

Japan-U.S. Security Relations under the Koizumi Administration: Implications for Bush's Second Term

Heigo Sato

On Japan-U.S. Relations

On December 22, 2004, the Joint Inquiry Board for Japan-U.S. Security and Base Realignment of U.S. Forces of the Policy Research Council of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) issued a paper titled "The Future of Japan's Security and Japan-U.S. Alliance," which outlines points for consideration concerning Japan-U.S. relations. This report describes the current situation as follows: Japan and the U.S. are seeking a new approach to security which will specify the roles and responsibilities to be fulfilled not only for the defense of each country but also for the peace and security of the international community and the Asia-Pacific region. In Item (2) of the report, "Establishment of common strategic objectives and division of roles and mission between Japan and the U.S.," under Section 5, "Major Issues and Goals of Consultations with the U.S.," the following are given as specific policy aims: "establishing a common awareness between Japan and the U.S. toward the strategic environment of the international community and East Asia as well as toward threats," and "strengthening the alliance through a division of roles and mission between Japan and the U.S. in their respective areas of excellence, such as diplomacy or military affairs."¹

The points of discussion indicated by the inquiry board are the diplomacy and security policies. One point that Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi has repeatedly emphasized has been to have the LDP incorporate Koizumi's policy into their future policy agenda. The Board indicated the direction of Japan-U.S. relations founded on the simultaneous pursuit of the Japan-U.S. alliance and international cooperation. Concerning the Japan-U.S. alliance, Prime Minister Koizumi has stated, "Japan and the United States share fundamental values such as the respect for basic human rights, democracy, and promotion of the market economy. Japan's relationship with the United States is the linchpin of its diplomacy. Our alliance is the cornerstone for peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. I intend to continue to cooperate with President Bush in striving for peace and prosperity of the world

¹ Joint Inquiry Board for Japan-U.S. Security and Base Realignment of U.S. Forces of the Policy Research Council of the Liberal Democratic Party, "The Future of Japan's Security and Japan-U.S. Alliance," December 22, 2004.

by jointly tackling the issues that the international community is faced with as we further strengthen the Japan-U.S. alliance in the global context.”² Prime Minister Koizumi also stated, “President Bush and I have agreed that we must strengthen the Japan-U.S. alliance in the global context. On the basis of the Japan-U.S. alliance, Japan and the U.S. are striving to resolve the world’s various problems in coordination with the countries of the world. With this as our objective, we have reaffirmed our commitment to strengthen this cooperative relationship, and I believe this is consistent with Japan’s national interest. This alliance is not limited to cooperation based on the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. There have been no changes in the relationship of rights and obligations stipulated in the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.”³

The Japan-U.S. alliance, which is based on the common values held by Japan and the U.S., is understood to be a bilateral relationship whose purview extends beyond the scope of application of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. As Prime Minister Koizumi has explained, and as indicated by the LDP’s inquiry board, if Japan is going to specify the common strategic objectives based on the framework of the Japan-U.S. alliance and define their roles and missions, it will be possible to build a mutually complementary and mutually reinforcing relationship. This arrangement is probably consistent with the countries’ national interests. From the Japanese perspective, this arrangement will allow them to maintain and expand its globally-extended benefits under the strategies implemented by the U.S. Moreover, Japan will be able to rely on the involvement of the U.S. in dealing with such factors of instability as the military challenge by North Korea and the rise of China. Meanwhile, the U.S. will be able to harness Japan to reinforce its own global strategies both politically and militarily. For the U.S., Japan will symbolize the course of its international cooperation efforts and at the same time U.S. military strategy will be reinforced under the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

However, Japanese and U.S. efforts to strengthen the alliance in this direction will substantially heighten domestic tensions. The problem for Japan is that its national interests can always be brought under the influence of U.S. policy orientations. At the same time Japan’s policymakers must respond to the doubts of its people as to whether international cooperation and its emphasis on the Japan-U.S. alliance are consistent, or whether these two policies are in conflict. It is also possible that the establishment of a domestic legal system will not keep pace with efforts to strengthen the alliance. For the U.S., there is the concern that their incorporation of Japan’s interests within their policy making will result in a loss of flexibility in policy implementation.

² 160 – House of Representatives – Plenary Session – 2, August 2, 2004.

³ 161 – House of Representatives – Plenary Session – 2, October 13, 2004.

