MASARYK UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Department of International Relations and European Studies

Application of theories of international relations to Japanese post-war development

Diploma thesis

Michal Kolmaš

Supervisor: PhDr. Pavel Pšeja, Ph.D.

UČO: 182016

Field: International Relations

Matriculation year: 2009

Brno 2010

I hereby profess that I have written the diploma thesis *Application of theories of international relations to Japanese post-war development* alone, using only literature and resources given in the list.

Brno, April 10, 2010 Michal Kolmaš

Here, I would like to thank Dr. Pavel Pšeja for his guidance, consultations and advice he has provided me. Also, I would like to thank everyone who helped me in any way, especially my family and friends.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Japan is and always has been a very peculiar player in world politics. However, it is only now, that the attention of researchers in the field of international relations has reached the Japanese islands. Even a few decades ago, the research only belonged to “Japan hands”, whose study was more concerned with Asia as a whole. This can most easily be said about thinkers concerned with theories of international relations. Through the viewpoint of international relations theorists, Japan has primarily been a “sui generis” nation, whose political culture, foreign affairs or even the society itself were singular and strange.

Today, those, who explicitly or implicitly see Japan as a nation “sui generis”, have been joined by more systemic thinkers, trying to explain Japan through a broad range of theories of international relations. Some, following the teaching of the neorealist school, regard Japan as a future military superpower, one that will definitely acquire nuclear weapons and force projection capabilities (Waltz 1993, 64-67).

The others, following liberal or neoliberal teaching, see Japan as a modern, liberal and pacifistic country of the future (Rosencranze 1985); a country that “lives” for the international system, multilateral diplomacy and contribution towards the global order (Berger 2007, 259-261). However, these approaches are but a fragment of many different viewpoints, used to look at Japan. These two approaches are more of a major a priori assumptions, which are fundamental within the broader theoretical perspective in the research connected to Japan. The reason is that Japan is still to some extent regarded as a sui generis country, and its international relations in the post-World War II era have been subject to a range of contending interpretations.

Although Japan might have been described from different points of view, it is these two discussions – neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism - which are still taking a major role in whatever theoretical approach we may come across. Even though they are sometimes labeled as insufficient, they still provide considerable explanatory power. And, as Jeremy D. Mayer (1996, 51) points out “Interpretations and predictions about Japan are greatly affected by which set of a priori assumptions about Japan’s place in the structure of world politics is adopted.”

Therefore, this thesis will try to test these a priori assumptions; the applicability of the range of theories of international relations towards Japanese post-war development.

Although even post-positivist theories might be considered within the text, the emphasis will be put primarily on neorealist and institutionalist approaches, as these two theories still are the principal means of analyzing Japan's international relations, reflected in most theoretical academic writings.

Since the hypothesis is that "Japanese line of foreign policy has been changing since the Second World War and especially in the last 20 years", the thesis will have to provide a broad analysis of Japanese domestic as well as foreign policy making processes; for only through thorough knowledge of the subject matter can the theories be applied holistically. The second hypothesis this thesis is aiming to prove is that the neorealist school of thought gives the most accurate explanations for the dynamics and development inside Japanese politics, and can be most easily used to foresee the changing nature of Japanese politics. This hypothesis will be executed through a comparative analysis lead by the theories; by applying neorealism and institutionalism to a broad range of aspects of Japan's foreign policy.

For the first hypothesis, this thesis will set up two terms for working with independent and dependent variables. These terms, "reactive" and "proactive", describe separate stages of Japan's foreign policy making process, of which this thesis will advocate change towards a "proactive" process. Therefore, the change from a "reactive" foreign policy to a "proactive" one is the dependent variable. To account for this change, five aspects of Japan's international relations will serve as the elements to account for the independent variable. These elements will consist of five principal notions of Japan's foreign policy: Japanese security policy and U.S.-Japan bilateral relations; Japan-China relations, Japan-North Korea relations, Japan and multilateralism, and the discussion about constitutional change in Japan. These elements were chosen, because not only are they the most important issues within Japan's foreign policy, but also they serve as wonderful grounds for a theoretical approach.

This change within Japan's international relations will then be analyzed by neorealist and institutionalist paradigms, with the second hypothesis, stating that a neorealist approach still provides the best explanatory power when dealing with Japan in international relations. But as theoretical approach is never "truthful" nor "absolute", the evaluation of the theoretical approach will primarily be executed by the author. This evaluation will be primarily based on primary literature, such as Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs-issued security policy outlines, treaties, and bilateral arrangements, as well as on communiqués and

speeches by Japanese government officials. Secondary literature will be composed of theoretical books and journals, with emphasis on most influential theorists concerned with the region, such as Kenneth Waltz, Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye, Thomas Berger or John Ikenberry.

Methodology will be anchored in a qualitative approach, since the method of theoretical comparative analysis supported by a significant body of research especially provides explanatory and analytical potential based on a deep understanding of the subject matter. The subject matter is the elements of independent variable; Japan's foreign policy issues framed within a historical analysis. Only the second part of the 20th century, though, will be put forth, since within this period, the change in Japan's policy making is most clearly visible.

I have chosen to write this thesis in English, because it will be a part of my future research outside of the boundaries of the Czech Republic; therefore I have to write it in a more commonly accepted language.

2 Theoretical approach

As I have already stated, this work will be based primarily on positivist theories; therefore it is necessary to describe these theories first. In detail, the primary theories to be used will be the Waltz's version of neorealism and the set of theories based on the liberal paradigm, commonly addressed as neoliberalist[1].

2.1 Neorealism

Neorealism is a theory based on a classical realist school, which started with Edward Carr and Hans Morgenthau in the inter-war period[2]. However, Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations (1948) has been deconstructed so many times that by the end of the 1980's, traditional realism had already changed drastically from what it was when the book was written. Since there are many versions of realist thinking, for the sake of this thesis only the "main" ones will be described and used.

2.1.1 Traditional realism

Realism was a reaction to the international system after the First World War, especially a reaction to newly emerging conflicts in Asia and Europe. Idealism, a leading theory of the inter-war period, relied on rational actions of individuals and thus a peace-forming potential; realists on the other hand, put emphasis rather on power and interests. Edward Carr criticized idealists for relying on ideals, rather than history and scientific methods of analysis. However, Carr did not reject idealism as a whole, since he regarded realism as over-emphasizing causality; for Carr any viable theory should have characteristics of both of the main theories (Plechanovova 2003, 16).

[1] However, some authors tend to name this version of classical liberalism in other words. For example, Ole Weaver (Smith 1996, 149) addresses this theory as "pluralism, interdependence and world society"; Brown (1997, 40) refers to this theory as "neoliberal institutionalism", however, most of the authors concerned with the theoretical research admit, that the core of this theory really is in some version of traditional liberalism (thus neoliberalism).

[2] However, as the realists always point out, the sources of realism can be found a long time ago, with thinkers and historians such as Thucydides.

It was the experience of the Second World War that allowed realists to be fully established into international relations theory. The war proved that the ideals propagated by liberalists (such as rationality) were not enough to provide peace. Thus, after the war, a new generation of thinkers had developed, without any connection to pre-war idealism and rejecting legalistic and moralistic foundations of the field. Hans Morgenthau, a German immigrant to the United States, is usually considered as the founder of classical realism, because in his book Politics Among Nations he defined the essential premises of realist thinking. In the beginning of Politics Among Nations, Morgenthau (1948, 1) says:

> The theory, (in other words), must be judged not by some preconceived abstract principle or concept unrelated to reality, but by its purpose: to bring order and meaning to a mass of phenomena which without it would remain disconnected and unintelligible.

This phrase defines the basics of the classical realist theory: Realism of various stripes may be said to wish "to go directly to the effectual truth of the thing", rather than to "the imagination of it", in particular, refusing to be tempted to lift its gaze from the harsh political "is" by the charms of any wished for political "ought" (Bartlett 1994, 381). "And may have imagined republics and principalities that have never been seen or known to exist in truth; for it is so far from how one lives to how one should live that he, who lets go of what is done for what should be done learns his ruin rather than his preservation" (Machiavelli, 71).

However, this idea is not the only one that has lived through the transformation of realist thought up to the version we know today. All realist thinkers, neo-classical, structural, etc., have also some other assumptions regarding political life in common.

The first is the essentially conflictual nature of international affairs. Realist thinkers have always tried to find someone to tell, that as Hobbes put it "It's jungle out there"; anarchy (in international system) is the rule; order, justice and morality are the exceptions. The realist need not believe that one must always forego the pursuit of these higher virtues, but realists do stress that in the world as it is, the finer arbiter of things political is power. All moral schemes will come to naught if this basic reality is forgotten (Gilpin 1984, 290).

The second assumption of realism is that the essence of social reality is the group. The building blocks and ultimate units of social and political life are not the individuals as

liberalists put it, nor classes as seen through the prism of the Marxist paradigm[3], but "tribes" or organized groups of people. The loyalty of Homo sapiens in an unjust world towards tribes ranks to most of us above all loyalties other than that of the family. This form of loyalty in the modern world can be called "nationalism" and the competition of these tribes can be described as between "nation-states". And even though this category has always been changing - tribes, city states, kingdoms, empires, nation-states, the essential nature of intergroup conflict remains unchanged.

The third assumption of realism is the privacy of all political life of power and security in human motivation. As Thucydides (431 B.C.E) told us long time ago: "Men are motivated by honor, greed and above all, fear". This doesn't necessarily mean that other virtues, such as beauty, wisdom, love are not important in human life, but that these noble virtues will always be subordinated to basic and unchangeable human needs and ambitions (Gilpin 1984, 291). Thus, this pessimistic view of human nature lead realist thinkers even to redefine morality in international relations: it was Machiavelli who argued for strong and efficient rulers for whom power and security are the major concerns. Unlike individuals, such rulers are not bound by individual morality. Any action, that can be regarded as important for the survival of the state carries in it a built-in justification (Smith 1986, 12 in Griffiths 2007, 12).

Thus, realists speak in terms of power, not ideas. The projection of power is state interest, which objectively exists and so it can be observed. However, this doesn't necessarily mean that the contents of interest (and consequently of power) are given; power in these terms is anything that provides the control of one person over the other. Power engulfs all social relations, which serve this purpose; from physical violence to the most delicate psychological connections, by which one mind controls the other (Morgenthau 1948, 18). This power is then executed on the state[4] level, and thus states and those who lead them become the fundamental actors for understanding international relations. The understanding and explanation of international relations and the struggle for war and peace is, after all, the main realist objective. All the research is useless, unless it is connected with this aim (Morgenthau 1948, 18).

[3] Although in some circumstances, "class" may be a basis of group solidarity. More in Gilpin (1984 , 290)
[4] Or, as Gilpin (1984, 290) writes "organized groups of people" in form of a nation state

2.1.2 Neorealism

The realist worldview was revived and revised with the publication of Kenneth Waltz's 1979 *Theory of International Politics*, a book that replaced Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations* as the standard bearer for realists (Griffiths 2007, 13). This teaching (or as it is called now, neorealism) is usually considered as a response to the changes within the international system, society and the theories themselves. Growing interdependence, intra-national organizations, institutionalization (Brown 1997, 40-45), and importance of international political economy[5] as described by the new pluralist theorists, pushed on classical realist theory[6], resulting in a re-emergence of realist thinking. This thinking accepts most of the basic realist axioms, but tries to focus more on structural characteristics of the international system, which are able to influence the behavior of its actors more than the actors' own attributes (Plechanovova 2003, 24).

Thus, even though neorealism still accepted the assumptions mentioned earlier, the focus has switched primarily towards the international system. And by describing the international system as a singular unit, with structural level and the level of units distinct, yet interconnected, neorealism advocates the autonomy of international politics (Plechanovova 2003, 24). Neorealism develops the concept of a system's structure, which binds the domain that students of international politics deal with, and enables them to see how the structure of the system and variations in it affect the interacting units and the outcomes they produce. International structure emerges from the interaction of states and then constrains them from taking certain actions while propelling them towards others (Waltz 1990, 29).

However, the main objective of Kenneth Waltz's neorealist theory of international relations is to construct a systemic theory, and not a general account of all aspects of international relations[7] (Sorensen 2005, 22). This enables him to gaze benignly on many of

[5] And thus once again growing importance of liberalism-based paradigms

[6] However, „classical" realist theory of international relations was no longer the same, because of the changes that English school and the events refered to as „the second Great debate" brought to it. As it is not the focus of this thesis, I will mention it only shortly. Second debate originated in the criticism, that classical realist school is not based on researchable methods, that its assumptions (such as human nature) are not proper theoretical material. Thus, this debate is considered as a debate on the method, which did not alter from the classical realist ontology, just brought scientific measures into it. More in Smith, Booth, Zalewski (1996), Baldwin (1993), Sullivan (2005), Buzan (2001),Gilpin (1984), Brown (1997) etc.

[7] As Stefano Guzzini (1998, 154) points out, Waltz acknowledges the importance of other theories, by stating that: "The fact, that there might be no balance of power, or that some states do not successfully cope with

the changes described by the pluralists, because they do not address the nature of the international system as such, only aspects of its component units. One of the positions he advocates most forcefully is that it is only possible to understand the international system via these systemic theories; to understand the system by theories that do not concentrate on the system as whole, but on the units within the system is the ultimate sin of reductionism (Brown 1997, 46).

Waltz adds that we know that reductionism is wrong, because there are recurring patterns within the international system, which must be a product of the system itself, not of any of its components. Thus, for example Lenin-Hobson theory that explains imperialism in the terms of the dynamics of monopoly capitalism is wrong because some forms of imperialism have been around here forever, but monopoly capitalism is of a recent origin (Waltz 1979, 20-28; Wendt 1987, 341).

Broadly framed, realists and neorealists pay over-whelming attention to the material forces of the state and the structure of international system in seeking to explain its behavior (Waltz 1979). The state's pursuit of an immutable national interest, through power political means, including the use of military force if necessary, is at heart of the realist approach towards international relations. If one image dominates in realist literature, it is that of an international system made up of unitary actors, as in the billiard ball metaphor, even if more sophisticated versions of realism paint a more complex picture of a state's domestic policy process influencing international behavior (Carr 1946 in Hook 2001, 38). This approach will be in the center of a neorealist understanding of Japan's international relations; an understanding based on the pressure of the international system and relations with its surroundings.

---

successful practices of other states can be easily disregarded as based on forces outside the reach of neorealist theory" (Waltz 1979, 124-125 in Guzzini 1998, 155, translated to English by the author)

2.2 Neoliberalism

Even though "classical" liberal internationalism is considered as a basis for most of the modern "neo-liberal" theories (such as neoliberal institutionalism, commercial liberalism, republican liberalism or sociological liberalism[8]), there is no firm consensus amongst the IR theorists about how much "modern" liberal theories are still considered as "liberal". For the sake of this essay, after illustrating the general history and basic ideas of this theory, we will distinguish two major approaches; "modern" liberalism defined by Andrew Moravcsik and neoliberal institutionalism, based on the classical literature of Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye.

2.2.1 Liberal theories

A neoliberal theory is a set of theories originating in "classical" liberal internationalism – the projection of liberal thought and political principles to the international realm. This theory emerged as a coherent worldview in the Enlightenment and reached its height as a systematic statement of international reform with Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, intended to form the basis of the post-World War I peace. Liberals[9] believed that the outbreak of World War I had vindicated their critique of the prevailing system of international relations and sought to establish a liberal peace marked by open diplomacy, the right of self-determination, free trade, disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the establishment of an international security organization in the form of the League of Nations. (Griffiths 2007, 21, Brown 1997, 23-24) However, the system created in the inter-war period (by the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919) was shattered by German, Italian and Japanese armament during the 1930's, culminating in the World War 2. These events with the onset of the Cold war brought a number of influential realist critiques, which almost devastated this idealistic teaching.

The major assumption of this theory is individualism; the human ability of moral distinction based on a reason that is capable of understanding natural law and the common

[8] See Baldwin (1993, 3), Moravcsik (1997, 525-530), Sorensen (2005, 194)
[9] Or idealists, as some authors describe liberalism in the inter-war period. E.g. Hollis, Smith (1990, 31), Brown (1997) etc.

good. To be able to execute this ability, one must be independent in all his actions, not only in political, but also in economic spheres[10] (Plechanovova 2003, 20).

This independence of a human being is also being transferred to the state level. Liberals say that the state is an institution, whose role and functions are merely derived from the interests and needs of individuals - interests, such as safety of oneself and safety of one's property (Sorensen 2005, 194). The connection between the individual and the state are then transferred even to the international level, since the international sphere is considered only as an extension of the domestic politics. This liberal belief leads to another classical liberal conviction that the relations between states can be organized by the same instruments as the relations among people on the state level.

Idealism (as the beginning of this field right after the World War I) to a certain extent originated in the experiences from the (until that time) biggest known war. As an alternative to this incident, idealism believed that there is an incentive to act good (and the ability to cooperate and act altruistically) within the human nature[11] (Hollis, Smith 1990, 22-23, Griffiths 2003, 20-22). According to this belief, the concern for others, which is natural to humans, justifies the premise, and that progress is possible; that the enlightened project of improving the human society through rational steps is still valid (Plechanovova 2003, 20). If one acts evil, it is not because of his nature then, but because of the faulty institutions and structural organization that lead him to act selfishly.

This idea leads even to the certainty that war itself is also a product of this faulty institutional organization[12], and as such can be diminished or even completely extinguished. However, as the old international system assumed the need for war, idealism argued for international cooperation to unite in order to remove the old institutions and create a new international system based on rational criteria. The reorganization of the system and banning of war were supposed to come out of three major principles: the establishment of international (global) organization, pursuit of international law[13] and disarmament through the study of peace.

---

[10] Therefore, the economic aspect is also very important for liberal theory; especially the economic independence, as it was presented by the classics of economic thought, Adam Smith and David Ricardo

[11] Whereas realists argued, that human nature is neutral, but would most like tilt to the evil side, rather than to the good side

[12] An organization, that anticipates war

[13] Resulting in a 1928 Briand-Kelogg pact that definitely outlawed war

However, from the beginning of 20th century, as international relations theory has constantly been changing, so has classical liberalism. As I wrote before, there are many forms of "new", "modern" liberalism today and even liberalism itself has changed. To account for this change, Andrew Moravcsik has formulated a new version of liberalism, defining liberalism as a single and comprehensive theory with many applications (Meyer 1996, 51); clearly based on liberal premises, yet different from the theories formulated about three decades ago: pluralism, rationalism, neoliberal institutionalism. Moravcsik (1997, 516-517) picks out three fundamental assumptions:

The first one is the primacy of societal actors. Differently from realism, liberalism teaches that the fundamental actors in international politics are individuals and private groups, who are on the average rational and risk-averse and who organize exchange and collective action to promote differentiated interests under constraints imposed by material scarcity, conflicting values, and variations in societal influence. (Moravcsik 1997, 517)

Second are representation and state preferences. States (or other political institutions) represent some subset of domestic society, on the basis of whose interests state officials define state preferences and act purposefully in world politics.[14]

The third assumption deals with interdependence and the international system. It states that "the configuration of interdependent state preferences determines state behavior" [15] (Moravcsik 1997, 519). In other words, a state's preferences are always determined by other states. This new formulation of liberalism acts as a bridge between classical liberal theory and its branches, neoliberal institutionalism in particular. However, for the sake of this thesis, the description and work with neoliberal institutionalism itself is more challenging, so from liberal theories, the biggest emphasis will be put on institutionalism.

