RSIS Working Paper

The RSIS Working Paper series presents papers in a preliminary form and serves to stimulate comment and discussion. The views expressed are entirely the author's own and not that of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. If you have any comments, please send them to the following email address: Rsispublication@ntu.edu.sg

Unsubscribing

If you no longer want to receive RSIS Working Papers, please click on "Unsubscribe." to be removed from the list.

No. 255

Security Identity, Policymaking Regime and Japanese Security Policy Development

Bhubhindar Singh

S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Singapore

5 March 2013

About RSIS

The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) was established in January 2007 as an autonomous School within the Nanyang Technological University. Known earlier as the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies when it was established in July 1996, RSIS' mission is to be a leading research and graduate teaching institution in strategic and international affairs in the Asia Pacific. To accomplish this mission, it will:

- Provide a rigorous professional graduate education with a strong practical emphasis,
- Conduct policy-relevant research in defence, national security, international relations, strategic studies and diplomacy,
- Foster a global network of like-minded professional schools.

GRADUATE EDUCATION IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

RSIS offers a challenging graduate education in international affairs, taught by an international faculty of leading thinkers and practitioners. The Master of Science (M.Sc.) degree programmes in Strategic Studies, International Relations and International Political Economy are distinguished by their focus on the Asia Pacific, the professional practice of international affairs, and the cultivation of academic depth. Thus far, students from more than 50 countries have successfully completed one of these programmes. In 2010, a Double Masters Programme with Warwick University was also launched, with students required to spend the first year at Warwick and the second year at RSIS.

A small but select Ph.D. programme caters to advanced students who are supervised by faculty members with matching interests.

RESEARCH

Research takes place within RSIS' six components: the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS, 1996), the International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR, 2004), the Centre of Excellence for National Security (CENS, 2006), the Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies (Centre for NTS Studies, 2008); the Temasek Foundation Centre for Trade & Negotiations (TFCTN, 2008); and the recently established Centre for Multilateralism Studies (CMS, 2011). The focus of research is on issues relating to the security and stability of the Asia Pacific region and their implications for Singapore and other countries in the region.

The school has four professorships that bring distinguished scholars and practitioners to teach and to conduct research at the school. They are the S. Rajaratnam Professorship in Strategic Studies, the Ngee Ann Kongsi Professorship in International Relations, the NTUC Professorship in International Economic Relations and the Bakrie Professorship in Southeast Asia Policy.

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

Collaboration with other professional schools of international affairs to form a global network of excellence is a RSIS priority. RSIS maintains links with other like-minded schools so as to enrich its research and teaching activities as well as adopt the best practices of successful schools.

ABSTRACT

Compared to the Cold War, Japan's post-Cold War security policy has undergone significant change. This is especially visible in the new means Japan has adopted, both outside and within the context of the U.S.-Japan security relationship, in contributing to regional and international affairs in military-strategic terms. Challenging realism's dominance, this paper captures this shift through the use of collective identity, more specifically, Japanese security identity. It argues that Japan's security policy expansion is captured by the shift in Japan's security identity from a peace-state to an international-state. To understand this shift, the security identity is studied in the context of the Japanese security policymaking regime. Three elements of the regime are studied: the agents involved in the security policymaking process, the decision-making structure, and the role of the U.S. in Japan's security policymaking process. The combined effect of these elements determines the dominant security identity and Japanese security policy.

****

Dr Bhubhindar Singh is Assistant Professor and member of the Multilateralism and Regionalism Programme at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. His research interests include the international relations of Northeast Asia with a special focus on Japan's security policy, the international relations of Southeast Asia and defence diplomacy in East Asia. Before joining RSIS, Bhubhindar was a lecturer in Japanese Studies at the School of East Asian Studies, University of Sheffield, and Associate Research Fellow at the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Singapore. He has published in the *European Journal of International Relations, International Relations of Asia-Pacific, The Pacific Review, Asian Survey, Asian Security, The Round Table, Contemporary Southeast Asia* and *Issues & Studies*; and his book is entitled *Japanese Security Identity Transformation: From a Peace-State to an International-State* (Routledge).

Security Identity, Policymaking Regime and Japanese Security Policy Development

Introduction

It is widely recognised that Japanese security policy has undergone significant change when comparing the Cold War and post-Cold War periods. This change is especially visible in the new security roles that Japan's Self-Defence Force (SDF) has adopted. Four areas stand out: the inclusion of humanitarian and disaster relief duties in the SDF's mandate, as well as peacekeeping following the passage of the 'Law Concerning Cooperation for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and Other Operations' (also known as the International Peace Cooperation Law (IPCL)) in 1992; the deepening and widening of the responsibilities of the SDF within the U.S.-Japan defence cooperation mainly in the form of rear-area logistical support to the U.S. military following the revisions of the defence guidelines passed by the Japanese National Diet in 1999, and greater interoperability between the two militaries in the first decade of the 2000s following Japan's proactive participation in the U.S.-led war on terror; joining other concerned states in combating the rise of piracy incidents when Maritime SDF (MSDF) destroyers were deployed off the coast of Somalia to guard vessels from Japan and other countries; and finally, diversifying security partnerships outside of the U.S.-Japan alliance as Japan signed strategic partnerships with Australia (2007), India (2008), Vietnam (2010) and the Philippines (2011) to strengthen bilateral defence cooperation through ministerial meetings, military exchanges and joint exercises.

These changes have been well documented in the extant literature that falls in the realism tradition of international relations theory**.** Even though some of these developments would fall under the human security categorisation, they are collectively understood as clear indications in support of Japan's move away from its minimalist or constrained security policy to a greater military role internationally, described in the literature as 'normalisation' or remilitarisation'. Authors from the neorealism (or structural realism) strand argue that these changes were due to the transformation of the international system in the post-Cold War period characterised by enhanced anarchy due to the instability of the U.S.-led unipolarity and the unfavorable shift in the East Asia balance of power against Japan's interests resulting from tensions on the Korean Peninsula, China's rise in economic, political and military terms, and Japan's territorial disputes with China (Senkaku or Diaoyu Islands), South Korea (Takeshima or Tokdo Islands) and Russia (Kurile Islands or Northern Territories) (See Waltz

2000, 1993; Layne 1993). Along with the instability from the shifting East Asia balance of power, authors from the neoclassical realism strand added other variables from the domestic level, referred to as the 'black-box', to explain Japan's security policy expansion in the post-Cold War period. These include the gradual erosion of the normative structures that constrained Japanese security policy during the Cold War, Japan's long-running economic recession since the early 1990s that precluded the practice of defining its national interests solely in the language of economics, and changes within the Japanese political system that resulted in the increased importance of security issues featured on the national agenda (See Boyd and Samuels 2005; Green 2003; Hughes 2004, 2009; Hughes and Krauss 2007; Pyle 1992, 2007; Samuels 2007).

This paper challenges the abovementioned literature on two accounts – the conclusions or expectations reached by the realist analyses and their neglect of the collective identity variable. The realist works ended with two conclusions – Japan will pursue strategic independence from the US and adopt more combat roles in regional and international security affairs (See Waltz 2000, 1993; Layne 1993). Both these conclusions have not materialised. Instead of strategic independence, Japan has repeatedly reaffirmed and strengthened the US-Japan security relationship through various bilateral agreements. That has led to strengthened bilateral defence cooperation including the expansion of the SDF's roles in the alliance relationship, strengthened interoperability between the two militaries, joint development and deployment of the Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) system, and the convergence of interests in relation to the regional and global security environment. The U.S.-Japan security relationship, which offers Japan conventional and nuclear security cover against potential threats, remains the central pillar of Japanese post-Cold War security policy. Though the SDF's roles have expanded and become more diverse with wider geographical coverage, it is important to note that these have occurred only in a limited way - mainly in rear-area logistical duties or in non-combat support roles. Limits are attached when the SDF is deployed overseas. That implies Japan's security policy was still made in an environment where traditional restrictions on the SDF remained strong.

Nevertheless, Japan's security role has certainly expanded and the SDF's role within this bilateral relationship has undergone significant change. The developments within Japanese security policy that point towards an expanded security role have occurred in the context of Japan playing a more responsible role in regional and international affairs. The missions have largely been for humanitarian and disaster relief with an international dimension, that is, Japan joining other countries to address global security challenges. These developments were not motivated solely by national power augmentation or balance of power demands but efforts that reinforce Japan's middle power status. At the onset of the post-Cold War period, the Japanese security policymaking elite recognised that the economics-based policy required a revision due to a shift in the normative structure in the post-Cold War period – a point brought home by Japan's experience in the 1990-1 Persian Gulf War. The result of this revision has been the added contribution by Japan to the military-strategic dimension of regional and international affairs both independently and in the context of the U.S.-Japan security relationship.

These developments in the SDF's role in the post-Cold War period are best captured by the change in role conceptions or collective identity in Japanese security policy. Unlike its Cold War peace-state identity that produced a minimalist security policy, the adoption of new security roles by the Japanese military was captured by a new identity conception that incorporated an international dimension in military terms into Japanese security policy. More specifically, the argument here is that the change we are witnessing in Japanese security behaviour is explained by the shift in the dominant security identity from the peace-state during the Cold War period to the international-state security identity in the post-Cold War period.

The notion of utilising security identity in analysing Japanese security policy is not new. According to Oros (2008), Japanese security policy is shaped by a security identity defined as domestic antimilitarism that comprises three principles: no traditional armed forces, no use of force by Japan except in self-defence and no Japanese participation in foreign wars (p. 5). The argument presented here differs from Oros in four ways. First, though Oros agrees that Japanese post-Cold War security practice has undergone change, he attributes this to the changes within the domestic political forces and the international strategic environment, not a result of a shift in the domestic security identity. The argument here places the cause of the changes in Japanese security policy on the security identity variable. Second, unlike Oros's domestically focused security identity, the focus of this paper is on Japan's security identity portrayed overseas. This identity refers to Japan's position in regional and international security affairs and the kind of security role(s) it aspires to assume in contributing to external peace and stability. Third, whilst in agreement with Oros on the continued relevance of antimilitarism in the Japanese security debate and policymaking process, this research argues that antimilitarism in Japanese post-Cold War security policy is reflected in a different way. The normative framework of the post-Cold War period in which Japan has been able to carve out an advanced security role without contravening the social and legal constraints at home displays another dimension to Japanese security identity – internationalism.

Fourth, this paper analyses Japan's security identity at the level of Japanese domestic politics, namely in the context of Japan's security policymaking regime in the two periods under study. The relationship between the security identity and the security policymaking regime is that the dominant security identity within the regime sets the parameters of the security policy debates, privileges a certain set of security interests and determines the outcome of the security policy. Within the security policymaking regime, three core elements are highlighted – the agents/actors involved in the security policymaking process, the decision-making process for security policy, and finally, the role of the US in this process. During the Cold War, Japan's security policymaking regime was supported by the peace-state security identity that had mainly a self-defence focus. Together with the legal and social restrictions, the self-defence focus was reinforced by the policymaking process that was controlled by the civilian bureaucracy and politicians that adhered to the principles of the Yoshida Doctrine. This left little or no room for those actors that pushed for an activist security policy in military terms within the security policymaking process. Any attempt to break from the self-defence focus came only after intense pressure from the U.S. In this instance, the policymaking process was mired in immobilism and institutional rigidities, susceptible to external pressure from the U.S. This dominant peace-state security identity was challenged during the post-Cold War period. The former immobilist or reactive state characterisation was challenged by a more proactive feature in the security policymaking process. This activism was facilitated by the increasing dominance in the security policymaking process of politicians and bureaucrats that supported an activist security role for Japan's SDF in external security affairs. They displayed a strengthened internal dynamic in setting Japan's security policy interests, managing the decision-making process, and also actively devising means to bring about peace and stability in the regional and international security environment that were suitable to Japan's domestic conditions. These moves saw a reduction in the U.S. pressure on Japan's security policymaking process. This behaviour led to the transformation of Japan's security identity from a peace-state to an international-state.

This paper is structured in the following manner. It begins with a conceptual discussion of the relationship between security identity and security policymaking regime. The second section discusses Japan’s security policymaking regime’s peace-state security identity during the Cold War and the resultant minimalist security policy. The final section discusses the changes to the security policymaking regime resulting from the adoption of the international-state security identity during the post-Cold War period that produced a more activist security policy for Japan. It is important to note this paper is confined to the period starting from the onset of the postwar period to the end of Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)’s political rule in August 2009, when it suffered an electoral defeat to the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) in the national general election. The reason for selecting this period is that the foundation for an activist security policy for Japan was laid during the LDP’s dominant tenure of the political system. Nevertheless, the DPJ’s security policy practice will be discussed in the concluding chapter – a discussion that will show that the DPJ is committed to pursuing an activist or internationalist security policy as well.

Security Identity and Policymaking Regime

This section aims to examine the notions of collective identity, in this case security identity, and the security policymaking regime and how their interaction shape Japanese security policy behaviour.

Security identity

Security identity is understood as a collective identity within the state’s national identity. Though integrally linked to other domains of national identity, it is possible to analyse security identity independently in conceptual and empirical terms. States possess specific role conceptions that shape their security behaviour and determine the outcome of their security policy. Security identity, according to Oros (2008), is referred to as collectively held principles that provide the overarching framework which determines a state’s policy in the domain of security affairs. These principles shape the actions and decisions of the security policymaking elite and other major actors within the state that are responsible for the formulation of the state’s security policy (pp. 9-10). The effect of these principles is that they determine the collectively held ideas that shape the outcome of a state’s security policy implemented to achieve its security objectives and interests (Legro 2009). The security identity, defined by the collectively held principles, becomes dominant in shaping the state's security policy only when actors within the state and society perceive it to be legitimate and embrace its impact (Oros 2008, 9-10; Bukovansky 2002).

The notion of security identity shares several essential features common to other collective identities. First, a security identity is shaped by various factors, material and non-material, operating at both the domestic and international levels. At the domestic level, the material factors include the state's geo-strategic position, territory and population size; and the non-material ones include the historical, political, social and cultural contexts that the state is embedded in. At the international level, the security identity is also shaped by its position and interactions with other actors in the international system. The identity informs states who they are, who others are and how they are related in a particular context. The combined effect of all these factors, at both the domestic and international levels, results in an intersubjective reality that shapes and reinforces a particular collective identity (Bukovansky 1997, 210), resultantly informs the state what action is possible, and allows other states to understand its actions (Chafetz et al 1998/99; Dittmer and Kim 1993). Second, like all identities, security identity is a social and relational concept requiring an Other (Neumann 1996). The Other does not necessarily have to be a state but it can be an idea, history, place or an international order (Hopf 2002, 3; Legro 2009); and it does not necessarily have to be an out-group but can be within the subject of analysis - Japan, in the case of this paper (Brewer and Brown 1998, 564 cited in Hopf 2002, 10).

