

《 論 說 》

Strategies vs. Norms: An Assessment of Theories to Explain Japan's Security Policy

H. Steven Green

Abstract

This paper is the first of two essays that will examine Japan's Security Policy in the early 21st Century. In this first essay I review the arguments from two theories of international relations – realism and constructivism - that try to explain Japan's security policy. Realists argue that Japan's security policy over the past 60 years is consistent with conventional strategies of defensive realism and buck-passing. Constructivists assert that Japan's foreign policy reflects unique norms of anti-militarism in society and the body politic. In this essay I argue that the conventional claim by the realists is the better of the two explanations for Japan's security policy over the past 60 years. In Part 2 of this project, I will propose that what the constructivists wrongly claim is a norm is better understood as a useful ideology and that this fact actually strengthens the realist explanation for Japan.

The topic of both of these essays is not normative but empirical. My aim is not to argue what Japan's security policy should be, but to analyze what it is and has been on the basis of modern international relations theory.

Introduction

Japan's constitution renounces war as the nation's right and pledges never to maintain land, sea and air forces. In fact, since the end of the United States occupation Japan's governments have seemed to prefer a global *under-extension* of the nation's power. The state with the third-largest economy of the world contributes neither to peaceful

nor military resolutions of conflict in proportion to its wealth or size. By the 1980s Japan “stood well ahead of any single European country in economic size,” notes Edward Lincoln, yet it “has not changed or even significantly influenced world institutions and systems...The Japanese people want peace, exports and investment abroad,” but tend to see involvement in foreign affairs issues such as human rights or conflict in the Middle East as “none of their business.”⁽¹⁾

However, since the 1991 Gulf War to liberate Kuwait, the government of Japan has dispatched military personnel and matériel to United Nations peacekeeping operations (UN PKOs) and humanitarian relief operations in eight nations on three continents⁽²⁾. Japan joined South Korea and Australia as the only Pacific regional states to send military personnel to support the US in battle theaters in both Afghanistan and Iraq and, along with the US and India, played a leading role in rescue and relief for victims of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. Since the 1980s prime ministers have quietly but firmly pressed Japan's case for a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. The title of a seven-page brochure published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for distribution to Japanese embassies and consulates worldwide in March 2005 reads “Reform of the UN Security Council.” Pages 4 through 8 present five reasons “Why Japan should become a permanent member,” which is the brochure's subtitle and probably indicates the intended aim of the proposed reform.⁽³⁾ In September 2004, Defense Agency chief, Yoshinori Ono, expressed his “hope that public opinion will mature”⁽⁴⁾ to permit a greater role for Japan in global security.

(1) Edward Lincoln, “Japan: Using Power Narrowly,” *Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2003-04, pp.111, 124

(2) JSDF UN PKO humanitarian relief operations have been dispatched in accordance to the International Peace Cooperation Law of June 1992 to: Cambodia (1992-93); Mozambique (1992-1995); Rwanda (1994); Golan Heights (1996-); Afghanistan (2001); East Timor (2002-04); Brindisi (2003) and Jordan (2003). (Compiled from a map produced in Christopher Hughes, *Adelphi Paper 368-9: Japan's Re-emergence as a 'Normal' Military Power* (New York, NY: Oxford UP, Inc. for the International Institute of Strategic Studie, 2004) p.12

(3) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Reform of the UN Security Council: Why Japan should become a permanent member” (Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, March 2005)

Whether or not public opinion needs to “mature” probably depends on one’s particular view of Japan’s role in the world and of the nature and role of democratic publics in general. However, for the past 15 years the Japanese government has been increasing its involvement in the kinds of operations for which Edward Lincoln claims Japanese people regard as someone else’s problem. In order for Japan to play a larger role in international security, however, advocates for that role must work against nearly three generations of efforts by previous politicians and officials to cultivate the image of Japan as an anti-militarist state whose contributions to the international system must exclude force or even a military.

Constructivists argue antimilitaristic norms have become deeply embedded in Japanese society. In the first section below I review the case for the idea that Japan’s pacifist sentiment is an actual norm that influences security policy. In the second section I contrast arguments about Japanese norms with the facts of Japan’s powerful Self-Defense Forces to illustrate that despite its antimilitarist rhetoric, Japan has developed one of the most formidable militaries in the world and I will review how realist scholars have identified Japan’s military build-up as consistent with the behavior of a defensive realist, as well as of a buck-passer. Finally, in section three I assess both explanations and show why the case for Japan as a defensive realist is the better of the two.

1. Japan the Antimilitarist: Constructivist Arguments

In the field of international relations constructivism is a school of thought that believes that the most important facts of relations among states, beginning with any state’s concept of its own security needs, are socially and historically contingent: ideas and ongoing social processes, not unchanging human nature or material circumstances, create the beliefs of politicians and statesmen. In the case of Japan, constructivists consid-

(4) Nao Shimoyachi, “New defense chief sees SDF playing more active role in global security,” *The Japan Times Online*, September 29, 2004
www.japantimes.com/cgi-bin/getarticle.p15?nn20040929f2.html

er Japan's devastating defeat in the Second World War as the formative event in shaping the core beliefs that continue to guide Japan's behavior in international relations.

As is well known, Japan's constitution was written by a team of American officers, scholars and lawyers working under the direction of General Douglas MacArthur. According to constructivists, the idea of Japan as "first and foremost a cultured, peace-loving nation" is rooted in Article 9 of the constitution, which reads:

"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 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 the state will not be recognized."

During the US occupation of 1945-52, General Douglas MacArthur promised Emperor Hirohito, that in a hundred years the whole world would revere Japan for its renunciation of war. Following the end of the US Occupation, Japan pledged to contribute to world peace through a variety of non-military means. Despite it being a product of a foreign occupier, the Japanese have never amended their constitution, which constructivist scholars take as evidence for the existence of powerful societal norms against militarism or the use of force in resolving disputes.

