

EUGENE H. DOOMAN, "A PENNY A DOZEN EXPERT":
THE TRIBULATIONS OF A JAPAN SPECIALIST IN THE AMERICAN
FOREIGN SERVICE, 1912 - 1945.

by
Peter Alexander Adams

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate school
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
1976

Copyright Peter A. Adams 1976

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Thesis: EUGENE H. DOOMAN, "A PENNY A DOZEN
EXPERT": THE TRIBULATIONS OF A JAPAN
SPECIALIST IN THE AMERICAN FOREIGN
SERVICE, 1912 - 1945.

Name of Candidate: Peter Alexander Adams
Master of Arts, 1976

Thesis and Abstract Approved: Marlene J. Mayo
Marlene J. Mayo
Associate Professor
Department of History

Date Approved: August 11 1976

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: Eugene H. Dooman, "A Penny A Dozen Expert":
The Tribulations of a Japan Specialist in the American
Foreign Service, 1912 - 1945.

Peter Alexander Adams, Master of Arts, 1976.

Thesis Directed by: Marlene J. Mayo, Associate Professor,
History Department, University of Maryland.

This thesis is a biographical portrait of Eugene H. Dooman, a Japan specialist in the American Foreign Service, 1912 - 1945. As such, it raises a series of related questions. What was an expert? How did American Foreign Service Officers develop their expertise? Finally, what effect did career officers have on Japanese-American relations during the years between passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the end of World War II in the Pacific? Based on research in the diplomatic papers of the United States Department of State and Dooman's private papers, the essay traces his career from its earliest stages when he entered the student interpreter corps and his subsequent consular service to his rise as Counselor of Embassy in Tokyo and his final years in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. Close attention is given to Dooman's efforts to prevent the outbreak of war between Japan and the United States, 1937 - 1941, and his attempts to influence postwar planning for Japan and American peace

offers in 1945. Despite his Japanese language proficiency, his knowledge and experience, Dooman's advice often went unheeded, a reflection of American ambivalence towards the need for expertise in dealing with the peoples and cultures of East Asia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE MAKING OF A PENNY A DOZEN EXPERT.....	1
II. THE DECISIVE DECADE.....	25
III. YEARS OF TRYING - TRYING YEARS.....	57
IV. DEDICATION AND DISILLUSIONMENT.....	91
V. "A SADDENING WORLD".....	115
VI. "PANDORA'S BOX".....	147
VII. THE JUSTICE OF ANGRY MEN.....	186
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	196

CHAPTER 1

THE MAKING OF A PENNY-A-DOZEN EXPERT

The problem of career diplomats in the American Foreign Service, Eugene H. Dooman had discovered, was that no one listened to their expert advice. He had spent thirty-three years in the service, from 1912 to 1945, almost entirely in Japan and had learned this truism from his experience, but he found it hard to understand and accept. The point was driven home again on a spring day in 1945, shortly before he retired. After giving a high level report on American Occupation policy for Japan, Dooman overheard Assistant Secretary of War, John McCloy, solicit Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson's opinion. "I have discovered," Acheson replied, "that these Far Eastern experts are a penny a dozen. And you can find some experts which [sic] will support any point of view that you care to have. I prefer to be guided by those who think along my own lines."¹

¹Eugene H. Dooman, unpublished oral memoirs, pp. 139-140; United States' Senate, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary, Hearings, Part 3, The Institution of Pacific Relations (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 723 (hereafter referred to as IPR). The anecdote here is a compilation based on accounts given in both sources. The oral memoirs (hereafter referred to as EHD) are part of a larger collection which Dooman's widow recently donated to the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

The disdain expressed by a man of Acheson's caliber underscored the breadth and depth of the indifference and opposition that Dooman had faced for a good part of three decades and which seriously affected his life and career.

Dooman's career was an enigmatical series of events, and a study of his thirty-three years of government service raises several questions. What was an expert? How did American Foreign Service Officers gain their expertise? Finally, what effect did they have upon American foreign policy toward Japan in the period between the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 to the end of World War II in the Pacific. It is the purpose of this paper to investigate the nature of these problems by studying Dooman's career. This essay is not intended to be a complete biography but rather a portrait, a biographical overview, that provides some answers to the forementioned questions.

The idea of experts existed before Dooman entered the government, but his early career and training reflected a growing American tendency towards recognizing the need for them. Spawned in the 1890's, the idea of experts matured during the progressive era, from 1900 to 1916, and was applied to well educated individuals who also had training in a specific skill. Additionally, they had some thought of applying their specialization in the pursuit of some

higher social goal. The progressive era experts had taken their image from an 1892 experimental program conducted at the University of Wisconsin. The purpose of this "Wisconsin idea" was to provide practical training for the reform minded person who could, eventually, apply his skills as "an efficient practical servant of the state."²

In Dooman's case the problem of acquiring diplomatic expertise was compounded by the difficulties of becoming an area expert since he was expected to know the language, history, and culture of the country in which he specialized. He was caught in a paradox, as he later described it to associates

The trouble is that they sent people out to those countries to become specialists and after they had been there long enough to become sufficiently knowledgeable of the country they said you were too sympathetic to that country.

During the course of his career Dooman found that this was the most widely used argument employed by those who opposed him and his advice. The opposition over the years had included politicians holding high appointed offices, ranking military officers, foreign service officers and

²Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), see Chapter VIII, "The Rise of the Expert," and pp. 199-201; Robert D. Schulzinger, The Making of the Diplomatic Mind: The Training, Outlook, and Style of the United States' Foreign Service Officers, 1908-1931 (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1975), p 24.

Department of State personnel who represented different geographical areas, American journalists, and men whom Dooman labeled "opportunists," which to Dooman meant those individuals who acted in their own best interests, often to the detriment of the United States. Many of them had a role in the development of American foreign policy during the period under study, and, because of personal beliefs and ideals, they negated the efforts of Dooman and others who constantly sought an amicable solution to the problems of Japanese-American relations.³

Dooman reached professional maturity in the decades before 1941. His own evolution as a country expert coincided with the growth of the Department of State and the professionalization of the foreign service. There was a distinct idea of what a diplomat should be and the nature of his role in international relations, and in the years between 1900 and 1924, the Department underwent a metamorphosis. The changes were a result of both the direct and indirect efforts of private businessmen, government employees, and American scholars.

³Interview with Mrs. Eugene H. Dooman, February 25, 1973. The problems of becoming a Japan hand or China hand were unique in the Diplomatic Corps. While a good college education sufficed for other consular appointments, those destined to become Asian experts faced added burdens, most notably overcoming the language barrier. Lack of proper living quarters, and for some years, the lack of a systematic training program contributed to the problem. The continuing nature of this is explored in I.M. Destler's "Country Expertise and the United States Foreign Policymaking: The Case of Japan," Pacific Community, Vol. 5, 4, July 1974, pp. 546-564.

The arrival of the twentieth century marked the emergence of the United States as an imperialist nation playing a larger role in international power politics. As American interests overseas expanded with foreign trade and territorial acquisitions, there was a need for reorganizing the Department of State and improving the diplomatic and consular corps. Pressure for change came initially from the business community which argued that America's consular service should accommodate America's prime mover - business. Commercial firms sought to influence appointments that would insure the success of their foreign sales and investments. To accomplish this, representatives from the business world suggested that the "entire diplomatic system" should be administered on a "business basis."⁴

A second agent of change in the years following the Spanish-American War was the academic community. The professors stressed the need for training specialists in the art of diplomacy. Academic reformers were concerned about the intensification of international rivalries and American leadership in the world. Their ideas of reform found support among elected and appointed government officials, including President Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who believed there was a link between diplomacy and imperialism.⁵

⁴Warren Frederick Ilchman, Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1779-1939: A Study in Administrative History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 57, 70.

⁵Schulzinger, pp. 22-35, passim; Ilchman, p. 57.

Pressures like those produced results. Slowly the Department and the diplomatic and consular corps underwent changes, however limited. By 1905, the number of first and second secretaries had doubled over the 1895 figure. In 1894, recognition of the importance of communicating with foreigners in their native language had already led to the hiring of interpreters in Persia, Korea, and Siam. There followed in 1902 the formation of a student interpreter corps for service in China, then for Japan. The overseas expansion of the United States also led to the creation of the first specialized geographical and political office in the Department. In March 1907, the Department established the Division of Far Eastern Affairs at the urging of Third Assistant Secretary of State, F. M. Huntington Wilson who served as its director, assisted by William Phillips and Percival Heinzleman, who had served in the diplomatic and consular services in China. The division functioned on an experimental and temporary basis until 1909 when it became permanent with the appointment of Ransford Miller of the Japan service as its chief. The division was charged with:

Diplomatic and consular correspondence on matters other than those of an administrative character in relation to China, Japan, Korea, Siam, Straits Settlements, Borneo, East Indies, India, and in general the Far East.⁶

⁶Ilchman, pp. 72-73; Conversation with Marlene Mayo, August 6, 1976; Register of the Department of State, 1909 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909), p. 18.

The trend towards growth and professionalization received additional impetus in 1905 when Roosevelt signed an executive order that placed admission to the consular service, theoretically, on a merit basis. The order was in effect for a short period and had little direct effect, but it set a precedent for further efforts. Subsequent congressional action did, in fact, produce mild changes regarding hiring and provided for the inspection of consulates. A second executive order, issued in 1906, further strengthened professionalization attempts by establishing a board of examiners, and stipulating that entrance into the lowest positions of the consular service would be by examination. It also provided that promotions in the consular corps would be made on a merit basis and it abolished "partisan" appointments and promotions. This order like its predecessor had limited effectiveness because it would terminate with the end of Roosevelt's tenure, and, additionally, only candidates whose names appeared on an approved list were eligible to take the examinations. President William Howard Taft contributed to attempts at professionalization with an executive order in 1909 which re-emphasized that appointments should be made without consideration of political affiliation and which established a thorough examination testing "the flexibility of mind that characterized the 'generalist.'" It applied, as had the other measures, only to the lower echelons in the consular service. It did enhance the career

attractiveness of the service as salaries were raised and the possibilities for promotions were improved.⁷

In 1906, the first appointments to the student interpreter corps in Japan were made. Among the first appointees were John Caldwell in 1906, Edwin Neville in 1907, and Joseph W. Ballantine in 1909. All three spent the first two years concentrating on language studies after which they received appointments as vice consuls and thereby established a pattern for future Japan experts. For these men and those who followed, the student interpreter corps played an important role because it afforded them a means of entering into a career otherwise denied because of social or economic disadvantages. The corps had been in existence in Japan only six years, and it had attracted few candidates when in 1912 Dooman journeyed to Washington, D. C. where he and an estimated one hundred other applicants competed for appointments in examinations based on the 1906 and 1909 guidelines.⁸

Dooman passed the required physical examination and then took the general written test which required knowledge of eight major areas: modern languages; natural, industrial,

⁷Tracy Hollingsworth Lay, The Foreign Service of the United States (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1925), pp. 21-22; Schulzinger, p. 42; Ilchman, pp. 94-95, 99.

⁸Department of State, Department of State Register, 1906 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1906); EHD, pp. 2, 4.

and commercial resources, and commerce of the United States; political economy; international, maritime, and commercial law; American history, government, and institutions; political and commercial geography; arithmetic; and modern history (since 1850) of Europe, South America, and the Far East. Faced with this seemingly herculean task, Dooman harbored some misgivings about his chances of success, but he overcame his anxieties, took the examination and won an appointment. Notification came on March 18, 1912, one week before his twenty-first birthday, and shortly thereafter he traveled once again to Washington, then on to Japan, his home for most of the next three decades.⁹

⁹Department of State, Register of the Department of State, 1908 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1908), pp. 141-144, "Sample Examination of the Student Interpreter Corps." With the exception of the section on language, which required the examinee to translate a paragraph from and into either French, Spanish, or German, the remaining sections each had several questions, examples of which follow." "Discuss the commercial relations of the United States with the Far East, mentioning the principal articles of commerce with each country"; "Distinguish between a direct and indirect tax, giving an example of each"; "Name the essential elements of a contract"; "What effects did the discovery of America have on Europe in regards to geographical knowledge, commercial enterprise, and colonization"; "Name two countries which produce the largest supply of raw silk. What three countries produce the most pig iron?" "Briefly describe the causes and results of (a) the war between China and Japan (1894-95), and (b) the Russo-Japanese war." The examinee also had to completely itemize and balance a ledger. EHD, pp. 1-4; 123D72/a, Wilbur Carr, Acting Secretary of State to Dooman, 3/18/1912 (month/day/year), and 123D72/b, Carr to Dooman, 4/17/1912. The 123D72 file is a personal record of Dooman which is part of Record Group 59, Diplomatic Papers of the United States, which are deposited in the National Archives, Washington, D.C. Papers in the record group are indicated throughout this paper by their file number, author, recipient and title (if available), and the date.

For Dooman it was, more accurately, a return to Japan. He was born in Osaka on March 24, 1890, the son of missionary parents. Both of his parents' families were Nestorian Christians living in Urimiah, Iran. His father, Isaac M. Dooman, was born in Tiflis, Russia but he and his wife, Grace Allchin, grew up in Urimiah, the families' ancestral home. The father had been influenced by a Presbyterian Minister in his youth, and after the family migrated, first to France then to the United States, the elder Dooman entered the General Theological Seminary. After the death of his first three children he became an Episcopal missionary and was sent to Japan in 1887 where he worked seeking converts and training native lay ministers. His experience among the Japanese taught him that despite the "devil's success. . . ." in "sugar coating the sin of sexual immorality," which victimized the "entire male population," they were "open and trustful . . . with artistic tastes."¹⁰

The elder Dooman admired the Japanese and exhibited a quality of understanding not frequently associated with "culturally bound" missionaries. He acknowledged his belief that the Japanese needed salvation, but at the same moment he respected their unique national character. An unnamed

¹⁰Isaac M. Dooman, A Missionary's Life in the Land of the Gods (Boston: Gorham Press, 1914), pp. 237-238, 243. Confusion exists regarding Reverend Dooman's ethnic origins. He spoke Turkish and Persian indicating that he was from the Middle East. Questions remain as to whether he was Persian, Armenian or a Persian-Armenian. Associates of his son, including John K. Emmerson have identified him as an Armenian. Dooman does not give any indication of his families' ethnic origins other than the information cited above which is taken from "Isaac and Grace Allchin Dooman: 1857-1931," a paper prepared by Eugene Dooman, December 5, 1958.

American diplomat who had served in Japan for sometime, yet who claimed that he could not "understand the Japanese," explained his dilemma to the missionary. Dooman listened, then counseled the diplomat to view the Japanese from "a point of vantage," and attempt to "observe their better side with more prominence." This objectivity had led the missionary to a profound affection for the Japanese and Reverend Dooman passed these qualities on to his children. The elder Dooman's observation that professional diplomats who, by the nature of their work, ignored Japan's "ephemeral charms," provided an important lesson that his son, Eugene adopted in later years.¹¹

The Dooman family moved several times while residing in Japan, but by age five, Dooman had entered a French teaching brothers' institution, L'école de l'étoile du Matin, in Tokyo. In 1903, at age thirteen, Dooman left Japan traveling to the United States by himself and entered a military academy in Ohio. The following year his family also returned, settling in New York where Dooman completed high school in 1907. That fall he entered Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut where

¹¹Ibid., pp. 19-20. Isaac Dooman's awareness of Asian opposition to Western imperialism is also evident in his book. When asked if there was anything to fear "from the aggressiveness of the Yellow races," he replied that while the Asians would never invade Europe, they would want to repulse "the advancement of European nations in Asia. . . ."

he studied for two years. Then, after a year of "seeking certain avenues of intellectual development," including one semester at the University of Pennsylvania and one at Columbia University, he returned to Trinity. A schedule weighted in philosophy and the classics led to an interest in the past and Dooman decided on a career in archaeology. News of an impending war in the Middle East dashed his archaeological aspirations, and a newspaper advertisement for the student interpreter examination provided an interesting alternative. His background and education had influenced young Dooman, and with a reformer's spirit, he went out in 1912 as a student interpreter having made up his mind that his "career in the service should aim toward contributing something toward averting war between the United States and Japan."¹²

During his initial years in the service, Dooman's primary task was to learn the Japanese language. He and the other student interpreters studied with their private language tutors (Japanese nationals), while performing a minimum amount of official work. The labors of his superiors, Dooman recalled, focused on organizational problems related to a "consortium . . . of various financial groups. . . ." and "keeping Washington informed of the enactment of laws, and in general the trends in political affairs which were of no

¹²EHD, pp. 1-4; Dooman to Herbert Feis, 7/8/1949, Dooman papers. A discrepancy in dates exists. The father states that he served in Japan for twenty-five years (1887-1912). The son wrote in his 1958 paper that his father retired in 1922. In his 1962 interview, however, he states that the family settled in New York in 1907 (p. 1).

great moment." This lack of "urgent pressing problems. . . ." meant work of a "leisurely character." Given an inordinate amount of free time, Dooman took the opportunity to renew acquaintances with Japanese friends whom he remembered from the French school that he attended fourteen years earlier. They played tennis, frequented teahouses, and generally enjoyed themselves. "We weren't," as Dooman described it, "thinking of very serious things at that time."¹³

In spite of his own observation, Dooman was an industrious and dedicated worker who took full advantage of his time and that of his private tutor. During his first two years, he was tested at quarterly intervals, and at the end of that period he took a comprehensive examination. He also had to demonstrate a cognizance of "the history, geography, commerce, and institutions . . . and an elementary knowledge . . . of the laws. . . ." of Japan. Having passed this milestone in 1914, Dooman received a promotion and a

¹³EHD, pp. 4-7, 56-57. Dooman's description of the leisurely nature of his early assignment is corroborated by Joseph W. Ballantine, who had gone out to Japan two years before Dooman. Ballantine described a typical day as a student: from six to eight, study with a tutor; breakfast at eight; study until one; lunch at one, then tennis or riding in the afternoon. "The Reminiscences of Joseph W. Ballantine," contained in the Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, New York, 1961, p. 114. No evidence exists which reveals Dooman's reaction to the Japanese "Twenty-One Demands" issued to China in 1915, suggesting that he did not pay attention to "urgent and pressing problems of the moment." For procedures regarding the testing of student interpreters see the Department of State Register for 1912, pp. 138-144.

salary increase from one thousand to fifteen hundred dollars a year. Two years later he took his final examination, a test similar to the first but more detailed and the language section required him to read the Chinese classics in Japanese. That feat, Dooman reminisced, necessitated an understanding of over six thousand characters. But at this point, the time spent with his Japanese friends on the tennis courts, in tea houses, and in study began paying dividends. Dooman's performance on his exam warranted a telegram from his superior, Ambassador George W. Guthrie, to the Secretary of State, emphasizing Dooman's score of 92, which Guthrie felt deserved "particular commendation."¹⁴

In the years between 1912 and his appointment as assistant Japanese secretary at the Tokyo embassy in 1921, Dooman had the usual consular posts in Yokohama, Kobe, and Taihoku (Taiwan). From 1914 to 1917, he moved between Kobe and Yokohama, first as a student interpreter and then as a consul. During those years, he found himself concerned primarily with shipping and commercial work which he considered "very dull." Typically, as a consul he also processed visas and passport applications. After a promotion to vice consul in charge at Kobe, he was still confronted with characteristic consular chores that included investigating

¹⁴EHD, p. 3; 123D72/9, Charles J. Ansell to George W. Guthrie, 12/20/1916; 123D72/7, Guthrie to Secretary of State, 12/28/1916.

and reporting cholera cases and handling the affairs of German citizens, both alive and deceased. The latter chore was a result of the first world war and because Germany and Japan were at war, German citizens in Japan were forced to carry on their communications via the United States which remained neutral until April 1917.¹⁵

In the early years of his career Dooman had faced problems of a personal nature as well. In June, 1918, Irving Herskovits, president of the Russo-Asiatic Fur Company, wrote a letter to the Secretary of State in which he linked Dooman to an unscrupulous fur trader, S. J. Kanter, who had swindled the fur company out of nearly thirty thousand dollars. Although he threatened to sue Dooman in Japanese court, Herskovits failed to make any specific charges. Eight weeks later, a telegram from the consul general at Kobe to the Secretary of State reported that "no indication or slightest suspicion of any connection between consul Zooman [sic] and Kanter or firms. . . ." existed.¹⁶

Besides personal attacks on his character, the consular service officer in Asia during this period faced other

¹⁵EHD, pp. 8-9; 125.5215/4, Dooman to Secretary of State, 7/24/1916; 158.941/46, Dooman to Secretary of State, 8/20/1916; 394.623/4, Dooman to Secretary of State, 9/8/1916; 394.63/26, Dooman to Secretary of State, 5/31/1916.

¹⁶123D72/16, Letter, Irving Herskovits, to Secretary of State, 6/25/1918; 123D72/17, Robert Frazer to Secretary of State, 8/7/1918.

and more common problems. An associate of Dooman's who was serving in Kobe complained to higher officials that the salary of a junior officer fell short of providing a comfortable life style and contributed to a sense of feeling inferior. Erle R. Dickover, who was appointed as a student interpreter in 1914, complained that his "messmates," while eight to ten years younger than himself, and employed at the lowest level of employment in their private business firms, made substantially more than his one one thousand dollars a year. A similar complaint which Dooman filed, citing the high cost of living and lack of proper quarters, reinforced Dickover's statements. Coupled with the poor living conditions was a loss of dignity that came from performing duties that Dooman considered clerk-like and unimportant. This situation prompted him to request a transfer in 1919 based on his feeling that he "could be of greater service in a capacity in which knowledge of this [Japanese] language would be of assistance."¹⁷

In September, 1920, Dooman again sought a change, this time a major one. Dooman asked that he be transferred to France "or some other country in Western Europe," citing a popular argument that officers who were detailed in Japan

¹⁷123D562/29, Dickover to Secretary of State, 10/12/1918; 123D72/20, Dooman to Secretary of State, 2/13/1919.

for long periods should be transferred to Europe to broaden their experiences. Dooman pointed out that he had "been stationed in Japan for more than eight years, for more than five years in Kobe," and consequently was "keenly desirous of a change." He was so interested that he offered to defray the cost of his traveling expenses. His boss, Consul General George H. Skidmore, did not approve the request because of the understaffed conditions of the various consulates in Japan.¹⁸

As fate would have it, Dooman did receive a transfer, the cause of which was not his request necessarily, but rather an apparently common occupational hazard, malaria. The consul at Taihoku (present day Taipei), Taiwan, Henry B. Hitchcock had asked for an extended leave because of his wife's frail health. Hitchcock pleaded that her condition made her more susceptible to malaria, the disease "for which Formosa is notorious." Dooman soon received his order detailing him to the post. Ironically, Dooman had submitted a report about an outbreak of bubonic plague in Yokkaichi that went forward on October 16, three days after his arrival in Taihoku.¹⁹

¹⁸123D72/35, Dooman to Secretary of State, 9/10/1920.

¹⁹123H631/39, Hitchcock to Secretary of State, 10/11/1920; 158.941/46, Dooman to Secretary of State, 10/16/1920.

Taihoku must have been the scourge of foreign service officers stationed in East Asia. Malaria aside, few diversions existed on the island in 1920. A report that Dooman filed in compliance with a departmental request on "Aeronautics in Formosa," revealed that the island had no rules or regulations governing aircraft operation, nor for that matter were there officers who could enforce them if such rules had existed. There were no routes in, or out, and no airfields leading Dooman to estimate that the island's state was such that "it is doubtful whether civilian and commercial aviation will be developed in Formosa for many years to come." These unpleasantries were compounded by typical consular duties such as: reporting "export bounties" paid by the Taiwanese government; requests for funds necessary to pay salary raises for consulate staff members; reports on the peanut industry of the island; rules governing the manufacture and sale of tea; similar regulations regarding camphor production; and the "Annual January Census" report. The only break in his monotonous routine took the form of another scandal which occurred shortly after his arrival.²⁰

²⁰123D72/36b, Dooman to Secretary of State, 10/13/1920, 800796/73, Dooman to foreign trade adviser, 11/8/1920; 611.008/262, Dooman to foreign trade adviser, 10/26/1920; 125.9253/37, Dooman to Secretary of State, 11/3/1920; 125.9253/106, Dooman to Secretary of State, 3/4/1921; 165.213, Dooman to Secretary of State, 11/10/1920; 894.61332/1, Dooman to Secretary of State, 11/17/1921; 611.9499/7, and 611.9499/8, Dooman to Secretary of State, 2/7/1921 and 2/18/1921; 894.5011/8, Dooman to Secretary of State, 1/28/1921.

Prior to his departure, Hitchcock had received word that a Japanese national had approached several of the consulate's Japanese employees explaining that he wished to speak with the Consul about possible sale of several important military maps that the visitor possessed. After listening at some length to the stranger's comments, and in turn being subjected to intense questioning, the consul dismissed the man on the assumption that Japanese military officials may have been attempting to test Hitchcock's integrity. His suspicions aroused, Hitchcock warned Dooman of the incident. In less than a month after Dooman's arrival, the Japanese returned to the consulate where Dooman cordially invited him in. After examining what apparently were strategic military maps of forts at Keelung and the Pescadores, Dooman excused himself, asking his guest to finish the Japanese tea which the Consul had prepared. Dooman then contacted the police who stationed themselves outside the entrance to the consulate grounds and waited until Dooman ushered the thief out. For his part, Dooman gained personal commendations from the governor general and several other Japanese officers of rank, but the first newspaper accounts in the Taiwan Shinbun implicated Dooman as an accessory. Subsequent reports, however, cleared him, noting that Dooman spoke "in fluent Japanese" when he discussed the case, and a final editorial commented that "We Japanese must be grateful for the kindness

of the consul . . . who was able to use this opportunity to show in deed the good will the United States have towards Japan."²¹

In April 1921, Dooman returned to Kobe for three months. In July, he was transferred to the embassy in Tokyo as the assistant Japanese secretary. During the next decade, Dooman found himself increasingly involved in work of a more interesting and serious nature. At the same time his personal life would undergo a change.²²

By 1921, a major effort was taking shape among a group determined to change the diplomatic and consular services. The first world war and its aftermath had provided some impetus for change as it placed a strain on diplomats and consuls who found themselves overloaded with the task of protecting American citizens in belligerent countries and with the upsurge of visa applications filed by refugees fleeing war torn Europe. The war also left the United States in a position of economic predominance which produced another clamor from the business community for reorganization of the foreign service. But it was a group of diplomats and consular officers who worked hard between

²¹811.20294/28, Dooman to Secretary of State (copy to the embassy in Tokyo), 11/17/1920. Dooman had enclosed a translation of the last newspaper article which had appeared in the November 15 issue of the Taiwan Shinbun.

²²123D72/45 Edward Bell to Secretary of State, 6/30/1921.

1919 and 1923 at convincing their Washington superiors and Congress that diplomacy needed highly trained men.²³

Among the most active leaders of the group were Wilbur J. Carr, Joseph C. Grew, and William Phillips. Carr represented the interests of the consular service, and he favored a fusion of the two branches. He argued that a diplomat should begin his career as a consul and could thereby benefit from the "business side of diplomacy" so necessary for defending America's interests which were largely economic. In 1919 he prepared a paper entitled, "Reasons Why the State Department Should be Reorganized," and it was he who urged Department officials to testify at the Congressional hearings on reorganization.²⁴

Grew represented the diplomatic point of view regarding reorganization, although he was more interested in professionalizing the diplomatic corps. Grew was a career diplomat whose first appointment was in 1904. He recognized over the years a need for experienced individuals with skills in the art of negotiation. The impermanent nature of presidential nominees filling the highest diplomatic positions precluded the development of a qualified foreign service

²³Schulzinger, pp. 47, 67-68.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 58-59. Others in the group included Lewis Einstein, Leland Harrison, High Gibson, Hugh Wilson, and Charles Evans Hughes.

which he considered absolutely necessary for handling American foreign relations. But he and the other diplomats did not agree that amalgamation of the two branches was the best means for achieving his goal of an established foreign service.²⁵

The problem of cooperation fell on the shoulders of William Phillips, who as the Undersecretary of State and the senior career diplomat in the Department, worked with Carr and Tracy Hollingsworth Lay of the consular corps in preparing a reorganization plan to submit to the Congress. Together they worked on a previous bill and Representative John Jacob Rogers reintroduced it into Congress in 1924. Its passage made the Rogers Act of 1924 the most significant step taken in the direction of professionalization. The union of the two branches took place, with lateral transfers making it possible, theoretically, for consuls to achieve ministerial positions. It was now properly called the Foreign Service, and student interpreters were subsequently called foreign language officers. Salary scales were also adjusted, and in general, career opportunities enhanced. The act satisfied all concerned that the Department had

²⁵Ibid., p. 75; Waldo H. Heinrichs, Jr., American Ambassador: Joseph C. Grew and the Development of the United States' Diplomatic Tradition (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1966), pp. 95-96.

moved to eliminate a majority of the problems which previously confronted the two branches and had at the same time broadened the base of recruitment.²⁶

Those concerned knew the qualities that they were interested in. In a 1921 address to an American audience, France's renown ambassador to the United States, J. J. Jusserand had contributed something to the idea of the necessary characteristics of a modern diplomat. A nation's representative in a foreign state had to know, Jusserand stated, first his own country, then he "must study the country where he is . . . see people of all ranks . . . , [and] understand the trends of opinion and discover the various forces at play there." "No invention, no telephone, no aeroplane, no wireless will," he stressed, "ever replace the knowledge of a country and the understanding of a people's disposition." Seven years later, Charles Evans Hughes elaborated on this idea of the changing role of envoys:

The new diplomacy requires not the divining of the intent of monarchs, the mere discovery and thwarting of intrigues, but the understanding of peoples. There must be intimate acquaintance with their interests, their opinion. There must be ability to sift; to seize upon what is significant in the mass of news, of rumours, of assertion, of

²⁶Ibid., 74-75; Ilchman, pp. 143-146. The Moses-Linthicum Act of 1931 settled the remaining problems and guaranteed a true fusion of the two branches. Schulzinger, p. 122.

debate; to know the character and particular aims of men who control the action of governments. For this, alertness and general adaptability will not suffice. One must have the equipment of the student of history and politics, and the democratic sympathies and cultural training which enable him to enter into the thoughts of peoples. While he seeks to do this, he cannot escape giving an impression of the life of his own country. In no slight measure, by his own character and development, he determines the reputation of his government.²⁷

Dooman represented the new breed of diplomatic professionals. His background, education, and his particular skill qualified him as an expert. He was well educated and his practical training was in the form of a tool which few Americans possessed: the ability to understand and communicate in the Japanese language. In the decade following his assignment to the embassy in Tokyo, Dooman would have an opportunity to apply himself in earnest in his pursuit of bettering Japanese-American relations.

²⁷Jusserand, The School for Ambassadors and Other Essays (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925), pp. 37, 59. Jusserand first gave his address at a meeting of the American Historical Society, in 1921 and later revised it for publication as "The School for Ambassadors," (footnote, page 4). Lay, The Foreign Service, from the "Foreward" by Charles Evans Hughes, p. ix.

CHAPTER 2

THE DECISIVE DECADE

In July, 1921 Dooman began a decade of service in the Tokyo embassy, a vantage point from which he observed rising tensions between the United States and Japan. At the same time his own life underwent several changes as he benefited from the passage of the Rogers Act in 1924. His marriage the following year to Dorothy Calvert Wilcox, whom he had met during her travels in Asia, suggests that he sensed a feeling of job security and a good future. He received rapid promotions to Class VI in July of 1924 and to Class V in August. Within two years he was again promoted, this time to Second Secretary, attaining the rank of Class IV in 1928 and Class III in 1930. Then, after ten years of waiting, he received orders for Europe. He was assigned to London in 1931, as First Secretary of the embassy. He had witnessed the decline in Japanese-American relations during the 1920's and had been in London only a short time when news came of a clash between Japanese and Chinese troops in Mukden. He was subsequently ordered to Paris to act as special adviser to Ambassador Charles G. Dawes, the American representative to the special meetings called by the Council of the League of Nations to investigate the beginnings of the

Manchurian Incident. To Dooman those meetings symbolized the end of an important period in his life and career. It had been an ominous ten years.

