Japan's Resistance Strategy in the U.S.-Japan Alliance

Jitsuo Tsuchiyama Aoyama
Gakuin University, Japan
School of International Politics, Economics & Business
2005-10

About the Matthew B. Ridgway Center

The Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies at the University of Pittsburgh is dedicated to producing original and impartial analysis that informs policymakers who must confront diverse challenges to international and human security. Center programs address a range of security concerns—from the spread of terrorism and technologies of mass destruction to genocide, failed states, and the abuse of human rights in repressive regimes.

The Ridgway Center is affiliated with the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs (GSPIA) and the University Center for International Studies (UCIS), both at the University of Pittsburgh.

This working paper is one of several outcomes of the Ridgway Working Group on Challenges to U.S. Foreign and Military Policy chaired by Davis B. Bobrow.

Introduction

When we analyze Japan's resistance strategy, we will have the following questions. First, who is Japan resisting? While American international relations specialists may want to believe that Japan is inherently resisting the United States, most Japanese do not share this perception even if Japan does not always accept U.S. demands. As we will see later, the basic pattern of U.S.-Japan diplomacy over the past few decades is that the Japanese government does not often resist the United States, usually going along with the U.S. government's positions and demands.

Second then, we must consider the context in which Japan does resist the United States. Realists are apt to take the view that the weaker (e.g., Japan) puts up resistance to the stronger (e.g., United States). That image may take several variations of dichotomies such as a hegemon vs. a challenger, a winner vs. a loser, and a guarantor vs. a guarantee, etc. Using those dichotomies, one may be able to describe U.S.-Japan relations as an example of a power shift, a security dilemma, and alliance dilemma. For example, as will be discussed, the Japanese government resisted a particular U.S. alliance policy when Japan was faced with alliance dilemma problems. Japan's resistance intensified when the U.S.-Japanese created domestic opposition on either side.

Liberal theorists or constructivists prefer to use frameworks different from those used by realists in order to analyze Japan's resistance strategy. Unlike realists who focus on bilateral power competition, liberal theorists see those relations in a broader perspective such as multilateral bargaining in international regimes, or global governance. Some observers such as Richard Falk claim that global governance is associated with a "politics from above," whereas a politics of resistance is associated with a "politics from below."(1) Though it is a good question whether those conceptual frameworks are useful for analyzing U.S. alliance relations and U.S.-Japan relations in particular, a sound analysis of Japanese resistance strategy in the U.S.-Japan alliance should be based upon some sort of conceptual framework. Without making clear which framework one uses, the analysis of resistance strategy can easily became confused.

Because of the reasons stated above, it will be worthy of elaborating conceptual frameworks before explaining Japan's resistance strategy vis-à-vis the United States.

1. Resistance and Power

In this paper I will explain Japan's resistance strategy basically in agreement with the recent study of resistance and power conducted by Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall.(2) As they suggest, we could characterize resistance as being orthogonal to power; i.e. when one state (A) exercises power over another state (B) to do something B does not want to do, there is an inclination to resist A's demand on B regardless of the differences in power between the two sides. Though, as Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes suggest, "there is no single, central logic to power and resistance," the exercise of power often generates resistance. Thus, power and resistance are considered to be mutually constituted in diverse locations.(3)

Resistance can take different forms according to the way in which power is exercised. Barnett and Duvall propose four types of power. The first type of power is relations of interaction of direct control by one state over another state, which is named "compulsory power." The second is the indirect control of actors over other actors through diffuse relations of interaction, which is named "institutional power." The third is the social capacities in direct structural relations to one another, which is named "structural power." Finally, the fourth is the socially diffuse production of subjectivity in systems of meaning and signification, which they name "productive power." Structural power and productive power overlap in some respects; both are not controlled by specific actors, but are effected through the practices of actors. Nonetheless they differ in some respects; structural power is structural constitution, which means that social structure not only constitutes actors and their capabilities, but also shapes their understanding and interests. On the other hand, productive power is the constitution of all social subjects with various social powers through knowledge and practices.(4)