The constructivist school believes that norms directly influence a nation's security policies. Thomas Berger and Peter Katzenstein claim that domestic as well as international experiences of a nation generate societal norms, which in turn determine the permissible list of options from which the state's political decisions may be selected. The presence of a norm that considers certain policies unacceptable, such as the use of force to settle international disputes, may constrain state actors. "Whilst this norm

might not constrain individual policy-makers to the same degree...the acceptance of the norm on the popular level acts as a powerful constraint on the government's use of military force as a legitimate instrument of state policy."⁽⁵⁾

Berger and Katzenstein argue that the experiences of their governments' military aggression leading to crushing defeat imbued in each of the populations of Germany and Japan norms against war, or what the constructivists call a "culture of antimilitarism."⁽⁶⁾ According to Berger, any attempt by the state "to significantly expand... Japanese defense establishments and international roles foundered on the shoals of domestic opposition."⁽⁷⁾ Sun-ki Chai emphasizes the constraining effects of Article 9 on would-be Japanese hawks.⁽⁸⁾ Berger also argues that, unlike citizens in the older democracies of Great Britain and the United States, Japanese (and Germans) are suspicious of their military, even in the sixth decade since the conclusion of the war. Whereas the armies and navies of the US and Britain saved their populations from totalitarianism, the Japanese (and German) military were key actors in their nation's slide into totalitarianism and the subsequent near-total destruction of their homeland.⁽⁹⁾

Furthermore, adds Berger, the United States occupation of Japan instilled anti-militarist norms in an important, albeit unintended manner. While the role of General Douglas MacArthur and his staff in writing the Constitution and making sure that democratic values were disseminated cannot be underestimated, Berger notes that the mere fact that the American victors chose not to annihilate their defeated foes shaped norms

(5) Glenn Hook, Julie Gilson, Christopher W. Hughes, and Hugo Dobson, *Japan's International Relations: Politics, economics and security* (Oxon, UK: Sheffield Centre for Japanese Studies/Routledge Series, 2005) p.74

(6) Thomas U. Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996)

(7) Berger, p.6

(8) Sun-Ki Chai, "Entrenching the Yoshida Defense Doctrine: Three Techniques for Institutionalization," *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Summer 1997), pp. 389-112

(9) Berger, p.32

promoting pacifism as well. Post-war, left-wing idealists urged the role of Japan as a "peace nation" and;

"believed the probability that Japan would be invaded was very low but in the unlikely event of an attack, they advocated reliance on the force of world opinion, as expressed through the United Nations and on passive resistance. In a country that had just experienced one of the most peaceful occupations in world history after waging a merciless war against an enemy it had demonized for more than a decade, these views were more persuasive than they might have been otherwise."⁽¹⁰⁾

This passage suggests that constructivists trace the origins of Japanese norms not only to Article 9 of the Constitution – to what James Orr labels the "prime axiom of [Japanese] pacifist sentiment"⁽¹¹⁾ - and the policies of the Supreme Command of the Allied Powers (SCAP), but also to a sublime cognitive experience based in the non-violence of the Occupation itself.

Saeki Toshirou, the chairman of the editorial board of Japan's second-largest daily national newspaper, the *Asahi Shimbun*, suggests "the Japanese people wholeheartedly welcomed the Constitution because it delivered them from the hardships, sacrifice and oppression they had endured through the long years of military rule."⁽¹²⁾ In the words of a 72-year old owner of a antiques and reproduction shop in Tokyo's Roppongi ward, Japan's constitution is a "unique brand." Maki Takeshi told a reporter that, "Despite its cars, electronics and fashion, Japan has one unique brand that you can find nowhere else in the world: its constitution, and in particular Article 9."⁽¹³⁾ A 2004 recruitment poster commissioned by the JSDF appears to have been designed with this peace

(10) Ibid., 61

(11) James J. Orr, *The Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001) p.2

(12) Saeki Toshirou, "Amendment Is Just a Grand Illusion," *Japan Quarterly*, October-November 2001, pp. 73-74

(13) Angela Jeffs, "'Don of Roppongi' seeks peace in East Asia," *The Japan Times*, April 4, 2007

“brand” in mind. The poster features the 15 teenage members of the all-girl pop-idol singing group Morning Musume in smiles and summer dresses (which are probably not JSDF-issued uniforms) above the proclamation in Japanese that “Doing one’s best feels good” (*Isshou-kenme-te, ii-kanji*). Below this exhortation an English message appears in larger print: “Go! Go! Peace!”⁽¹⁴⁾

If the constructivists’ claims are true, we should expect to find evidence of constraints on the state’s ability to affect an active role in international security. A survey of Japan’s foreign and security policy since the end of the Occupation appears to provide evidence that anti-militaristic norms have prohibited a more active role in international security for Japan.

Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, known as “One Man” (*wan-man*) for his independence and willfulness, oversaw the creation of the predecessors to Japan’s Self-Defense Forces, the National Police Reserve and the National Safety Force (NSF). In 1952 Yoshida initially described the NSF as “not an army” but “a Force [sic] which possesses great strength for the purpose of maintaining peace and order of our country” though he would redefine its purpose as “to defend the peace and independence of the country” when the law for its creation was enacted in 1954.⁽¹⁵⁾ Yoshida’s decision was influenced by a 1951 meeting between John Foster Dulles and the chief justice of the Japanese Supreme Court, which concluded that, “a considerable degree of rearmament was possible within the existing framework of the Constitution.”⁽¹⁶⁾ By 1954 the Self Defense Forces were formed with the blessings of the Justice Ministry, whose legal brief on the matter concluded that “To maintain a level of actual power which does not reach “war potential” and to use this for defense against aggression does not violate the constitution” and that, since the maritime, air and ground branches of the SDF were “not being

(14) “Go! Go! Peace! The SDF wants you,” *The Japan Times*, August 9, 2003

(15) J.W. Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878-1954* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard East Asian Monographs), p.438

(16) *Ibid.* p.439

organized for war purposes it is clear that they are not a military.”⁽¹⁷⁾ Under Yoshida, writes J.W. Dower:

“Article Nine was blown up like a balloon, twisted like a pretzel, kneaded like plasticene. In the end, however, it remained unamended, and its survival was as significant as its mutilation. Even while bending the law to its purposes, the Yoshida group remained sensitive to its ultimate constraints.”⁽¹⁸⁾

Thus, the irony of the formation of what would be called a “military without war potential” is that it actually seems to confirm the constructivist argument for the constraining effects of an anti-militarist norm. Yoshida’s finance minister, Ikeda Hayato made clear to the Americans, in fact, that his government would never support a defense policy that “might infringe on the Japanese Constitution.”⁽¹⁹⁾

During the Cold War, while allied with the United States under the terms of the United States-Japan Security Treaty of 1960, Japan and its “military without war potential” remained on the sidelines in both the Korean and Vietnam wars, allowing the United States to use its Japan bases as staging areas for the conflicts, but not playing any other role.

