H-Diplo ROUNDTABLE XXI-45

Nick Kapur. ***Japan at the Crossroads: Conflict and Compromise after Anpo.*** Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018. ISBN: 9780674984424 ($39.95/£31.95/€36.00).

8 June 2020 | https://hdiplo.org/to/RT21-45
Roundtable Editors: Thomas Maddux and Diane Labrosse | Production Editor: George Fujii

Contents

Introduction by Jennifer M. Miller, Dartmouth College

In the past thirty years, historians of Japan have produced a rich and compelling array of scholarship on postwar social movements.[1] This literature examines how Japan was vibrant and alive with protest and dissent, from the labor movement to the anti-nuclear movement to the massive 1960 protests against the signing of a renegotiated U.S.-Japan security treaty which, based on the Japanese abbreviation, is known as Anpo. [2] The largest protest movement in Japanese history, Anpo saw hundreds of thousands of people take to the streets; though these protests failed to prevent the new treaty, they caused the fall of Japanese Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke. A former colonial bureaucrat and wartime cabinet member, Kishi had heavy-handedly forced the treaty though the Japanese Diet, and many protestors accused him of resurrecting the authoritarian wartime state. Yet there are surprisingly few book-length treatments of Anpo in English. As all the reviewers in this forum note, George R. Packard III's seminal 1966 study, *Protest in Tokyo*, has remained the primary Anpo text for decades.[3] In part, this lacuna may be due to Anpo's complex positioning. These protests are self-evidently important—as Nick Kapur notes, an entire generation of Japanese identifies as the "Anpo generation"—yet also hard to pin down due to the diverse array of participants and motivations (4). They stemmed from the intermingling of domestic and foreign policy; ostensibly seeking to prevent the renewal and strengthening of the U.S.-Japan defense alliance, protestors repeatedly declared that Japan's very democracy was at stake. The protests have an ambiguous legacy of success and failure, derailing Kishi's career while failing to stop the treaty itself. It is clear that Anpo was a momentous event. But unpacking its causes and consequences is no easy task.

Fortunately, Kapur's *Japan at the Crossroads: Conflict and Compromise after Anpo* more than rises to the occasion. Extending far beyond the protests themselves, Kapur's book deftly traces the complex legacies of the Anpo moment across a variety of fields, from diplomacy and politics to art, culture, media, and public expression. Rather than a "turning point," Kapur asserts, Anpo was an "inflection point, where trends that had been building slowly over the course of the 1950s were accelerated or rerouted onto different trajectories by the gravitational force of the crisis" (271). Anpo was thus important and even revolutionary, but the contradictory consequences extended far beyond what the protestors themselves envisioned. On the one hand, Kapur argues, the experience and disruption of Anpo loosened some aspects of Japan's political, social, and cultural life. On the international stage, it led to a more mutual and cooperative relationship between the United States and

[1] See, for example, Takemasa Ando, *Japan's New Left Movements: Legacies for Civil Society* (New York: Routledge, 2014); David Ernest Apter and Nagayo Sawa, *Against the State: Politics and Social Protest in Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); Simon Andrew Avenell, *Making Japanese Citizens: Civil Society and the Mythology of the* Shimin *in Postwar Japan*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010); Adam Bronson, *One Hundred Million Philosophers: Science of Thought and the Culture of Democracy in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016); Christopher Gerteis, *Gender Struggles: Wage-Earning Women and Male-Dominated Unions in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monographs 321, 2009); Andrew Gordon, *The Wages of Affluence: Labor and Management in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Yoshikuni Igarashi, *Bodies of Memory: Narratives of War in Postwar Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Rikki Kersten and David Williams, ed. *The Left in the Shaping of Japanese Democracy: Essays in Honor of J.A.A. Stockwin* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Robin M. LeBlanc, *Bicycle Citizens: The Political World of the Japanese Housewife*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Jennifer M. Miller, *Cold War Democracy: The United States and Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019); William Marotti, *Money, Trains, and Guillotines: Art and Revolution in 1960s Japan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013); James J. Orr, *The Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001); Wesley Sasaki-Uemura, *Organizing the Spontaneous: Citizen Protest in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001); Mari Yamamato, *Grassroots Pacifism in Postwar Japan: The Rebirth of a Nation* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004).

[2] The United States and Japan signed the first bilateral security treaty in September 1951, which formally established the U.S.-Japan security alliance. This treaty went into effect with the end of the U.S. occupation in April 1952. The 1960 treaty renewed and updated the 1951 treaty.

[3] George R. Packard III, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

Japan, while in the domestic sphere, it fostered an emphasis on patience and tolerance in politics, the rise of new citizens moments, and innovative forms of cultural and artistic expression. On the other hand, the Anpo moment also brought discord and new limits. It facilitated schisms in the left and political hegemony by the right, a restrictive commitment to conciliatory and consensual politics over mass politics, and a narrowing of acceptable and legalized forms of expression and protest, consequences that made "the types of massive protests seen in June 1960 increasingly less likely to recur" (7). Ultimately, Kapur concludes that Anpo was a significant and transformative moment in the formation of contemporary Japan as "a vibrantly creative and expressive society whose popular culture has found receptive audiences around the world, yet also a deeply conservative and risk-averse nation where certain behaviors, forms of dissent, and topics of conversation remain off-limits" (8).

All the reviewers agree that Kapur has produced an important and ambitious text. As Chelsea Szendi Schieder notes, "The Japanese history field has been in need of a book like this for a long time." Kapur's commitment to tracing Anpo's widespread consequences is also celebrated. While as Dustin Wright asserts that "it would be impossible to capture the entirety of the anti-Anpo protests and their legacies in one book," the reviewers feel that Kapur is successful in his attempt to both unpack and synthesize the variety of consequences and legacies wrought by these seismic protests. They also find much to compliment in Kapur's prose, describing his account as clear yet also textured and nuanced, both detailed and highly approachable.

In particular, the three reviewers single out Kapur's arguments about Anpo's impact on politics and institutions as especially compelling. It is common in Japanese history to speak of the '1955 System,' named after the year in which the Liberal and Democratic parties merged to create the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), Japan's ruling party for the next four decades, and the Left and Right Socialist parties merged to create the Japan Socialist Party (JSP), the largest opposition party. Yet Kapur argues that the LDP did not fully consolidate as one cohesive party until 1960, a consolidation made possible by the events of Anpo and the savvy yet restrained leadership of Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato. A more accurate descriptor, Kapur notes, is the 1960 system, and both James J. Orr and Schieder highlight this argument as especially significant for a broader understanding of postwar Japanese history and politics. Wright draws attention to Kapur's discussions of politics on the left, observing that "it is in the political muck that Kapur's book is particularly strong." He singles out the third chapter, which traces the post-protest divisions and breakdowns of a Japanese left mired in a sense of failure to prevent the treaty's passage. While the Communist Party expanded its membership, the Socialist Party struggled to discern any meaning or path forward from the protests. As Wright proclaims, "Kapur clearly distills the complicated machinations that both divided and energized the Japanese left."

