

REPORT

U.S. COURT RULES IN THE “OKINAWA DUGONG” CASE

Implications for U.S. Military Bases Overseas

Miyume Tanji

ABSTRACT: In January 2008, a U.S. federal court in San Francisco ruled that the U.S. Defense Department’s plans to construct a new U.S. offshore Marine airbase in Okinawa violated the National Historic Preservation Act by not protecting a Japanese “national monument,” the endangered Okinawa dugong. This article discusses the background and trajectory of the lawsuit and the implications of this judgment. The outcome of this lawsuit is expected to improve processes of evaluating and managing environmental and other social impacts of U.S. military forces on hosting communities in Okinawa/Japan. The case also demonstrates the potential of transnational civil society actors to overcome a deficient democratic system within one state. The expanded theater of the anti-base Okinawans’ protest brought them new allies while avoiding difficult and unnecessary conflict on the ground at home.

Advances in information and communication technologies in the past decade have intensified collaboration between social movements and advocacy networks across state borders. In Okinawa, with its own tradition of popular political opposition to the Japanese state and the U.S. military forces,¹ networking with overseas groups has provided local activists with important means for acquiring publicity and knowledge.² The “Okinawa Dugong Lawsuit” is an important recent example of transnational cooperation between Okinawan, U.S., and

mainland Japanese citizens. The direct goal of the legal action was the protection of an endangered species, the Okinawa dugong. It has, however, also been an important part of a long-term antimilitarist, anti-base, and antiwar strategy intended to obstruct the construction of a new U.S. offshore airbase near Henoko, in Nago City, Okinawa. This case requires further explanation from a variety of perspectives, most importantly from the point of view of the local participants. The expanded theater of their protest also brought them new allies while avoiding difficult and unnecessary conflict on the ground at home. This article offers an initial account, based on interviews and secondary materials.

Background

The dugong protection movement of the Okinawans started at least a decade ago, in combination with the political opposition to the new U.S. Marine airbase construction plan atop the coral reef of Henoko Bay. The construction plan for a new base to take the place of the now more than 60-year-old U.S. Marine's Futenma Air Station came about following the 1995 kidnapping and gang-raping of a 12-year-old school girl by U.S. soldiers in northern Okinawa.³ As a result of massive protest and international publicity, the two superpowers engaged in a major overhaul of arrangements and a downsizing of U.S. forces in Okinawa, with the establishment of SACO (Special Action Committee on Okinawa). The closure of the Futenma Air Base has been the major item on SACO's agenda.

The immediate origin of the Okinawa dugong case lay more specifically in the setback suffered by the anti-base opposition movement after the 1997 referendum in Nago City.⁴ The referendum resulted in the majority vote rejecting the Futenma Replacement Facility in Nago. However, local politicians tendering for the government's financial stimulus packages and subsidies given in exchange for the acceptance of new U.S. military bases especially in and around Henoko have given democracy second place.⁵ Tokyo unashamedly targeted Nago City by holding the G7 Summit in Nago, at a cost of 1.3 billion yen. They also set up "the Northern Districts Development Fund," which benefited local municipalities located near the new base. This involved as much as ¥100 million.⁶ In short, the Nago local government ignored the referendum result. Thus, democratic paths closed down at the level of local politics, driven by the logic of political economy of bases and compensation.

Since then, the anti-base activists, including local residents and outside supporters from other parts of Okinawa and mainland Japan, have engaged in raising international publicity on the predicament of the Okinawan environment. The dugongs have been the vulnerable species most threatened by the construction of a new U.S. military base.

-
1. Tanji 2006.
 2. Yonetani 2004.
 3. Angst 2001, 243–66.
 4. Yonetani 2001, 70–95.
 5. See Miyagi and Tanji 2007.
 6. McCormack 2007, 163.