The Koizumi Administration and Japan-U.S. Relations

There is little doubt that the Japan-U.S. alliance under the Koizumi administration has led to a strengthening of security alliance and policy coordination. On a visit to the U.S. in June 2001, immediately following his appointment, Prime Minister Koizumi and President Bush announced the “Partnership for Security and Prosperity.” In this document, both leaders reaffirmed that the Japan-U.S. alliance will continue to be the cornerstone of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. It also proclaimed that consultations would be intensified at various levels on further steps in security cooperation, building on continuing implementation of the Defense Guidelines of the two countries.⁴ In this agreement, Japan and the U.S. described each other as “partners in an enduring alliance.” In addition, at the ceremonies that commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty held immediately before September 11, both countries again described each other as “indispensable partners.”⁵

Japan quickly emphasized strength of the alliance with the U.S. immediately after September 11. On a visit to the U.S. for a Japan-U.S. summit meeting with President Bush following September 11, Prime Minister Koizumi emphasized that Japan and the U.S. would make a concerted effort toward “eradicating and destroying terrorism,” that Japan would provide cooperation to U.S. military operations, and strengthen its stance of contributing to the economic and social stability of the countries surrounding Afghanistan.⁶ In addition, at the Japan-U.S. Summit Meeting held on the occasion of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Summit Meeting in Shanghai in October 2001, Prime Minister Koizumi stated that despite Japan would not participate in the use of force. Japan is willing to provide cooperation in areas such as goods and transportation. It is for this purpose that the use of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) is under consideration. Prime Minister Koizumi also explained that no military contribution, such as economic and diplomatic efforts blocking terrorist funding, is of urgent necessity in the Afghan operation. Furthermore, Prime Minister Koizumi announced that military success, political stability, and reconstruction are the three important elements for the success of the operation. Therefore he stated, Japan would make all possible efforts to achieve political stability and reconstruction.⁷ However, what attracted

⁴ “Partnership for Security and Prosperity” June 30 2001.

<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2001/0630anzen.html>.

⁵ http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/kiroku/g_tanaka/arc_01/usa9_01/kyodo.html.

⁶ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010925-1.html>.

⁷ http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/s_koi/apec2001/j_us_kaidan.html.

the most interest in the Afghan operation was the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law enacted on October 29, 2001.

Japan's involvement in the Afghan operation was significant in that it was neither based on a United Nations (UN) collective security measure and peace-keeping functions, nor the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. Rather, it was based on Japan's own policy decisions. Following the involvement in Afghanistan, Japan's international involvement had afforded symbolic meaning in its representation of "cooperation with the international community" and has rapidly grown since then. In answering questions at the press conference regarding the purport of the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Bill, submitted to the Diet on October 5, 2001, Prime Minister Koizumi stated that, "The Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law establishes measures, etc., to be implemented for the purpose of making a proactive and independent contribution to international efforts for preventing and eradicating international terrorism, which are activities that Japan is able to carry out in accordance with the spirit of international cooperation of the Preface and Article 98 of the Constitution to the effect that it does not conflict with Article 9 of the Constitution."⁸ Prime Minister Koizumi added, "The purpose of the bill is to make a proactive and independent contribution to the efforts of the international community to prevent and eradicate international terrorism based on related UN Security Council resolutions and is not directly related to the Japan-U.S. alliance which forms the basis of the Japan-U.S. security system."⁹ An important point with respect to this explanation is that Japan will make a "proactive and independent" contribution to issues faced by the international community. In effect Japan demonstrated that its contribution to the international community was not solely out of consideration for Japan-U.S. relations. This was the standpoint emphasized during a visit to North Korea by Prime Minister Koizumi in September 2002. Under this policy, Japan dispatched SDF vessels to the Indian Ocean for refueling for the Afghan operation based on the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law enacted on October 29.

This justification of advancing Japan-U.S. coordination while promoting comprehensive international coordination employed by Prime Minister Koizumi was also seen in the war in Iraq. The war in Iraq sparked a conspicuous confrontation between the U.S. on the one hand, and France and Germany on the other, within the UN Security Council. This confrontation led to the perception that international coordination and cooperation with the U.S. as advanced by

⁸ Reply to question from Yoshinori Suematsu of the Democratic Party of Japan. 153 – Lower House – Plenary Session – 5, October 10, 2001.

⁹ Reply to question from Ryushi Tsuchida of the Liberal Party 153 – Lower House – Plenary Session – 5, October 10, 2001.

