In accordance with the “Objects and Rule of the
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BCOF” derived by the Australian government, the force was also required to assist in the democratization of Japan. This was a rather ambiguous concept which involved illustrating to and impressing upon “the Japanese people, as far as may be possible, the democratic way and purpose of life.” The difficulty of interpreting this directive was only further complicated through the introduction of a rigid non-fraternization policy. Issued in the form of personal instruction from the BCOF Commander-In-Chief, the policy stressed the importance of maintaining formal interaction and representing the British Commonwealth with dignity and courtesy. The non-fraternization policy was largely motivated by the “deep suffering and loss” sustained throughout the Commonwealth in the recent war and the desire to protect the health and well-being of the troops but, as Wood argues, it was wholly ineffectual in terms of practical application. From the outset, it was undermined by the necessity to communicate daily with not only the 41,000 Japanese employed by the BCOF but with other members of the population to perform assigned tasks such as the repatriation of service personnel. This was only further compounded by the emergence of black marketeering and the development of close relationships, particularly amongst the BCOF servicemen and Japanese women.

Whilst the occupation represented the first significant exposure to Japan for the majority of the BCOF personnel, they brought with them a legacy of suspicion, fear and
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mistrust which had been fostered by the recent war. Comparatively, the occupation represented utter defeat and humiliation for the Japanese, who were forced to contend with the disturbing prospect of obeying the unconditional authority of their former enemy. Whilst the occupation was surprisingly devoid of major incidents, a complex relationship existed between the occupying forces and the occupied population which arose primarily from the obvious disparity in power and the existence of cultural differences.

It is my intention to examine the plight of the one hundred and four children born of Australian servicemen and Japanese women who were essentially a product of this relationship. Initially, I had hoped to investigate the decision of the Australian government in 1962 to reject the proposed adoption of these children to Australia with respect to the Anzac myth, the White Australia policy and the developing economic relationship between Japan and Australia. It was decided, however, that this would undermine the value of conducting my research in Japan and the opportunity to access resources that have not yet been thoroughly analyzed by Western scholars. I, therefore, intend to examine the representation of these “mixed-blood children” in newspapers published during and immediately after the occupation. The newspapers to be examined are the Chugoku Shinbun, Chugoku Nippo, Asahi Shinbun, Mainichi Shinbun and the British Commonwealth Occupation News, which will enable cross analysis to be
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conducted of the local, national, Western and Japanese interpretations of this issue. In terms of the work I have undertaken in the last ten weeks, establishing a succinct thesis proposal with this primary objective has perhaps been the most crucial. It involved conducting an extensive literature review of secondary Western material in order to establish the context and determine the feasibility of my proposed topic. Aware of my impending departure to Japan, I also set myself the task of collating Australian primary source material, which culminated in a research visit to the National Archives of Australia and the Australian War Memorial in Canberra. Proceeding is thus an evaluation of this material, much of which has provided a solid foundation from which to launch further research in Japan.

Western scholarship on the occupation of Japan has rapidly expanded in recent years. Historical works solely concerned with the paramount role of America in reforming the occupied nation had previously dominated this literature.\(^\text{16}\) The British Commonwealth contribution to the occupation is largely excluded from these accounts, an unsurprising result considering the disparity which existed between the American and British Commonwealth forces in size, strength and influence.\(^\text{17}\) A journal article composed by Herbert Passin analysing the impact of the American-derived reforms in shaping the history of Japan is a key example of this type of historical writing. Although Passin adequately argues that the program of reform directed at such societal facets as the electoral system, the division of church and state and the education ministry was the most
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drastic that had been imposed by an outside power in modern history, he evaluates their success singularly in terms of statistical figures. For example, Passin contends that the reforms enabled greater community-wide access to higher levels of education much more rapidly than inevitable but standard educational growth.\textsuperscript{18} Passin validates this argument by stating that only ten percent of the population continued to higher secondary school prior to the war in comparison to a ninety-five percent retention rate following the introduction of the reforms.\textsuperscript{19} Whilst this certainly would indicate an increase in the availability of higher education to a greater number of students, it is an essentially clinical methodology of examining the impact of the reforms. It is clear that the article aims only to assert the centrality of America’s role but of more concern is the complete failure to address the most critical issues arising from this area of research as, for example, the effect of the institutional reforms on altering the values, norms and behaviors of the Japanese public.\textsuperscript{20}