[14] Government, in this sense, is seen as a battleground, constrained by the underlying identities, interests and power of individuals or groups.

[15] In this argument lies one of the differences from neoliberal institutionalism. Institutionalism says, that "state preferences should be treated as if they were partially convergent", which differs from liberal "state's preferences are always determined by other states". See Moravcsik (1997), Baldwin (1993), Grieco (1988)

2.2.2 Neoliberal institutionalism

Neoliberal institutionalism originated with Robert Keohane's book After Hegemony[16] (1984, 9), "a response" to the gloomy international situation of the 1980's and the undermined position of liberalism.

According to Keohane's description, institutionalism accepted several core propositions of realism: the central role of power in politics, the dominance of nation state in the contemporary international system and the realist argument, that anarchy impedes the achievement of international cooperation (Grieco 1988, 486). Accepting this, Keohane was able to explain why even self-centered, rational egoists often prefer multilateral cooperation to competitive unilateral politics (Schweller, Priess 1997, 3). However, the main focus of the newly established neoliberal institutionalism shifted to the role of organizations within the international system: "State actions depend to a considerable degree on prevailing institutional agreements" (Keohane 1989, 2).

These international institutions (regimes[17]) then serve states in several ways. Neoliberals argue that they help states to overcome "market failures" in international relations. Specifically, institutions enable fruitful cooperation by reducing the "relative costs of transaction" or as Keohane writes: "At any point in time, the transaction costs are to a substantial degree the result of an institutional context"[18] (Keohane 1988, 386). However, as Keohane adds that even though these institutions should last only as long as member states have incentives to maintain them, the effect of these institutions is never neutral; they may advantage the fully participating members and disadvantage others: the rules of any institution will reflect the relative power positions of its actual and potential members, which constrain the feasible bargaining space and affect transaction costs (Keohane 1988, 387).

---

[16] But was also advocated in Keohane and Nye's (1977) *Power and Interdependence* and others

[17] "Regimes" and "institutions" are parallel terms; many of the terms of regime literature are also reflected in institutions literature. See Schweller, Priess (1997, 3-4)

[18] Keohane continues by stating that "Dynamically, the relationship between these institutionally affected transaction costs and the formation of the new institutions will, according to the theory, be curvilinear. If transaction costs are negligible, it will not be necessary to create new institutions to facilitate mutually beneficial exchange: if transaction costs are extremely high, it will not be feasible to build institutions-which may even be unimaginable" (Keohane 1988, 386)

Another major institutional way of promoting the cooperation is the increase of the amount of information available to states about each other, which, as neoliberalists claim, reduces the likelihood that states will cheat (or profit by cheating) on established agreements and norms (Keohane 1984, 92-96): “As anticipated by the theory, effective international regimes include arrangements to share information and to monitor compliance, according to standards established by the regime; and they adapt to shifts in capabilities among their members“ (Keohane 1988, 387).

2.3 Neo-Neo debate

As we have pointed out, neoliberal institutionalism and neorealism do not stay on completely different bases. On the contrary, even though there have been severe debates (or as some authors name it “the third great debate”) between Kenneth Waltz, Stephen Krasner, Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye, Joseph Grieco or John Mearsheimer [19], there are some fairly visible connections between these two theories; points, that will help us understand even the differences between these two theories and their applicability.

First, the current neo-neo debate does not evolve around the techniques of statecraft. Even though Keohane and Nye in their 1977 *Power and Interdependence* (2001, 23-28) called for the revision of the classical realist tenet that “military force is always a central component of national power”, only a few years later Grieco's (1988, 491) description of the five central propositions of realism mentions only a concern for power and security and says nothing about the utility of military force[20].

Second, earlier critics of realism, especially in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, often cast the debate as one between altruistic moralists and egoistic power calculators. In the current

[19] Three especially important works on the liberal side were the special issue of *International Organization* on "Transnational Relations and World Politics" in 1971 (Keohane and Nye 1972); Keohane and Nye's *Power and Interdependence* in 1977; and the special issue of *International Organization* on "International Regimes" in 1982. Three especially important works of neorealists during the 1970s and 1980s included Kenneth Waltz's "Theory of International Relations" in 1975, his *Theory of International Politics* in 1979, and Joseph Grieco's "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism ' in 1988. The first was a preliminary version of the second, which has become the touchstone for neorealists, .much as Morgenthau's text (1948) served as a touchstone for realists in the 1950s. (Krasner 1983a in Baldwin 1993)

[20] Daniel Baldwin (1993, 5-6) adds, that “It is not clear why this issue receives so little attention since it does not seem to have been resolved. One should not be surprised if it resurfaces as the debate evolves.”

debate, however, both sides argue from assumptions that states behave like egoistic value maximizers. Moral considerations are hardly mentioned (Baldwin 1993, 5-8).

Third, the question of whether to treat states as the essential actors in international politics has been pushed into the background. Although neorealists and neoliberals disagree on the relative importance of nonstate actors, both treat states as the primary actors. And fourth, this is not a debate between conflict theorists and cooperation theorists. The twin ideas that conflict and cooperation are intrinsic elements of international politics and that both can be studied at the same time are accepted by both sides. The books by neorealist Joseph M. Grieco (1990) and neoliberal Robert O. Keohane (1984) are contributions to theories of conflict *and* cooperation. Although neorealists are more likely to emphasize conflict[21] and neoliberals are more likely to emphasize cooperation[22], both sides have moved beyond the simple dichotomy between cooperation and conflict that characterized earlier discussions (Baldwin 1993, 5-10).

Thus, neoliberal institutionalism will be a more suitable theoretical approach towards the aims of this thesis. The neo-neo debate is a viable question even of today's international relations theory and the differences and similarities of these two theories will serve as an interesting battleground for the application towards the Japanese foreign policy. Thus, even though some "classical" liberal theory notions might also be mentioned, the main focus will be put on the institutionalist paradigm, trying to find an answer to the "How do international organizations, regimes or other groups of actors affect the Japanese position in international system" question, as opposed to the neorealist "how does the structure of international system affect the position of Japan in international relations".

[21] See Jervis 1999

[22] As an example of this debate, we can see John Mearsheimer's (1994, 5-7) realist critique of institutions. Mearsheimer argues that the classical institutionalist teaching that "institutions can alter state preferences and therefore change state behavior. Institutions can discourage states from calculating self-interest on the basis how every move affects their relative power position. Institutions are independent variables and they have the capacity to move states away from war" is nothing more, than just a "reflection of the distribution of power in the world, based on self-interested calculations of the great powers with no independent effect on state behavior"

3 Background for analytical work

The background for application of these theories is of course, the Japanese history since the Second World War. However, for the simplification of the approach, this thesis will divide the assets of Japanese 20th century history (after identifying general tendencies in Japanese history as well as institutional bases for foreign policy creation) into single chapters and treat them accordingly. The main topics for this research will then be: the U.S.-Japan relations and Japanese pacifism; Japanese approach towards the North Korea issue; Japanese relationship with China; Japanese role in the region (primarily South-East Asia) and the debate about the possible change of Japanese constitution.

3.1 Brief overview of Japanese post-war history

Japanese post-war development demonstrates a strong continuity in foreign policy making process. There are several widely acknowledged tendencies, which have been present in Japanese foreign policy throughout most of the 20th century, and even though these trends are slowly changing, it is still important to present them.[23]

3.1.1 Centrality of United States

The United States saw Japan's importance very well. With 85 million of inventive and hardworking people, and understanding Japan's strategic position, it would be a disaster if Japan would fall into communist hands. President Eisenhower stated in 1954, that "If the Kremlin controls them, all of the great war-making capacity would be turned against the free world…and the Pacific would become a communist lake" (Eisenhower 1954, 585-90 in Brands 1986, 387). Eisenhower saw the need for Japanese rearmament, but at the same time encouraged the congress to support the Japanese economy; and thus these two factors became the center of American policy towards Japan for more than three decades.

A similar approach toward the needs of an American presence in the region can be recognized even in the behavior of Japanese political leaders. The outcome of the debates

[23] This division is based on a book by Michael J. Green*, Japan's reluctant realism* (2003, 4-10)

about Japan's role in the world and its relationship with the United States was the formula established by Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru[24]. This was soon to become the Yoshida doctrine, centered on close alliance with the United States, minimal military rearmament, and a focus on economic recovery (Green 2003, 11; Wan 2001, 24-25).

However, this formula and all the debates that came before it come from American foreign policy during and after the Second World War, particularly the occupation of Japan and the so-called "peace clause" (Bowen 1992, 57). This clause was an Article 9 of the newly made Japanese constitution, stating that,

> "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes. In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of state will not be recognized." (Japanese constitution, article 9; Seth 1994, 904)

This constitution, as well as the Yoshida doctrine has served as the framework for Japanese foreign policy ever since. Alliance with the United States provided technology transfer, economic assistance and a market for those conservatives that were concerned primarily with economic recovery. For the "hawks", the alliance provided a source of military technology, defense assistance and external political support for some level of rearmament. For the "doves", the alliance (constitution) provided a cap on that rearmament, or in the words of one foreign minister, "an honorable watch-dog" (*obankensama*) over Japan (Pyle 1996, 59 in Green 2003, 12).

Nowadays, most of the ideas set up by the Yoshida doctrine remain valid. Japan still does not challenge U.S. primacy in the area and there is a broad consensus on the need for the U.S.-Japan alliance. However, Japan is becoming more aware of its position within the international system, and pushes for a chair in the United Nation's Security Council, raises the questions about the need of the change of the constitution and presses for a greater recognition in international organizations and in the region.

[24] In office from 1948 to 1954

3.2.2 The primacy of economic tools

Following the slogan first used in the Meiji era (1868-1912), *fukoku kyouhei* ("rich country, strong army"), and in accordance to the Yoshida doctrine, the economic catch-up and overtaking (*oitsuke oikose*) of the West have remained the key national goals of the post-war era (Hook et al. 2001, 8). As a result, since 1945 the principal image of Japanese international relations has been linked firmly to the pursuit of economic interests.

However, with the pursuit of economic interests, Japanese political international presence has been less salient and influenced by a variety of factors.[25] Thus, concentrating on economic tools, the Japanese government has not actively deployed political ideology in the service of its international relations, and has lacked the political appetite and capacity to assert a clearly identifiable leadership role on the world's political stage. (Hook et al. 2001, 11)

Despite a growing focus on traditional security concerns and a recognition of declining relative economic resources, Japanese foreign policy continues to rely primarily on economic tools for power and influence. These tools include foreign aid and contributions to international organizations as well as overseas foreign direct investment. In response to regional political and security crises in the 1990s, Japan's first responses have usually been financial. (Green 2003, 5; Berger 2007, 115)

3.2.3 Constraints on the use of force

Normative and institutional constraints on the use of force[26] (or active foreign policy according to some authors)[27] are primarily based within the Constitution. As already written, Article 9 has functioned as a major guideline for conducting Japanese foreign policy. Therefore, it is not surprising, that "for almost six decades, conservatives have regarded Article 9 as a heavy constraint in conducting an active foreign policy, whereas progressives have regarded it as the principal foreign policy guideline" (Berger 2007, 48).

[25] Primarily by the cooperation with United States and American military presence in Japan. Another influence on the executability of Japanese foreign policy have been the historical relationship and unfinished issues such as the wartime memories or as Rapkin (1990, 195) puts it, „legitimacy deficit."

[26] This understanding of power or this inability in translating Japanese economic power into political power has confused most realist thinkers. More in Hagstrom (2005, 396-7)

[27] E.g. Berger (2007, 49)

The constitution was established under the 1951 U.S.-Japan security alliance, the single greatest constraint on both foreign policy and domestic politics during the Cold War (Samuels 2007, 39). This alliance was originally designed as an unequal treaty, obviously inluenced by American concerns with Japanese post-war development[28] and the shape of the international system during the post-war period.[29] Timothy Temerson makes U.S. ambitions quite clear: "In entering into a security alliance with Japan in September 1951, the United States sought both to defend against Soviet/communist aggression and to control the future course of Japanese rearmament, foreign policy and domestic politics."(Temerson 1991 in Samuels 2007, 39).

So, as it is described earlier, Japan has been constrained on the use of force, not only by domestic factors, but also by international ones. However, these normative and institutional constraints are supplemented by cultural factors: the imperial elite, and in particular the members of the Japanese military establishment that had been discredited by the disastrous defeat, and the prewar militarist ideology that was widely rejected. Article 9 was embraced by many in Japan, both on the idealistic left, but also by many in the Japanese political mainstream (progressives) who developed a nearly pathological fear of the military as a potential threat to democracy (Ikenberry, Mastanduno 2003, 393).

This underlying fear of Japanese re-armament is visible even today, even though the normative and institutional constraints have become more flexible. New missions and capabilities for peacekeeping, noncombatant evacuation operations, space surveillance and logistical support for U.S. forces in regional contingencies all give Japan more tools in its security kit bag (Green 2003, 5). Even though the use of force is still very contentious and strictly observed, the possible constitutional change which would bring more freedom towards active foreign policy is being discussed every day.

[28] Samuels (2007, 39) specifies three American concerns about Japan: The first is that Japan might re-militarize after the Occupation and launch a revanchist attack. The second was that it might remain unstable and require excessive U.S. attention. The third was that it might make a separate peace with the Communist powers and give them access to its considerable industrial potential.

[29] As a part of U.S. security doctrine, we may see traces of classical geopolitical thinking, inspired by such authors, as were Halford Mackinder or Nicholas Spykman. According to Spykman, Japan was part of a so-called rimland, an area vital to American security interests. This rimland theory was then projected into the containment strategy and executed by U.S. during most of the cold war period. More in Spykman (1942)

3.2.4 No alternate strategic vision

The end of the Cold War brought many unforeseen structural changes within the international system. Security policy seemed to become less important (compared to low policy and economics); there was a widespread expectation that Japan would assume international leadership in a world where economic and technological prowess, more than military strength, would be the decisive measures of power (Pyle 2007, 3). At the same time, the U.S.-Japan trade frictions intensified and the possibility of the withdrawal of U.S. troops was more than real. With the possible withdrawal of U.S. troops, the U.S.-Japan alliance itself, the bedrock of Japan's postwar foreign policy, is endangered.

To remedy this situation, Japan cautiously embarked on a post-Cold War strategy on supporting the declining U.S. hegemony, through a gradual expansion of *Nichibei* [30]partnership into a global relationship, since no other country (including Japan) was yet prepared to play the type of leadership role that U.S. played in international security and economic affairs during the Cold War. In the area of "high politics", however, Japan was still unready and unwilling to play an active role in international affairs before the Gulf War (Purrington 1992, 162).

The impact of the Gulf War crisis on Japanese domestic and foreign policy was tremendous. Japan's failure to respond quickly and the unwillingness to provide even humanitarian or rear-area support[31] resulted in almost no international gratitude or recognition. According to Courtney Purrington (1992, 162-3) the result of this crisis acted as a "catalyst for a emerging consensus, that Japan must play a more proactive role in international affairs, commensurate to its international economic power and also partially remedied the "allergy" of the Japanese people and opposition parties to military matters." In other words, it was plainly visible that "the traditional low-posture foreign policy that had focused primarily on economic objectives and means and had worked so well in the past was no longer sufficient" (Berger 2007, 5).

However, even though it is widely acknowledged that the Yoshida doctrine is no longer sufficient for Japan's foreign policy, no political leader has articulated a clear

[30] Nichibei (日米) is a Japanese term for Japan-U.S. partnership

[31] Despite the fact that Japan supported the U.S.-led coalition with a hefty monetary contribution of $13 billion. More in Berger (2007, 4-6)

alternative to it. Political leaders have heralded new initiatives towards Russia or Southeast Asia, but there has been no political mandate for bolder reformulation of Japan's world role. In part this reflects the weakness of the current senior leadership in Japanese political parties, but it also is based on the conservatism of the Japanese public about international affairs (Green 2003, 5-6). In the current climate of political realignment, leaders who take clear ideological stands on foreign policy have difficulty building a broad enough coalition to govern.

3.2. Domestic institutions and Foreign policy

The acceptance of the fact that the crucial factor in shaping Japan's foreign policy is the structure of international relations does not imply a ready acceptance of realist or neorealist positions, nor that it's the only factor, which shapes the international relations of a state. Especially Japan should not be seen as a hermeneutically sealed unit; instead, Japan's response to, and degree of acquiescence in, the limitation of the structure of the international system is determined by interactions between domestic policy making agents and a range of other political actors. These actors have a different and individual perception of national interests, which interacts with the notions of international system. This means, that Japanese foreign policy making actors and their interests are in constant contact with the pursuits of the system, thus Japan's international relations should be viewed as the product of a dialectical, or two-way, relationship between international structure and domestic agency, which determines the actions of the latter in response to the former in the context of interest perceptions (Hook 2001, 40-41). With this in mind, the understanding of the Japanese foreign policy making process and actors is crucial to understanding the relations between the structure and the unit.

Japanese foreign policy has been described as "reactive", "minimalist", "situational" or "too little, too late". These parameters describe the strategic culture that has been present in Japan since the Second World War, but they must also be understood as an external manifestation of a political and bureaucratic system, as a projection of the features and dynamics within Japanese politics. This chapter introduces these institutions, identities of the principal policy actors, the normative and ideational factors which condition their perceived interests, and the processes and outcomes of interaction between them. This

analysis will help explain their role in the foreign-policy making process, as well as the way in which Japan responds to the international system.

3. 2. 1 Policy making model

The best-known after-war policy making model in Japan stresses the elitist nature and high degree of interdependence between its principal actors, identified as the central bureaucracy, big business (*zaikai*) and the governing party – the Liberal-Democratic Party (LDP). A range of accounts of the policy-making process in Japan have not excluded competition between the bureaucracy, ruling party and *zaikai,* but have stressed more their shared human networks and tendency towards collaboration in order to exclude other actors from political influence and policy making process. In this way, the elites have been seen to form an interlocking directorate, or alternatively an "iron triangle[32]" (Nester 1990, Green 2003, 37, Maruyama 1969, 128-9), capable of governing Japan's rapid economic development, albeit with the acknowledgement that these elites are subject to infighting and factionalism within themselves, as well as between each other (Hook 2001, 41).

This triangle policy making model is often seen to be dominated by one of its compounds; however, there is no firm consensus on which of these institutions it is. More likely, the focus switches with time. But, as Chalmers Johnson (1975, 2) points out: **"**Like a physical tripod, each leg is indispensable for the stability of the structure. It is an endlessly fascinating process to study how each focus of political force interlocks and interpenetrates with the others, but in the end they still must be seen as somehow "incorporated"[33].

This "frozen" system is, however, slowly changing. Even whilst policy making tends to remain highly elitist in nature, a host of other political actors do have an input to the final policy outcome depending on the time frame and the specific issue involved. The growing diversity of Japanese society as a whole, and the rise in saliency of a range of new security, political and economic issues, mean it is necessary to consider the policy-making input of not just the tripartite elite, but also of opposition parties and wider domestic society. This

[32] The first one to define this concept was a famous Japanese political scientist and a student of Fukuzawa Yukichi, Maruyama Masuo in his book Thought and behavior in modern Japanese politics (1963) (Maruyama 1969, 128-129; Hiraishi 2003, 241)

[33] With this idea comes the "nickname", the Americans gave Japan during second part of 20th century: "Japan Inc."

suggests that where possible, a pluralistic and "polyarchical" model of policy-making in Japan should be adopted (Milner 1998 in Hook 2001, 42).