Each of those types of power is expected to generate different kinds of resistance. For example, compulsory power generates resistance as attempts by the controlled states to take

a counter-action to their controllers. Institutional power generates resistance premised on altering the rule of the game and agenda-formation. Structural power generates resistance as attempts by subordinated states to reduce their vulnerability and inequality stem from their structural positions. Structural power also generates resistance that takes the form of solidaristic action by subordinated actors. Examples include the decolonization movement of the mid 20th century and anti-globalization movement of more recent times. Productive power fosters resistance as attempts by actors to destabilize their subjectivities, and to transform the broader social processes and practices through which those subjectivities are produced. Such examples include transnational fundamentalist movements of recent years. Hence, Barnett and Duvall write that, "(b)ecause power in world politics is complex and takes many forms, so, too, is resistance."(5)

If the premises of those arguments were correct, it would be a mistake to say that the fact that the United States became a sole superpower with the end of the Cold War alone has generated resistance among its allies and followers. To analyze U. S. allies' resistance, it would be more meaningful to investigate which type of power the United States exercises at the present time. Without making clear the logic why U.S. allies resist the United States, whatever the arguments we are going to make tell far too little about the actual mechanisms of allies' resistance.

2. American Empire and Japan's resistance

Relating to institutional and structural power that Barnett and Duvall formulated, recent debates over the United States as an empire or hegemony is worth discussing here. Pointing out the fact that the United States is an empire does not explain much about why European allies resisted, for example, the U.S. decision to attack Iraq in 2003. As a matter of fact, the U. S. share of material resources has not changed much during the past two decades despite the end of the Cold War system. But, what has changed was the U.S. foreign policy behavior that has tilted towards unilateralism from multilateralism, during, and especially after the Clinton administration.(6)

When the U. S. allies resist the United States, they are not necessarily against U.S.

imperial/hegemonic power, but they resist specific U.S. foreign policy behavior and attitudes. Contrary to what we are told today, the U.S. allies usually accept the American empire as long as the U.S. remains what Niall Ferguson calls a "liberal empire" which enhances not only its own security and prosperity but also provides the rest of world with generally beneficial public goods—economic freedom and international institutions necessary for the prosperity of all. (7)

When, for example, Japan resisted the United States, one of the basic assumptions is that the United States has been the preponderant power since the end of World War II, after the end of the Cold War in particular. Because the United States is an empire/hegemon, they say that not only U.S. rivals but also U.S. allies adopt resistance strategy. Certainly, there appeared to be "unipolar moments" in the post Cold War era, in which the United States could have done many things without worrying about rival countries' reactions. Hence, for example, Kenneth N. Waltz claims that the fact that the United States dominates the world has not been changed even after September 11th.(8) Similarly, Michael Mastanduno writes that the persistence of unipolarity depends on the ability of the United States to maintain an American-centered international order.(9) Those arguments have been often accepted without careful scrutiny. But, we should not confuse the fact that the U.S. enjoys superior material power with the notion that the present international order has been maintained rather smoothly.

In the context of our discussions on Japan's resistance strategy, in this section, I would like to ask: what does a hegemony in international politics really mean?; is the United States an empire/hegemon?; and, if the United States is a hegemonic imperial power, should the secondary states use resistance strategy in managing their relations with the United States?

If hegemony is defined as "a situation in which one state is powerful enough to maintain the essential rules governing interstate relations, and willing to do so,"(10) a hegemon must have not only asymmetrical power relations, but also the ability to obtain the secondary states' compliance. Unlike an imperial power, for example, Robert Keohane writes that a hegemonic power cannot enforce rules without consent from secondary states.

(11) In other words, material predominance alone does not guarantee effective international leadership in an international system. Therefore, according to Keohane, a hegemon has to "invest resources in institutions in order to ensure that its preferred rules will guide the behavior of other countries."(12) In institution building as well as managing processes, resistance strategy of the secondary states could take place. As a government requires its public's consent to implement domestic politics, international leadership necessitates cooperation of other states to make norms and rules in international affairs.