Third, at any given time, multiple identities, which include clashing conceptions, coexist, pushing actors to behave in varying ways (Saideman 2002). An identity assumes a dominant position through a process of negotiation. Despite the constant competition from other identities, collective identities can be stable and enduring. What this means is that the security interests of the state that shape the collective identities can also be stable. However, the dominant collective identities can also undergo change. This change might come through repeated interaction with a competing identity (Chafetz et al 1998/99, xi) and/or result when the competing identity furthers a state's interests more than the previous one (Bukovansky 1997, 217). A shift in the dominant collective identity shaping policy is likely to emerge under two conditions: first, whenever there are competing definitions of identity that call for contradictory behaviour; and second, whenever collective identity definitions are no longer relevant to the historical conditions (Barnett 1999, 10; Dittmer and Kim 1993, 6-7). This competition for dominance between identities is particularly stiff during periods of crises or structural transformation. The ascendancy attained by one identity over others is also followed by the rise of a particular set of interests or preferences, which are determined by the situations the state finds itself in and the type of actors that dominate the policymaking elite (Wendt 1999, 230; Hopf 1998, 175). However, it is important to note that the coexistence and competitive nature of multiple identities is not about the existence of one identity and the extinction of others. Even if one identity achieves dominance in one period, the subordinate identities persist in the background to structure future debates and competition (Saideman 2002, 184).

As discussed above, this paper discusses two sets of security identities - the peace-state identity and the international-state - that have largely dominated Japanese security discourse and debates during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods. The main point of the paper is not to show the competition between the various identities during each of the periods, as this point is already well documented in the extant literature (Berger 1998, Hook 1996, Katzenstein 1996, Oros 2008). Instead, the paper aims to illustrate the transformation of the dominant security identity that shaped Japan's security policy behaviour during the Cold War and the post-Cold War periods, along with the domestic conditions that supported these identities. We discuss the origins of each of the identities as follows.

Peace-State Identity: The origins of the peace-state identity lie in Japan's defeat in WWII and the American occupation of Japan (1945-52). The American Occupation authorities led General Douglas MacArthur to impose a series of reforms that aimed to democratise and demilitarise Japan (Dower 1999; Welfield 1988). One of the significant and probably the most controversial reforms was Japan's adoption of the Peace Constitution or Article 9.[1] Imposing a legal restriction on the use of force as a tool in its security policy and the maintenance of the war potential, Article 9 became the embodiment of the peace discourse in Japan. It was embraced by Japanese state and society and attempts by the US to reverse the demilitarisation process following the outbreak of the Korean War in 1951 and the subsequent intensification of the Cold War were resisted by Japan, led by Yoshida Shigeru and his followers. Their position was based on Yoshida's vision of constructing Japan as a merchant nation (*shōnin kokka*), in which all efforts were concentrated on achieving the main goal of economic resuscitation and development, whilst maintaining a low profile in military-strategic affairs (Berger 1996: 336-337). Defined by the Yoshida Doctrine, this security strategy was supported by the peace-state security identity.[2]

---

[1] The peace clause of the Constitution, Article 9, reads as follows:
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.
(taken from Hook and McCormack 2001, 8)

Despite challenges from those who were opposed to the s*hōnin kokka* vision in the 1950s, the peace-state identity dominated Japan's national security discourse, especially in terms of Japan's role in external security affairs. That was especially the case from the 1960s onwards, following the mishandling of US-Japan Security Treaty Revision Crisis (AMPO) by the anti-Yoshida politicians (led by Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke) and the success of Ikeda Hayato's (Kishi's successor) announcement of the income-doubling plan in the 1960s (See Samuels 2007, 34-6). While Yoshida was not convinced about its long-term appropriateness, the peace-state identity was certainly the main conception that shaped his vision of Japan's Cold War security policy. In fact, most Japanese prime ministers (with the exception of Nakasone Yasuhiro) not only grounded Japan's security policy in that strategy but also strengthened the principles by institutionalising measures that supported a low-profile security role for Japan. Described as a 'unique' approach to national security (Muto 2001, 176), Japanese security policy entailed narrowly defined security interests that focused on self-defence objectives and de-emphasised external security issues. Whatever external focus there was, it was predominantly defined by economic objectives resulting from a repeated practice of the separation of economics from politics (*seikei-bunri*) by the security policymaking elite when formulating Japan's security policy. The outcome was the adoption and entrenchment of values and legal structures within Japanese state and society that collectively defined and supported Japan's peace-state security identity (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993).

---

[2] At this point, it is important to highlight that the Yoshida Doctrine's definition is contested. This is because there is no official historical record that clarifies the definition and Yoshida himself did not specifically refer to such a doctrine or strategy. One of the most common definitions of the Yoshida Doctrine is: (1) the reliance on the US for Japan's security; (2) the maintenance of a limited defence capability; and (3) the concentration of its international efforts on economic development. For the contested nature of the Yoshida Doctrine, personal interviews with Igarashi Takeshi (Tokyo, 22 September 2005) and Tanaka Akihiko (Tokyo, 6 September 2005); and Pyle (1987: 245, fn. 5). For the features of the Yoshida Doctrine, interview with Tanaka Akihiko (Tokyo, 6 September 2005) and Berger (1993: 140)

International-state identity[3]: The notion of constructing Japan as an international-state is not a post-Cold War phenomenon but a continuation of a process that began in the late 1970s (Igarashi Takeshi, Interview, Tokyo, 22 September 2005; Pyle 1992, 74).[4] Due to a range of external and internal factors, efforts were made to incorporate a new sense of internationalism into Japan's national purpose. Although Ōhira Masayoshi (1978-1980) initiated the process in the area of Japanese foreign and security policy, it was Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro (1982-1987) who adopted the bold initiatives that set Japan on the course of distancing itself from the Yoshida Doctrine and its related peace-state security identity. Nakasone saw the world at being at a crossroad and with how Japan could play a part in shaping international politics over the next several decades (Edström 1999, 120). Not only did Nakasone share the view that Japan's future was dependent on the international community, he went a step further to declare that the future of the international community depended on Japan (Edström 1999, 120). For him, it was important that Japan maintained its 'supplementary regional power' position (Takahashi 2001) within the *Pax Americana* structural context. Nakasone introduced his 'grand design' to transform Japan into an international-state (*kokusai kokka*), which entailed, amongst other dimensions, Japan's assumption of an active role in global military-strategic affairs and a revision of Japan's politically passive image (Pyle 1992, 89; 1987, 254-68).

In the Cold War context, Nakasone's identification of Japan as an international-state meant an increase in responsibility in confronting the communist threat from the Soviet Union. He introduced bold policies that directly challenged those that were formed under the peace-state identity label, as his strategy entailed a bigger role for Japan through the promotion of greater integration into U.S. military strategy. These policies included the approval to transfer military technology to the U.S. - which was announced during his trip to Washington in January 1983 to meet President Ronald Reagan - a clear departure of the

---

[3] Note two important points relevant to the utilisation of 'international-state' identity in this paper. First, the argument here focuses on Japan becoming an international-state in the area of security or military-strategic issues. It was already an international-state in other areas, such as economics, finance, technology and investment. See the chapters in Hook and Weiner (1992). Whilst these chapters discuss the extent to which Japan is an international-state in areas related to economics, politics and society, a discussion on security issues was clearly absent. Second, the use of the label 'international' to describe Japan's new security role is not new (See Okawara 1990, Ryu 2005 and Soeya 2005). This is not surprising, as the Japanese government has repeatedly used the label 'international' to describe its role in post-Cold War regional and international affairs, which incorporates a security role expansion in external security affairs. This research however attempts to bring the debate forward by showing how the security policymaking regime has embraced the internationalism in relation to the activities of the SDF in regional and international security affairs.

[4] See Edström (1999) for a historical overview of how the word internationalisation entered into Japan's national discourse.

Yoshida Doctrine's Three Principles of Arms Exports; the announcement of Japan's willingness to contribute in patrolling the Sea of Japan to check on any intrusion from Soviet submarines and other naval activities during an emergency – a reversal of Japan's inactive security posture within the US containment strategy; and the show of bold support during the Group of Seven (G-7) meeting in Williamsburg in May 1983 for the U.S. decision to confront the Soviet installation of SS-20 nuclear missiles in Europe and Asia – a clear declaration of Japan's alignment with the West. In the context of these moves, Nakasone likened Japan to America's 'big aircraft carrier' (*ōkina koku bokan*), which was subsequently interpreted in the media as 'an unsinkable aircraft carrier' (*fuchin kubō*) due to his interpreter's translation (Pyle 2007, 272). At home, Nakasone also challenged long-held taboos that had resulted in Japan's passive security role owing to its peace-state identity. These came in the form of attempts to break the 1 percent limitation on defence spending and publicly talking about the constitutional revision of Article 9 (Pyle 2007, 272-4; 1987, 266-8).

Despite his bold actions, Prime Minister Nakasone's transformation of Japan's identity was limited. While he was successful in triggering public debate, which notably facilitated Tokyo's capacity to undertake more security responsibilities alongside the U.S.,[5] Nakasone was unable to transform Japan's peace-state identity entirely. Nakasone's limited success was attributed to the resistance of the bureaucracy and the continued presence of strong adherents to the Yoshida School in Japanese politics during the Cold War period. However, the transformation of Japan's security identity from a peace-state to international-state gained momentum in the post-Cold War period. The shift in the international material and normative structures following the end of the Cold War period compelled Japanese policymakers to assess Japan's minimalist role in regional and international security affairs. The international-state security identity became part of the official discourse as Japan renegotiated its role in the new regional and international security environment.[6] The

---

[5] One example was Japan stepping up joint military cooperation with the US forces and other Pacific nations in the Rim of Pacific (RIMPAC) exercises (Pyle 1992, 103).

[6] In the post-Cold War period, many competing identities emerged to account for the developments in Japan's security policy. They include Japan as a 'global civilian power' (Hughes 1999; Funabashi 1991-92), Japan as a 'normal' state (Hughes 2004; Singh 2001 and 2002; Ozawa 1994), and Japan as an 'ordinary' state or country (Inoguchi 2003; Inoguchi and Bacon 2006).

Japan as a 'normal state' or 'ordinary power' can be subsumed under the international-state category. In fact, the use of the international-state term is preferred for the following three reasons. First, it is difficult to define the term 'normal' state or 'ordinary' state in academic terms. This is reflected by the lack of consensus in the academic literature on the definition of what a 'normal' state or an 'ordinary' state is. This term is usually used in the policy-based literature to describe the recent advancements in Japan's role in security and military affairs. Second, the 'normal' state or 'ordinary' state phrases owe their origins to the attempts made by the previous trajectory of the Japanese post-Cold War security policy suggests that politicians within the LDP who supported an activist security policy had succeeded in incrementally reconstructing Japan’s security identity in such a way that the ‘peace-state’ label no longer dominated Japanese security discourse and defined its security policy. Instead, the Japanese government was gradually sending out messages to the international community of a reformed Japan that was willing to adopt an activist security policy in regional and international security affairs. Japan expanded its security roles, scope and functions in regional and international security affairs to fulfil its responsibilities as a member of the international community both independently and in the context of the U.S.-Japan security relationship. The expansion of Japan’s security roles did not signal an unravelling of the domestic constraints defined by antimilitarism. Peace as a collective idea remains strong within post-Cold War Japan. However, the means towards achieving peace now includes a more active role in the military-strategic dimension of regional and international affairs.

Identity-Regime

This section explores the relationship between security identity and institutional structure in the production of security policy. This is in line with Barnett’s (1999) hybrid constructivist and institutionalist approach. It is important to incorporate the institutional context for two reasons. In theoretical terms, the dominant collective identity is supported by an institutional structure. The focus here is on how a particular security identity supported by an institutional structure triggers specific kinds of behaviour. Though the policymaking process may comprise practices that relate to competing visions, the security policy outcome is usually determined by a set of dominant practices. Once these dominant practices are

---

Japanese governments beginning in the 1970s to construct Japan as an ‘international-state’. Third, the use of the ‘international-state’ label corresponds to Japan’s official security discourse. It has frequently expressed the need for Japan to adopt international responsibilities in the areas of economics and military-strategic matters. Yanai Shunji (Interview, Tokyo 24 May 2006) and Tokuchi Hideshi (Interview, Tokyo 14 September 2005) also rejected the use of the ‘normal’ state conception in capturing the changes to Japanese post-Cold War security policy.

Accordingly, the use of the term civilian power also serves as an inappropriate characterisation for the developments in Japan’s post-Cold War security role. Civilian power, as used by Maull (1990) and Funabashi (1991-2), had a specific meaning. It was particularly used to refer to Japan’s role expansion in the post-Cold War period through the use of its economic and technological strengths and increased participation in UNPKOs. However, Japan’s security role has expanded beyond the remit of being a global civilian power. Apart from UNPKOs, Japan’s security role has occurred in the form of providing the US military rear-area support during periods of crises and peace. While the SDF’s missions remain focused on promoting peace, the use of the military is increasingly accepted as a legitimate tool of its foreign and security policy with the corresponding decline in its aid budget – a direct challenge to the civilian power characterisation.

institutionalised, they become quite durable, stable and have a collective impact on the promotion of a specific identity and its related security policy behaviours. This arrangement results in a mutually reinforcing relationship between the collective identity and the institutional structure. In empirical terms, Japan's security policymaking structure displays distinctive features, making the incorporation of the institutional structure an essential element in understanding the production of its security policy. Japan's security policy formation process is shaped by, according to Chai (1997), Japan-specific 'symbolic boundaries and images', according to Katzenstein and Okawara (1993), specific domestic social and legal norms, and according to Berger (1998), a unique political culture defined by antimilitarism. This paper builds on these existing works that stressed the importance of the domestic institutional structure through incorporating the collective identity variable, more specifically, security identity.

The production of a security policy understood in an institutional context is a result of a collection of elements. These include the institutional structure, actors, and processes and procedures (both formal and informal ones) and external factors. This collective is referred to here as the security policymaking regime. The outcome of the policy or behaviour from the interaction of these elements is dependent on the dominant collective identity that is embedded in the policymaking regime. The dominant collective identity reflects the dominant normative structure responsible for the formation of security policy. It sets the parameters in all aspects of the security policymaking process and reflects the dominant security interests that influence the policy. In this paper, we study three elements of the security policymaking regime - the agents/actors, the decision-making structure and the US pressure. These are critical elements of the Japanese security policymaking process and important determinant of the dominant security identity. The combination of these three elements reflects the normative structure of the policymaking regime that reflects the dominant identity conception and the outcome of the security policy. It is best understood in normative terms as a particular collective identity of the policymaking process tends to repeatedly produce a similar policy. For the purpose of this paper, we study two outcomes of Japanese security behavior - minimalist and internationalist security policy.[7]

---

[7] Any two sets of separate identities can have overlapping interests or features. However, a clear distinction is made here for two main reasons. First, both peace-state and international-state security identities have particular definitions that result in different security policy behaviour. Though the concept of peace is at the centre of both identities, each of the identities is a product of a separate normative structure that supports a specific security policy for Japan. The peace-state identity results in a low military role for the SDF and an international-state

The first element is the agents who are involved in the security policymaking process. The question asked by this element is who is in and who is out in the policymaking process. This would, in turn, suggest whose interests are incorporated (and become dominant) and whose are excluded (Barnett 1999, 16; Oros 2008). The 'in' agents are those who control the policymaking process by influencing which interests of the state are met, and the 'out' ones belong to the marginalised group whose interests are excluded from influencing the security policy outcome. In the case of Japan, the agents involved in the security policymaking process (also known as the security policymaking elite) loosely comprise the Prime Minister, officials from the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and Cabinet Secretariat, the Chief and Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretaries, the ministers and other high-ranking political appointees and bureaucrats from various ministries, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) (previously known as the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI)) and others, selected members of the LDP and DPJ, opposition parties and academia in Japan.