3.2.2 Main actors – Bureaucracy

Official bureaucracy was not established in Japan for scientific reasons but by the Meiji oligarchs to prevent the nascent political parties from placing their supporters into the administration (Johnson 1975, 28). However, over time, the various ministries (*shou*) and agencies (*chou*) of the central bureaucracy have become a vital part of the Japanese foreign policy making process, often exercising leading influence over the state's international relations. The central bureaucracy takes general responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy initiatives in the fields of politics, economy and security, and leads negotiations in bilateral and multilateral settings and executes the drafting of legislation and treaties related to foreign affairs.

The central bureaucracy is generally regarded as a very powerful institution (Green 2003, 56-57; Hook et al. 2001, 42-43; Johnson 1975, 1-28; Pyle 2007, 246-247; Berger 2007, 5-6), with the power and influence being largely based on the talent, skill and accumulated policy expertise of its personnel. It is often said that "Japan suffered from third-rate politicians, but benefited from first-rate bureaucrats." This quality of the bureaucracy's personnel is then derived from the Japan's top universities, where most of the bureaucrats come from,[34] and from the *esprit de corps* feeling stemming from a severe competition to enter the elite ministries.

Besides technocratic expertise, the human networks (*jinmyaku*) are other important means of power-exercise within the foreign policy making process. As noted before, the role of the university[35] is crucial for entrance to the bureaucracy; the limited number of top-rated academic institutions tends to create fractions or cliques (*gakubatsu*) within and intra ministries. These cliques usually extend even further, to the LDP and big business – for instance in mid-1980's around one quarter of Diet members and the presidents of 401 out of

[34] Tokyo University in particular. It's said, that around 80% of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and 90% of Ministry of Finance (MOF) officials are Tokyo University (and Faculty of law in particular) students. (Koh 1989, 67-123 in Hook et al. 2001, 42)

[35] And the name of the university in particular. Students of Tokyo, Keio, Kyoto or Waseda universities are generally considered as a elite of the nation with open door almost in any company or institution. See Doyon (2001), Kiefer (1970) etc.

1,454 largest firms in Japan were graduates of the Tokyo University (van Wolferen 1990, 111 in Hook et al. 2001, 43). Furthermore, the central bureaucracy has succeeded in "colonizing" the LDP, almost one quarter of the members of both the House of Representatives and House of Councilors are former bureaucrats.

The way of controlling the *zaikai* is a practice called *amakudari* (literally: descent from heaven or parachuting from on high), a tactic involving the placing of retired bureaucracy officials on the boards of companies or quasi governmental, special corporations (*tokubetsu houjin*), especially in order both to provide a financially lucrative post for the ex-official and to ensure closer relations between the bureaucracy and the private sector. These ex-bureaucrats have functioned at various times to heighten the influence of the central bureaucracy over the policy-making process (Hook et al. 2001, 43).

3.2.2.1 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA, *Gaimushou*)

MOFA is chiefly responsible for day-to-day running of Japanese diplomatic agenda with the most important part of work being implementing and creating of Japanese foreign political, economic and security policy. It is divided into ten bureaus: five functional (Foreign Policy; Economic Affairs; Economic Cooperation; Treaties, Intelligence and Analysis) and five regional affairs (North American; Asian; Europe and Oceanic; Latin American and Caribbean, Middle East and African) (Stockwin 2003, 166) with North American Affairs Bureau (NAAB) being probably the most powerful, since it is dealing with pivotal bilateral relations.[36] NAAB is formed by highly trained and educated officers and is devoted to the preservation of the alliance with the US, making MOFA the "Champion in U.S.-Japan relationship in the Japanese government (Green 2003, 59). Throughout the 1990's, MOFA has been subject to growing criticism for failing to articulate a clearly independent Japanese foreign policy. This situation[37] resulted in a reconfiguration of United Nations bureau into the Comprehensive Foreign Policy Bureau, which is often considered as a "rival" for NAAB, combining long-term policy planning with short-term crisis management – a difficult function to say at least.

[36] This U.S.-Japan bilateral bureau gave MOFA an occasional "nickname" in the press: "Kasumigaseki branch consulate of the US embassy in Japan"

[37] Second reason for the change is usually considered Japanese diplomatic fail during the Gulf War

MOFA functions in many ways as the coordinator of Japan's international relations and as the state's window upon the world. However, as Glenn D. Hook (2001, 45-46) points out, "its ability to direct and manipulate Japanese foreign policy is constrained by its own internal organizational limitations and the influence it exerts over other ministries and actors. Despite the vast expansion in Japan's overseas economic and political activities in the recent years, MOFA remains understaffed and underfunded compared to the diplomatic services of many other states. As a consequence, MOFA is unable to oversee the implementation of many ODA[38] programmes and is notoriously weak in gathering information relating to political and security matters."

3.2.2.2 The Ministry of Finance (MOF, Okurashou to 2001, Zaimushou from 2001)

MOF has traditionally been the highest ranked ministry, with unparalleled influence over all aspects of public policy as well as foreign affairs. This influence is nested within two of the MOF's main organs: the Budget Bureau, controlling the budget of other ministries and agencies, and the National Tax Agency, controlling revenue collection and audits. MOF's primary role has traditionally been the protection of the domestic banking industry and fiscal rectitude, and the main focus has always been ensuring the survival of Japanese banks, controlling inflation and exercising investment guidance (Stockwin 2003, 165). However, since the break-up of the Bretton Woods financial system, MOF has been pushed to play a bigger part in international financial system. MOF's direct role in international affairs is managed by the International Bureau[39], which is mostly responsible for the international activities of Japanese banks, communication with international financial institutions such as IMF, WB, OECD or G7 and bailout packages for debtor countries.

MOF is aware of US's primary role in the international financial system and has cooperated in bilateral, regional and global development bank forums in order to stabilize the global economy. However, these major issues aside, MOF is showing a huge deal of energy in challenging the US's global and primarily regional role. Senior MOF officials have made high-profile proposals like the Asian Monetary Fund, and continue to engage actively

[38] Official Development Organization

[39] Former International Finance Bureau, the newest of all the Bureaus within MOF. This bureau was created as a response to Japan joining OECD and IMF in 1964. See Stockwin (2003)

in the future “architecture” of international financial system. Their efforts, however, are usually hampered by the ministry’s inability to execute restructuring of the banking and financial sector at home (Green 2003, 61).

3.2.2.3 Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI, Tsuushou sangyoushou) / Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI, Keizaisangyoushou) (after 2001)

MITI’s (now METI’s) function is to promote Japan’s international trade and commercial interests, and plays an important role in trade negotiations and the distributing of the ODA (Haitani 1990, 240-241). It is divided into seven bureaus, but possesses a number of special corporations such as the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) – an organization with considerable information-gathering capacity (Hook et al. 2001, 47). MITI/METI plays a direct role in Japanese foreign policy primarily through the International Trade Administration Bureau (which handles trade insurance, foreign exchange and import/export promotion) and the International Trade Policy Bureau (concerned with international trade negotiations and WTO, G8 and APEC).

MITI has always been aware of the US’s importance for Japan’s foreign trade and has always worked within this framework. However, at the same time, and most importantly recently, MITI has “discovered” the trade opportunities in East Asia and Europe and acted accordingly; MITI has started pursuing Japan’s economic relations even if it has threatened or caused friction with the US. In contrast with MOFA, MITI has become far less pro-US, focused on the promotion of economic cooperation with China or Vietnam. Another difference between MOFA and MITI lies in MITI’s significant domestic constituency and its connection with large firms; there are a lot of MITI’s officials who moved to private sector by the *amakudari* practice.

3.2.2.4 Evaluation

Thus, even though there are grounds for criticizing the bureaucracy performance over the past century, it has certainly been equal or superior to that of such groups as the military, the politicians and the economic leaders (Johnson 1975, 28). However, despite the influence and quality of the central bureaucracy officers, it has hardly been insulated from

the strong winds of change in the political world (especially in last 20 years), in Japan's own political economy, and in the international system. Political realignment has complicated the bureaucrats' policymaking process and exacerbated interministerial conflicts (which must be arbitrated by the politicians). Changes of coalition governments have led to political purges against senior bureaucrats, and the loss of socioeconomic cohesion has weakened the bureaucrats' levels of influence. The collapse of the Japanese economic model (with the bubble economy crisis of the first part of 1990's) has undermined their prestige and morale. The media and nongovernmental organizations are following the politicians and encroaching on bureaucratic control of information and policy decision. And the external shocks of the Gulf War, the North Korean threat, and the rise of China have challenged their old modus operandi (Green 2003, 57).

The central bureaucracy still plays a major role in Japanese politics and exerts a considerable influence over Japanese foreign policy-making process. At the same time though, the extent of this influence is counteracted by the conflicts of interests within or between the ministries themselves. It is possible that a new equilibrium in political realignment and the emergence of a clearer political platform will lead to more centralization of decision making and the bending of the bureaucrats to a national mandate. But, as for now, each bureaucratic institution is in transition, struggling to reshape old strategies to the form, which could safeguard national power and well-being in the uncertain times ahead.

3.2.3 Liberal-Democratic Party and the party system transition

The LDP has traditionally been the subject of much public and academic derision insofar as foreign policy-making is concerned. This originates in LDP's apparent deference to the central bureaucracy, lack of policy vision in international relations and greater interest in constituency politics than in Japan's position within the international system. It is perhaps most surprising then, that even after all the financial and economic troubles and even electorate reforms, which took place in the first half of the 1990's, LDP still remains in power (Krauss, Pekkanen 2004, 2). The electorate reforms of 1994 introduced new disclosure rules on campaign financing and the move away from multi-member constituencies to a dual system of first-past-the-post single member constituencies and proportional

representation[40] (Hook et al. 2001, 53; Park 2001, 431-7). This move greatly restricted political fundraising, introduced governmental subsidies for political parties and put an end to the former tendency of personalization of politics for politicians. The last point is especially important, since it stopped the notion of avoiding taking a stance on international issues in favor of low-key policy statements and a focus on the particular interests of the voters at the grassroots level.

Nevertheless, as a member of the tripod system, the LDP has been one of the most important foreign policy-making actors since its foundation in 1955. Its influence dwells from its policy-making expertise with the connection to the central bureaucracy; adjusting the interests of various elite groups of state or non-state organizations and their democratic mandate as the representation of the citizens. This allows the party to use the intertwined interests of various pressure groups and organizations and project them to the policy-making process. Furthermore, the Diet's members possess an ultimate advantage over the state's foreign policy, as they control the passage in the Diet of Defense, ODA and ministerial budgets as well as legislation connected to security, political and economic matters.

And since LDP has been a ruling party for most of the 20th century, it is important to take a look at its performance and primarily its adaptation to the party politics transition in the 1990's.

[40] In other words, the old electoral rules were replaced with a mixed-member system where 300 seats are elected in single-member districts and 200 in one of 11 PR districts. The number of PR seats was reduced to 180 after the 1996 election. A PR district is one where voters cast a vote for a party list and then seats are allocated to that party in proportion to the percentage of votes it receives. See Christensen (1994), Patterson, Maeda (2007), Rahat (2004), Horiuchi, Saito (2004)

Figure 1. LDP vote shares in post-war elections

SOURCES: For 1958–2003, Ishikawa Masumi, *Sengo Seijishi Shinpan* [The history of post-war politics, new edition] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2004). For 2005, *Asahi Shimbun*, September 12, 2005 in Patterson, Maeda (2007, 420).

NOTE: The vote shares for the four elections under the new electoral system (1996, 2000, 2003, and 2005) are weighted averages of two components of the electoral system.

Figure 1 shows the vote shares captured by LDP during the second half of 20th century, revealing a tumultuous election history, but within this timeframe, 4 electoral periods are identifiable (Patterson, Maeda 2007, 419). However, since the elections to the Lower House held on August 30, 2009[41] brought the victory of opposition – Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)[42], we should add a fifth period for this scheme to be accurate.

The initial period reflects the first three elections, in which LDP secured an overwhelming victory, resulting in an unlimited rule, sometimes called “one-and-half” party

[41] And the Upper House elections of 2007, where LDP lost its majority to DPJ. See Govella, Vogel (2008)

[42] Political party, which was formed in 1996 from SDPJ (Social Democratic Party of Japan) and former members of NFP (New Frontier Party)

system.[43] This period was followed by a period of secular decline, with two visible benchmarks: 1967, the first time LDP's vote share dropped below 50%, and 1976, when the share of Lower House seats dropped under 50%, forcing LDP to search for alliance members[44]. Third period can be seen as the five consequential elections following the 1976 incidents (until 1990). In this period, we can see "conservative resurgence" (*hoshu kaiki*), with LDP getting stable score of 45-50%, even though the results may seem a bit shaky. This period was ended with the 1993 elections, and those who had made the LDP lose its predominance status. To be sure, the LDP was still the country's largest vote getter, but it could no longer singularly dominate the House of Representatives with the vote and seat shares it obtained in lower-house elections. Part of the reason for this is that prior to the 1993 election, the LDP's centrifugal tendencies led it to fracture more seriously than ever before, residing in a number of fractures leaving the party[45] (Patterson, Maeda 2007, 421). Consequently, this period is often called "party dissolution" period.

However, it is necessary to add the last, fifth period. This period originated in 1997's Upper House elections, dealing a fatal blow to LPD seats, forcing Prime Minister Abe Shinzo to resign in September (despite citing health problems). (Govella, Vogel 2008, 97-100)

Figure 2. 2007 Japan's Upper House elections.

TABLE 1 *July 29, 2007, Upper House Election Results*

Party	*Total Current Seats*	*Total Pre-Election Seats*	*Seats Won in the Election*	*Seats at Risk before the Election*
DPJ	109	81	60	32
LDP	83	110	37	64
New Komeito Party (NKP)	20	23	9	12
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	7	9	3	5
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	5	6	2	3
People's New Party (PNP)	4	4	2	2
New Party Nippon (NPN)	1	0	1	0
Unaffiliated	13	7	7	1
Total	242	240	121	119

[43] This term is connected to the elections of 1958, 1960 and 1963 and its meaning is simply to capture the strength of LDP in terms of votes and seats, both of which were over the majority mark. Also, this phrase frames the situation, when LDP was twice as strong as its nearest vote competitor. See Patterson, Maeda (2007, 419-420), Hook (2001, 52)

[44] In 1976 it was the unaffiliated conservatives and New Liberal Club, a newly-formed party which split from LDP after the Lockheed scandal of 1976. Despite the success they earned in 1976 elections, they were eventually made to re-join LDP in 1986. See Reed, Scheiner (2003)

[45] I.e. Nihon Shinto (Japan New Party), Shinseito (Japan Renewal Party) and the Shinto Sakigake (New Party Harbinger)

Source: Govella, Vogel 2008, 98

This event was seconded with the August 2009 Lower House elections, dealing another fatal blow for LDP. DPJ won with what most of the news commentators regarded as a landslide victory (Talmadge 2009, Fackler 2009, Alastaire 2009), sending LDP out for only the second time during the after-war period[46]. This vote symbolized the final blow to the island nation's postwar order, which has been slowly unraveling since the economy collapsed in the early 1990s[47].

The LDP is a catch-all party, diverse in political alignment and with a range of views on Japan's international relations. Its overall conservative pro-bilateral alignment has, nevertheless, served in favor of Japan-US bilateral relations and alignment with the US, which has remained a fundamental basis for all spheres of Japanese international relations. This connection of LDP with the US is visible throughout all the 2nd part of 20th century. LDP has worked hard on preserving domestic support for the security alliance and wider relationship with the US. During the Cold War, for instance, this meant that the LDP often advocated support by the Japanese government for US client states in East Asia, such as the provision of ODA to South Korea and South Vietnam, and usually voted in accordance with the US on questions such as North Korea and communistic China in the UN (Hook et al. 2001, 53). In accordance with this, LDP has invited the Japanese Liberal Party (LP) to a coalition (1999-2000), since it has advocated strong, proactive line on Japan's security relations with US after the Cold War.

Of course, this pro-American stance was challenged from time to time, due to LDP's factional structure; however, this dissent has been aware of the need to avoid worsening of Japan-US relations. Prime example might be the serious debates within LDP on the issue of Japan-China relations in the first part of the Cold War period[48]. These different opinions within LDP have been manifested through 'policy tribes' (*zoku*) or factions (*habatsu*). Although these groups have usually have supported the US-Japan relations, they differ on a

[46] The first time was the 1993-1994 11months period

[47] However, as most polls indicate, the current situation looks grim for DPJ, as it got only 35% in the last Asahi shimbun poll. See Ozawa (2010)

[48] This debate evolved around the idea, that Japan should exploit all the possibilities it had; Japan wanted to explore Chinese market and the LDP stood split: China lobby on one side and Taiwan lobby on the other.

range of aspects of Japanese foreign policy; causing conflicts within LDP[49]. These conflicts might either remain unresolved (and produce a stalemate), or be settled and produce a dramatic victory of one faction over another. However, it is not as important whether they immobilize Japanese foreign policy or make it more dynamic; important is the demonstration of domestic factors in shaping Japan's international relations. And even though the LDP's main policy line has been the protection of US-Japan alliance, it is visible that even LDP members are willing to "exploit the flexibility in the structural limits imposed upon them by the US in order to inch towards fuller engagement with those states and institutions at apparent loggerheads with US interests" (Hook et al. 2001, 55)

3.2.4 *Zaikai*: the business community

The third part of the iron triangle, Japan's private sector business community consists of large TNCs and business conglomerates and associations. As Japan relies so heavily on external trade, the business community is very influential in foreign trade and policy. However, *zaikai*'s main source of power is the network connection within LDP, other political parties and bureaucracy – especially the economic ministries MOF and MITI; making it difficult to discuss public policy abstracted from private interests (Calder 1989, 379). *Zaikai*'s main interest is to advance profitable private sector links with the US, Europe, East Asia and elsewhere.

Similarly, as with other members of the iron triangle, the business community should not be seen as a unitary actor. Their views are represented by four business organizations: Federation of Economic Organizations (*Keidanren*); Japan Council for Economic Development (*Keizai Douyoukai*); Japan Chamber of commerce (*Nihon Shoukou Kaigi Shou*); and Japan Federation of Employer's Association (*Nikkeiren*) with *Keidanren* being the largest and most influential one of them (Langdon 1961, 271-3). *Keidanren* has taken the lead in promoting liberalization of the Japanese economy, as well as of promoting Japanese FDI abroad. Also,

[49] Examples can be the cross-party groups, trying to influence the foreign policy, such as Dietmen's league for the Promotion of Japan-North Korea Friendship, Japan-China friendship, Comprehensive Security; Japan-EU inter-parliamentary Delegation. See Hook (2001)

until the end of 1955 system[50], *Keidanren* provided massive funding for the leading LDP, to gain indirect influence over policy-making.

The role of the business community in foreign trade is usually connected with information gathering, though it is also believed to excel that of MOFA and even JETRO. The business intelligence is usually backed by extensive personal links and connections to other state's government or economic sphere, making Japan's business sphere often more integrated and knowledgeable of economic policy debates of host countries then MOF or MITI. These connections make the *zaikai* an important connection for the Japanese government, as they improve Japanese position and support the government's efforts. However, the business community should be seen as a private sector actor; the excess of its government support depends on the outcome; thus *zaikai* often exploit their position in order to overcome the structure of political and economic isolation imposed on Japan by its relationship with the US.