However, when we examine U.S. foreign policy under the G. W. Bush administration with Keohane's definition of hegemony in mind, one may become hesitant to use "hegemonic" to describe the current U.S. foreign policy behavior. To some, U.S. foreign policy of the Bush administration appears to be more "imperial" which assumed that power preponderance creates incentives to project its power abroad. In a similar vein, U.S. foreign policy during the Vietnam War was also criticized by U.S. foreign policy observers as imperial. Nonetheless, it is not always the case that U.S. hegemony had been resisted by the secondary states. On the contrary, U. S. hegemony has been accepted, or even welcomed by foreign powers in many cases, including the case of Japan. Especially during the Cold War, U.S. allies were tolerant of U.S. claims of special prerogatives, or even voluntarily accepted U.S. superiority, because they needed strong U.S. leadership to protect their safety and prosperity. (13) For those countries the United States was "Empire by invitation."

Regardless of the differences between realism and liberal theory, a number of international relations scholars have a positive view of U.S. hegemony. Robert Gilpin, for example, attaches great importance to the post World War II U.S. primacy as a precondition for maintaining international security order.(14) Taking a broader view of hegemony, Keohane writes that U.S. foreign policy after World War II has greatly contributed to international stability by providing and maintaining a stable international currency system, an open trading system, and a stable oil supplying system. The United States has

succeeded in creating those systems that not only enabled the United States to enhance its national interest, but also allowed other states to gain benefits from cooperating with the United States. Though those systems may not be collective goods in the strict sense, Keohane suggested that U.S. hegemony has contributed to international peace and prosperity.(15)

G. John Ikenberry takes a step further. He asks why the international order has made American power acceptable to other states and peoples during and after the Cold War (16). His answer to this question is that the United States after World War II succeeded in legitimating order by restraining its coercive power and making commitments. Since the weaker states have fears of abandonment and domination by the stronger states, a leading state must reassure the weaker states that it will not exploit its advantages and will abide by its international commitments. By contrast, "compulsory power" (Barnett and Duvall) or coercion is always expensive, because, in the words of Margaret Levy, its use precipitates resentments that can fuel the flames of resistance.(17)

As long as a hegemonic power refrains from exercising compulsory power or coercive use of power and keeps commitments, the asymmetries in power are rendered tolerable for the weaker country. In this context, the United States foreign policy after 1945 was more successful in creating order than its foreign policy immediately after World War II, says Ikenberry. A legitimate international order is one in which its members willingly comply with institutional norms and rules that are usually created by leading states. To use Ikenberry's words, stable international orders are those that have low returns to power and high returns to institution.(18) If his arguments are relevant to explaining Japan's foreign policy behavior in the post World War II era as well, Japan may not have a convincing systemic reason to adopt a resistance strategy vis-à-vis the United States except in cases in which the two governments failed to manage their alliance relationship.

3. The European International System and Japan (19)

Because Japan was one of the first non-European states to enter the European international system during the second half of the 19th century, the Japanese have had their

share of identity problems in the world. In fact, the Japanese are still struggling to convince themselves that they are true members of international society. In contrast with most European countries' goals of their alliance diplomacy, Japan's motivation of alliance is quite different. For example, the fear of being dominated by European powers was one of strong political as well as psychological incentives that let Japan end its 215 years of isolation policy. To use Japanese diplomatic historian Seizaburo Sato's words, "deep-rooted feelings of inferiority" and "deep anxiety over being isolated internationally" were very characteristic of Japanese attitudes towards its international environment during the mid 19th century.(20) Basically, Japan's motive of alliance formation and management stems from the perceived weakness and backwardness of Japan.

When China was defeated by European powers in the mid 19th century, Japan's national identity that had been cultivated in large part in the Chinese international order evaporated. Shortly after the Opium War, Japan's search for a new national identity began. Japan's response to the European power's invasion into China was quite different from those of other secondary countries in Asia such as Korea and Vietnam. Since Korea and Vietnam were not only too close to China geographically, but also their domestic politics and diplomacy were closely tied to those of China, they did not have a strategy to choose between the Chinese international order and the European international order. However, since Japan is located at periphery of China, only Japan had a strategic flexibility as to whether Japan would remain in the Chinese international order or enter into the European international order. (21)

In the case of Japan, its diplomatic opening in the world in the middle of the 19th century coincided with a domestic change – the Meiji-restoration. Instead of ambiguous legitimacy of the rule that Japanese rulers obtained under a Chinese order in the past, a new Meiji government searched a new source of legitimacy of domestic rule and new style of diplomacy by entering into the European international order.