Looking back at the period some forty years later, while engaged in interviews for an oral history project for Columbia University, Dooman recalled a pattern of events that he felt had seriously affected Japanese-American relations in the decades before Pearl Harbor. Years of previous confrontations, always ending in losses to western powers, nurtured, Dooman believed, Japanese antipathy towards western powers including the United States. He traced Japan's disenchantment with western diplomacy back to the 1896 Triple Intervention. Japan's victory in the first Sino-Japanese war had quickly drawn the attention of the imperialist nations with an interest in China. The Treaty of Shimonoseki, which ended the war, had not been signed, when Russia and Germany, knowing of Japan's plans to acquire the Liaotung peninsula, made overtures to Great Britain and France seeking a united front of opposition. Great Britain declined, happy that Russia had another concern, thus relieving some of the pressures already in existence between those two European powers. France and Germany, hoping to maintain their security in the Far East, sided with Russia, and representatives from the three nations met with Japanese leaders and "advised" them to relinquish their claim. This confrontation resulted

in a Japanese compromise that failed to satisfy the European powers who now forced Japan's hand. Asserting to the public that Japan had attained its original goals, the government returned the Liaotung territory as the powers demanded. A second treaty, appropriately revised, followed, avoiding national humiliation.¹

That show of power, Dooman believed, had a lasting impact on the Japanese. He described the incident as "an episode which the Japanese have never forgotten . . ." and, he continued, "I have heard a great number of them say that never again would Japan give up, surrender under pressure, any of the rights that it had acquired in China." Although the United States had not played a role in that clash, Dooman maintained that it had a lasting effect on Japanese-American relations.²

¹Hugh Borton, *Japan's Modern Century* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955), pp. 209-210; William L. Langer, *The Diplomacy of Imperialism: 1890-1902* (2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), pp. 177-189 passim; It is interesting to note that this chapter in the second edition of Langer's work is unchanged following page for page the original published in 1936. Frank W. Iklé, "The Triple Intervention: Japan's Lesson in the Diplomacy of Imperialism," *Monumenta Nipponica*, XXII, nos. 1 & 2, 1967. Iklé challenges Langer's contention that the Russians led in the intervention. He contends that the responsibility rested with the Germans who sent an early warning to Japan (although it was not delivered to the Prime Minister) on March 6, 1895. This German willingness to cooperate, Iklé explains, was the key to the intervention.

²EHD, p. 14; Iklé supports Dooman on this point. "The basic lesson had been that might makes right, and that national survival and salvation could only be obtained through military strength and aggressive nationalism.

In the subsequent decades the United States and Japan gradually emerged as Pacific powers, and a change in diplomacy slowly took effect. It came in part from the agreements reached at the Washington Conference of 1921-1922. The American government called the conference primarily as a result of growing concern over Japan's "process of aggrandizement;" a process that included Japan's acquisition of the Liaotung peninsula from Russia in 1905, annexation of Korea in 1910, and an ever increasing number of demands on the Chinese. Spurred on by Wilsonian idealism, and the horrors of World War I, American government officials hoped to accomplish more than a restoration of the international order which they felt Japan threatened; they planned the demise of worldwide imperialist diplomacy. With these goals in mind the Department of State began efforts to stymie the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance; an alliance which they believed served Japan's imperialist ventures and ensured British recognition of Japan's spheres of influence.³

The United States' emergence as a leader in Asian diplomatic maneuverings bore bitter fruit. Although Japan accepted the new spirit of the Washington Conference and peaceful economic expansion, Dooman raised the possibility that American insistence on the abrogation of the Anglo-British

³Akita Iriye, *After Imperialism: The Search for a New Order in the Far East, 1921-1931* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), pp. 14-15.

alliance and its demands at the Washington Conference adversely affected the good relations which had existed, and subsequently led to the Pacific war.⁴ Despite their disillusionment, Japanese representatives entered into agreements concerning Pacific fortifications, naval arms limitations, and new guidelines governing actions of foreign powers in China.

The new guidelines of conduct were outlined in the Nine Power Treaty. It proscribed unilateral actions by the foreigners in dealing with the Chinese, required signatories to respect China's territorial integrity, forbade foreign intrusion in Chinese internal affairs, and called for equal economic opportunity for all concerned. Implementation of these policies necessitated cooperation of all the powers party to the treaty including China. With some misgivings about the intent of the changing of the rules by the western powers, the Japanese moved to end their expansionist policies and abide by the new concept of international agreements.⁵ France failed to ratify the treaty until mid-1925 and in the interlude, the United States' Congress approved legislation that precluded Japanese immigration into the country.

⁴EHD, pp. 14-15.

⁵Iriye, pp. 18-19; Borton, pp. 303-304; Iriye, "The Failure of Economic Expansionism: 1918-1931," in Bernard S. Silberman and H. D. Harootunian, eds. Japan in Crisis: Essays on Taisho Democracy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 239-240, 243, 249, 262-263.

That move was part of a larger outbreak of xenophobia which occurred after World War I. The anti-foreign campaign touched all sectors of the United States, focusing on the particular group most evident in the area. In Illinois the Italians received the brunt of the attacks. In Georgia it was an anti-Catholic movement, and in the mid-west the Jews fell prey to propaganda financed by Henry Ford. Anti-Japanese hysteria struck on the west coast, then spread east and finally into Washington, D. C. by 1923.⁶

It was in this atmosphere that two congressmen introduced into the House of Representatives a bill aimed at preventing further Japanese immigration. Although unsuccessful in their initial attempt in December of 1923, the two men reentered their proposed act early the following year and with the support of Southern and Mid-Western sympathizers pushed the bill through in April. Similar action typified Senate reaction after some early opposition. Opponents of the legislation had the support of Secretary of State Hughes, who opposed it on legal and moral grounds. He argued that it would cause strong Japanese resentment thereby undermining the progress made at the Washington Conference.

⁶Rodman W. Paul, The Abrogation of the Gentlemen's Agreement (Cambridge, Mass.: The Society, 1936), pp. 14-18, 34-37; John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New York: Atheneum, 1964), pp. 264-265; Oscar Handlin, Race and Nationality in American Life (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1948), pp. 170-172.

In an eleventh-hour attempt at preventing passage Hughes met with the Japanese Ambassador Hanihara Masanao. Hughes suggested and Hanihara prepared a letter protesting the discriminatory nature of the proposed legislation, which the Secretary then forwarded to the proper Congressional committees. Hughes' tactic backfired as proponents of the bill, led by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, seized on Hanihara's allegation that enactment would produce "grave consequences."⁷

The embassy closely followed, as did the Japanese press, Congressional action on the bill. The embassy observed in April that "a resentful tone" had surfaced in various articles. When it appeared that both houses would accept the legislation, it became the major news item in Japan, taking precedence over a bitter political campaign which was being waged at the same time. Eventually, the embassy produced, on a daily basis, telegrams detailing the deep seated bitterness that the Japanese felt. Shortly after congress passed the bill, on April 24, Ambassador Cyrus E. Woods cabled the Secretary of State:

It is now perfectly clear to me that unless some decisive action is taken which will correct the impression created in Japan by the recent passage . . . the good work accomplished by the Washington Conference, insofar as Japan is concerned, can be regarded as lost, together with the wonderful opportunities for businesses which have grown up recently in Japan. Unless a remedy is found there

⁷Ibid., pp. 57, 78.

will remain a deep seated resentment against our government and against our people which cannot be overcome in many years.⁸

In Tokyo, Dooman then Assistant Japanese Secretary, had watched the American lawmakers build their wall, then he experienced Japanese reactions voiced in newspaper editorials and at demonstrations near the embassy and the chancery. "There was no violence," he emphasized, "but there was no doubt that the Japanese were hurt right down to the bone." It was not until eight years later, in 1932, that he discovered evidence that raised some question about Hughes' sincerity or, at least cast some shadow of doubt on the Secretary's wisdom. In 1932, Dooman had returned to the Department on temporary assignment on the Japan desk. While removing materials from a desk that had been occupied by Ransford Miller, Dooman discovered a series of documents that the Division had accumulated relating to the debate over the Exclusion Act. Among these documents appeared a draft letter that Hanihara had prepared and submitted for prior approval to Hughes and John V. A. MacMurray, head of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Piecing together the chronology of events, Dooman found that Hughes had taken the initiative

⁸711.945.1045, Woods to Secretary of State, 4/15/1924; 711.495/1050, Woods to Secretary of State, 4/17/1924; 711945/1052, Woods to Secretary of State, 4/19/1924; 711495/1123, Woods to Secretary of State, 5/31/1924.

in suggesting that Hanihara prepare a note setting forth the Japanese point of view. A speech previously given by Baron Sakatani Yoshiro in Japan's House of Peers denouncing the proposed legislation had obviously impressed the Ambassador, Sakatani had used the term "grave consequences" in reference to Japan's possible cessation of cooperation in China, taking care to make equally explicit that he harbored no thoughts of war when he used the phrase. Apparently, with that thought in mind, Hanihara incorporated the fateful words in his draft to Hughes and MacMurray. Hughes read it, and pausing momentarily when he reached the term, commented that it was an "unfortunate phrase," but neither he nor MacMurray raised any further objections. Ambassador Hanihara then sent the definitive letter to Hughes, who forwarded it to "the interested committees of the House and Senate." Undoubtedly, MacMurray, who read the diplomatic reports from Tokyo, and reported to Hughes, knew of Sakatani's speech and its true meaning. Lodge seized Hanihara's choice of words and exploited congressional ignorance of its intended meaning. Using inflammatory articles for support, Lodge assured his colleagues that Japan had threatened the United States and in reaction, they passed the bill.⁹

⁹Merlo J. Pusey, Charles Evans Hughes, Vol. II (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), pp. 513-514; Paul, p. 78. Dooman implies that Miller was at the desk in 1924. This is an error as Miller was in Chosen (Korea). He was at the desk in 1932, and as Dooman points out, Dooman was his replacement at that time. EHD, p. 18; see the Department of State Register for 1924, p. 27, and for 1932, p. 7.

Several congressmen and others interested in the bill suggested that the tone and phraseology of the letter sounded familiar, so familiar in fact, that many believed that Hughes had contributed heavily to the final version of the note. Hughes and MacMurray vigorously denied any complicity. The draft that Dooman discovered, however, had changes and corrections in the handwriting of both men. Aware of the "touchy nature" of his discovery, Dooman removed the documents in 1932 and burned them.¹⁰

Ambassador Hanihara found himself in an awkward position in 1924. Any attempts at explanation that would uncover the American role in preparation of the letter would have been embarrassing. Thus, he never spoke out in his own defense nor attempted to explain the misunderstanding. Neither did he, or Hughes, make public the fact that the Secretary had approved Hanihara's letter and that it did not have the connotations which others attached to it. Dooman believed that passage of the bill did irreparable damage to Japanese-American relations. Despite "the stupidity" of the act, he recognized it as a formal act of his government and refused to discuss it outside of official channels.¹¹

Although he reserved comment, Dooman realized the serious implications of the act. In later years he called

¹⁰Paul, p. 68, Pusey, pp. 514-515; EHD, 17-22.

¹¹EHD, p. 22. Dooman explained that "This was a formal act of the United States and it was not a matter that you could discuss. . . ."

the congressional action "unfair and iniquitous," and he knew that the anti-American feelings generated by the bill made it a pivotal point in Japanese-American relations. He paraphrased a statement by Edmund Burke, to sum up his feelings as to whether or not the "exclusion act" had, in part, led to Japan's decision for war in 1941:

It is impossible in these political inquiries to find any proportion between the apparent forces of any moral cause we may assign and their known operation. We are therefore obliged to deliver up that operation to mere chance or more piously or more rationally - to the occasional interposition and irresistible hand of the Grand Deposer.¹²

He was certain that serious inroads had been made into relations between the two nations by events growing out of agreements contained in the Nine-Power Treaty and the failure of the United States to honor its commitments.

Dooman believed France's ratification of the treaty in 1925 coincided with an intensification of the Chinese nationalist movement; this, Dooman maintained, killed the Washington system in childbirth. During the decade of the twenties, the Kuomintang (KMT) nationalist forces struggled for power against warlord armies in the north and west of China and with the ever growing force of Chinese communists. As the warlords became less of a factor, communist and KMT leaders struggled to win a mantle of legitimacy; the right

¹²Ibid., 17, 19.

to head the Chinese nationalist movement. In their efforts to accomplish this, both groups began focusing their attentions on a common enemy, western imperialist nations.¹³

1925 also marked a momentous shift in American attitudes regarding international agreements affecting China. Chinese officials who had exploited the events surrounding the May 30 incident, demanded concessions from foreign powers, particularly in the area of judicial and tariff autonomy. A special tariff conference for this purpose had been scheduled for later in the year. In the United States, a new Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, received the requests from the Chinese and wasted little time in establishing an official attitude of American sympathy for China. Unlike his predecessor, he lacked an interest in maintaining multilateral relations in East Asia. Dooman described the pro-China sympathies Kellogg demonstrated at this point as "misplaced American benevolence" which simply encouraged the Chinese towards radical action that evolved into "a veritable orgy of violating foreign rights and interests. . . ."¹⁴

In the spring of 1926, the Chinese government in Peking challenged a western power in a move that Dooman described as a "piece of diplomatic banditry," but which the United States supported. As a signal that it intended

¹³Ibid., 23-24, 27.

¹⁴Iriye, 63-65; EHD, 25-27.

to eliminate unequal treaties, the warlord supported administration informed the Belgian government of their intent to abrogate an 1865 treaty between the two nations. Belgian authorities denied that the Chinese could demand, according to the treaty, such a change. Belgium took its case to the Court of International Justice and then turned to the other signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty for assistance. Kellogg announced in September that he saw no reason to support them. Belgian resistance collapsed and the Chinese followed through, announcing the abrogation in November.¹⁵

At home congressional action substantiated the United States intentions to respect, unilaterally, Chinese nationalist aspirations regardless of existing treaty obligations. In January 1927, Representative Stephen Porter, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, introduced into the House a resolution intended to guarantee United States' support for a China free of unequal treaties. Porter worked with H. L. Warnshuis, Secretary of the International Missionary Council and whom Dooman described as a representative of an "active sinophile" element in the United States. The two men,

¹⁵Iriye, 96-97; EHD, 30, 33-34, 36. Dooman erroneously states that the move against the Belgians occurred in the summer of 1926; Dorothy Borg, American Policy and the Chinese Revolution, 1925-1928 (New York: MacMillan Company, 1947), pp. 122, 135, 150. Borg argues that Kellogg failed to support Belgium in order to allow the United States to remain "Free to enter into negotiations for a new agreement to replace the Sino-American treaty of 1903 if it so desired."

Dooman believed, worked for "the dissociation of the United States from the . . . Nine-Power Treaty . . ." arguing that special privileges granted in the unequal treaties hampered religious and social work. Congress adopted the resolution. Kellogg now sensed support for his position and issued a policy statement that expressed America's willingness to recognize and help a stable, legitimate Chinese government without collaboration of the other powers. Although he announced a new policy, the secretary had not made any new or practical commitments to China outside of those made earlier at the Washington Conference. Kellogg re-emphasized: (1) The obligation of Chinese authorities to protect American nationals, (2) a continuation of the spirit of the Open Door policy and its provision of equality for all, and (3) the willingness of the American government to enter into negotiations with representatives of a stable Chinese government. Dooman saw in this event "a spirit and temper. . . ." among State Department officials which indicated to him an increasingly strong disposition towards dealing with China independently on the issue of treaties.¹⁶

A major problem confronting State Department officials concerned with East Asian affairs was the lack of a stable Chinese government. Between 1926 and 1928, forces of the KMT rectified the problem as its "northern expedition" succeeded

¹⁶Iriye, 107-109, Borg, 242; EHD, 34-35.

in partially unifying China and eliminating most KMT rivals. The KMT's drive to reduce its opposition paid dividends when on July 25, 1928, the Nationalists concluded the long sought after treaty with the United States. In it the American government recognized China's tariff autonomy, the start of a deliberate effort at establishing bilateral agreements calculated to force the other nations into similar concessions. This treaty, Dooman speculated, which was negotiated and settled while the other powers were meeting in Peking to discuss the same topic, sounded the death knell for all hopes of international cooperation.¹⁷

The "consequences" of these events, particularly the American response to the situation in China, "were to prove tragic for both Japan and China and . . . were to eventually involve the United States in a war . . ." In his oral memoirs Dooman later supported his idea of these pre-1931 origins of the Pacific war by pointing to the gradual change in Japanese foreign policy from 1927 to 1931. One manifestation of this change came in 1927 with the ouster of Japan's Foreign Minister Shidehara Kijuro. Shidehara, Japan's representative at the Washington Conference, embraced the western powers' concept of international cooperation. Until the Northern Expedition, he had depended on that cooperation for settling damages that Japanese nationals incurred as a result

¹⁷Iriye, 229; EHD, 38-39.

of hostilities between warring Chinese factions. After 1926 repeated instances of destruction, with little hope of compensation added heat to political fires in Tokyo. Internal economic and political problems plagued Japan, and those attacks on Japanese nationals on the mainland had an intensifying effect. Shidehara had consistently refused to interfere in China's civil war, nor would he press, as army officials had hoped, for further Chinese concessions. This attitude ran counter to those of expansion-minded militarists.¹⁸

General Tanaka Giichi, President and leader of the opposition party, the Seiyukai, condemned Shidehara's "weak" China policy. Tanaka demanded a more "positive" approach in resolving Japan's problems on the Asian mainland. The Nanking incident of March 29, 1927 indicated just how weak Shidehara's program was. After Chinese troops attacked and killed several foreigners, including Japanese nationals, the United States and Great Britain bombed the city to aid their countrymen who were fleeing. Japanese naval units remained silent. This conciliatory attitude which won the trust of the western powers for Shidehara worked against him at home where criticism of his "weak kneed policy towards China"

¹⁸Borton, pp. 310-312; Iriye, p. 311.

increased. Less than a month after the Nanking incident, Tanaka became Premier and announced his intentions of serving as his own Foreign Minister.¹⁹

At the time of Tanaka's appointment, Dooman described the general as a "great student of international affairs. . . ." who had become Premier only as a result of "fortuitous circumstances." Dooman reported that the new Premier lacked the qualities of a good politician, but that the general could prove to be an able statesman. In that same embassy dispatch, Dooman's superior, First Secretary Norman Armour, concluded that despite Tanaka's claims, the Premier would not make any major changes in Japanese foreign policy. Some thirty-five years after the fact Dooman concluded that 1927 marked Japan's shift from an internationalistic approach to a more nationalistic means of settling the "China problem," and he cited Tanaka's appointment as an indication of "growing support for an expansionist policy in China. . . ." Reasons for this change not only included the internal chaos in Japan, but also American violations, in spirit, of the Nine-Power Treaty. Dooman asserted that as far as the Japanese were

¹⁹Nobuya Bamba, Japanese Diplomacy in a Dilemma: New Light on Japan's China Policy, 1924-1929 (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972), pp. 267, 272, 279, 280; Iriye, "Failure of Economic Expansion," p. 263. Iriye points out that some Japanese officials managed to carry on the facade of cooperation after 1928, but this ended in 1931; Sidney DeVere Brown, "Shidehara Kijuro: The Diplomacy of the Yen," in Diplomats in Crisis: United States-Chinese-Japanese Relations, 1931-1941 Richard Dean Burns and Edward M. Bennett, eds. (Santa Barbara: American Biographical Center, Clio Press, Inc., 1974), p. 212.

concerned, the United States "had disavowed any obligation to work in concert with Japan. . . ." Members of the State Department sensed the shift as well. Early in 1928, Stanely K. Hornbeck, newly appointed Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, noted in a memorandum to Assistant Secretary of State Nelson T. Johnson that despite "Premier Tanaka's daily affirmation that Japan has no intentions of interfering in China's internal affairs, Japan is devoting twenty-four hours a day to interference in one form or another."²⁰

Japan's meddling reached its apex three years later as Japanese Kwantung Army troops stationed in Manchuria staged a military coup and captured the territory. This, Dooman attributed to several factors, including Japan's depressed economy, popular support for expansionists policies, increasing prestige and independence enjoyed by the military, and the breakdown of international diplomacy in Asia. These factors led to the invasion, and it in turn marked a turning point in Japanese-American relations - in 1932, Dooman contends, "the die was cast."

Our contributions to the China disaster . . . [were made] with the most praiseworthy intentions, but with invincible ignorance, without imaginativeness and with tactical inflexibility, the magnificent plan designed by Mr. Hughes was eviscerated, and misplaced American benevolence towards Chinese

²⁰ 894.00253, Norman Armour, Chargé, to Secretary of State, 4/27/1927. Dooman had prepared the biographical data on each of Tanaka's appointees including the Premier, EHD, 41-42; Iriye, 142; 793.94/Manchuria/33, Hornbeck to Nelson T. Johnson, 4/6/1928.

violations of foreign rights gave encouragement to the Chinese to continue on a course ending in a war which lasted for 15 years.²¹

Dooman's 1962 assessment of the situation in East Asia during the tumultuous decade between 1921 and 1931 is perhaps understandable given his background. He was not completely objective in his evaluation of the period, since he lacked sympathy for and understanding of the Chinese Nationalist movement. This, by the nature of his background, was to be expected. Dooman was a conservative, that is he distrusted anything that threatened the status-quo. He came from a middle class strongly religious family, and he had worked hard over the years to achieve his position. As an American expert on Japan, trained in the early half of the century, he had to be distressed by the action of the Chinese nationalists who appeared to be a small group of rabble rousers with xenophobic fears. In a 1926 publication, China's New Nationalism and other Essays, Professor Harley Farnsworth MacNair described the situation in China as seen by many of his contemporaries and shared by Department officials, including Dooman:

To be sure, there was an anti-foreign sentiment aroused, but this was based rather upon the personal feelings of a few, and the feeling of racial superiority of the many, than upon the spirit of nationality itself.

²¹EHD, 46, 53-55; James B. Crowley, Japan's Quest for Autonomy: National Security and Foreign Policy, 1930-1938 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966). Crowley contends that the breakdown in American-British-Japanese relations resulted from an abuse of the Washington Conference treaties. It was not a conflict over Manchuria but rather the events surrounding the London Naval Conference in 1930, p. 34.

Dooman's description of Nationalist activities as a "series of reckless and wanton violations of treaties and international law. . ." coincides with MacNair's point that events during the period "show conclusively that China is not yet ready for responsible . . . government."²²

Dooman's apparent insensitivity to the nationalist movement is comprehensible in light of the fact that the theory of national self-determination which had gained in popularity after World War I, did not receive wide acceptance until after the Second World War. Borg confirms this in her work American Policy and the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1928. The Washington Conference and the treaties that it generated affirmed the fact that the powers were determined to continue the treaty system despite their promises of future revisions. Borg indicates that Americans generally supported or accepted the nationalist movement, but many of those whose testimony she cites as evidence had some prior commitment to China and two of the most reliable newspapers at the time reflected a concern over Chinese-Soviet ties.²³

Dooman seems justified in his concern over the attitude of the Department of State, particularly that of Kellogg, which

²²MacNair, Harley Farnsworth, China's New Nationalism and other Essays (Shanghai: Commercial Press, Limited, 1926), pp. 5, 379; EHD, p. 32.

²³Borg, American Policy, pp. 243-245, 263-264.

seemed to give approval to the efforts of the Chinese thereby destroying the basis of the Nine-Power Treaty. This he concluded led to the destruction of amicable relations with Japan. Although Secretary Kellogg emerged as a leader of foreign support for the nationalists, there remains, as previously discussed, some doubt as to the nature of the "support" that he received from his associates and the American populace. The widely held assumption that the United States sympathized with the Chinese falters somewhat when one considers that on this issue there existed no clear cut difference between "conservative" and "liberal" opinion, and for good reason. It was an issue that both could support - the "liberals" because of their ideals, and the "conservatives" because of their isolationist tendencies. Thus the United States government could and did support the nationalist impulse.²⁴

Dooman's argument that it was this attitude on the part of the United States which led the Japanese out of a period in which they were willing to cooperate and into a period of self-aggrandizement has received additional historical support. That shift, Dooman contended, was a natural outgrowth of Japan's desire for increased national well being and security. Here Dooman appears to have

²⁴Note: Borg does not bring up the question of this isolationist attitude in her work.

anticipated the later works of Bamba, Iriye, and Crowley whose books generally explored Japan's attempts to solve its diplomatic problems during the period in question. Their work expanded on ideas similar to Dooman's, although Iriye disputes the notion that "that the die was cast" in 1932, arguing persuasively the notion that other alternatives presented themselves to the Japanese in subsequent years. All agree that as a result of the nationalist movement in China and American reaction to it, international diplomacy in Asia broke down.

During the period between 1927 and 1931 Dooman remained on assignment in Tokyo, watching those shifts in international relations and biding his time. Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931, half a world away touched Dooman in London where he had been assigned as First Secretary of the embassy. The Council of the League of Nations convened a special meeting in Paris to consider the situation. Although the United States had not joined the League, its members persuaded the American government to send an unofficial representative to the council sessions. Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson designated Charles G. Dawes, then ambassador to Great Britain, and in a transatlantic telephone conversation recommended Dooman's services. Dooman soon found himself bound for Paris supposedly as Dawes' "specialist and guide on things Japanese." G. Howland Shaw, a Middle Eastern specialist was considered by Stimson to be "one of the best men in Europe."

Dawes' and Shaw's limited knowledge of Asian matters in general, and of the Manchurian incident in particular, made the presence of an East Asianist an obvious necessity. But, as Shaw saw it, Dooman's presence made little difference, since Dawes functioned without the benefit of advice from anyone.²⁵

Dooman, however, had opinions and gave advice in a lengthy memorandum, in which he analyzed the shifting of Japanese foreign policy and the poor planning that the department had undertaken in its attempts to cope with the situation in Asia. Somehow this came to the attention of

²⁵Department of State, Foreign Relations, 1931, Vol. III, the Far East (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1946), 407-414; EHD, pp. 10-11; Sara Smith, The Manchurian Crisis, 1931-1933: A Tragedy in International Relations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 158; Robert Ferrell, American Diplomacy in the Great Depression: Hoover-Stimson Foreign Policy, 1929-1933 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 147-149. The most thorough analysis of the Manchurian Incident is presented in Christopher Thorne, The Limits of Foreign Policy: The West, The League, and The Far Eastern Crisis of 1931-1933 (London: Hamish-Hamilton, 1972). Other texts dealing with the period, but not as extensive in coverage include Sadako N. Ogata, Defiance in Manchuria: The Making of Japanese Foreign Policy, 1931-1932 (Berkeley: Stanford University Press, 1964), and Crowley, Japan's Quest for Autonomy. Dooman's work did warrant a letter of appreciation from Stimson, noting his "efficient services . . . and manner during these delicate negotiations. . . ." 123D72/120, Stimson to Dooman, 2/3/1932.

General Frank McCoy, close friend and confidant of Stimson, and a member of the Lytton Committee.²⁶

"The Manchurian affair . . . is just the sort of thing that we in Tokyo had considered likely to happen," Dooman wrote. He complained that the embassy had warned of impending Japanese encroachment but that "F. E. [Division of Far Eastern Affairs] thought we were being unnecessarily exercised by an interesting problem but one that was entirely academic. . . ." This attitude sprang, Dooman alleged, (and he apologized for his "impertinence") from a preoccupation "with affairs of the moment." He stressed the fact that not enough time was given for planning ahead on "questions which are in a state of solution but likely to be precipitated at any time." This lack of planning, he continued, had

²⁶Memorandum, unsigned and undated, and marked as being from Dooman ("E.H.D., Emb. London, formerly Tokyo"), in the Frank L. McCoy papers, Library of Congress. McCoy served on the Lytton Commission that went to Manchuria to investigate the causes of the incident. For further information regarding McCoy see Who Was Who in America, Vol. III (Chicago: A. N. Marquis, Co., 1960), p. 574. The McCoy-Stimson relationship is established in Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, On Active Service in Peace and War (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), pp. 40, 115, 350. Both McCoy and Stimson had wanted to align the powers against Japan.

been caught completely unprepared and consequently found itself groping for answers.²⁷

Having made clear these observations, Dooman drew on his twenty years of service and experience, then he summoned his courage and let his inner feelings regarding American policy towards Japan be known. The West in general, and the United States in particular, had consistently, although erroneously, measured situations in Asia by "Occidental standards." There also seemed to exist, Dooman observed, an unequal set of standards for international behavior. The United States had cited its right of self-defense in implementing various policies in South America. France had done likewise in the Mediterranean, as had Britain in numerous

²⁷Dooman's allegation that the embassy had warned the department is not clearly supported by dispatches, May-Sept., 1931. The embassy had stated in its August report on political developments in Japan that there were rumors in the Japanese press regarding "radical changes" in Japanese policies toward Manchuria. But there was no further information available regarding the changes. 894.00PR/44, 8/1/1931, Edwin Neville to Secretary of State. In the September report, the embassy made reference to "The already tense relations between Japan and China over Manchuria. . . ." in describing the murder of a Japanese army officer who was murdered while traveling on an improper passport and carrying a large sum of money. His destination was Mongolia and the embassy concluded that his mission was one of "spying and propaganda." 894.00PR/45, 9/12/1931, Neville to Secretary of State. In an ex post facto comment, the embassy observed that the invasion of Manchuria "fanned into flame the feelings of irritation which had been smouldering in the minds of the Japanese over a long series of unsettled problems. . . ." 894.00/46, 10/9/1931. Stimson acknowledges that "we had known in the Department of the strained relations in Manchuria . . . [and] there had been preliminary warnings of possible trouble during the summer." Henry L. Stimson, The Far Eastern Crisis: Recollections and Observations (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936), p. 31.

parts of the world. Neither France, Britain, nor the United States, nor any other power for that matter, had submitted to arbitration by the League any question involving the national interests of these countries. Failure to do this was, Dooman pointed out, in violation of Article 2 of the Kellogg Pact which stipulated that "'all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be' should be settled by pacific means." He further argued that "the Chinese had refused to enter into direct negotiations. . . ." and at the same moment, the powers had insisted that "conditions in China are 'normal'" and thus negated "the Japanese contention that its forces [were] caught in the middle, unable to convince the Chinese or the Western powers of their claims that they were protecting their vital interests and acting as any other nation might in the same circumstances."²⁸

Dooman believed that the onus for settling the issues in question fell on the western powers according to the agreements entered into in the Nine-Power Treaty. Those powers, he insisted, had a legal obligation to ask Japan to seek a peaceful settlement. But those nations also had a moral obligation "to suggest to Japan a method of solution which they would adopt for themselves in analogous situations, at least to refrain from tacitly condoning Chinese intransigence."

²⁸Dooman in the McCoy papers.

