

Third International Forum for Peace and Prosperity in Northeast Asia

Sixty Years of the San Francisco System

Continuation, Transformation, and Historical Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific

Conference Report

April 28, 2012
Waterloo, ON Canada

Preface

This report is a summary of the Third International Forum for Peace and Prosperity in Northeast Asia, *Sixty Years of the San Francisco System: Continuation, Transformation, and Historical Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific*. It was held on April 28, 2012, the 60th anniversary since the enactment of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

This conference was a major phase in our collaborative project that examines key development of the major political and security issues that share common foundation in the early post-World War II arrangement with Japan, particularly the San Francisco Peace Treaty. These include disputes over territorial sovereignty and boundary demarcation, status of territories, war crime and responsibility, and historical reconciliation. In search for keys to producing solutions, the project considers how these issues have developed and remained contentious long after the San Francisco arrangements. It aims to produce a valuable volume to deepen our understanding of, and provide a more comprehensive account to explain, these complex regional issues and the “San Francisco System” as a whole.

At the conference, there were lively exchanges among the participants, who gathered from Korea, Japan, Russia, China, Taiwan, the United States, and across Canada. The conference also generated significant discussions and new inspirations. While production of the book is underway with revised papers and additional contributions, this conference report serves as an interim report for the project.

This conference was made possible with the generous funding of the Northeast Asian History Foundation of Korea, as well as the local funding and kind support of Renison University College, Balsillie School of International Affairs, and the Japan Futures Initiative at the University of Waterloo, Canada.



Kimie Hara
Professor and the Renison Research Professor
Director, East Asian Studies, Renison University College
University of Waterloo

**Introduction: “San Francisco Peace Treaty, ‘Unresolved Problems’, and Canada?”
Kimie Hara, University of Waterloo, Canada**

Exactly 60 years ago, on 28 April 1952, the San Francisco Peace Treaty (SFPT) came into effect. With this post-WWII arrangement, prepared under US initiative, Japan returned to the international community, and then achieved remarkable post-war recovery. However, the treaty also left negative legacies of “unresolved problems”. Today, countries and peoples in East Asia are still divided by history, politics, and unsettled borders.

Early US drafts of the peace treaty were rigid in nature and detailed, with clear border demarcations. However, in the context of the escalating Cold War and the conflict in the Korean Peninsula, the final treaty became simple and left postwar settlements, including territorial sovereignty, ambiguous. Seeds of “unresolved problems”, or “wedges”, were left among the neighbours in East Asia, to prevent “domino effect” of the communist expansion and to secure Japan in the Western block. The SFPT significantly shaped the post-WWII international order in the region. Sixty years since then, we analyze contemporary significance of the “SF System” in this workshop. How have these “unresolved problems” developed over the last sixty years, and yet remained contentious? What are the driving forces promoting, and obstructive factors preventing, their solutions? Are there any common patterns, and what are the linkages among these regional issues? How can these problems, or differences, be resolved?

It is also meaningful that the workshop is taking place in Canada. Canada was one of the signatories of the treaty and also made significant contributions to the birth of the territorial/frontier problems in the region by proposing that the treaty not specify the recipient governments of the territories Japan renounced. Considering its historical involvement and responsibility, as well as its current interest, Canada can perhaps play a more constructive role to promote peace and stability in East Asia.

**Keynote Address: “San Francisco Peace Treaty and Its Legacies in Northeast Asia”
Jae-jeong Chung, President of Northeast Asian History Foundation, Republic of Korea**

The Northeast Asian History Foundation was established in 2006 to promote historical reconciliation and mutual understanding between Korea and its neighbours. To do this, the Foundation supports and funds: academic and policy research, forums like this workshop, and exchange programs. East Asian history has been tragic, caused by foreign powers and the Japanese imperialism in the past. The San Francisco Peace Treaty failed to fully meet the expectations of the people in the region and left many problems for future generations. It is the Foundation’s belief that educating future generations about

this tragic history is important not just for East Asia but also for the world in order to prevent such tragedies from repeating in the future.