Then in 1902, Japan concluded the Anglo-Japanese alliance, with which Japan succeeded in identifying Japan in the European international system for the first time.

What Japan's alliance policy meant in 1902 was that an alliance is more than just a tool for balancing power or betting on the "winning horse." In a nutshell, an alliance for modern Japan is considered as a contract to be identified itself with the European international society as its "official" member. And this is still the case. That is why the Anglo-Japanese alliance was widely accepted by the Japanese in the first quarter of the 20th century, and why the U.S.-Japan alliance has been supported in the present time.

Because of the very same reason, the sudden decision to terminate the Anglo-Japanese alliance at the Washington Conference (1921) was a shock to the Japanese public. With the termination of the Anglo-Japanese treaty, the Japanese felt rejected by international society, so that Japan's foreign policy orientation gradually began to tilt toward the political forces that felt frustration with the Anglo-American powers. In this sense, Japan's Axis policy in the 1930's can be characterized as Japanese resistance to the Anglo-American condominium.

Then, only two years after Japan lost a war in 1945, the initiative to form the U.S.-Japan security arrangement was taken by Japan, which took place three years before the outbreak of the Korean War by sending a signal to the United States which indicated that Japan would accept the U.S. bases in Japan even after the peace treaty should be concluded. Japan's grand strategy was to reenter the international society in exchange for Japan's acceptance of U.S. hegemony in East Asia—i.e., U.S. military bases in the post-occupied Japan. It was also generally understood by Japanese decision-makers in 1951 that the U.S.-Japan security treaty was in essence a "base-lending agreement" at least at the beginning. During the past half century, Japan occasionally adopted resistance strategy in the U.S.-Japan alliance: from the security treaty negotiations in 1958-60 to the negotiations for Okinawa reversion in 1967-69, and from trade negotiations of the textile disputes of 1970-71 to the FSX turmoil of 1987-89. Yet, these resistances were different in nature from those that took place in the 1930's. Japan's resistances in the U.S.-Japan alliance are the tactics taken within a framework that includes Japan, while Japan's resistance in the 1930's was the strategy taken as an opposing political force.

4. Legitimacy in International Society and Resistance

As has been suggested in the previous section, the Japanese have been very sensitive to the problem as to whether Japan is included as an "official" member of international society. As mentioned earlier, alliances were used as a principal tool to incorporate Japan into the European international system. Therefore, the Japanese were increasingly frustrated as they came to feel excluded from international society in the 1930's. By contrast, the Japanese were not so sensitive to the fact that Japan had been resisted by its neighboring states, especially China and the two Koreas. Those neighbors had felt humiliated by Japan's "imperialistic" behavior during the first half of the 20th century.

The matter to be discussed in this context is the legitimacy of foreign policy that states are seeking in international order. Relating to the legitimacy of foreign policy, what Alexander L. George calls "policy legitimacy" may be useful in this context. (22) Policy legitimacy has two components: normative component and cognitive component. When a particular foreign policy (e.g., U.S.-Japan alliance) is consistent with the fundamental values of society, we can say it has a normative component, which establishes the desirability of a particular foreign policy. On the other hand, when the government can convince their people that it knows how to achieve foreign policy goals, we can say it has a cognitive component, which establishes the feasibility of the policy.

Here, George's main concern is how decision-makers can establish policy legitimacy inside the nation. Nevertheless, a similar logic may help us to consider whether a particular foreign policy of leading states can achieve its goals in international society. In other words, if leading states can establish policy legitimacy in the world—especially regarding ends and means—they are more likely to succeed in achieving their goal.

Another set of arguments on legitimacy relates international order and its stability. For example, Henry Kissinger's study of the Vienna settlement suggests that a consensus among the leading nations makes the international order legitimate.(23) His study suggests that the more legitimate the settlement, the better for order's stability. Furthermore, when Kissinger says a consensus, it is a consensus among the great powers (mostly winners).