Finally, the reviewers note that Kapur's work offers tantalizing inspiration for future research. Schieder highlights the sixth chapter, "in which Kapur discusses the rise of post-Anpo 'reactionary' forces in the courts, police, mass media, and right-wing groups." All of these topics, she asserts, are ripe for more scholarship: "we need more investigations into the role of the judiciary, the police, and the mass media regarding protest in postwar Japan." Such research could do much to illuminate the history of postwar Japanese conservatism, a topic that remains underexplored in the English language literature on Japan. Wright notes that much of the existing work on Anpo—including Kapur's book—is understandably focused on Tokyo, the site of the largest protests and Japan's major political institutions. There is an opportunity here, he notes, to broaden historical explorations of postwar protests and take Kapur's multifacted approach to "areas and institutions that were outside of the megalopolis. Okinawa, for example, stands out as a place where Anpo and its legacies are intimately felt in everyday life."

When it comes to the non-political consequences of Anpo, the reviewers are more divided in their assessment. In particular, they differ on Kapur's chapter on arts and culture. Wright declares this part to be one of his "favorites" of the book, particularly Kapur's descriptions of innovative and radical artistic movements. In contrast, Schieder finds this portion of the book less convincing, "at times painting history with too broad a brush." It is difficult, she notes, to address equal attention to each aspect of Anpo's legacies and "these sections may demonstrate the limits to a comprehensive study of all the after-effects of 1960." While Wright suggests geographically broadening the scope of analysis, Schieder proposes changes to the temporal frame, wishing that Kapur had carried his story further forward and touched more fully on the impact of the

Vietnam War and the student activism of the late 1960s. How these activists—whom Kapur describes as being far more violent than the student participants in Anpo—"actually inherited the legacy of 1960 Anpo" is an "open and interesting question." Given that many of these students called their protests "Anpo 1970," Schieder believes that "there is a missed opportunity in Kapur's book to understand how late-1960s student activism was not just sectarian disintegration and violence (as suggested by Kapur), but was also deeply influenced by 1960 Anpo student activism."

Overall, Kapur has produced a rich, compelling, and important book that addresses a seminal moment in the history of postwar Japan and the U.S.-Japan relationship. There is no doubt it will be read and cited widely by scholars of postwar Japan and U.S.-East Asian relations. Yet Kapur's book deserves attention beyond a Japanese history audience. There is much to be found for scholars of social movements, conservatism, and national imaginaries. *Japan at the Crossroads* forces us to think carefully about the diverse and complicated ways that a state's interactions with the world intersects with 'domestic' affairs well beyond politics. By focusing, as Kapur writes, on how the varied consequences of Anpo were "in many ways mutually constitutive," his work presents an intriguing model for scholars seeking to trace consequences and legacies across a wide array of human spheres.

Participants:

Nick Kapur received his Ph.D. in history from Harvard University and is presently Assistant Professor of History at Rutgers University's Camden campus, where he teaches Japanese and East Asian history. His research interests focus on modern Japan and East Asia in transnational and comparative perspective, as well as the history of US-Japan relations. He is the author of *Japan at the Crossroads: Conflict and Compromise after Anpo* (Harvard University Press, 2018) and has also recently published an article entitled "The Empire Strikes Back? The 1968 Meiji Centennial Celebrations and the Revival of Japanese Nationalism" in *Japanese Studies* 38:3 (Fall 2018). He is currently working on a book project about suicide and self-sacrifice in modern Japan.

Jennifer M. Miller is an Assistant Professor of History at Dartmouth College and the author of *Cold War Democracy: The United States and Japan* (Harvard University Press, 2019).

James Orr is an Associate Professor in the East Asian Studies Department at Bucknell University. An historian of postwar Japan specializing in Japanese national identity and collective remembrance of the Asia-Pacific War, Orr is the author of *Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (University of Hawaii Press, 2001), and more recently, "The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Postcolonial Japan: State, Shrine, and Honor for Ethnic Veterans, the Fallen, and their Bereaved,"in Michael Lewis, ed., *'History Wars' and Reconciliation in Japan and Korea: The Roles of Historians, Artists, and Activists* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017): 33-49. Orr maintains an enduring interest in ideological positioning in politics and culture regarding Hiroshima, war victimhood, and national identity. His most recent work in this regard focuses on disparate treatment of veterans, the fallen, and bereaved groups by the postwar Japanese state and Yasukuni Shrine, and on comparisons of collective remembrance of the atomic bombings and conventional air raids at the end of WWII in Europe and Asia. He is currently working on a history of Little League baseball as a form of youth sport culture in postwar Japan, tracing its Cold War organizational development and the discourses of gender, class, and nation that were contested on its fields.

Chelsea Szendi Schieder (Ph.D., Columbia University) is a historian of contemporary Japan and an Associate Professor in the School of Economics at Aoyama Gakuin University in Tokyo, Japan. She writes about protest, women, violence, and Japan for academic and general audiences. Her articles on women and activism have appeared in *Monthly Review, Dissent*, and *Foreign Affairs*. Her book on the gendered politics of protest in the 1960s in Japan, entitled *Co-Ed Revolution: The Female Student in the Japanese New Left*, is forthcoming on Duke University Press.

Dustin Wright is a historian and assistant professor of Japanese culture and language at California State University, Monterey Bay. He is also co-director of the Okinawa Memories Initiative. Dustin is currently writing a manuscript on the long history of anti-military base struggle throughout Japan.

Review by James Orr, Bucknell University

The political economy of Japan experienced two game-changing crises in 1960: the mass protests against renewal of the revised U.S.-Japan security treaty (Anpo) in the spring; and the long and passionately contested coal miners' strike at the Miike mine in the late summer and fall. Unprecedented numbers of Japanese from all walks of life rallied against the postwar conservative establishment that linked the American-led capitalist trade regime, large Japanese corporations, and the Liberal-Democratic Party (LDP). Both contests involved violent clashes between strikers and sympathetic protestors on the one side, and police and hired thugs on the other. Both contests were resolved with some ambivalence as to who won. The revised security treaty was implemented but Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke was forced to resign, and progressive camps took solace in the success of the movement in mobilizing large numbers of the citizenry beyond the usual suspects of labor unionists, students, and Socialist and Communist adherents. The labor unions eventually had to accept industry and state economic bureaucracies' plans to phase out domestic coal production in favor of imported petroleum, but the *keiretsu* (industrial combines) committed themselves to transfer and retrain laid off workers, a step toward the 'lifetime employment' component of the high growth era corporation. The idea that this one-two punch, so to speak, marked a pivot from the 1950s decade of oppositional politics and labor-management strife to the 1960s era of collaboration to build a bigger economic pie through doubling national income has long been a teaching point in secondary and collegiate surveys, certainly since the widely disseminated 1992 video series, *The Pacific Century*, made it the focal point for its 'Japan, Inc.' narrative.[4]