Greeting: Song Oh, Minister, Republic of Korea Embassy in Canada

The Republic of Korea was not a signatory of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, but it nevertheless had an important impact on Koreans and subsequent Korea-Japan diplomatic relations. Based on my own experience in the Foreign Service, I believe we must bring together government-level negotiations and dialogue at other non-governmental levels of society to resolve ongoing issues between Korea and Japan. Distinguished scholars' academic dialogue at this workshop will surely provide a significant opportunity for enhancing community-conscious building in East Asia.

Session One: Border/Territorial Disputes

Chair: Kimie Hara, University of Waterloo, Canada

1. "A Lost Chance at San Francisco 1951", Konstantin Sarkisov, Diplomatic Academy, Russia

In 1951, the Soviet Union did not sign the SFPT and this has been a stumbling block for Russo-Japanese relations ever since. Recently recovered archival sources confirm that the US and USSR negotiated in 1950, however, the USSR rejected signing because the US would not include Communist China as a party. The USSR's participation in the treaty would have caused the current territorial dispute over the Kuriles to have a fundamentally different dimension. The USSR's failure to sign and Japan's signing and renouncing their right as well as claim to the Kurile Islands has been disadvantageous to both sides' positions. With the return of Putin, it might be possible for both parties to sign a new peace treaty based on genuine compromise.

2. "Japan-China Border/Territorial Disputes: Senkaku/Diaoyu & Ryukyus", Unryu Suganuma, J.F. Oberlin University, Japan

After Hatoyama Yukio of the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) became the Prime Minister in 2009, he proposed the "fraternity foreign policy" and the "East Asian Community" for improving bilateral relations between Japan and China. However, the territorial dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands remains a point of contention with both countries continuing to claim sovereignty over the islands from the perspective of historical evidence or international law. The territorial dispute is a complex issue with the potential to destabilize overall bilateral relations since it is closely linked with other peripheral issues China finds problematic: Yasukuni Shrine visits, revisionist textbooks, war reparations, and Japan's "neo-nationalist" tendency with the rise of Koizumi Junichiro during the last decade. Therefore, the

Island dispute must be dealt with in a comprehensive manner by carefully considering its link to historical developments in various peripheral issues, and any mismanagement of the issue will certainly have much broader consequences for the future of both nations.

**3. “San Francisco Peace Treaty and Its Legacies in Northeast Asia: Korea and Japan”,
Seokwoo Lee, Inha University, Republic of Korea**

There are three territorial disputes over islands in East Asia involving Japan, and historical bitterness between Japan and other disputants has impeded their resolution. The San Francisco Peace Treaty has contributed to this situation. It largely reflected the Allied Powers’ policy, especially that of the United States, in the post-World War II territorial arrangements in East Asia without considering the interests of local claimants over specific territories in dispute. Reaching a solution by Korea and Japan over the Dokdo/Takeshima issue is difficult due to domestic pressures. However, it is nevertheless possible in a quid pro quo deal, in which Japan is offered something of *more* importance than the claim over the island and Korea gives up something of *less* importance than the maintenance of the current control over the island.

**4. “San Francisco Peace Treaty and the South China Sea Dispute: A Review of History and Prospects for Dispute Settlement”,
Nong Hong, National Institute for South China Sea Studies, P.R. China**

The South China Sea dispute is a set of competing territorial claims by China and ASEAN countries over the Paracel and the Spratly Islands. The SFPT has contributed to the situation since it does not say which particular country or government Japan renounced its sovereignty. In order to mitigate the ongoing tension, China and the ten members of ASEAN adopted a Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea (DOC) in 2002, but its effect is yet debatable. In the end, the South China Sea dispute must be resolved in a collective manner; the Island Regime of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) should be the legal framework applied by the concerned parties, and third-party forums established under the UNCLOS should be given a role in the settlement process.