Prime Minister Koizumi was not consistent, and doubt emerged concerning cooperation with the international community. With the unilateral tendency of the U.S., the question of how to harmonize its policy to emphasize the Japan-U.S. alliance with international cooperation repeatedly came up as a politically contentious issue in domestic policy.

After extending cooperation for the Afghan operation, Japan provided support for the war in Iraq and then support for the reconstruction of Iraq. It also heightened political tension in Japan. This raised the question as to what stance Japan should take in response, not to the situation in which there is direct impact on Japan's territorial defense but to the situation relating to crisis management. At the same time, this situation politically presented an indicator of the degree of common awareness between Japan and the U.S. toward international issues. Legal system issues that would enable Japan's involvement in such challenges—beyond the scope of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty—were also brought into focus for the purpose of fostering peace and security in the Far East.

International Cooperation and the Japan-U.S. Alliance

Faced with these issues, the Koizumi administration repeatedly requested the U.S. to place more emphasis on international cooperation. At the Japan-U.S. Summit Meeting which followed his speech at the UN General Assembly on September 12, 2002, Prime Minister Koizumi highly praised the speech President Bush delivered to the UN and stated that it was his hope that further efforts would be undertaken to advance international cooperation towards the resolution of the issue. Prime Minister Koizumi stated that while he understood the resentment of the people of the United States, it was preferable to bear the unbearable and to undertake further international cooperation.¹⁰ In addition, Prime Minister Koizumi, while recognizing that Iraq's defiance of international resolutions is a problem, added, "I am asking the U.S. to make exhaustive efforts to enable the regime of international cooperation to be adopted through the cooperation of the international community. The Japan-U.S. alliance, which is the basis of Japan's peace and prosperity, allowed Japan to enjoy peace in the post-war period and devote its full effort to economic development while ensuring security. I believe we must give equal importance to international cooperation and the Japan-

¹⁰ Outline of the summit meeting on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly Session attended by Prime Minister Koizumi (September 12, 2002). http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/s_koi/usa_02/us_kaidan.html; In the General Policy Speech in October 18, 2002, Prime Minister Koizumi stated "I clearly conveyed to President George W. Bush of the United States our view that international collaboration is vital in addressing the issue of Iraq. Japan will continue to carry out diplomatic efforts in cooperation with the international community."

U.S. alliance and make them consistent. This, I believe, is Japan's fundamental, enduring, and unwavering policy in the past, present and future."¹¹

Since the start of the Iraq War in March 2003, the stance of the Koizumi administration to give equal importance to international cooperation and to Japan-U.S. security did not change. In a press conference after the start of the war against Iraq, Prime Minister Koizumi stated, "Deeply reflecting on the defeat of the Second World War, Japan must never again allow itself to be isolated from the international community. Based on such thoughts, Japan has pursued its development while working on an international cooperation system. At the same time, in order to ensure its security, Japan formed an alliance with the United States based on the recognition that it was insufficient for Japan on its own to protect itself. Given that Japan cannot ensure its own security alone, Japan concluded the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and has firmly maintained the Japan-U.S. alliance as a means of ensuring the security of our nation." Prime Minister Koizumi explained further, "With the solid trust under the Japan-U.S. alliance, Japan has to date worked to ensure the security of its people and to attain economic development. Even if an international coordination system to deal with the Iraqi problem failed to be formed for now, I am convinced that the time will come when many countries keenly realize the necessity of international collaboration for world peace, stability and prosperity. Japan's policy of holding firm the importance of the Japan-U.S. alliance and of the international cooperation to attain this will not change."¹²

Prime Minister Koizumi's posture of giving importance to the U.S. is obviously based on the expectation, given the involvement of the U.S. in Japan's security, of U.S. cooperation in the political issues he faces. In a Diet report presented on March 20, 2003, he stated, "The United States now stands at the forefront of the international movement to dismantle such weapons of mass destruction. The United States is an irreplaceable ally of Japan and provides a vital deterrence that defends the peace and security of our nation. The United States also plays an indispensable role in securing the peace and security of the Asian region surrounding Japan. At a time when the United States is about to make tremendous sacrifice for the great cause of the international community, it is Japan's duty, and is all too natural, that Japan should provide support as much as it can." In addition, Prime Minister Koizumi stated in a press conference following the start of the air campaign at in Iraq on March 20, 2003, "The United States has clearly stated that an attack on Japan would be an attack on the United States. The United States is the only country which clearly states that an attack on

¹¹ 156 – House of Councillors – Committee on Budget – 7, March 24, 2003.