It is a failure which also characterizes Hans H. Baerweld’s critique of the leadership purge executed by the occupying forces. Baerweld constructs a convincing argument attributing the failure of the purge to the ambiguous nature of the purge criteria, the reversal in occupation policy, the difficulty of administering the policy through the existing structure of the Japanese government and the failure to adequately implement surveillance over the subsequent activities of those purged but it is at this point he concludes.\textsuperscript{21} Like Passin, Baerweld fails to progress further than a constricting evaluation
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of the imposed American reforms. Essentially, these policy-orientated examinations of the occupation display critical hallmarks of the traditional approach to historical writing. By exhibiting a sole concern with the political sphere, accounting only an elitist version of events and failing to incorporate other disciplines in their research, the works are thoroughly weakened but more importantly, the validity of their arguments is forced into question.22

In the majority of these American works, there exists a failure to perceive the occupation of Japan in terms of “its own times and values.”23 The occupation is instead regarded as a pre-cursor to the American-Japanese relationship24 or analyzed solely within the context of the Cold War.25 In other words, it is examined in terms of the relationship between occupation policy and the strategy employed by America to stifle communism. According to Moore, however, this type of approach wholly undermines the historical value inherent within the occupation itself.26 For example, Moore proposes that there is merit in conducting an examination of the censorship, literature, publishing and entertainment of the occupation period to comprehend the complex interaction which occurred between imposed changes and emerging values.27 This failure to recognize the historical value of the occupation itself is not restricted to American scholarship. In both official and unofficial Australian military history accounts, the contribution and experience of the British Commonwealth Occupation Force or BCOF has been
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marginalized as either a postscript to the events of World War Two or as a pre-cursor to the commitment in the Korean War. In either case, Carter contends, the BCOF is presented as a military force of minor importance involved in an uneventful and immaterial occupation.

In terms of literature, there also exists a number of historical novels centering on the occupation period but more significantly, a number of personal memoirs composed by members of the occupying forces. A pertinent example is the journal article composed by F.C. Hutley who graduated from the United States Army School of Military Government but was employed as a Military Government Liaison Officer with the BCOF during the occupation. The article is a reflective commentary on his experience in Japan with astute observations of the damaged infrastructure within his assigned prefecture, the contrasting approaches employed by troops of different nationalities and the importance of the contribution made by the BCOF to the occupation. Of particular importance, Hutley presents a number of lucid anecdotes which demonstrate the complete obedience displayed by the Japanese public to the occupying forces and the manner in which this compliance was strictly enforced by the Japanese authorities. It is this type of material which will assist in further comprehending such aspects of the occupation as the complex relationship which existed between the occupying forces and the occupied population.

is thus unfortunate that the majority of these memoirs composed by Australian
participants of the BCOF have been required to be self-published but, as Grey remarks, it
is clearly a reflection of the minimal interest this period has garnered.33

Certainly it would appear that the exceptionally slight Australian scholarship on
the occupation and particularly the BCOF is a revealing testament of the difficulties
confronted by the former personnel to attain recognition for their efforts. Upon their
return, the ex-servicemen and women were denied membership to the Returned
Servicemen’s League club, failed to be awarded a campaign medal and were ineligible to
apply for a service pension on the grounds that the force was completing postwar
peacekeeping duties, not susceptible to danger from hostile forces and not located within
an operational zone.34 According to Davies, however, the BCOF was neither post-war nor
peacekeeping but on active service in military occupation of a foreign country with which
Australia was in a current state of war. Davies contends that Australia was legally in a
state of war at the time the BCOF was dispatched and continued to be until the Treaty of
Peace (Japan) was signed in March 1952. Furthermore, Davies argues that the BCOF
came within the definition of “Active Service” in both the Defense Act 1903-1953
Section 3 and the amendment No.7, 1949, 53 to Section 4.7 of the Defense Act 1903-
1948, the latter stating, “active service in relation to a person subject to military law
means the service (1) when he is attached to or forms part of a force which (c) is in
military occupation of a foreign country.” 35 In spite of the persistent claims of the BCOF
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In recent years, however, Western scholarship on the occupation of Japan has altered dramatically through the contributions of James Wood, George Davies, Carolyne Carter, Christine de Matos, Jeffrey Grey, Prue Torney and John Dower. Representing a rejection of the American dominated accounts of the period, these works, with the exception of Dower, concentrate on recording the equally valuable contribution of the BCOF. Davies, for example, employs a predominantly Whig theoretical approach to examine the role, responsibilities and structure of the Australian and New Zealand contribution. This is conducted contextually in terms of the Anglo-Australasian relations prior to and during the occupation and the desire of Australia and New Zealand to assert an independent and primary position within the Pacific arena. Also focusing on the political sphere, Wood contends that the BCOF formed a significant expression of the Australian defense policy from the conclusion of hostilities to the fall of the Chifley government in 1949. In a decisive argument, Wood asserts that the BCOF was the instrument whereby the Australian government sought to attain a position of leadership in the Pacific region on behalf of the British Commonwealth but more importantly, he
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argues the inception of the force demonstrated an increasing awareness of the
government to exercise the nation’s potential as a key contributor to international affairs
as well as a willingness to negotiate firmly with allied partners to achieve a national,
political objective.