Nick Kapur's *Japan at the Crossroads* provides extensive texture and nuance to this larger characterization. His first chapter is in the spirit of conventional diplomatic history, a solid reconstruction of how the Kennedy and Ikeda administrations created the institutional framework for consultation and collaboration between the two governments in cultural, diplomatic, and economic spheres. The U.S. side was motivated by a realization gained from the Anpo crisis that too much U.S. pressure might energize left-wing forces capable of endangering conservative Japanese rule. It was also defined by newly designated U.S. Ambassador Edwin Reischauer's insight that Japanese government support for or at least acquiescence to U.S. diplomatic policies would best be achieved through prior notification if not consultation on such issues as resumption of atmospheric nuclear bomb testing. The Japanese understood the quid-pro-quo, which was made explicit in the June 1962 guidelines, that the U.S. would follow a gradual policy of trade liberalization without harsh demands that the Japanese do the same. Kapur notes that this was a departure from implicitly coercive patterns of interaction of the late 1950s Kishi-Eisenhower era's hard-nosed take-it-or-leave-it approach. He emphasizes that this characterization is a departure from conventional assumptions that the U.S.-Japan relationship did not change much after the Anpo crisis, although it is in line with the conventional textbook characterization of the succeeding Ikeda administration's general collaborative approach in domestic politics that was based on the assumption that economic growth would provide a bigger pie for all.

In three successive chapters Kapur provides narratives that further explain how the machinations of various political actors during the 1960 crises ultimately led to the consolidation of conservative political domination, the weakening of progressive opposition to conservative rule, and the dissolution of the grand alliance of progressive forces that mounted such spirited and widespread protest. Kapur's main idea is that the frustrating and violent national Security Treaty crisis threw the spotlight on the weaknesses of the late 1950s political structure both in the LDP and in the progressive opposition, and pushed both sides to adjust their positions moving forward. As the author notes, under Prime Minister Kishi's hard push to turn back many of the Occupation-era liberal reforms, in a one-and-a half party system where two-thirds Diet vote majority is required for constitutional revision, the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) could legitimately claim that a vote for the Socialists was also a vote to retain the present constitution. Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato took the wind out of the JSP's sails by backing off from constitutional revision and shifting the discursive focus of Japanese politics to his income doubling campaign in which the LDP was better positioned to deliver results. Furthermore, Ikeda's moderate and purposefully

[4] Pacific Basin Institute, "Pacific Century: 6 The Era of 'Japan, Inc.'," YouTube video, 57:40, 27 May 2016, https://www.pacificcentury.org/videos.

respectful approach toward political opponents, exemplified by his moving eulogy for assassinated JSP leader Asanuma Inejirō, set the tone for working with the Socialists enough that the edge was taken off political differences, thus muting violent opposition. Making seemingly trivial impressionistic changes such as changing to softer plastic framed eyeglasses and forgoing elite recreational pursuits like golf and geisha parties, "Ikeda was clearly modulating both his policies and his public persona to accord with the exigencies of…the aftermath of the traumatic experience of the Security Treaty crisis" (87). The success in popular mobilization against the Security Treaty led by the national umbrella organization Kokumin Kaigi, itself a product of a galvanized Left in the face of Kishi's 1958 proposed revision of the Police Duties Law, prompted the LDP to get serious about their own organization, and led to at least requisite pro forma opposition to factions if not actual elimination of them. Under Ikeda's leadership, the LDP shifted toward emphasizing social insurance and pension programs, and an economic nationalism based on pride in national GNP growth rather than nostalgia for pre-war military strength and imperial expansion.

Unlike the LDP, the radical student organizations and political parties of the Left proved unable to overcome ideological and strategic differences that the 1960 struggles brought to the fore. One fundamental set of fissures besetting Socialists lay in the antagonism among the "structural reformers" led by party chairman Eda Saburō, who advocated broadening the base of support through extra-parliamentary action, those who adhered to the alternative "poverty revolution" thesis, which was dismissed by critics as the "waiting around for a crisis thesis," and supporters of the "piecemeal revolution thesis" that advocated peaceful parliamentary engagement (119). Differences about working with the Japan Communist Party led Right Socialist moderate, anti-Communist farmer and worker activist Nishio Suehiro, to form the break-away Democratic Socialist Party in January 1960 even before the height of the protests. In the early 1960s, under Ōta Kaoru's leadership the Sōhyō labor federation shifted away from extra-parliamentary struggle to focus on worker wage gains, even while under the 'Eda Vision' the Socialist Party faced internal dissension from its left wing that saw Eda's overly optimistic and uncritical attitude toward American capitalism and British parliamentary democracy as weakening the party's socialist core values. Kapur notes that "an era of near zero unemployment and spectacular annual wage increases made labor militancy and its attendant risks seem increasingly unpalatable" (142). The shift from labor militancy and extra-parliamentary political activism to ritualized annual spring wage offensives, from 'workplace struggle' to 'workplace action,' seems to have solidified immediately before the spring 1964 offensive when Sōhyō's Ōta and Iwai Akira met Prime Minister Ikeda and agreed to peg public sector wages to private sector gains in exchange for an end to public sector union militancy (143).

After describing how similar ideological and strategic differences splintered the student movements, and how three major public intellectuals soured on political activism (Yoshimoto Takaaki, Shimizu Ikutarō, and Maruyama Masao), Kapur asserts that the late 1960s feminist, environmental, and residents' movements were then free to emerge in a more grass-roots fashion precisely because the 1960 progressive institutional coalitions had collapsed. His remaining chapters explore the emergence of new directions in literature and the arts in an era of energetic artistic experimentation that accompanied high economic growth and social change. For this reviewer, the most compelling section is the exploration of self-consciously political visual artists of the Zen'ei Bijutsukai from the 1950s, Bitō Yutaka and Katsuragawa Hiroshi. Failures on the political front, presumably in the anti-base and anti-nuclear movements, culminating in the failure of the Anpo protests, fueled what young artist Akasegawa Genpei describes as "the destructively energetic 'Neo-Dada' art group" (194) and what came to be called 'anti-art.' Similar radically experimental developments in literature and theater led to what Kapur rightly characterizes as a 'post-modern' sensibility in the 1960s Japanese artistic community. Lest the reader be left with an idealized image of a Japanese society liberated from political taboo, Kapur's last substantive chapter traces the activities of the courts, *yakuza* gangsters and other right-wing groups, the police, and mass media company reactions that resulted in significant narrowing of the range of socially and legally permissible speech.

Kapur's detailed and highly approachable narrative, which reads more like a textbook rather than a treatise arguing theory or process, elicits insights that otherwise might pass unnoticed. For example, this reviewer appreciated the author's observation that Prime Minister Kishi's clumsily handled 1958 Police Duties bill provoked the coalescence of an organized progressive opposition that enabled mass mobilization against the Anpo revisions two years later. Also, the proliferation of television sets on the occasion of the imperial wedding in 1959 laid the communications foundation that made the Anpo struggle a

much more powerfully experienced national controversy, and the coincidence of the Soviet downing of American pilot Gary Powers's U-2 on 1 May 1960 highlighted the dangers of allying Japan with one side of the Cold War.

