

ABSTRACTS

**Territorial Dispute over the South China Sea
— China's Growing Assertiveness and Responses from Southeast Asia —**

Tomotaka Shoji

Senior Research Fellow, Asia and Africa Studies Division, Regional Studies Department

1-22

This research examines the responses of Southeast Asia, especially of Vietnam, to the current status of the territorial dispute over the South China Sea. Recently, the countries involved in Southeast Asia have become concerned about this issue once again. The state of tension is caused mainly by China's increasingly active and sometimes aggressive policy. In the South China Sea, the physical presence of China's navy forces and maritime law enforcement agencies is increasing, and China is also reinforcing the management of aquatic resources. Vietnam is growing concerned about such actions by China, and is trying to reach a breakthrough not by "containment" using military options but through the framework of ASEAN-based multilateral dialogues and by using ASEAN's collective diplomatic power, with the participation of extra-regional countries when needed. In addition, by carefully approaching the U.S., Vietnam is trying to strengthen its hedge against the rise of China. The Philippines is also growing more wary of the actions of China; it has reinforced ASEAN-based diplomatic activities and is promoting security cooperation with the U.S. Meanwhile, Malaysia has shown no remarkable movement except for military affairs, while Indonesia, as the current chair of ASEAN, is actively promoting multilateral talks in ASEAN-related meetings. Member countries of ASEAN will continue to develop pluralistic foreign diplomacy for the peaceful resolution of the issue. In this regard, it would be salient whether and how ASEAN can maintain its "unity" over the issue.

The Concept of Virtual Nuclear Arsenals and "a World without Nuclear Weapons"

Sukeyuki Ichimasa

Research Fellow, Defense Policy Division, Policy Studies Department

23-38

Regarding the concept of virtual nuclear arsenals suggested by J. Schell, et al. during the Cold War, justification of the nuclear threat, infringement of irreversible requirements for nuclear disarmament, and immobilized discriminating structure around nuclear weapons have been viewed with suspicion, from the perspective of nuclear disarmament. On the other hand, from the perspective of nuclear deterrence, the problem of instability and feasibility inherent in the concept, and the idea of rebuilding nuclear arsenals that will decrease the second assault capability have been criticized harshly. Based on the idea of finding a new node in the argument between nuclear disarmament and nuclear deterrence over the political principle of "a world without nuclear weapons" suggested by the Obama Admini-

stration in the U.S., this research examines implications that the concept of virtual nuclear arsenals can bring to the current international security environment from the following two aspects : nuclear deterrence and disarmament, and nonproliferation.

Issues and Future Outlook for Counterinsurgency Operations

Tetsuya Yano

Lieutenant Colonel, JGSDF; Research Fellow, Government and Law Studies Division, Security Studies Department

39-64

Major countries have a strong interest in counterinsurgency (COIN) operations, which are carried out mainly in Iraq and Afghanistan. In particular, in the U.S., which has led the occupational administration since the Iraq War, there has been much military research since the U.S. Army created the COIN manuals. However, a look at the details reveals many problems: the impact of the U.S. Army's inconsistent operational doctrine and complex duties, the adverse effect of the sense of rivalry in the Air Force, alteration of the theory of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Department of Defense, and stereotyping of COIN. Solutions to these problems have not yet been found. Furthermore, recent military conflicts have highlighted the important problem that the exit strategy of COIN operations is not valued.

The Evolving Roles of U.S. Special Operations Forces : Direct and Indirect Approaches to Irregular Warfare

Katsuya Tsukamoto

Senior Research Fellow, Defense Policy Division, Policy Studies Department

65-86

After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the United States used force against Afghanistan and Iraq. In these conflicts, the U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF) were extensively deployed and played three critical roles : (1) providing support for resistance forces; (2) guiding aerial bombings and precision-guided munitions; and (3) capturing and killing terrorists. After combat operations, they have engaged in stabilization and reconstruction operations by providing training for the security forces in the host nations. Although the U.S. SOF were first established during World War II, their strategic utility came to be fully recognized only after the 9/11 attacks. From this point forward, the SOF have been frequently employed to counter asymmetric and unconventional threats against the United States. However, there are two critical challenges for the future of the SOF. First, although a rapid expansion of the SOF is required to meet increasing demand, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet this demand since it takes considerable time to recruit and train SOF personnel. Second, direct attack missions, including capturing and killing terrorists, are appealing but have been overemphasized, and this skewed emphasis undermines the ability of

the SOF to perform other missions. In order to utilize the SOF more effectively, it is necessary to understand their nature and unique capabilities and create an environment in which they can focus on roles and missions that general purpose forces cannot perform.

[Research Note]

Legislative Process and Issues of the Military Secrets and Other Laws

Takeshi Hayashi,

Colonel JGSDF; Former Senior Fellow, 2nd Military History Research Office, Military History Department

Tomoyuki Wada

Lieutenant Colonel, JGSDF ; Fellow, Military History Division, Center for Military History

Atsuhiko Oyagi

Commander, JMSDF ; Fellow, National Security Policy Division, Center for Military History

87-110

Before World War II, laws concerning the protection of military secrets in Japan had been introduced by the end of the Meiji Period after the Japanese-Russo War. The legal system consisted of provisions of the Military Secrets Act (1899) and other laws. However, under the influence of World War I and strained international situation due to the Manchurian Incident and Sino-Japanese War, the system of laws to protect military secrets in Japan was expanded and strengthened. The framework consisted of the Revised Military Secrets Act (1937), the Military Resources Secret Act (1939), and the National Secrets Act (1941). During their legislative processes, there was heated debate over the definition of secret specified by each act and the application of the laws.