In the 1960s Prime Minister Sato Eisaku decided to cap spending on defense at 1% of GDP, which remains to this day as an unofficial, but accepted, and expected, benchmark by which to measure JSDF-related spending. Although the Sato administration supported US involvement in the Vietnam War, he never proposed dispatching JSDF forces to that conflict. In December 1967 he introduced The Three Non-Nuclear Principles, which the Diet passed into law in 1971 and for which the Nobel Committee awarded him a Peace Prize in 1974 (shared with Sean McBride). The so-called “three no’s” are non-production, non-possession and non-introduction of nuclear weapons. The last “non” was seen as a constraint on US military arrangements in the Pacific as it

(17) Ibid., 441

(18) Ibid., 439

(19) Ibid., 442

barred nuclear-weapon carrying vessels from Japanese territory.

By the conclusion of the 1980s Japanese officials served as the heads of the World Health Organization (WHO), and the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), which were the highest positions of authority in international organizations ever reached by any Japanese in the post-war era. These positions seem modest considering that the bubble economy of that decade had many contemplating, and some fearing, Japan as a new superpower.⁽²⁰⁾ Even under the leadership of Prime Minister Nakasone, who famously pledged to President Reagan that Japan was an unsinkable aircraft carrier for the United States in its struggle against communism, Japan did not seek a position from which it could directly influence international uses of force.

The first test to Japan's pacifism since the Yoshida era came in the run up to the international effort to liberate Kuwait from Iraq in 1990-91. Facing intense pressure to support a coalition of multinational forces against Saddam Hussein's army, Prime Minister Kaifu Toshiki's government raised taxes to pay for a contribution of \$13 billion, the single largest sum of any state in the coalition, although it was delivered after the war had ended. The government and the Japanese public were shocked when this contribution was dismissed abroad as mere "checkbook diplomacy" as well as when Japan was excluded from a list of governments thanked by the Kuwaiti government in a full-page *New York Times* ad after the coalition had driven out the Iraqis. Eventually, in May of 1991, Japan would dispatch minesweepers to the Persian Gulf, which marked the first time since 1945 that a Japanese military vessel was sent outside of Japanese territory or waters. Lee Kuan Yew, the former prime minister of Singapore, publicly fretted that permitting Japan's defense forces to join an overseas campaign was like "giving liquor chocolates to an alcoholic."⁽²¹⁾ To assuage Asian fears, "Japanese officials practically repeated a mantra that Japan would never again become an independent military

(20) Edward Lincoln, "Japan: Using Power Narrowly," *The Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2003-04, p. 111

(21) Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era, Second Edition* (Washington, DC: The AEI Press, 1996) p.164

power...Japan would 'learn from the lessons of history,' [and would remain a] 'new-style peace-loving and cultural nation'" assured a Ministry of Finance report in 1990.⁽²²⁾

Following the Gulf War crisis, through lengthy parliamentary deliberation, and against a backdrop of public demonstrations against the decisions, in the early-1990s Japan began to deploy its Self-Defense personnel to international peace keeping operations (PKOs), first to Cambodia and then to Mozambique, the Golan Heights, and East Timor. Diet sessions were consumed by debates over whether or not Japanese personnel should be allowed to carry weapons – doing so would violate the Constitution, opponents claimed – and how troops would be allowed to respond if they came under fire. Indicative of the constraints on the use of force even by JSDF personnel faced with defending themselves, are comments by then Post and Telecommunications Minister Koizumi Jun'ichiro to a Cabinet meeting convened after a Japanese member of a UN-led PKO had been fatally shot in Cambodia in May 1993. On the subject of allowing Japanese personnel to use weapons even if only in self-defense, Koizumi reportedly argued, "We should not [make international contributions] to the point where blood starts flowing. If Japan is criticized for that, we should resign ourselves to that criticism."⁽²³⁾

On September 11, 2001, in his role as prime minister, Koizumi was the first foreign leader to telephone President George W. Bush to offer condolences as well as to pledge Japan's support for an American military response. On October 29th the Diet passed an Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law (ATSML) that allowed SDF units to deploy to the Indian Ocean as part of a logistical support network for US and multinational forces. In July 2003 the Diet passed a Law Concerning Special Measures on Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance (LCSMHRA) to dispatch JSDF troops to Iraq to provide logistical support for US and coalition forces on the ground in Iraq. Less than 18 months later, the Koizumi-led government would dispatch 600 Ground Self-Defense Forces to southern Iraq to aid in reconstruction efforts in an area considered secure and

(22) Ibid.

(23) Reiji Yoshida, "Koizumi's credibility placed on the line," *The Japan Times*, December 10, 2003

non-hostile.

Coming as they did in the face of polls that consistently showed 70% of the public disagreed with the US-led effort to attack Iraq, Koizumi's backers considered Koizumi's legislative victories proof of his excellent leadership while his detractors charged he was recklessly violating the Constitution. In any event, as Dower wrote of Yoshida's justification for the creation of the JSDF, the Koizumi government may have twisted the logic of Article 9 "like a pretzel" but the Constitution remains un-amended. A 2007 poll by Japan's largest daily newspaper, the pro-revision *Yomiuri Shimbun* shows that only 35.7% of the public support revising Article 9, even though public approval ratings for both Koizumi and his successor Abe Shinzo, who favors revising the constitution, has been 60% or higher.⁽²⁴⁾ The *Asahi Shimbun's* Saeki Toshirou claims that, "any thought of revision" of Article 9 "would be simply a grand illusion."⁽²⁵⁾ The fact that not a single opinion poll taken since adoption of the Constitution has ever shown a majority of Japanese favor revising Article 9 indicates, he notes, that the idea could not pass the national referendum required for constitutional amendments.

Thus, just over sixty years after the end of a war in which Japanese soldiers nearly conquered most of East and Southeast Asia- and, for as long as it racked up battlefield successes, to the public celebration of their countrymen back home- it seemed that Japan had not only "repented" but found a successful role for itself as, in the words of a former Japanese vice-minister for foreign affairs and ambassador to Israel, a "small, but shining country."⁽²⁶⁾ Liberal democracy has taken root in Japan and it has developed into one of the world's wealthiest nations, without developing a sizeable military or becoming entangled in international conflicts. Not only did Japan offer the world a developmental model to emulate, it appeared to offer a principle of peace worth emulating

(24) "Kenpou-no yakuwari kou-hyouka 15-nenkan [Kaisei] ta-suu," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, April 6, 2007 pp.14-15

(25) Saeki, p.79

(26) Yutaka Kawashima, *Japanese Foreign Policy at the Crossroads: Challenges and Options for the Twenty-First Century* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2003) p.139

as well. In sum, constructivists emphasize that Japan's 60-year long policy of "punching below its weight" as proof that norms have powerful effects upon a nation's security policy.