Kapur's monograph attempts to refashion our understanding of the overarching trajectory of postwar Japanese politics, diminishing the importance of the 1955 political alignment into the ruling conservative LDP and opposition JSP, as characterized by the term '1955 system.' He argues instead for the importance of 1960 as a year of inflection, highlighting the catalytic impact that the Anpo Crisis and the Miike Strike has had among political and cultural agents up to the present. In agreeing with this general assessment, one must also recall other developments that help explain the consolidation of conservative forces and weakening of the socialist labor movement coming either before or continuing through 1960. Certainly, Andrew Gordon's work on management's cooption of labor unions in the steel industry, and Christopher Gerteis's exploration of how labor unions adopted the male wage earner model, are important in explaining the weakening of the socialist labor movement.[5]

Although it is not the focus of this book, the author's treatment of 1955's foundational political re-alignment is too cursory and at times misleading. For example, to state without equivocation that Kishi Nobusuke "orchestrated [the formation of the conservative LDP in 1955] with advice and encouragement from the US Central Intelligence Agency" suggests too much agency to both Kishi and the CIA (10) at the expense of the many other conservative stakeholders of that era. Of course the U.S. government was both overtly and covertly active in influencing Japanese politics and culture in the middle 1950s. Kapur's curious exaggeration seems based on an overly credulous reliance on a trade-book history of the CIA, which is based on interviews with that spy agency's operatives, rather than on archival work and scholarly studies by Japan specialists.[6] It should be said that this oversight lies outside the main focus of the book, and is out of sync with the author's extensive use of Japanese and scholarly English-language sources elsewhere. The lack of bibliography is unfortunate, but close reading of endnotes provides plenty of leads to further reading.

Japan at the Crossroads will make excellent background reading for instructors and source material for undergraduate research papers or assigned reading in university courses. It provides a much-needed update to George Packard's long useful *Protest in Tokyo*.[7] With granular descriptions of the motivations and tactics of individual participants in its narrative, it makes a fine complement to Jennifer Miller's recent *Cold War Democracy* that focuses more on institutional interests, policy perspectives, and broadly shared ideological positions.[8]

[5] Andrew Gordon, *The Wages of Affluence: Labor and Management in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); and Christopher Gerteis, *Gender Struggles: Wage-Earning Women and Male-Dominated Unions in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monographs 321, 2009).

[6] Kapur uses Tim Weiner's *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the CIA* (New York: Doubleday, 2007). For a scholarly analysis see Masaru Kohno, *Japan's Postwar Party Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

[7] George R. Packard, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

[8] Jennifer Miller, *Cold War Democracy: The United States and Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019).

Review by Chelsea Szendi Schieder, Aoyama Gakuin University

The Japanese history field has been in need of a book like this for a long time. Few monographs have examined the multi-faceted events of the mass protests that surrounded the 1960 revisions of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, which is often referred to by its shortened name, *Anpo*. The term Anpo itself, however, has come to indicate not only the Treaty and its revisions and renewals, but also the mass movement against the Treaty. Anpo, then, indicates a constellation of events with wide-ranging effects in various realms in Japan: the geopolitical, the cultural, and the social. It is a tightly packed cluster of associations that requires careful work to unpack and analyze.

Kapur's monograph is a welcome addition to the limited scholarly works in English that treat Anpo. The earliest and still in many ways most authoritative book on Anpo in terms of parsing the actors and their motivations is George Packard III's 1966 *Protest in Tokyo,* but Packard's work is also a creation of the Cold War context in which it was written.[9] Two other more recent monographs that treat 1960 Anpo at length are Wesley Sasaki-Uemura's *Organizing the Spontaneous* and Simon Avenell's *Making Japanese Citizens.*[10] While Both Sasaki-Uemura and Avenell focus their investigations around the shift in formulations of 'civic consciousness' and grassroots social movements from the 1950s to the 1960s, Nick Kapur's book attempts to take on the meanings of Anpo across a broader spectrum of political, social, and cultural changes. The result is an ambitious but at times uneven work that gives readers a good sense what was at stake in 1960 in Japan in clear prose.

This work is strongest when Kapur examines the way that Anpo influenced Japanese institutions. The chapters on the post-Anpo administrations of Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato and President John F. Kennedy, on Ikeda's reforms of the post-Anpo Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), on the tensions that undermined the opposition parties, and on the reactions of the courts and the mass media tell us a lot about how, on the elite level, perceptions of the excesses, successes, and failures of what was dubbed the 'political season' of Anpo protest shaped the form of subsequent politics. In these sections, Kapur's account reflects careful combing of contemporary press reporting and deep dives into official archives on both sides of the Pacific, including the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, the Digital National Security Archives, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Diplomatic Records Office, the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, and the Ōhira Masayoshi Kaisōroku Kankōkai. Additionally, Kapur's introduction is the best summary in the English literature I have read on the course of events that we associate with Anpo. This section in particular does a good job of breaking down the development of the anti-treaty movement and identifies the actors and institutions involved in each, and clearly explains what was at stake for the various participants.

Overall, Kapur's book makes two compelling contributions to our understanding of post-war Japanese history. The first concerns what was actually involved in Ikeda Hayato's 'Income Doubling Plan,' and the second is Kapur's argument that it is necessary to understand the consolidation of LDP control as the post-Anpo '1960 system,' rather than the '1955 system' (so-called because the LDP first formed in 1955). Both the rapid economic growth under Ikeda and the unity of the LDP are critical elements that shaped not only postwar Japanese politics and economics, but also society.

In the first two chapters—"Reformulating the US-Japan Alliance" and "Stabilizing Conservative Rule"—Kapur introduces the policy goals and, importantly, the policy style of Ikeda Hayato, which included the implementation of Ikeda's income-doubling plan. It is a standard narrative that with the resignation of 'authoritarian' Kishi Nobusuke in the wake of the 1960 Anpo protests, Ikeda's policies managed to shift the focus from politics to the economy, but what is not spelt out in this

[9] George R. Packard III, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

[10] Wesley Sasaki-Uemura, *Organizing the Spontaneous: Citizen Protest in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001); Simon Andrew Avenell, *Making Japanese Citizens: Civil Society and the Mythology of the Shimin in Postwar Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).

narrative is why this actually worked. Kapur demonstrates how the experience of 1960 Anpo persuaded Ikeda to take a 'low posture' of humility and compromise, both in dealings with the United States and within domestic politics. In the United States, a shift in administration also opened up more space for cooperation. President Dwight D. Eisenhower had encouraged the pushing through of the 1960 U.S.-Japan Security Treaty renewal, and had blamed the mass movement against it on Communist agents from Moscow and Beijing; in the wake of the Anpo fiasco, Kennedy was more open to at least a semblance of diplomacy among equals with Japanese politicians. While the Ikeda-Kennedy relationship did not present a radical break with the goals of Kishi-Eisenhower, their framing of their diplomacy as based on an "equal partnership" was new (73). Kapur draws our attention to the importance of performance, affect, and expression in foreign relations. He points to diplomatic decisions that may have pre-empted protests like those seen surrounding Anpo: in the spring of 1962 Kennedy sent a personal message to Ikeda to explain why the U.S. would resume atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons ahead of the tests. While Ikeda could have done little to argue with the decisions that Kennedy had already made, this kind of advance notice was unprecedented in US-Japan relations (63-64).