¹² <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2003/03/20houkoku.html>.

Japan would be considered as an attack on the United States. The people of Japan should not forget that the fact that the United States deems the attack to Japan as an attack to itself is serving as a great deterrence against any country attempting to attack on Japan.”¹³

Indeed, the security issues of the Asia-Pacific region are, for Japan, issues with a direct impact on Japan's security. However, caught between historical experience and actual policy needs, Japan's efforts to deal with security issues independently is considered to worsen the situation. Taking the issue of North Korea's nuclear weapons development program as an example, the abduction of Japanese by North Korea and other issues unique to relations between the two countries would probably worsen the situation if Japan formulated policy independently. Hence, it is important that a solution to this issue be found through multinational negotiations including the U.S. With regard to concerns about the rise of China, the firm relationship between Japan and the U.S. unquestionably boosts the peace of mind in Japan. At a press conference following the Japan-North Korea Summit Meeting held on June 7, 2003, Prime Minister Koizumi stated, “I pointed out that both ‘dialogue’ and ‘pressure’ are necessary for a diplomatic and peaceful solution. I have a view that if North Korea further worsens the situation, the three countries, the ROK, the United States, and Japan, must have a close consultation and take tougher measures.” These remarks indicate that Prime Minister Koizumi regards the involvement of the U.S. as essential.¹⁴

Conditions for Consistency

With regard to the issue of consistency of the “Japan-U.S. alliance” and “international coordination,” we must turn our attention to the following question: Under what sort of conditions can Japan pursue both the “Japan-U.S. alliance” and “international coordination”? This matter has been referred to on various occasions such as in the opening remarks of the Prime Minister's press conference held upon the enactment of the Law Concerning the Special Measures on Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance in Iraq. Prime Minister Koizumi defined the issue of humanitarian and reconstruction assistance in Iraq as an issue requiring actions from Japan in its pursuit of both the Japan-U.S. alliance and international coordination. Prime Minister Koizumi then stated, “Japan cannot alone secure its own peace and security. It was for such a reason that we concluded the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and why we must accord the Japan-U.S. alliance the importance it deserves.” Prime Minister

¹³ <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2003/03/20houkoku.html>.

¹⁴ <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2003/06/07seimei.html>.

Koizumi went on to discuss the importance of Japan continuing to serve as a dependable ally of the U.S. He continued by emphasizing that the reconstruction of Iraq will not be conducted by U.S. efforts alone. He also pointed out that the U.S. is giving priority to international coordination through the UN in this respect, adding that within the coordination regime, it would be inadequate if Japan alone provided funding cooperation. Moreover, Prime Minister Koizumi stated that the reconstruction of Iraq is an issue related to international security and suggested that if Iraq's current condition is left as is, Japan's security would also be affected. Further, Prime Minister Koizumi stressed that the SDF would be dispatched to Iraq in accordance with the principle stated in the preface of the Constitution.¹⁵

As Prime Minister Koizumi has asserted in the past, in order for Japan to achieve consistency between international coordination and support to the U.S., three conditions had to be met. First, Japan must maintain an unshakable sense of trust toward the commitment of the U.S. This sense of trust will be affected by the individual sense of trust between the leaders of the two countries and the degree of progress of policy coordination for each individual issue. Prime Minister Koizumi and President Bush have built a close interpersonal relationship through summit meetings held on the occasion of various opportunities. This sort of relationship of trust was lacking during the Clinton administration. Similarly, it should be kept in mind that the strategic environment has become a structural factor promoting a closer bilateral relationship. The stability of regions within the so-called "Arc of Instability," which the U.S. regards as the focal point of security, is consistent with the national interests of both Japan and the U.S., and cooperation of both countries is essential for continued involvement in the region. In particular, the maintenance of military balance in the Asia-Pacific region, and defense cooperation, and political involvement in the fight against terrorism will be executed smoothly through the Japan-U.S. alliance as the region's public good. In addition, from the perspective of international relations theory, it should be noted that the favorable turn in Japan-U.S. relations has taken place while the international system has remained unchanged.¹⁶

The second condition is having a shared awareness toward the security issues faced by the international community and the Asia-Pacific region, and a common perception of methods of resolving these issues. Among the security issues facing the international community today, a certain consensus undeniably exists, at least among the industrialized nations, concerning many important issues as far as the UN Security Council Resolution 1540

¹⁵ <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/fukkosien/iraq/031209kihon.pdf>;
<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2003/12/09press.html>.