Dooman concluded with what turned out to be his cure for the ills plaguing Japanese-American relations:

So long as the powers do not clearly indicate that they expect equity to be maintained, the Japanese will be suspicious of the good faith of their intervention. The atmosphere must first be changed; and when that is done, and the League's commission has finished its work, it should not be so difficult as it would be if things are left to drift for the two countries to be left to find a satisfactory settlement.²⁹

Instead there was a generally hostile atmosphere in the Department of State. One man in particular generated a feeling of enmity towards Japan: Stanley Hornbeck. He had been outraged by Japan's intrusion onto Chinese soil and he had solicited support for his idea "to condemn Japan and brand her an outlaw." But he lost to the wishes of cooler heads, including President Herbert Hoover and Stimson. The Secretary of State did, nonetheless, take Hornbeck into his confidence along with Undersecretary of State, Allen Klots, and Assistant Secretary James Grafton Rogers. Together they composed a letter enunciating America's response to Japanese plans for establishing an independent state in Manchuria. On January 7, 1932 Stimson sent his letter to the governments of both China and Japan. Stimson later revealed the gist of that note to the American public in an open letter to Senator William E. Borah, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee,

²⁹Ibid.

and a staunch isolationist who opposed American intervention. These two letters were the only public protests forthcoming from the United States.³⁰

The passive nature of his government's policy vexed Hornbeck and in a memorandum on January 12th, two days after the publication of the Stimson letter, Hornbeck registered his dissatisfaction. He agreed that China's inclination towards pacificism and its political disorganization "invited disciplining and despoiling," but he warned that the Japanese were "inclined towards imperialism," and were organized on the lines of "military feudalism." Thus, "her natural inclination is to use force rather than to rely on the possibilities of success by methods of persuasion."³¹

Hornbeck's warning seemed to be borne out when on January 28, Japanese troops stationed in Shanghai attacked Chinese units of the local Nationalist leader, Wang Ching-wei. The attacks followed a series of events including several murders of both Chinese and Japanese citizens. The murders

³⁰ Armin Rappaport, Henry L. Stimson and Japan: 1931-1933 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 38; Stimson and Bundy, p. 248. Hornbeck had originally favored the use of economic sanctions. Convinced of Japan's financial weakness, he suggested their use in September but Stimson and two of his assistants, James Grafton Rogers and Allen T. Klots objected, as did President Herbert Hoover. By December his plan had won support from Stimson and his aides and they submitted a formal plan of action to Hoover but the President again refused, professing a desire to avoid any confrontation. See Elting Morrison, Turmoil and Tradition: A Study of the Life and Times of Henry L. Stimson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960), p. 317.

³¹ 793.94/3610, Hornbeck Memorandum, 1/12/1932.

had been instigated by Japanese who had hoped to draw attention away from events in Manchuria. The fighting intensified, causing concern among the other powers in the Shanghai area, and the United States and Great Britain announced their intention of dispatching military reinforcements to the settlement.³²

The formal establishment of the puppet state of Manchukuo in March further enraged Hornbeck. In another memorandum entitled "China-Japan Affair: Problem of United States Far Eastern Policy," Hornbeck compared Japan to Prussia in 1914. In supporting his comparison, Hornbeck asserted that "as Prussian ideals and aspirations were in conflict with the rights and interests of Great Britain, so Japan's ideals and aspirations are today in conflict with those of the United States." Because of these conflicts, the United States, as one of the "advanced nations," had to take positive action to avoid war with the "backward and most reactionary of the great powers. . . . (Japan)."³³

To Hornbeck and other State Department officials, Japan's transgressions were obvious, and they cited numerous

³²Thorne, pp. 205-206, 211. It should be noted that Wang Ching-wei was a member of a rival faction of the Kuo-mingtang that did not support Chiang Kai-shek nor was the faction noted as being particularly anti-Japanese as was Chiang.

³³711.94/671, Hornbeck Memorandum, 3/8/1932.

violations of the Nine-Power Treaty as manifestations of that guilt. Dooman, in looking back at the period and remembering American violations of treaties, found it ironic that individuals, living in glass houses chose to throw rocks. Stimson had called attention to the treaty in his Borah letter, describing it as the "legal basis upon which rests the open door policy towards China." According to Stimson, Japan threatened the existence of that policy and the army had invaded Manchuria because it failed to respect Japan's treaty agreements. "We believe," he wrote, "that this situation would have been avoided had these covenants been faithfully observed. . . ." The secretary concluded his letter stating that "We concur with those statesmen representing all the nations in the Washington Conference who decided that China was entitled to make that our policy for the future."³⁴

Herein lay, though ever so subtle, the irony and the fact. The United States had dedicated itself unilaterally to aiding China while continuing to insist on Japanese adherence to the ideals of international cooperation. It seemed that the Americans used cooperation much as they would use a taxi - taking it as far as it was convenient, then leaving it for the use of others.

For Dooman, the contradictions inherent in this ironic relationship grew out of the United States' decision to

³⁴793.94/2411a, Stimson to Dawes, 11/14/1931.

"follow an independent course. . . ." foregoing "such procedures as friendly persuasion and counseling of the Chinese by the powers acting in concert." To Dooman, the reasons for that choice remained "an insolvable mystery." "The Nine-Power Treaty was," he contended, "inoperable without the full consultation and cooperation among its signatories. . . ." and between 1931 and 1941 the United States made this point in "dozens of notes. . . ." American dedication to the system lay in the shadow of other considerations, including the open door language of the Porter Resolution. How, Dooman asked, could a foreign government take seriously American pleas for multilateral efforts and agreements when its own lawmaking body had overwhelmingly passed a resolution that read in part:

The United States should now free itself from entangling relations with other powers whose policies are not identical with those of the United States.

The language of that resolution, coupled with American actions, indicated to the Japanese that "the United States had no legal responsibility or obligation to consult with the other signatories. . . ." and thus, Dooman concluded that "they regarded the contract . . . no longer binding."

We had gone our own way. We had disavowed any obligation to work with the other interested powers to bring the Chinese into line, And from the point of view of the Japanese, there was consequently no validity to the legal pieces of paper known as the

Nine-Power Treaty. To that extent, the United States contributed toward the creation of the crisis which eventually led to the Pacific war.³⁵

The roots of the United States-Japanese conflict therefore extended, in Dooman's mind, to events that occurred before 1931.

His work in the first two decades of service had won Dooman promotions, praise, and attention. In 1928, Stanley Hornbeck had asked that Dooman be assigned to the Division of Far Eastern Affairs in conjunction with a forthcoming leave.³⁶ Dooman did visit the division, but it was not until 1933 that he received permanent assignment, to the Japan desk, where he remained for a period of four years. He worked under the direct supervision of Hornbeck, a close associate of Stimson, and Hornbeck had undoubtedly read Dooman's "impertinent" letter to McCoy citing the numerous faults of the division. In addition, Hornbeck's penchant for China nearly matched Dooman's own propensity for Japan. A clash was inevitable.

³⁵EHD, pp. 53, 55.

³⁶123D72/73, Hornbeck to Division of Foreign Service Administration, 8/8/1928.

CHAPTER 3

YEARS OF TRYING -- TRYING YEARS

In 1933, Dooman returned home where he spent the next four years working at the Japan desk. His arrival coincided with Franklin D. Roosevelt's launching of a new deal, the President's attempt to cure America's economic ills. There emanated from Washington a new idealism, a conviction that problems plaguing the nation could be solved and things made better. Roosevelt, his cabinet, and a new elite, the "brain trust," epitomized this notion of revitalization. Beneath this frosting of things new, Dooman found continuity of the old existing in the form of anti-Japanese sentiment, both within and outside of government. Some American businessmen, bemoaning their financial state, claimed that Japanese competition, through unscrupulous practices, threatened their survival. Dooman also perceived this anti-feeling in his boss, Stanley Hornbeck. Although a personal conflict developed between the two men, it remained submerged in a routine of daily problems and particularly those necessitated by planning for and events surrounding the London Naval Conference, scheduled for 1935-1936.

America's depression had led to an increasingly inward focus of attitudes solidifying the isolationist impulse that had seized the nation following World War I. During the performance of his duties, Dooman found that this mentality manifested itself in numerous complaints from members of the business community. A large amount of his time went into investigations of various allegedly insidious tactics that Japanese companies used in their attempted encroachment upon the American market. One such case involved research into allegations that Japanese prophylactic toothbrush manufacturers had violated American patent rights when they used designs and brand names closely resembling their American made counterparts. Representatives of American firms argued that the Japanese imitations, introduced into the United States at a price substantially lower than the American product, threatened the existence of the American companies, and thus also threatened the nation's economic well being. A similar complaint regarding Japanese intentions of securing a monopoly in the production and sale of matches resulted from a Ripley's Believe it or Not report that the "crafty" Japanese had renamed a section of their country "Sweden," thereby enabling match manufacturers in that region to market matches embossed with the message "Made in Sweden." Use of this tactic had a two-fold purpose: First it permitted sale of an item which was cheaply produced in Japan but which

carried a symbol of excellence since Swedish matches had gained world-wide recognition. Additionally, the false labeling permitted the Japanese to import matches into the United States over and above the quota set for matches marked "Made in Japan."¹

Inquiries into these and similar allegations mirrored America's economic concerns and the business world's influence on the Department of State. The complaints and the investigations that they engendered also provide some indication of how Americans looked upon the Japanese. They seemed to have preferred images or stereotypes. There were reasons for such attitudes. As Walter Lippman later observed, stereotypes provide a defense. They offer an "ordered, more or less consistent picture of the world. . . ." Thus, stereotypes tend to promote security as they give a feeling of orderliness to a turbulent and disorderly range of daily experiences. In the turmoil of the Depression, Americans would have found it easy to believe the negative image of the Japanese popularized by contemporary magazines. Within the covers of some of the

¹See 611.006/matches series, 1934. See also 894.542/prophylactic toothbrush file, 1933-1934. The 611 file contains reports on similar complaints which were filed regarding liquor, sunglasses, lead pencils, cotton, and other products. Some investigations took up to four years to complete. As the Division was a rather small unit (manned by seven officers until 1934) the bulk of this work was completed by Dooman, the single Japan hand until the assignment of William T. Turner in October 1934. Department of State Register, 1935, p. 8.

most widely circulated journals, Americans learned that the Japanese had achieved economic success "thru unfair practices, conniving slyness, low standards of living [and] poor working conditions." In the words of journalist Edgar Snow who was basically a China hand, the Japanese were a "smirking, haughty, undersized, energetic, toothy, baffling, disciplined. . . ." people who threatened the "white man's prestige." The invasion of Manchuria marked, recorded Upton Close in a Saturday Evening Post article, Japan's "industrial invasion of the world." Close echoed an article that warned of impending Japanese economic warfare, that had appeared the previous year in the same magazine, noting that the Japanese government supported businesses and industry to the point where "The Nipponese bayonet and sample case invariably travel together."²

During his four-year assignment to the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Dooman found himself burdened with a multitude of apparently menial chores that resulted from, and reflected, typical diplomatic encounters. An investigation, for example, into the legal and ethical aspects regarding the importation of Japanese camelia trees intended for the wife of a United States senator, required Dooman's

²Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 63; Issac F. Marcossou, "Made in Japan," Saturday Evening Post, July 7, 1933, p. 5; Edgar Snow, "The Decline of Western Prestige," Saturday Evening Post, August 26, 1933, p. 12; Upton Close, "Trade Follows the Flag - Home," Saturday Evening Post, October 11, 1933, p. 11; Marcossou, "The Japanese Smokescreen," Saturday Evening Post, May 7, 1932, p. 3.

attention. A complaint from the Japanese embassy in Washington concerning government publication of a 1919 document in reference to Japanese operations in Shantung during World War I necessitated some diplomatic maneuvering, and it became Dooman's responsibility to convince the embassy's representative that publication of the document would not, as the attache had suggested, have "undesirable repercussions in Japan. . . ." Dooman succeeded in his task, pointing out that the document in question merely set forth the Department of State's position. That position "closely followed" President Woodrow Wilson's and the Japanese had not, Dooman commented, objected to publication of the President's statement which appeared in the same volume. Besides, he added pragmatically, "the type has already been set."³

From these and similar episodes, he discovered what others had apparently known for sometime - that "being in charge of the Japan desk" afforded less dignity and carried less prestige than the title implied. Early in 1934, Professor Payson J. Treat of the History Department, Stanford University and a specialist in Japanese-American diplomatic relations, had written to Robert McClintock, American vice-consul at Kobe and a former student, that "lack of a well-experienced Japan hand . . . at the Division desk. . . ."

³093.941/67, Dooman memorandum 4/21/1934; 026. foreign relations/691, record of conversation, Dooman and Okazaki, 5/5/1934.

left something to be desired. In his reply, McClintock told Treat that "your wish . . . has come true," as "they have transferred First Secretary Dooman . . .," who "is, with the exception of Counsellor Neville, probably our most experienced Japan man." Commenting on the nature and bias of the division, McClintock speculated that Dooman had been chosen as part of the President's request to strengthen the Japanese section, and that required a man with "the weight of rank or years to stand up to the old China hands led by Dr. Hornbeck." Treat presented a further commentary on the Chinese orientation of the division and the magnitude of Hornbeck's power in subsequent correspondence:

I am very glad to hear that Dooman was about to be sent to the Department. I know him and have a very high regard for him . . . I hardly expect him to stand up to the Ph.D. Chief, but perhaps the Big Shot himself will turn to Dooman for advice on purely Japanese affairs. When I was working downstairs in 1928-29, the Japanese hands were huddled in a little office across the hall from the Chief.⁴

Dooman, unaware of this exchange of views, learned for himself what it meant to be a Japan hand working for the "Ph.D. Chief." Following Dooman's temporary assignment to

⁴Payson J. Treat, had been researching material for his book Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Japan: 1853-1895 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1932). Correspondence between Treat and McClintock is contained in the Payson J. Treat papers, Archives of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. Treat to McClintock, 2/8/1934; McClintock to Treat, 3/14/1934; Treat to McClintock, 4/3/1934. These letters were provided by Dr. Marlene J. Mayo, University of Maryland, for use in this essay.

the Division in 1932, Hornbeck had prepared a written report on his future Japan expert. Hornbeck credited Dooman with "an unusually effective working knowledge of and general proficiency in the use of the Japanese language," and possession of a "satisfactory" personality. He further noted that Dooman was "tactful and willing. . . ." with "no objectionable habits. . . ." while being "agreeable in appearance and manner." The evaluation focused, however, on Dooman's shortcomings. "On the whole," Hornbeck averred, "his performance fell short of the high quality which . . . had been expected." His "knowledge of Japan, the Japanese people and Japanese foreign relations. . . ." failed, in Hornbeck's mind, to counterbalance the lack of "knowledge of the United States and of American foreign relations in general." Despite a "keenness in analysis and discussion of problems. . . .," Hornbeck decried Dooman's "lack of imagination. . . .;" and "constructive initiative." Continuing in this vein, Hornbeck alleged that Dooman's prime concern centered around "certain financial aspects of the relationship between himself and the service. . . ."

Dooman's failure to "work overtime . . . unless absolutely required. . . ." evidently led to the charge that Dooman failed to match up with other officers when "given the opportunity to 'show their stuff.'" Using what might best be described as a back handed compliment, Hornbeck hinted at Dooman's abilities, attributing his shortcomings to a

lack of experience in that Dooman did not "apprehend fully the difference between the work . . . and tempo . . . of a political division in the Department and the work of an embassy or consulate in Japan." In summing up, Hornbeck wrote that he construed Dooman's qualifications and capacities to be far greater than would appear from his report and he theorized that Dooman's apparent ineptitude sprang from three factors: "the temporary character of his detail to the Department . . . the fact that the whole of his experiences . . . had been in Japan," and finally, with perhaps a subtle hint of an ethnic slur, "the inheritance and temperament of this officer."⁵

Dooman, in return, was to find his boss less than perfect and with a special temperament of his own. Dooman (in later years) characterized Hornbeck as an individual who lacked an "objective mind." "He had," Dooman believed, "two supreme passions. One was a feeling of affection and sympathy for China. And the second was a pathological hatred of Japan and the Japanese." Although he could only speculate about the cause of these feelings (perhaps an "unpleasant experience" while Hornbeck was a "young man teaching in Mukden. . . ."), Dooman concluded that these

⁵Hornbeck's evaluation of Dooman, FSO, Class III, 5/24/1933, Box 146, Hornbeck papers. Provided by Marlene J. Mayo, Associate Professor, History Department, University of Maryland.

two inclinations acted as the "motivating elements" in Hornbeck's "conception of dealing with Japan." Given this mutual antipathy, Dooman described his four years at the Japan desk as "an unpleasant experience."⁶

The winter of 1933-34 had witnessed a deluge of rumors raising questions about the possibility of a change in America's Far Eastern policy commensurate with the change in administrations in Washington. Hornbeck quashed these rumors on December 11, 1934 in a speech that received much attention in Japan. In it, he assured the world that no change would be forthcoming and that the Roosevelt administration, as had Hoover's, would not recognize "governments made by swords." The following year, the United States' navy sent a flight of six flying boats to Honolulu and the army dispatched ten bombers to an air base in Alaska. Both incidents received great play in the Japanese press and exaggerated already existing fears among the Japanese. Brigadier General William "Billy" Mitchell's speech in October 1934 had a further amplifying effect when he urged construction of air units designed specifically for attacks on Japan.⁷ On the heels of these displays, which the

⁶EHD, p. 108.

⁷William Neuman, America Encounters Japan: From Perry to MacArthur (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1965), pp. 201-208; U. S. Department of State, "Principles of American Foreign Policy in Relation to the Far East," address by Stanley K. Hornbeck before the Ninth Conference on the Causes and Cure of War, Washington, D. C., 11/18/1934.

Japanese press interpreted as belligerent acts, America's minister to the Netherlands suggested that he be sent on an official visit to the Dutch East Indies.

Since 1933 the governments of Japan and Holland had been involved in a series of trade disputes growing out of the Dutch colonial government's issue of quotas and restrictions affecting imported Japanese goods. By 1935, the two nations were engaged in commercial warfare. In view of this situation, the Japanese had taken careful note of public discussions in the Netherlands as to whether the United States would support Dutch colonial possessions in the Pacific from possible Japanese economic or military expansion.⁸

Members of the Division found themselves enmeshed in this conflict as a result of a suggestion made by American Minister to the Netherlands Grenville T. Emmet that he visit Pacific islands belonging to the Netherlands. Various individuals in the Department of State supported his plan, and it drew the attention and patronage of President Roosevelt. Hornbeck, for one, considered it an "excellent plan . . ." as "it would at least cause among the Japanese all sorts of conjectures, some suspicions and some real worry . . ." and

Government Printing Office, 1934). The term "Far East" was widely used during the period under study, but has recently been discouraged because of its ethnocentric and imperialistic origins. Academicians now prefer the term East Asia which is more specific, referring to China, Japan, and Korea, while the Department uses the term to include Southeast Asia as well.

⁸033.1156D/3, Roosevelt to Hull, 4/25/1935.

as such the trip would be a "helpful" move. Having voiced his personal feelings, Hornbeck then cautioned against the visit and at the same time alluded to a rift of opinion within his own "bailiwick," stating that "I have not the slightest doubt but that the Japanese (and probably a good number of other people -- including not a few of our nationals) would assume that there was something special and important 'doing.'" When called upon several weeks later, Hornbeck reiterated his complete accord "in principle" with the visit but added that the political assumptions it would engender did not warrant the risk of such a misunderstanding. "This proposal," he wrote in April 1935, "should not be approved."⁹

Dooman did not share his superior's feelings about the results that Emmet's sojourn might have vis-a-vis Japanese-American relations, nor did he hesitate to explain the reasons for his opposition. After carefully detailing the existing Japanese-Netherlands' economic confrontation, he added his personal viewpoint in a memorandum that Hornbeck sent to Phillips and Hull. "There exists," Dooman concluded, "not only in this country, but in Far Eastern countries an impression that the United States has assumed an obligation to maintain the territorial integrity of China." Accordingly, the proposed visit to the East Indies would only enhance Japanese consternation over America's continuing involvement

⁹033,1156D/1 and 2, two memoranda from Hornbeck to William Phillips, 12/14/1934 and 4/23/1935.

and, Dooman surmised, "no benefit which may accrue to the United States from a visit . . . would . . . offset the international difficulties (suspicions) created by the confusion of thought which would arise. . . ."10

The timing of Emmet's request added significance to the controversy that ensued as it came during preliminary talks undertaken in connection with the forthcoming London Naval Conference. His request had in fact come just days before Japanese officials made known their plans to abrogate those naval treaties scheduled for renegotiation in 1935. While the subtle differences in Doomans and Hornbeck's political posture appeared in their respective memoranda issued in response to Emmet's proposal, the papers that each drew up regarding the naval conference clarified those differences.

The conference was an outgrowth of earlier ones that had taken place in 1921-1922 and 1930. Agreements reached at Washington in 1922 had been generally satisfactory to all parties and had set a tone of international cooperation. The second came, however, during a period of internal upheaval in Japan. Cooperation that had been the keynote of Japanese-Western relations after 1922, seemed threatened in 1927 when General Tanaka Giichi assumed Japan's Premiership. Under Tanaka, Japan's military undertook expeditions in China, an

¹⁰033.1156D/2H/DF, Dooman memorandum, 4/23/1935.

action which won support from economically depressed Japanese who interpreted the move as a part of the new Premier's "positive" policy. But, like his predecessors, Tanaka could not satisfy the multi-interests of the many Japanese political factions including the military. In 1928, a group of Japanese army officers, dissatisfied with Tanaka's efforts, forecast his decline when their troops precipitated the assassination of Chang Tso-lin, the ruling Warlord in Northern China. Tanaka's cabinet fell in 1929 as a result of the incident. In November, Hamaguchi Osachi, who succeeded Tanaka, announced his intention to participate in the naval conference scheduled to begin two months later. Japan's participation came under the direction of Foreign Minister Shidehara Kijuro, who sought re-establishment of Japanese-Western cooperation in hopes of achieving peace, stability, and prosperity in East Asia.¹¹

Shidehara attained his goal and yet failed. Under intense pressure from the United States in Britain, Japan's delegates to the conference forewent their objective of attaining a 10:7 ratio in heavy cruisers, accepting instead a 10:6 ratio. Ratification by the Emperor depended on a favorable recommendation from the Privy Council where discussions raged pro and

¹¹For a lengthy explanation of the Tanaka/Shidehara policy towards China and the problems raised by Chang Tso-lin, see Iriye After Imperialism, Chapter V, "Coprosperity in Manchuria," and pp. 205-214.

con, bringing Hamaguchi's "soft" policy under fire. Despite their reluctance and fierce opposition from the navy's Chief of Staff and a hostile press over a period of two months, the council recommended approval. Here success turned to failure as the turmoil created led to Hamaguchi's assassination a few weeks later. The upheaval continued, increasing in the years preceding the 1935 conference.

The second naval conference, scheduled to convene in London five years after the first, foreshadowed the eventual clash between Japan and the United States and its ally Great Britain. Each of these nations envisioned differently the conference's purposes. The Western allies entertained thoughts of talks geared to producing a phoenixlike resurrection of the Washington treaty system, then in ashes. Japanese officials, under growing influence of several political and military groups, determined to assert their nation's equality with that of the western nations. From the outset, a common idea seized officials in both of the nations that the conference would fail. Thus, the participants held fast to their own positions and simultaneously tried fostering the idea that any failure was the result of the other's intransigence.

By early 1934, American officials involved in the planning stages, including Dooman, realized that the distinct possibility existed of Japan's withdrawal from the Washington and London treaty agreements, should the latter be denied

parity with the western nations. Hornbeck preferred seeing Japan's withdrawal if parity was the only alternative and he agreed with a contemporary journalist who equated such action as "ratifying Japan's Monroe Doctrine." Hornbeck, like many of his associates, clung to the belief that national security depended on overwhelming naval strength and that abandoning a position of relative power for the sake of maintaining a treaty made little sense. Thus, in the early stages of conference planning, he advised that the fixed ratios were "correct" and should stand, adding that the United States and Britain should meet any demand for changes that Japan might make with a refusal to hold a conference.¹²

Military leaders in Japan, particularly naval officers, who had been humbled in 1930, objected. They were determined that Japan would achieve parity with the west. The Kwangtung army's success in its Manchurian adventure stimulated thoughts of empire and lent credence to the idea that Japan needed a firm policy in East Asia. Carrying out any "positive" policy, while at the same time

¹²500.A15A5/34, Dooman memorandum, "Japanese insistence upon participation in any preliminary conversations which may be held with regard to naval limitation;" 2/6/1934; 500.A15A5/277 1/2, Hornbeck to Hull, and Phillips, 11/16/1934; 500.A15A5/135, Hornbeck memorandum, "Naval Conference: Preliminary Conversations," 6/25/1934; 500.A15A5/53 1/2, Hornbeck to Hull, 7/23/1934; 500.A15A5/45 1/2, Hornbeck to Hull, 3/31/1934; 894.00/533, Dooman to Maxwell Hamilton, and Hornbeck, 8/9/1934.

providing an adequate self defense, required a stronger military, a position that naval officers felt had been undermined by the agreements of 1930. By 1933, moderate admirals (proponents of disarmament) no longer held influential positions, victims of political machinations carried out by members of the more radical "fleet faction."¹³

Outside of the military developments on the national and international scene abetted the navy's campaign. In their attempts to maintain domestic tranquility, proponents of disarmament found themselves out of political office. In 1932, the Minseito, Japan's pro-disarmament party lost its majority in the Diet to its rivals in the Seiyukai. The latter favored a firm policy and also the capture of Manchuria with its rich resources had lifted hopes for Japan's economic recovery. These changes enhanced the military's power when in 1933 it received further support for its advocacy of a stronger navy. The United States had reduced construction of naval vessels after the onslaught of the Depression, but as part of Roosevelt's new deal, the administration announced plans for increased naval spending and construction, enabling Japan's military leaders to promote themselves and their ideas for a strong navy to a point where they won popular support for their

¹³Stephen E. Pelz, The Race to Pearl Harbor: The Failure of the Second London Naval Conference and the Onset of World War II, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 14, 16.

demands of parity. They resolved that failure to achieve satisfaction would not be compromised by another ratio agreement. Abrogation or parity were the only alternatives.¹⁴

Officials, both civilian and military, in the United States charted the various developments in Japan and at the same time plotted their own course of action. For American naval leaders there existed only one direction: increased naval construction that would bring the United States up to its treaty limits as soon as possible. This required convincing their new Commander in Chief that their needs superseded and surpassed the arguments of American isolationists and economic conservatives. They found an ally in Roosevelt.

The Department of State interpreted the problem differently. Unhappy with Japan's aggressive action on the Asian mainland, American diplomats faced a dilemma; how could Japan be controlled if the Japanese were, as they had indicated in Manchuria, insensitive to international pressure. This was complicated by the fact that military coercion did not exist as an option since the western powers lacked the strength and the desire to use it.

America's hopes then seemed to rest in having Japan adhere to the already existing ratio. Should attempts to realize this end fail, the United States had to make it appear that the Japanese caused the breakdown of international

¹⁴Pelz, 13, 40-41, 81.

cooperation. By the winter of 1933, the first alternative ran out. W. Cameron Forbes, former American Ambassador to Japan and who had retired the preceding year, stopped by to chat with Hornbeck. They discussed the former Ambassador's views regarding disarmament, and Forbes suggested that the military element in Japan had gained a predominant position and that "no Japanese statesman will dare sign an agreement leaving the ratio as it is."¹⁵

The evolution of American policy clearly required a depth of understanding and an equal amount of adept maneuvering. Dooman provided just that. Forbes had suggested to Hornbeck that the United States and Britain use political pressure as a means of bringing about Japan's continued acceptance of the 10:6 ratio produced a sharp reply from Dooman. Aware of Japan's sensitivity to allied force directed at the Japanese, Dooman warned against the strategy since in the past they had evinced "no satisfactory results," but only raised the possibility of reviving" in full strength the fanatical spirit of 1931 and 1932." He suggested, as an alternative that the United States should take its time, noting that this alternative left two years before the conference convened, "by which time there may be a favorable change in the atmosphere."¹⁶

¹⁵500.A15A5/14, Memorandum of Conversation, Hornbeck and Forbes, 12/14/1935; 500.A15A5/15, Dooman to Hornbeck, 12/15/1935.

¹⁶Ibid., 500.A15A5/23, Hornbeck to Phillips, 1/12/1934.

Such a change seemed unlikely in 1933 and in early 1934, as members of the navy's "fleet faction" secured top naval positions. One of these, Admiral Suetsugu Nobumasa, who had risen to the rank of Commander in Chief of the combined imperial fleet, fanned the diplomatic fires with comments carried in a news story that reached Hornbeck's desk. The admiral warned of an impending "trade war between Japan and America . . ." in which the United States would have the support of the other "powers." Faced with this threat Japan had little choice but to depend on its military preparedness and therefore would not concede its position of "armament equality." Hornbeck deemed Suetsugu's remarks "significant" though "not conclusive." In a report to Phillips, the Division's Chief reported that Suetsugu was "the leader of the ultra-nationalistic element in the Japanese navy . . . and he commands considerable influence among that group . . ."

Dooman had provided Hornbeck with the description of Suetsugu and cautioned him that the latter's comments "need not be taken as more nor less than the words of one admiral." But Hornbeck nonetheless interpreted the remarks as "significant," perhaps because the two men's opinions complemented one another. The admiral's comment that "a naval treaty does not bring peace . . . (or) reduce financial burdens," Hornbeck felt, was "right to the point." The admiral's contention that "we do not believe that diplomacy will settle the issues and we are determined to prepare for the worst possibilities of

an economic and political clash . . ." not only described, in Hornbeck's mind, "the general view of the Japanese," but was an idea that he appraised as "thoroughly realistic." Hornbeck seemed a firm adherent of Suetsugu's ideas and he used a similar argument that America's national security rested on possession of a superior navy and therefore the United States had to "proceed as rapidly as possible with naval construction."¹⁷

The antagonistic views shared by these men, exchanged even before the preliminary talks began, indicated that little hope for a successful conference existed. Internal political developments within Japan worsened daily, prompting Ambassador Grew to report in January of 1934 that despite the existence of a "liberal" and "conciliatory view" in Japan regarding naval limitation, the navy would "have the final say at the conference in 1935." Dooman corroborated Grew's position, commenting that the Japanese navy did indeed have "unrestricted freedom . . . to determine naval policy."¹⁸

Planning for the conference continued, however, and Dooman took various opportunities to express his opinions

¹⁷500.A15A5/135, Hornbeck memorandum, "Naval Conference: Preliminary Conversations," 6/25/1934.