Kapur attributes the successes of the Income-Doubling Plan to Ikeda's new 'low posture' politics, and also breaks down how it differed from previous plans: it lasted for ten-years instead of five; emphasized government-sponsored social welfare and developing human resources; called for eliminating wage and income disparities across industries and regions; and formulated its targets "according to political calculations" (103). Kapur argues against scholars who have dismissed the Income Doubling Plan as simply Ikeda attempting to take credit for postwar economic growth that was already in effect. He gives examples of specific programs, but also cites "the significant but ultimately incalculable 'propaganda effect' the announcement of the plan had on thousands of individual investment decisions within private industry" (105).

Kapur also illuminates Ikeda's role in changing the organization of the LDP, and thus consolidating its political power. He argues that "prior to 1960, the LDP was less of a political party than a loose coalition of eight small parties each focused around a faction boss" (88). Ikeda sought "party modernization" to undermine the power of factions and strengthen party organization from the grassroots up (90-91), which also served as a response to, and in many cases a cooptation of, the many organizations that so successfully launched anti-Anpo protest by organizing at the grassroots. Ikeda also formed an "all-faction" cabinet to preclude the existence of an "anti-mainstream" group (94). By 1963, the dissolution of factions became the official policy of LDP. Even if they did not stay dissolved for long, they did become less about being "personal factions" to being "policy factions" (97). These kinds of policy factions actually helped the LDP maintain power: rather than risk power shifting to an opposition party, rival factions within the LDP could appeal to voters.

Kapur's work also gives a sense of exciting new directions for research on postwar Japan. Chapter six, 'Reshaping the Landscape of Expression,' in which Kapur discusses the rise of post-Anpo 'reactionary' forces in the courts, police, mass media, and right-wing groups, points to many potential topics for future research: we need more investigations into the role of the judiciary, the police, and the mass media regarding protest in postwar Japan. Kapur gives a sense of how the Anpo protests made it possible for more conservative elements in the courts and the police to restrict their definitions of freedom of assembly and expression, and there is still a lot to explore here.

Another theme that one could expand upon is the changing role of the mass media in politics in this period. Throughout the book, Kapur gives a sense of how politicians came to depend upon their mass media images in different ways. Kapur links Ikeda's success, for example, with the rise of a new kind of politics: "At precisely the moment when television's popularity was soaring and a new type of medium driven by images more than text was taking root, Ikeda grasped what Kishi had not, which was that for a modern prime minister, public image now mattered even more than actual policy" (84). Takemasa Ando has pointed out a rise in the importance of Public Relations as a strategy for the police in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[11] Kapur's work gives a sense that there is a larger story to be told regarding the politics of perception and reception in this period as well.

[11] Takemasa Ando, *Japan's New Left Movements: Legacies for Civil Society* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 80-109.

My main criticisms of Kapur's book have to do with the handling of more social and cultural responses to Anpo. The latter sections on social movements and the arts remain less convincing than those on diplomacy and institutions, at times painting history with too broad a brush. The citations in these sections also reveal less archival research than those on diplomacy and institutions, and pressure to address every possible aspect of social and cultural life potentially touched by Anpo seems to be responsible for some of the books less-sound conclusions. Since it is impossible to summarize the diverse afterlives of complex events like Anpo, these sections may demonstrate the limits to a comprehensive study of all the after-effects of 1960.[12]

There is one point on which I disagree fundamentally with Kapur's arguments. This illuminates some of what I see as popular misconceptions about protest in postwar Japan in general. This point concerns the relationship between 1960 Anpo student activism and late-1960s student activism, which Kapur discusses in chapter four, 'The Collapse of the 1960 Coalition.' In his reading, the failure of the 1960 Anpo protests led to the extremist violence of some New Left sects in the early 1970s. Kapur describes the loosely organized All-Campus Joint Struggle Committees (Zenkyōtō) that sprung up across college campuses in the late 1960s and early 1970s as "nihilistic," involved in an "orgy of self-destruction" (152). He notes that he "draws heavily" on the work of journalist Suzuki Hideo's conclusions about this movement (295n21), but does not introduce many primary source materials that would help the reader understand the mechanics of what Kapur describes as the "vicious spiral of increasing violence and extremism" after the death of a New Left activist at a protest against the Vietnam War in October 1967 (152). Rather than dismissing later 1960s activism wholesale as irrational and violent, it would have been more intriguing to think of how how student activists in the late 1960s and early 1970s actually inherited the legacy of 1960 Anpo, which remains an open and interesting question.

Since many of the late-1960s student protests were framed as 'Anpo 1970' (the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty was up for renewal again in 1970), and protests in some cases became a self-consciously adopted mission on the part of many young people who had witnessed Anpo 1960, there is a missed opportunity in Kapur's book to understand how late-1960s student activism was not just sectarian disintegration and violence (as suggested by Kapur), but was also deeply influenced by 1960 Anpo student activism. Many of the graduate students who were key organizers and leaders on university campuses in the late 1960s cut their teeth in 1960 anti-Anpo protests (Tokoro Mitsuko, Yamamoto Yoshitaka); several of the younger participants recalled a desire to enter university in the late 1960s and to become an activist that was the result of their exposure to 1960 Anpo through television and radio, but also through publications of Kanba Michiko's writings, posthumously published after her 15 June 1960 death protesting Anpo.

Kapur observes how intellectuals influenced student activists in 1960 Anpo and afterwards (151), but there is little discussion about the impact of global events that also clearly shaped popular protest. How does 1960 Anpo fit into a larger, geopolitical framework that included other charged events: the civil rights movements and anti-colonial struggles, 1956 Budapest and Suez, and then Black Power and Third-Worldism? Also, if the late 1960s student movement in Japan was only a confused disintegration that began with the 'failure of Anpo,' why were there similar campus-based New Left movements, occupations, sects, cases of violence (significantly, both police violence as well as activist violence) in other places at the same time, ranging from Paris to New York, Mexico City to Dar-es-Salaam? One could argue that Anpo 1960 was not only the beginning of income doubling or the reign of the LDP, but also the beginning of Japan's global sixties.

Two key reasons for the shared temporalities of the global student New Left in the global sixties were the Vietnam War and the expansion of universities in general, which led to a questioning of the role of the university and knowledge-production itself in many places, not just Japan. The Vietnam War figures very marginally in Kapur's analysis, but this was a huge mobilizing factor for the late-1960s generation of student activists in Japan, where U.S. military bases allowed under the terms of Anpo supported U.S. war-making in Southeast Asia. This violence prompted many students to undertake ever more dramatic actions as they witnessed a war that was being waged with Japanese complicity produce more and more carnage. The student population in Japan also swelled in the 1960s, meaning that the very definition of university student

[12] The afore-mentioned works by Uemura-Sasaki and Avenell give more rich histories of grassroots politics surrounding Anpo.

became more expansive. Whereas the student activists of 1960 Anpo represented a limited vanguard of relative social elites, the activists of the late 1960s came from a wide swath of upwardly aspirational households.