But, when Ikenberry says a consensus, it is more like a contract not only among victors, but also between victors and losers.(24) Rather than impose winners' will, the strong can restrain its power, thereby reassuring the weak. Under such conditions, the strong do not always have to do what they can, while the weak do not need to suffer.

Coming back to the Japanese case again, Japan may adopt a resistance strategy if the international order with which Japan is identified or the foreign policy of the leading states were regarded as illegitimate by Japanese leaders and people. Similarly, if Japan's foreign policy were regarded as illegitimate in the eyes of people in neighboring countries, Japan would be resisted. For example, as long as the Chinese and Koreans do not regard the Japanese bid to gain a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council as a legitimate Japanese foreign policy goal, they will continue to resist it.

5. Alliance Dilemma and Japan's Resistance

As mentioned earlier, Japan's resistance strategy may not be explained well only in the context that the world is faced with American dominance. Japan's foreign policy behavior over the past one hundred years suggests that Japan has been bandwagoning with a hegemonic power, not balancing against it. So far as the United States remains a benign hegemon, Japan's foreign policy orientation is likely to remain unchanged. But of course this does not necessarily mean that Japan does not adopt a resistance strategy at all in the U.S.-Japan alliance. On the contrary, Japan's resistance strategy would be influenced by many factors such as Japanese concerns regarding its security, power, economic interests, identity, culture, and history.

Among the examples Japan resisted the United States in the U.S.-Japan alliances, let us focus on the cases caused by Japan's alliance dilemma. As can be seen in all other cases, Japan has had alliance dilemma problems from time to time. On the one hand, Japan has "a fear of abandonment," the fear that Japan may not be sure to obtain U.S. security assistance in a time of crisis. One the other hand, Japan has "a fear of entrapment," where Japan is afraid that Japan may be unwillingly involved in America's wars in Asia. Generally speaking, if an alliance commitment is too weak, the alliance may not function well in one's

hour of need. But, if one's commitment to an alliance is too strong, then one may be dragged into a war that is not in one's interest. Therefore, one's alliance commitment should be strong enough not to be abandoned, but weak enough not to be entrapped.(25)

During the first two decades of the U.S.-Japan alliance, the fear of entrapment rather than abandonment dominated Japan's concern. Mainly because a war was in progress on the Korean peninsula when the U.S.-Japan security treaty was concluded, the Japanese government carefully avoided including, for example, the phrase for collective military action against foreign aggression. Article 9 of the constitution also encourages Japan not to use military force in general. As a result, most of Japan's key foreign policy principles during that time put heavy constraints on Japanese security policy: no dispatch of the Self Defense Force overseas, no offensive military doctrines and armaments, no export of weapons, no nuclear weapons, and no exercise of the right of collective self-defense, etc. In short, the Japanese government resisted U.S. demands of increasing Japan's military budgets and capabilities and of its more cooperative measures in joint military operations.

The fear of entrapment was a major element in the revised security treaty of 1960, too. Since Article 6 of the new security treaty granted the United States the use of its military forces and facilities in Japan for the "security in the Far East," the controversy arose over the scope of the Far East. Since the Japanese government included such areas as the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and the northern territories in the Far East, the oppositions attacked the government claiming that the Far East clause would bring Japan into U.S. wars in Asia, especially in as much as the Quemoy-Matsu crisis was still quite recent.

To ease the fear of entrapment, the Japanese government proposed to impose the so-called "prior consultation" clause in the revised security treaty of 1960, which could be seen as another example of Japan's resistance. That clause was imposed partly in the Japanese hope that Japan would not become involved in U.S. wars in Asia. The provision for prior consultation as contained in the exchange of notes says:

> Major changes in the deployment into Japan of United States armed forces, major changes in their equipment, and the use of facilities and areas in Japan as bases for military combat operations to be undertaken from Japan other than those conducted under Article 6 of the said Treaty, shall be the subject of prior consultation with the Government of Japan.

It was understood that, without having Japanese agreement, no more than one Army division, one Navy task force, or one Air Force division of U.S. forces in Japan could be deployed or withdrawn; nor could the United States bring nuclear weapons into Japanese waters or territory, and U.S. forces in Japan could not be sent to participate in combat operations outside Japan. As John Emmerson, an American diplomat, once wrote, the prior consultation clause had been considered within the U.S. government as a Japanese "veto" on U.S. requests, at least until the Sato-Nixon meeting of 1969.