II. A Pacifist Armed-to-the-Teeth? The Argument of Defensive Realism

The prevalence of antimilitarist norms notwithstanding, Japan has developed the second-most powerful military in East Asia after the United States and is among the top three nations when defense spending is measured.⁽²⁷⁾ Whereas constructivists emphasize constraints on Japan's policy-makers, other scholars have highlighted the specific features of Japan's "military without war potential" as proof that, even before the debates of the 1990s, Japan was behaving in accordance with expectations from one branch of the realist school, defensive realism. Offensive realists hypothesize that the anarchy inherent in the international realm drives great powers to seek regional hegemony.⁽²⁸⁾ Defensive realists argue that states respond to anarchy by strengthening their defense, rather than focusing on offensive capabilities, because expansionism tends to produce counterbalancing coalitions.⁽²⁹⁾

Does Japan behave like an offensive- or defensive realist? An offensive realist would expect Japan either to attempt to build regional hegemony through military conquest or to align with a powerful aggressor to gain its spoils, or "bandwagon."⁽³⁰⁾ Japan attempted to consolidate imperial gains obtained between the end of the 19th Century and the 1930s and made a failed bid for regional hegemony. Now, discounting the presence of

(27) As Jennifer Lind shows, Japan ranks second behind the US if spending is measured at market exchange rates and third behind the US and Russia if measured using price purchasing power parity. See: Jennifer Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy," *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Summer 2004), pp. 92-121

(28) John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001)

(29) Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979); Jack L. Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1991)

(30) Lind, p.103

the United States in the Pacific, Japan's only current conceivable rival for East Asian hegemony is China, which arguably benefits from the US-Japan Security Treaty as it has contained Japan for over six decades now. As the United States has neither achieved regional hegemony through conquest, nor enlisted Japan's direct involvement in the Korean or Vietnam wars, the case for Japan bandwagoning on another aggressor's success cannot hold water.

The remainder of this section will review Japan's military power and then consider whether or not that power is consistent with defensive realist predictions. Jennifer Lind observes that commentators underestimate Japan's military power because they measure it by comparing defense spending as a percentage of GDP across various nations. Japan typically devotes about 1 percent of GDP to its "self-defense" needs, compared to between 1.5 and 3% in other great powers.⁽³¹⁾ As Lind notes, however, this measure is inaccurate since a state with a large economy can produce a large military at a small expense and suggests measuring military power by comparing aggregate defense spending. On this measure, Japan is among the top two or three nations in total defense spending; second behind the United States when measured at market exchange rates, and third behind Russia and the US if measured using price purchasing power parity.⁽³²⁾

What kind of bang has Japan gotten for its buck? On the one hand, the JSDF has low ground power capabilities but high air- and sea power capabilities. Japan lacks airborne and air assault divisions and has no marine corps. It cannot provide airlift or sealift logistics and has no long-range ground attack systems, such as cruise missiles. These kinds of capabilities are offensive so their lack follows from the Yoshida administration's interpretation of defensive force as consistent with the letter and spirit of Article 9.

On the other hand, as Christopher E. Twomey notes, "Japan is very secure militarily."⁽³³⁾ In order to remain at least rhetorically true to Article 9 Japan relies on euphe-

(31) Lind, p.95

(32) Ibid.

misms for much of its military vocabulary, beginning with the term Self-Defense Force. *The Economist* dryly notes, that the 240,000 men in the Japanese military – whose jobs would seem to be forbidden constitutionally “are not soldiers, you understand, but members of the land, sea and air ‘self-defense forces.’ Japan does not have tanks-” it continues, “those would sound too much like the sort of thing an army might have. But it does have ‘specialty vehicles’ which look remarkably like, well, tanks.”⁽³⁴⁾ The Maritime Self-Defense Force’s (MSDF) “disaster relief ship” is really an amphibious assault ship; air defense destroyers are “escort ships,” and “an underwater targeting project” is doublespeak for a potent submarine force.⁽³⁵⁾ Japan has the largest destroyer force in the Pacific, “centered around four of the most advanced, guided-missile cruisers in any ocean.”⁽³⁶⁾ Observers consider the “underwater targeting project” as the best submarine force in the region, as well. The Air Self-Defense Force (ASDF) possesses several squadrons of F-2 strike fighters, which are the “most capable fighters” in East Asia, after the American planes. Furthermore, the ASDF’s F-2s and F-15s can be armed with both air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles produced in Japan.⁽³⁷⁾ The MSDF could deploy 100 P-3C anti-submarine patrol planes in the event of a submarine blockade around the Japanese archipelago plus 100 anti-submarine helicopters. The MSDF can also protect the home islands with a mine fleet larger than that of the United States. It is difficult to refute Twomey’s claim that “an adversary’s navy entering Japanese waters would suffer dearly, and all but the most capable navies would find themselves out-gunned anywhere in the Western Pacific.”⁽³⁸⁾

(33) Christopher P. Twomey, “Japan, a ‘Circumscribed Balancer’- Building on Defensive Realism to Make Predictions about East Asian Security,” *Security Studies*, No. 4 (Summer 2000): Citations here refer to the draft version of this paper, available at <http://www.nps.navy.mil/faculty/ctwomey/Research.htm>

(34) “To Arms,” *The Economist*, print edition online, July 24, 2003

(35) Twomey, p.22

(36) *Ibid.*, p.23. All statements relating to Japan’s military capability in this paragraph are compiled from Twomey, pp.23-24

(37) *Ibid.*, p.24

Which theory of defensive realism best describes Japan in light of the current size of its military? Of two defensive strategies, balancing and buck-passing, Japan's behavior matches the expectations of the latter. Where balancers find allies and confront aggressive states, buck-passers "recognize the need to balance against a threat, but they do as little of the required balancing as possible by relying on the efforts of others."⁽³⁹⁾ Buck-passers do see the need to balance but also see that doing so can be costly, as a long-term balancing strategy may bleed away manpower and wealth.⁽⁴⁰⁾ A strategy of buck-passing transfers much of these costs and risks to other states.