Discussant: James Manicom, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Canada

In the upcoming book, the presentations here should focus on topics of both the San Francisco Peace Treaty and historical reconciliation. Although all the presentations of the panel criticized the role of the United States in the drafting and signing of the treaty and subsequent unresolved issues in East Asia, it would also be fruitful to consider counterfactuals. For example, would the ongoing territorial/historical

issues have been any different if the United States “got it right” sixty years ago? It is plausible that some territorial disputes would not have been created, but territorial disputes which are linked to natural resources would have remained the same. We must also look at the legacies of the treaty from contemporary geo-political pictures of East Asia. What is the influence of the rise of China in the ongoing disputes? We should ask whether the unresolved problems solely concern historical reconciliation per se, or more hard politics of a contemporary nature.

Keynote Speech: “The San Francisco System: Then, Now, and Hereafter”
John Dower, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA

The San Francisco System enabled Japan to regain its independence as well as enjoy peace and democracy for the past sixty years. However, independence did not mean “autonomy”, and this “subordinate independence” status under the San Francisco System is maintained by the following quid pro quo Japan agreed to during the Cold War. The biggest cost Japan paid in order to be independent within the US Cold War strategy was to provide the US with forward bases, particularly in Okinawa. Japan rearmed itself without revising the constitution in order to support the US presence in Asia for containing the Soviet Union and China, but it also had to support the US nuclear policy in order to guarantee the protection of the “nuclear umbrella”, despite the fact that it was the only country to be victimized by the atomic bomb. Finally, in order to facilitate the reconstruction of Japan as a new ally, the US encouraged Japan to sign “separate peace” with each of its neighbours without clearly addressing its war responsibilities. Japan’s reparations to its former colonies were implemented to enlarge Japanese economic presence in those regions rather than as a sign of remorse. This policy of disregarding the legacy of colonialism pursued both by the US and Japan is at the heart of unresolved territorial and other historic issues still marring Japan’s relations with its neighbours. To be fair, Japan had little choice in the context of the Cold War. In this new era in which the US is pivoting itself to Asia once more, we find Japan in a similar position as when it signed the San Francisco Treaty sixty years ago. Japan, still dependent on the US, is again forced to make choices. Japan might have a few more options than sixty years ago, and words like “normal” and “mature” are heard frequently. But in the end, Japan’s trajectory will continue to be closely linked to its relations with the US.

Session Two: Divided Nations and the “Okinawa Problem”

Chair: Seokwoo Lee, Inha University, Republic of Korea

5. “The San Francisco Peace Treaty and South Korea”, Dong-Choon Kim, Sungkonghoe University, Republic of Korea

The San Francisco Peace Treaty marked the end of war between Japan and the Allied powers, and it laid the foundation for the regional structure of the Cold War in East Asia. In order to help the United States confront a new war, the treaty and the system based on it allowed Japan to get exemption from all accountability of the war crimes committed toward its Asian neighbours. This left sovereignty, compensation, and territory issues ambiguous and the past victims of Japanese colonialism unrepresented in the treaty. Therefore, an important historical task of reshaping the post-colonial order in East Asia was overshadowed by the Cold War atmosphere, and the old colonies were re-victimized. This legacy has left a particularly long lasting diplomatic conflict between Japan and the Korean Peninsula. Thus, the only way to build a future-oriented regional community is to overcome the ongoing San Francisco System for achieving permanent regional peace.

6. “Another 428: The Neglected Taipei Treaty and Taiwan’s Sovereign Status”, Man-houng Lin, Academia Sinica, Taiwan

The Treaty of Peace between the Republic of China (ROC) and Japan, the Taipei Treaty (TPT), was signed on the same day as the SFPT enactment. Japan agreed to renounce its former territories – including Taiwan – by creating special arrangements outside of the SFPT. The TPT was one of those arrangements based on the SFPT. Since the United States pressured Japan to sign a peace treaty with ROC and not the People’s Republic of China (PRC) as a precondition for the SFPT, the TPT is an important legal document establishing the sovereignty of ROC in Taiwan. Although largely neglected, the TPT is also important in re-establishing Taiwan’s sovereign status in contemporary East Asia since the PRC has replaced the ROC as the sole sovereign representative of China. When the PRC and Japan formalized diplomatic relations in 1972, the PRC recognized the SFPT (since it was the prerequisite for Japan’s sovereignty). This implies that the PRC also recognized the TPT (which states the sovereignty of the ROC in Taiwan), as it was based on the conditions laid down by the SFPT.