The people in this group could be broadly classified into three subgroups – mainstream conservatives, revisionists,[8] and progressives (Boyd and Samuels 2005).[9] Based on Yoshida's *shōnin kokka*, mainstream conservatives (that included Yoshida Shigeru, Ikeda Hayato, Ōhira Masayoshi, and Miyazawa Kiichi) envisaged Japan directing all efforts toward achieving the main goal of economic development and technological autonomy, while keeping a low profile in military-strategic affairs (Berger 1996, 336-337). Also known as the pragmatists, this group supported the retention of Article 9 of the Peace Constitution to maintain a minimalist security policy. Though they were committed to strengthening the U.S.-Japan security relationship, they deflected U.S. pressure on Japan to acquire military capabilities that were regarded as inimical to Japan's strategic interests and also resisted pressure for Japan's participation in international military missions. Developing an autonomous defence capability was understood as an economically and politically costly

---

security identity results in a more active military role in regional and international security affairs. Second, the distinction between the two identities is made for methodological reasons so as to highlight the significant change in Japan's security policy between the Cold War and the post-Cold War periods. This significant change is best shown when the two categories of identities are treated separately.

[8] What is referred to as revisionist here is normal nation-alist for Samuels (2007), military realist for Mochizuki (1983/84) and Tamamoto (1990), and the assertive conservative right for Togo (2010). For a detailed discussion on the historical background, policies, and members of these groups, and their debates on security issues, see Samuels (2007, 18-36) and Togo (2010).

[9] For other classifications of the political actors involved in the debates on national security policy, see Berger (1998) and Oros (2008).

option (Samuels 2007, 32-33; Boyd and Samuels, 2005, 26; Berger 1998, 104). Opposing this vision were the revisionist politicians (that included Ashida Hitoshi, Hatoyama Ichirō, and Kishi Nobusuke). Like the mainstream conservatives, they supported the existence of the U.S.-Japan security treaty. However, they viewed Japan's delegation of full security responsibilities to the U.S. as a 'humiliation' (Inoguchi and Bacon 2006, 2). They pushed for a greater degree of security independence from the U.S. through a policy of autonomous defence and an activist security policy. To support this, the revisionist politicians called for a revision of Article 9 to allow Japan to pursue rearmament and widen the SDF's role in external security affairs (Samuels 2007, 30; Boyd and Samuels, 2005, 3). On the extreme left were the progressives who comprised the intellectuals, labour activists and left of centre politicians from the JSP and Japan Communist Party (JCP). Led by the main opposition party JSP, this group supported the policies of pacifism, unarmed neutrality and the abolition of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (Inoguchi and Bacon, 2006, 2). Despite these principles, the progressives supported Yoshida's strategy of practicing a minimalist security policy defined by the peace-state identity (Hook 1996, 27-37; Samuels 2007, 30; Boyd and Samuels 2005, 19; Pyle 1992, 44-5).

The second element is the decision-making structure for Japan's security policy. For this element, we ask the question, to what extent did Japan's decision-making structure facilitate an internal dynamic that promoted an activist security policy in military terms? In answering this question, we analyse the role of the bureaucracy over the security policymaking process. Here, the type of ministries involved and their extent of influence over the process is examined. The role of the prime minister and his leadership are also examined. They determine the extent of influence the prime minister could exercise over the security policymaking process. The influence of the JDA/MOD is also explored here, namely the kind of influence, or lack thereof, this institution exercised over the security policymaking process. Finally, this element also analyses whether the decision-making process related to security policy was rigid/immobilist or flexible in relation to the implementation of an activist security policy.

The final element is the influence of the U.S. in Japan's security policymaking process, namely the strength of U.S. pressure (*beiatsu*). The question asked here is to what extent the U.S. pressure influenced Japan's security policy in terms of Japan's involvement in external security affairs. As a result of the U.S. role as the occupying authority and the existence of the U.S.-Japan alliance (including the provision of U.S. military bases in Japan), U.S. pressure has been regarded as an important factor in shaping Japan’s security policy. The feature is captured, rightly or wrongly, by the concept of ‘karaoke diplomacy’, as introduced by Inoguchi and Jain (2000). According to this concept, Japan’s foreign policy options are likened to the list of songs in a karaoke machine. The menu of policy options (especially the essential ones) for Japan is provided by the U.S. This practice leaves little room for leaders in Japan to exercise innovation in choosing independent policy responses. Although Tokyo has some leeway in deciding whom, when, where, what or how it will engage internationally, Japan’s eventual policy choice reflects compliance with U.S. directives (see Inoguchi and Jain 2000, xv).

Peace-State Security Identity: Minimalist Security Policy

Japan’s peace-state security identity during the Cold War repeatedly produced a minimalist security policy defined by self-defence principles, with a low priority on external military-strategic issues. That was supported by the following features of the security policymaking regime.

In terms of agents, the security policymaking process during the Cold War was dominated by mainstream conservatives or Yoshida School politicians. As discussed earlier, this group of politicians resisted any attempt to expand Japan’s role in external affairs outside the confines of economics. They deflected repeated pressure from both the U.S. and the revisionist politicians for Japan to acquire stronger military capabilities and participate in military missions that were beyond Japan’s national territory (Boyd and Samuels 2005, 26). Owing to the astute leadership of Yoshida and his followers, they were able to unify all three main political groups within the Japanese political environment, as discussed above, around the Yoshida Doctrine as the foundation of Japanese security policy. On the one hand, the mainstream conservatives ensured the continued support of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (in line with the revisionists), but on the other hand, they supported Article 9 (in line with the demands of the JSP). Subsequently, most Japanese prime ministers (except for Nakasone) not only grounded Japan’s security policy in that strategy but also strengthened the principles that defined Japan’s external security role predominantly in economic terms, supporting Japan’s low profile in regional and international military-strategic affairs.

The decision-making process displayed a weak internal dynamic within the security policymaking elite to promote policies that would have expanded Japan's external security role and responsibilities. That was due to several reasons. First, the objectives of the Yoshida School politicians were supported by officials in the Japanese bureaucracy. As this institution dominated the Japanese policymaking structure, support from the bureaucracy was crucial in the formation and maintenance of the consensus on the SDF's low profile in external military-strategic affairs (Campbell 1989, Rix et al 1988, Fukui 1977, Baerwald 1977). The large civilian bureaucracy oversaw all aspects of Japan's security policy, controlled mainly by civilian officials from MOFA and the economics-focused ministries, MITI and MOF, with the civilian and military officials from the JDA playing a supporting role. That resulted in a practice where economic perspectives of external security issues received greater emphasis than military-strategic ones (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, 92-3; Samuels 2007). Major policy decisions on defence were made based on the consensus achieved through an inter-ministerial coordination arrangement at the National Defence Council[10] (restructured as the Security Office in 1986) located in the Cabinet Secretariat. Though the JDA members were allowed to participate, the discussions were dominated by the civilian officials from the economics-based ministries that routinely, both formally and informally, ensured that the economic and political aspects dominated the security policymaking process over defence and security issues (Katzenstein 1996, 106; Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, 93). In discussions of national security issues, such as those related to defence build-up plans, the National Defence Council was dominated by Yoshida School adherents who repeatedly pushed limited security policy objectives focusing on national defence and a low military involvement in external affairs. When they did push for an expanded security policy (displayed in the passage of the 1976 NDPO), the main objective was not to support the SDF's expanded external security role (a demand of the revisionist politicians) but to further extend civilian control over areas of security policy which were then informally in the hands of the U.S. and Japanese militaries (Berger 1998, 104).[11]

---

[10] The National Defence Council was tasked to review major defence policy decisions before they were presented to the Cabinet for final approval (Berger 1998, 50).

[11] The SDF's role relative to other ministries strengthened in the mid-1970s and early 1980s. This was not only because of its superior technical knowledge in military matters but also due to its close links with the US military through consultations and negotiations on building stronger defence cooperation, joint studies and joint military exercises. The SDF became an important source for receiving US demands, requests and expectations of Japan's defence roles and missions (Katahara 2001, 77, 79), though it occurred more behind the scenes of the security policymaking process.

The sole dominance of the bureaucracy in the security policymaking process was tempered from the mid-1970s. That was when the bureaucrats and the LDP politicians, especially the defence *zoku* (tribe) which comprised experts in defence issues, strengthened cooperation in policymaking. Though this new arrangement facilitated greater involvement of the politicians, it did not shift the focus of Japan's security policy. As the cooperation flourished, both the politicians and the bureaucrats from MOFA, MITI and MOF relied on each other in promoting the consensus based on the Yoshida Doctrine. They reinforced each other's policy stances during and after negotiations on Japanese security policy, leaving the JDA with a low key role (George Mulgan 2003; Katahara 2001, 77). The consensus between the politicians and the bureaucrats was legally backed up by the Cabinet Legislation Bureau (CLB) – an important bureaucratic organ that was responsible for official interpretations of Article 9 and various aspects of Japan's security policy (Samuels 2007, 49).[12] Due to the integral influence of legal issues in Japanese security debates and the SDF's roles and limitations, the CLB played an influential role in limiting an overseas security role for the SDF in legal terms and preserving Japan's minimalist security policy (See Samuels 2004; 2007, 49-52). The Cabinet, in this arrangement, was a 'rubber-stamping' institution that supported the consensus and discussed matters that were already approved by the LDP policy committees, namely the Policy Affairs Research Committee, its sub-committees and the General Affairs Committee; hence, showing little agency in shaping the policymaking process (Estévez-Abe 2006, 637).

Second, the weak internal dynamic to produce a more activist security policy was a result of the weak position of the JDA and the SDF officers within the security policymaking regime. Due to the mistrust of the military within Japanese state and society, the military's role was kept 'quasi-legitimate' (Berger 1998, 83) and was denied an independent position within Japanese security policymaking and planning. Its main task was perceived to be centred on self-defence, that is, to defend Japan from physical attacks (Katzenstein 1996, 104). The JDA had a status of an agency rather than a ministry, led by a director-general, rather than a minister under the prime minister's office. This institutional characteristic of the JDA pointed to its inferior status within the bureaucracy and its weak influence in security policymaking (Oros 2008, 61; Samuels 2007, 52). Moreover, the JDA was subjected to strict civilian control displayed in many ways. First, the director-general of JDA had to be a civilian state minister; that position was assisted by two vice-ministers, who were also civilian officials. The highest ranking SDF officers, namely the chief of staff of the GSDF, MSDF and ASDF, were subject to civilian supervision and direction. Second, within the defence agency, the MOF, MOFA and MITI not only controlled the security policymaking process, as discussed above, but their influence also penetrated the top, middle and lower levels of JDA's organisational structure. Their presence was also dominant in the negotiation and implementation stages of policies in various areas of the agency. The JDA's budget was controlled by the MOF through the appointment of an official as JDA's administrative vice-minister; an official from MOFA occupied the Policy Office; an official from MITI controlled the Equipment Bureau; and senior officials from other ministries were brought in to reinforce civilian control in the JDA (Samuels 2007, 52-53). Third, JDA officials were also seconded to other ministries for exposure to the work and ethics of non-military areas. In such a policymaking structure, the influence of military professionals, experts in defence and security issues, was subordinated and circumscribed by the entrenched civilian bureaucracy (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, 95-7; Hughes 2009, 55).

---

[12] The CLB provided legal advice on all critical aspects of Japanese security policy, including the SDF's constitutionality and its limitations, interpretations of collective self-defence operations, SDF's overseas deployment and definition of the use of force. During the Cold War, the CLB was made up of officials from the various civilian ministries but no defence agency official had ever been assigned to the bureau. All proposed legislation, speeches, regulations were vetted by the officials at the CLB and the interpretation by the CLB became the official interpretation of the politicians and bureaucracy. Yoshida and his followers relied on the CLB to deflect pressure from the US and those within Japan that pushed for an expanded security role in regional and international security affairs. This facilitated the maintenance of a narrow security policy as captured by the peace-state identity conception (See Samuels 2007, 49-52). Also see Samuels (2004).

Third, the weak internal dynamic to produce a more activist security policy was augmented by the weak position of the prime minister in providing leadership and policy direction in the security policymaking process (George Mulgan 2003). Though the postwar Constitution legally granted the prime minister control of the SDF and 'relative freedom in foreign affairs' (Shinoda 2007, 19, 25), the function was limited due to mainly three reasons: first, the weak presence of political appointees in the ministries, hence, keeping the influence of the prime minister and other politicians low over the bureaucracy's dominance in the security policymaking process; second, the prime minister was unable to rely on support from politicians inside the LDP, especially those belonging to the defence *zoku*, as it usually consisted of members from various factions, and the defence *zoku* could not be seen to be too close to the prime minister (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, 93); and third, the prime minister's role was to seek a consensus for a policy over a wide range of groups in politics, business and bureaucracy before making a foreign policy decision, and a role that was more policy-oriented and aggressive in nature was viewed with suspicion by politicians (Hosoya 1974, 368; Angel 1988/89).

This point becomes especially important in explaining the inability of Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro to break the dominance of the Yoshida Doctrine's influence on Japan's security policy in the Cold War period. As a member of the revisionist camp, Nakasone's mandate was to expand Japan's security policy objectives away from the strong economics and self-defence focus. To promote his more active security agenda, Nakasone introduced a set of administrative reforms to gain greater control of the policymaking process – from a traditional bottom-up approach to a top-down (presidential) approach (Shinoda 2007; Angel 1988/89). Though he saw some success (such as the formation of the Security Council and the reorganisation of the Cabinet Secretariat, and better coordination between various ministries and agencies in the context of a domestic or international crisis faced by Japan), Nakasone faced severe constraints from the institutional arrangement that was dominated by the interests of the dominant bureaucracy, especially the economic ministries (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, 93-5).[13] He was able to push some of his active security policy agenda over the bureaucracy following his reforms of the policymaking structure but these did not result in the expansion of Japan's security role in regional and international security affairs.[14]

The above features of the decision-making process predisposed Japan to produce a minimalist security policy within the normative structure that was defined by the peace-state security identity. Any initiative that hinted at an expansion of Japan's low key security role usually failed. Those that were successful were characterised as 'too little, too late', hampered by the immobilist and incremental defence policymaking process (Hellman 1977, 332; Keddell 1993). The repeated practice of a peace-based security policy led to an 'institutionalised inertia' (Grimes 2003) in the security policymaking process that precluded Japan from breaking away from the economics-based security policy to formulate a more activist security policy. That security policymaking structure inhibited decisions that departed from the 'normal' which was defined by self-defence and low involvement in external military-strategic affairs. It reinforced the immobilist structure within Japanese security policy decision-making and resulted in Japan becoming reactive to the international environment and external pressure from the US. This leads to the third element of the security policymaking regime.

---

[13] On example illustrated by Angel (1988/9) was that bureaucrats from the finance and foreign affairs ministries and the defence agency assigned lower ranking officials (instead of the administrative vice-ministers) to serve at the Cabinet Secretariat offices as this allowed the ministries to retain influence over these officials (pp. 599-600).