¹⁸500.A15A5, Telegram 650, Grew to Secretary of State, 1/22/1934; 500.A15A5/34, Dooman memorandum, "Japanese insistence upon participation in any preliminary conversations which may be held with regard to naval limitation," 2/6/1934.

and demonstrate his understanding of the immediate and the long range problems involved in Japanese-American political relations. Expounding on a naval attache's report from Tokyo, Dooman warned of impending dangers inherent in a suggestion for preliminary Anglo-American talks. Recalling past experiences (and personal knowledge), he cautioned discretion in all actions so as not to arouse Japanese fears of a western conspiracy. He reiterated his point that "influential Japanese" had in the past expressed to him their determination that "Japan would never again offer an opportunity to be caught off its feet." Any preliminary talks excluding Japan would, he contended, provide the Japanese with an excuse - that the western powers were once again plotting together against Japan - allowing them to withdraw from the conference. Dooman's recommendation was to avoid all talks excluding Japan, leaving the onus for failure of the conference on the Japanese.¹⁹

On April 20, 1934, a relatively junior officer in Japan's Foreign Office, Amō Eiji, produced what he described as an "unofficial" statement regarding Japan's new Asian policy as necessitated by foreign assistance to China. The document said in effect that Japan had "special responsibilities in East Asia," and that the Japanese would oppose collaboration among other powers that might be detrimental

¹⁹Ibid.

to China or Japan, or the stability of East Asia. Japan's Foreign Minister, Hirota Koki, attempted to soften the tone of the "Amau Statement" several days later. His efforts had little effect as most westerners interpreted Amo's statement to be an accurate description of Japan's new hard line.²⁰

Four days after Amo met with reporters, Dooman reacted by preparing a memorandum analyzing this new development that he sent to Norman Davis who had been designated to

²⁰The spelling of Amo's name had been, until recently, Amau. This was an error in transliteration. U. S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan: 1931-1941, Vol. I (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1943), pp. 224-225, Foreign Relations volumes are hereinafter referred to as FRUS. Dorothy Borg, The United States and the Far Eastern Crisis of 1933-1935: From the Manchurian Incident throughout the Initial Stage of the Undeclared Sino-Japanese War (Cambridge: Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964). Borg has a rather detailed account of the incidents which preceded the "Amau Statement" and American reaction to it. See "The Challenge of the Amau Doctrine," pp. 46-99. Borg describes the statement as a Japanese attempt "to prevent the rehabilitation (particularly economic) of China" and that it "constituted a more direct challenge to the West." p. 55. In his essay on "The Role of the Department of State" Thomson contends that the significance of Amo's action was that the episode solidified relations among the members of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and the President. It also reflected American "post-Manchurian, post-Stimsonian . . . disinclination to respond with vigor . . . to the evolving shape of Japanese intentions." p. 96. Iriye, in commenting on "The Role of the United States Embassy in Tokyo," reaches the same conclusion as Thomson regarding the situation in the Department but that the doctrine more firmly convinced Grew of mounting Japanese expansionism. He also notes that the Ambassador interpreted Hirota's role in correcting the misunderstanding caused by the statement as further proof of the influence of Japanese "moderates" in controlling foreign policy. pp. 112-113.

head the American Delegation to the London Conference. This, Dooman wrote, "can only be considered as an abandonment by Japan of the principles enunciated in the Nine-Power Treaty." Amo's statement and others like it, he continued, "indicate beyond any possibility of a doubt that it is not the intention of Japan to agree to the acceptance . . . of the naval ratio now allotted to her . . . [and] that the conference, if held would be abortive." Japan did have, however, reasons for continued adherence to the Washington treaty, "particularly the advantage . . . of maintaining the present restriction on fortifications in the Pacific." Consequently, he concluded that Japan would want to see the conference held, and would call for its opening if none of the powers acted.²¹

Obviously distressed by the entire series of events, particularly that of Amo, Dooman reversed his earlier position. He suggested that the United States and Great Britain announce their intention of withdrawing from the Washington treaty system and then invite France and Italy to participate in a separate gathering. Despite "its chances of bringing forth something concrete," Dooman wrote, "a conference of the four powers would at least have a chance of arriving at some arrangement." Such a conference, "would, by emphasizing

²¹FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. I, p. 227.

the isolation of Japan, have a moral effect incalculably greater than any statement or practicable action denunciatory of Japan's disregard for treaties.²²

Given a day to reconsider his suggestions, Dooman tempered his remarks. In a memorandum sent to Davis on the 25th, Dooman reiterated his point that "the power party to the treaty which would be most apt to violate the treaty has, in effect, withdrawn from it. . . ." and thereby reduced "the importance and value of . . ." it. But he noted that:

In giving consideration to the question of denunciation by any power of the Washington Naval Treaty, it would be necessary to give thought to the effect of denunciation upon the status of the political treaties of the Washington Conference.

Dooman pondered the problem of the American public's reaction to its government's denunciation of the treaties, suggesting that it would be seen "as a jettisoning of fundamental American policies." In a subtle manner he also moderated his call for denunciation of the treaties. In the first note he had suggested that action, but in the second he shifted to a passive statement: "If it be decided to act towards denunciation of the Naval Treaty, the two political treaties [the Four-Power and Nine-Power] should be allowed to stand until

²²Dooman to Davis, memorandum. "Naval Policy and the Far East: Exclusion of Japan from Treaties for the Limitation of Naval Armament," 4/24/1934, Norman Davis Papers, Box 70, Library of Congress.

an opportunity is had, in conference with Great Britain and if possible with other interested Western powers, to decide. . . ." on the future of those agreements.²³

Dooman's dedication to achieving the best position possible for the United States in the diplomatic jousting related to the doomed naval conference never clouded his sensitivity to Japanese awareness of western antipathy. He knew that events like the triple intervention in 1895, and the Immigration Act in 1924 had worked to the disadvantage of good Japanese-Western relations. Indeed, the feeling that they would not be "caught off their feet" had become a driving force in Japanese diplomatic dealings. Dooman maintained that by 1934 this drive had become more than a "sentimental emotion" as Grew had suggested. This feeling, Dooman observed, had, between 1931 and 1934, taken on a "utilitarian purpose." The Japanese envisioned themselves as constant victims of western conspiracies and thus had set forth on an attempt to prove - particularly to the Chinese, that Japan would no longer be coerced into unacceptable agreements. Dooman pointed out that the end

²³Dooman to Davis, "Political Treaties of the Washington Conference: The Effect Thereon of Termination of the Naval Treaties," 4/25/1934, Davis Papers, Box 70. Dooman was a member of the American Delegation for the preliminary sessions and the full session. He went out as an adviser from the Department of State. It was during the full session that he suffered a bleeding duodenal ulcer that confined him to bed for sometime and would later become a source of serious illness. FRUS, 1935, Vol. I, p. 64; Interview with Mrs. Dooman.

product that the Japanese hoped for was a concert of Japan and China's foreign policies.²⁴

Japanese machinations springing from their determination to achieve their ends paralleled those of the Western allies, and the resulting antagonism ensured the failure of the conference. The United States had hoped to avoid any confrontation while quietly racing to bring its fleet strength upwards toward treaty limits. Great Britain's government plotted the most likely ways of securing, through more treaty agreements, protection for their Eastern empire, and it was they who watched with increasing trepidation as hopes for successful negotiations dwindled. Their concern over unlimited growth of the Japanese fleet made them prone to granting concessions but an intransigent United States precluded any hopes for "a deal." The ultimate cost of failure of the conference went beyond the predictions of some of the policy makers who had facilitated the collapse of the treaty system. Most felt that the likely result would be an arms race. Within the United States' government, Hornbeck predicted that Japan would eventually fall behind in naval arms production because of a lack of natural resources, a factor, he suggested, that limited growth of Japan's navy to a point of "natural limits"

²⁴Telegram, 1333, Grew to Secretary of State, 5/31/1935, FRUS, 1935, Vol. I, p. 68; 500.A15A5/419, Dooman to Hamilton, 6/20/1935.

by 1937. In light of this, he went on, the United States would win any naval race and thus be capable of supporting its foreign policy in Asia. Dooman agreed with his boss that "there may be some possibility that the Japanese would eventually be exhausted by a naval race." But, he pointed out, almost in prophetic terminology, that those circumstances could cause the Japanese, "in desperation . . . [to] bring the competition to an end by seeking hostilities."²⁵

On January 15, 1936, the Japanese delegation walked out of the conference making good their declared intentions. The announcement left little doubt that effective January 1, 1937, Japan would, for the first time in a decade and a half, be free from binding contracts with the United States and Britain. It also marked the advent of a program that had as a conclusion the hostilities which Dooman had predicted. The recalcitrant Japanese admirals who sought to gain a decided military advantage were partially responsible for the failure of the conference. Their demands for parity and their inflexibility had as their source motivations other than naval predominance in the Pacific. Commenting on those reasons, Grew quoted from a Japanese newspaper thoughts that coincided with those set forth in Dooman's 1935 memorandum in which he had suggested that Japan wanted to demonstrate that it was a first class power. The Chugai article clearly linked Japan's action at London to its policy in China:

²⁵Pelz, pp. 128-129; 500.A15A5/631, Hornbeck memorandum, 1/16/1936; 500.A15A5/15, Dooman memorandum, 12/15/1933.

In the present conference this country has adopted a policy which does not give China the slightest cause to believe that Japan is subservient to Great Britain and the United States. Japan's policy in the conference has been independence. Thus it would be hard for China to see in it any sign of weakness.²⁶

The question of responsibility went, however, beyond those Japanese admirals and even beyond Japan's desire to demonstrate its independence to China. It lay also with the shapers of American foreign policy; men like Hull and Hornbeck. The latter had made his feelings about the Japanese quite clear on numerous occasions but never were they so distinct as in his memorandum of March 27, 1935. "The people and Government of the United States want peace," he wrote. "The people and Government of Japan are not so soliticious about peace." With this as his premise he went on to show that a major cause of misunderstanding sprang from the Japanese inability to honor laws and treaties. "They do not believe as firmly as we do in regulation by law and by contract and by treaty; nor are their concepts of laws and contracts and treaties of respect which should be given them identical with ours." For Hornbeck, a man given to a legalistic point of view, the crux of the problem lay in this failure to abide by treaties and consequently the United States could expect,

²⁶The Japanese plan and the work of the admirals is part of the thesis that is set forth in Pelz; 500.A15A5/491, Dooman memorandum, 6/20/1935; FRUS, 1936, Vol. IV, pp. 25-28.

he forecasted, "barring unpredictable political accidents or acts of God," war with Japan.²⁷

War was an inevitable outgrowth of a "war minded" people according to Hornbeck's thesis, and the Japanese were, he believed, seized with the "militarist" fervor. Dooman disputed Hornbeck's argument that a Japanese military clique had taken control of the nation and had popular support. Dooman agreed that a "militarist trend" had a popular base, adding quickly that "there had been two occasions in recent Japanese history when public upheaval had brought about and supported a more pacific and cooperative policy . . .," and that this pattern presented a possible precedent for a shift in policy, "although it might be a long process."²⁸

Hornbeck's attitude prevailed throughout the period of the naval conference, having its roots in the post-Manchurian Incident feelings toward Japan. Policy-makers in the Department of State marshalled support for their inexorable contention, based on that 1931 confrontation, that Japan and the United States shared a mutual enmity, a consequence of what one officer in the division described as a "white man's burden;" an attitude that the Japanese were aware of and it had convinced them that "the United States is in their way."

²⁷711.94/1034, Hornbeck memorandum, 3/27/1935.

²⁸FRUS, 1935, Vol. I, p. 65.

Japanese officials, enjoying as they were, "successful military operations," in Manchuria, had developed a "war minded" consciousness and they justified Japan's actions on the continent as a legitimate effort to fulfill Japan's "inevitable destiny." Therein lay the basis of what Hornbeck described as Japan's "Janus headed foreign policy." Japanese "liberal elements" lacked control over Japan's foreign policy, which was in the hands of military leaders who effected this two faced policy - one with a "smiling, refined face . . ." looking eastward, while an "expression of . . . Attila. . . ." faced west. Based on these conclusions, Hornbeck had advised his superiors, Phillips and Hull, that "in dealing with Japan we are dealing with a military and militant state," and that those same military leaders believed that the Far Eastern policy of the United States threatened their efforts to a point that there existed the possibility of war. The resulting problem facing American officials of this persuasion was how to cope with this military state without betraying their biases or appearing to be belligerent.²⁹

Since 1922, the treaty system, while not as effective a tool as some Americans would have preferred, served as a vehicle for checking Japanese aggression. The system worked in great measure, not because there existed an enforcement

²⁹711.94/822, two memoranda, one by Joseph E. Jacobs, the other by Hornbeck, were sent to Phillips and Hull on 6/12/1933.

body capable of carrying out sanctions, but because the Japanese had been willing to adhere to western concepts of international behavior. But by the 1930's, they became aware that the treaty system had paid few dividends in their behalf, and they began a counter attack on the western standards that they had tolerated for over a decade. They began in 1931 with their invasion of Manchuria, elevated the attack with their withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933, and reached a peak with their abrogation of the treaty system itself in 1936.

Dooman perception of the Japanese viewpoint emerged in a note delivered to Hull and Phillips via Hornbeck a few weeks after Japan announced its intention to abrogate the agreement. Rather than being offended by the apparent disregard for contracts of cooperation, Dooman urged that westerners should examine the "oriental concepts" of legal pacts.

Pursuing this logic, he went on to explain that:

To the Japanese a contract is essentially a declaration of intent, and not, as it is to the Occidental, a definition of the rights and obligations in regard to a given set of circumstances of the respective parties. It is an accepted principle among Japanese . . . that if the circumstances in which a contract is to be fulfilled are modified, they party adversely affected by the change may in good faith claim relief pari passu with the modified circumstances.

Perhaps the major difference in understanding contracts came in the settlement of claims, as Dooman indicated:

The party favorably affected by the change is expected to refrain from asserting his full legal rights, and if he should reject a proposal to compromise and seek redress . . . the onus tends to fall upon the plaintiff, for the reason that he has refused to compromise, rather than on the respondent for failure to carry out the terms of the contract.

In view of this understanding of contracts, and as a result of changes that had taken place since 1931, the Japanese simply wished to exercise their right to abridge the agreements and forego their obligations thereunder, in 1935.³⁰

Dooman posed the immediate question that arose from this situation: "Is it possible for two nations with fundamentally different conceptions of the significance of a contract to develop between themselves satisfactory relations on the basis of contractual arrangements?" He answered in the negative, but added that it was a gray area that had previously gone unexplored. He went on to explain that without this understanding, the United States could not establish satisfactory relations with Japan if the American relied solely upon the basis of the exercise of rights, and the fulfillment of obligations arising out of contractual agreements. He proffered instead a call for a "convincing show of good will . . ." and "a sympathetic, cooperative and helpful attitude toward Japan. . . ." while abstaining,

³⁰711.94/1025, Dooman memorandum, "Relations Between the United States and Japan: Occidental and Oriental Concepts of the Effect of Contracts," 2/7/1935.

wherever practicable from initiating intervention in situations affecting . . ." that nation. "I cannot but feel," he closed, "that the problem of maintaining relations with Japan on a satisfactory basis calls for something over and beyond care in the exercise of legal rights and observance of legal obligations. . . ." ³¹

Undaunted by these suggestions, individuals in the Department continued pressing for a treaty settlement and insisting that Japan remain bound to its treaty commitments. Both Hull and Hornbeck revealed in legalist theory and they represented the prevailing attitude in Washington. Ratification of pledges made at the conference in 1921 had elated Hornbeck, who felt that his own concerns for China had been set down in terms of international law:

That these provisions have given the Open Door policy a new and enhanced position in the realm of international commitments, that they place the problems of international relations in the Far East on a new basis, and that they offer China a vastly improved opportunity for solving her many . . . problems of reconstruction, are propositions scarcely open to challenge. . . . They are intended to promote peace and to safeguard the rights and interests of all the peoples concerned.

Hull believed in high principles of international behavior and strict adherence to negotiated contracts. "To me," Hull explained, "these doctrines were as vital in international relations as the Ten Commandments in personal relations." ³²

³¹Ibid.; 711.94/1026, Dooman to Phillips, 4/2/1935.

³²EHD, p. 107; Hornbeck, "Principles and Policies in Regard to China," Foreign Affairs, Vol. I, no. 2, December 15, 1922, p. 135; Cordell Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull (New York: MacMillan Company, 1948), p. 356.

In 1937, Dooman's four years in Washington ended, and he left behind his "unpleasant experience." His opinions had not always differed greatly from those of his associates, but the school of thought that Hornbeck represented distressed him. If he entertained any desire to depart, he could not have been happier than when he received his new assignment in January 1937 - as Counselor at the Embassy in Tokyo.³³

³³123D72/186, Secretary of State to Dooman, 1/5/1937.

CHAPTER 4

DEDICATION AND DISILLUSIONMENT

During the first two years of his tour in Tokyo, Counselor Dooman handled an array of minor problems, typical of those experienced by American diplomats which included answering complaints from missionaries who felt threatened, resolving customs conflicts, and giving speeches at official dinners. There were others, however, of a more serious nature, including one that threatened Grew's career and another that brought the United States and Japan to the brink of war. Dooman met these problems head on, using his expertise, his friendship with Japanese officials and private citizens, and common sense. Between 1937 and 1938, he supervised maintenance of the embassy building, trained junior staff officers, and solved a Japanese-American fishing dispute thereby saving Grew from an embarrassing moment. All of this occurred as he and Grew witnessed a marked decline in Japanese-American relations and the outbreak of war between Japan and China.

Strained relations between Japan and the United States had made Grew increasingly aware of his need for fully competent second-in-command. In June 1936, Grew responded to an inquiry from Hornbeck as to a candidate to replace Edwin Neville, Counselor of the embassy. Specifying his preference

for a language officer, Grew suggested three candidates: John K. Caldwell, Joseph W. Ballantine, and Dooman. He then eliminated the first two men, noting that he did not know Caldwell and indicating that he knew Ballantine had already been assigned to a position in the division. He dwelled on Dooman, commenting that they had twice met and in both instances Grew's impressions had been "entirely favorable." To allay any misapprehensions which Hornbeck may have harbored, the ambassador assured the chief that Dooman's reputation, his "prejudices," and "'touchiness'" preceded him. Questioning the undesirability of such traits, Grew went on to comment that Dooman's "broad background of things Japanese" and his "poise and mature judgment," made Dooman the ideal candidate. After some elucidation as to the importance of a well qualified wife, "a factor worthy of consideration," Grew returned to the subject at hand pointing out that Dooman would arrive in Tokyo fully informed and with a "clear conception of just what material the Department needs and desires and the form in which it can be most helpfully presented." Grew described that knowledge as "a controlling factor," in choosing Neville's successor. Thus, on January 5, 1937, Dooman was ordered to Japan.¹

¹Letter, Grew to Hornbeck, 6/22/1936, Grew papers; 123D72/186, Acting Secretary of State, Wilbur J. Carr to Dooman, 1/5/1937.

For his efforts, the ambassador had gained a loyal and worthy adviser and a diligent worker. The two men complemented each other. Grew, the model ambassador, possessed the proper social, economic and political background enabling him to function at a patrician's level. Dooman typified the epitome of an "expert" possessing special knowledge of the country in which he served and a language capability that made it possible for him to communicate with a wide range of individuals at various levels of government and society. Dooman enjoyed two advantages not shared by Grew: a large number of influential Japanese friends and the ability to communicate with them in their native tongue. His depth of training and experience in Japan so thoroughly overshadowed Grew's, that Ballantine, who read incoming dispatches from Tokyo, concluded that Grew was an excellent diplomat but the most important reports came from Dooman. Ballantine recalled that it was Dooman and not Grew whose "analyses and reports . . ." reflected "an outstanding quality of penetration, knowledge, and understanding of Japanese character."²

Japan perplexed Grew. He reached the point of believing that the more he learned about the country and its people, the less that he really knew, and, because of

²Ballantine, "Reminiscences," p. 30.

this feeling, he abandoned his efforts along these lines. This problem never afflicted his subordinate. Grew's qualities and limitations also left him with a smaller circle of contacts than that of Dooman. The Ambassador counted among his acquaintances, aristocrats, the wealthy, and high officials, or as he described them, "the worthwhile . . . better class . . . substantial Japanese." They were the "liberals," and he felt most comfortable among them since many spoke English or French, the language that he relied on for diplomatic occasions, even those involving the Emperor. Grew's sensitivity to his lack of skill in the Japanese language was such that despite his reservations regarding the appointment of Matsuoka Yosuke in 1940, he nonetheless, took comfort in the fact that the Foreign Minister could speak English. Dooman's qualifications made him an obvious asset in the Tokyo embassy, and the two men's work and contacts converged rather than diverged. Consequently, they worked together closely, becoming as Grew had promised, "thick as thieves."³

Dooman arrived at the embassy on May 22, 1937, some four months after receiving his orders to Tokyo. He departed from the United States, evidently having resolved the "certain cases" which Hull reported as the cause of his delay. During those additional weeks, Dooman attacked the

³Heinrich, pp. 193-196, 209-210, 239, 324.

Department and voiced his dislike and consternation over the preference which he believed the Department was giving to China over Japan. In a note to the Assistant Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Maxwell M. Hamilton, and to Dooman's own successor, Ballantine, he questioned the effectiveness of the Department while pointing out its pro-Chinese tendencies. While sorting diplomatic dispatches, he had discovered a memorandum from Nelson T. Johnson, American Ambassador to China. The paper was a record of a conversation between Johnson and General Chang Chun, Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, relating the general's interpretation of reasons behind the Emperor's selection of General Ugaki Kazushige as head of a new cabinet. This conversation infuriated Dooman, not because Chang's evaluation "missed the mark by several leagues. . . ." but because he felt that Johnson had ignored the availability of his own government's Japan experts and had seemingly endorsed the Chinese explanation. This criticism served notice that the recipients should be skeptical of information gained in this manner and should rely on the Division's geographic specialists for intelligence related to a specific nation. Having alerted Ballantine to what he considered a political problem within the Department, Dooman left for Japan and new problems.⁴

⁴123D72/189, Secretary of State to American Embassy, Tokyo, 3/16/1937; 894.00/708, Dooman to Hamilton and Ballantine, 3/20/1937.

Dooman's arrival strengthened an already capable staff. Besides Grew, there were others who had previously won accolades from the superiors for their work as diplomats or military men. Edward Crocker, Grew's protocol officer, had served in Europe. He lacked training in Japanese, but he made up for that shortcoming to a great extent by drawing on his broad background in the Foreign Service. It would later fall on Crocker's shoulders to deliver the United States' declaration of war. Cabot Coville, First Secretary, was a former Japanese language student with eleven years of service. He supervised a group of young language officers which included Maxwell Bishop, U. Alexis Johnson, and John K. Emmerson. Daily, this group accumulated and assimilated as much information as possible from a wide range of sources, then prepared their analyses. Dooman and Grew then read and approved or modified those reports before sending them to Washington. Working in this manner, the staff produced and delivered integrated messages that carried Grew's signature. In addition, the Ambassador made allowances for dissident opinions. He would forward dispatches bearing the initials of the officer who prepared the report, attaching to it a note with his comments. Despite the qualities of the individuals involved, cooperation remained the keynote, and Grew expected everyone, regardless of his own special

training, to pitch in and help in matters outside of his own area.⁵

This was also true of the military attaché. Grew received his military intelligence from a staff of officers whose training and abilities matched that of his civilians. The army's contingent included at one point, Frank Merrill, who later led the famed "Merrill's Marauders" in Burma, and Captain Maxwell Taylor, destined to become the army's Chief of Staff. Among the naval personnel was a Lieutenant-Commander, Edward T. Layton, and a marine language student, Alva Bryan Lasswell. Layton, who became an admiral during the war, and Lasswell, who rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel in army intelligence, had occasion to work together again after leaving Tokyo. In 1942, Lasswell deciphered and translated intercepted Japanese messages that made it possible for Layton to plan and direct the destruction of Admiral Yamamoto Isoroku's plane in the south Pacific.⁶

⁵Interview with Cabot Coville conducted by Sharon Chamberlain, 4/19/1975; EHD, pp. 61-63; Ballantine, "Reminiscences," p. 30; Charles E. Bohlen, Witness to History: 1929-1969 (New York, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1973), p. 108. Ballantine said that Dooman lacked perspective since he had not served in Manchuria. There, Ballantine concluded, Dooman could have seen the other side of the Japanese. Ballantine stated that Dooman "had no idea of the character that this absolute power. . . ." free of "public opinion and social sanctions," engendered. Dooman could never "visualize that and have it so impressed so indelibly upon his mind that he couldn't get away from it . . . as I did." Ballantine, "Reminiscences," pp. 12-13, 17.

⁶Relmin Morin, East Wind Rising - A Long View of the Pacific Crisis (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 298; David Kahn, The Codebreakers (New York: MacMillan and Company, 1967), pp. 595, 598.

Although these officers, for the most part, departed from Tokyo at different intervals, continuity remained in the form of expert replacements and it remained a harmonious organization throughout the period prior to the second world war. Together the staff functioned in a "white tie suburbia," as one witness described it. They associated with other foreign representatives, missionaries, and businessmen, playing golf and tennis, two passions that Grew and Dooman shared.⁷

Dooman's auspicious arrival in May into this congenial atmosphere began a very short period during which he and Grew had few opportunities to indulge in any outside activities. A minor skirmish at the Marco Polo Bridge near Peiping (Peking) on July 7 developed into hostilities on a large scale. The fighting intensified and spread into northeastern China. Although daily telegrams reporting escalation arrived in the Department, none of the reports indicated or speculated that a Japanese invasion of China would follow. The events of July sent Dooman scurrying, and he found himself exploiting his close friendship with Yoshizawa Seijiro, Chief of the Foreign Ministry's American Bureau. For his part, Grew decided that the embassy should maintain a low profile and confined his reporting to Japanese actions affecting

⁷Morin, p. 299.

American nationals or interests in China. He consciously avoided making policy suggestions.⁸

In August, Grew moved cautiously away from this position and ventured making a recommendation to Washington. Earlier, on July 28, Britain had proposed offering Anglo-American good offices as a means of bringing Chinese and Japanese officials into negotiations. A week later, as a follow-up, the British government asked for Grew's opinion as to the probably Japanese reaction to such an offer. Grew met with James Dodds, British Chargé, Dodd's Assistant, George Sansom, and Dooman to consider the matter. All agreed that there was "no discernible enthusiasm among the Japanese government or people for war with China. . . ." and consequently, the American government "should leave no stone unturned to prevent war. . . ." Based on this consensus, Grew recommended acceptance of the British suggestion. The plan failed to materialize, perishing in the wake of increased fighting and the receipt of a news report announcing the enlistment of American aviators in the Chinese Air Force.

⁸Grew to Dooman, letter, 2/9/1937, Grew papers, Vol. 83; cf. Tokyo's telegrams 205, 7/16/1927, and 211, 7/17/1937, in FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, pp. 184, 209; see also, Record Group 84, 1937, Box 61, Vol. XI, marked 711.2 China-Japan: Blockade of China, Record of Conversation, Dooman and Yoshizawa, 8/26/1937, and Box 62, Vol. XV, 1937, 710 China-Japan file, July 24 - August 31, Dooman memorandum, "North China Situation," 8.5.1937; Joseph C. Grew, Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years, 1904 - 1945, Vol. II (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952), p. 1063.

Undaunted, Grew cabled a penetrating analysis of the Sino-Japanese situation on August 6, which included further suggestions for policy formulation.⁹

The Ambassador made clear that the report represented the integrated view of his staff, adding that he had drawn on the "extensive experiences" of himself and "several of my advisers." They emphasized that Japan's friendship should not be lost in the attempt to save China's. To this end, the document carried a plea which Grew and Dooman had made earlier, asking Washington to consider carefully the wisdom of taking any action that would destroy Japanese good will and confidence in the United States. It stressed the dangers inherent in a strict legalistic interpretation of the problem in Asia and solutions arrived at solely on the basis of treaties, a point that Dooman had made in 1935. In supporting this point, they recalled the repercussions resulting from the passage of the Immigration Act and the non-recognition doctrine, two actions that had previously threatened Japanese-American relations. Given the consequences of those two incidents, Grew and Dooman responded that history supported their contention that the United States stood to

⁹FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, Ambassador in the UK, Bingham, to Secretary of State, 6/28/1937, p. 286; Grew, Ten Years in Japan: A Contemporary Record Drawn From the Diaries and Private and Official Papers of Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan, 1932 - 1942 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944), pp. 214-215; FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, telegram 250, Grew to Secretary of State, 8/6/1937, pp. 340-341.

gain more from a display of good will and impartiality. Their beliefs became the cornerstone of the embassy's future policy recommendations and the basis of their opposition to the use of offensive measures.¹⁰

Hull's response shocked them. It also forecast the nature of Washington's attitude. "We have no desire," Hull wrote, "to injure either country, we wish to be a good neighbor to both, but we should not permit ourselves to be hampered in the making of our decisions by being especially solicitous that what we do shall not be displeasing to one or other or both of the combatant countries." Having declared his opposition to Grew's suggested line, the Secretary of State bluntly told the Ambassador that Japan had angered the American people and if the Japanese expected his country's good will and assistance, they could best demonstrate those desires through proven respect for American policies and methods. Hull assured the embassy that United States' policies would continue to "be guided by laws and treaties."¹¹

This legalistic determination that Hull relished and adhered to had as an avid supporter, Stanley Hornbeck.

¹⁰FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, telegram 321, Grew to Secretary of State, 8/27/1937, pp. 485-488.

¹¹FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, telegram 187, Hull to Grew, 9/2/1937, pp. 505-508; Akira Iriye, "The Role of the United States Embassy in Tokyo," in Pearl Harbor as History: Japanese-American Relations, 1931-1941, ed. by Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973), p. 114.

Hornbeck's reaction to the events of July 1937 varied little from his reaction to the Manchurian incident six years earlier. He again saw the Japanese, in their inherently lawless fashion, precipitating a crisis with the intention of separating north China from the rest of the nation. Accordingly, the Marco Polo Bridge incident had not happened accidentally, but rather it marked Japan's direct assault on Chinese sovereignty. Although appalled, Hornbeck saw few legally justifiable moves that his government could make. He pointed this out in a conversation with Wang Cheng-tung, China's Ambassador to the United States. Hornbeck informed Wang that the most likely action that the Chinese might expect from the United States would be an appeal for support from the signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty. Hornbeck indicated to the envoy that the United States could not act independently and that neither the Nine-Power Treaty nor the Kellogg Pact detailed a specific course of action. He thus counseled the Chinese to fend for themselves as best they could. Hornbeck, however, did not give up seeking some legal method of intervening. He suggested that an emergency conference be held at the White House to consider a request for re-enforcing American forces in Shanghai. Ostensibly the troops would be for the protection of American interests, but, he observed, they would also serve to deter Japanese encroachment on the city. He recommended immediate action, citing as justification the

right of any nation to protect the lives and property of its nationals. In the meantime he cautioned Hull against "inducing the Chinese to make concessions."¹²

The attitude which the Secretary expressed put the embassy staff on the defensive. Grew sent a letter of clarification in which he reviewed Hull's comments point by point. It had become abundantly clear to the two men in Tokyo that they shared the same feelings as their Washington superiors, a dislike of the course of action which the Japanese were pursuing. The major source of disagreement, Grew wrote, centered "not about policy or attitude," but around the "method" needed to effect successful relations in the future. Dooman's feelings along this line were evident in a warning against American or allied "moral intervention." A criticism of British "ineptitude" included in the letter also bore evidence of Dooman's sensitivity to Japanese feelings:

¹²FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, series of Hornbeck memoranda, and records of conversations covering the period from July 16 to August 12. See pages 189-190, 333, 312, 380-382, 420-424. Subsequent historical research indicates that the incident was not a premediated act on the part of the Japanese government or military, as Hornbeck alleged. The hostilities could have been ended except that the Nationalist government was determined to use the incident in opposing Japanese penetration of China. Similarly the Japanese government, determined to reduce the influence of the Kuomintang in north China, steadfastly opposed a solution that would not alter the status quo of the area. See James B. Crowley, "A Reconsideration of the Marco Polo Bridge Incident," Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. XXII, 3, May 1963.

There sometimes appears an ineptitude in their methods, and especially in the tone and language and timing of their official communications. . . . These things do count.¹³

Grew's letter reached Hull on October 5, the same day that President Roosevelt delivered his "Quarantine Speech" in Chicago. In his address, Roosevelt implied that Japan had continued in an undeclared war that included the murder of innocent civilians and it had thus become part of a small group dedicated to obtaining its goals through the use of force. That small section, that "ten per cent," said the President, faced the other ninety per cent who opposed blatant violations of international agreements. Because of the "contagious nature" of war, Roosevelt called for a quarantine of the infected nations. His speech coincided with publication of a League of Nations report that blamed Japan for the hostilities and the following day, the Department of State endorsed the League's findings that Japanese encroachment into China contravened the Nine-Power Treaty. American reaction to the speech varied. Hull's own feelings represented, he believed, those of the American people and he cited numerous demonstrations, polls, and calls for impeachment. Other surveys indicated, however, a favorable reaction. Press coverage and correspondence from both the public and private sectors supported Roosevelt,

¹³FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, Grew to Hull, 9/15/1937, pp. 525-530.

and one article praised him for enlightening Americans with "things which need saying."¹⁴

The Japanese press seized on the same feelings that Hull had sensed. The Foreign Office directed its official reaction not at the speech, however, but at the State Department's endorsement of the League's accusations. Echoing Dooman's pointed memorandum on Western and Oriental concepts of contracts, the Foreign Office took the position that since conditions had changed since the signing of the treaty, it could not be used as a basis for regulating relations between China and Japan. It was the type of reaction that Dooman and Grew had warned of and predicted.¹⁵

A marked change in Japanese attitudes followed. On the day preceding Roosevelt's speech, Matsuoka Kojiro, a member of a zaibatsu family, called on Grew. In the course of their conversation, Matsuoka revealed that his sources had informed him of a shift in Japanese military thinking. He indicated that the Japanese army and navy had previously

¹⁴U. S. State Department, Department of State Press Releases, Vol. XVLL, 419, October 9, 1937, p. 275; FRUS, 1937, Vol. IV, Hull to U. S. Minister in Switzerland, p. 62; Hull, Memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 545-546; Travis Beal Jacobs, "Roosevelt's Quarantine Speech," The Historian, Vol. XXLV, 4, August 1962; see also Dorothy Borg, "Notes on Roosevelt's 'Quarantine Speech,'" Political Science Quarterly, Vol. XXLL, 3, September 1957, pp. 405-433.