Business is an important actor within Japan's foreign policy making process, and its importance lies mostly on the information and indirect influence it can exert within host countries. Its willingness to cooperate with the government though, stands on the amount of money the business is able to earn; the government can in fact only create the political and economic conditions, through the distribution of ODA and working to stabilize diplomatic relations and similar activity, which serve to encourage Japanese firms to trade and invest in other states (Hook et al. 2001, 57). This being said, the lack of business interest may be an immobilizing actor for Japanese foreign policy.

[50] Party system from 1955 to 1993/4

4 Grounds for application

In the previous chapter, the principal foreign policy making institutions were described (the less important institutions were omitted, as it is not the main focus of this thesis). In this chapter, the emphasis shall switch to the primary topic of this thesis. That is, a close examination of the projections of Japanese international relations (and its changing nature), through the optics of the theories of international relations. Since the hypothesis indicates that neorealism is the most suitable theory for understanding the dynamics and change within Japan's international relations, it shall be primarily used. Neoliberal theories shall be applied as well, to set this concept in wider surroundings and bring different approach for the same agenda. The grounds for this application shall be divided into several main foreign policy issues Japan has been through during the last 50 years.

4.1 US-Japan security relations

Obviously, one of the topics central to IR theory is the understanding of peace and war in international relations. Since the time of the warring Greek city states, theories have been spun to account for state behavior in alliance construction, threat response, and other aspects of statecraft (Meyer 1996, 52). Japan since the Second World War has been an anomaly among nation-states, a nation that clearly had the capacity to become a military superpower, but chose to remain distanced from security issues. However, unlike Switzerland or Sweden, Japan did not choose to become an "armed neutral state" in the bipolar system between the US and the Soviet Union; Japan pursued a strategy, which can be called "moderately-armed non-neutral state".

With East Asian security relations in flux after the end of Cold War, Japan's security role is critical in influencing the region's future (Hirata 2008: 123). Japan had long depended on the US for its national security, and enjoyed peace and stability without the burden of constructing its own security systems and institutions. The pursuit of economic prosperity had been given priority over security issues. In the 1990s, however, it seemed that Japan showed some distinct signs of change towards becoming a more proactive state even in security field (Hatekeyama 2005, 2). Japan has expanded its role even in the security issues: Japan's own military personnel (SDF – Self Defense Forces) has been involved in abroad

missions with prime example being the Peace Keeping Forces (PKO) operating within the United Nations peace-keeping operation framework. However, this is not the only outcome of the end of Cold War: with the United States losing a vital interest in Japan (and US bases there), Japan was forced to redefine its role within the US-Japan alliance and enlarge not only its military strength but also its share of „global responsibilities" (Arase 2007, 566; Rix 1989-1990, 461). Thus, the main questions this section will deal with are: Has Japanese position within the US-Japan framework changed and what is its impact on Japan's security policy and international relations? A brief overview of Japan-US relations will also be mentioned.

The uniqueness in Japan's security position in the present era can be seen in comparison to earlier periods. During the first part; 1951-1989, under the influence of the United States, Japan created modest, defensive military configuration. In the 12 years from 1989 to 2001, the U.S. used its increased leverage after the Cold War to prod Japan into an extra-territorial role supporting U.S. forces in the region, aided by a series of international crises and conservative nationalist elements in Japan. In the last 9 years though, Japan's reluctance to engage in security matters has diminished to an unforeseen rate, and accordingly, American pressure on Japan's engagement has became more effective (Arase 2007, 561). However, compared to earlier phases, it is presumable, that Japan's security policy will further expand even without the United States'pressure.

The roots of Japan's post-war security policy can be seen in the United State's occupation and the security sphere of Japanese politics which emerged from it: The 1947 constitution and the 1951 US-Japan Mutual Security Assistance Pact[51] (Samuels 2007, 32). These two events allowed the US to build military bases on Japanese territory, but at the same time forced the US to protect them and thus protect whole Japan. This system actually forced Japan to preserve its pacifist status, as any attempts to change it would be of a very little effect; giving Japan the freedom of following the earlier mentioned Yoshida Doctrine[52] (Makin, Hellman 1989, 3). The American pressure on Japan's foreign policy remained even through the later part of 20th century.

[51] The 1951 pact can also be seen as a result of the loss of China as a strategic partner to US in 1949. See Yoda (2006)

[52] Theorists concerned with constructivist theory argue, that one of the main factors shaping the Yoshida doctrine and the post-war pacifism is also the trauma of atomic bombing and catastrophic defeat, which discredited war in Japanese people's eyes. See Berger (2007), Arase (2007), Ikenberry, Mastanduno (2003), Hatakeyama (2005), etc.

The end of the Vietnam War brought another opportunity to press Japan, as US president Nixon forced Tokyo to acknowledge, that Korean peninsula is its primary security concern (1969 Nixon-Sato Communiqué). The Nixon doctrine clearly stated that allies should take more responsibility for their own defense, forcing Prime Minister Sato to seek for an "autonomous defense" (*jishu boei*). This idea raised huge discussions within Japanese society, resulting in an acceptance of 1976 National Defense Program Outline (NDPO), which was a compromise between *jishu* and *senshu* policy advocates (Arase 2007: 564).[53] The US's reaction to this document came with the 1978 US-Japan Defense Guidelines for a deeper understanding of US-Japanese security relations. However, it was not until Nakasone Yasuhiro came to office in 1982 that the US-Japan relations began to improve. Nakasone agreed on US's SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) project and broke the 1% GDP limit on defense spending. However, even through all these efforts, Japanese foreign policy had still been regarded as "check-book diplomacy" (Langdon 1985, 404-8).

The breakthrough came after the end of the Cold War, since with the elimination of common enemy and the emerging Japanese economic superiority, many realist thinkers argued that the alliance is going to dissolve. However, Japanese reluctance to accept a global role and the strength of bilateral institutions prevented the alliance from breaking up. Even though the alliance remained, American incentive on the cooperation changed; it no longer needed military bases on Japanese grounds and Japanese "check-book diplomacy" was no longer sufficient. This was proven by the Gulf War of 1991, which caught Japan unprepared for the new world; with its still reactive policy completely inadequate to Japan's new international position[54].

Criticism from the U.S. and the wider international community led Japan to realize it needed to work shoulder-to-shoulder with other nations to maintain peace and stability. However, this meant Japan would have to reconcile acting abroad with Article Nine. Japan responded with the International Peace Cooperation Law (1992), which allowed the SDF to join other nations in U.N. peacekeeping (Arase 2007, 566). This act broke various normative and psychological barriers connected to sending Japanese troops abroad and after the 1993

[53] The leader of "realist" defense activists, Nakasone Yasuhiro did not see this as a victory for Japanese remilitarization though, as autonomous defense still had not been accomplished.

[54] Courtney Purrington (1992) pointed out, that the main reason Japan failed during the Gulf War was the public opinion allergic to dispatching SDF. On the other hand, the main actor forcing on the dispatch was the LDP.

North Korea crisis and 1994 Geneva Framework Agreement, Japan widened this act with 1995 NDPO, allowing SDF to be dispatched to "situations in the areas around Japan that have a direct effect on Japan's security"(National Defense Program Outline 1996, Section III).

By 1995 China had conducted 5 nuclear tests since 1992, forcing the US to reevaluate its need for Japan and in 1997 signed US-Japan Defense Cooperation. This document was particularly important for Japan, as it defined the usage of SDF to respond to regional contingencies to support US forces exclusively in non-combat roles, such as naval patrols, medical services, logistics, education, etc.[55] However, this document did not specify regional contingencies in Korea or Taiwan, stating that SDF was allowed to respond to situations, "which, if remained unchecked, may bring about direct armed attack against Japan."[56] This was corrected after the 1998 Taepodong launch by North Korea, with the 1999 Law Ensuring Peace and Security in Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan. These acts, according to David Arase (2007, 568) went far beyond the PKO usage of SDF: "by the end of the decade Japan had agreed to an over-the-horizon role for the SDF supporting U.S. interventions to stabilize the East Asian region."[57]With this recent "military build-up", we can see also significant budget rise after, as the Mid-term Defense Build-Up Plan was accepted in 1995[58]. This is reflected in figure 3.

Figure 3: Total Amount of Defense-Related Expenditures Set out in the MTDP's (Mid-term Defense Programs)

	The Former MTDP		The Current MTDP
	(initial)	(revision)	(initial)
Total Amounts	¥ 25,150 billion	¥ 24,230 billion	¥ 25,010 billion
(ave. growth rate in real term)	(+2.1%)	(+0.9%)	(+0.5%)

(the Former MTDP: FY1995 value, the Current MTDP: FY2000 value)

Source: National Defense, Ministry of Finance, Tokyo, Japan

[55] See US-Japan Defense Cooperation, on-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_policy/dp04.html
[56] US-Japan Defense Cooperation, Section V, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. See on-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_policy/dp04.html
[57] For overall incentives for US-Japan cooperation, see The Guidelines for US-Japan Defense Cooperation, http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/guideline2.html and Bluebook on Japan's foreign policy, section 2: http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1988/1988-3-2.htm
[58] However, the national budget has not been raised to a significant degree, as it was seconded with the restructuralisation of Japanese military. See Japanese Budget, 1998, Chapter 7: National Defense. On-line text http://www.mof.go.jp/english/budget/bib012.pdf

Note: The total amount of Japanese Defense Expenditure for FY 2010 is ¥4,790.3 Billion. See the Japanese Budget (2010)

In brief, Japan had a chance to become an independent actor in international relations, but disregarded it because of its prevailing institutional and normative factors. These factors, however, have been changing, especially since the beginning of 1990's. The pressure of the international system (especially American criticism) and regional difficulties (China and North Korea in particular) have changed Japan's perception of peace[59] within the region. Japan shows signs of greater involvement within the international system, more and more willing to cooperate not only on Peace Keeping Operations, but also in accordance to its security ties with the United States.

4.1.1 Neorealist approach

The economic liberals have often cited Japan's post-war pacifism and focus on economic policy as a proof, that it has rejected war and fully succumbed under the liberal paradigm (Rosencranze 1985; Berger 2007; Mueller 1988). John Mueller even in 1988 wrote that "(Japan) another formerly aggressive major power seems to have embraced fully the virtues and profits of peace" (Mueller 1998, 77). Realists strongly disagree with this position. Structural realists especially, see Japan's post-war policy as a clear embodiment of the realist paradigm (Waltz 1993; Green 2003; Samuels 2007; Heginbotham, Samuels 1998). Even though neorealists tend to emphasize military strength and its independence, Japan's after-war pacifism is also seen as a realist interest, only following the Yoshida doctrine. This is so because the structure of the system of international relations is still present; as Kenneth Waltz puts it: "Despite the changes that constantly take place in the relations of nations, the basic structure of international politics continues to be anarchic" (Waltz 1993, 59).

Thus, neorealists concerned with Japan agree, that Japan's focus on economic recovery after the war is nothing more than a product of the structure; the alliance with the United States was in accordance with Japan's post-war strategy of avoiding any commitment that could slow the economic recovery. When John Foster, chief negotiator of the 1951 and 1952 peace and security treaties, pressed Japan to expand its National Security Force from

[59] Not only on the national level, but also on the level of Japanese public opinion

110,000 to 350,000 troops, Yoshida refused, fearing that if Japan's forces were larger than absolutely necessary to defend Japan, the United States would ask it to send forces to Korea (Dower 1979 in Heginbotham, Samuels 1998, 175).

Kenneth Waltz also accounts for another aspect of structural realism: the emphasis on relative gains. Waltz (1993, 60) argues that "Prosperity and military power, although connected, cannot be equated. Yet with the use of military force for consequential advantage negated at least among nuclear powers, the more productive and the more technologically advanced have more ways of influencing international outcomes than do the laggards." In this sense, Waltz also sees Japan's economic policy only as absolutely necessary for future military build-up and thus fully in accordance with neorealist position.

Furthermore, according to neorealist paradigm, the willingness of a state to assume economic leadership is dependent on the threat of opponent countries and their relative economies. The Soviet Union was still relatively powerful during the 1950s and 1960s and the United States considered countries such as Japan (on the rimland) as especially important for the Cold War and so disregarded the "free-ride" period.

Not only the economic policy then, but also the military policy during the Cold War has not been outside the neorealist premises. From the structural point, realist author Donald C. Hellmann argues, that Japan's postwar pacifism is largely a result of geopolitical realities surrounding Japan (Hellmann, Makin 1989, 242-243). In the center of these realities during the Cold War were the American hegemony as well as Soviet and possible Chinese threats. Especially the Soviet Union had been regarded as a primary military threat towards Japanese foreign policy. In this context, neorealism understands Japan joining the bilateral agreement with the United States also as a balancing mechanism to counter this threat. Although according to Yoshida doctrine, Japan failed to maintain stable and independent military force, and did not expend significant resources to maintain its connection with the United States; this is not necessarily an objection towards the neorealist interpretation, since relatively weak powers (as Japan was in 1950's and 1960's) do not need to balance as actively as more powerful states (Heginbotham, Samuels 1998, 176).

By the end of 1970's Japan's economy had surpassed that of the Soviet Union and by the end of the Cold War, Japan was larger in proportion to US economy, than it was in 1939 combined with Germany. Japan had become very rich indeed, yet it suffered from the undermined position of its military or at least in the eyes of neorealist theorists. The

uncertainty concerning Japan's unwillingness to militarize has served as a primary factor for criticizing the neorealist approach (Berger 2007; Heginbotham, Samuels 1998). This critique is usually on the background of the end of the Cold War and the changing nature of international system. As it was already said here, for realist authors, Japan's pacifism was primarily a product of the structure of international system, the US-Japan relations and the Soviet threat in particular. Why is it then, that even though the Soviet threat has been eliminated, Japan still has not acquired nuclear weapons and forced projection capabilities?

Neorealist theorists' reply to this argument is that it is just a question of time; some of them even call it inevitable (Waltz 1993; Meyer 1996; Ikenberry, Mastanduno 2003). Furthermore, neorealist theorists emphasize the fact, that even though Japan's military budget has not been growing up to a desired degree; Japan's military spending is still the second biggest in the world. This fact is supplemented by the fact, that from early 1990s, Japan has had massive stockpiles of high grade nuclear fuel that was reprocessed in France and with Japanese technology can easily serve for the creation of nuclear weapons[60] (Ikenberry, Mastanduno 2003, 29-31). Thus, on the technological and strategic level, Japan is very well capable of remilitarization during a very short period of time, either as a result of an unbearable external pressure or by Japan's own decision resulting from it. Kenneth Waltz (1993, 64) adds that "the increased international activity of Japan (and Germany) reflects the changing structure of international politics," which, in accordance to a 1988 Prime Minister Takeshita's plea for "defensive capability matching Japan's economic power" may symbolize (whether intended or not) Japan's own incentive on becoming a superpower. Waltz concludes by a neorealist analysis of Takeshita's request: "He was saying that Japan should present itself in great-power panoply before the nations of the world. A great power's panoply includes nuclear weapons"[61] (Waltz 1993, 64).

[60] Tetsuya Endo (2007) in his analysis of Japan's capability of creating nuclear weapons argues, that "Technologically, Japan is capable of developing nuclear weapons if it invests considerable time and money. A major nuclear energy user possessing 55 nuclear reactors and committed to its nuclear fuel cycle program, Japan possesses high-level nuclear technologies, a substantial amount of plutonium and the capability to enrich uranium. Although nearly all this plutonium is reactor-grade plutonium unsuitable for nuclear explosion, Japan does possess a small amount of high-grade plutonium." With this analysis Endo proves, that it is far from impossible for Japan to create its nuclear potential.

[61] Japan's dispatch of peacekeeping troops to Iraq may be another sign of this statement's validity

4.1.2 Liberal and neoliberal approach

For classical liberals, as opposed to neoliberal internationalists, Japan is a prime example of a post-modern state, one that has overcome the use of military and settled in a world of "peaceful trading states without military threats" (Meyer 1996,: 54). John Mueller even classifies Japan as a country that underwent "hollandization", a phenomenon according to which "(countries like Japan) once warlike and militaristic, have been quietly dropping out of the war system to pursue neutrality and, insofar as they are allowed to do so, perpetual peace" (Mueller 1988, 74). Furthermore, this statement implies that the decision to remain peaceful comes from Japan's own decision. For this to be true, liberals undermine the position of US-Japan alliance during the Cold War, saying that Japanese after-war pacifism is not based on the US-Japan alliance, the American hegemony or even the Soviet threat. For liberals, Japanese after-war economic policy springs from the political and economic conception of "good". The definition of "good" in this context may spring either from economic benefits of peace, the horrible memories of war or the normative influences of domestic regime. Whichever of these is true, according to classical liberal understanding, Japanese pacifism is not a product of the structure of international relations, but a product of human rationality.

The neoliberal institutionalist explanation is based on different premises and, maybe not surprisingly, is closer to Waltz's neorealism then to Moravcsik's liberalism. Institutionalists base their understanding (almost similarly to neorealists) on the US-Japan security cooperation, which created a normative and constitutional framework that would promote a nonaggressive Japan.[62] This framework allowed Japan to concentrate on economic policy and on the international institutions that promote this policy. Safe under United States' nuclear umbrella, Japan could pursue the membership of GATT, UN or OECD (Meyer 1996: 55). Furthermore, these regimes, as Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane (2001: 267-284) pointed out long ago, facilitate burdensharing, which has been more and more present over the time. Even though Japan had been seen as a free-rider on America over more than the first two decades after war, Japan's increasing donations towards American

[62] Since the US were afraid of Japanese after-war revanchism

foreign policy, military actions or the withdrawal of American troops from Japanese bases put greater emphasis on burdensharing and cooperation.

To some extent, even Japan's cooperation (especially dispatching the peace-keeping forces) on the Iraq war is seen as burdensharing, again reminding us of the neorealist approach. The difference is that even though neorealists see US-Japan cooperation as a product of the system; institutionalists dwell on the cooperation itself and on the normative framework it produced. Japanese pacifism then clearly originates in this cooperation; and has been sustained by the overlapping of Japanese and American interests; which facilitated other types of cooperation. According to Thomas U. Berger (2007, 260-262), "today's Japan is making a serious effort to contribute to the international system, not only economically but in the diplomatic and security spheres as well, and what motivates it's doing so is an essentially liberal philosophy of international relations, one that stresses building international institutions and deepening economic and social ties between nations, including potential adversaries, as ways of creating an international system that is inherently more cooperative and peaceful than it has been in the past."

This statement, however, implies that even Japan's militarization and its overall proactive role during the last two decades have origins in institutionalist paradigm. Japan, in Berger's analysis, is militarizing not because of the pressure of international system, but because of the devotion to international security order and cooperation; Japan's proactive role serves the international system and institutions it has produced. Burdensharing in this context changes to "contribution to the global order" (*kokusai kouken*) and spreads into many layers of international relations. However, even in Berger's analysis, Japanese pacifism and *kokusai kouken* is only a result of the connection to the United States and the (overall liberal) international system that the United States has produced. (Berger 2007, 286-289) Even if American role within these bilateral relations might be diminishing, it is still the major institutional assurance of Japan's foreign policy. Japan's pacifism then, is clearly seen as a result of this alliance and the interests these two countries share. Pacifism will, despite the neorealist fears, remain the mood and policy of Japan, so long as the institutions that support it remain vibrant (Meyer 1996, 56).