The Japanese student movement was bigger and qualitatively different in 1960 and in the late 1960s, in part precisely because of the changes in education that were connected to Ikeda's high-economic growth policies. Autonomy became a slogan for campus-based protests not only because of the influence of intellectuals, but also because of the way students at increasingly 'mass-production' private universities that were geared to meeting government and industry expectations and quotas felt cut out of the decision-making processes of the institutions. As a complement to Kapur's strengths in writing institutional histories, examining educational institutions may have offered a less speculative way into understanding shifts in student activism in 1960 Anpo and after.

Review by Dustin Wright, California State University, Monterey Bay

Throngs of frustrated people marching through the streets of a major global city, defying curfews, clashing with police, and demanding that the ruling government resign. At the end of twenty-teens, it could be just about anywhere: climate strikes throughout the world, political struggles in La Paz, Hong Kong, London, and Beirut, to name but a few. There is always a good reason to study the recent history of social movements, but perhaps the current moment is particularly striking for the disparate but related wildfires of dissent that are flaring globally. It may well be that 2019 will hold the imagination the way that 1968 did for a previous generation.

Students of social movements will be pleased with Nick Kapur's new book, *Japan at the Crossroads: Conflict and Compromise after Anpo*, which deep dives into the most famous protests of Japan's postwar period. The book does much to broaden Anglophone understandings of the seismic protests that rocked Tokyo in 1960. For decades, readers outside of Japan have perhaps relied most heavily on George R. Packard's important but now dated *Protest in Tokyo* (1966) to understand the immensity of 1960 in shaping domestic politics and the U.S.-Japan geopolitical relationship.[13] Given the widely recognized significance of the protests within Japan, it is surprising that English readers have had the patience to wait so long for a dedicated book on Anpo (the abbreviation for the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan). Perhaps this speaks to the staying power of Packard's work, but it could also be that the field of Japanese Studies has, to its embarrassment, subscribed to the myth that significant protest in Japan effectively ended after 1960. This is an unfair statement, since protest takes many forms, but it is curious that Anpo appeared to have been more or less "settled."[14] Still, it would be difficult to find a Japanese historian who does not think that the protests had an immense impact on post-1960 Japan.

Obviously, a major transitional movement like the anti-Anpo protests has not been completely neglected by scholars in the preceding decades, but Kapur has done a great service by distilling the complex array of actors and ideologies into six clear and accessible chapters.[15] Like Packard's *Protest in Tokyo*, *Japan at the Crossroads* is in large part centered on the major political parties and labor unions, elite intellectuals, and institutions before and after the protests, which comprises the bulk of the first four chapters.

Chapter one, "Reformulating the US-Japan Alliance," will stand out for those with an interest in diplomatic history. Kapur introduces the major political figures who led the effort to stabilize the bilateral ties between the two countries. Prime Minister Ikeda Hayato and John F. Kennedy's ambassador, the famous 'Japan hand' Edwin O. Reischauer, both embarked on press offenses and efforts to rebuild public trust, which was seen as badly bruised in the wake of the protests. The prevailing sense of these efforts has long been that they were mostly superficial, but Kapur argues that the 1960 crisis forced

[13] George R. Packard, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

[14] A small example of English books on social movements and protest might include Robin M. LeBlanc, *Bicycle Citizens: The Political World of the Japanese Housewife* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); William Marotti, *Money, Trains, and Guillotines Art and Revolution in 1960s Japan* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2013); Franziska Seraphim, *War Memory and Social Politics in Japan, 1945–2005* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2008).

[15] In addition to those in the above footnote, we can include Yoshikuni Igarashi, *Bodies of Memory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); David Ernest Apter and Nagayo Sawa. *Against the State: Politics and Social Protest in Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); J. Victor Koschmann, "Intellectuals and Politics," in Gordon, Andrew, ed., *Postwar Japan as History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Ellis S. Krauss. *Japanese Radicals Revisited: Student Protest in Postwar Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974). Hiroko Hirakawa, "Maiden Martyr for 'New Japan,': The 1960 Ampo and the Rhetoric of the Other Michiko," *U.S.-Japan Women's Journal* 23 (2002): 92-109.

leaders to embark on a 'significant readjustment' on the security relationship, one that was ostensibly more equal than the one of the 1950s, in which the Japanese government labored under a long hangover from the Occupation.

The second chapter, "Stabilizing Conservative Rule," details the strengthening (some might say calcifying) rule of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and confronts the long-held belief among academics in the '1955 system,' a catch-all meant to represent "the structures that adhered to Japanese politics from the unification of the left and right socialist parties and creation of the LDP" (107). A deep dive into LDP machinations after the 1960 protests leads Kapur to conclude that conservative rule was far from assured in 1955. Moreover, after Kishi Nobusuku resigned, Ikeda Hayato's kinder, 'low posture' governing style (as opposed to the view by many that he was simply a 'bad cop' waiting to reemerge) was a major reason that political consolidation was even possible after the protests. Kapur writes, "Ikeda foresaw that by first winning over the media and then gradually the majority of the Japanese people, the creation of such a middle ground would ultimately allow the LDP to draw clear-cut distinctions between a practical nationals consensus and the ideology-driven policies of the increasingly marginalized opposition parties" (88). This, coupled with Ikeda's famous ten-year 'Income Doubling Plan' (counter that with the Japanese Socialist Party's platform to promise that people would be able to afford "Three glasses of milk a day!"), helped to drive economic investment throughout the 1960s (102).

It is in the political muck that Kapur's book is particularly strong. The third chapter, "The Waning of the Opposition Parties," paints a bleak picture of some elements of the left's political parties, the internal divisions of which were exacerbated by the failure of the 1960 protests to prevent the resigning of the security treaty. However, Kapur notes that after the protests ended, Communist Party enrollment greatly increased along with readership of the Party's newspaper, *Akahata* (130). This in contrast to the Japanese Socialist Party, which was sent into a tailspin from the "conflicting interpretations on the meaning of the 1960 protests" (114). Contrasting the post-Anpo lives of these two parties, Kapur clearly distills the complicated machinations that both divided and energized the Japanese left.

In Chapter Four, "The Collapse of the 1960 Coalition," Kapur follows the post-Anpo lives of major organizational actors and elite intellectuals, including Yoshimoto Takaaki, Shimizu Ikutaro, and Maruyama Masao. I appreciated Kapur's effort to rehabilitate Shimizu Ikutaro, who was widely vilified after he expressed support for the elimination of Article 9 and Japan's development of nuclear weapons. Kapur writes that in considering the totality of Shimizu's life, including his being born in 1907, receiving prewar nationalist education, and never really holding "deeply Marxist" views, "it should not be difficult to see how his views had maintained a degree of internal consistency" (162). Kapur mines a delightful metaphor from Shimizu's memoir, in which the then elder intellectual compares his political struggle throughout Anpo as akin to the psychological trauma of golf (incredibly small ball, big playing space), of which he was liberated after the movement's defeat. Post-Anpo, Shimizu could hit his ball in any direction (163).