¹⁵FRUS, 1937, Vol. III, telegram 456, Grew to Secretary of State, 10/7/1937, pp. 585-586.

envisioned the United States as Japan's most dangerous enemy. This had changed because of a recent shift in British attitudes. Before leaving the embassy, Matsuoka spoke with Dooman, taking the opportunity to emphasize the point that he had already made to Grew. Dooman inquired as to the specifics that generated the change reported by Matsuoka and learned that the British had offended Japanese leaders, by calling them "natives" in various communiques. The United States, on the other hand had, observed Matsuoka, presented written comments which were considered "reasonable and were formulated as though they were addressed to a 'civilized' nation." The events of October 5 and 6 brought an immediate change. A week after he had spoken with Grew and Dooman, praising American attitudes, Matsuoka returned for another visit. Taking up their conversation of the previous week, Dooman asked his visitor for further elaboration as to the thinking of those military friends whom Matsuoka had represented. "That is now ancient history," announced Matsuoka, "a result of the President's Chicago speech and the Department's announcement of October 6. . . ." "There is," he continued, "intense adverse feeling toward the United States."¹⁶

¹⁶Record group 84, Vol. XII, 710-China Japan Good Will Missions Abroad, record of conversation, Grew and Matsuoka, 10/5/1937, and record of conversation, Dooman and Matsuoka, 10/5/1937. Both memorandums were forwarded to Hull, dispatch 2619, 10/8/ 1937. The record of the Matsuoka-Dooman conversation of October 12 was sent from Grew to Hull, dispatch 2633, 10/12/1937. See Grew, Turbulent Era, II, pp. 1156-1157. Hirota

Aside from indicating Japanese reaction to Roosevelt's speech, this incident demonstrated the minor consideration given to recommendations from Tokyo. Aware that he lacked the "complete picture," which he assumed was visible in Washington, Grew nonetheless felt that he had the wherewithall to make wise suggestions, drawing as he did on his own experiences and the knowledge of his experts. The significance of information gained in private conversations and passed on to Washington served not so much as an accurate indicator of official Japanese attitudes, but were intended to act as a barometer of Japanese sentiments in general. These, Grew and Dooman believed, could be used in the formulation of policies. They realized from the events of October that their Washington associates cared little if any for this line of thought. The offensive quality of Roosevelt's comments led Grew to believe contrariwise that his nation had chosen instead a path that potentially led to war.¹⁷

Two months later, on December 1, that possibility loomed into reality as Japanese aircraft, without orders

had told Grew that "The Japanese had hitherto blamed Great Britain for attempting to organize a solid united front against Japan . . . This was in November and Hirota added that "The Chicago speech had temporarily modified. . . ." that conclusion, but subsequent statements by the President restored their confidence. Borg, The United States and the Far Eastern Crisis, p. 464.

¹⁷Heinrichs, p. 248.

from Tokyo, attached and sank the U. S. S. Panay, an American gunship patrolling the Yangtze River in China. The incident ended as quickly as it began, thanks to Grew's quick action. In less than four hours, after reading the cables reporting the attack, he and Japan's Foreign Minister, Hirota had spoken together twice, the latter expressing dismay and regret. They immediately undertook efforts to resolve the problem. Grew's alert measures, without instruction from Washington, produced an apologetic note from the Japanese, which Grew cabled to Hull and thereby avoided a potentially explosive situation. Two weeks after the sinking, the United States accepted Japan's formal reply to an American note of protest. Final settlement came on April 30, 1938, when Yoshizawa presented to a rather nervous Dooman a check in the sum of \$2,214,007.36 for damages to the vessel and its crew.¹⁸

Dooman's first year in Japan had been an eventful one and Grew was happy with his new lieutenant. He registered that satisfaction in an efficiency report filed in November 1937, six months after Dooman's arrival. Lauding his counselor's "high abilities, sound judgment, cooperative spirit and indefatigable industry," Grew told of Dooman's

¹⁸Iriye, "The Role of the United States Embassy in Tokyo," pp. 119-120; Grew, Ten Years, p. 32 ff; Manny T. Koginos, The Panay Incident: Prelude to War (Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Studies, 1967); Interview with Mrs. Dooman.

"continual assistance during 'this intense period.'" The Ambassador had, he observed, "to rely on him as my right hand assistant, constantly seeking his reactions, judgment and advice. . . ." Dooman's assets included "his analytical mind . . . his frankness and courage in supporting his convictions once they had been reached by thorough and careful analysis . . . and his ability to draft dispatches and other documents in accurate and lucid style." His social graces, which were hardly tangential to diplomatic work, drew praise from the Ambassador also. Grew had made Dooman an etiquette officer, turning over to him young staff members who greeted people while smoking cigarettes, arrived late for luncheons or "slouched" into a room, hands in pockets. He also noted Dooman's unique position among the Japanese, having lived among them as a child and as a young man. The latter quality enabled Dooman to "meet the Japanese on intimate terms. . . ." making his contacts "of outstanding helpfulness to the Embassy." Even Dooman's golfing abilities (necessary for "establishing contacts with, and commending . . ." oneself "to a considerable sector of the government and business world which indulges in that form of exercise. . . .") received the Ambassador's attention. In recommending his subordinate for promotion to Class I, which Dooman received

sixteen months later, Grew confided that he "could have asked for no more effective and efficient counselor than Dooman."¹⁹

Grew's thoughts and feelings, set down in a routine efficiency report told only half the story. Grew had, in fact, discovered that he owed Dooman a larger debt, for his counselor had saved the Ambassador from a situation that was so embarrassing that Grew had considered resigning. As early as 1930, American fishing concerns had observed Japanese vessels in and near Alaskan waters, particularly the Bristol Bay area. In 1935, a complaint received in Washington resulted in a Department of State enquiry into the possibility of a treaty protecting American salmon fishing interests. Japanese officials responded negatively, citing limited Japanese interest in the Bristol Bay area. The following year, a proposed Japanese investigation into the possibility of "open sea fishing enterprises" in Alaskan waters, drew an immediate request for confirmation of the project from Hull. Grew replied in the affirmative, clarifying that the activities would be carried "on the high seas," and not in American waters. By December 1936 Dooman became

¹⁹Grew papers, Vol. 85, 1937; Vol. 94, 1934, Diary, 4/22/1937, p. 4017. In a letter to Hamilton, Grew stated that the reporting and representation was "in a very large degree of any merit . . . due to my efficient and effective staff in which I am particularly fortunate especially in the admirable support of Dooman." Grew papers, Vol. 91, Letters, 1938, Grew to Hamilton, 9/6/1938.

involved, conferring with members of the Canadian legation in Washington and seeking some form of agreement with the Japanese. The American solution was to commit the governments of those countries with a northern Pacific coastline (The United States, Russia, Canada, and Japan) to a treaty supporting conservation of the salmon resources in the northern Pacific. The magnitude of the problem came into sharp focus as President Roosevelt became personally involved, and in December 1937 he seriously considered issuing an executive proclamation closing the Bristol Bay area to all fishing. Finally, the Japanese consented to abandonment of their planned exploratory expedition, but not before they called attention to the fact that fishing on the high seas remained a privilege of all nations. Grew wrote Hull that this move signaled the Japanese government's intention of not providing licenses that would allow Japanese vessels to fish in Alaskan waters.²⁰

The incident, far from being over, had reached its peak. Under normal circumstances complaints of this nature

²⁰FRUS, 1935, Vol. III, Telegram 639, William Phillips to Grew, 11/19/1934, p. 1072; telegram 118, Grew to Phillips, 6/3/1935, p. 1075; telegram 119, Hull to Edwin Neville, 8/3/1935, p. 1076; telegram 208, Neville to Hull, 11/12/1935, p. 1078; FRUS, 1936, Vol. IV, telegram 67, Hull to Grew, 6/3/1936, p. 943; telegram 124, Grew to Hull, 6/14/1936, p. 943; memorandum of conversation, Dooman and Representatives of the Canadian Embassy, 12/16/1936, p. 947; FRUS, 1937, Vol. IV, telegram 1262, Hull to Grew 6/5/1937, p. 740; Roosevelt memorandum 12/21/1927, p. 768; memorandum by Counselor of Department of State, 11/22/1937, p. 771; telegram 669, Grew to Hull, 12/22/1937, p. 777.

might have very well passed away, given the efforts of a few good commercial attaches. But this period was not normal, and the already strained relations between the two nations magnified non-political problems to their fullest. So it was that in late March 1938 Grew read an International News Service story published in Tokyo which reported a Congressional measure "specifying that no foreigners should be allowed to fish in Bristol Bay" was obviously aimed at Japanese fishermen. Grew, in convincing Hirota to accept the settlement reached the previous year, had indicated that passage of such legislation appeared imminent if an agreement could not be reached. The Foreign Minister acted on Grew's suggestion, helping to bring about the December arrangement. The proposed bill thus appeared to compromise Grew's word to Hirota. It seemed that once again Grew's efforts had been wasted, particularly if Roosevelt signed the act, since Grew presumed that he had negotiated his agreement with Hirota under the auspices of the President. Such action would indicate a breach of faith on Grew's part, and that, he believed, left him little choice but to resign.²¹

But Dooman interceded, taking the matter into his capable hands. The chief credit for the solution of the Alaskan fishing problem, Grew later wrote, "is abundantly due to Dooman who . . . has given a large part of his efforts,

²¹Grew papers, Diary, Vol. 93, March 1938, pp. 3735-3736.

thought and constructive suggestions in working out the details with Yoshizawa. There have been moments of great discouragement when a solution looked hopeless and I attribute to Dooman a major share of the credit for ironing out the almost inseparable difficulties which were largely of a domestic political nature." Dooman also reached Grew in the Ambassador's moment of despair and the counselor helped with a momentous decision. Grew wrote in his diary:

Very fortunately, I decided to omit from my preliminary telegram any question of resignation, which could be approached subsequently if the press reports were confirmed. Dooman and I discussed the question for the better part of that night and were in entire agreement. It was not a pleasant night at all.

Relief overcame the Ambassador when he received a departmental cable informing him that the matter had been resolved and that the news report had been incomplete and that the bill referred only to a restriction of fishing in American "territorial waters."²²

Grew was thankful, nonetheless, for Dooman's performance, and he appealed on Dooman's behalf for consideration of his counselor's enigmatic position in the service, a situation that Grew described to Hull in detail. This needed clarification, he wrote to Hull, because "this . . .

²²Grew papers, Vol. 91, 1938, "Letters," Grew to Hull, 3/29/1938.

point may not be well known to the officers now dealing with personnel questions in the Department." Continuing, he explained how Dooman had entered the consular service prior to 1924 in the capacity of a language student, later becoming a secretary, and "He has never been able to overcome the penalty of serving those somewhat anomalous positions during those early days. . . ." Despite Dooman's twenty-six years of service he remained in Class II of the service, a "penalty" that permitted officers junior to Dooman to be promoted ahead of him. This created, according to Grew, "a situation which might have killed all service in a less selfless and conscientious man." He concluded his letter with a note on an additional problem, that of Dooman's modesty. He emphasized that Dooman had "not suggested this letter . . . [and] does not know that I am writing it and would probably disapprove if he did . . . He is not inclined to blow his own horn." Grew asked that his comments be given prompt consideration and that his letter be filed in Dooman's record. He closed his note to Hull with a comment that Dooman "has proved himself an absolutely first class officer Chief of Staff, a wise and well balanced counselor and one of the hardest workers I have ever been associated with. . . ." Leaving no stone unturned, Grew sent a copy of the letter to Hornbeck as well, asking him to "put in an oar" if possible. A year later Dooman received his promotion to Class I.²³

²³Ibid., See also Grew papers, Grew to Hornbeck, 3/29/1938; Vol. 94, Diary, p. 4017, 3/22/1939.

CHAPTER 5

"A SADDENING WORLD . . ." ¹

In the two years that followed his promotion, Dooman continued in his efforts to prevent or at least delay the complete collapse of Japanese-American relations. Deterioration of the tense situation in Europe compounded problems, particularly after the signing of the Tripartite Pact that linked Berlin and Rome with Tokyo in September 1940. Between 1939 and 1940 Dooman and Grew met with Japanese representatives in a series of talks which they hoped would lead to resolution of various problems and misunderstandings. Repeatedly they failed largely because of the resistance of Hull and his subordinates. By December 8, 1941, the two men in Japan learned that they had not succeeded and they could take little comfort from knowing that they had tried.

In the years between 1938 and 1941 American policy-makers linked events in Asia with those occurring in Europe where Germany's Adolph Hitler menaced neighboring states.

¹From the Haiku by Issa:

A Saddening World:
Flowers whose sweet
Blooms must fall . . .
As we too, alas . . .

By March 1938, he had consolidated his power sufficiently to absorb neighboring Austria without encountering an opposing shot. Within a year Czechoslovakia fell. Significantly, the Nazi successes in Europe coincided with Japanese actions in China, including the "Rape of Nanking," and the fall of Hankow and Canton. American officials, most notably Hull, saw a connection between the events, despite being separated by thousands of miles. Roosevelt had also linked Japanese action to the intensifying struggle in Europe. This image, however slow to develop in the minds of the American people, clearly existed in the minds of American policy makers. In this manner, events in Asia became inextricably bound up with those of Europe.²

German policy makers, evaluating the global situation, perceived the benefits of a German-Japanese alliance that would require the Russians to watch closely their back door and place an additional burden on the British in protecting its Asian colonies. Success for this plan hinged on events in Japan. The possibility of an alliance seemed to gain in momentum on January 4, 1939, when the Konoye cabinet fell because, according to Grew, it had "completed its mission in China and Konoye's failure to stem the tide toward a more authoritarian form of government. . . ." The appointment of Baron Hiranuma Kiichiro, whom the Ambassador described as

²Iriye, Across the Pacific, pp. 201-203.

"one of the leading proponents. . . ." of Japanese totalitarianism, followed the next day. On February 8, Grew again cabled Hull, this time informing him of German-Japanese negotiations "intended to produce a definitive alliance, military and political." Grew had already spoken with Arita Hachiro, who became Japan's Foreign Minister in October of 1938. The Ambassador had suggested to Arita that the Japanese government should consider the effects that the proposed alliance might have on Japanese-American relations. Hull agreed with Grew's point regarding the undesirability of an alliance and he wired the Ambassador, asking that Grew seek some form of rapprochement but emphasizing the importance of having the Japanese take the initiative "so as not to commit us formally." The Ambassador moved, seizing every opportunity to proffer his opposition to the pact, speaking with government officials, journalists, acquaintances, and other foreign diplomats.³

Grew's lobbying, combined with other external considerations, succeeded. The Ambassador was aided in his efforts by a Japanese concern for maintaining good relations with the United States and their apprehension regarding Russia's possible reactions to a German-Japanese pact. The

³FRUS, 1939, Vol. IV, telegrams 4, 5, and 6, Grew to Hull, all dated 1/5/1939, pp. 443-444; Hull, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 627; Heinrichs, American Ambassador, p. 278; Johana Meskill, Hitler & Japan: The Hollow Alliance (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), pp. 5-6.

relationship with the United States had received, in the meantime, an additional boost when the American government announced its intentions of delivering to Japan the ashes of a former Japanese Ambassador aboard the warship Astoria. Saito Hiroshi had recently retired as Japan's Ambassador and was not an official at the time of his death. Thus, the Japanese interpreted the move as a good will gesture. Taking these events into account, Grew wired Washington that the chances of the proposed alliance coming to fruition were nil.⁴

The predicted failure of the alliance comforted Grew, but it had less significance for those at home in the Department. Hornbeck's attitude was one of "so what." Agreeing that a "substantially hostile act" by the United States "might" drive Japan into the Berlin-Rome pact, he went on to comment that "I do not: (1) believe that the taking of any moderate steps toward bringing pressure upon Japan such as have been and are under consideration in this country would have such an effect, and I do not (2) believe that, in any event the world situation would be substantially worse if the Japanese were to take such a step." For once Hornbeck allowed the Japanese a rational mind, pointing out that Japan would not antagonize the United States by signing the treaty just to gain popularity with the Fascist states. All reason aside,

⁴Heinrichs, p. 287.

he asked what difference would it make since over the years such a pact would not "substantially alter the effective course of world events."⁵

This generally negative attitude on the part of Hull's most influential Far Eastern adviser had an effect on the declining relations between the two nations. On May 18, Grew and Dooman met with Arita who presented them with a message from Prime Minister Hiranuma, indicating that the Prime Minister wanted it delivered personally and in confidence to the American government. Grew departed on leave to the States that same evening, having delivered the embassy to the "effective hands of Dooman." The Ambassador had with him both Arita's comment that better relations between the two countries would be forthcoming and Hiranauma's message urging detente. The Prime Minister had indicated that Japan and the United States had a moral responsibility to curb the fighting in Europe and to work for world peace.⁶

Soon after Grew's departure, Dooman became enmeshed in the first of two attempts that directly involved himself and Japanese leaders in efforts to find extra-diplomatic means of settling Japanese-American differences. On May 23,

⁵FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, Hornbeck memorandum, 5/11/1939, pp. 34-37.

⁶FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, telegram 234, Grew to Secretary of State, 5/19/1939, p. 1; telegram 235, Grew to Secretary of State, 5/18/1939, pp. 1-5.

Hiranuma's personal adviser, identified only as "a man named Fujii" in Dooman's oral history, called on the Charge asking if he would be willing to meet "privately and secretly" with the Prime Minister. Dooman agreed. They set a time, and in a clandestine series of events Fujii picked him up and they drove to the Shinjuku area of Tokyo where they alighted and walked the remaining three blocks to Hiranuma's home. There the two men ate a traditional Japanese meal and discussed the world situation. According to Dooman, Hiranuma "gave a very interesting discourse on the way things were threatening to develop. He said that there was a great deal to be said on behalf of Germany and Italy from the long range point of view. . . ." although he wasn't defending the Nazis." The Prime Minister stressed that the rapidly spreading war in Europe promised to draw Japan and the United States into its vortex. This could be avoided, he continued, if the two nations worked jointly to avoid becoming involved and moved to achieve peace in Europe. Dooman expressed his doubts concerning the possibility of such a collaboration citing the fact that "Japan was considered to be guilty of the same acts of which Germany and Italy stood, condemned. . . ." in the adverse American press coverage. Without responding directly, Hiranuma suggested that he would take the necessary steps to bring Germany and Italy to a joint conference if Roosevelt would take similar action with the British and

French. In conclusion, he urged, and Dooman agreed, that their meeting and discussion should be kept secret.⁷

Hiranuma's concern for secrecy was not without reason. His control of government policies depended on his ability to satisfy and manipulate various elements within his cabinet which could bring down his government, particularly the army. In a high level meeting on April 25, Army Minister Itagaki Seishiro, who favored a European alliance, threatened to resign and inspire acts of violence if the other cabinet members failed to support their position. The army's war in China had slowed and its leaders, envisioning an Axis victory in Europe, believed that the European alliance would aid them in their efforts on the Asian mainland. Arita and Navy Minister Yonai Mitsumasa opposed the pact and Arita threatened to resign if Itagaki prevailed. Hiranuma was caught between the two factions and although he had initially

⁷EHD, pp. 73-76; FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, telegram 242, Dooman to Secretary of State, 5/23/1939, p. 171. Dooman did not initially explain the concern for secrecy, nor to whom Hiranuma was referring. Obviously Hiranuma did not want his Japanese opponents to learn of his overture, but he apparently had authorized Dooman to report the proposal to the Secretary of State, as coming directly from the Prime Minister. Dooman did clarify this bit of confusion in a subsequent cable on August 3 in which he stated that Arita "has no knowledge of this project. . . ." Dooman pointed out that in his dispatch 3936 he had "stressed 'the importance of keeping a profound secret the forthcoming talk' with the Prime Minister, whose 'political position was reasonably secure, but that the alignment of factions within the Government over European policy was so delicate as to require that the Prime Minister act very cautiously.'" See footnote 74, FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, p. 202.

sided with the army, he later changed and aligned himself with the more moderate elements hoping to keep Japan neutral.⁸

Dooman reported his discussion with Hiranuma to the Department that same night, including in his cable the Prime Minister's suggestion for a joint meeting. In a follow-up telegram, Dooman stressed that Hiranuma's attitude did not come "from any moral regeneration but from realization that Japan's security can be safeguarded in this manner." But this was an opportunity, he maintained, that the United States should exploit. He cited a conversation that he and Grew had engaged in on May 16 with "a well informed person" who had given them a similar impression of Japanese willingness to cooperate with the United States. The individual, Baron Harada Kumao, had explained that he represented a group of Japanese sufficiently influential to ensure defeat of the proposed alliance with the Axis powers. This led Dooman to suggest that the Department should give careful thought to the Prime Minister's plan noting that Hiranuma's views "may prevail or they may not, but they cannot be ignored."⁹

⁸Richard A. Yasko, "Hiranuma Kiichiro and Conservative Politics in Pre-War Japan," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973, p. 30; Frank W. Iklé, "Policies Toward Germany," in James W. Morely, ed., Japan's Foreign Policy, 1868-1941: A Research Guide (New York: Columbia University Press) 1974, pp. 319-320.

⁹FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, telegram 245, Dooman to Secretary of State, 5/26/1939, pp. 40-42; EHD, pp. 76-77; Grew identifies the "unnamed individual" in his Turbulent Era, II, p. 1292; FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, dispatch 3936, Dooman to Undersecretary of State, 6/7/1939, p. 43.

To a man, the Department's Far Eastern hands reacted negatively to the Arita/Hiranuma overtures. Ballantine, Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, interpreted Arita's comments as a move to convince the United States that Japan was not "a totalitarian state and to conciliate this country insofar as this can be accomplished without compromising Japan's thesis with regard to the 'new order' in East Asia." Ballantine's superior, Maxwell Hamilton agreed that once Japan had modified its program on the mainland then meaningful talks could take place. Hornbeck added that even at that point any results would be "of temporary effectiveness." In a subsequent memorandum Ballantine compared Arita's comments and Hiranuma's proposal. He concluded that Japan wanted a way out of the situation in China which would also serve Japanese ambitions on the continent. The Prime Minister's suggested meeting could, he went on, produce a change in Japan's program in China or even lead to a withdrawal of troops, but if the United States appeared to take the initiative it would give Japan a better bargaining position. Any compromises, and he noted that concessions would have to be made, would likely leave everyone concerned unhappy. Besides, Ballantine added, the current course of action in China was a source of embarrassment to the Japanese army and if it was allowed to run to its extent

the army might have to withdraw regardless and with a greater loss of prestige.¹⁰

The attitude and reaction of those in Washington justified Dooman's skepticism. Several weeks elapsed, and Fujii came by to inquire if there had been a reply to the proposal. His visit prompted Dooman to request instructions from the Department as to what action he should take. That cable too went unanswered. Again Fujii visited, and again Dooman sent a telegram requesting instructions. It was not until two weeks later that he had a response which informed a stunned Dooman that a reply had been sent via regular diplomatic pouch.¹¹

That dispatch arrived on July 8, six weeks after Dooman sent his initial cable. In it Hull referred to the note of May 18 which Hiranuma had sent with Grew, pointing out that it lacked any reference to the May 23 meeting and the Prime Minister's proposed meeting. Hull's note was little more than a moralistic tract, repeating parts of his and the President's speeches. Hull, therefore, failed to provide

¹⁰894.00/856, Ballantine memorandum, initialed by Hamilton and Hornbeck, and sent to the Undersecretary of State, Sumner Welles, 5/24/1939; FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, Ballantine memorandum, initialed by Hamilton, 6/7/1939, pp. 182-184.

¹¹EHD, pp. 76-77. This information is based solely on Dooman's recollection of the events. The telegrams are not printed in the Foreign Relations series which necessitates future research into archival materials.

the answer that those in Tokyo were anxiously awaiting: would the President work for a summit?¹²

Undaunted, Dooman continued in his quixotic mission. On July 28, he cabled Hull acknowledging receipt of his dispatch. He noted that he had no quarrel with the Department's note, as a reply to Hiranuma's note of May 18, but said he urgently needed "further guidance as to what I should say to the Prime Minister with regard to the holding of an international conference to be called by the President to discuss problems causing world unrest including Far Eastern problems." He emphasized the point that the message handed to Grew contained no concrete proposal and "was intended as an opening move which the Prime Minister had made." Dooman suggested that if the Department had no intention of following through on the proposal, then it should allow Dooman to invite the Prime Minister "to read between the lines" of Hull's note. The other alternative, if the Department was still considering the possibility of a summit, was for the Charge to deliver the reply and indicate that another would be forthcoming. He indicated that whichever tack was chosen, expediency was the key to effectiveness.¹³

¹²FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, letter 1767, Hull to Dooman, 7/8/1939, pp. 508.

¹³FRUS, 1939, Vol. III, telegram 376, Dooman to Secretary of State, 7/31/1939, p. 200.

The brusque tone of his request drew a retort from Sumner Welles, who had become Acting Secretary of State at that point. The Department failed, he wrote, to understand the basis of the Chargés confusion:

In view of the Department our proposed message answers both the Prime Minister's message handed to Mr. Grew and the Prime Minister's subsequent proposal communicated through you which we construe as an elaboration of the message.

Welles stated that neither of the tactics that Dooman had suggested "need be adopted," since the reply "needed no explanatory comment." In closing, Welles told Dooman that the Department had prepared a slightly modified version and that when the Chargé delivered it, he should make "no interpretative comments other than to say, if expressly asked, that the reply is meant to cover both the Prime Minister's written message and his statements. . . ." of May 23.¹⁴

Confusion reigned. As best as he could determine there seemed to be a lack of communication and Dooman took it upon himself to clear matters up. He cabled the Department:

I must correct a misunderstanding which I have inadvertently permitted the Department to form by failing to stress that it has been represented to me, and I believe correctly, that knowledge of the Prime Minister's proposal with regard to an

¹⁴Ibid., telegram 235, Acting Secretary Welles to Dooman, 8/1/1939, p. 201.

international conference is confined only to his entourage. That the Foreign Minister has no knowledge of this project is strongly indicated by the fact that both he and the Vice Minister, hearing that I had been received by the Prime Minister, asked me on separate occasions what the Prime Minister had to say. I believe that this fact will serve to explain my feeling that the Prime Minister's personal and confidential move merits a reply separate from the official reply to his official message.

An official reply, Dooman seemed to be saying, would have to be delivered through Arita since the Foreign Minister had delivered the original message to Grew. The manner in which the Department intended to handle the matter would "be interpreted," he ended "(a) by the Japanese government as an indication that the attitude now taken by the American government requires the termination of the conflict in China as a condition precedent to the betterment by Japan of her relations with the United States; and (b) by the Prime Minister as a closing of the door to insure peace in the Far East."¹⁵

Dooman believed that Hiranuma's offer warranted expeditious handling, a consideration that the Department ignored. On August 8 he delivered the message via Fujii, informing him that Hiranuma should be told that it was also a reply to his confidential remarks. Considering Washington's sluggish performance, the events that followed came as no surprise to Dooman. In a fortnight Germany and Russia concluded

¹⁵Ibid., telegram 384, Dooman to Secretary of State, 8/3/1939, pp. 202-203.

a nonaggression pact, a move that had the appearance of an effort to isolate Japan completely. Hiranuma's attempts at stabilizing international diplomacy had failed, forcing him and his cabinet to resign.¹⁶

The delays that Dooman experienced and which had led to Hiranuma's resignation had not been accidentally perpetrated. There existed in Washington, among the highest echelons of government a strong anti-Japanese feeling, a fact Grew and Dooman realized. Hull believed Hiranuma "to be a Japanese counterpart of the European Facists and Nazis," and thus he "regarded Hiranuma's approach with skepticism." He suspected an "ulterior motive . . . chicanery engineered to embarrass the United States." Hull distrusted the Japanese and Sumner Welles hated them. Welles had spent two years in Tokyo, 1915-1917, as Secretary of the embassy, where he developed a "lifelong hatred" of the Japanese and sharpened, he believed, his perception. With this highly developed sense, he claimed to see beyond the "veneer of Westernization" that the Japanese used to camouflage their "primeval military machine." Welles commented that during the late 1920's Japanese politics had lost the moderating influence of the elder statesmen and consequently the people "reverted to the 'vicious and uncivilized forms of antiquity.'" He characterized the Japanese as a race "moved by blind hate . . . able to exist

¹⁶Ibid., telegram 393, Dooman to Secretary of State, 8/8/1939, p. 205.

and prosper at an incredibly low standard of living." An additional threat which he had noted was their unusual ability to reproduce faster than other racial groups. People with these characteristics, he concluded, were not beyond turning a high level conference into a "ruse" for "sinister purposes."¹⁷

Ballantine, who was Hamilton's Assistant, also sided with the anti-Japanese faction. He was the lone Japanese expert among the group, and a fellow worker has described him as a "'frightfully timid . . . broken spirited clerk.'" He believed that Hiranuma's succession to the Prime Ministership in January of 1939 strengthened "the army's control of the government," and subsequently he went along with Welles' sinister theory of Japanese international relations. Ballantine accused Hiranuma of playing a double hand by trying to win an alliance with Germany and at the same time soliciting Roosevelt's good will.¹⁸

¹⁷Hull, Memoirs, Vol. I; Welles, The Time for Decision (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1944), pp. 275-277, 305. Welles used this explanation including the term "ruse" in describing the proposed Konoye-Roosevelt meeting in 1941, see pp. 292-295. For an additional comment on Welles' anti-Japanese feelings see Robert A. Divine, Second Chance: The Triumph of Internationalism in America During World War II (New York: Atheneum Books, 1971), p. 42.

¹⁸874.00/831, Ballantine memorandum, 1/4/1939; James C. Thomson, "The Role of the Department of State," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor, p. 83. Thomson cites a 1969 interview with Alger Hiss. John K. Emmerson stated that this description was essentially correct. Interview with Emmerson, May 15, 1976; Ballantine, "Mukden to Pearl Harbor," Foreign Affairs, July 1949, p. 655; Ballantine, "Reminiscences," pp. 12-13.