7. “The San Francisco Treaty at 60 – the Okinawa Angle”, Gavan McCormack, Australian National University, Australia

The San Francisco System is supposedly in place for the defence of Japan, but it is in fact a system for the defence and expansion of the United States and Pax Americana. Under this system Japan remains occupied by its former conqueror and in this time of transition in East Asia the realization of a true

commonwealth of regional states - Pax Asia - is hindered by Japan's pseudo-independent status of being a client state. The post-war settlement consolidated by the San Francisco System imposed on Japan the division of the country into "war state (American-controlled Okinawa)" and "peace state (the mainland)" and this design was in fact pledged and endorsed by the emperor. Resolution of the "Okinawa problem" and the realization of Pax Asia can only be achieved by Japan truly becoming an independent state and distancing itself from hegemonic designs of the United States through democratic and constitutional principles.

Discussant: David A. Welch, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Canada

Seen from a non-historian, political scientist-perspective, it must be noted that despite the various negative consequences the SFPT has brought, the post-war system it created provided the region with sixty-plus years of stability. We must ask ourselves whether East Asia would have been better off in the absence of the treaty. Concerning the Korean Peninsula, academics have neglected the importance of the Korea issue in the process of the signing of the SFPT, but it is a separate matter whether the post-war division and domestic turmoil which traumatized Koreans were directly brought on by the treaty. Finally, concerning Okinawa, it is not true that all islanders support the withdrawal of US troops despite the undeniable fact that their burden for maintaining security and stability for Japan has been too substantial compared to the mainland. Furthermore, the security design of the United States in the region is not confined to Okinawa, and the presence and influence of the US is not likely to change even if the troops are relocated to a different regional location.

Session Three: Historical Reconciliation and Regional Integration – Regress, Progress, and Challenges

Chair: Yongwhan Kim, Northeast Asian History Foundation, Republic of Korea

8. "The Japanese Military 'Comfort Women' Issue and the San Francisco System", Hirofumi Hayashi, Kanto Gakuin University, Japan

The Japanese military "comfort women" issue was not dealt with under the San Francisco System. Although some Allied prosecutors had collected information as evidence of this as a war crime, the International Military Tribunal for the Far East neither found the "comfort women" issue to be a war crime nor sexual slavery. Both the Japanese government and the Allies, especially the United States, were more interested in utilizing Japan as a new alliance partner, and thus war criminals responsible were eventually released by the Japanese government's appeal to clemency in the Cold War context. Japan's neighbours, whose women suffered, also failed to address the issue during war compensation conventions as they were enticed by Japan's economic assistance. With the democratization of these

countries (and economic liberalization in the case of China), former victims started to speak out, and former Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio promised to offer a formal apology and compensation. Unfortunately, he resigned before implementing the promise and his successors, influenced by the current feeling of domestic nationalism, are not willing to address the issue.

9. “Beyond San Francisco’s Margins: Asian Canadians, Transnationalism and the Legacies of War”, John Price, University of Victoria, Canada

The San Francisco Peace Treaty has mostly been researched from a geo-strategic perspective. However, a re-examination of the treaty by incorporating the notions of “racism” and “empire” and the treaty’s consequence on Asian Canadians must be given more attention. In the first place, the exclusion of most Asian countries from the treaty-making process by deliberate policies of Western Allied powers – including Canada – must be considered one of the most pernicious acts of global racism in world history. In other words, the treaty reflected and reinforced in a new context the domination of a racist alliance that started much earlier than the treaty itself. In Canada, the treaty also had significant ramifications for Asian Canadian populations who retained ties with their respective old countries, and Asian Canadian media covered the treaty process in detail. However, it is unfortunate that Canadian researchers have failed to examine this rich material.