The final two chapters are my favorites. "New Directions in Literature and the Arts" highlights some of the important radical artistic movements of the period. The performance artists that Kapur lovingly describes, including the Neo-Dada Organizers, sought 'creative destruction' as a way to "create a space for new types of art by systematically seeking out and violating existing rules." A manifesto read aloud during the protests by group member Akasegawa Genpei is particular gem in the chapter: "As we enter the blood-soaked ring of this 20.6 century—a century which has tramples on sincere works of art—the only way to avoid being butchered is to become butchers ourselves" (196). Readers who have watched Linda Hoaglund's magisterial documentary *Anpo: Art X War*[16] will be familiar with some of the art described in this chapter, but Kapur digs deeply to give the works new exposure.

In "Reshaping the Landscape of Expression," Kapur pushes back against a common narrative that the Japanese press was monolithic in its support and later condemnation of the protests. As Kapur reminds us throughout the book, it was always more complicated. Drawing from a 1974 study, Kapur notes that while "many newspapers expressed deep reservations about certain aspects of the revised treaty, particularly the perceived weakness of the 'prior consultation' stipulation and the

[16] Linda Hoaglund, *ANPO: Art X War* (Harriman: New Day Films, 2010).

vagueness of the term 'Far East,' not a single daily newspaper in the nation ever expressed open opposition to the ratification of the treaty" (228).

It would be impossible to capture the entirety of the anti-Anpo protests and their legacies in one book, but Kapur has adeptly synthesized many of the political, cultural, and intellectual shifts that wafted across Tokyo after 1960. Still, *Japan at the Crossroads* is very much like *Tokyo at the Crossroads* given the book's understandable focus on the protests on both the streets and in the political party conference halls of the capital. One wonders how Kapur's interrogation into facets like the fractured political parties, the gradual conformity in the press, and the intellectual evolution of the movement's participants and critics might look when applied to areas and institutions that were outside of the megalopolis. Okinawa, for example, stands out as a place where Anpo and its legacies are intimately felt in everyday life. This is less a critique than a call for others to undertake further research into how the protests were felt among those majority of Japanese people who were not Tokyoites.

To end where this review began, this book is timely for a surprisingly sinister reason. In 2018, participants in a white nationalist rally in New York City apparently reenacted the famous 1960 assassination of Japanese Socialist Party leader Asanuma Inejiro by a young fascist, a story recounted in Chapter Six, which Kapur describes as "the darkest side of the renewed right-wing confidence" (252).[17] Asanuma was murdered during a live television debate, an act that was witnessed by millions of viewers. That the event has become wrapped into the folklore of America's twenty-first century neo-Nazis is a reflection on the curious and disturbing ways that Japan's 1960 continues to cast a long shadow.

Even fifty years after the event, the story of the anti-Anpo protests is likely not yet complete. After all, when does a social movement actually end? Revolution is an ongoing process of rehearsals and it is rarely clear exactly when the show opens.[18] If anything, the continued shackling together of Japanese and American defense policies means that the history of the anti-Anpo protests remain unresolved.

[17] Bedford + Bowery, "Inside the Proud Boy Event That Sparked Violence Outside of Uptown GOP Club," 13 October 13 2018, https://bedfordandbowery.com/2018/10/inside-the-proud-boy-event-that-sparked-violence-outside-of-uptown-gop-club/.

[18] During the summer of 2012, in the wake of the Arab Spring, I attended a scholarly workshop in Beirut on "spaces of protest." Though the civil war in Syria was raging, there was a sense among many of the participants that the major upheavals of the region had run their courses, deposing some governments while strengthening the grip of others. Some of the workshop participants referred to the Arab Spring, and the protests that for years had preceded it, as 'rehearsals' for a final act that was not predetermined. Seminar on Experimental Critical Theory, American University of Beirut, July 2012.

Response by Nick Kapur, Rutgers University-Camden

I am deeply grateful for the care and effort that Professors James Orr, Chelsea Szendi Schieder, and Dustin Wright devoted to giving my book such close and thoughtful readings, and to Jennifer M. Miller for providing such a nuanced and illuminating introduction. I have personally learned much from reading the work of all four of these scholars,[19] and it is an honor and a genuine thrill to have my book introduced and reviewed by such a quartet.

In *Japan at the Crossroads*, I attempted to chart the aftermath of the massive 1960 protests against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (abbreviated 'Anpo' in Japanese) across a wide array of fields in Japanese politics, society, and culture, as well as U.S.-Japan relations and the Cold War international system. This wide-ranging and interdisciplinary approach arose in part from my own perplexity with the way the 1960 protests have often been treated in previous scholarship. Although scholars of modern Japan have consistently accorded the protests a position of great importance across a wide range of disciplines, including history, political science, sociology, literature, art history, and film and media studies, very rarely do scholars in these diverse fields read and cite each other, and thus works in each field are only able to offer a single facet of a multi-faceted story. I sought to place these many stories in dialogue with each other, because over the course of my research it became clear to me that all of these elements were in many ways mutually constitutive, and that ignoring some elements while overemphasizing others precludes a full understanding of the 1960 uprising and its aftermath.

As I write in the conclusion, while an understanding of international politics helps us understand Japanese art and literature, it is equally important to recognize that what Japanese artists or writers were doing (and not doing) after 1960 furthers our understanding of the role Japan came to play in the international system. By tracing the impact of a major event such as the 1960 protests across a wide variety of fields, we can gain a clearer understanding of how foreign policy and domestic politics intersect and overlap, and how political, social, and cultural changes are inextricable from each other (270-271).

In taking this broad and wide-ranging approach to the aftermath of the 1960 protests, I drew inspiration from John Dower's *Embracing Defeat*, a magisterial study of the aftermath of a similarly momentous event in Japan's modern history—Japan's defeat in World War II.[20] By no means do I presume that my book even approaches the quality of Dower's masterpiece—written by a legendary scholar in his prime—but I raise the comparison only because I found Dower's approach, whereby he sought to understand the importance of a major event in a three-dimensional and multi-faceted way by tracing the impact of that event across as many fields of inquiry as possible, to be of great utility in conceptualizing my own project.