Grew and Dooman contended that the United States had missed an opportunity because of the attitudes of those in the Department. It was in fact the first "last good chance" there were two more. After Grew's return in 1940, Dooman undertook a second effort securing a rapprochement via extra-diplomatic activities. In 1938 Hashimoto Tetsuma, head of the Shuinso (Purple Cloud Society), visited Dooman on an irregular basis. The Shuinso had previously drawn the attention of the embassy because of its "ultra patriotic" nature and its anti-western editorials published in the organization's newspaper. Although no stranger to the embassy in 1940, Hashimoto took the unusual step of asking for an appointment with Grew. The Ambassador reluctantly agreed seeing the opportunity to tell Hashimoto that he resented some of the things that the Shuinso had published in reference to the United States. Their meeting, which Dooman attended, lasted for an hour and a half and had been "disappointing" for Hashimoto. After Hashimoto departed, Dooman spoke with Grew. He pointed out that their visitor had ceased his attacks on the United States and had begun pressing for "a way out of the Japanese-American impasse." At Grew's request, Dooman then telephoned Hashimoto and explained that a great deal of misunderstanding had been

created, adding that he would like a second meeting between himself and Hashimoto, who agreed.¹⁹

Both Grew and Dooman harbored some doubts as to what influence, if any, Hashimoto might have within the Japanese government. Moving cautiously, Dooman began a series of talks with the Japanese peace seeker. Hashimoto quickly overcame Dooman's doubts when he reported the contents of a note which Dooman had previously delivered to the Foreign Minister. Because of his contacts, which included, "Hiranuma . . . Marquis Makino (Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal), and various prominent generals. . . ." Hashimoto became an important source of information for the embassy.²⁰

In the summer of 1940, shortly before Dooman was to leave on a six month furlough in the United States, Hashimoto came by with news that he too planned to visit America. He informed Dooman of his desire to meet with as many prominent individuals as possible and to explain Japan's hopes for a peaceful settlement of the disrupted relations between the two nations. Several events had motivated Hashimoto. On May 10, 1940, his organization had published in their own and

¹⁹Record Group 83, "Correspondence," 1939, Vol. XXX, 800 S to Z, note for file prepared by Cabot Coville, 12/30/1939; Tetsuma Hashimoto, The Untold Story of Japanese-American Negotiations (Tokyo: Shuinso Press, 1946), pp. 18-30; Grew papers, Vol. 100, Diary, 3/29/1940, p. 4336.

²⁰EHD, p. 91; Hashimoto, pp. 22-23, 27.

in ten other leading Japanese newspapers an article that strongly advocated cultivating peace with America. Dooman called Hashimoto upon reading the article, informing him that the embassy had wired the gist of his statements to the Department. Dooman added that if the Japanese Foreign Office agreed with the contents of the article then relations could "be adjusted at once." Before his departure in August, Dooman again contacted Hashimoto to assure him that Dooman would be waiting in Washington to introduce him to members of the Department.²¹

The two men planned to meet in January, but in the interlude there were a series of ominous episodes. In September, Japan had signed a pact with Germany and Italy - a move that virtually turned American opinion against the Japanese. In Washington, Dooman visited the Department only to discover that he was not popular with certain individuals. Hashimoto in the meantime visited with Prime Minister Konoye Fumimaro, and members of his Cabinet and also spoke with representatives of both the army and the navy. From various government officials he received both funds and good wishes. From Grew, he received a letter of recommendation describing Hashimoto as a man whom the Ambassador held in high esteem and who was dedicated to bringing about an improvement in Japanese-American relations. Hashimoto then left for the States.²²

²¹Hashimoto, pp. 28-31.

²²Ibid., pp. 59, 63, 66-67; Grew papers, Vol. 98, Letters, Grew to Hornbeck, 12/27/1940.

On January 17, Dooman and Hashimoto met in Washington. Dooman introduced the visitor to members of the Division but he did not take part in any of the subsequent discussions because, he reported to Hashimoto, he had encountered opposition from those who felt his views were too moderate regarding Japan. Therefore Dooman felt his presence might jeopardize the talks. Hashimoto persevered, and in the following weeks he met with Hornbeck, Ballantine, and Hamilton. In his initial conference Hashimoto told the Americans that his purpose in visiting the States "was to gain an insight into the attitude of the American government and people . . . which might be useful to his country in shaping a better course of policy." He then raised a controversial point that Hornbeck seized upon. Hashimoto agreed that Japan had the responsibility for taking the initiative in any efforts to change policy, but he added that it "would be very helpful if the Japanese could be given some assurance. . . ." that a favorable change in Japanese policies would be met with American cooperation. Despite a strong pro-German group in Tokyo, there was much support for improving relations with the United States. He cited as evidence the fact that his government had allowed him to visit the United States and that he had the support of influential individuals. Hornbeck then took the offensive, drawing attention to the apparent conflict between the views which Hashimoto represented

and the actions of the Japanese government. Hornbeck asked if Japan was truly free of strong German influences. Apparently realizing that Hashimoto had already settled that point, Hornbeck quickly added that the onus for rectifying the tangled affairs in Asia lay with Japan and not the United States. The United States had remained committed to one position, he concluded, but Japan had constantly shifted. Hashimoto asked for a recess claiming that he could, if given time, produce some possible solutions to the problems raised in the session.²³

Four days later Hashimoto returned with a summary of the problems which he believed prevented the adjustment of relations and a list of possible solutions. The problems included American fears of being economically squeezed out of China and the Far East and concern over the Japanese-German alliance. To resolve these, Hashimoto suggested that the two countries prepare a "Pacific Pact" that would guarantee the status quo in Asia and an American offer of good offices in the Sino-Japanese conflict. He also presented what was basically a reiteration of Hiranuma's proposal for a meeting called by the United States for the purpose of achieving peace in Europe and East Asia. Hamilton and Ballantine listened to the presentation without comment.²⁴

²³Hashimoto, pp. 56, 67-68; FRUS, 1941, Vol. IV, Ballantine memorandum of Conversation with Hashimoto, Hamilton, and Hornbeck, 1/18/1941, pp. 4-6.

²⁴*Ibid.*, Ballantine memorandum of conversation, 2/22/1941, pp. 10-12.

After Hashimoto's departure, Ballantine described him as "somewhat visionary and impractical in his outlook." He questioned his "very earnestness," observing that the programs were unlikely to succeed. Even if Japan accepted the plan, Ballantine continued, he would remain opposed to it because "it would tend to bring about a situation in which it could be made to appear that the present policies of Japanese leaders have been successful in bringing the United States around to assent to Japanese policies rather than the reverse." In a move that bordered on intentional deceit, Ballantine suggested that Hashimoto should meet with a higher officer in the Department. This move had been engineered earlier to indicate to Hashimoto that his trip had been fruitful and that some hope of an agreement existed. Ballantine had Hashimoto meet with Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, who confined himself to a "few general observations" to satisfy Hashimoto's desire to meet with an influential person. As a final gesture, Ballantine also met with Hashimoto before he left Washington and presented him with a statement that reiterated the Hull line of international behavior.²⁵

Ballantine's strategy worked. Hashimoto left convinced of the "sincerity on the part of the American side

²⁵Ibid., Vol. IV, Ballantine memorandum, 2/5/1941, pp. 27-28.

for the adjustment of . . . relations." The move also fooled Dooman, who believed that the venture had been productive and that it had led to Japan's dispatch of Iwakuro Hideo and Ikawa Tadao who represented the Japanese in the "John Doe" negotiations that followed. Ballantine too was pleased with his work. In a memorandum to Hull he stated that Hashimoto had departed "satisfied with the results of his visit . . . and convinced that Japan's hope for the future lay in a policy of cooperating with the United States." Everyone involved was satisfied with the manner in which the matter was handled but, once again Japanese officials seeking direct answers to pressing problems had come away with little more than they had had previously.²⁶

Dooman, in the meantime, had returned to Japan. There he found Grew distraught and discouraged. During his Counselor's absence, the Ambassador had learned to dislike the jingoistic Matsuoka Yosuke, Konoye's Foreign Minister and a man Dooman characterized as "very clever. . . ." and possessing "a virtual hatred of the United States and Americans in general." Matsuoka had spent his youth in the United States and had related to Dooman the origins of his prejudice. As a student at the University of Washington, Matsuoka had experienced the racist treatment which west coast Americans accorded Japanese. He himself had been a

²⁶Hashimoto, p. 7; EHD, p. 91; FRUS, 1941, Vol. IV, Ballantine memorandum, 2/25/1941, pp. 49-50.

victim of a racial incident. Two white students set upon him stealing his hat. The first of the two threw the hat to the ground and when Matsuoka stooped to pick it up the second "gave him a kick in the backside. . . ." knocking him down. "Matsuoka said," Dooman recalled, "that he had never forgotten that." Those years in the Pacific northwest left an unfavorable impression on Matsuoka though he kept it concealed "under an extremely effusive and . . . friendly. . . ." appearance until 1940. Beginning in that year Matsuoka verbally attacked the allies in what Dooman believed was an attempt to provoke a new spirit of toughness in Japanese diplomacy.²⁷

The Foreign Minister seemed to be enjoying some success in that direction in February of 1941 when Dooman arrived back in Tokyo. Japan appeared on the verge of securing bases in French Indo-China, and Grew had strong reasons to believe that Japan's next move would be an expensive plunge southward towards Singapore. The blusterings of Matsuoka and other warning signals caused Grew to prepare a telegram to Hull suggesting a show of naval power in Asian waters. He had delayed sending the cable pending Dooman's return. His Counselor argued persuasively that the proposed action would most likely fail as a deterrent, adding that a major show of force ran the risk of a hostile

²⁷EHD, pp. 77-78, Heinrichs, p. 324.

encounter. The reports of the Military Attaché, Lieutenant Colonel Harry L. Cresswell, had failed to support the Ambassador's contention, as well. After some discussion among the staff, Grew decided against sending the cable.²⁸

Dooman had not taken his position out of a feeling of weakness, nor was he opposed to a show of force when the situation called for it. A week after the incident of the telegram Dooman took it upon himself to demonstrate his unhappiness with Japanese officialdom in an explosive manner. During a meeting with Ohashi Chuichi, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dooman reached his flash point. After listening to a diatribe defending Japanese policy, Dooman unleashed a tirade of his own. Using his Japanese to its fullest, he made Ohashi aware of America's growing dissatisfaction with the general world situation and Japan's alliance with Germany and Italy. That pact, the growing enmity with America's ally Great Britain, and Japan's failure to resolve the Chinese conflict threatened to bring the United States into those hostilities. Having concluded, Dooman left. Ohashi was stunned and was at a loss for words. Although his outburst had been spontaneous, the hard hitting words became official when Grew assured Matsuoka with some pleasure that Dooman had spoken with the Ambassador's approval and that Washington had not disavowed any of the Counselor's comments.²⁹

²⁸Heinrichs, pp. 326-327.

²⁹Ibid.; FRUS Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, Grew to the Secretary of State, 2/26/1941, pp. 137-143.

During the summer of 1941 tensions in the Pacific increased sufficiently that Konoye took a further step towards reaching an accord with the United States. On September 6 Konoye sent his private secretary Ushiba Tomohiko to the embassy asking for a secret meeting with Grew and Dooman. At the appointed time an unmarked car arrived at the embassy to pick them up and carry them to a house in the Tokyo suburbs. In a private setting, the four men, Grew, Dooman, Konoye, and Ushiba dined and talked "openly and frankly. . . ." Konoye assured Grew that he accepted the four principles that Hull had steadfastly insisted on as the basis for establishing any subsequent agreements or action. Konoye commented that the urgency of the situation necessitated his approach outside of ordinary diplomatic channels. He told the Americans that he was prepared to reconsider an earlier proposal and meet with President Roosevelt at which time he would present the President with a "proposition that . . . Roosevelt could not afford to reject." If acceptable to Roosevelt, Konoye would radio the news back to Tokyo, and a cessation of the fighting in China would follow.³⁰

³⁰Grew papers, "Personal Notes," 9/26/1941, p. 5643; EHD, pp. 94-95. Hull's four principles were: (1) Respect for the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of each and all nations; (2) Support of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries; (3) Support of the principle of equality of commercial opportunity; (4) Non-disturbance of the status quo in the Pacific except as the status quo may be altered by peaceful means. See FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, p. 332.

Throughout the encounter, Ushiba had acted as an interpreter. As the two Americans prepared to leave Konoye detained Dooman speaking to him in Japanese. "Now," Konoye began, "I'm going to tell you something that I don't want you to repeat to Mr. Grew or in any way disclose. This is purely for your own information so that you can advise the Ambassador with more intelligence as to what my thinking is." The Prime Minister's concern for confidentiality was apparent from his next comment. "The fact is that as soon as I reach an agreement with the President I will report immediately to the Emperor and it will be the Emperor who will command the army to suspend hostilities." This and other statements made during the evening convinced Dooman that Konoye had acted independently without knowledge of his cabinet members or any other government official. It became imperative to the Counselor, therefore, to maintain the cloak of secrecy if the gamble for peace was to succeed.³¹

Without mentioning Konoye's last remarks, Dooman prepared a report of the meeting which Grew forwarded to Hull. Konoye's actions had impressed both men, and the

³¹EHD, p. 95. In 1953 Dooman met Ushiba again and asked if he had any idea as to the nature of the terms that Konoye had in mind. Ushiba replied that he did not, but he assured his American friend that the terms had not been those tentatively agreed upon by Japanese military leaders. Based on this information and his own knowledge of events, Dooman speculated that Konoye had in mind a double cross of the military and that he had in fact a different set of proposals than those that the Emperor had approved for presentation to Roosevelt. EHD, pp. 120-121.

Prime Minister's sincerity led them to believe that the proposed meeting offered the best opportunity thus far for a peaceful settlement of the China war. They pointed out in the report that Konoye had shattered all precedents and traditions by offering to meet with a head of state outside of Japanese territory. They argued that Konoye's willingness to negotiate was a "gauge of the determination of the Japanese government's attempts to reach a settlement." They stressed their belief that this could be "very likely the final effort on the part of the Japanese government to win in its struggle to avoid war with the United States."³²

The proposal enjoyed a brief moment of hope before passing into limbo. President Roosevelt declared that he "would relish a meeting. . . ." with the Prime Minister, but on the advice of Hull and his "associates" the President declined. Roosevelt made the final decision, but his negative answer had strong support in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Hornbeck, who was now Hull's Political Adviser and who had "viewed it from the outset with suspicion and disfavor," advised Hull that the proposed meeting be delayed until the two governments signed a formal agreement reconciling their differences.³³

³²FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, Grew memorandum; Grew, Turbulent Era, Vol. II, pp. 1285-1286, 1302, 1332-1333.

³³Hull, pp. 1023-1025; James C. Thomson, "The Role of The Department of State," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor, p. 83.

The roots of this distrust lay in past events, particularly the "John Doe" negotiations. The idea of the summit had originated during those talks which had begun early in 1941 and continued through the spring and summer. Included on the American side were two Maryknoll priests, James E. Walsh and James M. Drought, and on the Japanese side were a banker and businessman, Iwaka Tadao, and Colonel Iwakuro Hideo. On April 16 the four men drew up a "draft understanding" which they hoped would become a basis for high level talks. They delivered the document to Hull and Japanese Ambassador Nomura Kichisaburo for consideration during their negotiations which were being conducted simultaneously. Konoye also received a copy, and he believed that it had originated in the Department at the instigation of the President. Foreign Minister Matsuoka objected to the contents of the note and had Nomura deliver a response that differed significantly from the agreements included in the April 16 paper, and he deleted any reference to a conference. On August 8, however, Nomura inquired as to the possibility of a meeting between the Premier and the President, and Konoye made similar overtures through the Ambassador on August 18 and 28. It seemed to Hull and his advisers that Konoye's offers were a reiteration of earlier proposals that the Japanese had responded to negatively in May, and they viewed with suspicion and with a jaundiced

eye the Premier's overtures of August and September as they came shortly after the American government's freeze of Japanese assets in July.³⁴

³⁴Robert J. C. Butow, "Backdoor Diplomacy in the Pacific: The Proposal for a Konoye-Roosevelt Meeting, 1941," Journal of American History, LIX, 1, June 1972, pp. 49-72. Butow concludes that had Grew and Dooman been aware of the origins of the proposal they may have been skeptical; Chihiro Hosoya, "Japan's Foreign Ministry and its Embassy in Washington," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor, pp. 149-157; FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, pp. 344-347. Dooman states in his oral History interview with Hull complicated matters by violating the request for secrecy, thereby ensuring the collapse of any further attempts at negotiations. One of the significant points of the September 6 meeting was Konoye's agreement to the four principles, but that this had to remain confidential. But Dooman, continues, Hull asked Nomura why the Ambassador had not made any mention of the four principles while Konoye had indicated his acceptance of them. Repercussions from Hull's actions, according to Dooman, reached back to Japan. Toyoda Teijiro, the new Foreign Minister called on the embassy asking to speak with Grew or Dooman. Solemnly Toyoda, who Dooman believed had remained uninformed of Konoye's move until this point, asked "is it true that Prince Konoye unconditionally or conditionally accepted Mr. Hull's four principles?" Dooman goes on to say that he and Grew believed that Hull had deliberately violated the request for secrecy to undermine Konoye's move. The results of Hull's indiscretion doomed, Dooman believed, the talks and destroyed the good faith that Grew and Dooman had built among Japanese leaders. With the embassy out of the picture all further negotiations became meaningless. EHD, p. 97; Dooman's allegations are not supported by the documents examined.

The embassy had in fact contributed little in the way of policy making since 1939. The negative attitude of Roosevelt's and Hull's advisers in Washington had negated Grew and Dooman's efforts in each of the three instances of special overtures seeking an end to the existing enmity. Those negative reactions simply could not have come from a belief that Grew and Dooman interpreted events incorrectly, for in one instance at least, Dooman's evaluation of Hiranuma's effort in 1939 had not differed significantly from the Department's. The differences that occurred throughout the period centered around what action should be appropriate. In each of the cases it seems that Dooman was willing to accept, or at least feign acceptance of, the proposals and thereby ease tensions which in turn may have opened the way to further negotiations. Dooman and Grew blamed Washington for the failure of the attempts at peace in 1939, 1940, and 1941. The negative responses discouraged any further Japanese moves in this direction. By 1940 the world was divided into two camps, and the allies had rejected the Japanese, forcing them into the axis alliance. The staunch demands of Hull and the constant rejections made by Washington had left the Japanese two alternatives in 1941. They could give in to the demands of a western power or go to war.

War came. Grew and Dooman had expected it, predicted it and warned against it but to no avail. Officials in Washington maintained that they appreciated the information

that they received from Tokyo but that it had limited value because of Grew and Dooman's limited perspective. Hornbeck, Hull, and the others shared, Dooman alleged, "The invincible conviction that Japan was bluffing. . . ." They dismissed Dooman's explanation of the situation that Japan had fought for four years and was earnestly seeking a way out with "prestige and dignity unimpaired." This had been the embassy's goal as well during the period but it failed because of attitudes like those held by Hornbeck, who believed that Japan could be brought to its knees by economic sanctions and without the use of force. Dooman cited as a good example a November 27 memorandum that Hornbeck had prepared. In it Hull's adviser set forth his firm belief that "the Japanese government does not desire or intend to have forthwith a conflict with the United States . . .," adding conclusively that the United States was not "on the immediate verge of war in the Pacific." Within two weeks the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor.³⁵

From December 8, 1941 until June 25, 1942, the Japanese held American diplomatic personnel prisoners within the embassy compound. Grew described the period of internment as "incarceration," as his keepers worked at making the stay

³⁵ Heinrichs, pp. 355-356; FRUS, Japan, 1931-1941, Vol. II, Grew to Secretary of State, 11/3/1941, p. 704; EHD, pp. 109, 123-124. For an analysis of the decreasing role that the embassy played see Iriye, "The Role of the United States Embassy in Tokyo," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor, pp. 121-123, 125-126.

unpleasant. Dooman, who had lived among the Japanese for years and who had developed a strong affinity for them, saw the other face, the one that Ballantine had described. The police whom he described as being puffed up with a "swollen sense of importance," initially refused him entry into the embassy grounds. Inside Japanese servants continued working for the Americans, giving up their own freedom. Finally, after seven months of diplomatic maneuvering and bickering, Dooman and the others departed from Yokohama as part of an exchange of official personnel. His work in behalf of good Japanese-American relations seemed at an ebb, but in fact they were to continue.³⁶

³⁶Heinrichs, p. 358; EHD, pp. 103-104, 108-109, 125-131; Grew papers, "Diary" 1941, pp. 7-8.

CHAPTER 6

PANDORA'S BOX

Dooman did not come home a hero. He had not anticipated retirement when he returned from Japan in 1942, but during the next three years he came under increasing attacks from sources both within and outside of the government. After a brief stay in the Soviet Union, he returned to the Department and once again worked for Grew who in 1944 became Under Secretary of State. In 1944-45 Dooman focused his energies on post-war planning for Japan, and the victory in Europe shifted his attention to the problem of American demands for Japan's unconditional surrender. Under Grew's auspices Dooman worked to produce a document spelling out American plans regarding the Emperor and the imperial institution in hopes that it would alleviate Japanese fears and hasten an end to the war. Consequently, the two men became the object of bitter criticism and were accused of being appeasers. Dooman's apprehensions intensified as he learned of rumors of Japan's desire to capitulate, but even as he prepared a document which eventually became the instrument of surrender for Japan, American scientists were perfecting the first atomic bomb. The decision to use that weapon was unwise, Dooman

concluded, and it was made by men who had little concern for the Japanese but who had more interest in winning a victory in the rapidly developing cold war.

Upon his return to the United States in 1942, Dooman underwent a debriefing process before beginning a two-month furlough. He resumed his duties in an entirely new environment, serving as the Chargé at the embassy in Moscow. He later moved to Kuybyshev, the Soviet Union's wartime capital. Even in neutral Russia he found himself constantly reminded of the strife existing between the United States and Japan. American diplomats attended state functions where they inevitably encountered Japanese representatives. Protocol demanded that the two parties should refrain from any unfriendly gestures. For Dooman, however, the problem was of a different nature. Many of those individuals were his friends, people whom he had known and associated with on a personal basis. Such was the case when, on a crisp spring evening, Dooman met Ota Saburo, a Foreign Ministry official, at the opera house. This produced little more than formal glances of recognition, but soon afterwards at a luncheon the two met again. This time Dooman took the initiative, slipping a small piece of paper into Ota's hand. On it, written in Japanese, was a message that almost moved the Japanese diplomat to tears: "'Mina-san

ni yoroshiku. Genki de ne. (Regards to everybody. Keep well.)¹

Dooman himself was not well, as persistent problems with his duodenal ulcer cut short his tour. In April 1943 he became seriously ill and returned home. That summer, he worked for a short period under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agreement, in November he joined other Department personnel assigned to post-war planning for Japan. He continued working in that capacity until his retirement at the end of August 1945.²

¹EHD, pp. 131-132; Asahi Shinbum, The Pacific Rivals: A View of Japanese-American Relations, by the staff of the Asahi Shinbum (New York: Weatherhill/Asahi, 1972), p. 104.

²EHD, pp. 131-132. Department officials had realized early the importance of presurrender planning. That recognition had produced an Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy, an embryonic presurrender planning group in February 1942, less than two months after the attack on Pearl Harbor. This committee spawned various subcommittees with responsibilities for specified geographic areas. In the summer of 1943 the Department began forming interdivisional area committees, and a few weeks later an area committee for the Far East emerged. Members of these various bureaucratic organs drew up papers recommending specific directions that policy should take. In an attempt to control and coordinate the work of all the groups Stettinius made his proposal for a single coordinating committee. The evolution of the post-war planning groups is described in Hugh Borton's "American Presurrender Planning for Postwar Japan," Occasional Papers of the East Asian Institute (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 5-14, 18. Borton's pamphlet provides a description of the creation of the Department of State's planning groups and the work that they did and includes Borton's own role as a planner. The work leaves room for further study, particularly in the area of analysis regarding the effectiveness of the groups, and the intersection of the Department's offices and the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department.

Secretary of State Hull's resignation in November 1944 was followed by a reorganization of the Department of State. Roosevelt had chosen Edward Stettinius as Hull's successor, and the new Secretary selected Grew as his Under Secretary. Ballantine took over the recently renamed Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and Dooman was appointed his assistant. Stettinius had already proposed that a committee be appointed to coordinate the post-war planning efforts of the State, War, and Navy Departments and followed through with his idea once appointed. This committee had, besides intradepartmental functions, the responsibility of formulating recommendations for the Secretary of State regarding military and political issues. This joint State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) first met in December and three weeks later appointed a subcommittee on the Far East with Dooman as the Chairman.³

Dooman's return to the Department and his promotion had not gone unnoticed. In September 1943, Truman Martin, a colonel in the War Department's military intelligence section, contacted Dooman, soliciting his opinion on the possible effects of American protests against Japanese maltreatment of prisoners and a possible warning that the United States would hold the Emperor responsible for such mistreatment. Dooman replied that such threats would have

³Borton, "Presurrender Planning," p. 18.

little effect on Japanese military leaders except to antagonize them and thereby further endanger the lives of those held captive. This initial contact began a sequence of correspondence that lasted over a year during which time Martin came to rely on Dooman's counsel.⁴

Others too had taken notice of Dooman's position. In December, Julian Friedman, a Treasury Department employee, notified Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Dexter White, of recent appointments within the Department of State. Friedman noted Dooman's return calling Dooman's position as Assistant Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs a "key post." He also pointed to Grew's and Ballantine's appointments, and lumping the three men together, described them as individuals who believed "that agreement between the United States and pre-war Japan was possible . . . that war with Japan was unnecessary and caused mainly by our 'sentimentalist' attitude toward China." The three men wanted at war's end, Friedman continued, "a strong Japan and a weak China." The memorandum reflected an already existing antipathy between Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, White's superior, and those sympathetic to Japan. Dooman depicted Morgenthau as being "under the thumb . . . of White," and he added that both shared an opposition for

⁴Truman Martin to Dooman, 9/3/1943; Dooman to Martin, 9/11/1943; Other correspondence between the two men include letters on 1/31/1944, and 3/24/1944. Dooman papers.

"anything like a rational treatment of Germany and Japan." Thus it was that Friedman noted the ascent of a trio that precluded a satisfactory settlement of post-war problems in Asia.

These are the men who will be in charge of State Department policy on the Far East when the fate of China and Japan are being decided . . . It does not seem likely that sufficient voice will be given to the importance of building up China, as the stabilizing country in the Pacific area.⁵

Unaware of Friedman's letter, Dooman began work in January of 1945 overseeing the work of SWNCC's subcommittee on the Far East which drafted, reviewed, and submitted proposals to the parent committee for approval. Those recommendations, once passed by SWNCC became official United States policy subject, in Japan's case, to implementation by the Supreme Allied Commander of Pacific forces (SCAP). The Yalta Conference in February was to result in a major change in policy formulation. In March a new organization, the Informal Policy Committee on Germany (IPCOG) came into existence, relieving SWNCC of its responsibilities for Germany and shifting more attention to Dooman's subcommittee, as SWNCC began devoting its planning efforts almost exclusively to matters pertaining to Asia.⁶

⁵U. S. Senate, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, The Morgenthau Diary (China) Vol. III (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), memorandum, Friedman to White, 12/27/1944, p. 1394.

⁶Borton, "Presurrender Planning," pp. 19-20.

Dooman and his committee alleviated the burden of work carried out by earlier planning groups, and they quickly found that the problem of Japan's imperial institution required a large amount of time and effort. They were keenly aware of the importance of the Emperor, and they approached their task with caution. The Japanese revered their monarch with, the committee reported, "almost a fanatical devotion . . . , because of the unique position the Emperor occupies." The Emperor is considered "to be the source from which all authority emanates and is regarded as sacred and inviolable." This information was elementary as most people knew that traditionally the Japanese believed the Emperor and his ancestors represented a divine, unbroken lineage of rulers in Japan since 660 B.C. and provided a link between his people and their spiritual ancestors. Thus his position transcended the normal role of a ruler as the head of state. The special position of the Emperor obviously made difficult any attempts to deal with this problem.⁷

Dooman, Borton, and others had tackled this problem in May 1944, prior to the establishment of the SWNNC sub-committee. As members of the Department's Interdivisional Planning Committee on the Far East, they had drafted a policy paper focusing on "The Institution of the Emperor," contending

⁷PWC 116D/CAC 91E, policy paper entitled "Japan: Political Problems: Institution of the Emperor," 5/9/1944, Box 78, Notter files.

that any "attempt from the outside to abolish the institution of the Emperor would, so long as the present attitude of the Japanese continues, probably be ineffective." As an alternative, they suggested that the allied Military Governor, who would hold a superior position during a post-war occupation, should allow the Emperor "to direct certain functions . . . which relate to the delegation of administrative duties to subordinate officials." The planners hypothesized that "This procedure should facilitate the rise of Japanese officials . . . under the military government." This policy of indirect occupation subsequently became part of the official post-war plans for Japan.⁸

A second nettlesome problem had been created in December 1943 when Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek met at Cairo and issued a statement setting forth the general aims of the allies, including a call for the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers. By April of 1945 the outcome of the Pacific war was evident, and the question no longer was "would Japan surrender," but rather "when would Japan surrender?" American air power, striking from bases in Saipan, attacked targets within the Japanese islands at will while American naval vessels crippled Japan's fleet and blockaded the sealanes. In desperation, Japanese pilots resorted to suicide (kamikaze) attacks, but it was

⁸Ibid. Borton, "Presurrender Planning," pp. 15-18.

already clear that even these "divine wind" fliers could not turn the tide of defeat. Still the fierce fighting of Japanese soldiers on Saipan and Iwo Jima indicated that an invasion of Japan's main islands, in an effort to secure an unconditional surrender, could mean an inordinate number of allied casualties.

Faced with that unpleasant prospect and armed with the knowledge of Japan's weakened condition, SWNCC's Far Eastern Committee prepared a statement early in 1948 defining "unconditional surrender." Basing their paper on an earlier document, the subcommittee arrived at a "workable definition" of the term and recommended that Japan be given the right to settle its own economic, political, and social problems. Their proposal went to the parent committee, and to the surprise of some of the drafters SWNCC approved it. Thus, by May, the problem created through the use of the term "unconditional surrender" seemed to diminish, and a possible settlement in the Pacific appeared to be in the making.⁹

Further evidence that an end to hostilities was imminent had come on April 15 when Admiral Suzuki Kantaro, a "moderate," replaced General Koiso Kuniaki as Japan's Prime Minister. Dooman believed that this move indicated a Japanese willingness to enter into talks in the direction of capitulation. In a 1944 "estimate of the requirements for bringing forth an unconditional surrender of Japan. . . .,"

⁹Ibid., pp. 24-25.

Dooman spelled out the sequence of events that he felt would lead to that action. He predicted a "series of violent offensive operations . . . diminishing in intensity . . . and final exhaustion," followed by "a reorganization of the Japanese Government in preparation for surrender." Little more than a year had elapsed since Dooman's prediction when Suzuki took over as Prime Minister.¹⁰

Subsequently reports regarding Japanese enquiries into the possibilities of concluding the war reached Washington through the Office of Strategic Services. Intercepted Japanese messages also revealed that Japanese government officials had sent former Prime Minister Hirota Koki to Russia for the purposes of improving Soviet-Japanese relations and convince the Soviets to act as an arbiter between the Japanese and the allies. That effort failed because of a secret agreement that Russia had made at Yalta committing itself to enter the Pacific war once Germany had been defeated. Similar attempts by Japanese army officers to solicit aid from the Chinese communists also failed.¹¹

¹⁰Dooman to Martin, 1/31/1944, Dooman papers.

¹¹740.00119PW/5-1245, OSS Director William Donovan to Assistant Secretary of State James Dunn, 5/12/1945; 740.00119PW/6-2245, G. Edward Buxton, Acting Director, OSS to Dunn, 6/22/1945; Robert J. C. Butow, Japan's Decision to Surrender (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954), pp. 90-92; Saburo Hayashi and Alvin D. Coox, Kogun: The Japanese Army in the Pacific War (Quantico, Va.: Marine Corps Association, 1959), pp. 176-177.

Despite the Japanese attempts to initiate peace talks, the United States maintained a "hard line" on surrender. On May 8, President Harry S. Truman, who had succeeded Roosevelt upon the latter's death in April, had issued a statement directed at Japan. He reemphasized unconditional surrender, spelling out what this meant for Japan. Truman promised "utter destruction" of Japanese military units and their supporting activities if hostilities continued. Should the armed forces accept their defeat, the President pointed out, it would mean "the end of the war . . . for the Japanese people." "It means," he continued, "termination of the influence of . . . military leaders . . . the return of soldiers and sailors to their families . . ." and a hope for an end to "the present agony and suffering of the Japanese." Truman concluded by saying that "Unconditional surrender does not mean the extermination or enslavement of the Japanese. . . ."12 The President's speech made no reference to the Emperor.

