GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

If it is desired that the General Considerations be used as an introduction to the paper, it is recommended that it be condensed along the lines of the Conclusions of NIE 41-60 and that any remaining background information desired be placed in an annex; otherwise it is recommended that the entire General Considerations section follow the Objectives and Policy Guidance.

Other comments on the General Considerations section of State's Draft will be made verbally during the Planning Board discussion of this section.

OBJECTIVES

Paragraphs 16-19 - No comment.

Paragraph 20, lines 5 and 6 - Revise as follows:

"... ship in the Afro-Asian Bloc, and to contribute to strengthen its own defense against external aggression and thereby to contribute to the security of the Pacific area."

REASON: Japan already contributes something to its defense and to the security of the Pacific area. The need is to strengthen this defensive capability and contribution to the security in the Far East.

Add new paragraph 21 as follows:

"21. Continued availability in Japan and in the Article 3 Islands of necessary U.S. bases and facilities under conditions which will give the
U.S. the greatest possible freedom of action to take those measures con-
sidered necessary for the security of the U.S., Japan and the Western Pacific
area."

**REASON:** The importance of these bases to U.S. security justifies
that their retention be stated as an objective of U.S. policy.

**POLICY GUIDANCE**

**Paragraph 21** - Delete.

**REASON:** Paragraph is repetitive. Same points are made in other
sections of the paper.

**Paragraph 22** - No comment.

**Paragraph 23** - No comment.

**Paragraph 24** - Delete.

**REASON:** This is too general a statement. In certain cases, we will
not want to inform Japan of our objectives and thereby cannot obtain
their understanding and support. It would appear desirable, however, to
discreetly promote Japanese understanding and support of the following
objectives which have been established in our Far Eastern policy: (1)
Of developing conditions which in time are likely to bring about accept-
able changes in the character, policies and actions of Asian Communist
regimes; (2) of retarding the growth and reducing the power of these
regimes; (3) of improving the conditions of life of free Asian nations
and peoples and of assisting them to preserve their national independence;
and (4) obtaining recognition of the fact that these goals can only be realized within the Free World.

In view of Japan’s growing influence in international affairs it would appear that Japan could be very helpful in our pursuit of these objectives, particularly among the Afro-Asian nations, and that a paragraph or paragraphs under Policy Guidance to this end could be drafted.

Paragraph 25 - No comment.

Paragraph 26 - No comment.

Paragraph 27, line 2 - Change to read as follows:

"... as an equal partner, giving full recognition consideration to Japan’s vital interests in ..."

REASON: "Full recognition" is too strong a statement. It implies that we give first priority to Japan's vital interests in formulating our policies for the area.

Paragraph 28, line 2 - Change to read as follows:

"... exchange programs and seek to broaden scientific cooperation, particularly in including ..."

REASON: The words "particularly in" indicates that we want special emphasis placed on Japanese developments in these two fields. It is doubted that we do want to indicate any such special emphasis, since it might result in reducing the resources that otherwise would be made available to such important programs as strengthening the Japanese defense forces, providing rising living standards and economic development of less developed nations.
Paragaphs 29-32 - No comment.

Paragraph 33 - Substitute the following:

"In consonance with U.S. policy to ensure a strong military position in the West Pacific area as clear evidence of our capability and intent to fulfill our treaty commitments in the Far East, retain in Japan such U.S. military rights, facilities and forces as are required by U.S. security interests."

REASON: To emphasize the relationship between the policy set forth in paragraph 34 of NSC 5913/1 and the retention of our military rights, facilities and forces in Japan in meeting U.S. security interests.

Paragraph 34 a, line 2 - Change to read as follows:

"... attack against the territories under the administration of Japan."

REASON: The expression "territories under the administration of Japan" is used in the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and, therefore, should be used here for accuracy and clarity.

Paragraph 34 b - Substitute the following:

"Consult with the Japanese Government prior to (1) major changes in the deployment into Japan of U.S. armed forces, (2) the introduction into Japan of nuclear weapons and intermediate and long-range missiles, and (3) the launching of U.S. military combat operations from bases in Japan against areas outside Japan when Japan is not a party to the conflict, other than those operations outlined in paragraph 34 c below."
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REASON: The State Draft omits the important requirement given in
the new Treaty that we consult with the Japanese Government prior to
making any major changes in our deployments into Japan. The State Draft
does not make clear the fact that we do not have to consult with the
Japanese Government prior to undertaking immediate operations in the
event of Communist attack against the UN forces in Korea. The last
sentence of State's paragraph 34 b should be deleted as unnecessary. If
the Treaty is ratified, it should be assumed that we will abide by it
and will observe the wishes of the Government of Japan insofar as our
own national interests will permit.

Paragraph 34 c - No comment.

Paragraph 34 d - Delete.