The Japanese Society of Mammalogists has declared that dugongs in Okinawa (pictured here) are “critically endangered” as a result of overfishing and loss of habitat. (Credit: Greenpeace Japan)

In Okinawa and the Ryukyu Archipelago, dugongs traditionally have been harvested, their meat consumed and traded at high values during the Ryukyu Kingdom era. With seriously reduced numbers due to over-fishing and loss of habitat, the dugongs in Okinawa, as elsewhere, have been judged as “critically endangered” by the Japanese Society of Mammalogists.⁷ Their whereabouts and precise numbers were not known before November 1997. Then, an investigator sighted a dugong swimming in the coastal area during the preliminary coastal investigation for the construction of a new U.S. Marine base conducted by the Japanese government off the shore of Henoko hamlet on the northeast coast of Okinawa Main Island.⁸ Local and international environmentalist nongovernmental organizations (such as WWF Japan) raised the concern that the land reclamation required by the construction of the new airbase would put an end to the survival of the already endangered dugong and the sea grass on which they fed. An estimated fifty dugongs still live near the coast around Okinawa Main Island. Multiple citizens’ groups in Okinawa are actively involved in dugong conservation, including Jugon hogo kikin (Dugong Conservation Fund), Dugong Campaign Center Okinawa, and Hokugen no jugon o mimamoru kai (Association to Protect Northernmost Dugongs).

The construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility, estimated to take at least fifteen years, if all goes well, has been stalled for more than a decade. This is due to technical difficulties and firm positions taken by the local governments, including conservative Okinawa governor Inamine Keiichi; it should be

7. According to a UNEP report, “the Government of the Ryukyus, which was under U.S. occupation at that time, listed Okinawa dugongs as a natural monument in 1955.” See Marsh et al. 2002.

8. Hanawa 2002, 115.



Oura Bay. According to the “Roadmap for Realignment Implementation” drafted by the U.S. and Japanese governments, the proposed runway would extend into Oura and Henoko Bays, involving land reclamation of a coastal area more than twenty meters deep. (Credit: all photographs by author unless otherwise noted.)

noted, however, that the civil disobedience actions of local protestors had challenged the government of Japan as never before by blockading the drilling investigation in Henoko Bay’s shallow reef area. This forced the U.S. and Japanese governments to give up this construction site in 2005.⁹

Since 2005, the construction plan for the replacement airbase has been altered. In May 2006, the governments of Japan and the United States agreed on the current V-shaped airfield plan. According to the two governments’ “Roadmap for Realignment Implementation” (Roadmap), the proposed runway will extend into Oura and Henoko Bays. This plan would require land reclamation of a coastal area that is more than twenty meters deep. Makishi Yoshikazu, an Okinawan architect-activist, has pointed out the possibility that a new pier would be constructed here; the depth of water would make it possible for a nuclear aircraft carrier to berth.¹⁰ Oura Bay is also a site where dugongs graze on beds of sea grass.

Significantly, international conservation campaigns and the recent legal action in San Francisco have developed alongside continuous local citizens’ protests and disobedience. The Japanese Defense Ministry and its contractors have attempted to begin construction work on the Futenma Replacement Facility in Henoko Bay, under the guise of “investigation.” Likewise, the preparation for helipad construction has started in the remote forest of Takae district, located in Higashi village (home to some 150 residents), farther north of Henoko. The local anti-base citizens continue their encampment, sit-ins, and blockades in the ocean of Henoko and in front of the U.S. Marine Corps facilities in Takae. These actions have often involved intense altercations with the police and contract in-

9. See McCormack 2007, 164–65.

10. See Makishi 2006.

investigators. The round-the-clock sit-in in Henoko has continued unbroken for more than four years, supported only by the scarcest of human and financial resources.

Building Transnational Support Networks

Local activists have obtained support from international environmental NGOs such as WWF Japan and Greenpeace. (Anti-base activists in South Korea, Puerto Rico, and other places have been campaigning against the local presence of U.S. military forces.) Activists have also appealed to the World Conservationist Union (commonly known as IUCN): In 2000, delegates from Okinawa attended the IUCN Congress in Amman, Jordan, to lobby, network, and help to draw up IUCN resolutions on the protection of the Okinawa dugong. The IUCN resolution urged the U.S. and Japanese governments to adopt policies for the protection of the dugong.¹¹

Okinawan-U.S.-Japanese transnational legal action is a product of long-term planning and trust building through repeated visits and face-to-face meetings. The internet and electronic communication have definitely helped, however much “on-line networks cannot...be automatically understood as proxies for off-line networks.”¹² The IUCN congresses have been one of the venues where the Okinawan activists have met and established connections with overseas environmentalist groups.