¹⁶ Colin Dueck, "Ideas and Alternatives in American Grand Strategy, 2000-2004," *Review in International Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (October 2004), pp. 511-535.

and the G8 resolutions (regarding terrorism and non-proliferation and action plans) are concerned. However, differences in views between countries can be seen concerning policy methods and policy prioritization, which undeniably cause a loss of international cooperation, as well as friction with the U.S. as it pursues its independent course in policy-making. In the war in Iraq, the exercise of the so-called doctrine of preemption (the Bush Doctrine) by the U.S. has met with severe criticism by the international community. Some conclude that the lessons of the war in Iraq have led to the infeasibility of this doctrine. However, it should be noted that the use of force has not been from the U.S. as a policy option for overthrowing a government, as seen in statements by Senator John Kerry in candidates' debates in the 2004 presidential election.

Japan did not initially welcome the Bush Doctrine. Following a speech by President Bush at West Point in June 2002, Minister for Foreign Affairs Yoriko Kawaguchi stated, "If the U.S. should take new military action in the future, I understand that it is natural that such action will be conducted in accordance with the rights and obligations of the U.S. under international law." Minister for Foreign Affairs Kawaguchi continued that this doctrine "shows a determination to guarantee the security of the U.S. and its citizens. It also encourages determination on the part of the American people, and at present the doctrine has not declared that concrete military action will be taken."¹⁷ Prime Minister Koizumi stated that he "understood and supported" the U.S. attack on Iraq. However, he concluded that the uncooperative stance of the Saddam Hussein regime invited the attack and highly evaluated the efforts of the U.S. to obtain a UN resolution. In addition, at the Japan-U.S. Summit Meeting held in Crawford, Texas in May 2003, Prime Minister Koizumi praised the quick resolution of the action in Iraq and the rebuilding of international coordination through the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1483. He also called for the U.S. to recognize the importance of international coordination particularly through the UN.¹⁸ Moreover, in November 2004, Prime Minister Koizumi stated, "Whenever I meet with President Bush, I always stress the importance of international coordination. It is for this very reason that a resolution to provide assistance for the reconstruction of Iraq was unanimously adopted at the UN, including France, Germany, Russia and China, for each country to offer assistance to Iraq. I think that this is a typical example of how the U.S. is placing emphasis on the international coordination system."¹⁹

The third condition is continued U.S. support of the activities of the SDF overseas. With

¹⁷ 154 – House of Representatives – Committee on Foreign Affairs – 21, July 12, 2002.

¹⁸ http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/s_koi/us-me_03/us_gh.html.

¹⁹ 161 – House of Councillors – Special Committee Concerning Humanitarian Reconstruction Assistance Activities to Iraq and Response to the Use of Force – 2, November 5, 2004.

regard to the role of the SDF in the fight against terrorism, Japan's "memory of the Gulf War" was initially pointed at having had a major influence on Japan's policy-making. Many news reports were seen in which demands for the dispatch of the SDF were made out from repeated call from U.S. through slogans such as "Show the Flag" or "Boots on the Ground." What we ought to think about is not whether these reports were true or false, but the fact that Japan accepted such requests and dispatched the SDF to assist in the Afghan operation and the reconstruction of Iraq. At the Japan-U.S. Summit Meeting in Crawford in May 2003, President Bush stated, "The Japanese government demonstrated its commitment to peace and freedom, along with America," thus expressing his appreciation for Japan's role in the reconstruction and humanitarian assistance in Iraq. President Bush went on to state that "our two nations are committed to the fight against global poverty, hunger, and disease." This indicates that the Japan-U.S. alliance is a relationship in which both countries are involved in global issues.²⁰

The Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and the Japan-U.S. Alliance

The dispatch of the SDF to Afghanistan and Iraq symbolizes a changing in Japan's approach to participation in overseas operations. On a courtesy visit by Secretary of State Colin Powell on October 24, 2004, Prime Minister Koizumi stated that the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty is essential to the peace and security of Japan and the Far East. He also stated that efforts to resolve the important problems of the international community through cooperation between Japan and the U.S. have become increasingly important and cited the activities of the SDF in Iraq and Afghanistan as examples. However, Prime Minister Koizumi explained that these two examples should be distinguished from cooperation under the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, and for this reason Japan is providing cooperation and contributing to the effort by establishing special measures laws in each case.²¹ It should be understood that Prime Minister Koizumi is suggesting that on issues common to the international community that are directly linked to Japan's national interest, consideration should be given to how Japan and the U.S. should pursue such cooperation, although this exceeds the scope of application of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

Since Japan became independent following the end of the Second World War, there has been a wide range of discussion on the issue of how the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty can be maintained as the framework for dealing with the security problems of the Far East, including

²⁰ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030523-4.html>.