In additional examples of this scholarship, both Torney and Carter employ a
“history from below” approach to respectively examine the representation of the BCOF
in the Australian press from 1946-1950 and the experience of the BCOF personnel
occupying southern Japan. Torney contests the claim that the press were overtly critical
of the BCOF and deliberately propagated the notion that immorality, venereal disease and
black marketeering were prevalent within the force. According to Torney, the publication
of an article responding to adverse developments within the BCOF was misconstrued as
merely the first in a wholly negative press campaign. Torney argues that this notion
gained strength in the wake of the complications arising from the non-fraternization
policy and the increasing antagonism towards the Chifley government but in fact, the
press exhibited restraint, sensitivity and support to the BCOF personnel. Drawing
primarily on intelligence reports and personal memoirs, Carter addresses the experience
of the BCOF personnel with respect to the complex relationship which developed
between the occupying forces and the occupied population in both the private and official
domains. Carter particularly succeeds in analyzing the extent to which prior conceptions
of Japan incited by the notion of exoticism and the recent hostilities effectively shaped
this relationship for the BCOF personnel.
Whilst these various contributions have revolutionized existing Western scholarship on the occupation of Japan, the works are marred by a significant weakness which characterized earlier accounts of the period. Essentially, these works not only fail to address the occupation from the perspective of the occupied but furthermore, fail to incorporate Japanese primary source material in their research. Both Moore and Dower attribute this to an American predilection to view the period as an “American show” rather than as a significant moment in Japanese history but Grey disputes it is not a concern which is restricted to American scholarship. Whilst the Japanese experience of the occupation draws reference in a number of recently published Australian, New Zealand and British works, the majority use only primary source material produced by the Western occupying forces. Using both Japanese and Western primary material to examine the occupation as experienced by the defeated Japanese population, the work of John Dower is the sole exception to this scholarship. For example, Dower uses newspaper correspondence and radio interviews to analyze the extent to which incompetent and irresponsible governance was responsible for the rapid increase in prostitution at the commencement of the occupation. The failure of these other scholars to fully address the occupation from a non-Western perspective and to incorporate Japanese primary source material within their work not only limits the breadth of research but more importantly, undermines the validity of the conclusions attained.
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It is perhaps this monolinguistic approach of so many scholars which accounts for the limited research conducted into the plight of children born of Australian servicemen and Japanese women during the occupation period. Indeed, a short documentary entitled “Japan: The Hidden Legacy of War,” broadcast by the ABC Television program “Foreign Correspondent” and produced by Walter Hamilton represents the only contribution which has been made to this field thus far. Having conducted oral interviews with a number of individuals fathered by Australian servicemen, Hamilton draws upon the experience of the children to examine concepts of race, identity and memory.41 This work is of critical importance not least because it draws attention to an aspect of the occupation which has been so obviously and consistently neglected in other scholarly accounts of the period. Certainly, such failure to address the plight of these mixed-blood children cannot be attributed to the lack of primary source material available. The sources preserved in Australia alone at the War Memorial and National Archives are both rich and varied. Primarily centering upon the debate which occurred following the proposed adoption of the children to Australia, these archival records include newspaper clippings, inter-governmental correspondence and letters from the public.42 The source material could be used, for example, to examine the general public response to the debate, the social status of the children in Japan and the reasons constituting the decision of the government to reject the proposal for adoption. The archival records centering more specifically on the occupation period are equally as abundant. A complete collection of administrative and government records of the BCOF in addition to numerous war diaries and private records
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of personnel have been upheld.\textsuperscript{43} I intend to use this material in conjunction with other 
sources I hope to access in Japan to conduct my own research into the plight of the 
children born of Australian servicemen and Japanese women. I hope my thesis will thus 
serve to address and amend this deficiency within existing occupation scholarship.  

Participating in the summer session research program has enabled me to not only 
to determine the feasibility of my proposed topic by conducting an extensive literature 
review of secondary Western material but grasp an understanding of the context in which 
it is situated. Of perhaps more importance, I have been able to improve upon and 
subsequently produce a concise thesis proposal with a clear and focused objective. The 
work I have undertaken in the last ten weeks will provide a solid foundation from which 
to launch further research in Japan.  
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