[14] Examples of these successes include: Nakasone's use of personal advisors to circumvent the bureaucracy to strengthen Japan's relations with South Korea in 1983, which led to his successful visit to South Korea in January of that year; Nakasone's show of direct support to the US missile deployment in Europe during the Williamsburg Summit in January 1983; the revision of the 1967 three principles of arms exports to allow the export of military technology to the US; and strengthening the authority of the Kantei in crises management (Shinoda 2007, 28-37).

As a former occupier and security guarantor, the U.S. applied constant pressure on Japan, either implicit or explicitly, to ease its reliance on the policy of *seikei-bunri* (separation of politics from economics) and assume a larger security role in the alliance relationship. This was especially true since the 1970s when Cold War tensions intensified (represented by the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan and Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea) and Japan emerged as the second most powerful economy in the world. Okawara Yoshio, Japan's ambassador to the U.S. during the period 1980-85, admitted that the U.S. had pressured Japan to strengthen its defence capabilities and assume international responsibilities as a member of the Western Alliance (Okawara 1990, 121).[15] The dominance of the alliance in Japanese security policy treated Japanese security interests as identical to those of the U.S. due to the extensive bilateral political and economic relations between the two countries. Hellman (1977) wrote '[b]eyond the US alliance, there has been virtually no strategic policy regarding external threats or regional conflict' (p. 329). This point is well articulated by Miyashita (1999) in the context of Japan's aid policy. He argued that the asymmetric interdependence between Japan and the U.S. (in the areas of the export market and security) led to the widespread belief within Japan that it had more to lose if the bilateral relationship experienced difficulties. According to Miyashita (1999), that resulted in Japan giving in to U.S. pressure and the U.S. gaining substantial bargaining leverage over Japan.

In summary, Japan's Cold War security policy was an outcome of a set of beliefs, practices and policies supported by the peace-state security identity within the security policymaking regime. That arrangement was defined by the consensus between politicians from the Yoshida School and civilian bureaucrats from MOF, MITI, and MOFA that dominated the policymaking structure. Japan displayed a weak internal dynamic within the Japanese security policymaking elite to develop a wider security role or internationalism in its security policy due to the marginalisation and suppression of revisionist politicians and defence officials who supported a wider security role for Japan in global security affairs, accentuated by the weak position of the prime minister in the security policymaking process. Any policy that hinted at an expanded security policy was hampered by the rigid or immoblist decision-making process in relation to external security affairs, and came mostly from U.S. pressure (*beiatsu*). These enduring features during the Cold War produced a security policy that not only prioritised Japan's economic objectives/interests but also framed Japan's role in regional and international affairs in mainly economics terms. That approach resulted in a minimalist security policy that limited the SDF's mandate to national defence and excluded external security affairs.

---

[15] Needless to say, the Japanese prime ministers, members of the LDP, and the bureaucracy were supportive of the close relationship with the US in all aspects of the bilateral relationship, including security policy. The support from the Japanese prime ministers of the US served two functions. First, they allowed them to avoid domestic responsibilities for implementing controversial policies raising the breakdown of the US-Japan relationship as a consequence (Angel 1988/9, 588). Second, the conservative politicians in the LDP relied on the US to push for an agenda that would expand Japan's security role.

International-State Security Identity: Activist Security Policy

The policymaking regime that supported the peace-state security identity was challenged in the post-Cold War period. That led to the emergence and the subsequent strengthening of the normative structure that supported the international-state security identity within the Japanese security policymaking regime that produced an activist security policy. That is discussed below.

The end of the Cold War ushered in major changes to the Japanese political sphere. Apart from the brief hiatus in LDP rule during 1993-1994, there were three other significant developments relevant to the actors featured in the Japanese security policymaking regime. First, the political power of mainstream conservatives declined. Prominent figures of this camp, such as Miyazawa Kiichi, Gotōda Masaharu, Kaifu Toshiki, Katō Koichi, Kōno Yohei, Koga Makoto and Nonaka Hiromu, experienced either a severe reduction of influence within the LDP and in the security policymaking process or departed from the political scene (Boyd and Samuels 2005: 27-41). Second, revisionist politicians replaced them as the dominant political force within the Japanese political system. That was reflected by the accession to power of Prime Ministers Hashimoto Ryūtarō, Mori Yoshirō, Koizumi Junichirō, Abe Shinzō and Aso Taro. As these politicians incrementally dominated the political system, they exercised greater control over the formulation of Japan's national security objectives and interests. As discussed earlier, they were keen in raising Japan's profile in external security affairs, accepting the Japanese military as a legitimate tool of its security policy and, in various degrees, revising the Peace Constitution to support the new SDF roles in regional and international security affairs. The position of the revisionist politicians was strengthened by a third development - the demise of the JSP as the main opposition party and political force within the Japanese political system in the post-Cold War period. This development followed as the JSP/SDPJ shifted away from its core principles, as discussed above, and became a coalition member with the LDP in 1994. The more centrist DPJ replaced the JSP/SDPJ as the main opposition party in Japan and eventually took over the national government following the historical electoral victory over the LDP in 2009. What is important here is that the demise of the JSP/SDPJ led to the removal of strong 'psychological and political obstacles' (Kohno 2007, 40) from the Japanese domestic political environment for a more advanced SDF role in regional and international military-strategic affairs. The DPJ, as the main opposition party, had a security policy posture that was more similar to the LDP (Pekkanen and Krauss 2005, 437). Though there were divisions within the DPJ itself, the policy of strengthening Japan's military contribution to regional and security affairs was common between the LDP and DPJ. The two parties differed in the means and specific conditions of Japan's security role expansion – a development discussed in more detail in the conclusion.

With the shifts in the political sphere described above, the decision-making process also developed a stronger internal dynamic to formulate a more activist security policy for Japan. The foundation of this change came with the institutional and administrative reforms carried out during the period 1996-2001 by revisionist politicians. Initiated by Prime Minister Hashimoto, the main purpose of these reforms was to strengthen national leadership in times of peace and crises. That required a modification of Japan's traditional structure policymaking, as discussed under the peace-state security identity, and the strengthening of the central authority of the Japanese government over the policymaking process, namely the prime minister and his Cabinet (Shinoda 2007, 63; Mishima 1998).

The reforms included measures to strengthen the support structure for the prime minister and the Cabinet. That was especially evident in how the Cabinet Secretariat (Naikoku Kanbō) and the Cabinet Office (Naikakufu) were reformed. The Cabinet Secretariat saw an expansion in its functions in terms of drafting and planning of policies and creation of new positions with new roles or functions with a more flexible mandate. Unlike previous practices, these positions were opened to individuals from both outside and inside the government (George Mulgan 2003, 87). The reforms also saw the replacement of the Prime Minister's Office (Sōrifu) with the Cabinet Office as part of the reorganisation undertaken by Hashimoto in the late 1990s. This body empowered the prime minister greater control in the exercise of central leadership over the initiation and coordination of government policy (George Mulgan 2003, 87-88). As part of the reforms, the Prime Minister's Official Residence (Kantei) was also reorganised to facilitate a wider influence on the policymaking process. The reorganisation led to an increase in the number of staff assisting the prime minister. To the existing Chief Cabinet Secretary (CCS) and its three deputies, an additional three assistant CCS and five special advisors were added to the team. As their appointments were political, it gave them greater influence in the policymaking process especially in terms of coordination over the ministries (George Mulgan 2003, 88). As part of the reforms, the Kantei broke away from traditional practice related to the recruitment of staff, as new positions were made based on flexible appointments of officials rather than relying on transfers from the traditional strong ministries that imposed their interests on the policymaking process. Moreover, high-level appointments from ministries were screened to ensure suitability (Shinoda 2007, 64-70). Apart from the issue of personnel, administrative reforms also led to the creation of ad-hoc offices for specific policy areas to ensure institutional flexibility and further coordination in policy between ministries (Shinoda 2007, 75).

Unlike George Mulgan (2003) who argued that administrative reforms have had limited impact on the policymaking process (p. 89), the argument here regards these reforms as important since they contributed to the normative shift within the policymaking regime leading to the implementation of an activist security policy (also see Shinoda 2006). The reforms led to the three important changes relevant to Japan's security policy decision-making process. First, the bureaucracy no longer had the same dominance over information and the various aspects of the security policymaking process as they did during the Cold War. The number of ministries and agencies were reduced from 20 to 14 and bureaucrats were no longer permitted to testify in parliament. The reforms shifted the power in the policymaking process from the bureaucracy to the prime minister and the Cabinet, and other institutions, such as the Cabinet Office, Cabinet Secretariat and Kantei. Unlike the peace-state security identity, the Cabinet and other institutions not only strengthened their coordination role over the ministries and agencies in the policymaking process but also their role to initiate and draft policy initiatives (Boyd and Samuels 2005, 38; Calder 2009, 150). Moreover, there was also a strengthened centralisation of the power of politicians within ministries. The control of politicians over the policymaking process vis-à-vis the bureaucrats was strengthened through the introduction of junior or deputy ministers and parliamentary secretaries, which had direct impact on the strengthening of the Cabinet's role, coupled by a similar impact on the role of the prime minister, over the policymaking process (George Mulgan 2003, 89; Estévez-Abe 2006, 645).

Second, the administrative reforms bills addressed the other cause of impasse in Japanese Cold War security policy under the peace-state security identity - the consensus-style decision making process. The strengthening of the central authority of the Kantei and the prime minister allowed them to overcome conflicting interests of various dominant ministries by adopting a top-down approach in the policymaking process – referred to by Krauss and Nyblade (2005) as the presidentialisation of the office of the Japanese prime minister. As mentioned above, this process facilitated security policy debates based on national interests rather than any ministry's interests (Shinoda 2007, 64). However, as Pekkanen and Krauss (2005) have pointed out, consensus remains an important feature of the security policymaking process in the post-Cold War period. Instead of forming consensus at the factional level within the LDP or between the LDP and the bureaucracy as in the Cold War period, consensus is now reached in the political sphere, such as between parties in the ruling coalition and/or between the ruling coalition and other opposition parties (pp. 441-442). More importantly, the consensus on an activist security policy, which included the expanded SDF contribution to regional and international affairs, became fairly strong.

Third, the centralisation of the policymaking structure around the prime minister, the Cabinet and the Kantei resulted in a shift in the balance of power between ministries in the security policymaking regime. The economic ministries and MOFA were no longer dominant in defining or setting the security policy objectives. The JDA/MOD and the SDF officials, marginalised in the Cold War period, became increasingly more involved and integrated in the security policymaking process from the 1990s. JDA's/MOD's widening role in the security policymaking process was evident since the update of the US-Japan defence guidelines in 1996 and the expansion of Japan's SDF role beyond national defence expressed in new security policies and doctrines implemented in the post-Cold War period (Green 2003, 63; Katahara 2001, 70). One indication of this development was the reformation of the

Security Consultative Committee - the principal coordinating mechanism for the U.S.-Japan alliance – to the Two-plus-Two meeting in 1996, which consisted of representation from both the foreign and defence ministers of Japan and the U.S. The inclusion of the director-general of the JDA along with the foreign minister in this meeting had an equalising effect between the two ministries and raised the JDA's involvement in matters relating to U.S.-Japan security relations (Hughes 2009, 55; Katahara 2001, 82). Along with shaping the U.S.-Japan security relationship, the JDA/MOD and SDF also played a critical role in pursuing defence diplomacy through the promotion of security dialogues and defence exchanges with neighbouring states during the post-Cold War period (Katahara 2001, 82).

Outside of external security relations, the JDA/MOD and SDF officers also played a key role domestically in the debates and coordination process of Japan's defence policies and doctrines. Previously a distrusted body, the SDF became more involved in the security policymaking process from Hashimoto's period especially in an advisory role to the Prime Minister, contributing to the discussions on defence and security issues at the National Diet (a role that was banned by the 1952 National Safety Agency order), and participating as staff members at the Cabinet's National Security Affairs Office (Nagashima 1998 cited in Katahara 2001, 82). In recognition of its elevated role in the policymaking process, the JDA was upgraded from an agency to a ministry in 2007 after 53 years with the head holding a ministerial position. This elevated status granted the defence minister and the civilian and military officials within the MOD new powers and greater involvement in the security policymaking process especially in using the SDF to contribute to regional and international peace and stability.[16]

The changes in the decision-making feature of the security policymaking regime outlined above led to the deliberate incorporation of an international dimension into Japan's post-Cold War security objectives and the widening of the SDF's roles and responsibilities in regional and international security affairs both outside and within the U.S.-Japan security relationship. One of the initial milestones during the early years was the incorporation of humanitarian and disaster relief activities into the SDF's mandate through the passage of the IPCL in 1992. The passing of the peacekeeping legislation was the result of a push by the revisionist politicians within the top leadership of the LDP, such Ozawa Ichirō, who was the leading advocate of Japan’s contribution to international society through an SDF deployment (Yamaguchi 1992, 166; Samuels 2003b); members of the defence zoku; and like-minded bureaucrats within MOFA (George 1993, 565). Even though these issues were traditionally overseen by MOFA, there was a realisation within the security policymaking elite that MOFA’s lead in drafting the IPCL would not have been suitable for the achievement of the objective that was strictly defined by the deployment of the SDF to UNPKOs. In order to achieve the passage of IPCL, a centralisation of the policymaking process was required. The Kantei took control of the drafting of the bill. This move facilitated inter-ministerial coordination that led to the successful drafting and passage of the PKO legislation (Shinoda 2007, 58-59). Without Kantei’s lead, as Shinoda (2007) asserted, the IPCL would not have been passed (p. 62).

---

[16] For details of the reformed JDA/MOD and SDF officers roles in the security policymaking process, see Hughes (2009, 53-65).

Subsequently, Japan also displayed political will to revise its security role in the context of the U.S.-Japan security relationship despite strained bilateral relations during and in the aftermath of the Persian Gulf War. The Japanese leadership was aware that the changes required of Japan’s role within the bilateral security relationship would mean a widening of Japan’s security responsibilities in maintaining regional peace and stability. What followed was a decision by Japan’s security policymaking elite to update the U.S.-Japan security relationship in line with the strategic challenges of the post-Cold War period. In more precise terms, that meant increased bilateral defence cooperation despite the existence of domestic constraints. Following the Hashimoto-Clinton summit in 1996, the security policymaking elite including the civilian and military officials from the JDA, pushed for the development of a regional role for the SDF alongside the U.S. military. They formulated means to allow the SDF to assist the U.S. military in times of crises over a larger geographical area, though with limits. The Japanese leadership suggested and agreed for the SDF to engage in rear-area roles, such as to evacuate Japanese based overseas in the areas of conflict, to cope with a large-scale refugee problem during a crisis, to support UN sanctions, including a sea blockade if a conflict erupted in the Asia-Pacific region, and to provide logistical support to the U.S. military in ‘areas surrounding Japan’ (*Japan Times*, 4 May 1996).[17]

---

[17] Apart from developing an active humanitarian and disaster relief role and a strong US-Japan security relationship, the Japanese security policy-making elite also demonstrated an internal dynamic in providing ‘thought leadership’ in the construction of the regional security architecture suitable in the post-Cold War period. Japan promoted a multilateral security dialogue in Asia, in the form of the Nakayama proposal, which eventually led to the formation of the ARF in 1994 (Midford 2000).