Realists theorize that buck-passing is most likely in states whose "geography or military technology make them less vulnerable to immediate invasion. Buck-passing is also particularly appealing to countries that are relatively secure and to those that have powerful allies that can contain foreseeable threats."⁽⁴¹⁾ As the perceived security threat changed, realists would expect to see changes both in the size and content of the buck-passer's defense and in how much it is willing to defer to its more powerful "protector." Japan's security policy in the postwar era matches the expectations of the defensive realists. Following the war, as an island nation quickly redeveloping its industrial base, Japan would not have been an easy target for invasion. With a superpower offering it protection against shared regional threats Japan could obtain protection more cheaply through a strategy of buck-passing than it could have on its own, particularly during the first two decades of reconstruction. From the 1950s through the end of the Cold War Japan was content to remain under the US defense umbrella for security against the USSR, which was making hegemonic claims on East Asia. Enlargements of the JSDF coincide first, during the Cold War with increases in the Soviet threat and then, after the collapse of the USSR, with new expectations from the United States and new

(38) Ibid., p.24

(39) Lind, p.103 (Lind provides a concise, thorough summary of offensive and realist strategies and an exhaustive list of the scholars in each branch in pages 102-110 of her *International Security article*)

(40) Ibid., p.104

(41) Ibid.

threats from North Korean missiles in the 1990s. Since the Cold War's end Japan has pursued a more active role in international security and peacekeeping operations which fulfills the realists' expectation that buck-passer's adjust strategy to changes in the security environment.

The Yoshida Doctrine encouraged alignment, but not alliance, with the United States, cooperation with which Yoshida viewed initially as temporarily expedient.⁽⁴²⁾ It conceived of a grand strategic bargain that gave the United States bases in the Far East, backed up by the JSDF to enhance Japan's defensive posture, and support of its struggle against communism. In return, Japan obtained protection from a military superpower, including a spot under the nuclear umbrella, and economic privileges such as market access- with no expectation of reciprocity- and financial aid. The deal with the United States also brought Japan back into good standing with the international community while allowing it to pursue rapid economic growth.

Yoshida realized the US-Japan relationship carried costs. These were found in the classic security dilemma of entrapment.⁽⁴³⁾ (During the Cold War the fear of abandonment was not salient as Yoshida understood the United States could not afford to abandon Japan for as long as China and the Soviet Union were communist.) For Japan, an alignment with the United States raised the possibilities of becoming a proxy target of a US enemy state or of being pushed into a conflict by the US. Beginning with Yoshida, Japan's leaders took measures to reduce the risk of entrapment. First, Yoshida made clear to the Eisenhower administration that Japan would adhere to a principle of individual self-defense and rejected consideration of any collective security arrangements. Yoshida also minimized the military capabilities of the young JSDF, thereby "frustrating US expectations" that Japan would grow into a reliable military ally.⁽⁴⁴⁾ At the same time, the Yoshida administration established domestic defense production capabilities.

(42) Hughes, p.22

(43) Ibid. p23

(44) Ibid., p.24

Yoshida's successors, Hatoyama and Kishi, would also adjust the security arrangements with the United States to Japan's advantage. Both negotiated a promise from the Eisenhower administration to guarantee Japan's defense by recognizing an attack on Japan as an attack on the US. This promise became codified in Article 5 of the 1960 Treaty for Mutual Security and Cooperation Between the United States and Japan (a.k.a. the US-Japan Security Treaty.) Article 4 requires the US to consult with Japan on implementations of the treaty as well as on troop deployments and US combat operations departing from bases in Japan. In the 1960s as the US enlarged its commitment to the Vietnam War, Prime Ministers Ikeda and Sato resisted US requests for more than economic assistance and use of the bases. Throughout the first two decades, Japan relied on the Yoshida Doctrine to preserve the status of the US-Japan relationship as an alignment, not an alliance. As late as 1976, Prime Minister Miki pledged not to spend more than 1% of GDP on defense.

However, in response to the Soviet build-up in the Pacific that began in the late 1970s and which was clearly aimed at Japan, prime ministers would refer to the bilateral relationship as an alliance and enlarge the JSDF. Following the normalization of relations between China and the US and China and Japan, the Soviets began a campaign to try to intimidate Japan away from close ties with Beijing and Washington. They dispatched amphibious troops to Shikotan Island, located approximately from 75 km from the Hokkaido city of Nemuro. The USSR also deployed SS-20 tactile nuclear missile launchers to eastern Siberia and, in 1985 simulated an attack on Hokkaido. By the end of the 1970s the Soviet Union's Pacific Fleet was the largest of the four Soviet fleets with increased numbers of ballistic missile submarines and surface ships and improved amphibious capabilities.⁽⁴⁵⁾ The Soviet navy began practicing exercises in the western Pacific that simulated attacks on Western forces and the air force deployed more MiG-23, MiG-27 and Su-19 aircraft and *Backfire* bombers to bases in eastern Si-

(45) Lind, p.107

beria. The Soviets also increased their amphibious capabilities in the Kurile Islands, just off the northern tip of Hokkaido.⁽⁴⁶⁾ By the end of the 1970s Japan and the US had to contend with the fact that the balance of power had shifted from their partnership to the Soviets.

During the 1970s the US did not balance this Soviet build-up in the Pacific. It pulled troops out of Vietnam, was planning, under President Jimmy Carter, to take all troops out of South Korea and reduced the size of its naval presence in the region by 600,000 tons, while the USSR increased its naval tonnage by 1.6 million tons. Even the US military build-up under President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s did not immediately alleviate Japan's fears as it "was stretched thin between rising commitments in Europe, the Middle East and Asia"⁽⁴⁷⁾ prompting the US to request greater contributions to security from its allies, including from Japan. The JDA's White Paper concluded in 1977 that Japan could no longer rest its security upon the premise of *détente*, as the US "could no longer unilaterally provide its Western allies with the same amount of military potential it offered in the past."⁽⁴⁸⁾

Japan did not abandon its buck-passing strategy but it did adjust to changes in the security environment and the strength of the US umbrella by taking "steps that would transform it into one of the world's major military powers."⁽⁴⁹⁾ The GSDF acquired mobile battle tanks and moved the bulk of its deployments to Hokkaido. The ASDF developed the E-2C Airborne Early Warning Group (AWEG) and purchased F-15 fighters to defend against the Soviet Backfires.⁽⁵⁰⁾ The MSDF acquired 100 "state-of-the-art" P-3C naval patrol aircraft, Yushio-class diesel-electric submarines and four "highly advanced" guided missile destroyers with Aegis radar.⁽⁵¹⁾