Then, as the U.S.-Japan alliance entered into the 1970's, Japan's alliance dilemma shifted from the fear of entrapment to the fear of abandonment due to several political events including the "Nixon shocks" of 1971, the Sino-U.S. rapprochement of 1972, the collapse of the Saigon regime of 1975, and the U.S. plan to withdraw its ground forces from South Korea in the mid 1970's. With those unexpected moves, the fear of abandonment arose among conservatives. They came to resist to the U.S. move of disengagement from East Asia in the post-Vietnam era. They were the major political forces that brought the government to formulate the National Defense Program Outline (NDPO) of 1976 and the Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation of 1978. The former was designed to enable Japan to deal with "a small and limited aggression" on its own and to cooperate with the United States in dealing with a larger attack, while the latter aimed at ensuring coordinated action in military operation, intelligence, and logistics between the SDF and U.S. forces in Japan in the case of a crisis. Those security policies were possible, in large part because of the fact that Japan's alliance dilemma shifted from the fear of entrapment to the fear of abandonment. Without that shift, Japanese security policies adopted in the 1980's such as Japan's commitment to protect the sea-lanes of communication within 1,000 miles of

Japan and defense buildup in the Nakasone administration were not feasible.

Despite the fact that the alliance dilemma is still one of the key factors that influences U.S. allies' behavior, whether Japan's fear of abandonment continues to play an important role in U.S. security policies remains to be seen. During the Cold War era, mutual dependence in balancing against a common enemy served as the "cement of fear" for the U.S. allies who depended upon U.S. power to protect their safety from the Soviet threat. Allies' dependence enhanced their tolerance for U.S. demands and kept their resistance at a minimum because of fear of abandonment in the face of the Soviet threat. Hence, U.S. allies seldom resisted key U.S. positions during the Cold War era. On the other hand, the United States has also been tolerant of allies' incompliance, because it needed the allies' support.(26)

The end of the Cold War has changed the strategic rationale of the U.S. alliances and the implications of alliance dilemma. Without the Soviet threat, the U.S. allies have become less tolerant of U.S. prerogatives, because they have much less fear of abandonment, especially among U.S. European allies. To the extent that the U.S. allies no longer feel the Soviet threat, they could resist U.S. pressures. Recent German/French resistance and resentment of the U.S.-Iraq operation was such an example. Their resentments grow as American domestic politics appear to pursue not international, but parochial interests. For example, the Bush administration has shifted its foreign policy principles from multilateralism (international cooperation) to unilateralism (domestic interest oriented foreign policy). President Bush's conviction, as expressed in his 2003 State of the Union address, is that "the course of this nation does not depend on others." He also stated in March 2003, "(w)hen it comes to our security, we really don't need anybody's permission." Absent Cold War imperatives, the United States is less willing to pay attention to its allies' concerns, while U.S. allies became more assertive in expressing their resistance and resentment to U.S. domestic interest oriented foreign policy.

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 have had significant impacts on Japanese thinking about its alliance policy, too. Immediately after the 9/11 attacks, the Koizumi

government quickly passed an anti-terrorism law to dispatch the Maritime Self Defense Forces for rear-echelon support of anti-terrorism activities in the Indian Ocean, and it also submitted a law that would authorize the dispatch of the Ground Self Defense Forces to Iraq. The GSDF were then sent to Iraq in 2004. Both of these steps were unprecedented in Japanese diplomacy after World War II.