4.1.3 Evaluation

For explaining Japanese post-World War 2 pacifism, it is absolutely necessary to put it into historical context. The constitution and the post-war position within the international system shows striking difference from the policies Japan was conducting before and during the war. In this sense, Japan's post-war pacifism can easily be regarded as artificial, created by American presence within the region. This statement is accepted by both neorealism and institutionalism, yet with differences in motives. Neorealism argues that it was the bipolar international system which provided the opportunity of an American nuclear umbrella for Japan; institutionalism sees this cooperation as a result of overlapping interests and the normative framework it produced. I advocate that the structural point in this debate is the principal mean of understanding this position.

The cold war period and its impact on Japan's position within the system clearly originate in the Yoshida doctrine, which could only be established (and is a reaction) because of Japan's geopolitical position in the region and the role it was willing to play within the bipolar structure. The United States accepted this "free-ride" role just because of the system and its need to have Japan balance the Soviet Union. The shift within the America-Japan relations and Japan's position within the system after the end of Cold War is further proof for the neorealist understanding. With connection to Japan, Waltz predicted that "the great powers of the world must take care of themselves" (Waltz 1993, 64), a sentence that has been present in modern Japan more than ever.

Similarly, the dissolution of the bipolar structure can be seen as the major factor for Japan to understand, that it no longer lies in a post-modern haven and has to "take care of itself". The Gulf War shock and the post-Gulf War laws, such as Peace Cooperation Law, the 1995 U.S.-Japan Defense Policy Outlines and the 1999 Law Ensuring Peace and Security in Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan are simply reactions to the newly emerged international system, one with a lesser (although still significant) role of the United States and bigger need for Japan to cope with the multilateral threats this new system had developed. Furthermore, analyzing Japan's defense policy papers and Japanese officials' speeches, we can see not only Japan's growing emphasis on the threats in the region, but also its urge for becoming a "normal nation" (Koizumi 2005), focused on promoting its role in the newly emerged multilateral system. All these examples assess that it was not an

overlapping of Japan's and America's interest or interdependent economic ties, which formed Japan's foreign policy during last 60 years or so, but more of a outside structure-induced pressure, created by Japan's interaction with the United States and other actors in the region.

4.2 Japan – China relations

Throughout much of modern history, the way China and Japan relate to each other has fundamentally shaped their respective regional roles and the contours of the East Asian international system (Deng 1997, 373). However, in the mid-1950s Japan and China were separated from political, economic and security interaction with each other by the structural boundaries of the Cold War bipolarity, together with the legacies of national division and the colonial past. Although these structural factors and mutual suspicions continued to limit Japan-China relations, at the same time Japan has had powerful motives to circumvent the restraints imposed by the structure of the international system and push for gradual and constructive engagement (Hook et al. 2001, 164).

This strategy was established by Yoshida Shigeru, who believed, that Japan and the West will eventually lure China away from Moscow by offering it an advantageous alternative to the dependence on the Soviet Union. In Yoshida's view, prosperous China would inevitably become friendly with Japan and the United States[63] (Green 2003, 77). China's prosperous state and good relations with Japan were necessary then, for Yoshida's economic policy and especially for the opening of China's huge market and natural resources. Even though Yoshida was hotly debated within the pro-Beijing and pro-Taipei fractions of LDP for doing so, his predictions were largely precise. Even though during the Sato administration (1964-1972), Japan had tightly followed American foreign policy despite the external and internal pressure, and the weakening of the bipolar Cold War structure and Nixon's China policy effectively removed US objections towards the improvement of Sino-Japanese relations (Hook et al. 2001, 166).

[63] However, as some other authors add, these reasons were not the only ones connected to the Japan-China relations. Glenn D. Hook (2001,164) points out that "The Japanese state and its people ever since the period of the Chinese world order, have felt a sense of cultural affinity and friendship with their massive neighbor, expressed in the phrase *doubun doushu* (same Chinese characters, same race)."

The year of 1972 and Nixon's visit to China brought significant improvement of not only the China-Japan relations. The tripartite relations with U.S., Japan and China were greatly improved, based upon a common antagonism toward the Soviet Union (Choi 2003, 79). According to this re-establishment of Sino-Japanese relations, Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei visited China in 1972 and signed joint communiqué establishing full relations with China.[64] This communiqué signalized abandoning official ties with Taiwan and accepting the "three principles" of normalization, with only the Sankaku islands issue unresolved.

These circumstances created a wonderful environment for the deepening of economic ties, as it was presupposed by Yoshida Shigeru. *Zaikai*, and primarily *Keidanren,* immediately grabbed this opportunity and with the use of its business ties facilitated the 1978 Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and the People's Republic of China[65]. During the negotiations for this document, China even privately indicated that it would tolerate Japan's security relations with the US (Hook et al. 2001, 167). During the 1980s, the relations followed this track, primarily through growing economic interdependence, investment and economic assistance from Japan[66]. This economic assistance had almost no opposition in Japan, as Japan saw a major trading partner in China, but also regarded this money as atonement for its past behavior; Japan's conciliatory behavior reflected a powerful consensus among Japanese political and bureaucratic elites (Berger 2007, 236).

Yoshida's predictions were only partly correct though. Greater trade, foreign aid and investments could not fully insulate the bilateral relations from the turbulent incidents of the last 20 years. Even though Japan's reaction to the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident was very muted and weak – compared to the public outcry in the United States, particularly because of the historical experiences between China and Japan which did not allow Japan to criticize China or impose economic sanctions – the break-up of the Soviet Union marked a new era in Japan-China relations. Consequently with the disappearance of a common enemy for Japan and China, Japan's position was undermined with the economic "bubble" crisis of 1991.

---

[64] See http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/joint72.html, for overall Japan-China relations since 1972, see http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/China/index.html

[65] See http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/treaty78.html

[66] Berger (2007, 235) points out three major loan packages: ¥330 billion for 1979-1983, ¥470 billion for 1984-1988, ¥810 billion for 1989-1993

The real impact of the Soviet Union break-up on the bilateral relations did not come until the mid 1990s. In 1993, Japanese government (Prime Minister Hosokawa Morihiro) started pressing for greater transparency in Chinese military policy. Another fallback in bilateral relations came in 1995 after five consequent Chinese nuclear tests and especially in 1996 during the Taiwan Strait crisis, reaffirming US-Japan bilateral relations. These incidents were reflected even in the public opinion and by the end of 20th century, Japan's fundamental thinking of China changed from economy-lead policy to a more pragmatic and realistic policy.

This pragmatic political stance towards Japan-China relations were particularly set out during the rule of the Koizumi cabinet (2001-2006). In 2002, Koizumi released a document called Basic Strategy for Japan's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: New Era, New Vision, New Diplomacy[67], in which he explicitly called for more active role not only In relations with China, bet overall by stating that: "Japan has not seen the external world enough so far. Japan has to face the reality of the world and to actively engage itself in world affairs." Furthermore, he described Japan's relations with China as the most important foreign policy theme of the 21st century and stated, that these relations would involve a mix of "cooperation and coexistence" with "competition and friction". These statements mean a shift in Japan's approach towards this relation: even though Japan was still to some extent willing to engage China, it intended on articulating its views and interests in a frank and pragmatic way and thus building the relations on the mutual respect and common interests instead of "historical connection or friendship".

4.2.1 Neorealist approach

Neorealists understand Japan's after war policy and the Yoshida strategy in Sino-Japanese relations as a continuation of the neorealist paradigm. According to Yoshida's strategy, Japan was engaging China in order to wean it away from the Soviet Union; towards the stable, friendly and wealthy side of the United States. This understanding is based on the geoeconomical perception of China: rich and prosperous China would inevitably become friends with Japan and the United States and function as a vital part of anti-soviet alliance.

[67] See on-line text, http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN017527.pdf

This strategy also brings up to light on of the major factors in Sino-Japanese relations during the second part of the 20th century: the Japan-US security alliance. This alliance is seen as a vital part of Japan's international relations, as it held Japan from becoming more independent in foreign policy making.

Even the shift within Japan-China bilateral relations has been seen by neorealist theorists as a prime example of a shift towards more realistic foreign policy (Green 2003, 1996). This shift originates in China's strategic position; according to neorealists, Japan looks at China as a country sitting in between Japan and South East Asia, Japan's most important source of raw materials and one of its most important markets for finished products. Furthermore, China's economic and especially military capabilities are growing and thus making China the greatest strategic problem in nowadays Japanese foreign politics (Heginbotham, Samuels 1998, 181).

Chinese military budget is continuously growing[68] and even Chinese foreign policy has developed some sort of Grand strategy; according to Ikenberry and Mastanduno (2003, 4), this strategy is similar to that of Bismarck: "an effort to engage and reassure other major powers in order to provide space for Chinese development as a great power without alarming or provoking more powerful rivals, individually or collectively." This strategy is then understood as China pushing on a structural change within the East Asia region; a transition from a U.S.-dominated order to one that is more genuinely multipolar.

This calling for a greater role in the region is ultimately seen as a threat to Japan's position. Japan's approach towards this problem however, can be seen as to some extent relative. As realist paradigm (and its balance-of-power logic) would presuppose, Japan would rather pursue relative gains at the expense of China; Japan would cut the aid and investments to China as method for retarding the role of China in the system. Japan has not done so. Instead, as Michael J. Green (2003, 79) points out "Japan's China policy is moving forward on two levels. At one level, Tokyo continues to provide massive economic assistance in the form of yen loans, with only slight decreases in ODA. At another level, however, Tokyo is actively seeking to counter Chinese political influence in Asia while hedging against the prospect of longer-term Chinese threats." This policy thus combines the engagement

[68] Over 10 year's period since the Tiananmen incident, the budget grew by over 60%, in real terms.

(economic aid) and pragmatic approach (balancing) towards Chinese foreign policy, as it was set in the Koizumi memorandum.

This stance was further expressed in an LDP foreign policy paper of 1997: “Ultimately China’s future rests in its own hands-including how stably it will develop. Therefore, even as we seek to preserve and enhance our amicable relations with China, we must maintain a close watch on the direction China is headed and be prepared to cope with a variety of contingencies” (cited from Green 2003, 79). This foreign policy review is then seen as an affirmation of the neorealist approach as the suspicion within Sino-Japanese relations causes the urge to effect the change in China and balance it through multilateral or bilateral security networks.

Maybe even greater importance lies in the future of this relation. According to neorealist interpretation; Japan has two possible alternatives on the future coping with the growing China. First one lies in Japan’s acquirement of nuclear weapons as a balancing factor for Chinese rising military threat. Second one lies in even stronger cooperation with the United States, as well as creating tighter cooperation ties with geopolitically important states in South East Asia, such as South Korea or India. With both of these solutions, neorealists emphasize the importance of reevaluation of Japan’s economic policy towards China to “exhibit great sensitivity to the distribution of gains through the trade with China (Heginbotham, Samuels 1998, 182).

4.2.2 Neoliberal approach

Institutionalists see Japan in a different way than realists: even though they also to some extent acknowledge the geopolitical realities, they emphasize, that because of its relative size and population, Japan would not play a central role in dealing with rising China. Therefore, Japan must work within a broader alliance, connected to other countries and organizations. Primarily the United States and the United Nations will play a major role in this environment, as the United States and the institutions it has been promoting are seen as the architects of the international system. But again, as it is the normative framework that has created Japan’s foreign policy, it is the overlapping of Japan’s and American interests that is crucial in dealing with China.

As the shift within Japan's approach towards China is clearly visible, even neoliberal authors cope with it. Opposed to neorealists however, they do not stress the shift leading towards a balance-of-power policy, the regard Japan's approach towards its China relations primarily as a reflection of Japan's engage strategy. During the period from 1972 to the middle part of 1990s, Japan had been leading "friendship diplomacy", trying to engage China into economic interdependence and institutional framework; in order to resolve historical disputes and anchor China within the institutional system preferable for Japan.

The shift towards "reluctant realism" within Japan-China relations has been explained by institutionalists as compromise between engaging and balancing Chinese influence within the system. Unlike realists though, institutionalists emphasize the economic sphere of this policy; they argue, that balancing of China is particularly inefficient and dangerous, since it would inevitably lead to the deterioration of the security dilemma and endless spiral of military build-up. On the other hand, institutionalists emphasize the economic interdependence and common concerns about transnational issues such as environmental degradation. These aspects of international relations are and will be steering China-Japan relations to maintain a cooperative relationship (Roy 2005 in Berger 2007, 250-251).

These policies have even been leading China to a more conciliatory approach toward Japan. However, given the historical disputes and conflicts, Japan and China should strike a grand bargain to establish "a new era of cooperative and forward looking bilateral relations" (Berger 2007, 252). This deal then, would be centered on compromise diplomacy largely under the framework of a larger, multilateral cooperation and would embrace not only cooperation on security fields, but also the promotion of common interests within international relations of these two countries: economic interdependence, energy security, environmental protection and social equity. These policies would lead to the promotion of cooperation of these two countries in the region and would lessen the frictions within their relations.

4.2.3 Evaluation

The evolution of Japan-China relations is clearly an evolution towards the predictions set by the realist paradigm, based on motives best understood by neorealist predictions. The structural threat, that China means to Japan has been reflected in Japan's official foreign

policy papers, making China a primary threat to Japan's East Asia order (See Koizumi memorandum, MOFA papers, etc.). Japan has been using some institutionalist-propagated means of settling the security dilemma with China, such as multilateral diplomacy or the push for economic interdependence; Chinese responses have pushed forward its security policy at the expense of common interest-lead multilateral diplomacy.

Therefore, Chinese militarization, nuclear weapons tests, the emphasis on security policy and aggressive rhetoric, and historical, but also present Japan-China disputes are the core of the new Japanese perception of China's role within the region. Even the withering of Japan's engagement policy towards China can be seen as a more pragmatic, realistic approach, and not as an emphasis on a promotion of common interests or an outcome of interdependent policies.

4.3 Japan and the North Korea issue

The Korean peninsula is of particular importance to Japan. The Japan-Korea entanglement has lasted for more than two thousand years, and because of the geographical, historical and cultural similarities, the development on Korean peninsula always touch a raw nerve in Japan; and the Korean issues are always unique in Japanese foreign policy (Kawashima 2003, 73). Even through a quick glance at Japanese annual foreign policy white papers (Defense of Japan[69]), since the end of the Cold War, the historical conflicts are being supplemented with new threats to Japan's international relations, making North Korea issue one of the most serious problems for Japan: "North Korea's military behavior has increased tension over the Korean peninsula, and constitutes a serious destabilizing actor for the entire East Asia region, including Japan" (Defense of Japan 2009, Part 1: 35)

The historical relations culminated in the 20th century, primarily with colonization of the peninsula by Japan from 1910 to 1945. This set of events marked an important breakpoint in Japan's Asia policy and especially in connection to Korea; as these historical issues[70] tend to form Japan's public opinion and foreign policy making process. The Korean

[69] See http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/index.html

[70] The colonization issues is probably the major one, but there are also many other important historical problems in effect even now - for instance the abductions of Japanese citizens (to teach Japanese language in

peninsula was divided right after the Second World War, with Southern part placed under the control of the United States and Northern part under the control of the Soviet Union. In 1948 Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was established in the north and Republic of Korea (ROK) in the south, with DPRK attacking ROK only two years later. However, DPRK (although being a threat to ROK and the US) has not symbolized a major security threat for Japan during most of the Cold War period, compared to the military behemoth of the Soviet Union. That is, Japan's security interests vis-à-vis North Korea were largely ensured by the U.S.'s massive military presence in Japan and South Korea and the American containment policy towards the North (Hughes 2009, 297).

As the Cold War began to wind down, a number of developments on the Korean peninsula altered the status quo. The Soviet Union normalized its relations with the South Korea in 1990, abandoning the role of security guarantor and economic benefactor of North Korea. Also, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, it became apparent, that Russia can no longer play a deterrent role if North Korea took any destabilizing actions. In 1992, even China normalized its relations with ROK, leaving DPRK isolated within the new structure. This isolation was probably the main factor for the ignition of North Korean nuclear energy program[71] (Kawashima 2003, 78). Resulting crisis came in 1994, as DPRK did not allow IAEA (International Agency for Atomic Energy) control over its nuclear power-plants and threatened to begin processing spent nuclear fuel[72]. Even though this crisis was settled with the Agreed framework and Korean Peninsula Energy Development (KEDO - DPRK ceasing its nuclear program against massive international funding for DPRK's light water reactors in 1994), the 1998 test firing of a Taepodong missile over Japan immediately ignited Japanese already high concern for the region, addressing the missile test as "affecting Japan's security directly[73]" (MOFA 1998).

Japan's growing concern with the region was supplemented with the American one: the Perry report on U.S. North Korea policy from 1999 clearly states, that the "1999

DPRK), which was finally and shockingly admitted in 2002. Another important issue is the question of comfort women in Korea and China. See Kawashima (2003), Wan (2001) etc.

[71] However, this program started during the 1980s. See Kawashima (2003, 78)

[72] Another reason for Japanese worries was the 1994 speech of the DPRK's ambassador to North Korea, in which he indirectly admitted the possession of nuclear weapons and directly stated, that "our nuclear arms, if developed, would be primarily designed to contain Japan" (Meyer 1996, 56)

[73] Interesting fact is that even right after the missile test, DPRK still exacerbated Japan's occupation of Korea as a historical injustice in bilateral relations, making it very difficult for any reasonable conclusion to be reached. See Perry Report (1999)

landscape is profoundly different from 1994" and that "DPRK acquisition of nuclear weapons and continued development, testing, deployment, and export of long-range missiles would undermine the relative stability of deterrence on the Korean Peninsula, a precondition for ending the Cold War and pursuing a lasting peace in the longer run" (Perry 1999). This stance was a clear outcome of the fact, that with the launching of the Taepodong missile in 1998, it became apparent, that all the speculations about North Korea pursuing the development of ICBM (Intercontinental Ballistic Missile) had been true.

However, by the end of 1990s Japan's and American leaders have come to a conclusion, that North Korean behavior originates in the insecurity it feels regarding its economic and political stability and have shown willingness to respond to the DPRK threat by offering economic concessions (Hughes 2009, 297-8; Fouse 2004, 8-9). Nonetheless, economic tools are still the only means of Japanese foreign policy toward the "Korean threat". Even though during the summitry in 2002 and 2004, Japan tried to engage Korea diplomatically, right after the 2006 nuclear and missile tests, Japan's reaction were "only" economic sanctions. Despite Japan's non-military means of settling conflicts with North Korea, Japan is very cautious of the development and with the shift in Japan's foreign policy, even its position within the region has become more active.[74]

4.3.1 Neorealist vs. Neoliberal approach

North Korean nuclear program and especially the missile crisis of 1994 are regarded by neorealists as a lecture of *Realpolitik* in Japan's post-war pacifist heaven. Neorealists have advocated the thesis, that under the threat of an unstable, hostile and unpredictable country, Japan would soon come back to reality from its illusory pacifism. Further on, neorealism predicts not only the shift on the elite level of the state, but also on the level of public. As the power is the principal mean of international relations, the economic carrot and sticks diplomacy is considered as a waste of time. Only military deterrence, either from America or Japan or both would suffice to convince of the errors of its ways. The crises would

[74] However, there is no firm consensus on the actual shape of the threat. Some authors downplay the DPRK's military role, saying it is based on an ages-old technology with only a little chance of success; Korean missiles definitely are threats, but their reliability, accuracy and actual capabilities are highly questionable. Thus even some Japanese foreign policy analysts exert some confidence over the North Korean nuclear program, arguing DPRK is still far from mastering its missiles and from creating an actual warhead. See Hughes (2009, 299)

demonstrate the predominance of military and security matters over the “low politics” issue of economics and trade. At the very least, the North Korean situation would dominate the agenda of Japanese government; states are first and foremost concerned with its security (Mayer 1996, 57).