(46) *Ibid.*

(47) *Lind*, p.108

(48) As cited in *Lind*, p.109

(49) *Ibid.*, p.111

(50) *Hughes*, pp.27-28

(51) *Lind*, p.111

However, this surge in Japan's military strength did not indicate a break from its buck-passing strategy, but an adjustment to it. The additional firepower remained concentrated in and immediately around Japan and was designed to compensate gaps between the US and Soviet strength-levels, in as much as the gap directly affected Japan. For example, the explicit purpose of the F-15s was not to intercept *Backfires* bound for the Japanese archipelago but to protect US bases. Furthermore, although Prime Minister Suzuki Zenko publicly referred to the US-Japan relationship as an "alliance" in 1981, neither he, nor his successors, ever proposed to commit Japan to any collective security arrangements. Finally, despite having the right to exercise a limited veto over US military operations based in Japan through Article 4 of the Security Treaty, Japan has never chosen to do so. In fact, it has turned a blind eye to the movement of American nuclear weapons in and out of Japan, the "three non's" notwithstanding.

Now, absent the Soviets, Japan faces no conventional military threat, particularly from the sea and neither North Korea nor China can directly challenge the US-Japan alliance.

III. Assessing the Theories

Which theory better explains Japan's security policies since the end of World War II—a norm of anti-militarism or a strategy of buck-passing? The buck-passing theory explains more of Japan's security policies than the anti-militarist argument. It would predict Japan's weak military through the 1970s. It also accounts for Japan's defense build-up in the 1970s and 1980s to balance the increased Soviet power in the region, as well as its self-imposed restraint on involvement in international uses of force, including PKOs, through the 1980s. That Japan strengthened its defenses during this period without compromising on its refusal to enter collective security engagements or even to integrate the JSDF's command structure with America's, also fit the theory's expectations. As Christopher Hughes as noted, not only were the two nations' military capabilities and command systems complimentary, but, even after the build-up, Japan still could

not defend itself without the US. Yet, Japan feared ceding any control of its military to the US and even continued to seek domestic producers for defense technology. In other words, Japan wanted as many of the benefits of "alliance" with its more powerful partner, and as few of the costs as possible throughout the Cold War era.

Jennifer Lind surmises that in the post-Cold War era the buck-passing theory's prediction about Japan "receives neither a strong 'pass' nor a strong 'fail.'"⁽⁵²⁾ On the one hand, the JSDF has "undergone a quantitative build-down of its Cold War style capabilities."⁽⁵³⁾ By 1995 total JSDF personnel were reduced to 160,000 from 180,000 in 1976 and to 148,000 by 2003.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Between 1976 and 1995, the GSDF reduced the number of regionally deployed units by a third, the number of battle tanks by 25% and the number artillery by 10%.⁽⁵⁵⁾ By 1995 the MSDF had reduced the number of destroyer units by three divisions to seven, from ten and the number of minesweeping units from two flotillas to one. On the other, hand, Japan "has attempted to compensate by the qualitative build-up of its capabilities to address the new security environment."⁽⁵⁶⁾ The JDA has purchased highly sophisticated M-90 battle tanks, AH-1S and anti-tank and ground-attack helicopters and the latest *Hawk* surface-to-air missile. To help gather intelligence on, track and arrest suspected terrorists in Japan, the GSDF created a 300-member special operations unit. Meanwhile, the MSDF is increasing the number of its *Aegis* war-fighting system *Kongo*-class destroyers from four to six. It also has acquired *Osumi*-class transport ships with decks for helicopters and docks for hovercraft that can deliver tanks to shore. *Osumi*-class ships were dispatched to transport GSDF troops and materiel to East Timor in 1999 and again to Iraq in 2003.

(52) Ibid., p.116

(53) Hughes, p.76

(54) The figures for 1979 and 1995 are from Hughes, p. 72, Table 2 "Equipment and personnel numbers under 1995 and 1976 NDPOs." The figure for 2003 from "Posto-9.11 jie-i-tai 4: Jiei-tai no jitsu-ryoku," *Yomi-uri Weekly*, July 13, 2003, p.92

(55) Figures based on numbers in Hughes, p.72, Table 2

(56) Hughes, p.76

The ASDF increased the number of fighter aircraft from 400 in 1995 to 480 by 2003,⁽⁵⁷⁾ and upgraded the radar and avionics of its F-15s as well its Patriot Advanced Capability-2 (PAC-2) batteries “to act as a PAC-3 missile interceptor system.”⁽⁵⁸⁾ The JDA also purchased four Boeing-767 tanker aircrafts and in-flight refueling capabilities. In December 2004 Japan lifted its 35-year ban on arms exports, which would facilitate the development of a missile program with the US, something Prime Ministers Koizumi and Abe Shinzo promoted. (The lifting of the export ban will allow manufacturers to sell their products to other nations in order to generate funds for R&D.)⁽⁵⁹⁾

Although Japan’s transformation of its defense forces in the immediate post-Cold War era would seem to challenge the defensive realists’ expectation that states will reduce their military power absent a conventional threat, the probability of war in Northeast Asia has arguably increased, despite the removal of the Soviet threat. In the *East Asian Strategic Review*, published by a research institute associated with the JDA (which was upgraded to the Ministry of Defense in January 2007), the National Institute for Defense Studies (NIIDS) Japan, the authors identify North Korea’s nuclear weapons program, the PRC’s pressure on Taiwan and its own military build-up as destabilizing factors in East Asia.⁽⁶⁰⁾ In 1998 North Korea launched an unarmed Taepodong missile over the main island of the Japanese archipelago and in July 2006 it launched six short-range missiles and one-long range missile into the Sea of Japan. Of course, its nuclear program has been a source of tension not just for Japan, but also for China, South Korea and Russia.

Some observers worry China and the United States are moving toward armed conflict considering that China’s expanding economic base is matched with an expansion

(57) *Yomiuri Weekly*, p. 92

(58) Hughes, p.83

(59) This description of qualitative changes to the composition of the JSDF is not exhaustive. For a detailed and comprehensive review I recommend Hughes, Chapter 3.