10. “The San Francisco Peace Treaty, the Cold War, and Indigenous Peoples”, Scott Harrison, University of Waterloo, Canada

When we look at the history of non-state peoples such as Indigenous peoples in the Asia-Pacific (particularly Ainu, Okinawans, Marshal Islanders and Taiwanese Aborigines) through the lens of the Cold War and the SFPT, it becomes clear that a meaningful examination of their history requires holistically incorporating the perspectives of global, national, and local processes and identities into one, and move beyond national borders. The treaty functioned to support the US Cold War policies of containment and integration – meaning the US consolidation of Indigenous lands for military use and an integration with postwar development, border consolidation and sovereignty – and therefore Indigenous peoples have always been closely tied to international issues in the region. Researchers must perceive these peoples as more than domestic issues in order to solve outstanding Indigenous issues. Historical reconciliation, based on a depoliticized and denationalized understanding of the region’s history, is one step required for any meaningful settlement.

11. “Historical Legacies and Regional Integration”, Haruki Wada, University of Tokyo, Japan

In East Asia, three wars of the last century have left lasting legacies. They are 1) the Japanese 50 Years' War of aggressive imperial expansion (1894-1945); 2) the New Asian 30 Years' Wars of post-colonial state-building struggles between communists and anti-communist nationalists (1946-1975); and 3) the Cold War (1946-1987) that started in the region with the Korean War. In the beginning of the 21st century, we are still experiencing the legacies of these past wars. The most striking legacies of the Japanese 50 Years' War are the failure to renormalize Japan-North Korea relations and the various territorial problems while those of the New Asian 30 Years' War are the issues of the two Koreas and China/Taiwan. In order to overcome these problems and build a regional community, we must go beyond individual bilateral negotiations and utilize already-existing regional forums such as the Six-Party Talks in order to build a true regional community.

Discussant: Mark Selden, Japan Focus/Cornell University, USA

The presentations mostly focused on negative aspects of the San Francisco Peace Treaty. The treaty represents Japan's subordination to the “permanent warfare state” – the United States – and its acceptance of “permanent occupation” as a part of the US consolidation of order in the Asia Pacific. The treaty also ignored the issue of colonialism. However, we must also ask the question “who gained?” It must be admitted that Japan was the recipient of peace and democracy under the system and that South Korea also benefited. We must therefore admit that the system has contributed to the stability of the region. But at the same time, scholars of international law must go beyond clauses and articles and tackle the question of what right a treaty brought on by one country has on the unfolding of another region's history. From this perspective, the SFPT is not solely an issue of international law but of hegemony.

Appendix A: Participants

Glenn Cartwright, Principal, Renison University College, University of Waterloo, Canada

Jae-jeong Chung, President, Northeast Asian History Foundation, ROK

John Dower, Ford International Professor and Professor of Japanese history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA

Kimie Hara, Director of East Asian Studies at Renison University College, Professor and the Renison Research Professor at the University of Waterloo, Canada

Scott Harrison, PhD Candidate (A.B.D.) in History, University of Waterloo, Canada

Hirofumi Hayashi, Professor of politics, Kanto Gakuin University, Japan

Nong Hong, Associate Professor (Research), Deputy Director, Research Centre for Oceans Law and Policy, National Institute for South China Sea Studies (NISCSS), PRC

Dong-Choon Kim, Professor of Sociology, Sungkonghoe University, ROK

Young Hwan Kim, Research Fellow, Northeast Asian History Foundation, ROK

Seokwoo Lee, Professor of International Law, INHA University Law School, ROK

Man-houng Lin, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, Taiwan

James Manicom, SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Canada

Gavan McCormack, Emeritus professor, Australian National University, Australia

Song Oh, Minister, Korean Embassy in Canada.