The Japanese government's activist approach towards security policy was most evident during the U.S.-led global war on terror. It was premised on a commitment from the Japanese leadership not to repeat the heavily criticised response to the 1990-1 Persian Gulf Crisis when Japan's contribution was confined to economic support. It displayed an internal dynamic in carving out an appropriate role in the fight against terrorism on the basis of Japan being a responsible member of the international community. Immediately after the September 11 attacks, Satō Yukio, Japan's Representative to the UN, informed the 56th UN General Assembly that 'combating terrorism is also Japan's own responsibility', emphasising the keen interest Japan had in participating in international efforts meant to challenge the threat posed by international terrorism (MOFA 2001a). In carving out Japan's responsible role in response to the September 11 attacks, Prime Minister Koizumi relied on the Preamble of the Japanese Constitution. He said, "The Preamble to the Constitution states that Japan will strive to achieve a respectable position in international communities. We have to act differently from the past (when Japan acted passively in international affairs)" (*Mainichi Daily News*, September 18, 2001. Parenthesis from original).

Breaking from past practice, Prime Minister Koizumi Junichirō took advantage of the administrative and institutional reforms that facilitated the exercise of a top-down decision-making approach in formulating Japan's response to the U.S.-led war on terror. The Kantei, not MOFA, was central in the development of the activist security policy during Koizumi's government. This centralised arrangement bypassed the traditional consensus-seeking process within the LDP and core ministries. With this arrangement, Koizumi expertly used the strengthened position of the Kantei to push through anti-terrorism legislation for the SDF's deployment to Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and another bill that authorised an SDF deployment for a humanitarian mission in Iraq (Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)) even when fighting was underway (Shinoda 2007, 93-6). Deputy CCS Furukawa Teijiro said, "If the Kantei has not handled this issue [personnel contribution to OEF], we could not have done this quickly" (Shinoda 2007, 93. Parenthesis added). Moreover, unlike the 1990-1 Persian Gulf Crisis, Prime Minister Koizumi wasted no time in characterising the events of September 11 as a 'crisis' for Japan (Shinoda 2003, 28-9; 2002; Singh 2006). That crisis discourse spread and was internalised by the top officials of the Koizumi government and the entire bureaucracy (Shinoda 2003, 28). This framing of the September 11 attacks added a sense of urgency within all institutions that were responsible for the formulation of Japan's proactive response. This crisis discourse facilitated the Japanese government's efforts to expand its international role in global security affairs.

This strengthened activism challenged the rigid or immobilist characteristic of Japanese security policymaking process defined by the peace-state identity, as witnessed in the context of Japan's participation in the war on terror. According to Tokuchi Hideshi, the quick passage of the ATSML by the Diet surprised everybody and changed the perceptions of the international community that Japanese security policymaking process was slow and immobile (Personal Interview, Tokyo, 14 September, 2005). That change becomes obvious when Japan's responses to the 1990-1 Persian Gulf Crisis and the U.S.-led war on terror are compared. Compared to the failed UN Peace Cooperation Corps Bill during the 1991 Persian Gulf Crisis and even the IPCL bill that was passed in 1992, the bills that authorised the SDF deployment to both OEF and OIF were passed relatively quickly by the Lower and the Upper Houses of the Diet. According to one estimate, the total time taken for deliberation of the ATSML in both houses was only 62 hours, whereas the IPCL took 179 hours (Shinoda 2002). Another estimate states that the ATSML took three weeks and 33 hours of Diet debate, while the IPCL took nine months (Hughes 2004, 15). The quick decision-making structure displayed during the global war on terror was not a temporary development in the Japanese security policymaking process but a permanent feature that continues to produce a more responsive security response to regional and international crises. For example, in response to North Korea's alleged nuclear test in October 2006, Abe Shinzo, Koizumi's successor, adopted a quick response that included the imposition of Japanese sanctions against North Korea (even before the U.N. Security Council had adopted a resolution against North Korea), the closing of all Japanese ports to North Korean ships and cargo and a ban on all visits by North Koreans to Japan (Hughes and Krauss 2007, 164).

The activism on the part of the Japanese leadership occurred in the context of reduced pressure from the U.S. against Japan in the realm of security policy. This activism shown by the Japanese security policymaking elite did not materialise in the form of an independent security policy even though there were instances of such behaviour.[18] Instead, it was expressed in the form of a pragmatic approach based on the recognition that an enhanced international and regional security role for Japan would only be legitimised under the aegis of the U.S.-Japan security relationship. The U.S. continues to shape and influence Japanese security policy decisions. This was the case during the Cold War era and continues to be the case now. All the post-Cold War Japanese prime ministers, across both the conservative and socialist political spectrums, recognised the core importance of the U.S. for Japanese security policy practice. However, unlike the Cold War period, the U.S. pressure in the post-Cold War period did not automatically result in the security policymaking elite's decision to conform to U.S. demands to expand the SDF's role in the maintenance of peace and stability in regional and international security affairs alongside the U.S. military.[19] Instead, the security policymaking elite displayed political will in developing a security policy based on common strategic interests to address the asymmetrical nature of the bilateral relationship. Japan's show of increased agency through an expanded security role, characterised as being a reliable ally, was in response to maintain a strong U.S.-Japan security relationship and, in turn, reinforce its military presence in Asia. Enhanced efforts to widen the SDF's role within the U.S.-Japan security relationship from the security policymaking elite have contributed to the replacement of its 'free-rider' or 'Japan as a follower' image with 'Japan as a reliable ally' image (also see INSS Special Report 2000).

---

[18] Some examples include Japan's questioning of the US security commitment following the 1990-1 Persian Gulf Crisis and the 1998 Taepodong Crisis, Japan's engagement policy towards China following the Tiananmen Incident, and Japan's acquisition of intelligence satellites following the 1998 Taepodong Crisis.

The weakened U.S. pressure was most revealing from the manner Japan formulated its response to the U.S.-led war against terrorism. Although it was clear that Japan's proactive response in the U.S.-led anti-terror campaign was to display a strong commitment to the U.S., the security policymaking elite persistently defined Japan's response not as a result of U.S. pressure but as its own initiative (Midford 2003, 335-336). The reports of Deputy Secretary Armitage urging Japan to 'show the flag' during his meeting with Japan's ambassador to the U.S., Yanai Shunji, were denied by Prime Minister Koizumi. He said, "We've received no such request. However, the important thing is not what the United States asked us to do. It is what we can offer to combat terrorism" (*Mainichi Daily News*, September 18, 2001). Emphasising his willingness to support U.S. retaliatory efforts, Prime Minister Koizumi said, "We support the U.S. as an ally and plan to provide as much support as possible, while taking our *own* initiatives to exterminate terrorism" (*Nikkei Weekly*, September 24, 2001; MOFA 2001b. Emphasis added). The US also reciprocated. It displayed caution by not pressuring Japan on how it should contribute to the war on terror (Shinoda Tomohito, Personal Interview, Tokyo, September 12, 2005).

---

[19] There were instances during the early post-Cold War period of US pressure that led Japan to back down from its foreign policy objectives. Some examples include Japan's rejection of membership in Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad's East Asia Economic Caucus (EAEC) proposal and its suspension of loan aid to Iran for a hydroelectric power in 1995 (Miyashita 1999, 703-704). However, what is important to note is that the focus here is on US pressure in the area of Japan's contribution to regional and international security affairs in military terms. This pressure weakened over the course of the post-Cold War period showing the weakening of an element of the institutional culture that supported Japan's peace-state security identity.

Japan had also displayed activism by crafting a security role that was useful to U.S. military objectives during the fight against terrorism. That has been referred to by Midford (2003) as 'manufactured *gaiatsu*', defined as 'a time-honoured practice whereby the Japanese government requests foreign pressure in order to give it an excuse to do what it wants to do anyway' (pp. 335-6). The g*aiatsu* (from the U.S.) was manufactured by Japan in several ways. The MSDF approached the commander of the U.S. Navy to propose ways Japan could be of assistance to the U.S. military that included the escorting of U.S. battle fleets to the Indian Ocean and intelligence-gathering. In the face of immense opposition at home, the MSDF approached the U.S. Navy to request U.S. pressure on Japan to despatch the advanced air-defence Aegis destroyer and P-3C anti-submarine patrol aircraft to the Indian Ocean. The defence lobby group in the Diet was also urged to lobby high-ranking officials in the U.S. State Department and National Security Council to support a 'push' for Japan's active participation in OEF. The widely reported 'show the flag' comment allegedly made during the meeting between Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and Ambassador Yanai Shunji could also be perceived as manufactured *gaiatsu*. As mentioned earlier, Koizumi denied such a request from the U.S. Moreover, a diplomat present at the meeting with Deputy Secretary Armitage also could not confirm the 'show of flag' comment (Midford 2003, 335-336).

In summary, the shift in the dominant security identity within the security policymaking regime had a direct impact on the kind of security policy that was produced in the post-Cold War period. Japan displayed an activist security policy in which the SDF was mandated to contribute to regional and international security environment, both independently and alongside the U.S. The security policymaking elite's widening of Japan's military contribution to international affairs was supported by a reformed security policymaking regime. The former immobilist or rigid characterisation of the security policymaking process was replaced by a more proactive feature. That was supported by the emergence of revisionist politicians who replaced the dominance of Yoshida School adherents on the political scene and the security policymaking process, the strengthened positions and influence of the prime minister, Cabinet and Kantei over the security policymaking process allowing for a more top-down decision-making style and an increase in the influence and involvement of both civilian and military officials from the JDA/MOD in the security policymaking process, especially in terms of influencing the outcome of Japan's security objectives, doctrines and policies. Under the reformed policymaking regime, Japan displayed a strengthened internal dynamic in setting its security policy objectives and controlling the decision-making process related to security policy. Instead of being influenced by intense U.S. pressure, Japan actively devised its own means to bring about peace and stability in the regional and international security environment.

Conclusion

The aim of the paper was to analyse the cause for Japan's security policy expansion in the post-Cold War period. It argued that Japan's security policy expansion is captured by the shift in Japan's security identity from a peace-state to an international-state. That collective identity shift is understood in the context of the Japanese security policymaking regime. Three elements of the regime were studied - the agents, the decision-making process and the role of the U.S. In the Cold War period, the dominant normative structures that expressed a minimalist security policy were defined by the peace-state security identity. It was characterised by low activism within Japan in carving out an overseas security role, a high-level of pressure from the U.S., a policymaking process dominated by the Yoshida School adherents and a bureaucracy that suffered from immobilism while implementing an activist security policy in military terms. In the post-Cold War period, the shift in the normative structures resulted in the Japanese security policymaking elite pushing for an activist security role in external security affairs in military terms. That was a result of the increased dominance of revisionist politicians in the policymaking process, greater centralisation of decision-making in the area of security policy within the Kantei, Cabinet and the politicians with a concomitant decline in the dominance of the bureaucracy and especially the economics-based ones and greater involvement of the JDA/MOD and SDF in the security policymaking process. These changes challenged the immobilist characterisations of the security decision-making process and decreased pressure from the U.S. in the area of security policy. That reflected Japan's embrace of internationalism and the emergence of the international-state identity in shaping Japan's security behaviour.

The aggregate impact of the shift in Japanese security identity in the context of the security policymaking regime leads one to conclude that Japan's contribution to regional and international affairs in military terms will face less domestic inertia. It is important to note that the SDF's increase in prominence in the security policymaking structure does not signal a weakening of civilian control over security policy. The civilian leadership in the security policymaking structure remains strong, as made evident by the removal of General Tamogami Toshio, chief of the ASDF, following his voicing of contrarian historical views and policy positions from the official stance. It was the civilian leadership that pushed for reforms in the Japanese political system that allowed for a more active security policy overseas. As a result of the activism, the traditional characterisation of Japan as a 'reactive state' and the fear of international isolation have reduced currency in describing contemporary Japanese security policymaking and practice. Those that prescribed to these views overlook the efforts of the Japanese leadership's ability to implement security measures that are in tune with the emergent trends in the post-Cold War order that are in line with the constitutional constraints to contribute responsibly to regional and international security affairs.

Though the paper largely focused on the LDP-led policies, the argument can also be applied to the DPJ-led government.[20] Under the DPJ-led government, the normative structures supported by the international-state security identity within the security policymaking regime were also reinforced to facilitate Japan's activist security policy in regional and international affairs.

In terms of actors, the DPJ, though mainly described as a centre-left party, is a party that supports an expanded role for the SDF in external security affairs. Though restricted by its coalition partner, the SDPJ, the DPJ has shown willingness for the SDF to engage in international peace cooperation activities and even in crises resolution efforts both independently and/or alongside the U.S. military, as discussed earlier. Such a position is supported by the presence of politicians such as Ozawa Ichirō, Maehara Seiji, Nagashima Akihisa and former Prime Minister Noda Yoshihiko that either are or have been actively involved in the security policymaking process. The DPJ has also strengthened the centralised decision-making structure within the Cabinet and Kantei in all areas, including security policy. One of DPJ’s main campaign pledges during the August 2009 elections was to shift power away from the bureaucracy to the politicians. Since its accession to power, some measures taken by them have been the disbandment of the administrative vice-ministers coordination meetings, which were held without the involvement of the politicians before the Cabinet meetings to resolve the inter-ministerial questions, and the addition of 100 political appointees from the Diet to top ministerial positions (Green 2011, 113). These moves by the DPJ have contributed to the reform process facilitating a strengthened internal dynamic within the security policymaking process that is less rigid but more responsive to security issues. The U.S. continues to be the main pillar of DPJ’s security policy. However, U.S. pressure, as under the LDP, is less of a determining factor in shaping DPJ’s security objectives and policy. The security policymaking elite under the DPJ-led government has shown initiative in pursuing an activist security policy aligned with U.S. strategic interests. That point might not be evident in light of the on-going Futenma base relocation issue, seen as the contributing reason to Hatoyama’s premature departure after 10 months in office. However, even in regard to this issue, the U.S. has lifted the pressure off Japan. Unlike his visit to Tokyo in October 2009, Secretary Robert Gates, in a subsequent visit to Tokyo in January 2011, did not push Japan on the Futenma issue but chose to focus on the deepening of bilateral security cooperation (Barnes 2011).

---

[20] For analyses on DPJ's security and foreign policy, see Nakasone (2010), Easley, Kotani and Mori (2010), Hagström (2010), Sneider (2011a); Green (2011) and Hughes (2012).

A clear example of this activism was DPJ’s announcement that Japan will not retreat from external security affairs following the Great East Japan Earthquake, which was the country’s worst natural disaster in recent history. The earthquake triggered a devastating tsunami that swept away villages and towns and caused meltdowns and explosions of the nuclear reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi plant. Even though the nuclear reactors were brought to a cold shut down in December 2011 and the government started reconstruction efforts in affected areas, there will still be long-term consequences on the Japanese economy and society from the strain of the high reconstruction costs on Japanese finances, radiation released from the nuclear plant and the overall low level of confidence towards the Japanese leadership to see through the reconstruction of north-eastern Japan successfully. Some analysts had opined that the ‘triple crises’ would lead Japan to look inward (Sneider 2011b). However, that has not been the case. In his first policy speech at the National Diet since becoming prime minster, Noda said to the 179th session of the Diet, “…that Japan was determined to repay the world by contributing to a better future for all humankind. We will unfailingly put those words into action” (Noda 2011). Just before making his first trip overseas for the U.N. General Assembly, Noda said that he would like to reassure the world leaders of Japan’s ‘will and ability’ to continue to contribute to solving various global issues even faced with the devastating consequences of the triple crises (Hayashi, Nishiyama and Sekiguchi 2011). In a MOFA report, it stated that “[t]he Government of Japan will continue to make appropriate and active contribution to the international community in humanitarian assistance in spite of the recent serious domestic natural disaster, the Great East Japan Earthquake’ (MOFA 2011)”. What this means is the normative shift in security policymaking regime is a permanent feature that will continue to facilitate Japan’s advance role in regional and international affairs in military terms.