Institutionalists, on the other hand, emphasize the role of international community and especially the role of the Japan-U.S. alliance in dealing with the Korean problem. With the DPRK’s acquisition of nuclear potential, institutionalists predict Japan to fasten the relations with the United States and with the Republic of Korea, since they share the interest on the issue of nuclear proliferation. Further on, according to neoliberal paradigm, Japan would seek help through the international organizations, such as the United Nations or KEDO, to exert a pressure on North Korea and create solidarity among the “friendly” states. Issue linkages would appear, as Keohane predicted (Mayer 1996, 58). Furthermore, institutionalists argue, that economic concerns with not become subordinate to security issues, as neorealism would argue, as well as the bilateral trade ties with the United States would not remain unaffected, as some neorealists would argue.

4.3.2 Evaluation

Which of these models can more easily be applied to the reality? This question is particularly difficult to assess, as even though Japan’s proactive stance can easily be acknowledged, its policymaking towards the Korean peninsula remains fluid and inconsistent (Green 2003, 111). Nevertheless, as the 1994 nuclear crisis and the development since the Koizumi government indicates, some points of these predictions can be assessed.

First, the institutionalist predictions that “Japan would fasten the relations with the United States” and “organizations such as UN or KEDO” in order to promote the joint interests of all the participating parties, is fundamentally flawed. As we have seen, the 1994 nuclear crisis has not brought Japan and the United States together, as their “common” interests were not as “common” as institutionalism had predicted. In order to fasten the alliance in 1994; Japan would have to serve the bilateral alliance, but with the growing pressure of the structure on Japan’s military cooperation (illustrated by Japan’s inability to deploy troops in the Gulf War); it would not suffice to provide economic help and thus

"entrap" Japan in an active military role[75]. Unlike the United States, Japan's primary objectives were set on the domestic security (as opposed to American regional stability interest), and Japan's failure to respond positively to Washington's Article 6-based requests triggered a crisis of political confidence in the alliance, and genuine Japanese fears that it might be abandoned as an untrustworthy ally (Hughes 2009, 300). The strengthening of the alliance and Japan's new security role in the region, which came right after the 1994 crisis with the 1995 National Defense Program Outline, then, cannot be seen as a product of joint interests of these two actors, but more of a structure-based reaction to Japanese fears of abandonment.

Second, the institutionalists-advocated KEDO also cannot be purely seen as the embodiment of neoliberal paradigm in Japanese policymaking. According to Hiroyatsu Akutsu (2000, 25-31), even KEDO has to be seen as a projection of a structure-inducted realist interest. Formally, Japan announced that its aim in KEDO is to assure Japan's own security from the DPRK's direct nuclear threat, to achieve regional security and global nuclear nonproliferation, and to make KEDO an example of multilateral approach to conflict resolution. However, as Japanese behaviour within the program indicates[76], Japan "used" the program to assure a cheap and effective strengthening of its ties with the United States and containing DPRK; as it stated that KEDO is "the most realistic framework to solve the DPRK's nuclear issue" and thus repeated what was written in the Perry report.

Third, the neoliberal assumption, that economic concerns will play a prominent role and will not be "subordinate to security policy" is also basically flawed. Even though there is a noticeable North Korean business community nested in Tokyo, their interest in dealing with North Korean issue (supporting Kim Jong Il) is diminishing and as the bilateral business relations between Japan and Republic of Korea are stably growing up[77], they are undermining the position of Japan-DPRK's business relations within broader policy scenario.

[75] For the strategies of abandonment and entrapment, see Cha (2000)

[76] For instance, Japan's continuation of contributions even after the 1998 test-launch of another Taepodong missile

[77] For instance right after the 1997 South Korea currency crisis, Japan donated a huge financial assistance, facilitating already warm inclination of Kim Dae Jung (ROK President) to promote greater cooperation with Japan. The result was a 1998 Kim-Obuchi memorandum of understanding between Japan's export-import bank and Korea's Ministry of Finance to provide an additional $3 billion in untied loans for small to medium-size South Korean firms. See Green (2003, 138-139)

Furthermore, analyzing Japan's Defense Policy White papers, despite Japan's efforts to deal with North Korea diplomatically (through KEDO or Six Party Talks); Japan has become fully aware of the DPRK's security threat to Japanese people. With the Perry review and Japan's new guidelines for Japan-U.S. security relations, Japan has acknowledged, that the security of the Korean Peninsula is essential to Japan's security (National Defense Program Outline in FY1996; Joint Statement 2002). The crises in 1994, 1998 and 2006[78] acted not only as a catalyst of North Korea's importance within Japan's international relations, but also showed the possible divergences between Japan's security and American regional and global interests. Since 9/11 2001, Japan has remained anxious of the possibility of abandonment by the United States, and thus slowly increasing the assertive attitude towards containing the North Korean threat, clearly emphasizing it over economic policies. For instance, in the wake of October 2006 North Korean nuclear test, Japanese policy makers considered the option of backing a potential U.S. economic blockade of the North, in keeping with Japan's Defense Guidelines. But the U.S. soon made it clear that it needed to pursue diplomacy and was not prepared as yet to exert military pressure on the North (Asahi Shimbun in Hughes 2009, 301-302).

Overall, by analyzing Japan's defense and foreign policy towards DPRK and especially during the last twenty years, it is clearly visible that Japan has adopted a more firm and conscious approach; one that counts on the U.S.-Japan alliance, but is aware of possible interest clashes between the United States and Japan. Because of that, most predictions set by the neorealist paradigm can be seen as fulfilled, especially as opposed to neoliberal predictions. The importances of security sphere, the self-consciousness in dealing with the United States, the systemic containment policy towards DPRK are its clear examples.

4. 4. Japan and Multilateral Diplomacy: South East Asia

The multilateral impulse has been strong in Japan's post-war foreign policy thinking, but in practice it has often been elusive. After joining the United Nations in 1956, MOFA declared Japan's position within the United Nations as central to Japanese Cold War world role (Wagagaikou no kinkyou, 1957). However, the Soviet veto undermined any further

[78] The 1994 nuclear crisis, 1998 Taepodong launch and 2006 second nuclear crisis

Japanese efforts of acquiring collective security guarantees. Japanese efforts of fostering regional diplomacy proved not much more effective either. Japan had resisted the Eisenhower administrative plan to establish a NATO-style collective defense organization in Asia as well as Soviet plans for region-wide multilateral frameworks. By 1958 the "UN-centrism" had disappeared from the preamble of Diplomatic Bluebook. In short, the Cold War was not kind to multilateralism in Asia (Green 2003, 193-194; Bowles 2002, 231).

Even in this regionalism-unfriendly environment though, there were a couple of initiatives for regional or multilateral cooperation. For instance, Japan's active role in creating organizations such as Asian Development Bank, the Ministerial Conference for the Economic Development of Southeast Asia, and the Asian Pacific Council (Sudo 1988, 509-510). It was not until the end of the Cold War though, for Japan's multilateral diplomacy to be fully liberated. The Gulf War of 1990-91 was especially important impetus, as it made the UN appear as reaffirming a central role in international politics. While the United Nations were only scarcely mentioned in Japanese foreign policy during the Cold War, it became an increasingly common *leitmotif* in the speeches of cabinet ministers from 1991 through 1994[79] (Green 2003, 194).

Another organization, that became far more attractive for Japan's post-war policy, was the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN[80]). Foreign affairs Minister Nakayama Taro even called for a centered on ASEAN in 1991, enthusiastically supporting what later became the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). These activities were largely lead by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, yet even MITI took part in establishing Asia-Pacific Cooperation Forum (APEC), with the aim of establishing Japanese superiority in the process of regional economic integration. All these efforts suggest, that during the first half of 1990s, Japan's international relations and its security role were largely focused on multilateralism, as it was written in the 1992 Diplomacy Bluebook: "in this post-Cold War international environment, it is important to promote region-wide political and security dialogues to enhance the sense of mutual reassurance in the Asia-Pacific region" (Diplomatic Bluebook, 1992, Chapter 2).

[79] Michael Green in this context cites an interview with MOFA official from 2000. See Green (2003, 194)

[80] ASEAN was founded on August 8, 1967 comprising Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Now it comprises also Brunei, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. See Japan-ASEAN relations http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/asean/

By the end of the decade, however, the idealism and enthusiasm surrounding Japan's multilateral diplomacy began driving way to a more cautious position. Whether focused on regional cooperation or collective security, the multilateral impulse in Japanese foreign policy has been frustrated on all fronts (Green 2003, 194). Japanese interest in promoting the UN reform for Japan's Security Council permanent seat has been fruitless. So have the efforts put into South East Asia regionalism: ASEAN was partly discredited because of its failure in dealing with the 1997-8 regional financial crisis; the ambitious project of establishing the Asian Monetary Fund (AMF) were hampered by American unwillingness to support this establishment as well as by Japan's inability to come to terms with superiority-seeking China (Bowles, 2002: 233; Dieter, Higgot 2003, 450-451).

Nevertheless, despite the lack of cooperation within the South East Asia region, multilateralism remains a very important factor in present Japan's international relations[81]. Over the second half of 20th century, Japan has become a very rich state, yet (as this is often the ground for criticizing realism) it still has not acquired nuclear weapons or played a significant role within the international system. This position, however, is changing. Japan is using multilateral diplomacy as a framework for its increasing involvement with the outside world, as it was affirmed in (for instance) MOFA's pamphlet Japan's Role in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security (2004, 2) which stated that "Japan has taken an active role in the maintenance of international peace and security. "At the same time though, Japan is gradually recasting its approach to multilateralism to fit into its narrower definition of national interest within the changing international structure.

4.4.1 Neorealist approach

Realists explain Japan's willingness to participate in alliances or institutional framework through the optic of national interest and the principle of balance-of-power politics. As neorealism emphasizes the anarchic structure of international system, states are responsible for their own security. However, according John Mearsheimer and his famous essay The False Premise of International Institutions (1994-95, 5-7), states can undergo cooperation, if it is in accordance with their national interest. Institutions in this sense are

[81] Regional and global institutions for instance, are becoming important in Japan's China policy, because they shape Chinese norms of international behavior and increase Tokyo's leverage on Beijing (Green 2003, 194).

just a "reflection of the distribution of power in the world, based on self-interest calculation of the great powers and possessing no independent effect on state behavior."

This formula is applied to most of the Cold War period. The unfriendly, bi-polar structure of the Cold War international system drove the United States to promote security cooperation, in order to contain the Soviet Union. This cooperation, however weakly institutionalized, was a reflection of the bi-polar system, and the lack of regional cooperation within Asia-Pacific region was a product of this bi-polar system: a regional cooperation was unnecessary for Japan, as its security lied on American security guarantees.

The end of the Cold War significantly changed the security environment; and a stream of threats[82] has provided a strong rationale for Japan to foster regional cooperation (Leavitt 2005, 219). Neorealists point out especially two motives for Japan's post-Cold War enthusiasm towards multilateral diplomacy and cooperation: the rise of China and the (possible) withdrawal of United States from Asia. These two countries will attempt to shape regional dynamics according to the dictates of their perceived national interests. Smaller powers, such as the core ASEAN countries, might balance or they might not, but ultimately they would band together in ways that best protect them against emerging security threats (Garofano 2002, 512).

Figure 4: Motives/Outcomes in the region according to neorealists

Group 1 Process
Leaders are concerned with relative gains.
Leaders do worst-case scenario development and procure accordingly.
Group 2 Outcomes
Policies aim at maximizing power and traditional conceptions of security.
Cooperative acts are narrowly self-interested.
Institutions are created or used by most powerful actors for their own perceived interests.

Source: Garofano 2002, 512

The slow withdrawal of the United States and the strategic uncertainty of 1990s pushed Japan to step to the fore in aiding South East Asia – and itself – to fight common

[82] Sandra Leavitt (2005, 219) specifies these threats for ASEAN-Japan security cooperation: problems with drugs such as methamphetamines, environmental challenges such as the Sumatran forest fires in the late 1990s, illegal labor migration and refugee flow from South and Central Asia, Indonesia and Cambodia. These are however, only side reasons, which do not have significant impact on the international system.

security challenges. This impetus got even more important after 9/11 and the attacks on United States, as their interest switched to their commitments in Afghanistan and Iraq. Furthermore, the dealing with China is becoming more and more difficult, as with China's fast militarization, Japan's balance-of-power policy is becoming more and more important: "With the expansion of China's sphere of influence, and with Japan's emergence as a world power, the role of Japan, not only in Asia, but in entire world, is given new significance…The important role that Japan is forced to accept…will make Japan fulfill its defense obligations" (Chong Ki-Choi, 1985 in Leavitt, 2005, 220).

In short, neorealism sees Japan's interest in multilateral diplomacy as a balance-of-power politics to counter the emerging superpower status of China and the change within American role in the region. They predict Japan to further promote security cooperation in the region, driven by this balance-of-power national interest despite the fact that it is unclear, how Japan might interpret its national interest and concept of self-defense. One thing is certain: Japan's push on becoming a "normal" world leader requires projection of not only economic and cultural power, but also of security power within the region.

4.4.2 Neoliberal approach

In dealing with multilateralism and institutions, the institutionalist paradigm might seem as a perfect one. This approach highlights the contributions to amicable relations made by the informational and enforcement functions of institutions (Garofano 2002, 505). Institutionalist agree with neorealist's presumption of self-help world, but state, that the institutional constraints and the power of institutions helps to lower the transaction costs, lower information deprivation and connects (or shapes) the interests of participant parties, in order to promote absolute gains.

Institutionalist explanation of Japan's involvement in South East Asia then, lies on the importance of common interests and economic interdependence. Institutionalists point out, that Japan has been the biggest donor of foreign aid to the region and to regional organizations such as ASEAN, to ensure that their economic interdependence would create a favorable environment to "foster trust and cooperation in all areas of normal state-to-state relations, including military when appropriate" (Leavitt 2005, 222). Moreover, this policy

would bring more confidence for the South East Asian countries' dealing with Japan[83], because regional stability is important to all in maximizing economic development.

Figure 5: Motives/Outcomes in the region according to institutionalists

Group 1 Motivating Perceptual Factors

Evidence, and shared views, that conflicts of interest can be ameliorated through shared information

Evidence of a concern among leaders for the shadow of the future

Group 2 Outcomes

Evidence that new information alters prior perceptions, policies, or behavior in the security realm

Evidence that regime-type arrangements effectively lower the costs of acquiring critical information

Evidence of regime-constraining effects on traditional behaviors and interests

Source: Garofano 2002, 511

Even institutionalists are aware of the progress Japan has been doing in security area. Unlike classical liberalists however (and more similarly to neorealists), institutionalists predicted this situation, due to the existence of shared threats and objectives. These security institutions (or bilateral relations), according to John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi's seminal work "Uses of Institutions: The U. S., Japan, and Governance in East Asia" are critical - and underappreciated – mechanism for the functioning of regional peace and stability. Even though multilateral institutions are weaker than bilateral ties, they also matter in "shaping and directing the flow of economics and politics" (Ikenberry, Inoguchi 2006, 2-3).

Furthermore, as Ikenberry wrote earlier, binding institutions are particularly important for constraining major powers and giving weaker powers a voice, creating avenues for confidence building, and establishing mechanisms other than coercion and military balancing behavior to resolve conflicts. As such, institutionalized collaboration offers South-east Asia some assurance that Japan will not easily and quickly remilitarize (Ikenberry 2001 in Leavitt 2005, 222-223). We might see some similarities with neorealist paradigm here, as in both scenarios institutions are used for balancing of power, despite being based on different motives.

For instance, let's look at ASEAN-Japan relations. In July 1977, an ASEAN economic mission, headed by Indonesian Trade Minister Radius Prawiro, vigorously negotiated with its

[83] As this policy would be a supplemental to the pacific sentiment between Japan and the region

Japanese counterparts. Presenting a four-point plan, the mission emphasized that "ASEAN has been giving priority to its economic development since the end of the Indochina war in 1975. In this context the ASEAN states attach importance to relations with Japan." The mission's requests implied the creation of an economic bloc with ASEAN hoping to win special preferential treatment for its exports to Japan. It naturally behooved Japan to respond to this strong call for an active role in the region (Sudo 1988, 513-514). For these reasons, Japan and ASEAN chose to recognize each other's calculated interest with a positive relationship. ASEAN needed Japan's economic assistance to reinforce regional cooperation, and Japan needed ASEAN to play its political role in the region and to develop multilateral economic relations[84] (Sudo 1988, 514).

4.4.3 Evaluation

The major difference between neorealist and institutionalist approach lies in the reasons for joining or creating the institutional structure. As I have stated before (neo-neo debate), neorealists tend to undermine institutions' position, since they regard them only as a projection of state's interests and power. Institutionalists, on the other hand, emphasize institutional effects on state's behavior and factors such as information and burden sharing, facilitating cooperation between nations.

There is however, an uncertainty in applying institutional paradigm. According to John Garofano's (2002, 511-512) assessment[85], neoliberals would expect elites to be aware of the need for future interactions and adjust their behavior accordingly. This may be impossible to measure if such expectations are internalized, but one indication might be the level of flexibility after initial rigidity. Where is real or potential conflict, there should be evidence, that lesser uncertainty (or more information) would ameliorate the situation promptly. Simply the information gap however, cannot be assumed to be the cause of tensions. Also, institutionalists would have to find evidence that information and institutions constrain security policies, moving them away from the worst-case scenarios and purely short-term selfish behavior.

---

[84] Japan's ASEAN policy was the core of Fukuda Doctrine, specifying Japan's role as "bridge building" between ASEAN and Indochina. See LDP: Fukuda period http://www.jimin.jp/jimin/english/history/chap8.html, compare Yuzawa (2005)

[85] Compare Ikenberry, Mastanduno (2003)

Neorealists (as expected) assess the situation more pragmatically. Japan's institutionalization processes (or the lack of them) during the second half of 20th century reflect the power position within the region. Right after the war, Japan relied on the bilateral U.S.-Japan treaty, since the structure was unfriendly for further cooperation and the United States were "enough" for Japan's security guarantees. Japan's post Cold War regionalism enthusiasm is also reliably explained by this paradigm, primarily due to the rising power status of China and the withdrawal of the United States. However, even if neorealism provides bigger explanatory potential when dealing with motives of Japan's behavior, what is interesting in this theoretical clash is the mutual supplement of these theories: it is apparent, that common threats, common goals *and* institutional linkages provide strong rationale for increasing Japan-South East Asia security cooperation.

4.5 The Japanese constitutional change debate

The constitution of November 3, 1947 which prohibited Japan from maintaining land, air or sea forces, as well as other war potential has been confusing political scientists for more than sixty years now[86]. Throughout the post-war history, this constitution has been shaping Japan's position in international system, in accordance with the Yoshida doctrine and Japan's interest in economic recovery. This "prohibition of war potential" however, has been subject to so many contending interpretations that the actual content of the constitution has been slowly adapting to the needs of international community and the U.S.-Japan alliance in particular.