It was at an event in Naha, Okinawa, that the idea of taking the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) to court was first discussed in March 2003: at the first international workshop on the “military and the environment” held by the coalition of Okinawan environmentalists, Okinawa Kankyō Nettowāku (Okinawa Environmental Network). While preparing for this workshop, one of the group’s members learned about the Center for Biological Diversity’s 2002 lawsuit on the internet. The NGO, based in northern California, had succeeded in stopping the U.S. Air Force’s live-fire raid training on a migratory bird habitat in the northern Mariana Islands.¹³ Earlier, in 2000, a mainland Japanese lawyer had suggested a dugong-related lawsuit against the Henoko airbase construction, based on the U.S. government’s Endangered Species Act.

After the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, however, environmentalist attorneys in the United States became wary of cases that might induce the U.S. government to nullify the Endangered Species Act. At the time, the U.S. govern-

-
11. Although Japanese and U.S. delegates to the IUCN abstained and refused to be bound by the resolution, “the IUCN resolution was still instrumental in securing local, national and international publicity, and in highlighting the environmental impact of the planned base.” In 2001, “the Ministry of Environment unofficially announced that they would list the dugong as an endangered species and look at the possibility of setting up a dugong sanctuary.” (See Marsh et al. 2002, 44.)
 12. Gillan and Pickerill 2008, 64.
 13. The case halted the “illegal killing of migratory birds at Farallon de Medinilla in the Northern Mariana Islands, home to more than a dozen migratory bird species” in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. See http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/international/pacific_islands.html; accessed 16 June 2008.

ment showed its readiness to forego protection of civil rights in all areas that they thought might conflict with anti-terrorist measures. Thus, the 2002 case on the internet instantly caught the eye of the Okinawan environmentalists. Consequently, a Center for Biological Diversity member, Peter Galvin, was invited to the aforementioned 2003 workshop in Naha. Galvin spoke on a panel on “conservation laws in the U.S. and dugong protection.” Activists and conservation specialists from Okinawa and mainland Japan were present as well. In his talk Galvin suggested the possibility of a case drawing on the U.S. National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). At that point, the not-for-profit environmental attorney organization Earthjustice, also based in northern California, became involved by representing the environmentalists’ case.¹⁴

Trajectory of the Lawsuit

In September 2003, a case was filed in the San Francisco Federal Court, with the Okinawa dugong as the primary plaintiff, along with three individual Okinawan citizens and six NGOs. From Okinawa came the Save the Dugong Foundation, the Dugong Network Okinawa, and the Committee against Heliport Construction/Save Life Society; from the United States, the Center for Biological Diversity and the Turtle Island Restoration Network; and from mainland Japan, the Japan Environmental Lawyers Foundation. The plaintiffs demanded the construction of the new offshore airbase be cancelled on the grounds that the “DOD has approved the 2006 Roadmap, including plans to construct the Futenma Replacement Facility, without having taken into account the effects of the facility on the Okinawa dugong.”¹⁵ The plaintiffs argued that the new U.S. airbase construction violated the 1966 NHPA, which bans any U.S. government projects, including overseas, that would harm properties of historical and cultural significance. Dugongs are listed as a “natural monument” on the Japanese Register of Cultural Properties, and Japan’s Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties prohibited any disturbance of their habitat. The court order issued on 2 March 2005 declared that the Okinawa dugong did indeed constitute historically significant “property,” rejecting the DoD’s claim that it did not.¹⁶ Thus the court case became the first NHPA application to a U.S. government project abroad.¹⁷

The federal court addressed other crucial questions such as whether or not the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility was actually a DoD undertaking. The DoD has argued that the project was entirely the Japanese government’s responsibility. Another question turned on whether or not the DoD had “taken into account the effects of the Futenma Replacement Facility on the Okinawa dugong,” as the NHPA required.¹⁸ At this stage, the court withheld judgment.