Bibliography

Angel, R. C. (1988/89) 'Prime Ministerial leadership in Japan: recent changes in personal style and administrative organization', *Pacific Affairs,* 61 (4): 583-602.

Baerwald, H.H. (1977) 'The Diet and Foreign Policy', in R. A. Scalapino (ed.), *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan,* Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 37-54.

Barnes, J.E. (2011) 'Gates, in Tokyo, seeks to placate Japan government', *Wall Street Jounal,* 13 January. Online. Available HTTP: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704015004576079014159731644.html> (accessed 6 January 2012).

Barnett, M. (1999) 'Culture, strategy and foreign policy change: Israel's road to Oslo', *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(1): 5-36.

Berger, T.U. (1993) 'From sword to chrysanthemum: Japan's culture of anti-militarism', *International Security,* 17 (4): 119-150.

Berger, T.U. (1996) 'Norms, identity and national security in Germany and Japan', in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 317-356.

Berger, T.U. (1998) *Cultures of Anti-militarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Boyd, J.P. and Samuels, R.J. (2005) *Nine Lives?: The Politics of Constitutional Reform in Japan Policy Studies 19*, Washington: East West Centre.

Bukovansky, M. (1997) 'American Identity and neutral rights from independence to the war of 1812', *International Organisation*, 51 (2): 209-243.

Bukovansky, M. (2002) *Legitimacy and Power Politics: The American and French Revolutions in International Political Culture*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Calder, K.E. (2009) *Pacific Alliance: Reviving US-Japan Relations*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Campbell, J.C. (1989) ‘Democracy and Bureaucracy in Japan’, in T. Ishida and E. Krauss (eds.) *Democracy in Japan*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Chafetz, G., Spirtas, M., and Frankel, B. (1998/99) ‘Introduction: tracing the influence of identity on foreign policy’, *Security Studies*, 8 (2/3): vii-xxii.

Chai, S-K. (1997) ‘Entrenching the Yoshida defence doctrine: three techniques for institutionalization’, *International Organization*, 51 (3): 389-412.

Dittmer, L. and Kim S.S. (1993) ‘In Search of Theory of National Identity’, in L. Dittmer and S. Kim (eds.) *China’s Quest for National Identity*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dower J.W. (1999) *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Aftermath of World War 11,* London: Allen Lane.

Easley, L., Kotani, T., and Mori, A. (2010) ‘Electing a new Japanese security policy? Examining foreign policy visions within the Democratic Party of Japan’, *Asia Policy*, 9: 45-66.

Edstrōm, B. (1999) *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa*, London: MacMillan Press.

Estévez-Abe, M. (2006) ‘Japan’s shift toward a Westminister system’, *Asian Survey*, 46 (4): 632-651.

Fukui, H. (1977) ‘Policy-making in the Japanese foreign ministry’, in R. A. Scalapino (ed.) *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Funabashi Y. (1991/92) ‘Japan and the New World Order’, *Foreign Affairs*, 70 (5): 58-74.

George, A. (1993) ‘Japan’s participation in UN peacekeeping operations: radical departure or predictable response’, *Asian Survey*, 33 (6): 560-575.

George M.A. (2003) ‘Japan's ‘Un-Westminster’ system: impediments to reform in a crisis economy’, *Government and Opposition*, 38 (1): 73-91.

Green, M.J. (2003) *Japan’s Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power,* New York: Palgrave and Council on Foreign Relations.

Green, M.J. (2011) ‘The Democratic Party of Japan and the Future of the US-Japan Alliance’, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 37 (1): 91-116.

Grimes, W. (2003) ‘Institutionalized Inertia: Japanese Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War’, in G.J. Ikenberry and M. Mastanduno (eds.) *International Relations Theory and the Asia Pacific*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Hagström, L. (2010) ‘The Democratic Party of Japan’s security policy and Japanese politics of constitutional revision: a cloud over Article 9?’, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64 (5): 510-525.

Hayashi, Y., Nishiyama, G., and Sekiguchi, T. (2011) ‘Japanese premier pushes nuclear-plant restarts’, *The Wall Street Journal,* 21 September. Online. Available HTTP: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904194604576582240847767666.html> (accessed 23 September 2011).

Hellman, D.C. (1977) ‘Japanese security and postwar Japanese foreign policy’, in R. A. Scalapino (ed.) *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hook, G.D. (1996) *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan*, London: Routledge.

Hook, G.D. and McCormack, G. (2001) *Japan's Contested Constitution: Documents and Analysis*, London: Routledge.

Hook, G.D. and Weiner, M (eds.) (1992) *Internationalization of Japan,* London and New York: Routledge.

Hopf, T. (1998) 'The promise of constructivism in international relations theory', *International Security,* 23 (1): 170-200.

Hopf, T. (2002) *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999,* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hosoya, C. (1974) 'Characteristics of the foreign policy decision-making system in Japan', *World Politics,* 26 (3): 353-369.

Hughes, C.W. (1999) *Japan's Economic Power and Security: Japan and North Korea,* London: Routledge.

Hughes, C.W. (2004) *Japan Re-emergence as a 'Normal' Military Power*, Oxford: Oxford University Press for International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS).

Hughes, C.W. (2009) *Japan's Remilitarisation*, Oxon, United Kingdom: Routledge for International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS).

Hughes, C.W. (2012) 'The Democratic Party of Japan's new (but failing) grand strategy: from 'reluctant realism' to 'resentful realism'?', *Journal of Japanese Studies,* 38 (1): 109-140.

Hughes, C.W. and Krauss, E.S. (2007) 'Japan's new security agenda', *Survival,* 49 (2): 157-76.

Inoguchi, T. (2003) 'Rethinking Japan as an ordinary power', paper presented at the conference on *The United States and East Asia: Old Issues and New Thinking,* Yonsei University, 30-31 May 2003. Online. Available HTTP:

<http://www.glocom.org/opinions/essays/20030612_inoguchi_rethinking/inoguchi_rethinking.pdf> (accessed 7 August 2006).

Inoguchi. T. and Bacon, P. (2006) ‘Japan’s emerging role as a ‘global ordinary power’, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 6 (1): 1-21.

Inoguchi, T. and Jain, P. (eds.) (2000) *Japanese Foreign Policy Today: A Reader*, New York: Palgrave.

INSS Special Report (2000), ‘The United States and Japan: Advancing Towards a Mature Partnership,’ available at http://homepage2.nifty.com/moru/lib/nichibei-anpo/pdf/INSS%20Special%20Report.pdf, accessed 16 July 2012.

Katahara, Eiichi (2001) ‘Japan: From Containment to Normalization’, in M. Alagappa (ed.) *Coercion and Governance: The Declining Political Role of the Military in Asia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Katzenstein, P.J. (1996) *Cultural Norms & National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Katzenstein, P.J. and Okawara, N. (1993) ‘Japan’s national security: structures, norms and policies’, *International* Security, 17 (4): 265-299.

Keddell, J.P. (1993) *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures*, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Kohno, M. (2007) ‘The Domestic Foundations of Japan’s International Contribution’, in T.U. Berger, M.M. Mochizuki, and J. Tsuchiyama (eds.) *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienne.

Krauss, E.S. and Nyblade, B. (2005) ‘’Presidentialization’ in Japan? The prime minister, media and election in Japan’, *British Journal of Political Science*, 35: 357-368.

Layne, C. (1993) ‘The unipolar illusion: why great powers will rise’, *International Security*, 17 (4): 5-51.

Legro, J. (2009) ‘The plasticity of identity under anarchy’, *European Journal of International Relations*, 15 (1): 37-65.

Maull, H. (1990) ‘The new civilian powers: Germany and Japan’, *Foreign Affairs*, 69 (5): 91-106.

Midford, P. (2000) ‘Japan’s leadership role in East Asian security multilateralism: the Nakayama proposal and the logic of reassurance’, *Pacific Review*, 13 (3): 367-397.

Midford, P. (2003) ‘Japan’s response to terror: dispatching the SDF to the Arabian Sea’, *Asian Survey*, 43 (2): 329-342.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan, (2001a) ‘Statement by Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Permanent Representative of Japan Mr. Yukio Satō’, 56th UN General Assembly, 2 October. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/terro0109/unstate.html> (accessed 28 June 2005).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan, (2001b) ‘Policy Speech by Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro’, 153rd Session of the Diet, 27 September. Online. Available HTTP: http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/pm/koizumi/state0927.html> (accessed 28 March 2005).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan, (2011) *Japan Remains Committed to ODA-based Humanitarian Aid despite the Great East Japan Earthquak*’, 2 September. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/jfpu/2011/9/0902-01.html> (accessed 5 September 2011).

Mishima, K. (1998) ‘The changing relationship between Japan’s LDP and the bureaucracy: Hashimoto’s administrative reform effort and its politics’, *Asian Survey*, 38 (10): 968-985.

Miyashita, A. (1999) ‘*Gaiatsu* and Japan’s foreign aid: rethinking the reactive-proactive debate’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 43: 695-732.

Mochizuki, M.M. (1983/84) ‘Japan’s search for strategy’, *International Security*, 8 (3): 152-179.

Nakasone, Y. (2010) ‘The future direction of Japanese diplomacy’, *AJISS-Commentary No. 100*, 26 October. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.jiia.or.jp/en_commentary/201010/26-1.html> (accessed 26 October 2010).

Neumann, I. (1996) ‘Self and other in International Relations’, *European Journal of International Relations*, 2 (2): 139-174.

Noda, Y. (2011) ‘Policy Speech by Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda’, 179th Session of the Diet. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/noda/statement/201110/28syosin_e.html > (accessed 31 October 2011).

Okawara, Y. (1990) *To Avoid Isolation: An Ambassador’s View of US/Japanese Relations*, Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Oros, A.L. (2008) *Normalizing Japan: Politics, Identity, and the Evolution of Security Practice*, Stanford: Stanford University Press and National University of Singapore Press.

Ozawa, I. (1994) *Blueprint for a New Japan: The Rethinking of a Nation*, Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Pekkanen, R. and Krauss, E.S. (2005) 'Japan's 'Coalition of the Willing' on security policies', *Orbis*, 49 (3): 429-44.

Pyle, K.E. (1987) 'In pursuit of a grand design: Nakasone betwixt the past and the future', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 13 (2): 243-270.

Pyle, K.E. (1992) *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, Washington DC: AEI Press.

Pyle, K.E. (2007) *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose*, New York: Public Affairs (A Century Foundation Book).

Rix, A., et al. (1988) 'Bureaucracy and Political Change in Japan', in J. A. A. Stockwin (ed.) *Dynamic and Immobilist Politics in Japan*, Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.

Ryu, Y. (2005) 'The War on Terror and Japan's National Identity', *Harvard Asia Quarterly*. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.asiaquarterly.com/content/view/152/40> (accessed 13 August 2006).

Saideman, S. (2002) 'Conclusion: Thinking Theoretically about Identity and Foreign Policy,' in S. Telhami and M. Barnett (eds.) *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Samuels, R.J. (2004) 'Politics, Security Policy, and Japan's Cabinet Legislation Bureau: Who Elected These Guys, Anyway?', *JPRI Working Paper No. 99*. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.jpri.org/publications/workingpapers/wp99.html> (accessed 29 February 2012).

Samuels, R.J. (2007) *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Shinoda, T. (2002) 'Japan's response to terrorism and the implications for the Taiwan Strait issue', *Japan-Taiwan Research Forum*, 22 January. Online. Available HTTP:

<http://taiwansecurity.org/TS/2002/JTRF-Shinoda-0102.htm> (accessed June 27, 2005).

Shinoda, T. (2006) ‘Japan’s top-down policy process to dispatch the SDF to Iraq’, *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 7 (1): 71-91.

Shinoda, T. (2007) *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan’s Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defence Affairs*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Singh, B. (2001) ‘The 1998 North Korean missile launch and the 'normalization' of Japanese statehood’, *Issues & Studies*, 37 (3): 142-162.

Singh, B. (2002) ‘Japan’s post-cold war security policy: bringing back the normal state’, *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 24 (1): 82-105.

Singh, B. (2006) *Japanese Post-Cold War Security Policy: Crises and Security Identity Transformation*, unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Sheffield.

Sneider, D. (2011a) ‘The new Asianism: Japanese foreign policy under the Democratic Party of Japan’, *Asia Policy*, 12: 99-129.

Sneider, D. (2011b) ‘Japan in the post 3/11 world – part 1’, *YaleGlobal*, 5 October. Online. Available HTTP: <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/print/7340> (accessed 11 October 2011).

Soeya, Y. (2005) ‘Japanese security policy in transition: the rise of international and human security’, *Asia-Pacific Review*, 12 (1): 103-116.

Takahashi, S. (2001) ‘The global meaning of Japan: the state’s persistently precarious position in the world order’, in G. Hook & H. Hasegawa (eds.) *The Political Economy of Japanese Globalization*, Sheffield: Routledge.

Tamamoto, M. (1990) ‘Japan’s search for a world role’, *World Policy Journal*, 7 (3): 493-520.

Togo, K. (2010) ‘The assertive conservative right in Japan: their formation and perspective’, *SAIS Review*, 30 (1): 77-89

Waltz, K.N. (1993) ‘The emerging structure of international politics’, *International Security,* 18 (2): 44-79.

Waltz, K.N. (2000) ‘Structural realism after the Cold War’, *International Security*, 25 (1): 5-41

Welfield, J. (1988) *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy,* London: Athlone Press.

Wendt, A. (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yamaguchi, J. (1992) ‘The Gulf War and the transformation of Japanese constitutional politics’, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 18 (1): 152-172.