²¹ http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/usa/kaidan_041024.html.

Japan's defense, and at the same time tackle security challenges that cannot be handled within this framework. Japan has put burden on the UN to deal with such problems, but in cases where the UN has been ineffective, Japan relied on Japan-U.S. security agreements. This is a policy that can only be enacted under situations where Japan's involvement in overseas operations is extremely limited. In the political process that followed September 11, it became clear that the existing framework could not adequately promote Japan's national interest in a situation where the UN's security functions are not fully implemented.

In his replies concerning the report of the UN peace cooperation advisory group meeting in July 2003, Chief Cabinet Secretary Yasuo Fukuda stated in connection with this issue, "I believe that we should have a single set of guidelines for Japan's international activities. By all means, let us continue these highly significant discussions."²² In addition, the President of the Democratic Party of Japan Naoto Kan stated at the general party meeting in January of 2004 that "Under Article 9 of the Constitution, we cannot send the SDF overseas for the purpose of military action as an exercise of sovereignty. However, the Constitution can be interpreted such that the participation of UN forces or corresponding multinational forces deployed for the purpose of exercising international police functions, or the participation as international civil servants, or participation from a corresponding standpoint, is not prohibited by the Constitution." He also asserted that a UN standby unit should be established aside from the SDF.²³ In addition, Mr. Katsuya Okada, the successor to Mr. Kan, in a speech given in the U.S., stated, "My position is that if the Constitution is revised and a clear resolution is passed by the UN Security Council, this should permit the use of force by Japan overseas and Japan should contribute actively to the maintenance of world peace."

The issue has spawned two debates. The first is the expansion of Japan's security policy to encompass a wider realm. The second is the redefinition of Japan-U.S. security. A rational attempt at the domestic level to expand Japan's security policy was described in the report of the Council on Security and Defense Capabilities announced in October 2004. This attempt involved adopting a "comprehensive security strategy" that organically links diplomacy and defense capacity within Japan's security policies. It also involved formulating plans for establishment of a permanent international contribution law. With regard to the former, the objective of security as given in the National Defense Program Guideline announced in December 2004 was stipulated as "preventing and eliminating direct threats to Japan and improving the international security environment such that threats do not extend to

²² 156 – House of Councillors – Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense – 18, July 23, 2003.

²³ Statement by President of the Democratic Party of Japan Naoto Kan at the FY2004 general party meeting.

Japan.” Achieving this objective requires “an integration of efforts by Japan itself, cooperation with allies, and cooperation with the international community.”

With regard to the latter, consideration is being given to the establishment of a permanent international contribution law following the enactment of the seven bills on legislation. These bills concern contingency response measures and three conventions in June 2004. Concerning the need for a permanent international contribution law, the “gap argument” drawn from the perspective of the issue of consistency with the Constitution in the dispatch of SDF to Iraq has become a major debate. In his reply in July 2003, Prime Minister Koizumi suggested that a general international contribution law would be necessary in order to fill the gap, describing this as follows: “The question is how to match the behavior of the UN and Japan in a permanent law, and what sort of legislation is necessary to govern activities of the SDF overseas in peacetime or normal times rather than formulating an ad hoc bill relating to SDF activities conforming to the situation when an incident occurs.”²⁴

With regard to the debate concerning the redefinition of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, attention is focused on defining common strategy objectives and the issue of how to achieve a division of roles and missions between Japan and the U.S. In an announcement coinciding with the establishment of the National Defense Program Outline, Chief Cabinet Secretary Hiroyuki Hosoda stated with regard to the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty that, “A Japan-U.S. security system is essential for the security of Japan and for maintaining the peace and security of the Asia-Pacific region. In addition, the cooperative relationship between Japan and the U.S. built on this foundation is important for effectively promoting international efforts for responding to new threats and to various situations. From this perspective, Japan intends to strengthen a common awareness by Japan and the U.S. concerning a new security environment and associated strategic objectives, and make efforts as a principal actor in strategic dialogues with the U.S. concerning the issue of security in general, including the division of roles between Japan and the U.S. and military readiness including the structure of the military force of U.S. forces based in Japan.”²⁵

The key points of these talks is the reaffirmation by the two countries that the Japan-U.S. security systems are the basis of the cooperative relationship between the two countries, and issues will be dealt with under this cooperative relationship. At the thrust of this logical conclusion lies the need for measures for political and legal rationalization of the Japan-U.S. relationship to deal with the various issues of the international community. If the purpose of

²⁴ 156 – House of Councillors – Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense – 18, July 23, 2003.