14. Email communication, Makishi Yoshikazu, May 2008.

15. U.S. District Court Northern District of California 2008, 12.

16. On 17 May 2004, the DoD attempted to dismiss the case “for failure to state a claim and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction” (U.S. District Court Northern District of California 2008, 7.)

17. *San Francisco Chronicle*, 3 March 2005.

18. U.S. District Court Northern District of California 2008, 7.

Following the 2005 court order, the DoD “compiled four separate administrative records, each covering a different aspect of the planning effort for the replacement facility.”¹⁹ As a result, the public became aware of previously undisclosed information including specific details about the construction plan. For example, the Japanese Ministry of Defense’s reports on the Roadmap and the Futenma Replacement Facility never mentioned the construction of extra facilities such as a military pier and an ammunition loading area. It had also been stated that aircraft would not conduct low-altitude flights that would damage the quality of life of residents who live near the base. DoD documents submitted to the court revealed the plan for these extra facilities, as well as its approval of low-altitude aviation over residential areas around the airfield if strategically necessary. As a result of the court order, the activists learned not only that the locals had never been consulted about such important matters, but that they had also been deceived: the mayor of Nago’s acceptance of the V-shaped runway plan was influenced by the Japanese government’s assurance that there would be no low-altitude flights.

The federal judge closed the case on 23 January 2008, ruling in favor of the plaintiffs. The court ruled that the Futenma Replacement Facility was essentially a DoD undertaking inasmuch as “the Roadmap is the final agreement between the United States and the Government of Japan marking the consummation of years of negotiation and planning.”²⁰ Most significantly, the court ruled that the DoD had violated the NHPA by not taking into account the effects of the Futenma Replacement Facility on the dugong.²¹ In the words of one newspaper report, the judge “sided with American and Japanese environmentalists who argued that plans to relocate the Futenma Air Station would threaten the dwindling number of dugong that lived in the sea grass beds around the island.”²² The U.S. judicial system has established that the responsibility to protect the endangered species in Okinawa falls onto the U.S. Department of Defense.

In closing the case, and to help give effect to its rulings, the court ordered the DoD

within ninety (90) days...to submit to the court documentation describing what additional information is necessary to evaluate the impacts of the Futenma Replacement Facility on the dugong; from what sources, including relevant individuals, organizations, and government agencies, the information will be derived; what is currently known or anticipated regarding the nature and scope of Japan’s environmental assessment and whether that assessment will be sufficient for meeting defendants’ obligations under the NHPA.²³

In April 2008, the DoD submitted a document to the court explaining that it had basically adopted the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted

19. *Ibid.*, 23.

20. *Ibid.*, 14.

21. The relevant portion of the NHPA requirements is section 402.

22. Associated Press 2008.

23. U.S. District Court Northern District of California 2008, 45.

by Japan's Defense Ministry. However, the DoD document also pointed out that the Japanese assessment had not specified the effect of the plan in relation to the survival of dugongs and their habitat. Importantly, the DoD document also indicated that it would require the government of Japan to come up with feasible methods to curtail destructive impacts of the airbase construction on the dugong habitat. Furthermore, it documented the DoD's commitment to continue researching the impacts of the detailed designs and operational methods of the new base on the dugongs. The DoD declared it would also consult local stakeholders and dugong specialists worldwide.²⁴ The local Okinawan community of protesters and activists received news of the outcome of this case with great enthusiasm.

Activism across State Borders: Implications

As an Earthjustice lawyer has observed, the court case alone will not be able to stop the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility in Henoko.²⁵ But whatever happens, the dugong court case sets a significant precedent for a number of reasons.