Newspapers

Japan Times
Mainichi Daily News
Nikkei Weekly

Personal Interviews

Igarashi Takeshi, Tokyo, 22 September 2005

Shinoda Tomohito, Tokyo, 12 September 2005

Tanaka Akihiko, Tokyo, 6 September 2005

Tokuchi Hideshi, Tokyo 14 September 2005

Yanai Shunji, Tokyo 24 May 2006

RSIS Working Paper Series

1. Vietnam-China Relations Since The End of The Cold War (1998)
   Ang Cheng Guan

2. Multilateral Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region: Prospects and Possibilities (1999)
   Desmond Ball

3. Reordering Asia: “Cooperative Security” or Concert of Powers? (1999)
   Amitav Acharya

4. The South China Sea Dispute re-visited (1999)
   Ang Cheng Guan

5. Continuity and Change In Malaysian Politics: Assessing the Buildup to the 1999-2000 General Elections (1999)
   Joseph Liow Chin Yong

6. ‘Humanitarian Intervention in Kosovo’ as Justified, Executed and Mediated by NATO: Strategic Lessons for Singapore (2000)
   Kumar Ramakrishna

7. Taiwan’s Future: Mongolia or Tibet? (2001)
   Chien-peng (C.P.) Chung

8. Asia-Pacific Diplomac*ies:* Reading Discontinuity in Late-Modern Diplomatic Practice (2001)
   Tan See Seng

9. Framing “South Asia”: Whose Imagined Region? (2001)
   Sinderpal Singh

10. Explaining Indonesia's Relations with Singapore During the New Order Period: The Case of Regime Maintenance and Foreign Policy (2001)
    Terence Lee Chek Liang

11. Human Security: Discourse, Statecraft, Emancipation (2001)
    Tan See Seng

12. Globalization and its Implications for Southeast Asian Security: A Vietnamese Perspective (2001)
    Nguyen Phuong Binh

13. Framework for Autonomy in Southeast Asia’s Plural Societies (2001)
    Miriam Coronel Ferrer

14. Burma: Protracted Conflict, Governance and Non-Traditional Security Issues (2001)
    Ananda Rajah

15. Natural Resources Management and Environmental Security in Southeast Asia: Case Study of Clean Water Supplies in Singapore (2001)
    Kog Yue Choong

16. Crisis and Transformation: ASEAN in the New Era (2001)
    Etel Solingen

17. Human Security: East Versus West? (2001)
    Amitav Acharya

18. Asian Developing Countries and the Next Round of WTO Negotiations (2001)
Barry Desker

19. Multilateralism, Neo-liberalism and Security in Asia: The Role of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum (2001)
Ian Taylor

20. Humanitarian Intervention and Peacekeeping as Issues for Asia-Pacific Security (2001)
Derek McDougall

21. Comprehensive Security: The South Asian Case (2002)
S.D. Muni

22. The Evolution of China's Maritime Combat Doctrines and Models: 1949-2001 (2002)
You Ji

23. The Concept of Security Before and After September 11 (2002)
a. The Contested Concept of Security
Steve Smith
b. Security and Security Studies After September 11: Some Preliminary Reflections
Amitav Acharya

24. Democratisation In South Korea And Taiwan: The Effect Of Social Division On Inter-Korean and Cross-Strait Relations (2002)
Chien-peng (C.P.) Chung

25. Understanding Financial Globalisation (2002)
Andrew Walter

26. 911, American Praetorian Unilateralism and the Impact on State-Society Relations in Southeast Asia (2002)
Kumar Ramakrishna

27. Great Power Politics in Contemporary East Asia: Negotiating Multipolarity or Hegemony? (2002)
Tan See Seng

28. What Fear Hath Wrought: Missile Hysteria and The Writing of "America" (2002)
Tan See Seng

29. International Responses to Terrorism: The Limits and Possibilities of Legal Control of Terrorism by Regional Arrangement with Particular Reference to ASEAN (2002)
Ong Yen Nee

30. Reconceptualizing the PLA Navy in Post – Mao China: Functions, Warfare, Arms, and Organization (2002)
Nan Li

31. Attempting Developmental Regionalism Through AFTA: The Domestics Politics – Domestic Capital Nexus (2002)
Helen E S Nesadurai

32. 11 September and China: Opportunities, Challenges, and Warfighting (2002)
Nan Li

33. Islam and Society in Southeast Asia after September 11 (2002)
Barry Desker

34. Hegemonic Constraints: The Implications of September 11 For American Power (2002)
Evelyn Goh

35. Not Yet All Aboard…But Already All At Sea Over Container Security Initiative (2002)
    Irvin Lim

36. Financial Liberalization and Prudential Regulation in East Asia: Still Perverse? (2002)
    Andrew Walter

37. Indonesia and The Washington Consensus (2002)
    Premjith Sadasivan

38. The Political Economy of FDI Location: Why Don’t Political Checks and Balances and Treaty Constraints Matter? (2002)
    Andrew Walter

39. The Securitization of Transnational Crime in ASEAN (2002)
    Ralf Emmers

40. Liquidity Support and The Financial Crisis: The Indonesian Experience (2002)
    J Soedradjad Djiwandono

41. A UK Perspective on Defence Equipment Acquisition (2003)
    David Kirkpatrick

42. Regionalisation of Peace in Asia: Experiences and Prospects of ASEAN, ARF and UN Partnership (2003)
    Mely C. Anthony

43. The WTO In 2003: Structural Shifts, State-Of-Play And Prospects For The Doha Round (2003)
    Razeen Sally

44. Seeking Security In The Dragon’s Shadow: China and Southeast Asia In The Emerging Asian Order (2003)
    Amitav Acharya

45. Deconstructing Political Islam In Malaysia: UMNO’S Response To PAS’ Religio-Political Dialectic (2003)
    Joseph Liow

46. The War On Terror And The Future of Indonesian Democracy (2003)
    Tatik S. Hafidz

47. Examining The Role of Foreign Assistance in Security Sector Reforms: The Indonesian Case (2003)
    Eduardo Lachica

48. Sovereignty and The Politics of Identity in International Relations (2003)
    Adrian Kuah

49. Deconstructing Jihad; Southeast Asia Contexts (2003)
    Patricia Martinez

50. The Correlates of Nationalism in Beijing Public Opinion (2003)
    Alastair Iain Johnston

51. In Search of Suitable Positions’ in the Asia Pacific: Negotiating the US-China Relationship and Regional Security (2003)
    Evelyn Goh

52. American Unilaterism, Foreign Economic Policy and the ‘Securitisation’ of Globalisation (2003)
    Richard Higgott

53. Fireball on the Water: Naval Force Protection-Projection, Coast Guarding, Customs Border Security & Multilateral Cooperation in Rolling Back the Global Waves of Terror from the Sea (2003)
Irvin Lim

54. Revisiting Responses To Power Preponderance: Going Beyond The Balancing-Bandwagoning Dichotomy (2003)
Chong Ja Ian

55. Pre-emption and Prevention: An Ethical and Legal Critique of the Bush Doctrine and Anticipatory Use of Force In Defence of the State (2003)
Malcolm Brailey

56. The Indo-Chinese Enlargement of ASEAN: Implications for Regional Economic Integration (2003)
Helen E S Nesadurai

57. The Advent of a New Way of War: Theory and Practice of Effects Based Operation (2003)
Joshua Ho

58. Critical Mass: Weighing in on Force Transformation & Speed Kills Post-Operation Iraqi Freedom (2004)
Irvin Lim

59. Force Modernisation Trends in Southeast Asia (2004)
Andrew Tan

60. Testing Alternative Responses to Power Preponderance: Buffering, Binding, Bonding and Beleaguering in the Real World (2004)
Chong Ja Ian

61. Outlook on the Indonesian Parliamentary Election 2004 (2004)
Irman G. Lanti

62. Globalization and Non-Traditional Security Issues: A Study of Human and Drug Trafficking in East Asia (2004)
Ralf Emmers

63. Outlook for Malaysia's 11th General Election (2004)
Joseph Liow

64. Not *Many* Jobs Take a Whole Army: Special Operations Forces and The Revolution in Military Affairs. (2004)
Malcolm Brailey

65. Technological Globalisation and Regional Security in East Asia (2004)
J.D. Kenneth Boutin

66. UAVs/UCAVS – Missions, Challenges, and Strategic Implications for Small and Medium Powers (2004)
Manjeet Singh Pardesi

67. Singapore's Reaction to Rising China: Deep Engagement and Strategic Adjustment (2004)
Evelyn Goh

68. The Shifting Of Maritime Power And The Implications For Maritime Security In East Asia (2004)
Joshua Ho

69.	China In The Mekong River Basin: The Regional Security Implications of Resource Development On The Lancang Jiang *Evelyn Goh*	(2004)
70.	Examining the Defence Industrialization-Economic Growth Relationship: The Case of Singapore *Adrian Kuah and Bernard Loo*	(2004)
71.	“Constructing” The Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist: A Preliminary Inquiry *Kumar Ramakrishna*	(2004)
72.	Malaysia and The United States: Rejecting Dominance, Embracing Engagement *Helen E S Nesadurai*	(2004)
73.	The Indonesian Military as a Professional Organization: Criteria and Ramifications for Reform *John Bradford*	(2005)
74.	Martime Terrorism in Southeast Asia: A Risk Assessment *Catherine Zara Raymond*	(2005)
75.	Southeast Asian Maritime Security In The Age Of Terror: Threats, Opportunity, And Charting The Course Forward *John Bradford*	(2005)
76.	Deducing India’s Grand Strategy of Regional Hegemony from Historical and Conceptual Perspectives *Manjeet Singh Pardesi*	(2005)
77.	Towards Better Peace Processes: A Comparative Study of Attempts to Broker Peace with MNLF and GAM *S P Harish*	(2005)
78.	Multilateralism, Sovereignty and Normative Change in World Politics *Amitav Acharya*	(2005)
79.	The State and Religious Institutions in Muslim Societies *Riaz Hassan*	(2005)
80.	On Being Religious: Patterns of Religious Commitment in Muslim Societies *Riaz Hassan*	(2005)
81.	The Security of Regional Sea Lanes *Joshua Ho*	(2005)
82.	Civil-Military Relationship and Reform in the Defence Industry *Arthur S Ding*	(2005)
83.	How Bargaining Alters Outcomes: Bilateral Trade Negotiations and Bargaining Strategies *Deborah Elms*	(2005)
84.	Great Powers and Southeast Asian Regional Security Strategies: Omni-enmeshment, Balancing and Hierarchical Order *Evelyn Goh*	(2005)
85.	Global Jihad, Sectarianism and The Madrassahs in Pakistan *Ali Riaz*	(2005)

86. Autobiography, Politics and Ideology in Sayyid Qutb’s Reading of the Qur’an (2005)
Umej Bhatia

87. Maritime Disputes in the South China Sea: Strategic and Diplomatic Status Quo (2005)
Ralf Emmers

88. China’s Political Commissars and Commanders: Trends & Dynamics (2005)
Srikanth Kondapalli

89. Piracy in Southeast Asia New Trends, Issues and Responses (2005)
Catherine Zara Raymond

90. Geopolitics, Grand Strategy and the Bush Doctrine (2005)
Simon Dalby

91. Local Elections and Democracy in Indonesia: The Case of the Riau Archipelago (2005)
Nankyung Choi

92. The Impact of RMA on Conventional Deterrence: A Theoretical Analysis (2005)
Manjeet Singh Pardesi

93. Africa and the Challenge of Globalisation (2005)
Jeffrey Herbst

94. The East Asian Experience: The Poverty of 'Picking Winners (2005)
Barry Desker and Deborah Elms

95. Bandung And The Political Economy Of North-South Relations: Sowing The Seeds For Revisioning International Society (2005)
Helen E S Nesadurai

96. Re-conceptualising the Military-Industrial Complex: A General Systems Theory Approach (2005)
Adrian Kuah

97. Food Security and the Threat From Within: Rice Policy Reforms in the Philippines (2006)
Bruce Tolentino

98. Non-Traditional Security Issues: Securitisation of Transnational Crime in Asia (2006)
James Laki

99. Securitizing/Desecuritizing the Filipinos’ ‘Outward Migration Issue’in the Philippines’ Relations with Other Asian Governments (2006)
José N. Franco, Jr.

100. Securitization Of Illegal Migration of Bangladeshis To India (2006)
Josy Joseph

101. Environmental Management and Conflict in Southeast Asia – Land Reclamation and its Political Impact (2006)
Kog Yue-Choong

102. Securitizing border-crossing: The case of marginalized stateless minorities in the Thai-Burma Borderlands (2006)
Mika Toyota

103. The Incidence of Corruption in India: Is the Neglect of Governance Endangering Human Security in South Asia? (2006)
Shabnam Mallick and Rajarshi Sen

104. The LTTE’s Online Network and its Implications for Regional Security (2006)
Shyam Tekwani

105. The Korean War June-October 1950: Inchon and Stalin In The “Trigger Vs Justification” Debate (2006)
Tan Kwoh Jack

106. International Regime Building in Southeast Asia: ASEAN Cooperation against the Illicit Trafficking and Abuse of Drugs (2006)
Ralf Emmers

107. Changing Conflict Identities: The case of the Southern Thailand Discord (2006)
S P Harish

108. Myanmar and the Argument for Engagement: *A Clash of Contending Moralities?* (2006)
Christopher B Roberts

109. TEMPORAL DOMINANCE (2006)
Military Transformation and the Time Dimension of Strategy
Edwin Seah

110. Globalization and Military-Industrial Transformation in South Asia: An Historical Perspective (2006)
Emrys Chew

111. UNCLOS and its Limitations as the Foundation for a Regional Maritime Security Regime (2006)
Sam Bateman

112. Freedom and Control Networks in Military Environments (2006)
Paul T Mitchell

113. Rewriting Indonesian History The Future in Indonesia’s Past (2006)
Kwa Chong Guan

114. Twelver Shi’ite Islam: Conceptual and Practical Aspects (2006)
Christoph Marcinkowski

115. Islam, State and Modernity : Muslim Political Discourse in Late 19th and Early 20th century India (2006)
Iqbal Singh Sevea

116. ‘*Voice of the Malayan Revolution*’: The Communist Party of Malaya’s Struggle for Hearts and Minds in the ‘Second Malayan Emergency’ (1969-1975) (2006)
Ong Wei Chong

117. “From Counter-Society to Counter-State: Jemaah Islamiyah According to PUPJI” (2006)
Elena Pavlova

118. The Terrorist Threat to Singapore’s Land Transportation Infrastructure: A Preliminary Enquiry (2006)
Adam Dolnik

119. The Many Faces of Political Islam (2006)
Mohammed Ayoob

120. Facets of Shi’ite Islam in Contemporary Southeast Asia (I): Thailand and Indonesia (2006)
Christoph Marcinkowski

121.	Facets of Shi'ite Islam in Contemporary Southeast Asia (II): Malaysia and Singapore *Christoph Marcinkowski*	(2006)
122.	Towards a History of Malaysian Ulama *Mohamed Nawab*	(2007)
123.	Islam and Violence in Malaysia *Ahmad Fauzi Abdul Hamid*	(2007)
124.	Between Greater Iran and Shi'ite Crescent: Some Thoughts on the Nature of Iran's Ambitions in the Middle East *Christoph Marcinkowski*	(2007)
125.	Thinking Ahead: Shi'ite Islam in Iraq and its Seminaries (hawzah 'ilmiyyah) *Christoph Marcinkowski*	(2007)
126.	The China Syndrome: Chinese Military Modernization and the Rearming of Southeast Asia *Richard A. Bitzinger*	(2007)
127.	Contested Capitalism: Financial Politics and Implications for China *Richard Carney*	(2007)
128.	Sentinels of Afghan Democracy: The Afghan National Army *Samuel Chan*	(2007)
129.	The De-escalation of the Spratly Dispute in Sino-Southeast Asian Relations *Ralf Emmers*	(2007)
130.	War, Peace or Neutrality:An Overview of Islamic Polity's Basis of Inter-State Relations *Muhammad Haniff Hassan*	(2007)
131.	Mission Not So Impossible: The AMM and the Transition from Conflict to Peace in Aceh, 2005–2006 *Kirsten E. Schulze*	(2007)
132.	Comprehensive Security and Resilience in Southeast Asia: ASEAN's Approach to Terrorism and Sea Piracy *Ralf Emmers*	(2007)
133.	The Ulama in Pakistani Politics *Mohamed Nawab*	(2007)
134.	China's Proactive Engagement in Asia: Economics, Politics and Interactions *Li Mingjiang*	(2007)
135.	The PLA's Role in China's Regional Security Strategy *Qi Dapeng*	(2007)
136.	War As They Knew It: Revolutionary War and Counterinsurgency in Southeast Asia *Ong Wei Chong*	(2007)
137.	Indonesia's Direct Local Elections: Background and Institutional Framework *Nankyung Choi*	(2007)
138.	Contextualizing Political Islam for Minority Muslims *Muhammad Haniff bin Hassan*	(2007)
139.	Ngruki Revisited: Modernity and Its Discontents at the Pondok Pesantren al-Mukmin of Ngruki, Surakarta *Farish A. Noor*	(2007)