REASON: (1) There is no requirement in the Treaty to so inform the
Japanese. The Ambassador has stated that existing practices will be con-
tinued under the Treaty. It has been the practice in the past to notify
the Japanese when we commenced major logistic operations to areas outside
Japan from their bases. As stated by the Ambassador, we will continue
to do so where feasible, but it is not a requirement and under certain
circumstances could not be done. (2) There is no requirement to notify
Japan in advance of withdrawal of forces although it is assumed we will
do so, as we did in Iceland, to promote good relations.

Paragraph 34 e - Delete.

REASON: If the Treaty is ratified it can be assumed that we will
implement the administrative arrangements in a manner to maintain sound
working relations with the Japanese. The paragraph, therefore, is unnecessary.

Paragraph 34 f - Delete.

**REASON:** This point is covered in the Administrative Agreement, which we are bound to observe if the Treaty is ratified.

Paragraph 35 - Substitute the following for the first sentence as a new paragraph. The remainder of the present paragraph 35 is contained in a second new paragraph following this one.

"Encourage Japan to develop and maintain military forces which: (1) are capable of maintaining internal security and of identifying and delaying Communist aggression; (2) are capable of coping with, and thereby deterring, Communist aggression; (3) contributing toward the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East."

**REASON:** The present paragraph attempts to cover too much subject matter in one paragraph with loss of emphasis on the above points. Further, it does not state fully the capability which we desire the Japanese Defense Forces to develop, and the expression "against a conventional attack", in the fifth line, is misleading. It is not policy to limit the Japanese forces to defense against conventional attack.

Paragraph 36 - Add the following new paragraph. This new paragraph includes the second sentence of present paragraph 35.

"Continue to consult with the Japanese Government concerning the rate and direction of defense development and the scope and nature of U.S. military assistance. While avoiding prejudicing Japanese political or economic
stability, try in these consultations to maximize Japan's own contribution to its defense effort and to stimulate the modernization of its military forces. In the long run, take steps to achieve at the earliest feasible time the ultimate objective that new commitments for the provision of military equipment on a grant basis should not be offered to Japan, making final decisions only after full consultation with the Japanese Government. However, for the present, continue, on a cost-shared basis to the maximum extent possible, such military assistance as will elicit a greater Japanese defense effort, permit continued United States influence over the evolution of Japan's defense forces, and provide for the continued transfer to Japan's forces of defense missions now discharged by the United States forces in Japan."

**REASON:** It is believed that this new paragraph is a clearer statement of the policy to be followed in promoting the evolution of Japan's defense forces.

**Paragraphs 36-38** - Renumber as paragraphs 37-39.

**Present paragraph 37, line 2** - Delete first two words, "in Asia."

**REASON:** To remove the implication that Japan should restrict the output of its defense industries to Asian countries.

**Add following new paragraph 40**

"Attempt to bring about better understanding and acceptance by Japan of the importance of nuclear weapons in effectively deterring war and of the need for their prompt and selective use when required."
REASON: To reaffirm Basic National Security Policy (NSC 5906/1) and U.S. Policy Toward the Far East (NSC 5913/1) and provide guidance with respect to Japan where antipathy toward nuclear weapons prohibits the U.S. from storing weapons.

Paragraphs 39-44 - Delete, and substitute therefore the following new paragraph 41.

"During the present international tensions in the Far East, maintain the degree of control and authority over the Ryukyus, Bonin and Volcano islands now exercised pursuant to Article III of the Peace Treaty with Japan."

REASON: The above is in keeping with present policy and the Eisenhower-Kishi Communique of June 21, 1957. Continued adherence to this policy is desirable to avoid encouraging those Japanese groups that are trying to bring pressure to bear to regain administration of the islands.

Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 39:

The continuation of the United States administration over the trust territory islands or the Japanese Peace Treaty Article III islands is not related to Japanese economic and security interests in the Pacific Ocean area; the administration of these islands is based on U.S. security interests.

Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 40:

The substitution indicated above essentially replaces this paragraph; however, it is considered that present language under which the U.S. has operated during the last five years is more acceptable.
Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 41:

The presence of the U.S. in the Ryukyu Islands is based on strategic military necessity. The Executive Order for their administration describes the steps to be taken for the welfare of the Ryukyuan people. It is considered that the so-called "continuing political sensitivity" and the "pressures" are overstatements of the situation and call for no statement of U.S. policy other than the Executive Order providing for the administration of the Ryukyus.

Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 42:

Again the administration of the Ryukyus is provided for by the Executive Order and it is wholly unrealistic to keep "arrangements for our administration" under review. There is no question of a balance between security requirements for bases and U.S.-Japanese relations; the sole reason for the presence of the U.S. in the Ryukyus is one of strategic military necessity.

Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 43:

The administration of the Ryukyus is conducted under the provisions of the Executive Order.

Reason for Deletion of State paragraph 44:

This subject is an operating arrangement that has no place in a statement of national policy. The entry of Japanese nationals and vessels into the Pacific islands under U.S. control is provided for by the regulations U.S. Government agencies assigned the administrative cognizance.