First, the case established that a U.S. military project in Okinawa (and such projects elsewhere in Japan) must follow the same rigorous U.S. legal standards that apply in the United States. This example upsets the "double standards" applied to a range of the U.S. military forces, facilities, and their operations in Okinawa/Japan. For example: the U.S. Marine Corps Air Station currently in operation in Futenma (in Ginowan City) is in a location that would not satisfy its home country's safety standards. According to the DoD's Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) program, areas within 4,500 meters of both ends of the runway are "Accident Potential Zones" and are not suitable for residential structures, schools, hospitals, and cultural facilities. Yet, in Futenma, densely built schools and houses fill the Accident Potential Zones.²⁶ This air station, which has been operating for more than sixty years, has been the scene of numerous accidents and crashes, most notably in 1956 (a primary school) and in 2004 (a university campus). In the case of the primary school, a U.S. jet fighter hit the Miyanomori Primary School, killing 17 and injuring 121 (many of them local children). Since 1972, aircraft have crashed no less than fifty times.²⁷

The DoD's AICUZ program is designed to ensure the safety and comfort of residents living around U.S. military airfields, but the problem is that the program applies only to "air installations of the Military Departments located within the United States."²⁸ This application of double standards reveals Okinawa's status as a military colony, as many local residents see it. In this sense, Chalmers Johnson observes that Okinawa represents a hotspot where privileges are granted to the U.S. military at the expense of the safety and human

24. *Okinawa Taimusu*, evening edition, 25 April 2008.

25. *Okinawa Taimusu*, 21 April 2008.

26. Ginowan Shiyakusho Kichi Taisakubu Kichi Shougaike 2006.

27. Tanji 2006, 79, 162.

28. For example, see Randolph Air Force Base 2008; Department of Defense 1977.



Scene at the Takae protest camp. “[L]ocal anti-base citizens continue their encampment, sit-ins, and blockades in the ocean of Henoko and in front of the U.S. Marine Corps facilities in Takae.”

rights of the local residents. This is an arrangement, he argues, that might upset the stability of U.S. hegemony and the web of alliances in the Asia-Pacific region.²⁹ As a result of the dugong case, the discrepancy between U.S. and Japanese standards in military-community relations was judged illegal by a U.S. court for the first time.

Second, the Japanese Defense Ministry’s EIA has, for the first time, been put under rigorous scrutiny by U.S. law. This could drastically change the quality of assessments conducted by Japanese government departments. These assessments have long been criticized as nonresponsive to the public’s environmental concerns. The U.S. court order rendering the DoD responsible for the effects of the Futenma Replacement Facility on the Okinawan dugong means that the DoD must also see that the EIA addresses detailed specifications and functions of the planned facility that take into account the protection of endangered dugong. In fact, the court demanded the translation of the detailed procedures and methods of Japan’s EIA of the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility. Now that assessing threats to the endangered dugong is clearly the DoD’s responsibility under NHPA, it is highly unlikely that the new construction plan will be judged safe as a dugong habitat.³⁰

This lawsuit is expected to contribute to more transparent processes of evaluating and managing environmental and other social impacts of U.S. military bases on the hosting communities in Okinawa/Japan. Furthermore, the federal court order will put increased pressure on the government to reflect the feedback of local residents to such processes.

29. Johnson 2000; Johnson 2006.

30. Yoshikawa 2008.



A Japanese Coast Guard vessel (foreground) challenges protesters who were trying to stop illegal scientific investigators being carried out in Henoko Bay in mid May 2007 by Defense Ministry contractors. (Credit: *Mainichi Shinbun*, 18 May 2007. Used with permission.)

It is hard to know, however, whether this new pressure on Japan's EIA has come early enough in light of the fact that Japan's Defense Ministry has already begun construction work for the Futenma Replacement Facility in Henoko and Takae (as noted above). According to the Environmental Impact Assessment Law,³¹ the Defense Ministry is supposed to make the assessment methods available to public scrutiny and revise them if public opinion deems this necessary. When the assessment method document was made public in August 2007, the plaintiffs in the dugong case informed members of the Okinawan Environmental Impact Assessment Evaluation Committee about elements missing from this document, namely, the DoD's plan to build additional facilities (e.g., the pier and the ammunition loading area) and possible allowances for low-altitude aviation training. Not surprisingly, the committee judged the Defense Ministry's assessment document insufficient, and the Okinawan governor demanded that it be rewritten. The impact assessment for this construction project has not even passed the standard required by the Environmental Impact Assessment Law. It appears, therefore, that a San Francisco court's scrutiny under NHPA will be the only effective corrective to the Defense Ministry's delinquent behavior. Had it not been for this court order, the local protesters who have been blockading and sitting-in would have been completely on their own.