John Price, Associate Professor of History, University of Victoria, Canada

Konstantin Sarkisov, Former Head of the Japan and Northeast Asia Studies Center, Diplomatic Academy, Russia

Mark Selden, Coordinator, *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* and a Senior Research Associate, East Asia Program, Cornell University, USA

Unryu Suganuma, Associate Professor, J. F. Oberlin University, Japan

Haruki Wada, Emeritus Professor, University of Tokyo, Japan

David Welch, CIGI Chair of Global Security and Director of the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and Professor of Political Science at the University of Waterloo, Canada

Appendix B: Agenda

Venue: Balsillie School of International Affairs, University of Waterloo
67 Erb Street West, Waterloo, ON N2L 6C2 Canada

- 09:00 **INTRODUCTION: “San Francisco Peace Treaty, ‘Unresolved Problems’, and Canada?”**
Kimie Hara, University of Waterloo, Canada
- 09:15 **KEYNOTE ADDRESS: “San Francisco Peace Treaty and Its Legacies in Northeast Asia”**
Jae-jeong Chung, President of Northeast Asian History Foundation, Korea
- 09:35 GREETING: Song Oh, Minister, Korean Embassy in Canada
- 09:45 COFFEE BREAK
- 10:00 **SESSION ONE: Border/Territorial Disputes**
Chair: Kimie Hara, University of Waterloo, Canada
1. Japan and Russia: Konstantin Sarkisov, Diplomatic Academy, Russia
 2. Japan and China: Unryu Sukanuma, J. F. Oberlin University, Japan
 3. Korea and Japan: Seokwoo Lee, Inha University, Korea
 4. South China Sea: Nong Hong, National Institute for South China Sea Studies, P.R.China
- Discussant: James Manicom, Balsillie School of International Affairs, Canada
- 12:00 LUNCH
- GREETING: Glenn Cartwright, Renison University College, University of Waterloo, Canada
- KEYNOTE SPEECH: “San Francisco System: Then, Now, and Hereafter”**
John Dower, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
- 13:30 **SESSION TWO: Divided Nations and the “Okinawa Problem”**
Chair: Seokwoo Lee, Inha University, Korea
5. Korean Peninsula: Kim Dong-choon, Sungkonghoe University, Korea
 6. Cross-Taiwan Strait Problem: Lin Man-houng, Academia Sinica, Taiwan
 7. Okinawa Problem: Gavan McCormack, Japan Focus/Australian National University, Australia
- Discussant: David Welch, University of Waterloo, Canada
- 15:00 COFFEE BREAK
- 15:15 **SESSION THREE: Historical Reconciliation and Regional Integration—Regress, Progress and Challenges**
Chair: Yonghwan Kim, Northeast Asia History Foundation, Korea
8. Comfort Women: Hirofumi Hayashi, Kanto Gakuin University, Japan
 9. Post-SFP Treaty reconciliation in Canada: John Price, University of Victoria, Canada
 10. SFP Treaty, Cold War, and Indigenous Peoples: Scott Harrison, University of Waterloo, Canada
 11. Historical Legacies and Regional Integration: Haruki Wada, Tokyo University, Japan
- Discussant: Mark Selden, Japan Focus/Cornell University, USA
- 17:10 CONCLUDING SESSION
- 17:50 DINNER



Third International Forum for Peace and Prosperity in Northeast Asia

***Sixty Years of the San Francisco System:
Continuation, Transformation, and Historical Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific
- Conference Report***

Prepared by Seung Hyok Lee

Edited and Prefaced by Kimie Hara

Photo and Editorial Assistance: Scott Harrison, Brilé Anderson

Published and distributed by

JFI-Belair Centre Series

Keiko and Charles Belair Centre for East Asian Studies

Renison University College

University of Waterloo

240 Westmount Drive North

Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G4

CANADA

Email: eas@uwaterloo.ca

ISBN 978-0-9782805-1-2

Printed by Pandora Press

2012