(60) The National Institute for Defense Studies Japan, *East Asian Strategic Review 2006* (Tokyo: The Japan Times, 2006), pp. 3-6

in defense capabilities, which suggests China will make hegemonic claims in the region on top of its claims that Taiwan is merely a rogue PRC province. China has increased the number of short-range ballistic cruise missiles based along the coast facing Taiwan and it is no secret that the PRC's annual war games since 1996 have been mock invasions of the ROC. In August of 2005 China and Russia conducted their first joint-military exercise, "Peace Mission 2005," in which a combined force 8,800 troops carried out amphibious landing and sea blockade exercise, which would be part of a Taiwan invasion.⁽⁶¹⁾ The *Strategic Review* also emphasizes the on-going threat of terrorism. Along with states like Britain and Australia, and South Korea, Japan remained firmly behind the United States in its missions in Afghanistan and Iraq. The flurry of special emergency bills passed by the Koizumi government generated far more controversy in Japan than the upgrading and transformation of the JSDF in response to changes in the Northeast Asian security environment. In 2007 the JDA itself was formally "upgraded" to ministry status and is now the Ministry of Defense, which gives its head official a seat in the government and more bargaining power in budget deliberations than when the JDA had to haggle for funding among governments, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Finance.

Whether or not these developments are part of a buck-passing strategy, or signal the beginnings of an independent Japanese military and defense and security policy remains an open question. Certainly, prominent members of the ruling Democratic Party, such as Ozawa Ichiro, argue for military independence from the United States. However, Democrats who support this notion claim they would rather link the JSDF more closely to the United Nations in place of the United States military. Furthermore, Christopher Hughes claims, that Japan "has not yet crossed its Rubicon" on board its deployments to Afghanistan and Iraq, though these have "set vital precedents" for the JSDF.⁽⁶²⁾ He also argues that Japan's new defense posture is designed to forge a

(61) Ibid, p.5

strengthened US-Japan alliance, in which Japan can obtain its security through support of US hegemony in East Asia, which will help prop up *Pax Americana* in general. In sum, Japan's security policy may yet remain consistent with defensive realist expectations, though much of theoretical debate will be fueled in the near future by developments in Japan-US partnership.

The constructivists' argument explains much less than the buck-passing theory, however. The creation of the JSDF and subsequent expenditures on defense matériel and personnel, first by the Liberal Party and, then, from 1955 onward, by the Liberal Democratic Party, challenges the notion of an anti-militarist norm as woven into the fiber of Japanese society. If a norm against militarism were prevalent then it is difficult to explain the development of the JSDF, much less its status as one of the world's premier forces.

A modified form of the anti-militarist argument, however, is more common among constructivists and argues that the anti-militarist norm has acted as a constraint on the ability of the Japanese state to develop an even more powerful military than it might have otherwise. Building on the works of Katzenstein and Berger, the authors of a textbook on Japan's international relations suggest "the acceptance of the norm on the popular level acts as a powerful constraint on the government's use of military force as legitimate instrument of state policy."⁽⁶³⁾ One of those authors, Glenn D. Hook, also writes in a co-authored book on the history of Japan's constitution with Gavan McCormack, that, "The hollowing out of Article 9 is plain, but this does not mean that it has been without impact. More importantly, the normative implications of this clause can be seen in the inability of policy-makers to use the military as a legitimate instrument of state policy."⁽⁶⁴⁾ Hook and McCormack also stress that "Given the way the constitu-

(62) Hughes, p.133

(63) Hook, et al, p.74

(64) Glenn D. Hook and Gavan McCormack, *Japan's Contested Constitution: documents and analysis* (New York: Routledge, 2001), p.21

tion has been contested, many of the provisions set in place fifty-three years ago *have yet to be fully realized*," (emphasis added).⁽⁶⁵⁾

The best evidence for what I will call the *argument from constraint* rests in the examples discussed above: Ikeda's message to the Eisenhower administration, Japan's strict adherence to Articles 4 and 5 of the US-Japan Security Treaty, Sato's non-nuclear principles and Miki's 1% pledge, all of which, when interpreted as examples of norms-based behavior, could reasonably be interpreted as examples of constraints upon the state's preferred choices, *viz.* greater militarization through alignment with the United States. The argument from constraint also finds leverage in the events that led to the authorization of the 1960 Security Treaty. Police forcibly removed JSP representatives from the Diet building after they tried to block the entrance of their LDP counterparts to vote on the treaty and demonstrations led by students and trade unions were so large and volatile that President Eisenhower's trip to Japan was cancelled. Eventually the treaty was passed by default because the House of Councilors failed to vote on it within the required thirty days. In the background to these tumultuous events stood the results of a January 1960 *Asahi Shimbun* poll that showed 35% of respondents favored unarmed neutrality in the Cold War and 24% favored dependence on the UN for Japan's security.⁽⁶⁶⁾ It should be noted that the combined percentage of these views (59%) is significantly greater than the combined electoral support for the socialist and communist parties (30.5%).⁽⁶⁷⁾ The parties of the left supported Article 9 as staunchly as they opposed Cold War alignment with the United States. Considering the capabilities the JSDF has developed over the past 30 years, though, the defense and security policies of Japan do not appear to be moving toward "realizing" the provisions of the constitution, at least as it relates to Article 9.

(65) *Ibid.*, p.20

(66) *Ibid.*, footnote no. 80, p.48

(67) The figure for electoral support is compiled from Ethan Scheiner, *Democracy Without Competition: Opposition Failure in a One-Party State* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2006), p.39, Table 1.1

However, Hook and McCormack also insist “the constitution still provides a normative framework informing, constraining and to some extent molding the behavior of” politicians and policymakers.⁽⁶⁸⁾ In fact, the opposite seems to have happened over time- politicians act with fewer *restraints* about expressing the need to loosen *constraints* on Japan’s development into what many pro-revisionists refer to as a “normal” country, i.e. a nation that may maintain and take up arms in its own defense, or even participate in international uses of force. Two excellent cases in point are the views of Ozawa Ichiro and the platform of the Democratic Party.