140. Globalization: Implications of and for the Modern / Post-modern Navies of the Asia Pacific (2007)
   Geoffrey Till

141. Comprehensive Maritime Domain Awareness: An Idea Whose Time Has Come? (2007)
   Irvin Lim Fang Jau

142. Sulawesi: Aspirations of Local Muslims (2007)
   Rohaiza Ahmad Asi

143. Islamic Militancy, Sharia, and Democratic Consolidation in Post-Suharto Indonesia (2007)
   Noorhaidi Hasan

144. Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon: The Indian Ocean and The Maritime Balance of Power in Historical Perspective (2007)
   Emrys Chew

145. New Security Dimensions in the Asia Pacific (2007)
   Barry Desker

146. Japan’s Economic Diplomacy towards East Asia: Fragmented Realism and Naïve Liberalism (2007)
   Hidetaka Yoshimatsu

147. U.S. Primacy, Eurasia’s New Strategic Landscape,and the Emerging Asian Order (2007)
   Alexander L. Vuving

148. The Asian Financial Crisis and ASEAN’s Concept of Security (2008)
   Yongwook RYU

149. Security in the South China Sea: China’s Balancing Act and New Regional Dynamics (2008)
   Li Mingjiang

150. The Defence Industry in the Post-Transformational World: Implications for the United States and Singapore (2008)
   Richard A Bitzinger

151. The Islamic Opposition in Malaysia:New Trajectories and Directions (2008)
   Mohamed Fauz Abdul Hamid

152. Thinking the Unthinkable: The Modernization and Reform of Islamic Higher Education in Indonesia (2008)
   Farish A Noor

153. Outlook for Malaysia’s 12th General Elections (2008)
   Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman, Shahirah Mahmood and Joseph Chinyong Liow

154. The use of SOLAS Ship Security Alert Systems (2008)
   Thomas Timlen

155. Thai-Chinese Relations:Security and Strategic Partnership (2008)
   Chulacheeb Chinwanno

156. Sovereignty In ASEAN and The Problem of Maritime Cooperation in the South China Sea (2008)
   JN Mak

157. Sino-U.S. Competition in Strategic Arms (2008)
   Arthur S. Ding

158. Roots of Radical Sunni Traditionalism (2008)
   Karim Douglas Crow

159. Interpreting Islam On Plural Society (2008)
    Muhammad Haniff Hassan

160. Towards a Middle Way Islam in Southeast Asia: Contributions of the Gülen Movement (2008)
    Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman

161. Spoilers, Partners and Pawns: Military Organizational Behaviour and Civil-Military Relations in Indonesia (2008)
    Evan A. Laksmana

162. The Securitization of Human Trafficking in Indonesia (2008)
    Rizal Sukma

163. The Hindu Rights Action Force (HINDRAF) of Malaysia: Communitarianism Across Borders? (2008)
    Farish A. Noor

164. A Merlion at the Edge of an Afrasian Sea: Singapore's Strategic Involvement in the Indian Ocean (2008)
    Emrys Chew

165. Soft Power in Chinese Discourse: Popularity and Prospect (2008)
    Li Mingjiang

166. Singapore's Sovereign Wealth Funds: The Political Risk of Overseas Investments (2008)
    Friedrich Wu

167. The Internet in Indonesia: Development and Impact of Radical Websites (2008)
    Jennifer Yang Hui

168. Beibu Gulf: Emerging Sub-regional Integration between China and ASEAN (2009)
    Gu Xiaosong and Li Mingjiang

169. Islamic Law In Contemporary Malaysia: Prospects and Problems (2009)
    Ahmad Fauzi Abdul Hamid

170. "Indonesia's Salafist Sufis" (2009)
    Julia Day Howell

171. Reviving the Caliphate in the Nusantara: Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia's Mobilization Strategy and Its Impact in Indonesia (2009)
    Mohamed Nawab Mohamed Osman

172. Islamizing Formal Education: Integrated Islamic School and a New Trend in Formal Education Institution in Indonesia (2009)
    Noorhaidi Hasan

173. The Implementation of Vietnam-China Land Border Treaty: Bilateral and Regional Implications (2009)
    Do Thi Thuy

174. The Tablighi Jama'at Movement in the Southern Provinces of Thailand Today: Networks and Modalities (2009)
    Farish A. Noor

175. The Spread of the Tablighi Jama'at Across Western, Central and Eastern Java and the role of the Indian Muslim Diaspora (2009)
    Farish A. Noor

176. Significance of Abu Dujana and Zarkasih’s Verdict (2009)
Nurfarahislinda Binte Mohamed Ismail, V. Arianti and Jennifer Yang Hui

177. The Perils of Consensus: How ASEAN’s Meta-Regime Undermines Economic and Environmental Cooperation (2009)
Vinod K. Aggarwal and Jonathan T. Chow

178. The Capacities of Coast Guards to deal with Maritime Challenges in Southeast Asia (2009)
Prabhakaran Paleri

179. China and Asian Regionalism: Pragmatism Hinders Leadership (2009)
Li Mingjiang

180. Livelihood Strategies Amongst Indigenous Peoples in the Central Cardamom Protected Forest, Cambodia (2009)
Long Sarou

181. Human Trafficking in Cambodia: Reintegration of the Cambodian illegal migrants from Vietnam and Thailand (2009)
Neth Naro

182. The Philippines as an Archipelagic and Maritime Nation: Interests, Challenges, and Perspectives (2009)
Mary Ann Palma

183. The Changing Power Distribution in the South China Sea: Implications for Conflict Management and Avoidance (2009)
Ralf Emmers

184. Islamist Party, Electoral Politics and Da‘wa Mobilization among Youth: The Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) in Indonesia (2009)
Noorhaidi Hasan

185. U.S. Foreign Policy and Southeast Asia: From Manifest Destiny to Shared Destiny (2009)
Emrys Chew

186. Different Lenses on the Future: U.S. and Singaporean Approaches to Strategic Planning (2009)
Justin Zorn

187. Converging Peril : Climate Change and Conflict in the Southern Philippines (2009)
J. Jackson Ewing

188. Informal Caucuses within the WTO: Singapore in the “Invisibles Group” (2009)
Barry Desker

189. The ASEAN Regional Forum and Preventive Diplomacy: A Failure in Practice (2009)
Ralf Emmers and See Seng Tan

190. How Geography Makes Democracy Work (2009)
Richard W. Carney

191. The Arrival and Spread of the Tablighi Jama’at In West Papua (Irian Jaya), Indonesia (2010)
Farish A. Noor

192. The Korean Peninsula in China’s Grand Strategy: China’s Role in dealing with North Korea’s Nuclear Quandary (2010)
Chung Chong Wook

193. Asian Regionalism and US Policy: The Case for Creative Adaptation (2010)
Donald K. Emmerson

194. Jemaah Islamiyah:Of Kin and Kind (2010)
Sulastri Osman

195. The Role of the Five Power Defence Arrangements in the Southeast Asian Security Architecture (2010)
Ralf Emmers

196. The Domestic Political Origins of Global Financial Standards: Agrarian Influence and the Creation of U.S. Securities Regulations (2010)
Richard W. Carney

197. Indian Naval Effectiveness for National Growth (2010)
Ashok Sawhney

198. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) regime in East Asian waters: Military and intelligence-gathering activities, Marine Scientific Research (MSR) and hydrographic surveys in an EEZ (2010)
Yang Fang

199. Do Stated Goals Matter? Regional Institutions in East Asia and the Dynamic of Unstated Goals (2010)
Deepak Nair

200. China’s Soft Power in South Asia (2010)
Parama Sinha Palit

201. Reform of the International Financial Architecture: How can Asia have a greater impact in the G20? (2010)
Pradumna B. Rana

202. “Muscular” versus “Liberal” Secularism and the Religious Fundamentalist Challenge in Singapore (2010)
Kumar Ramakrishna

203. Future of U.S. Power: Is China Going to Eclipse the United States? Two Possible Scenarios to 2040 (2010)
Tuomo Kuosa

204. Swords to Ploughshares: China’s Defence-Conversion Policy (2010)
Lee Dongmin

205. Asia Rising and the Maritime Decline of the West: A Review of the Issues (2010)
Geoffrey Till

206. From Empire to the War on Terror: The 1915 Indian Sepoy Mutiny in Singapore as a case study of the impact of profiling of religious and ethnic minorities. (2010)
Farish A. Noor

207. Enabling Security for the 21st Century: Intelligence & Strategic Foresight and Warning (2010)
Helene Lavoix

208. The Asian and Global Financial Crises: Consequences for East Asian Regionalism (2010)
Ralf Emmers and John Ravenhill

209. Japan’s New Security Imperative: The Function of Globalization (2010)
Bhubhindar Singh and Philip Shetler-Jones

210. India’s Emerging Land Warfare Doctrines and Capabilities (2010)
Colonel Harinder Singh

211. A Response to Fourth Generation Warfare (2010)
Amos Khan

212. Japan-Korea Relations and the Tokdo/Takeshima Dispute: The Interplay of Nationalism and Natural Resources (2010)
Ralf Emmers

213. Mapping the Religious and Secular Parties in South Sulawesi and Tanah Toraja, Sulawesi, Indonesia (2010)
Farish A. Noor

214. The Aceh-based Militant Network: A Trigger for a View into the Insightful Complex of Conceptual and Historical Links (2010)
Giora Eliraz

215. Evolving Global Economic Architecture: Will We have a New Bretton Woods? (2010)
Pradumna B. Rana

216. Transforming the Military: The Energy Imperative (2010)
Kelvin Wong

217. ASEAN Institutionalisation: The Function of Political Values and State Capacity (2010)
Christopher Roberts

218. China’s Military Build-up in the Early Twenty-first Century: From Arms Procurement to War-fighting Capability (2010)
Yoram Evron

219. Darul Uloom Deoband: Stemming the Tide of Radical Islam in India (2010)
Taberez Ahmed Neyazi

220. Recent Developments in the South China Sea: Grounds for Cautious Optimism? (2010)
Carlyle A. Thayer

221. Emerging Powers and Cooperative Security in Asia (2010)
Joshy M. Paul

222. What happened to the smiling face of Indonesian Islam? (2011)
Muslim intellectualism and the conservative turn in post-Suharto Indonesia
Martin Van Bruinessen

223. Structures for Strategy: Institutional Preconditions for Long-Range Planning in Cross-Country Perspective (2011)
Justin Zorn

224. Winds of Change in Sarawak Politics? (2011)
Faisal S Hazis

225. Rising from Within: China’s Search for a Multilateral World and Its Implications for Sino-U.S. Relations (2011)
Li Mingjiang

226. Rising Power… To Do What? (2011)
Evaluating China’s Power in Southeast Asia
Evelyn Goh

227. Assessing 12-year Military Reform in Indonesia: Major Strategic Gaps for the Next Stage of Reform (2011)
Leonard C. Sebastian and Iisgindarsah

228. Monetary Integration in ASEAN+3: A Perception Survey of Opinion Leaders (2011)
Pradumna Bickram Rana, Wai-Mun Chia & Yothin Jinjarak

229. Dealing with the “North Korea Dilemma”: China’s Strategic Choices (2011)
You Ji

230. Street, Shrine, Square and Soccer Pitch: Comparative Protest Spaces in Asia and the Middle East (2011)
Teresita Cruz-del Rosario and James M. Dorsey

231. The Partai Keadilan Sejahtera (PKS) in the landscape of Indonesian Islamist Politics: Cadre-Training as Mode of Preventive Radicalisation? (2011)
Farish A Noor

232. The Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) Negotiations: Overview and Prospects (2012)
Deborah Elms and C.L. Lim

233. How Indonesia Sees ASEAN and the World: A Cursory Survey of the Social Studies and History textbooks of Indonesia, from Primary to Secondary Level. (2012)
Farish A. Noor

234. The Process of ASEAN’s Institutional Consolidation in 1968-1976: Theoretical Implications for Changes of Third-World Security Oriented Institution (2012)
Kei Koga

235. Getting from Here to There: Stitching Together Goods Agreements in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement (2012)
Deborah Elms

236. Indonesia’s Democratic Politics and Foreign Policy-Making: A Case Study of Iranian Nuclear Issue, 2007-2008 (2012)
Iisgindarsah

237. Reflections on Defence Security in East Asia (2012)
Desmond Ball

238. The Evolving Multi-layered Global Financial Safety Net: Role of Asia (2012)
Pradumna B. Rana

239. Chinese Debates of South China Sea Policy: Implications for Future Developments (2012)
Li Mingjiang

240. China’s Economic Restructuring : Role of Agriculture (2012)
Zhang Hongzhou

241. The Influence of Domestic Politics on Philippine Foreign Policy: The case of Philippines-China relations since 2004 (2012)
Aileen S.P. Baviera

242. The Forum Betawi Rempug (FBR) of Jakarta: An Ethnic-Cultural Solidarity Movement in a Globalising Indonesia (2012)
Farish A. Noor

243. Role of Intelligence in International Crisis Management (2012)
Kwa Chong Guan

244. Malaysia's China Policy in the Post-Mahathir Era: A Neoclassical Realist Explanation (2012)
KUIK Cheng-Chwee

245. Dividing the Korean Peninsula: The Rhetoric of the George W. Bush Administration (2012)
Sarah Teo

246. China's Evolving Fishing Industry: Implications for Regional and Global Maritime Security (2012)
Zhang Hongzhou

247. By Invitation, Mostly: the International Politics of the US Security Presence, China, and the South China Sea (2012)
Christopher Freise

248. Governing for the Future: What Governments can do (2012)
Peter Ho

249. ASEAN's centrality in a rising Asia (2012)
Benjamin Ho

250. Malaysia's U.S. Policy under Najib: Ambivalence no more? (2012)
KUIK Cheng-Chwee

251. Securing the State: National Security in Contemporary times (2012)
Sir David Omand GCB

252. Bangladesh-India Relations: Sheikh Hasina's India-positive policy approach (2012)
Bhumitra Chakma

253. Strengthening Economic Linkages between South Asia and East Asia:
The Case for a Second Round of "Look East" Policies (2013)
Pradumna B Rana and Chia Wai-Mun

254. The Eurozone Crisis and Its Impact on Asia (2013)
Pradumna B Rana and Michael Blomenhofer

255. Security Identity, Policymaking Regime and Japanese Security Policy Development (2013)
Bhubhindar Singh