These interpretations have expanded far beyond of what most would have imagined possible in 1946, as various Cabinets stated officially that the Article 9 allows for not only limited self-defense, but also forward self-defense (defense of sea lanes and communications) and overseas dispatch of peacekeeping troops[87] (Ikenberry, Mastanduno 2003, 361-362). As for the security treaty, the constitution allowed United States' basing rights in Japan, but regarded this as Japan's self defense, not collective defense. As a result,

[86] This constitution was created under a great pressure from the United States, in the atmosphere of deep self-reflection. Some of its parts were even so remote from Japan's tradition that even new Kanji characters had to be created to embrace the meaning. See Wakamyia (2002)

[87] In 1958, Prime Minister Kinshi actually claimed that possession of nuclear weapons would not violate the constitution, but this was never an official explanation. See Grimes in Ikenberry, Mastanduno (2003, 380)

Japanese SDF (Self Defense Forces) have consistently been denied of participation in missions abroad different from disaster relief.

This situation is changing. Especially in last fifteen to twenty years, the institutionalized anti-militarism has been weakened. Japanese minesweepers were dispatched to the Persian Gulf in 1991; in 1992 the Diet passed a "PKO Law", allowing the SDF to be dispatched abroad in noncombatant U.N. peacekeeping operations. This law quickly became an accepted practice and in 2002, restrictions on the scope of these missions were quietly eased to permit more dangerous functions, including patrol of cease-patrol zones and disposal of weapons. In Japan's urge for closer ties in its U.S. policy, deployment of Japanese troops to Iraq and Afghanistan was handled legislatively on a case-by-case basis, but there was growing support in the Diet for reinterpretation of Article 9 to give participation in collective self-defense explicit legal justification (Pyle 2007, 366).

All these examples prove that the institutional framework, set by the constitution, has evolved into a situation, when it is no longer sufficient. In 2006, the Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated that "the present Constitution was established at a time when Japan was occupied and since then nearly 60 years have passed" and confirmed that "active debates are underway for a constitution that would be more suitable to a new generation". This new generation, as Abe added, will be based not only on tight cooperation with the United States, but also on the promotion of Japanese role on the world stage and gradual breaking up of the "the past diplomacy, which has tended to follow Washington" (New Constitution Needed Soon: Abe, 2006). This debate is going on even now and that a change is coming is almost clearly visible as Japan itself recognizes the challenges this new era has brought.

4.5.1 Neorealist vs. Institutionalist approach

As I have already noted, it is a generally accepted assumption that Japanese foreign policy stands at a crossroads (Compare Hirata 2008; Kawashima 2003; Green 2003; Samuels 2007 etc.) and the possible constitutional change is going to be a major factor shaping Japan's position in international system.

The neorealist theorists have been talking about this change for almost two decades now, as Japan's militarization would be a major breakthrough in a theoretical assessment of Japan's foreign policy. In Kenneth Waltz's analysis of Japan's position within the

international system (1993), Waltz pointed out many neorealists predictions about the future of this country: as Japan's economic policy is no longer sufficient for U.S.-Japan bilateral relations, sooner or later, Japan's international status will step up to its material resources. This of course applies also for the constitutional change. Neorealists such as Waltz predict that the structural threats such as the rise of China or the withdrawal of the United States will inevitably end up in Japan acquiring potential for controlling the region, and even possibly acquiring nuclear weapons.

Institutionalists, on the other hand, see Japan's current position in international politics as contributing towards the international system; deepening social ties between nations and building international institutions (Berger 2007, 260). Further, neoliberals argue, that it is these institutions and regimes (i.e. U.S.-Japan relations), which ameliorate the emerging security dilemma in this volatile region. The security of the region then is based on the prevailing cooperation ties, both economic and security. This being said, Japan's constitutional change would damage these ties, especially within U.S.-Japan alliance and it relations with China and thus is discrepant for Japan's pursue of common values, goals and interests.

4.5.2 Evaluation

It is still very difficult to foresee the future of the debate, that has been going on in some sense for more than sixty years. Since the Armitage report of 2000[88] and the 9/11 attacks however, the debate has taken clearer shapes, as the Koizumi cabinet has taken radical steps to undermine the validity of Article 9. For instance, under Koizumi, Japan dispatched SDF to Iraq in 2003, with the Prime Minister completely ignoring the Article 9 in his conference reasoning speech[89]. Further, on September 24, 2004, Koizumi addressed the United Nations General Assembly with a speech focused on promoting of Japan's

[88] Armitage report is a United States unofficial foreign policy review, stating that Japan's constraints on collective defense is a setback for Japan-U.S. bilateral relations. Even though this report was not an official government outcome, the Armitage committee (members of the two U.S. government parties under Richard L. Armitage) later became high officials within the Bush government; forcing Japan to re-start the debate. See the Armitage report (2000), compare Clemons (2001); Wakamyia (2002)

[89] See the Free Library notes, http://www.thefreelibrary.com/CORRECTED:+Koizumi%27s+Constitution+quote+stirs+criticism+of...-a0111295607

candidature for the permanent seat in the Security Council, clearly stating that “Japan's pacifist Constitution would be no hindrance to his bid for the permanent seat”. In this sentence though, Koizumi did not mean to push for the seat with unchanged constitution, he was trying to assure the UN of its change. In 2005[90], Koizumi cabinet instructed the LDP to map out a “blueprint for Japan’s own constitution” in order to make Japan a “normal nation with military forces”. The continuity in LDP’s attitude towards changing the constitution was visible even with following Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe. In 2006, he called for “step forward” in dealing with constitution and in 2007 “drafted a proposed new Constitution that allows the legal possession of what it calls "military forces for self-defense."

All these efforts are just examples of the debate that is presently going on. For most of the second half of 20th century, the constitution has been shaped according to the international pressure on Japan, yet has survived thanks to Yoshida’s doctrine and the role of public opinion. These two factors have changed, Japan’s economic foreign policy is no longer sufficient for dealing with the outside world, Japan’s environment has changed and brought new challenges with this change. Even Japan’s public opinion regarding the constitution is showing signs of approval, as 2009 Yomiuri Shimbun poll showed almost 52% Japanese in favor for the change[91], finally paving a way. Even though the Article 9 still remains within the Constitution, all these factors indicate that sooner or later, it will disappear and finally prove the neorealist predictions. Even the existence of the Article 9 though, is not a crucial flaw for the neorealist understanding, as the Constitution has been misinterpreted for a long time now, in order to serve American pressure for collective defense.

[90] However, this plan had been discussed since 2002/2003

[91] See Yomiuri online, http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/feature/20080116-907457/news/20090403-OYT1T00006.htm

Conclusion – Japan at the crossroads?

When analyzing Japan's present (and future) international relations, we can observe two fairly visible facts: 1, the international system has undeniably changed and 2, Japan has been reacting to this change. As this thesis argues though, the a priori assumptions about these changes differ significantly from one theory to another. For the concluding remarks, let's sum up these two major assumptions and describe the world (Japan and East Asian region) through the differences in this theoretical outlook.

Institutionalists are basically optimistic about Japan's position and its future. According to this paradigm, toward the end of twentieth century, the stability and effectiveness of the international order has been considerably enhanced by the deepening of a shared interest among East Asian nations, through the market mechanism; that in turn has prompted robust international economic interaction and widespread support for human rights and democratic forms of government. They see practically all significant countries in the region undergoing a radical transformation, today attaching the highest national priority to "economic development through the market mechanism and dynamic participation in the game of globalism" (Kawashima 2003, 148). In other words, the post-war international system has become more civilized, stable, and effective because of the sharing of interests and values amongst nations; and principally negating the neorealist-emphasized threats and security concerns emerged with the end of the cold war.

In this system, the basic orientation of Japan's international relations should be fairly obvious. Since no country in the present international system can ensure its own security, neither Japan should push for it. On the other hand, Japan must be an open and significant player in promoting multilateral policies with as many states as possible. This construction of the regional and international system will deepen and widen the sharing of interests and common values necessary for good relations among nations. In closer look, this construction of "common" international system should be based on the role of U.S.-Japan alliance; Japan's participation and promotion of international organizations such as the United Nations or ARF (like pursuing for the seat in Security Council); work with like-minded countries to seek a peaceful resolution of regional crises and continue to provide substantial amounts of assistance in order to alleviate poverty, and thus prevent the creation of Japan-unfriendly environment in the world.

If institutionalists are optimistic about the change the international system has undergone, neorealists are horrified. They see the post-Cold War era as deeply frustrating for Japan. The Gulf War was a diplomatic disaster and a national humiliation. The bubble economy was a disaster for Japan's economic model and Japan's image within the region. By the middle of the decade, collisions with China about the nuclear testing, defense guidelines, Taiwan, territorial disputes and historical aspects shook Japanese confidence about strategic convergence within the region. Furthermore, North Korean nuclear weapons and missile tests further eroded Japanese complacency about regional threats to national security. Strategic dependence on the United States only increased, yet Washington's attention to Japan waned (Green 2003, 270). Even institutionalists-promoted international organizations (APEC, ARF or UN) proved disappointing and elusive. In short, the end of the Cold War brought a very dangerous environment, forcing Japan to adopt firm and pragmatic approaches; step up in security realm and not rely only on institutional, normative framework.

The structure of this new and dangerous system has formed present Japan's position and its foreign relations. Japan has grown more acutely sensitive to power balances in the region and particularly vis-à-vis China. Also, where Japan's approach to international relations had been driven by self-interest in the past (the Yoshida doctrine and economy-first policies), the new structure and Japan's relative economic decline forced it to become more conscious about the development in the region and discard the passive approach Japan had been advocating through the Cold War. This emerging of a "proactive" foreign policy stance will, according to neorealist predictions, continue even in the future. With Japan's decline in willingness to distribute ODA (because of its relative economic decline), the base pillars of "checkbook diplomacy" are weakening and forcing Japan to develop more effective diplomatic practices. At the same time, the consensus on becoming a "normal nation" in security field is stably building up, fuelled by regional problems and the change in American approach towards the security alliance.

The fact that both of these theories (and most authors as well as Japanese politicians) have agreed on is that Japan is changing (and thus proving the first hypothesis). Whether the reasons for the change are more institutional or more realistic and even though there has not been a clearly articulated official strategic vision for Japan's further role in international

system[92]; Japan is standing at the crossroad. To predict, which way shall Japan take, the theoretical understanding of Japan's international relations is completely necessary.

Analyzing the most important factors in Japan's modern foreign policy, this thesis has come to a conclusion, that the neorealist approach provides significantly better explanatory power. It is obvious that main assumptions of neorealist paradigm go to the actual truth of the subject matter, rather than towards normative wishes the liberal theories sometimes provide us. The present international system in the region definitely cannot be seen as "civilized, stable and effective", but rather as an "environment of threats", because of which Japan is forced to "rethink its priorities" (see the Koizumi memorandum).

The structural point then can be seen as the major motive for the change that has been happening in Japan's foreign policy. The end of the Cold War has brought many new challenges towards Japan's international relations and it is very hard to believe that these challenges are presently leading towards a safer international community with interconnected interests, as institutionalists tell us. Rather, the analysis of the main aspects of Japan's foreign policy indicates that with the possible withering of Japan-U.S. alliance, Japan is constantly pushed into accepting a more significant, proactive role within the region. Japan's acceptance of the importance of North Korean threat directly to its own, domestic security or emerging insecurity connected to the growing Chinese military budget are products of the uncertainty, which came with the structural change.

The systemic pressure is so strong, that even the post-war pacifism is slowly disappearing. The Yoshida doctrine promoted economic cooperation, "checkbook diplomacy" and low profile policies. In accordance to neorealist predictions though, this strong incentive in Japan's pre-1990 foreign policy has been slowly replaced with more realistic, open and active policies. Japan no longer rests only on its economic interests, on the other hand, during the last twenty years, Japan has significantly expanded its role within the security realm. This fact is visible in every field of Japan's foreign policy, not only Japan-U.S. or Japan-China relations. The multilateral aspect of Japan's post-Cold War policy can be reliably explained through the optics of balance-of-power policy for balancing emerging superpower, China. All of these aspects of Japan's insecurity within the new international system are

[92] Prime Minister Koizumi has articulated a foreign policy vision, in his Basic Strategy for Japan's Foreign Policy in the 21st century. However, this vision has faded with last year's DPJ's triumph over the diet. Present Prime Minister Hatoyama and thus present Japan is, again, described as "lacking leadership and strategic vision." See Sahashi (2010)

reflected in the constitutional debate; the emerging consensus in this matter and the attempts to bend, alter or even change the constitution prove, that the situation is unbearable and the change inevitable.

These factors of Japan's international relations indicate that the hypotheses then can be seen as fulfilled. Japan's attitude has clearly started favoring more mature, confident actions, which might lead to Japan emerging as a major player within the world politics. This development has all along been predicted by neorealist paradigm. There might be little problems with the operationalization of the second hypothesis (neorealism explaining the change), as when dealing with theories, there are no "social rules" or "truth" to compare the approach to. There is however, explanatory power for motives of the state's behavior and the predictor power the theory provides. In these fields, neorealism has shown significantly better understanding of Japan's post-war development and Japan's present diplomacy and thus proved that even though its explanatory potential is being challenged by a range of other contending theories; it still functions as a holistic approach with considerable explanatory potential.

Resources[93]

Primary sources:

- *Basic Strategy for Japan's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: New Era, New Vision, New Diplomacy*; Task Force for Foreign Relations for the Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro; November 28, 2002. On-line text http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN017527.pdf
- *Defense of Japan 2005*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2005.html
- *Defense of Japan 2006*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2006.html
- *Defense of Japan 2007*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2007.html
- *Defense of Japan 2008*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2008.html
- *Defense of Japan 2009*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/2009.html
- *Diplomatic Bluebook: Annual Report on Japan's Foreign Policy*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/index.html
- *Diplomatic Bluebook 1992, Chapter 2: Japan's Role in International Community,* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1992/1992-2-1.htm
- Fackler, Martin (2009): *With Bold Stand, Japan Opposition Wins a Landslide*, New York Times, August 30, 2009. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/31/world/asia/31japan.html?_r=1
- *Highlights for the Budget in FY 2010*, Budget Bureau, Ministry of Finance, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mof.go.jp/english/budget/e20091225a.pdf
- *Japan-ASEAN Relations,* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/asean/

[93] With translations from Japanese by the author

- *Japan-China Relations*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/China/index.html
- *Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security – Alliance for the 21st Century – 17 April, 1996,* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/security.html
- *Japan's Role in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security,* Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan pamphlet, 2004, On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/role/pamph0408.pdf
- *Japanese Constitution,* On-line text http://www.constitution.org/cons/japan.txt
- *Joint Communique of the Government of Japan and the Government of the People's Republic of China*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/joint72.html
- *Joint Statement, U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee, Washington D.C., December 16, 2002.* Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/joint0212.html
- *Kenpo kaisei sansei 51.6%, futatabi tasu shimeru*; Seron Chosa, Yomiuri Shimbun, April 3, 2009 ("The agreement with constitutional change is 51.6%, again a great number"). On-line text http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/feature/20080116-907457/news/20090403-OYT1T00006.htm
- *Koizumi's Constitution quote stirs criticism of manipulation,* Kyodo News International via The Free Library, December 10, 2003, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.thefreelibrary.com/CORRECTED:+Koizumi%27s+Constitution+quote+stirs+criticism+of...-a0111295607
- *LDP's platform to call for a new Constitution*, Kyodo News, May 24, 2007. On-line text http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20070524a3.html
- Leithead, Alastaire (2009): *'Major win' for Japan opposition,* BBC, August 30, 2009. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8229368.stm

- *National Defense Program Outline in and after FY 1996*, Section III. III. *Security of Japan and Roles of Defense Capabilities*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/POLICY/security/defense96/capability.html
- *New Constitution Needed Soon: Abe*, Agencies, Tokyo in Taipei Times, September 30, 2006, p. 4, On-line text http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2006/09/30/2003329821
- Ozawa, Ichiro (2010): *Taikakushiji 37%（Sanin minshu kahansu）hantai 55%, Seron Chosa* ("Cabinet support rate 37%, as opposed to disapproval rate of 55%") Asahi Shimbun poll, February 22, 2010: http://www.asahi.com/politics/update/0222/TKY201002210317.html
- *Period of President Fukuda's Leadership*, Liberal Democratic Party of Japan, History. On-line text http://www.jimin.jp/jimin/english/history/chap8.html
- Perry, William J. (1999): *Review of United States Policy Toward North Korea: Findings and Recommendations*. Unclassified report by William J. Perry, Coordinator and Special Advisor to the President and the Secretary of State. Washington D.C., October 12, 1999. On-line text http://www.state.gov/www/regions/eap/991012_northkorea_rpt.html
- *Press Conference by the Press Secretary 1 September, 1998*; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/1998/9/901.html#3
- Talmadge, Eric (2009): *Japan Election Results: Opposition Democrats Win Huge Victory*, The Huffington Post, August 30, 2009. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/08/30/japan-election-results-op_n_272149.html
- *Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and the People's Republic of China,* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/treaty78.html
- *The Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/guideline2.html
- *The Japanese Budget in Brief, 1999*. Ministry of Finance, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mof.go.jp/english/budget/budget_b.htm

- Takahasi, Junko (2003): *Koizumi tells LDP to make blueprints for changes to Constitution by 2005*; The Japan Times, August 23, 2003. On-line text http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20030826a3.html
- *The U.S.-Japan Security Arrangements (including legislation related to Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation)* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/arrange.html
- *U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation*, Japan Ministry of Defense, Tokyo. On-line text http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_policy/dp04.html
- *Wagagaikou no kinkyou 1957* ("Present diplomacy"), Diplomatic Bluebook, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, on-line text http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/bluebook/1957/s32-contents.htm
- Yamamoto, Y. (2004): *Koizumi: Pacifist Constitution no hindrance to his bid for UNSC permanent seat*; Tokyo Free Press, September 25, 2004, On-line text http://www.tokyofreepress.com/article.php?story=20040925175921686

Books

- Baldwin, David (et al.) (1993): *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, Columbia University Press, New York
- Berger, Thomas U.; Mochizuki, Mike M.; Tsuchiyama, Jitsuo (2007): *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State.* Lynne Reinner publishers, London: Boulder
- Booth, Ken, Smith, Steve, Zalewski, Marysia (eds.) (1996), *International Relations Theory: Positivism & Beyond*, CUP, Cambridge
- Brown, Chris (1997): *Understanding International Relations*, Palgrave, London
- Burchill, Scott, Linklater, Andrew (2001): *Theories of International Relations*, 2. ed., Palgrave, London
- Green, Michael J. (2003): *Japan's Reluctant Realism*, Palgrave, Macmillan
- Griffiths, Martin (et al.) (2007): *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: an Introduction*, New York, London: Routledge