²⁵ <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/tyokan/koizumi/2004/1210danwa.html>.

the transformation of the U.S. military is to improve capacity to flexibly deal with issues across regions then it will be difficult for Japan to find room in which to accept the transformation within the existing Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. Therefore, the alliance must be redefined and it will be important for Japan to discover the role it should fulfill in this relationship. On October 16, 2004 Minister of Foreign Affairs Nobutaka Machimura stated that "A wide ranging debate has begun concerning how to deal with new threats. Focusing only on the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty or Far East clause will produce a narrow debate. Flexible and broad, open-minded discussions are important." This view could be said to reflect the concerns of Japan.²⁶ In order to avoid a hollowing out of the original purport of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, the need will arise to reestablish common objectives.

The Bush Administration's Policy on Alliances

The first Bush administration embarked on a process of rebuilding the various frameworks, including diplomatic and security policies, that were formulated during the administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. While the Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman administrations avoided the fixed alliances that the U.S. had traditionally taken the stance of forming since the days of George Washington, the first U.S. President, they substantially revised policies that relied on temporary alliances. This revision was a matter of convenience in the cases of national emergencies, and instead pursued security policies by building firm, solid alliances with Europe and Asia. However the collapse of the Soviet Union and the September 11 attacks rekindled the conflict between American diplomatic traditions and the actual demands of international relations. In *America Unbound*, Ivo H. Daalder and James H. Lindsey present the argument that the Bush administration has set down policies designed to liberate the U.S. from the constraints imposed by friendly countries and allies and international institutions, and that this posture exists in the often-quoted policy guideline of the administration which, "will act multilaterally where possible but is prepared to act unilaterally when necessary."²⁷ In other words, the Bush administration reconsidered the alliances that had continued for more than 50 years and is trying to reintegrate these alliances based on U.S. national interests. This experiment is receiving enormous domestic support.

The fact that the Bush administration's experiment formed a consensus in terms of

²⁶ http://www.shugiin.go.jp/index.nsf/html/index_shitsumon.html.

²⁷ Ivo H. Daalder and James H. Lindsey, *America Unbound* (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute Press, 2003), p.13.

U.S. security policy is brought into sharp focus by examining the views regarding security policy expressed by Senator John Kerry, the Democratic Party candidate in the 2004 presidential election. Kerry criticized the Bush administration's policies, saying that the strength of U.S. alliances is a driving force for the existence and success of freedom, and in order to build and lead alliances in the new era following September 11, it is necessary to rebuild these alliances.²⁸ In a televised debate between the candidates during the presidential election campaign, security policies such as the war in Iraq and the doctrine of preemption were points of contention. Curiously, there were no differences between the candidates in the direction of security policies. Kerry's criticism was focused on the Bush administration's failure to deploy sufficient military force in Iraq, that the U.S. was brought into war on the basis of erroneous information, and that insufficient effort had been given to building a consensus in the international community.

However, it is expected that the security strategy of the second Bush administration will be revised and redirected toward an emphasis on international cooperation. This revision is based on the recognition that there is a need for multilateralism by the change in the balance between international conditions that allow a unilateral stance on the one hand and U.S. capabilities on the other. On December 1, 2004, following the presidential election, President Bush visited Canada and gave his first foreign policy speech since the election. In the speech he stated that the administration will make efforts to foster a wide international consensus among three great goals, the first of which is to defend security and spread freedom by building effective multinational and multilateral institutions, and by supporting effective multinational action.²⁹ In addition, Bush emphasized the importance of multinational institutions and multinational responses, ranging from the fight against terrorism to measures against HIV/AIDS. He also stated that the U.S. will act to the greatest extent within a multinational framework and its success will be evaluated on the basis of results rather than process.