Dooman and Grew did not object to the President's declaration, although Dooman thought it was prepared with inadequate knowledge. In a 1965 letter to Len Giovannitti, Dooman recalled that he had read a draft which John K. Fairbank, a Harvard professor working for the War Department, had written and told Fairbank that his "statement lacked substance" and that the last line was particularly objectionable, if not

¹²U. S. Department of State, Department of State Bulletin, XII, 307 (May 13, 1945), p. 886.

ludicrous. After all, Dooman observed, "the Japanese people are aware that in this day and age a defeated people [are] not enslaved." It was, he recalled, simply inadequate for the purposes that the Department had in mind, and it came as no surprise to Dooman that there was no response from Japanese leaders. He then stressed his conviction that the only meaningful statement would be some insurance as to the well-being of the Emperor and the continuance of the monarchy. That mild protest was the only objection raised before the President issued the statement.¹³

Dooman was not alone in this view. There existed among the Far Eastern planners a consensus that some sort of statement was necessary regarding Japan's future. The problem remained one of the nature of the announcement. Dooman's subcommittee had considered this enigma prior to Germany's surrender, but victory in Europe stimulated them to work for an announcement guaranteeing the continuation of the imperial institution in order to "allay the fears of the

¹³Dooman papers, Dooman to Len Giovannitti, 3/11/1965. Dooman papers. Giovannitti was researching material for a National Broadcasting Corporation's television program, "The Surrender of Japan," which was aired on September 19, 1965, with Dooman taking part in an interview. A copy of the transcript is included in the Dooman collection. Giovannitti subsequently published a book based on the research that he did for the program. Len Giovannitti and Fred Freer, The Decision to Drop the Bomb (New York: Coward McCann, Inc., 1965). Dooman later questioned the wisdom of issuing the statement because it has, "as expected, served only to increase Japanese doubts and confusion." This is included in the paper which Dooman prepared and submitted to replace the oral history interview for Columbia, p. 4. Dooman had not been satisfied with the original transcript and submitted this shorter paper, which is hereafter designated as EHDCOHP.

Japanese" and encourage surrender. On May 26, following an extensive series of air raids on Tokyo, Grew asked Dooman to prepare a statement "calling on the Japanese to surrender and setting forth in general terms, but as succinctly as possible, what the allies would or would not do. . . ." Drawing on a composite of previously agreed upon principles and policies Dooman completed the paper and submitted it to Grew on the 28th.¹⁴

The would-be-proclamation had, in Dooman's mind, a dual purpose. It should spell out in no uncertain terms the determination of the allies to defeat Japan, but at the same time it should offer inducements to capitulation. He had lifted the preamble of his work "almost bodily" from an

¹⁴EHD, p. 161; EHDCOHP, p. 12. There has existed some questions regarding the May 28 document and whether or not it was the same one that Grew handed to Byrnes as the Secretary was leaving for Potsdam. The question was raised in the FRUS, Potsdam, Vol. I, regarding a document marked 740.00119EW/5-3145, page 897. Heinrichs subsequently saw that document and concluded correctly that it was not the version given to Byrnes but that the authorship was uncertain as there were no initials or indication of who may have prepared it. However there is another copy of the same document in the Pacific War decimal file series, marked 740.00119PW/6-1345 which bears Dooman's initials (AD-EHDOoman:bmz). Further proof that this is the document presented at the May 28 Meeting is evident from another document, 740.00119PW/8-245, 8/2/1945 prepared by Sir George Samson of the British embassy. In it Samson reviews "the document regarding the future treatment of Japan, which was shown to him on May 29." The notes attached clearly indicate that Samson read the paper described above. Heinrichs is correct in his observation that the two documents, the one of May 28 and the one given to Byrnes, are different.

earlier piece that former actor Douglas Fairbanks, Jr. had prepared for the Navy Department. Dooman had originally considered Fairbanks' effort as a bit too strong -- "It was one of those blood and thunder things . . . surrender or we'll blow you to hell sort of thing." But as he worked at preparing a document that would carry a message of hope to the Japanese, Fairbanks' "blood and thunder" warning was included, apparently to satisfy Americans who preferred "no quarter." In the body of the message, Dooman presented the "terms" of the allies in general phraseology that only indirectly dealt with the Emperor. "Unconditional surrender," applied in his version only to the armed forces, not to the Japanese people or government. Instead of guaranteeing that the United States would preserve the throne, he used a quotation from a speech by Chiang Kai-shek on New Years Day, 1944 in which the Generalissimo stated that the character of the future Japanese political system "should . . . better be left to the awakened and repented Japanese people to decide for themselves." In this manner Dooman felt that he had subtly raised and settled the issue of the Emperor.¹⁵

Dooman delivered his draft to Grew, who in turn discussed it with Assistant Secretaries Dean Acheson and Archibald MacLeish and the heads of the geographical divisions at a Department Policy Committee meeting.

¹⁵A copy of the original May 28 statement is attached to a memorandum prepared by Dooman on June 16, 1945 and given by Grew to the President June 15.

Acheson and MacLeish objected to the inclusion of any comment that inhibited the United States from disestablishing the monarchy. There were no further objections, and Grew discussed the document with Truman later that day. In his interview with the President, Grew emphasized "that the greatest obstacle to unconditional surrender by the Japanese is their belief that this would entail the destruction or permanent removal of the Emperor and the institution of the throne." The President agreed, stating that "his own thoughts had been following the same line," but asked that Grew first discuss it with the Secretaries of War and of the Navy.¹⁶

On May 29 all parties concerned met at the Pentagon. Those present included Dooman, Grew, Stimson, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, Director of the Office of War Information (OWI) Elmer Davis, General George C. Marshall, and the President's Legal Adviser Samuel Rosenman. Dooman and Grew addressed the group, restating their feelings regarding the disposition of the Emperor and the reason for the draft document. When they solicited comments from the group, Davis objected to the statement citing the same arguments that

¹⁶EHDCOHP, pp. 14-16; Grew Turbulent Era, Vol. II, pp. 1428-1434 (a copy of this excerpt in the Dooman papers is marked (erroneously) as being part of Grew's diary).

Acheson and Macleish had presented earlier. Stimson, Forrestal, and Marshall "were in accord with the principles," Grew reported, "but for certain military reasons, not divulged, it was considered inadvisable for the President to make a statement." Stimson, Forrestal, and Marshall were aware of the development of the atomic bomb and regardless of Grew's impression that the President had agreed with him, Truman later claimed otherwise. "I had listened to many arguments on the question of unconditional surrender, both pro and con," Truman wrote in his memoirs, and "The complete collapse of the German armies and their unconditional surrender had settled the argument by itself." In May, American scientists had nearly completed work on a device which Stimson described to Truman as "the most terrible weapon ever known in human history. . . .," the atomic bomb. Possession of this knowledge bolstered Truman's position, for he could realistically expect Japan to capitulate without question when confronted with this weapon to the American arsenal.¹⁷

Grew and Dooman persevered. On June 15, Grew once again brought Dooman's May 28 draft to Truman's attention, this time sending him a reply attaching it to a memorandum suggesting two minor changes. Then on

¹⁷740.00119PW/5-2945, Grew memorandum of conversation with Stimson, Forrestal, Marshall, Davis, Rosenman, and Dooman, 5/29/1945; EHDCOHP, p. 16. Dooman indicates that Assistant Secretary of War John McCloy and several generals and admirals were also in attendance. Harry S. Truman, Year of Decisions, Vol. I of Memoirs by Harry S. Truman (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955), p. 208; Henry L. Stimson, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," Harper's Magazine, February 1947, p. 99.

the 26th, Grew, Stimson, and Forrestal met the President. Grew now had a strong ally in Stimson, who had begun thinking, as several people had, that the Japanese should be given a warning prior to any extraordinary attack. Knowledge of the atom bomb and the projected high cost of lives that would be lost in an invasion had evidently aroused Stimson's compassion. Together with Grew and Forrestal he suggested that representatives from the State, War, and Navy Departments should prepare a statement of warning to Japan. With all in agreement, Grew nominated Dooman and Ballantine as the Department's representatives. On July 2, Stimson gave an additional push when he prepared a long memorandum setting forth his ideas regarding the purpose, nature, and content of the warning. The elements which he wanted to include in the "warning," as he described it, closely followed the points set forth in Dooman's earlier draft except that Stimson explicitly provided for the possibility of the Japanese maintaining a "constitutional monarchy under the present dynasty."¹⁸

Stimson sent his memorandum to Truman on July 2. Simultaneously the joint drafting committee sent its version to the State Department. The Committee's proposal, a thirteen paragraph document, incorporated many of Dooman's ideas but

¹⁸Stimson, "The Decision to use the Atomic Bomb," pp. 101-104, EHDCOHP. p. 22; 740.00119 P.W./6-1645, Grew to President, 6/16/1945.

did not make any specific reference to the person of the Emperor or the institution of the throne. When Dooman read the copy received at the Department on July 3, he called Assistant Secretary of War John McCloy's office and suggested that paragraph 12 be amended to allow, as in Stimson's memorandum, for the establishment of "a constitutional monarchy under the present dynasty." Grew had delivered the final draft to James Byrnes, who had succeeded Stettinius on July 3, and the new Secretary would carry it with him to the Allied Summit at Potsdam.¹⁹ With their mission completed, Grew, Stimson, and Dooman relaxed with a sense of accomplishment.

The three men had agreed on the need to maintain the imperial institution, and each had similar and different

¹⁹FRUS, The Conference at Berlin (Potsdam), Vol. I, Document 591, 6/26/1945, pp. 887-888; Stimson, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," pp. 101-104. Heinrichs has concluded that the final document was a third or fourth generation version of Dooman's May 28 Statement. It had undergone reworking in the Joint Committee. Heinrichs, note 57, p. 379. Further support for Dooman's claims to being the originator of the Potsdam Declaration is given in an August 27 Newsweek article that describes Dooman as "The Architect of Potsdam Terms." "The What to do Men," Newsweek, August 27, 1945, p. 39. There is no substantial evidence to prove that Dooman did in fact make the telephone call to the War Department. There is a note attached to the final version of the document with the modified paragraph 12 in the State Department papers. At the top there is a penned comment "Changes communicated to Col. Gerhardt over the telephone July 3, 5 pm." The handwriting on the sheet bears strong resemblance to Dooman's, but there is no record of who received the call in Gerhardt's office. (Colonel Harrison A. Gerhardt, General Staff Corps, Executive to the Assistant Secretary of War.) See document 740.00119PW/7-245. Who deleted the phrase in the document that was sent to the Department on July 3, and why the phrase was left out, remains a matter of supposition.

reasons. Stimson believed, as did Grew, that retention of the Emperor would guarantee Japanese acceptance of the proposed warning and would save both Japanese and Allied lives. Grew had vacillated over the problem. In 1943 he had stated that without the throne as a cornerstone "for a healthy and peaceful internal . . . regeneration, Japan faced a chaotic future." In April 1945 he had questioned Hirohito's continuance as Emperor and even retention of the throne itself, observing on several occasions that the official attitude towards the ruler should "be left fluid until we can definitely ascertain whether the emperor . . . or the institution of throne is going to be an asset or liability."²⁰

Dooman questioned the wisdom of a direct attack on the throne for some of the same practical reasons cited by Grew in April, but he did not share Grew's later doubts regarding the necessity of keeping the institution. Dooman believed, as he said later, that Japan's "whole social structure would fall apart," if "there were no emperor." The throne had, he elaborated, "kept the Japanese together as a unit for 1500 years" and its demise meant the destruction of the

²⁰FRUS, Potsdam, Vol. I, Document 592, enclosure 2, note Stimson to Truman, 7/2/1945, pp. 893-894; Ibid., note 9, p. 899; Stimson, "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb," p. 102; Grew to Hornbeck, 9/30/1943, Grew papers; Letter, Grew to Dooman, 4/12/1948; Dooman papers; Grew to Ronald Gould, 4/14/1945, and Grew to Lieutenant William W. Wertz, Jr., 5/9/1945, both in the Grew papers; Heinrichs, p. 377.

Japanese social order. He envisioned such a disunified period as an ideal moment for the social revolution called for by well organized communist forces. Retention would work to the advantage of the Allies, Dooman insisted, because the communists realized the incongruity of their system and monarchical governments. Both he and Grew saw communism as a potential threat and both wanted to combat it as best they could. In view of these considerations Dooman questioned the right of a victorious nation to reorder the social structure of the vanquished, and he focused on the need to protect the cultural integrity of the defeated nation.²¹

²¹EHD, pp. 142-143; Dooman to Giovannitti, 3/11/1965; PWC 116/CAC 93e, 5/9/1949 paper, "Japan: Political Problems: Institution of the Emperor," Box 78 of the Harley Notter files, National ARchives; IPR Hearings, p. 705. In 1962 Dooman carefully explained the term unconditional surrender in the paper he submitted to the Columbia Oral History Project. He pointed out that there was a difference between the term when applied to an enemy state rather than its armed forces. The former, he argued, was "known in international law as de bellatio, had defined by actual practice and precedents over the centuries as conferring on the victor absolute and unlimited rights of disposal over the vanquished nation (consistently with the dictates of humanity), including the right to end the latter's independence." He cited as examples the partition of Poland in 1772 and the conversion of the Boer republics into a British colony. On this basis, he evaluated the situation in 1945. "When the victor on his own initiative undertakes to assume limitations on his treatment of the about-to-be defeated nation as an inducement to surrender, and when that inducement is accepted by the latter, he cannot, with any color of reason or logic, now lay claim to the absolute right which unconditional surrender would have conferred." Stimson recognized the limitations which existed as Dooman later pointed out Stimson had stated in his Harper's article of February 1947: "While the Allies made no promises other than those already given. . . ." In a footnote Dooman pointed out that MacLeish had technically violated his own determined efforts to avoid

Several individuals remained unsatisfied by the outcome of the meetings and continued pressing their arguments. On July 5 Assistant Secretary MacLeish forwarded his comments on Dooman's draft to Acheson. He blasted Dooman for his "lack of clarity and candor. . . ." and his attempt "to substitute for 'unconditional surrender' surrender on 'terms' acceptable to the Japanese." MacLeish also criticized use of Chiang Kai-shek's quotation rather than one issued by the United States. He suggested that in the draft Dooman had approached the problem "obliquely" as it referred not to the Emperor but to "the political system" and "form of government." Even this implied easing of Allied demands upset the Assistant Secretary, who strongly objected to the idea of allowing the Japanese to "retain the characteristic and essential institution of their government," and to respect "the person of the incumbent of that institution."²²

offering terms in a radio broadcast of July 22, 1945. After stating that only the unconditional surrender of Japan was acceptable, the Assistant Secretary went on to say that "although the Allies might indicate the measures they would apply to post-surrender Japan, such clarification could not be taken as offering 'terms' to Japan, and therefore a proposal for a negotiated surrender would be nothing more than clarification of the 'treatment' which Japan might expect." Dooman added that "this piece of casuistry was probably put out in anticipation of the Potsdam Declaration." EHDCOHP, pp. 5-6.

²² 740.00119PW/7-545, MacLeish Memorandum to Acheson, 7/5/1945.

Dooman soon learned that others did not share his feelings, and that vestiges of past enmities still remained in the halls of the Department. MacLeish followed his July 5 memorandum to Acheson with a note to Byrnes, criticizing the jointly prepared statement. He reiterated his point that substituting terms, "even irreducible terms, is not unconditional surrender," and if this was the government's intention then he argued, "the American people have the right to know it." He commented that a compromise along the lines proposed proved inconsistent with the policy administered toward Germany. Then MacLeish ventured, as others before him had, his non-expert evaluation of the Japanese mind and the resulting effects that the compromise statement would have on the Japanese people. Although he agreed that retaining the Emperor might speed the capitulation process and save lives, he warned that "Japanese jingoes" had manipulated the throne in the past and they could as easily do so in the future. Retention had to be balanced against "the lives

already spent in vain . . . and lives [that] will be lost again in the future . . . if the throne is employed . . . as it has been in the past." In conclusion MacLeish recommended against issuing any public statement until some final departmental policy had been developed. He added that the reasons for change "should be precise and clear, so that no one in the United States will misunderstand."²³

Grew and Dooman had placed themselves in a tenuous position by suggesting what some interpreted as softening of American policy, and they soon found that others sided with MacLeish. As word of the "Grew-Dooman" proposal became known, the two men came under fire from what Dooman labeled "the liberal press." Two publications in particular, the magazine The Nation and the newspaper P.M. gave wide coverage to "appeasers" in the State Department. Nation carried articles with pseudonym by-lines like "Argus," and "Pacificus." Contributors and editors alike espoused a sympathetic line towards the communist movement, and they consistently attacked the Department for its "reactionary" elements. In February 1945, "Pacificus" had written a bitter criticism of Dooman and his role in the Department. The author decried Dooman's "staunch support" of Japanese "ruling groups" as the most likely source of future leaders for Japan while he ignored

²³FRUS, Potsdam, Vol. I, document 593, memorandum from MacLeish to Byrnes, 7/6/1945, p. 895.

other elements including "Communists . . . , [and] other labor and peasant leaders." The article alleged that Dooman's association with "upper class Japanese" rendered him ineffective as a director of post-war policy.²⁴

In June the attacks became more personal in nature as I. F. Stone and Owen Lattimore, advocates of a "hard peace" line, joined the opposition to any softening of American demands. Stone accused Dooman and Grew of using "the old red bogey" as a vehicle for saving Japan from "full defeat." A subsequent editorial linked Dooman to Assistant Secretary of State James Dunn, who was described as a man of "pro-Franco and anti-Russian prejudices." All three Department officials represented, according to the editorial, a sizeable number of policy makers who had been "contaminated by . . . snobbery and . . . false social standards," making them stumbling blocks to "a vigorous, consistent, democratic foreign policy." In the following issue, Stone continued this line of attack on the two men whom he described as having been "thrilled by the Imperial court and aristocratic society" and thus duped by the clever Japanese in 1941. Consequently Stone surmised that "they cannot be trusted for realistic or rigorous advice for the future of Japan."²⁵

²⁴EHD, p. 136; Pacificus, "Dangerous Experts," The Nation, February 3, 1945, pp. 127-128.

²⁵I. F. Stone, "Arrest of the Six," The Nation, Vol. 160, 24, June 16, 1945, pp. 666-667; Stone, "Clean out the State Department," The Nation, Vol. 161, 1, July 7, 1945, pp. 4-5; Stone, "Pearl Harbor Diplomats," The Nation, Vol. 161, 2, July 14, 1945, pp. 25-27.

Like The Nation, P.M. had a left of center political bias. Its writers assaulted "conservatives" and "Big Business" while supporting leftist ideals. In Max Lerner's four part article, "No Soft Peace -- A Hard Revolt," this point of view came across clearly as the writer attacked the Japanese throne and business concerns. He charged that Japan's problems, past and present, sprang from the "Emperor Institution" which had the support of "Big Business 'liberals . . . ' who are the darlings of the State Department's Grews and Doomans." Following Japan's surrender P.M. would picture Grew and Dooman in caricature, carrying Hirohito on their shoulders, with a caption reading "Our Hiro!" (See overleaf.) The only path open to allied planners, P.M. insisted, lay in the destruction of the throne.²⁶

Russian predominance in Eastern Europe and American fears of the spread of Communism affected war time diplomacy. The Japanese imperial institution became the focus of the debate between right and left wing ideologues in and out of government. American military leaders, notably Admiral William F. Halsey, represented right wing elements, which had called for the elimination of the throne

²⁶Max Lerner, "Mastering Japan's Masters," a four part article in P.M., July 22-August 14, 1945.



SOURCE: P.M., Tuesday, August 14, 1945, p. 2.

and the Shinto faith which supported it. Ironically, the American Communist Political Association announced, similarly, that one of its basic tenets was that "the 'Mikado' must be dethroned." The Nation and P.M., left in orientation, had also endorsed this theme because, they asserted, without the Emperor Japan could undergo a "social revolt," allowing "the people" to take power. Fear of this social revolution stimulated, the journals observed, American interest in retaining the monarchy.²⁷

²⁷ Barton J. Bernstein, "Roosevelt, Truman, and the Atomic Bomb, 1941 - 1945: A Reinterpretation," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 90, 1, Spring 1975, p. 68. Bernstein's article is a critical examination of the Alperovitz theory. (Gar Alperovitz, Atomic Diplomacy -- Hiroshima and Potsdam: The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation with Soviet Power (New York: Vintage Books of Random House, Inc., 1965). Alperovitz argued that the decision to bomb Japan with atomic weapons was made by American leaders who wanted to impress and frighten Soviet leaders in order to gain an advantage in the cold war. Martin J. Sherwin (A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975)) elaborates upon Alperovitz's views but shows that there was in fact a consistent desire to have the United States and Great Britain (the "Grand Alliance") control post surrender world affairs. Sherwin also emphasizes the fact that Truman and Stimson and the others were primarily interested in a swift end to the war with as few allied casualties as possible. All conclude, however, that the bomb and American interpretations of Russian attitudes influenced American foreign policy in 1945; 740.00119PW, memorandum, William T. Turner to Grew, 7/19/1945. Turner quotes Halsey's statements in an issue of Colliers magazine and evaluates Japanese reaction to it. Forrest Davis, "Did Marshall Prolong the Pacific War?" Freedman magazine reprint, November 19, 1951, p. 4.; Lerner, "What to do about the Emperor?" P.M., August 13, 1945, p. 2; Lerner, "What Do We Fear in the Far East?" P.M., August 16, 1945, p. 2; Stone, "Arrest of the Six," p. 6.

Officials sympathetic to those attitudes joined the argument and thereby complicated any movement in the direction of retention. One of the most outspoken of the leftist bureaucrats was serving in the Office of War Information. Owen Lattimore, former editor of Pacific Affairs, the journal of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and a China expert, who had written several books on Asia, bitterly contested what he called "the record of our experts on Japan," and Japan's negative attitude towards a "benevolent" United States. The "Solution in Asia," as Lattimore explained, meant harsh treatment of the Japanese, the removal of the Emperor, and the reorganization of Japanese society. To implement his plan, he called for the internment of the Emperor and all males eligible for succession ("preferably in China"), and for the transfer of royal estates along with those of zaibatsu families to agrarian reform programs. In this way, Lattimore decided, new vested interests would emerge and prevent restoration of the monarchy.²⁸

Among Dooman's associates in the Department were individuals whose work had helped to undermine the thesis that the communists posed a threat. John K. Emmerson, a Foreign Service Officer who had served in Tokyo before the war and later went to Yenan, China, as an observer of Japanese

²⁸Owen Lattimore, Solution in Asia, an Atlantic Monthly Press Book (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945), pp. 8, 17, 27, 47, 187-189.

Communist activities, wrote that the United States had nothing to fear from the communists in Japan. In fact, he argued, Americans could look forward to the help that the communists would provide in post-war Japan. Dooman found equally distressing the fact that few of his fellow workers shared his concern over a possible communist uprising and what he saw as the destruction of Japan's traditional political, economic, and social structure. Adding to his consternation was the problem of a news leak within the Department. Throughout the summer, policy statements made in confidence found their way onto the pages of The Nation and P.M.²⁹

The events of July seemed to favor, however, Grew and Dooman. The Allies had scheduled a conference for the

²⁹894.00/2-1645, John K. Emmerson memorandum, "Communism and the Future of Japan," 2/16/1945, Dooman testified against Emmerson at the IPR Hearings in 1951, and Emmerson has expressed puzzlement over his former "friend's" actions. Dooman testified that Emmerson had commended a Japanese communist, Nozaka Sanzo, to the Department and he, Emmerson, later visited with that same individual in a Japanese prison. Upon release, Emmerson picked him up and drove him to Occupation Headquarters in Tokyo in an official staff car. The latter actions were, according to Emmerson, part of his official duties in the SCAP government. Emmerson was then unaware of the bitter attacks on Dooman back home and later wondered why Dooman, with whom Emmerson "saw eye to eye" in 1945, had turned on him. IPR Hearings, pp. 749-750, and Interview with Emmerson, May 25, 1976. Dooman expressed his concern over the nonchalant attitude towards a social revolution in a letter to Benjamin Mandell, Director of Research, U. S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, 1/12/1959, Dooman papers. Dooman attributed the "leak" in the Department of State to Julian Friedman who was working for John Carter Vincent at the time. IPR Hearings, p. 714.

last two weeks of July at Potsdam, a small town near Berlin, Germany. Grew and Dooman had reason to be optimistic as to the outcome of the summit since American representatives to the conference, including Truman, had read intercepted Japanese cables and knew of Japan's attempts at surrender. Furthermore they had taken with them the draft statement that the joint committee under Dooman's tutelage had prepared. Dooman's hopes ran high. If the Allies published his declaration while at the meeting, he believed that Japan would capitulate allowing a peaceful conclusion to the war.³⁰

On July 26 Dooman's hopes collapsed. On that date the heads of the Allied powers issued the Potsdam Declaration. The statement, essentially the same one sent along with Byrnes, had a major change: the reference to the Emperor had been deleted. In a memorandum prepared for Truman, Admiral William Leahy had suggested that while the Joint Chiefs of Staff felt that the proclamation was "generally satisfactory," they wished to propose a change. "To some of the extreme devotees of the Emperor," Leahy speculated, "the phrase 'this may include a constitutional monarchy under the present dynasty' may be misconstrued as a commitment by the United Nations to depose or execute" Hirohito and place some other member of the family on the throne. He expressed further concern over the reaction of "the radical

³⁰Dooman to Giovannitti, 4/11/1965

elements in Japan to which this phrase may be construed to as a commitment to continue the institution of the Emperor and Emperor worship." Consequently Leahy suggested a phrase acceptable to the Joint Chiefs which made no mention of the Institution. Truman, a man quick to accept the advice of his military advisers, concurred and the original phraseology was changed.³¹

Following the broadcast of the declaration, the Allies bided their time. Little had changed. The powers had done nothing more than to re-emphasize their call for an unconditional surrender, and Japanese reaction to the Potsdam Declaration was a foregone conclusion to Dooman, Grew and others knowledgeable of Japan.

Initially the declaration did not discourage Japanese leaders. Members of the Japanese Foreign Office discerned "conditions" in the ultimatum, and they decided, despite

³¹FRUS, Potsdam, Vol. II, document 1239, Leahy to Truman, 7/18/1945, pp. 1268-1269. Note: the phraseology is Leahy's not the author's. Bernstein points out that Byrnes had deleted the phrase on advice from Hull, who argued inclusion might stiffen Japanese resistance and thereby create political problems for Truman at home. He also notes the action of the Joint Chiefs and concludes that based on these two moves and not for ulterior motives, the President agreed to deletion. The argument that Truman did not want to depart from Roosevelt's policy of unconditional surrender is persuasive except that, as Dooman has pointed out (see footnote 21), inclusion of the phrase would not have been a great deviation. It should also be noted that while Bernstein is aware of Grew's role he seems to have neglected that of Dooman. Thus he has ignored one of the most important questions involved in the entire episode - Why didn't those who made policy listen to an expert?

the objections of the military, not to reject the Allies demands. In a play for time, the government announced that its policy was one of mokusatsu, or "remaining silent." Here the Japanese language worked to the disadvantage of these government officials who had hoped to gain some room for negotiation. The ambiguity of the term produced some confusion because the word lacked an exact equivalent in English. Thus the Tokyo newspaper Mainichi stated that the government considered the declaration a "laughable matter." Japan's War Minister, Anami Korechika, who opposed negotiation, described the government's policy as one of "rejection by ignoring." On July 28 Radio Tokyo broadcast in English the message that Japan chose to "ignore" the Allies' ultimatum. Japan's fate was sealed.³²

Dooman later insisted that American decision makers had decided Japan's fate prior to the Tokyo radio broadcast. On June 1, a committee composed of scientists and government advisers sent to Truman their recommendation "that the bomb be used against the enemy as soon as it could be done." Others opposed its use or at least its direct use on any inhabited sector of Japan. Under Secretary of the Navy Ralph Bard led a group which broached the idea of offering a demonstration of the weapon to the Japanese before using

³²Kazuo Kawai, "Mokusatsu, Japan's Response to the Potsdam Declaration," Pacific Historical Review, XIX, 4 (November 1950), 412-413; Truman, p. 421.

it on target. In doing so, Bard explained the United States would live up to its reputation "as a great humanitarian nation" and display "the fair play attitude" of the American people. A group of sixty-three scientists, led by Leo Szilard, who had originally supported the development of atomic energy for military purposes, sent a petition to Truman asking him not to approve the use of the bomb against occupied areas of Japan. Their efforts went for nought because Truman had already made a decision. On the 26th, after consulting again with his advisers and Churchill, he ordered that the first bomb be dropped after August 3 if Japan had not surrendered before that date.³³ The bombs were dropped on August 6 and 9.