Third, the case has opened up an alternative venue of contestation for anti-base politics away from the local battles in Nago and Okinawa, where eco-

31. The Environmental Impact Assessment Law was enacted in June 1999.

conomic interest always speaks louder than humanitarian norms. In the past decade, the mainstream stakeholders in Henoko and Nago City, including the mayor, local governments, the construction industry, and the chamber of commerce, have decided to accept the new base. Many of the locals have likewise seen base-related compensation as a way of adapting to globalizing economic conditions. Nevertheless, at the end of the day, Okinawans across the board have shown a concern for the local environment, as well as a desire to live in a society free of militarism and war.³²

With no room allowed for compensation politics and with Okinawans “forced to choose” for so long in favor of the bases,³³ the San Francisco case illustrates how transnational civil society actors can bypass a deficient democratic system in one state.

Epstein argues that conflicts over nature and conservation today are increasingly less understood in terms of state borders and more in terms of immediate locality and social class.³⁴ This is evident in the attitudes of local Okinawans to U.S. bases. With regard to the people in Henoko, Inoue points out two different kinds of “Okinawan” identities. One belongs to a middle-class “Okinawa,” while the other is centered on the working-class. The second is a “different kind of Okinawan,” strongly grounded locally, in this case, in the concrete everyday lives of Henokoans. The former, consisting of more globally switched-on Okinawans, are proudly conscious of their distinct “way of life,” unashamed of it being considered “backward.” Whilst “appropriating the affluence of Okinawa made possible by the post-reversion Japanese money,” middle-class Okinawans oppose the U.S. military “in light of the globalised citizenship discourses centring on human rights, democracy, peace, ecology, and women’s issues.”³⁵

Working-class Henokoans, on the other hand, are “financially insecure, often living in fear of failure, decline, and underdevelopment;...they tended to reluctantly support the U.S. base in exchange for rent money and jobs the Japanese government provided.”³⁶ For these Henokoans, human survival comes with economic development and the preservation of dugongs must be way down the priority list (after all, they can go and see dugongs in Australia on their once-in-a-lifetime trips overseas). Just as whaling cannot be “reduced to relations between states,”³⁷ the politics of U.S. military bases is, to a significant extent, played across another divide between the global and the hamlet; it is not exclusively a matter of U.S.-Japan inter-state arrangements.

The Okinawan dugong case avoided the usual battle that takes place in local politics by taking it to a San Francisco Federal Court. For once, instead of battling their fellow working-class Okinawans at the hamlet level, the anti-base Okinawans managed to directly tackle the real enemy — the U.S. and Japanese

32. Inoue 2007, 125.

33. Sato 2006.

34. Epstein 2003.

35. Inoue 2007, 168–69.

36. *Ibid.*, 155.

37. Epstein 2003, 321.

governments working together as an ever more closely integrated military coalition. And the activists found welcome support among like-minded Americans.



A protester (pictured right) prepares to embark on a routine blockade at the proposed U.S. Marine airbase in Henoko Bay, May 2007. On 20 June 1998, three anti-base divers were confronted by thirteen Defense Ministry's contractors' boats, four Japanese Coast Guard boats, and twenty divers who were trying to protect scientific investigations that the protestors declare are in violation of EIA law.