Ozawa penned a “A proposal for reforming the Japanese constitution,” in which he writes of support for the SCAP-authored document that Japanese “have become attached to a fossil.”⁽⁶⁹⁾ Ozawa asks, “What is ‘peace’?”⁽⁷⁰⁾ He says indirectly that Japan’s pacifism is dependent upon American power. Ozawa suggests that those who would advocate neutrality and non-involvement in international security operations are really just complaining about Anglo-American-style globalization. “Breaking off our alliance with America,” he notes, “would be like Japan going into isolation. If we could assure ourselves that such a course would bring true happiness, then I think that this is one way of living and one philosophy. However, aiming to enjoy increasing material wealth while at the same time complaining about globalization is nothing but self-indulgence.”⁽⁷¹⁾ Yet, Ozawa does not advocate a role for Japan as a key-stone state in the preservation of American hegemony, but rather as a leader for the creation of a UN standing army. “While the US may not support this idea, we should work to persuade them of its merits.”⁽⁷²⁾ Ozawa wrote his “Proposal” while still president of the now-defunct Liberal Party but his views have not changed since he joined the Democratic Party and ascended to its presidency.

(68) Ibid., p.20

(69) Cited in Hughes and McCormack, p.161

(70) Ibid., p.162

(71) Ibid., p.168

(72) Ibid., p.167

When other Democratic party leaders such as Hatoyama Yukio and Kan Naoto suggested in 2000 that the party should consider expanding Japan's role in UN PKOs as well as the issue of constitutional revision, they were met with threats of demotion by party elders who had jumped aboard the party from the sinking ship of the JSP/SDP in the late 1990s.⁽⁷³⁾ Today the party's English- and Japanese-language websites contain an indirect reference to constitutional revision that echoes Ozawa's position. Under the heading of "Establish a Genuine Japan-US Alliance" the Party's manifesto advocates for an international division of labor in the international system:

"We will construct a mutual relationship of trust between Japan and the United States and establish a genuine alliance of equals between Japan and the US. To this end, Japan will construct her own diplomatic strategy, and we will make our national position clear. Furthermore, Japan should undertake a division of roles with the United States at an international level and actively fulfill the responsibility for her designated role."⁽⁷⁴⁾

The party's position on how to "Participate actively in United Nations peace operations" advocates the same interpretation of Article 9 as Ozawa's proposal.

"We will participate actively in UN-centred peace operations, in response to requests from the UN. UN peace operations, even participation in forcible measures in accordance with Articles 41 and 42 of the UN charter, are of a totally different nature from the exercise of the right to self-defence by a sovereign state and therefore do not infringe article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, but rather agree with the philosophy of the Constitution, which calls for Japan to

(73) Ethan Scheiner, *Democracy Without Competition: Opposition Failure in a One-Party Dominant State* (New York: Cambridge, 2006), p.195

(74) "My Basic Policies: Toward a Fair Society and a Country of Conscience," *The Democratic Party of Japan website* http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/mybasic2.html#a_33

play an active role in the international community.” (*British spellings in the original.*)

From these planks in its platform we can see that the DPJ considers the use of force acceptable when part of UN-authorized missions, if not US-led operations. Implicit to this interpretation of Article 9, but unstated, is acceptance of the maintenance of war potential. The difference between the two main parties, then, is not over the letter, or even the spirit of Article 9, except in as much as the DPJ links that spirit to a more cooperative vision to uses of force within the international community. The position of the Democratic Party, while more “dovish” than that of the LDP, whose leadership sometimes publicly promotes revising Article 9, and strengthening US-Japan military cooperation, is not consistent with the thesis that Article 9 has behavior-modifying properties.

Meanwhile, the fortunes of the parties on the left, which have remained steadfast in their opposition to revising Article 9, have suffered dearly at the election polls. The combined share of the national vote in House of Representative elections for the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) and Japan Communist Party (JCP) dropped from a peak of 40.3% in 1958 to 23.1% by 1993. By the 1996 elections, the JSP would be defunct and its successor, the Social Democratic Party (SDP) would capture just 6.4% of the vote in the PR districts, and 2.2% in the single-member districts in Japan’s first contest under its mixed electoral system. The JCP (which had always fared worse than the JSP under the old system) would outperform the SDP in 1996 but still manage to muster up only 13.1% of the PR vote and 12.6% of the SMD vote.⁽⁷⁵⁾ By the 2003 elections, they had both received even fewer votes.

(75) All figures compiled from Scheiner, Table 2.1 and Table 2.2, pp. 39 and 44, respectively.

Given the public opposition to revising the Constitution in general Article 9 in particular, it is almost certainly true that voters have not punished the left-wing parties for their principled support of the "peace constitution." Yet, it is also the case that voters have not punished the ruling LDP for the development of Japan's military capability during its half-century – minus nine months in 1993-94- in the prime minister's office. Considering this apparent contradiction, one may wonder if Japanese society is embedded not with an anti-militarist norm, but with a buck-passing norm! Even if most voters believe in the principles inherent in Article 9, their behavior at the ballot box suggests they rank-order that belief below other values, such as economic development, and security under the US umbrella.

The case for the prevalence of an anti-militarist norm cannot account for the regular cycle of LDP victories in light of the growth of the JSDF and the expansion of its activity abroad. The explanatory power of the argument from constraint peaks with the 1960 riots against the Security Treaty and weakens in the decades since. Electoral results since the 1960s, combined with Japan's expanded military capability and involvement overseas, disprove the thesis.

Finally, the anti-militarist argument rests upon an assumption of the uniqueness of Japan (and of Germany), as the result of case-selection bias. Wealthy, democratic states such as Israel, South Korea and Italy, for example, all have emphasized the development of limited power-projection capabilities in their ground and air forces and have never fully developed their navies, yet an anti-militarist norm does not presumably pervade Israeli, South Korean and Italian societies. More likely, the defenses of these states are based on security analyses that do not perceive threats via the seas, and are not based on a grand strategy of expansion. Not only Japan but many states are content to avoid the costs and contentious issue of nuclear armament and accept a place under the US nuclear umbrella. The constructivists cannot explain why, if a pervasive anti-

militarist norm were forged through the experience of total defeat in World War II, Japan did not become the Switzerland of East Asia. Article 9 and anti-militarist views may be popular in Japan. However, they have not been popular enough to prevent the government, with the consent of the electorate, from arming Japan mightily and including the presence of US military bases and security cooperation with the United States as part of its security policy for over 50 years. Japan behaves as a defensive realist.

In the next essay I will illustrate how what constructivists claim is a norm, is actually an ideology used by different groups in Japanese civil society and politics to advance their own interests. This fact actually strengthens the case for understanding how Japan is a defensive realist.

—H. Steven Green · 法学部専任講師—