Between 1960 and 1963 Dooman's attitude regarding the reason for the use of the bombings had solidified and his conclusion was similar to the one published by Alperovitz three years later. Truman and his advisers, Dooman alleged, "had made up their minds to use the bomb." He noted Truman's comment; "Let there be no mistake about it, I regarded the bomb as a military weapon and never had any doubt that it should be used." Dooman disputed Stimson's altruistic argument, which he set forth in his 1947 Harpers article,

³³Truman, pp. 419-420; Lewis L. Strauss, "A Thousand Years of Regret," in Strauss, Men and Decisions (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1962), p. 192; Sherwin, p. 202.

that the bomb would shock the Japanese into surrendering and thereby save "many times the number of lives, both allied and Japanese that it (an invasion) would cost." Stimson knew, Dooman argued, of Japan's weakened condition and of their interest in surrendering. Stimson dismissed the early attempts as being "not worthy of 'serious consideration,'" but Dooman counters that the Secretary of War later knew that the Japanese had not ignored the terms of the Potsdam Declaration because he had read an intercept of an August 3 message which indicated Japan's desire to negotiate a surrender based on the declaration. He also doubts the validity of the argument that Stimson set forth justifying the decision not to issue a warning in the end of May. The Secretary indicated in his article that he and others believed that the intense fighting on Okinawa would have been adversely affected by the issuance of a statement that could have been interpreted as making concessions. According to Dooman that theory fails because the battle for Okinawa had been won by the end of May and that only small pockets of resistance still existed at that time.³⁴

"Why then had the bomb been used?" Dooman asked. He speculated that Roosevelt and Truman had "badgered" Stalin into entering the war but that Churchill, after hearing of the

³⁴Dooman, "The A-Bomb and American Foreign Policy," a speech before Saint Michael's Church Men's Club (Litchfield, Conn.) 1/12/1960, Dooman papers; Truman, p. 419; Stimson, "The Decision to use the Atomic Bomb," pp. 101-102, 106; Truman, p. 419; EHDCOHP, 24-26.

successful testing of the bomb, concluded that the Allies no longer needed Russia. The Prime Minister believed, Dooman continued, that "the end of the war was no longer dependent on the pouring in of their armies. . . . We had no need to ask favors of them." Dooman inferred that Truman had agreed and consequently the bomb was not used to save lives but rather to force Japan's capitulation before Russia's entry into the war. In this manner, Dooman sadly concluded, those leaders had hastened to open "a Pandora's box of indescribable horrors. . . ." which became a "fearful price that mankind has been called on to pay for a reckless and sinister gamble which did not come off!"³⁵

Japan surrendered eight days fater the bombing of Hiroshima, but the bomb had not been the deciding factor according to Dooman. In its official account of the August 6 bombing of that city, Japan's Foreign Ministry described the nature of the weapon as a "conventional bomb of extraordinary power." The only confirmation that the United States had used a nuclear weapon appeared in the minutes of an August 9 meeting of the Supreme Council. After concluding that the bomb "was a nuclear device. . . .," General Umezu Yoshijiro reassured the Council that the military could provide an

³⁵Dooman "The A Bomb and American Foreign Policy."

effective defense against further air raids. Despite Umezu's confidence in the military, the Emperor ordered Japan's surrender.³⁶

Surrender meant an American occupation of Japan and implementation of SWNNC's policies to be carried out by the Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific (SCAP), Douglas MacArthur, and his staff. Grew and Dooman worked to have some voice in the SCAP by having Dooman assigned to the general's staff. They had begun their efforts following a mid-July meeting with Brigadier General William Crist, during which Grew had learned of MacArthur's desire for some "top notch men" to serve as his political, economic and financial advisers. Grew had respectfully declined Byrne's suggestion that he serve as political adviser to MacArthur and submitted Dooman's name. Grew had later sent a list of Department personnel which he thought were qualified, including at the top of the list Ballantine's and Dooman's names. Dooman also pursued the

³⁶EHDCHOHP, pp. 27-28; Dooman provides a translation of the Foreign Ministry's report in a footnote (p. 17) of his second version sent to Columbia's Oral History Project. He provides the following citation: "Shusen Shiroku (Documents Relating to the End of the War), Foreign Office, Tokyo, 1961, pp. 535, 536." See Butow, Japan's Decision to Surrender, pp. 151-153. There was a debate among the Japanese military leaders and scientists as to this question. It was not until August 10, a day after the second bombing, that they agreed as to the bomb's nuclear origins. Still many believed that countermeasures could be taken which would afford some protection, i.e., "concrete buildings . . . white clothing."

matter calling attention to the fact that the Department should "take the initiative . . . in appointing" a candidate. The War Department had set a precedent, he continued, when it appointed Robert Murphy as Eisenhower's adviser, adding that "if the initiative [was] left entirely to General MacArthur, the Department may have very little to say about . . . it."³⁷

Grew and Dooman's moves were uncovered and eventually came undone. Acting Secretary of War McCloy had written to Byrnes listing those characteristics which an adviser should possess, including that the individual "should . . . be known to the public as a person in whose judgment great trust can be placed." Dooman's reputation at that point left him short of this image. P.M. quickly picked up the various stories originating in the two Departments and printed them, suggesting that appointing Dooman would be tantamount to an American defeat. Dooman and Grew had acted, and would continue

³⁷740.00119PW/7-1645, Grew memorandum of conversation, 7/16/1945; 740.00 119PW/8-745. Ballantine to Grew, 8/7/1945; 740.00119PW/8-745, Grew to Byrnes, 8/7/1945; 740.00119PW/8-1345, Dooman to Grew and Dunn, 8/13/1945. NOTE: As late as August 22 Grew made efforts to have Dooman assigned to MacArthur's staff. Grew wrote MacArthur that Dooman was "a man who knows and understands the Japanese probably better than any living American," adding that he had passed the name on to the general should he need nature advice on Japan. Grew to MacArthur, 8/22/1945, Grew papers. Grew passed up the offer to go himself saying that he did not want to go back to Japan "in the guise of a conqueror. . . ." and that he doubted that anyone serving MacArthur "would be able to sway any important issue. . . ." as the general was "a prima donna." Grew to Harry S. Grew, 8/21/1945, Grew papers.

to act, according to P.M., not out of any deep concern for the Emperor, but out of a "fear that Asia will swing to the left as. . . ." Europe had.³⁸

The anxiety exhibited in P.M.'s editorials proved unwarranted. Byrnes named George Atcheson, Jr., as Acting Political Adviser, praising him as a "Foreign Service Officer who . . . devoted himself to Far Eastern work." He did not point out, however, that Atcheson had gained his experiences as a China hand and not as a Japan expert. Regardless of that fact Stimson readily accepted the nomination, as did MacArthur. One more battle had been lost.³⁹

Dooman continued in his efforts to prevent the reduction of Japan to a state of "fisherman and farmers," and the destruction of the imperial institution. Japanese acceptance of the Potsdam ultimatum constituted, he argued, a contractual agreement and not complete capitulation. His opponents, particularly John Carter Vincent and the Navy's representative on the SWNCC subcommittee on the Far East, Captain R. L. Dennison, staunchly opposed this point of view.

³⁸740.00119 (Control) Japan/8-1345, McCloy to Byrnes, 8/13/1945; I. F. Stone, "What About the Emperor?" P.M., p. 2; Max Lerner, "What Do We Fear in the Far East?" P.M., August 16, 1945, p. 2.

³⁹740.00119 (Control) Japan/9-145, Byrnes to Stimson, 9/1/1945; 740.00119 (Control) Japan/9-645, Stimson to Byrnes, 9/6/1945.

Not only had Japan surrendered unconditionally, the two retorted, but the Emperor had not received immunity in any form and should therefore be tried as a war criminal.⁴⁰

Dooman found his position untenable, and he decided to resign. The events of August upset him, and the liberal elements of the American press continued to criticize him. Those around him seemed determined to ignore the advice he offered as had happened in the past. He had dedicated his career to serving the United States and to that extent he had hoped to establish [in some way] good relations between the United States and Japan. Instead he had spent the years between 1937 and 1945 in a campaign against individuals antagonistic towards Japan or who had denigrated the role of the Japan expert. Dean Acheson was one such individual, and when Dooman learned that Acheson had been appointed Under Secretary of State, he made his resignation effective, not January 1, 1946 as scheduled, but on September 1, 1945.⁴¹

⁴⁰IPR Hearings, exhibit 241, pp. 736-743; Minutes of the 37th meeting of the SWNNC subcommittee on the Far East, 8/29/1945, p. 3; 38th meeting minutes, 9/1/1945, pp. 1-2; Minutes of the 43rd meeting 9/25/1945, pp. 3, 6; Minutes of the 48th meeting, 10/23/1945, p. 2; 851G.00/10. Vincent memorandum to Acheson, 10/2/1945.

⁴¹EHD. 139; Interview with Mrs. Dooman, February 25, 1973.

CHAPTER 7

THE JUSTICE OF ANGRY MEN

Dooman's experiences, particularly during the last years of his service, had made him bitter. In 1946 he denounced American occupation policies and "the present regime. . . ." in Washington. "I was kicked out," he commented. He later expressed his conviction that there existed a clique which was "primarily concerned with insuring the permanent continuation of the war time collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union." Dooman believed that he had prevented the "injustice," that he called, "the justice of angry men," but he had received constant opposition.¹

In 1951, during the peak of the McCarthy era, Dooman found a forum where he could vent his spleen. He volunteered as a witness before a Senate subcommittee which was investigating the Institute of Pacific Relations as part of a larger probe into possible violations of the Internal Security Act. There, under oath, he accused Vincent of attempting to undo the work of himself and Grew by attempting to appoint Lattimore as an adviser in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, noting Lattimore's insistence on the disestablishment of the monarchy, which

¹"Dooman Says Present Policies Mean 50 Year Jap Occupation," The News and Courier, Charleston, South Carolina, February 13, 1946, p. 1. Dooman, undated, untitled paper, section entitled "Is American Attitude Towards Japan Changing?" p. 2, in the Dooman papers; Dooman, "Open Letter to my Japanese Friends," November 24, 1949, Dooman papers.

Dooman described as one of the "cardinal points" of world communism. Dooman also criticized Vincent for wanting to try the Emperor as a war criminal and condemned him for his support of the Chinese communists and his association with Julian Friedman, whom Dooman had charged with leaking confidential Department information. Dooman made the point that Emmerson had associated with the Japanese communist, Nozaka, and that as MacArthur's adviser Emmerson had prepared a SCAP report on land reform which Dooman believed to be inspired by Nozaka's comrades.² Dooman did not believe, however, that Emmerson and the others were communists. "They were opportunists. . . .," acting in their own behalf without regard for the best interests of the United States or Japan, an attitude which galled Dooman, who envisioned himself as a realist and as one who had therefore never acted out of a devotion to any political ideology despite his conservatism. He doubted, for instance, the wisdom of American support for Nationalist China, calling Chiang Kai-shek's regime one "which had no future."³

Dooman did believe that between 1931 and 1941 American foreign policy makers had favored China while turning an

²IPR Hearings, pp. 704-705, 7-8-709; Dooman to Mandell, 1/12/1955.

³IPR Hearings, p. 753; Dooman to J. W. Fulbright, Chairman, F U. S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 3/14/1959; Interview with Mrs. Dooman.

insensitive ear to Japan. Reflecting on his service Dooman wrote that "the foreign policy of a democratic state is not the product of only a few. . . .," but he had found that a handful of people in positions of influence could, despite their qualifications, turn the corner on a particular issue, and in that manner continued action of this sort produced a long term effect on overall policy. This had been clear in the late thirties and early forties when Hornbeck undermined the work of Grew and Dooman. Hornbeck could not have been successful, Dooman concluded, if he had not represented a popular point of view, but he never doubted that Hornbeck had held a persuasive hand in determining pre-war policies and that he had spread his "pathological hatred for Japan" to those susceptible individuals around him, notably Hull. Dooman described the former Secretary as an individual "lacking that flexibility and . . . knowledge which distinguished other Secretaries of State." Thus Hornbeck had little difficulty in passing his anti-Japanese sentiment upwards.⁴

By 1945 the situation had changed significantly. The opposition to Dooman's advice no longer flowed from a

⁴Dooman, "American Foreign Policy and its Implementation in the Far East," paper included in Dooman's letter to Fulbright, 3/14/1959; EHD, pp. 50-51, 107.

group who applied American values to international disputes; but rather from a wide range of individuals of varying political persuasions. The most obvious group was those China and Japan hands, such as Vincent and Emmerson. There was also a concern among many government officials, including Stimson and Acheson that Russia would emerge victorious in the cold war. Thus control of the new threat took precedence over any concern for Japan and again it became a question of method that separated Dooman from his opponents. Dooman apparently believed that a strong democratic Japan built on the traditional basis of its own system would provide the bulwark of democracy in East Asia. Stimson and the others opted for, according to Dooman, a thorough defeat of Japan through the use of nuclear weapons as a way to convince the Soviets of American predominance in Asia and elsewhere.

Although embittered by his experiences, Dooman never relinquished his desire to improve Japanese-American relations. In 1948 he formed, together with lawyer James Lee Kaufman, and Harry F. Kern, foreign news editor for Newsweek magazine, the American Council on Japan. The Council set as its goals encouragement of harmony between the two nations, and it attempted through several methods, including a quasi-lobbying group, to produce changes in Occupation policies. In 1950 it sponsored an American tour by Ozaki Yukio, a member of Japan's first Parliament (1896), a Japanese liberal who had led the fight for universal manhood suffrage. In 1952 it

arranged for an exhibition of Japanese art which toured several major American cities. At this point the Council was convinced that it had "opened the eyes of the public" and its founders quietly disbanded their organization.⁵

Dooman remained active however. He visited Japan several times and saw old friends. He became involved in community and church activities in his new home of Litchfield, Connecticut where he also joined the editorial staff of a local historical organization that printed a journal of history written by laymen. In it he published an article based on materials which he had obtained and translated in 1928-1929. In 1962 he participated in Columbia University's Oral History Project and throughout his retirement he had constantly received enquiries from individuals researching the history of the war period.⁶

⁵EHD, pp. 149-154.

⁶Dooman had begun his research while stationed in Tokyo, having obtained the Japanese originals of papers that had belonged to Count Hotta Masayoshi, who had served on the Tokugawa Shogun's Council of Elders during the negotiations with Townsend Harris, American Minister to Japan, in 1856-1858. His original plan was to translate the documents for publication by the Department. Dooman to Tyler Dennett, Chief of Publications, Department of State, 1/4/1928, and 2/16/1928, Treat papers, Hoover Institute, Stanford California. Later he prepared a manuscript but the man to whom it was delivered for review died and it was lost. Dooman did publish an article based on the materials in the January of My Country of which he was an editor, "W. C. Reed and T. T. Dougherty," My Country, Vol. 3, no. 1, January 1969, pp. 16-19. Published by My Country Society, Inc., of Litchfield, Connecticut. Among those who corresponded with or interviewed (other than previously mentioned) Dooman were author John Toland (The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire, 1936-1945), 1972, and Professor Kenneth Colegrove of Northwestern University (The American Senate and World Peace, 1936).

On June 21, 1960, Dooman met with Japan's Consul General in New York, Tanaka Mitsuo. In a brief ceremony Tanaka presented Dooman with the Order of the Rising Sun, Second Class, in recognition of Dooman's "Long and meritorious service in the advancement of Japanese-American relations and in the building of a new Japan." Tanaka commented that "It was indeed fortunate for us that the SCAP policies were formulated with the advice and considered judgment of men of your stature. All of us Japanese will long remember your sympathetic understanding of our problems and aspirations through the years of crises and good times."⁷

Two years later Hornbeck exchanged views with Dooman regarding their years in the Department. In the course of a discussion with a friend regarding Department personnel, Hornbeck mentioned his belief that there was at the moment a great deal of "in-fighting." His unidentified associate remarked, "Has that not always been?" Hornbeck expressed doubts that any such strife had existed between 1928 and 1942, adding, however, that in 1942 and continuing through 1945 "there had been on the part of some of the officers . . . views and efforts directed toward undermining and getting rid of the official policies and the seasoned personnel and in place thereof substituting policies and

⁷Opening remarks, Consul General Tanaka Mitsuo, in ceremonies held on June 2, 1960, Dooman papers.

practices favored by and to be presided over by themselves." Hornbeck wrote to Dooman asking if he would substantiate the defense that Hornbeck had made. Dooman replied supporting his former associate's position but with qualifications. He pointed out that if by "in-fighting" Hornbeck meant that of the "conspiracy . . . back stabbing . . ." sort, there had been a minimum. "Of course there was," Dooman recalled, "discord and conflict of views and opinions. . . .," adding that he and Hornbeck had "disagreed violently. . . . over actions and attitudes with respect to Japan," but had not undone any professional regards that existed. Dooman noted two "back stabbing" incidents that affected first Hornbeck, and then Dooman and Ballantine. Although he could not remember the "'discord and conflict,'" Hornbeck concurred with Dooman's observation regarding the personal attacks.⁸

What does Eugene H. Dooman's life and career tell us about experts and the role of the Foreign Service Officer in Japanese-American relations during the period of his service? Dooman might be characterized as unsuccessful because he did not receive an ambassadorial appointment. In addition, his staunch pro-Japanese attitude negated,

⁸Hornbeck to Dooman, 3/9/1964 with memorandum attached; Dooman to Hornbeck, 3/13/1964 and Hornbeck to Dooman, 3/24/1964; Box 150; Hornbeck papers.

according to some, his ability to function effectively as an official of the United States' government. But such an observation would be too limited and personal in scope. Despite his failure to attain the highest diplomatic post, Dooman had risen in rank to Foreign Service Officer Class I, having overcome the "penalty" of serving in the Consular corps prior to the Rogers Act in 1924. He had been fortunate to serve under an outstanding diplomat in the person of Grew, but that also had been his undoing. There seems little doubt that of the two men Grew was the more polished diplomat, but Dooman was, as some believed, "a far abler man" than his chief. Had Grew not needed Dooman's expertise, perhaps the latter would have received the ambassadorial appointment that eluded him in the pre-war and war period.⁹

As a diplomat and as a Japan expert Dooman realized his own limitations. Some fifty years after his appointment as a student interpreter, Dooman paraphrased Townsend Harris who stated that the primary duty of a diplomat was to place the interests of the nation to which he was sent second only to the interests of his own country. This diplomatic "first commandment," as Dooman referred to it, created part of the expert's problems because the Foreign Service Officer in the field generally adhered to it, while those who were responsible

⁹I. E. Stone, "Pearl Harbor Diplomats," p. 26. Stone described Dooman as "a far abler man" than Grew.

for defining foreign policy gave more consideration to "promoting and safeguarding the rights and interests of the United States." Consequently Dooman deduced, those at home did not attach "to political force and movements in another country -- whether they be compatible or incompatible with American policy -- the same significance and weight that do their representatives on the spot." Thus there existed a natural tendency towards "some conflict of opinion between . . . the representative in the field . . . and his superiors at home."¹⁰

Dooman was generous in allowing "those at home" some consideration. Between 1924 and 1945 expert advice from both himself and others had gone unheeded. When Dooman and Grew sought talks aimed at settling the disturbed relations between Japan and the United States in 1939, 1940, and 1941, nothing happened. When the problem of deciding whether or not to define the terms of unconditional surrender, which Dooman believed could have avoided the nuclear holocausts at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, again nothing happened. It seemed that Acheson's remark was not only accurate in reference to himself, but that it could also be applied to a multitude of high echelon government officials throughout the period. American officials were ambivalent about expert advice regarding East Asian peoples and cultures.

¹⁰Dooman, undated, handwritten paper which he had prepared as an appendix to the paper submitted to the Columbia Oral History Project.

In 1962, some seventeen years after his retirement, and a half a century after he first went to Japan as a member of the Foreign Service, Dooman's efforts paid dividends at a personal level. At an imperial tea party, Emperor Hirohito took the unusual step of taking Dooman aside from the reception line and offered the American his heartfelt thanks for Dooman's work on behalf of the Emperor and the Japanese people. Dooman was happy, despite the shortcomings of his efforts. He took solace in the personal thanks that he received and in his own knowledge that he had been at least partially successful in his quest for better Japanese-American relations. He died seven years later.¹¹

¹¹Interview with Mrs. Dooman.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Private Papers

Stanford, California, Stanford University. The Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Peace, and Revolution. The papers of Eugene H. Dooman.

When used, these papers were in the possession of his widow, Mrs. Dorothy C. Dooman, Litchfield, Connecticut.

Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University. Houghton Library. The papers of Joseph C. Grew.

Washington, D. C. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division. The papers of Norman Davies.

Washington, D. C. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division. The papers of Frank L. McCoy.

Stanford California, Stanford University. The Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Peace, and Revolution. The papers of Payson J. Treat.*

Stanford California, Stanford University. The Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Peace, and Revolution. The papers of Stanley K. Hornbeck.*

Interviews and Correspondence

Mrs. Eugene H. (Dorothy C.) Dooman.

John K. Emmerson.

Cabot Coville. (Transcript provided by Sharon Chamberlain, graduate student, History Department, University of Maryland, who conducted the interview).

Maxwell W. S. Bishop.

*Papers from these collections provided by Professor Marlene Mayo, History Department, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Government Documents

- U. S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary. Hearings. Part 3. The Institution of Pacific Relations. Washington, D. C.:
- U. S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Morgenthau Diary (China). Vol. III. Washington: D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- U. S. Department of State. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. Various Volumes in Series, 1912 - 1945, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- _____. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan, 1931 - 1941. Two Vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1943.
- _____. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, The Conference at Berlin (Potsdam), 1945. Two Vols. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Books

- Acheson, Dean. Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1969.
- Asahi Shimbun. The Pacific Rivals: A Japanese View of Japanese American Relations. by the staff of the Asahi Shimbun.
- Alperovitz, Gar. Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam - The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation With Soviet Power. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- Bailey, Thomas A. The Art of Diplomacy: The American Experience. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Bamba, Nobuya. Japanese Diplomacy in a Dilemma: New Light on Japan's Foreign Policy, 1924-1929. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972.
- Beard, Charles A. President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.

- Bohlen, Charles E. Witness to History: 1929-1969. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1973.
- Borg, Dorothy. American Policy and the Chinese Revolution; 1925-1928. New York: MacMillian Company, 1947.
- . The United States And The Far Eastern Crisis of 1933-1935: From The Manchurian Incident Through The Initial State of the Undeclared Sino-Japanese War. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Borg, Dorothy and Okamoto, Shumpei, eds. Pearl Harbor As History - Japanese-American Relations, 1931-1941. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Borton, Hugh. Japan's Modern Century. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1955.
- Brown, Sidney DeVere. "Shidehara Kijuro: The Diplomacy of the Yen." Diplomats in Crisis: United States-Chinese-Japanese Relations, 1931-1941. Edited by Richard Dean Burns and Edward M. Bennett. Santa Barbara, California: American Bibliographical Center, Clio Press, Inc., 1974.
- Butow, Robert J. C. Japan's Decision To Surrender. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954.
- Byrnes, James F. Speaking Frankly. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Conkin, Paul. The New Deal. New York: Crowell American History Series, 1967.
- Crowley, James C. Japan's Quest For Autonomy: National Security And Foreign Policy, 1930-1938. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Davies, John Patton. Dragon By The Tail: American British, Japanese, and Russian Encounters with One Another. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1972.
- Devine, Robert A. Second Chance: The Triumph of Internationalism in America During World War II. New York: Antheneum Books, 1971.
- Dooman, Isaac. A Missionary's Life in the Land of the Gods. Boston: Gorham Press, 1914.

- Duus, Peter. Party Rivalry and Political Change in Taisho, Japan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Feis, Herbert. The Road to Pearl Harbor: The Coming of the War Between the United States and Japan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- _____. The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Ferrell, Robert. American Diplomacy in the Great Depression: Hoover-Stimson Foreign Policy, 1929-1933. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Forrestal, James. The Forrestal Diaries. Edited by Walter Millis. New York: Viking Press, 1951.
- Giovannitti, Len, and Freed, Fred. The Decision to Drop the Bomb. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1965.
- Grew, Joseph C. Ten Years in Japan: A Contemporary Record Drawn From the Diaries and Private and Official Papers of Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan, 1932-1942. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944.
- _____. Turbulent Era: A Diplomatic Record of Forty Years, 1904-1945. Vol. II. Ed. by Walter Johnson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952.
- Griswold, Whitney A. The Far Eastern Policy of the United States. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
- Handlin, Oscar. Race and Nationality in American Life. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1948.
- Harada, Kumao. Fragile Victory: Prince Saionji and the 1930 London Naval Treaty Issue, from the Memoirs of Baron Harada Kumao. Trans. by Francis Mayer-Oakes. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.
- Hashimoto, Tetsuma. The Untold Story of Japanese-American Negotiations. Tokyo: Shuinso Press, 1946.
- Hayashi, Saburo, and Coox, Alvin D. Kogun: The Japanese Army in the Pacific War. Quantico, Va.: The Marine Corps Association, 1959.
- Heinrichs, Waldo H., Jr. American Ambassador: Joseph C. Grew and the Development of The United States Diplomatic Tradition. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1966.
- Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New York: Atheneum, Books, 1969.

- Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
- Hornbeck, Stanley K. The United States and the Far East: Certain Fundamentals of Policy. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1942.
- Hull, Cordell. The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, Vols. I and II. New York: MacMillian Company, 1948.
- Ike, Nobutaka, Japanese Politics: An Introductory Survey. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1957.
- Ilchman, Warren Frederick. Professional Diplomacy in the United States 1779-1939: A Study in Administrative History. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Iriye, Akira. Across the Pacific: An Inner History of American-East Asian Relations. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1967.
- _____. After Imperialism: The Search for a New Order in the Far East, 1921-1931. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- _____. The Cold War in Asia: A Historical Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Jusserand, J. J. The School for Ambassadors and Other Essays. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925.
- Kahn, David. The Codebreakers: The Story of Secret Writing. New York: MacMillian Company, 1967.
- Koginos, Manny T. The Panay Incident: Prelude to War. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Studies, 1967.
- Langer, William L. The Diplomacy of Imperialism: 1890-1902. 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.
- Lattimore, Owen. Solution in Asia. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945.
- Lay, Tracy Hollingworth Lay. The Foreign Service of the United States. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1925.
- Leuchtenburg, William E. Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal: 1932-1940. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

- Lippman, Walter. Public Opinion. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- MacNair, Harley Farnsworth. China's New Nationalism and Other New Essays. Shanghai: Commercial Press, United, 1926.
- Mee, Charles L. Jr. Meeting at Potsdam. New York: M. Evans & Company, Inc., 1975.
- Morley, James W. ed. Japan's Foreign Policy, 1868-1941: A Research Guide. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Morin, Relman. East Wind Rising: A Long View of the Pacific Crisis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.
- Morrison, Elting E. Turmoil and Tradition: A Study of the Life and Times of Henry L. Stimson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.
- Mowry, George E. The Era of Theodore Roosevelt and the Birth of Modern America: 1900-1912. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.
- Najita, Tetsuo. Hara Kei in the Politics of Compromise, 1905-1915. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Neumann, William L. America Encounters Japan: From Perry to MacArthur. Harper Colophon Books. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Nish, Ian H. Alliance in Decline: A Study of Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1908-1923. Univ. of London: The Athlone Press, 1972, p. 158.
- O'Connor, Raymond. Diplomacy for Victory: FDR and Unconditional Surrender. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1971.
- Ogata, Sadako N. Defiance in Manchuria: The Making of Japanese Foreign Policy 1931-1932. Berkeley: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Paul, Rodman W. The Abrogation of the Gentlemen's Agreement. Cambridge, Mass.: The Society, 1936.

- Pelz, Stephen E. Race to Pearl Harbor: The Failure of the Second London Naval Conference and the Onset of World War II. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Pusey, Merlo J. Charles Evans Hughes, Vol. II. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Rappaport, Armin. Henry L. Stimson and Japan, 1931-1933. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Schulzinger, Robert D. The Making of the Diplomatic Mind: The Training, Outlook, and Style of the United States Foreign Service Officers, 1908-1931. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1975.
- Sherwin, Martin J. A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975.
- Silberman, Bernard, and Harootunian H. D., eds. Japan in Crisis: Essays on Taisho Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Smith, Sara. The Manchurian Crisis, 1931-1933: A Tragedy in International Relations. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.
- Stimson, Henry L. and Bundy, McGeorge. On Active Service in Peace and War. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- _____. The Far Eastern Crisis: Recollections and Observations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1936.
- Stuart, Graham. The Department of State: A History of its Organization, Procedures, and Personnel. New York: MacMillian and Company, 1949.
- Thorne, Christopher. The Limits of Foreign Policy: The West, The League and the Far Eastern Crisis of 1931-1933. London: Hamish-Hamilton, 1972.

- Toland, John. The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire, 1936-1945. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Truman, Harry S. Year of Decisions. Vol. I of Memoirs by Harry S. Truman. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955.
- U. S. Department of State. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: Japan, 1931-1941, Vols. I and II. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1943.
- Welles, Sumner. Seven Decisions That Shaped History. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- _____. The Time for Decision. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1944.

Articles and Pamphlets

- Ballantine, Joseph W. "Mukden to Pearl Harbor: The Foreign Policies of Japan." Foreign Affairs, July 1949, 651-664.
- Bernstein, Barton J. "Roosevelt, Truman and the Atomic Bomb, 1941-1945: A Reinterpretation." Political Science Quarterly. Vol. 90, (i) Spring, 1975, pp. 23-65.
- Borton, Hugh. "American Presurrender Planning for Postwar Japan." Occasional Papers of the East Asian Institute. New York: The East Asian Institute of Columbia University, 1967.
- Borg, Dorothy, "Notes on Roosevelt's 'Quarantine Speech.'" Political Science Quarterly, XXLL, 3, Sept. 5, 405-433.
- Butow, Robert J. C. "Backdoor Diplomacy in the Pacific: The Proposal for a Konoye-Roosevelt Meeting, 1941." Journal of American History, LIX 1, June 1972, 49-72.
- Close, Upton. "Trade Follows the Flag -- Home." Saturday Evening Post. October 21, 1933, pp. 10-11, 89-90, 92-93.
- Crowley, James C. "A Reconsideration of the Marco Polo Bridge Incident." Journal of Asian Studies, XXII 3, May 1963, 277-291.

- Davis, Forrest, "Did Marshall Prolong the Pacific War?" Freeman Magazine, November 19, 1951, p. 308.
- Destler, I. M. "Country Expertise and the United States Foreign Policymaking: the Case of Japan." Pacific Community, Vol. 5, 4, July 1974. pp. 546-564.
- "Dooman Says Present Policies Mean 50 Year Jap Occupation." News and Courier, Charleston, South Carolina, February 13, 1946, p. 1.
- Emmerson, John K. "Tokyo, 1941." Two Part Article in Foreign Service Journal, Vol. 53, No. 4, April 1976, pp. 10-13. 25; No. 5, May 1976, pp. 5-9, 26.
- "Foreign Relations -- Shortcomings." Time, Vol. XLVII, 27, December 30, 1946, p. 14.
- Hornbeck, Stanley K. "Principles and Policies in Regard to China." Foreign Affairs, I, 2, December 15, 1922, 120-135.
- _____. "America's Chinese Policy Analyzed." The Independent. Vol. 115, 40130, April 1927, 458-476.
- _____. "The Policy of the United States." Current History. XXVI, 3, June 1927, 389-397.
- _____. "Principles of American Policy in Relation to the Far East." Address before the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, Washington, D. C., January 18, 1934. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1934.
- Hosoya, Chihiro. "Japan's Decision for War in 1941." Hitotsubashi Journal of Law and Politics, April 1967, 10-19.
- Iklé, Frank W. "The Triple Intervention: Japan's Lesson in the Diplomacy of Imperialism." Monumenta Nipponica, XXII, 1 & 2, 1967, 122-130.
- Ito, Takashi. "Conflicts and Coalitions in Japan, 1930: The London Naval Disarmament Conference," in The Study of Coalition Behavior: Theoretical Perspectives and Cases from Four Continents. Ed. by Sven Groennings, E. W. Kelley, and Michael Leiserson. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Jacobs, Travis Beal. "Roosevelt's Quarantine Speech." Historian, XXLV, 4, August 1962, 483-502.
- Kawai, Kazuo. "Mokusatsu, Japan's Response to the Potsdam Declaration." Pacific Historical Review, XIX, 4, November 1950, 409-414.

- Lerner, Max. "Mastering Japan's Masters." Four Part Article, P.M., July 22 - August 14, 1945.
- Marcosson, Isaac. "The Japanese Smokescreen." Saturday Evening Post, May 7, 1932, pp. 3-5, 87-90.
- _____. "Made in Japan." Saturday Evening Post, July 7, 1934, pp. 5-7, 32, 34, 36, 38.
- Neuman, William. "Franklin D. Roosevelt and Japan, 1913-1933." Pacific Historical Review, 22, May 1953, 143-153.
- Pacificus, "Dangerous Experts." Nation, February 3, 1945, pp. 128-129.
- Snow, Edgar. "The Decline of Western Prestige." Saturday Evening Post, August 26, 1933, pp. 12-13, 67-69.
- Stimson, Henry L. "The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb." Harper's Magazine, February 1947, pp. 97-107.
- Stone, I. F. "Arrest of the Six." Nation, Vol. 160, 24, June 16, 1945, pp. 666-667.
- _____. "Clean Out the State Department." Nation, Vol. 161, 1, July 7, 1945, pp. 4-5.
- _____. "Pearl Harbor Experts." Nation, Vol. 161, 2, July 14, 1945, pp. 25-27.
- Strauss, Lewis L. "A Thousand Years of Regret." in Man and Decisions, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1962, pp. 163-200.
- U. S. Department of State. Department of State Bulletin, XII, 307, May 13, 1945, p. 886.

Doctoral Dissertations

- May, Gary Arthur. "The China Service of John Carter Vincent: 1924-1953." Colgate University, 1974 (Xerox # 74-29268).
- Prince, Gregory S. "The American Foreign Service in China, 1935-1941: A Case Study in Political Reporting." Yale University, 1973 (Xerox # 74-11868).
- Yasko, Richard A. "Hiranuma Kiichiro and Conservative Politics in Pre-War Japan." University of Chicago, 1973.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Peter Alexander Adams.

Permanent address: 5108 Iroquois Street
College Park, Maryland 20740.

Degree and date to be conferred: Master of Arts, 1976.

Date of birth: September 6, 1943.

Place of birth: Key West, Florida.

Secondary education: Key West Senior High School
Key West, Florida, 1961.

Collegiate institutions Attended:	Dates	Degree	Date of Degree
Miami-Dade Junior College	1963-1964		
University of Maryland, (Overseas Division) Turkey	1966-1967		
Japan	1967-1969		
University of Maryland	1969-1971	B.A.	1971
University of Maryland	1971-1976	M.A.	1976

Major: East Asian History.

Minor: United States History.