References

- Angst, Linda Isako. 2001. The sacrifice of a schoolgirl: The 1995 rape case, discourses of power, and women's lives in Okinawa. *Critical Asian Studies* 33 (2): 243–66.
- Associated Press. 2008. U.S. military must consider Japan base's impact on "sea cow" marine mammal. *International Herald Tribune*. 25 January.
- Department of Defense. 1977. *Instruction*. No. 4165.57. 8 November. Available on-line at <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/416557p.pdf>; accessed on 16 June 2008.
- Epstein, Charlotte. 2003. WorldWideWhale.Globalisation/dialogue of cultures?" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 16 (2): 309–22.
- Gillan, Kevin, and Jenny Pickerill. 2008. Transnational antiwar activism: Solidarity, diversity and the internet in Australia, Britain and the United States after 9/11. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 43 (1): 59–78.
- Ginowan Shiyakusho Kichi Taisakubu Kichi Shougaika. 2006. *Futenma Hikoujou no Anzen Futekikaku Sengen: Shichou Komento* [The mayor's manifesto regarding the Futenma Air Base's failure to meet safety standards]. Available on-line (in Japanese) at <http://www.city.ginowan.okinawa.jp/2556/2581/2582/27873.html>; accessed on 5 June 2008.

- Hanawa, Shinichi. 2002. Hokugen no Dugong o mamoru tameni [Protecting the northernmost dugong habitat]. In Dugong Protection Campaign Center, ed. *Dugong no umi to Okinawa* [Dugong, the ocean and Okinawa]. Tokyo: Kobunken.
- Inoue, Masamichi S. 2007. *Okinawa and the U.S. military: Identity making in the age of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Johnson, Chalmers. 2000. *Blowback: The costs and consequences of American empire*. New York: Owl Books.
- . 2006. *Nemesis: The last days of the American republic*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Makishi, Yoshikazu. 2006. U.S. dream come true? The new Henoko sea base and Okinawan resistance. *Japan Focus*. 12 February. Available on-line at http://www.japanfocus.org/_Makishi_Yoshikazu-US_Dream_Come_True_The_New_Henoko_Sea_Base_and_Okinawan_Resistance; accessed on 19 June 2008.
- Marsh, Helene, Helen Penrose, Carole Eros, and Joanna Hugues. 2002. Dugong: Status report and action plans for countries and territories. UNEP. Available on-line at <http://www.unep.org/dewa/Docs/DUGONG.pdf>; accessed on 22 April 2008.
- McCormack, Gavan. 2007. *Client state: Japan in the American embrace*. London and New York: Verso.
- Miyagi, Yasuhiro, and Miyume Tanji. 2007. U.S. dream come true? The new Henoko sea base and Okinawan resistance. *Japan Focus*. 3 August. Available on-line at http://www.japanfocus.org/_Miyagi_Yasuhiro_M_Tanji-Okinawa_and_the_Paradox_of_Public_Opinion_Base_Politics_and_Protest_in_Nago_City_1997_2007; accessed on 19 June 2008.
- Randolph Air Force Base, Texas. 2008. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study: Citizen's brochure. Available on-line at <http://www.randolph.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-080521-018.pdf>; accessed 19 June 2008.
- Sato, Manabu. 2006. Forced to "choose" its own subjugation: Okinawa's place in U.S. global military realignment. *Japan Focus*, 2 August. Available on-line at <http://japanfocus.org/products/details/2202>; accessed on 16 June 2008.
- Tanji, Miyume. 2006. *Myth, protest and struggle in Okinawa*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- U.S. District Court Northern District of California. 2008. Okinawa dugong v. Gates et al. 24 January. Available on-line at http://www.earthjustice.org/library/legal_docs/dugong-decision-12408.pdf; accessed on 29 May 2008.
- Yonetani, Julia. 2001. Playing base politics in a global strategic theater: Futenma relocation, the G-8 Summit, and Okinawa. *Critical Asian Studies* 33 (1): 70–95.
- . 2004. Appropriation and resistance in a "globalised village": Reconfiguring the local/global dynamic from Okinawa. *Asian Studies Review* 28 (December): 391–406.
- Yoshikawa, Hideki. 2008. Jugon soshou no yukue: Ge [The dugong case: Where to from here?] Part 3. *Okinawa Taimusu*, 21 January.

□