The Canada speech could be interpreted as an indication of a policy shift by the Bush administration. However, it should be kept in mind that there is a major difference between "a focus on international coordination" and "international coordination." In this speech, President Bush simply reiterated the positions he had previously been stating. In other words, there probably has been no change in the existing policy whereby multinationalism must produce results, and if results are not produced within a single framework then the necessary functions

²⁸ John Kerry, "Strength and Security for a New World," May 27, 2004.

²⁹ The second objective mentioned by President Bush was the fight against terrorism and the third objective was the establishment of freedom and democracy in the Middle East region.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/12/20041201-4.html>.

will be divided among the coalition countries. In this sense, it should be noted that President Bush has used the terms “multinational” and “multilateral institutions” differently. It should not be overlooked that systems of coordination and cooperation were established with many countries and under the security policies of the first Bush administration. In addition many of the major countries with which the U.S. has relations with agree with U.S. policies. In other words the policies of the Bush administration are expected to remain in place.³⁰

Challenges and Outlook

In his inaugural address given in January 2005, President Bush declared that domestic freedom would be guaranteed by achieving international freedom, and suggested that diplomatic and security policies that combine Wilsonian idealism and realism will be the core of the policies of the second administration. In the U.S. battle for freedom, overthrowing dictatorships is a necessary means, and in his inaugural address President Bush stressed that the U.S. would generously support these aims. In addition, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, who received Senate approval as Secretary of State the same month, designated five countries, including North Korea and Burma, as the targets in the fight for freedom. Thus, it is expected that the second Bush administration would continuously develop the diplomatic and security policies of the first administration. This fact demonstrates that there is no change in the challenges faced by the U.S. regarding security policies.

Because of three limiting factors, the security policies of the U.S. will be based on multilateral cooperation by necessity. First, there is the limitation on capability. Even with its outstanding military and economic strength, the U.S. does not possess all the necessary capacities. For example, the U.S. is limited in their military capacity necessary for nation-building, and in their ability to collect and analyze information in line with regional conditions. Second, there are geographical limitations. Even though the U.S. military is able to mobilize and deploy troops, it is necessary to have friendly countries or allies within that region in order to have access to regions of conflict. Third, there are limitations on legitimacy. The UN was placed at the center of international order after the Second World War, and remained at the center of gravity in the international legitimacy. The UN has increased its importance after the cold war. In addition, the consent of the regions involved is an essential condition from the perspective of the importance of taking into account the particular

³⁰ Thomas Donnelly and Vance Serchuk, “Transforming America’s Alliances,” *AEI National Security Outlook*, January 2005.

relationships of the region. At the same time, when requesting the cooperation of countries outside the region, securing legitimacy is crucially important. For the U.S. faced with such challenges, the existence of Japan and the Koizumi administration's support of the U.S. are extremely important. The conditions for achieving consistency between international coordination and the Japan-U.S. alliance have been described, and the U.S. will most likely craft its policies in the direction of satisfying these conditions in order to obtain the cooperation of Japan.

Meanwhile, Japan plans to expand the scope of activity of the SDF and redefine its own national interest and role through a redefinition of Japan-U.S. security. However, if multilateralism does not function effectively as the Bush administration reorganizes its alliances, the U.S. will maintain its policy of dividing roles among the coalition countries. In such cases, Japan, as a member of the coalition of the willing, will seek cooperation with the U.S. so long as the conditions for achieving consistency between international coordination and the Japan-U.S. alliance are met. In addition, advancing Japan-U.S. cooperation in this way will be in agreement with Japan's policy goals, i.e. peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan will adopt policies that enhance its own security while drawing benefit from U.S. circumstances. In this connection, a curious phenomenon has recently appeared: although confidence in the U.S. within Japan is declining, views in favor of supporting the alliance are increasing.³¹ A policy structure is emerging whereby Japan is pursuing cooperation with the U.S. in line with U.S. military transformation while also seeking solutions to domestic political issues, such as those associated with U.S. bases in Japan. It is true that resolving Japan's own security and domestic political issues by utilizing the Japan-U.S. alliance will have major facilitating effects for Japan. Therefore, Japan needs to expand its responsibilities in the international community to smoothen this policy arrangement, and practice consistency between international coordination and the Japan-U.S. alliance, as emphasized by Prime Minister Koizumi.

³¹ William Breer, "Difference of Strategic View?: Japanese Loss of Confidence in the U.S. but Continuing Support for the Alliance," *Japan Watch*, December 20, 2004.