- Guzzini, Stefano (1998): *Realismus v Mezinárodních Vztazích a Mezinárodní Politické Ekonomii*, Brno: Barrister and Principal
- Hatakeyama, Kyoko (2005): *Japan's Changed Perceptions Towards Security Issues*, CJES Research Papers, No. 2005-3, Centre for Japanese Economic Studies, Macquarie University
- Hollis, Martin, Smith, Steve (1990): *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. London: Oxford University press
- Hook, Glenn D.; Gibson, Julie; Hughes, Christopher W.; Dobson, Hugo (2001): *Japan's International Relations. Politics, Economics and Security.* London and New York: Routledge
- Ikenberry, John G.; Mastanduno, Michael (et al.) (2003): *International Relations Theory and the Asia-Pacific*. New York: Columbia University press
- Ikenberry, John G.; Inoguchi, Takashi (2006): *Uses of Institutions : The U. S. , Japan, and Governance in East Asia*, Palgrave, McMillan
- Kawashima, Yutaka (2003): *Japanese Foreign Policy at the Crossroads: Challenges and Options for the Twenty-First Century.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press
- Keohane, Robert O. (1984): *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University press
- Keohane, Robert O. (1989): *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Westview press
- Keohane, Robert O.; Nye, Joseph S. (2001): *Power and Interdependence*, third edition, New York: Longman
- Koh, Byung Chul (1989): *Japan's Administrative Elite*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Machiavelli, Nicolo (first published 1515): *The Prince*, 130 pages, on-line version http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince.pdf
- Makin, John H.; Hellmann, Donald C. (1989): *Sharing World Leadership? A New Era for America & Japan*. Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute
- Morgenthau, Hans (1948): *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* New York NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Maruyama Masuo (1969): *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, London: Oxford University Press
- Nester, William (1990): The *Foundation of Japanese Power: Continuities, Changes, Challenges*, New York: M.E. Sharpe
- Plechanovová, Běla (2003): *Úvod do Mezinárodních Vztahů*, Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku
- Pyle, Kenneth J. (2007): *Japan Rising: the Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose*. A century foundation books, New York: PublicAffairs
- Rosecrance, Richard (1993): *The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World*, New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Samuels, Richard J. (2007): *Securing Japan. Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University press
- Smith, Steve, Booth, Ken (2001): *Současné Teorie Mezinárodních Vztahů*, Barrister and Principal, Brno
- Sorensen, Georg (2005): *Stát a Mezinárodní Vztahy*, Praha: Portál
- Spykman, Nicholas, J. (1942): *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company
- Stockwin, J.A.A. (2003): *Dictionary of Modern Politics of Japan*, London: RoutledgeCurzon
- Thucydides: *The history of the Peloponnesian War*, written 431 before Christian era; on-line text http://classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.html
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979): *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw-Hill, New York
- Wan, Ming (2001): *Japan between Asia and the West: Economic Power and Strategic Balance*. New York: An East Gate Book

Articles, Journals

- Akutsu, Hiroyasu (2000): *Japan's Strategic Interest in the Korean Peninsula Energy Development (KEDO): a "Camouflaged Alliance" and its Double-Sided Effects on Regional Security*, LNCV – Korean Peninsula: Enhancing Stability and International

Dialogue, 1-2 June 2000, Rome. On-line text http://lxmi.mi.infn.it/~landnet/corea/proc/010.pdf

- Arase, David (2007): *Japan, the Active State? Security Policy after 9/11*. Asian Survey, Vol. 47, Issue 4, pp. 560-583
- Armitage, Richard L. et al. (2000): *The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership*; the Institute of National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, October 2000; on-line text http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/sr_01/sr_japan.htm
- Bartlett, Robert C. (1994): *The Realism of Classical Political Science*; American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 38, No. 2 (May, 1994), pp. 381-402, Published by Midwest Political Science Association
- Bowen, Roger, W. (1992): *Japan's foreign policy*, In. PS: Political Science and Politics, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Mar., 1992), pp. 57-73
- Bowles, Paul (2002): *Asia's Post-Crisis Regionalism: Bringing the State Back in, Keeping the (United) States Out*, Review of International Political Economy, Vol. 9, No. 2 (May, 2002), pp. 230-256
- Brands Jr., H.W. (1986): *The United States and the reemergence of independent Japan* In. Pacific Affairs, Vol. 59, No. 3 (Autumn 1986), pp. 387-401
- Calder, Kent. E. (1989): *Elites in an Equalizing Role: Ex-Bureaucrats as Coordinators and Intermediaries in the Japanese Government-Business Relationship*. Comparative Politics, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Jul., 1989), pp. 379-403
- Cha, Victor D. (2000): *Abandonment, Entrapment and Neoclassical Realism in Asia: The United States, Japan and Korea*, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Jun. 2000), pp. 261-291
- Choi, Woondo (2003): *Persistence and change in Japan-China relationship*. In Journal of International and Area Studies*;* Jun 2003; 10, 1; ABI/INFORM Global. pp. 75-92
- Christensen, Raymond V. (1994): *Electoral Reform in Japan: How It was Enacted and Changes It May Bring*. Asian Survey, Vol. 34, No. 9 (July 1994), pp. 589-605
- Clemons, Steven C. (2001): *The Armitage Report: Reading Between the Lines*; JPRI Occasional Paper No. 20 (February 2001), On-line text http://www.jpri.org/publications/occasionalpapers/op20.html

- Deng, Yong (1997): *Chinese Relations with Japan: Implications for Asia-Pacific Regionalism*. In. Pacific Affairs, Vol. 70, No. 3 (Autumn, 1997), pp. 373-391
- Dieter, Heribert, Higgot, Richard (2003): *Exploring Alternative Theories of Economic Regionalism: From Trade to Finance in Asian Co-operation?* In. Review of International Political Economy, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Aug. 2003), pp. 430-454
- Doyon, Paul (2001*): A Review of Higher Education Reform in Modern Japan* In. Higher Education, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Jun., 2001), pp. 443-470
- Endo, Tetsuya (2007): *How Realistic Is a Nuclear-Armed Japan?* Policy Forum Online 07-063A: August 23rd, 2007, on-line text http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/07063Endo.html#sect2
- Fouse, David (2004): *Japan's Post-Cold War North Korea Policy: Hedging Towards Autonomy*? Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies, February 2004, pp. 1-14
- Garofano, John (2002): *Power, Institutions and the ASEAN Regional Forum: A Security Community for Asia?* Asian Survey, Vol. 42, No. 3 (May.-Jun. 2002), pp. 502-521
- Gilpin, Robert. G. (1984): *The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism*; International Organization, Vol. 38, No. 2 (Spring 1984), pp. 287-304
- Govella, Kristi; Vogel, Steven (2008): *Japan in 2007. A Divided Government*. Asian Survey*,* Vol. 48, Issue 1, pp. 97–106
- Grieco, Joseph M. (1988): *Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: A realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism*; In. International organizations, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Summer 1988), pp. 485-507
- Hagstrom, Linus (2005): *Relational power for foreign policy analysis: Issues in Japan's China policy*; in. European journal for international relations, September 2005, pp. 395-431
- Haitani, Kanji (1990): *The Paradox of Japan's Groupism: Threat to Future Competitiveness?* Asian Survey, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Mar., 1990), pp. 237-250
- Heginbotham, Eric; Samuels, Richard J. (1998): *Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy*. International Security, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Spring, 1998), pp. 171-203
- Hiraishi, Nao'aki (2003): *The Formation of Maruyama Masuo's Image of Japanese Intellectual History during the War Period*, In. Social Science Japan Journal, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 241-254

- Hirata, Keiko (2008): *Who Shapes the National Security Debate? Divergent Interpretations of Japan's Security Role*, Asian Affairs: Heldref Publications, pp. 123-151
- Horiuchi, Yusaku; Saito, Jun (2004): *Reapportionment and Redistribution: Consequences of Electoral Reform in Japan*. In. American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Oct., 2003), pp. 669-682
- Hughes, Christopher, W. (2009): *"Super-sizing" the DPRK Threat: Japan's Evolving Military Posture and North Korea*. Asian Survey, Vol. 49, Issue 2, pp. 291-311
- Jervis, Robert (1999): *Realism, neoliberalism and cooperation: Understanding the debate* In. International security, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Summer, 1999), pp. 42-63
- Johnson, Chalmers (1975): *Japan: Who Governs? An Essay on Official Bureaucracy*, Journal of Japanese studies, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Autumn, 1975), pp. 1-28
- Keohane, Robert, O. (1988): *International Institutions: Two Approaches* in. International studies quarterly, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Dec. 1988) pp. 377-396
- Kiefer, Christie, W. (1970): *The Psychological Interdependence of Family, School and Bureaucracy in Japan*, American Anthropologist, New series, Vol. 72, No. 1 (Feb., 1970), pp. 66-75
- Krauss, Ellis S.; Pekkanen, Robert (2004): *Explaining Party Adaptation to Electoral Reform: The Discreet Charm of the LDP?* Journal of Japanese studies, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Winter, 2004), pp. 1-34
- Langdon, Frank, C. (1961): *Organized Interests in Japan and Their Influence on Political Parties*. Pacific Affairs, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Autumn, 1961), pp. 271-278
- Langdon, Frank (1985): *Security Debate in Japan*. Pacific Affairs, Vol. 58, No. 3 (Autumn, 1985), pp. 397-410
- Leavitt, Sandra L. (2005): *The Lack of Security Cooperation between South East Asia and Japan: Yen Yes, Pax Nippon No*. Asian Survey, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Mar. – Apr. 2005), pp. 216-240
- Mayer, Jeremy D. (1996): *International Relations Theory and Japanese Pacifism: Why Didn't Tokyo Go Ballistic over Korean Nukes?* In. Journal of northeast Asian studies, (Summer 1996), pp. 50-62

- Mearsheimer, John J. (1994-1995): *The false promise of international institutions; In.* International security, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994-1995), pp. 5-49
- Moravcsik, Andrew (1997): *Taking preferences seriously: A liberal theory of International politics* In. International organizations, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Autumn 1997), pp 513-553
- Mueller, John (1988): *The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons: Stability in the Postwar World*. International Security, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 55-79
- Park, Cheol Hee (2001): *Factional Dynamics in Japan's LDP since Political Reform: Continuity and Change*. Asian Survey, Vol. 41, No. 3 (May - Jun., 2001), pp. 428-461s
- Patterson, Denis; Maeda, Ko (2007): *Prime Ministerial Popularity and the Changing Electoral Fortunes of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party*. Asian Survey, Vol. 47, Issue 3, pp. 415–433
- Purrington, Courtney (1992): *Tokyo's policy responses during the Gulf War and the impact of the "Iraqi shock" on Japan*. In. Pacific affairs, Vol. 65, No. 2 (Summer, 1992), pp.161-181
- Rahat, Gideon (2004): *The Study of the Politics of Electoral Reform in the 1990s: Theoretical and Methodological Lessons*. In. Comparative Politics, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Jul., 2004), pp. 461-479
- Rapkin, Daniel P. (1990): *The Limits of Hegemony*, In. Daniel P. Rapkin (et al.) *World Leadership and Hegemony*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, pp.191-212
- Reed, Steven R.; Scheiner, Ethan (2003): *Electoral Incentives and Policy Preferences: Mixed Motives behind Party Defections in Japan*. In. British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 469-490
- Rix, Alan (1989-1990): *Japan's Foreign Aid Policy: A Capacity for Leadership?* Pacific Affairs, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Winter, 1989-1990), pp. 461-475
- Sahashi, Ryo (2010): *New Thinking about Foreign Policy Strategy in Japan*; East Asian Forum, January 27th, 2010. On-line text http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/01/27/new-thinking-about-foreign-policy-strategy-in-japan/
- Seth, S. P. (1994): *Japan's Constitutional Debate*, In. Economic and Political Weekly, pp. 904

- Schwarz, Briah (2005): *Japan moves to revise "peace constitution"*; American Thinker, October 30, 2005. On-line text http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2005/10/japan_moves_to_revise_peace_co.html
- Schweller, Randall, L.; Priess, David (1997): *A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutional Debate*. In. Mershon international studies review, Vol. 41, No. 1 (May, 1997) pp. 1-32
- Sudo, Sueo (1988): *Japan-ASEAN Relations: New Dimensions in Japanese Foreign Policy*, Asian Survey, Vol. 28, No. 5 (May, 1988), pp. 509-525
- Sullivan, Michael, P. (2005): '*That dog won't hunt': the cottage industry of realist criticism, or must you play that Waltz again*? Journal of International Relations and Development, Volume 8, number 4, 2005
- Wakamiya, Yoshibumi (2003): *The End of Kamikaze Pacifism? Terror and Japan's Peace Constitution*, Project Syndicate, On-line text http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/wakamiya2/English
- Waltz, Kenneth (1990*): Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory*. In. Journal of international affairs, Vol. 44, Issue 1 (Spring/Summer 1990), pp. 21-37
- Waltz, Kenneth (1993): *The Emerging Structure of International Politics,* International Security*,* vol. 18, no. 2 (fall 1993), pp. 44-79
- Weaver, Ole, *The rise and fall of the inter-paradigm debate*, in Smith, Booth, Zalewski (1996), p.149-185
- Wendt, Alexander E. (1987): *The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory*, International Organizations, Volume 41, Issue 3 (Summer 1987), pp. 335-370
- Yoda, Tatsuro (2006): *Japan's Host Nation Support Program for the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance: Past and Prospects*. Asian Survey, Vol. 46, No. 6 (Nov. - Dec., 2006)
- Yuzawa, T. (2005): *Japan's Changing Conception of* the *ASEAN Regional Forum: from an Optimistic Liberal to a Pessimistic Realist Perspective*, The Pacific Review, Vol.18, No. 4, pp. 462 – 499.

Internet websites:

- *Democratic Party of Japan*
  http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/
- *Kantei – Prime Minister of Japan and his Cabinet*
  http://www.kantei.go.jp/
- *Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan* (National Diet Library)
  http://www.ndl.go.jp/en/data/diet.html
- *Liberal Democratic Party of Japan*
  http://www.jimin.jp/jimin/english/
- *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*
  http://www.mofa.go.jp/index.html
- *Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Official Development Organization*
  http://www.mofa.go.jp/POLICY/oda/index.html
- *Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Japanese Foreign Policy*
  http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/index.html
- *Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry*
  http://www.meti.go.jp/english/
- *Ministry of Defense*
  http://www.mod.go.jp/
- *Ministry of Finance*
  http://www.mof.go.jp/english/

Newspapers:

- *Asahi shimbun*
  http://www.asahi.com/
- *BBC News*
  http://news.bbc.co.uk/
- *The Huffington Post*
  http://www.huffingtonpost.com/

- *Japan times*
  http://www.japantimes.co.jp/
- *Mainichi Shimbun*
  http://www.mainichi.jp/
- *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*
  http://www.asahi.com/
- *The New York Times*
  www.nytimes.com/
- *Sankei Shimbun*
  http://sankei.jp.msn.com/
- *The Washington Post*
  http://www.washingtonpost.com/
- *Yomiuri Shimbun*
  http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/

Suffixes:

1, List of after-war Prime Ministers

- Shidehara Kijuro (1945-1946)
- Yoshida Shigeru (1946-1947, 1948-1954)
- Katayama Tetsu (1947-1948)
- Ashida Hitoshi (1948)
- Hatoyama Ichiro (1954-1956)
- Ishibashi Tanzan (1956-1957)
- Kishi Nobusuke (1957-1960)
- Ikeda Hayato (1960-1964)
- Sato Eisaku (1964-1972)

- Tanaka Kakuei (1972-1974)
- Miki Takeo (1974-1976)
- Fukuda Takeo (1976-1978)
- Ohira Masayoshi (1978-1980)
- Suzuki Zenko (1980-1982)
- Nakasone Yasuhiro (1982-1987)
- Takeshita Noboru (1987-1989)
- Uno Sosuke (1987-1989)
- Kaifu Toshiki (1989 - 1991)
- Miyazawa Kiichi (1991-1993)
- Hosokawa Morihiro (1993-1994)
- Hata Tsutomu (1994-1994)
- Murayama Tomiichi (1994-1996)
- Hashimoto Ryutaro (1996-1998)
- Obuchi Keizo (1998-2000)
- Mori Yoshiro (2000-2001)
- Koizumi Junichiro (2001-2006)
- Abe Shinzo (2006-2007)
- Fukuda Yasuo (2007-2008)
- Aso Taro (2008-2009)
- Hatoyama Yukio (2009-present)

Note: except for Hosokawa Morihiro (New Japan), Hata Tsutomu (Japan Renewal), Murayama Tomiichi (Social Democratic Party of Japan) and Hatoyama Yukio (Democratic Party of Japan), all of these Prime Ministers come from the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan

2, List of Political Parties in Japan

Main parties:

- Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) *Jiyū Minshu-tō*, or *Jimin-tō* 自民党 (conservative, 1955-)

- Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) *Minshutō* (social liberal 1998-)民主党
- New Komeito - *Komeitō* (conservative, theocratic Buddhist, 1998-)公明党
- Japanese Communist Party (JCP) *Nihon Kyōsan-tō* (communist, 1922-)日本共産党
- Social Democratic Party (Japan) (SDP) *Shakai Minshutō*, or *Shamin-tō* (socialist, 1996-) 社民党
- Liberal League *Jiyu Rengo* (liberal, 1994-)
- People's New Party (PNP) *Kokumin Shintō* (conservative, 2005-)
- New Party Nippon (NPN) *Shintō Nippon* (2005-)
- New Party Daichi (NPD) *Shintō Daichi* (2005-)

Current political parties that used to be in the Diet but aren't currently represented:

- Dainiin Club *Dainiin Kurabu* (centrist, 1983-)
- New Socialist Party *Shin Shakai To* (socialist, 1996-)
- Sports and Peace Party *Supotsu Heiwa To* (centrist, 1989-)
- *Takeru* (centrist, 2001-)
- Rainbow and Greens *Niji to Midori* (green)
- *Ishin Seito Shimpu* (far right, 1995-)
- Women's Party (Japan) *Josei To* (Feminist, 1993-)
- Internet Breakthrough Party of Japan (Led by Iron Chef Comentator and Judge and former LDP member Shinichiro Kurimoto)

Some of the main regional parties represented in regional assemblies:

- Kanagawa Network Movement *Kanagawa Nettowaku Undo* (Yokohama, socialist)
- Seikatsusha Network *Seikatsusha Nettowaku* (Tokyo, socialist)
- Okinawa Social Mass Party *Okinawa Shakai Taishu To* (Okinawa, socialist)
- Green Niigata, *Midori Niigata* (Niigata, communist)
    - formerly Niigata New Party for People, *Shimin Shin-to Niigata* (Niigata, communist)
- Association of Independents *Mushozoku no Kai* (centrist, 1999-2004)
    - formerly House of Representatives Club *Sangiin Kurabu* (centrist, 1998-1999)
- New Conservative Party, (conservative, 2002-2003)

    - formerly Conservative Party of Japan (2000), (conservative, 2000-2002)
- Liberal Party (1998), (liberal, 1998-2003)
- Democratic Party of Japan (1996), (liberal, 1996-1998)
- Good Governance Party, (liberal, 1998)
- New Fraternity Party, (liberal reformist, 1998)
- Sun Party, (liberal reformist, 1996-1998)
- Democratic Reform Party (liberal reformist, 1993-1998)
- Midori no Kaigi *Environmental Green Political Assembly* (ecologist conservative reformist, 2002-2004)
    - formerly The Sakigake Party, (conservative reformist-ecologist, 1998-2002)
    - formerly New Party Sakigake, (conservative reformist-ecologist, 1993-1998)
- New Peace Party, (conservative, 1997-1998)
- Japan New Party, (liberal, 1993-1996)
- Japan Renewal Party, (liberal, 1993-1994)
- New Frontier Party, (socialist/liberal, 1994-1997)
- Democratic Socialist Party (Japan), (social-democratic, 1960-1994 - broke off from JSP)
- Democratic Party of Japan, Occupation, (agrarian conservative, 1945-1955)
- Liberal Party of Japan, Occupation, (conservative, 1945-1955)
- Great Achievement Association, (conservative nationalist, 1889-1909)
    - formerly Conservative Party of Japan (1880)
- Constitutional Liberal Party (Japan), (liberal, 1882-1931)
- Constitutional Progressive Party, (moderate liberal, 1882-1934)
- Liberal Party of Japan (1881), (liberal, 1881)
    - formerly Aikokusha, (liberal, 1872-1881)
- Liberalism in Japan

Source: List of political parties in Japan.

http://www.search.com/reference/List_of_political_parties_in_Japan