Because my study is so wide-ranging thematically, it was inevitable that I would have to maintain a rather narrow scope, chronologically speaking, in part to keep the project manageable. To this end, I limited the main focus of my study to the period beginning as soon as the protests ended in June 1960, to approximately 1964. In addition, the shorter timespan ensured that my story would be legible. Tracing the interwoven threads between so many different areas of Japanese society, culture, and politics would have been more difficult, and less comprehensible, had the warp and woof those threads been stretched out over an even longer temporal frame. But most importantly, one of my goals was to highlight the specificity of the 1950s and early 1960s. In fact, I deliberately sought to disaggregate the 'sixties' and examine our at times uncritical

[19] See, among others, James J. Orr, *The Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001); Chelsea Szendi Schieder, *Co-Ed Revolution: The Female Student in the Japanese New Left* (forthcoming from Duke University Press); Chelsea Szendi Schieder, "To Catch a Tiger by Its Toe: The U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, Moral Re-Armament, and Cold War Orientalism," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 23:2 (June 2016), 144–169; Dustin Wright, *The Sunagawa Struggle: A Century of Anti-Base Protest in a Tokyo Suburb* (PhD dissertation, University of Santa Cruz, 2015); Dustin Wright, "From Tokyo to Wounded Knee: Two Afterlives of the Sunagawa Struggle," *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics, and Culture* 10:2 (Winter 2017), 133-149; and Jennifer M. Miller, *Cold War Democracy: The United States and Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019).

[20] John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999).

assumptions about the presumed cohesiveness of that tumultuous decade. I found that essentially all of the groups, organizations, and individuals I studied reached caesuras in activity or activism around 1964, and all of the processes I was charting had reached important milestones or turning points. In 1964, at a time when the Vietnam war had not yet been Americanized, Japan had already become a fundamentally different space in which past forms of protest were no longer seen as viable, and future forms of protest took on fundamentally different forms.

I am grateful for the thoughtful comments of the three reviewers. Taken together, their main critique centers around a wish that the book might have encompassed even broader temporal and spatial dimensions. As the author, it is exciting to see this kind of engagement, and although I regret falling short of some expectations, I also view this critique as a compliment of sorts to the book's ambition.

I am deeply sympathetic to Dustin Wright's call for a broader understanding of the 1960 protests beyond Tokyo. As Wright points out, the field of Japanese studies has a strong bias toward Tokyo, because most archives are located there and most of the elites who leave behind large bodies of documents behind tend to be located there. Likewise, because I was telling the story of these protests within a national and transnational frame, and most of the main actors in my narrative were based in Tokyo, it was somewhat inevitable that my study would reproduce some of this Tokyo-centrism. However, Wright is correct that there is a pressing need for more research on how protest movements outside of Tokyo both reinforced and diverged from activism in the capital, and I look forward to reading more of Wright's own work on protest in Okinawa and elsewhere in the future.

Chelsea Szendi Schieder suggests that there was a missed opportunity in my book to draw more connections between the university students involved in the 1960 protests and later university protests in 1968 and 1969. I completely agree with this assessment, and I am excited by possibilities for future work that analyzes the many connections between these two movements. Indeed, I eagerly await Schieder's own forthcoming book about the Japanese "New Left" student movement across the long 1960s. In the case of my research, the university student federation (*Zengakuren*) was just one group out of several hundred groups from many different areas of Japanese society that took part in the protest movement. For this reason, although they were a key player, I was only able to devote one quarter of one chapter to what happened to student movements after 1960. I agree with Schieder that the students in later movements need to be treated on their own terms and deserve to be heroes of their own stories. Schieder's study will undoubtedly shed fascinating new light on what happened to the student movement at the end of the decade, and I very much look forward to reading more of her work on this later period.

I can understand why James Orr—who wrote a brilliant and field-defining book on Japanese war memory and culture in the 1950s—would have appreciated more fine-grained analysis of events in the mid-1950s.[21] It is a tribute to Professor Orr's attention to detail that he devoted a full paragraph of his review to a brief parenthetical aside in the first few pages of my introduction. I happily concede his point that there were other actors involved the formation of the Liberal Democratic Party in addition to the Kishi Nobusuke and the CIA, most notably Liberal Party politicians such as Kōno Ichirō and Miki Bukichi, and I agree that I could have provided more detail on these events. The reason I did not cite extensive sources for my parenthetical contention that Kishi Nobusuke "orchestrated" the formation of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) "with advice and encouragement" from the CIA (10) was not only that these events were outside the scope of my main narrative, but also because I considered these contentions to reflect an established scholarly consensus. Because my own research was focused on the period from mid-1960 to 1964, I inevitably had to rely on secondary sources for events falling outside that scope. Secondary literature in both English and Japanese overwhelmingly portrays Kishi as the leading architect of the LDP's formation, of course working in concert with other leaders in the conservative camp. Various reputable scholars describe his role as "architect" or "broker" of the 1955 merger who "took the lead" in bringing about the combination of the Liberal and Democratic Parties. Richard Samuels calls Kishi "the central figure in building the 1955 system" who had "been maneuvering to achieve it for half a decade," and even Masaru Kohno, whom Orr cites as a possible

[21] See Orr, *The Victim as Hero*.

counter-example, repeatedly describes Kishi as "taking the initiative" in bringing about the merger.[22] Regarding the CIA's role, the reason I cite a trade-press book's interviews with former CIA agents was that while scholars universally agree that the US and the CIA helped push for conservative unification based on recollections by those involved such as the former agents Tim Weiner cites,[23] to the best of my knowledge the actual documents related to these events still remain classified, and thus this is one of the main sources that can be cited. All that being said, I appreciate Orr pointing out that I might have cited more scholarly sources on the 1955 formation of the LDP and CIA involvement, and by way of making amends, I cite a portion of that literature here.[24]

Overall, I am extremely gratified and humbled to have received three such thoughtful and generous reviews of *Japan at the Crossroads*. It was exciting to find that all three reviewers find it to be a worthy and necessary successor to George Packard's long-serving first stab at this topic in his 1966 book *Protest in Tokyo*.[25] It was especially gratifying to hear that even after ranging so widely across so many different fields and disciplines in my effort to trace the overlapping impacts of these protests on Japanese politics, society, and culture, the book still left the three reviewers wanting even more. It is my hope that other scholars can pick up some of these threads, and that this book will continue to inspire other researchers in the years to come.

[22] Richard Samuels, "Kishi and Corruption: An Anatomy of the 1955 System," Japan Policy Research Institute Working Paper 83 (December 2001); Masaru Kohno, *Japan's Postwar Party Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 74, 84; and Masaru Kohno, "The Creation of the Liberal Democratic Party in 1955," in Robert Pekkanen, ed., *Critical Readings on the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 2018) 1:30.

[23] See Tim Weiner, *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the CIA* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 116–121.

[24] For examples of other scholarship that portrays Kishi as a leading figure in the 1955 unification of the LDP, see Nakakita Kōji, *1955-nen taisei no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 2002), especially 242-252; Richard Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), especially 225-231; and Bert Edström, *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 35. For more on the role of the CIA in fomenting the 1955 LDP merger, see Samuels, "Kishi and Corruption"; Chalmers Johnson, "The 1955 System and the American Connection: A Bibliographic Introduction," Japan Policy Research Institute Working Paper 11 (July 1995); and Brad Williams, "US Covert Action in Cold War Japan: The Politics of Cultivating Conservative Elites and its Consequences," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* (2020), https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2019.1652841.

[25] George R. Packard III, *Protest in Tokyo: The Security Treaty Crisis of 1960* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).