Different from U.S. European allies' cases, alliance dilemma still has significant impacts on Japan's alliance behavior even in the post-Cold War era. For example, North Korea's nuclear capabilities pose an immediate threat to Japan's safety, and a rising strength in China is becoming a growing concern for both the Japanese leadership and the public. At the same time, the Japanese are paying careful attention to U.S. plans for its military transformation, since they consider that it may result in weakening the U.S. commitment of Japan or increasing Japan's risk of entrapment into American conflicts. They believe that the U.S.-Japan alliance is, and will continue to be, the first condition to reassure Japan's security. This is part of the reason why the Japanese did not strongly resent and resist U.S. operation in Iraq. And yet, there was, and still is, a strong resentment of U.S. unilateralism among the Japanese public. Hence, Japan is on the horns of a dilemma. Whether Japan can continue to comply with U.S. foreign policy requirements will depend on many factors. But, it will in large part depend on Japanese perception of American domestic politics: How far will the U.S. Congress go along with unilateralism?; How much does the United States government invest in international institution?; and How much does U.S. foreign policy

build upon civic values shared by world citizens?, etc. As we will see later, the Japanese do not always have positive answers to these questions

6. Resistance Strategy and Domestic Politics

Up to this point, I have explained Japan's resistance strategy as if the Japanese resistance strategy can be analyzed by the government's calculated actions alone. Obviously, this is not always the case. As a good foreign policy could result in a failure without obtaining domestic support, we cannot explain Japan's foreign policy without

paying careful attention to its domestic politics. Especially when "national interests" are defined differently by different parts of the government, and between the government and the public, it does not make sense to explain Japan's resistance strategy as nothing but a government unitary action.

By introducing domestic approaches into alliance dilemma problems, one could describe Japan's dilemma differently. While the fear of entrapment was shared widely among Japan's opposition parties such as the Japan Socialist Party and the Japanese public in the 1950's and 60's, the fear of abandonment arose in the mid 1970's mainly among the conservatives, the Liberal Democratic Party in particular, and high-ranking government officials. Since an international alliance means the cooperation not only between governments but also between the "rulers," it was understandable that the Japanese government officials at that time feared abandonment when they thought that the United States was ready to withdraw from Asia.

When the government position and the opposition parties' position differ from each other, the Japanese government may adopt a different resistance strategy from opposition parties. By the 1980's, foreign policy principles of the opposition parties, especially the JSP, were almost diametrically opposed to the government's policies. As a result, even if the Japanese government tried to comply with U.S. demands, the opposition parties resisted U.S. demands in most security issues. For example, when the SDF initiated a study of a contingency plan known as "Mitsuya Research " in 1963, the government did not approve the SDF to conduct the study in large part because of opposition parties' strong resistance.

In the cases of economic frictions in the U.S.-Japan relations, resistance took place mostly over trade. The textile dispute of 1969-1972 is a good example. Prime Minister Sato accepted restrictions or restrict textile exports to the United States in exchange for the return of Okinawa through a back channel negotiation. Yet, not only textile industries but also the Ministry of International Trade and Industry came to resist U.S. demands. The political dispute over textiles in the early 1970's poisoned U.S.-Japan relations for a while. As have been the cases of U.S.-Japanese trade disputes in the 1970's-1980's, domestic

concerns basically shaped Japan's resistance strategy when domestic and economic interests were combined. Since both governments have their domestic interests, trade negotiations become more complicated once domestic politics are brought in. Furthermore, economic issues and security agendas were often linked together during the negotiations such as the case of a textile-Okinawa negotiation, and the situation becomes even more complex. As a result, all sort of peculiar ad hoc coalitions across the Pacific were formed and had a strong influence on government's decisions, as has been demonstrated in the cases of U.S.-Japanese negotiations of citrus fruits imported from the United States and U.S.-Japan automobile trade negotiations in the mid 1970's. During those trade disputes, only a few people understood who resisted whom, and on what grounds.(27)

Conclusion

Coming back to the points discussed in the first section of this paper, the fact that the United States became a sole superpower or an empire does not provide much help in explaining Japan's resistance strategy vis-à-vis the United States. Though analytical frameworks are necessary for analyzing resistance strategy of given states, there is no useful and solid framework to be applied to those cases yet.

In the case of Japan, as has been pointed out, Japan has been hesitant to adopt a resistance strategy in the U.S.-Japan relations for historical and other reasons. Concerning Japanese attitudes on U.S. primacy, it seems to me that there appear to be at least three groups of countries. The first group, including England and other U.S. European allies, basically support the U.S. primacy. Japan is included in this group, too. The second group takes a more neutral position than the first group, in which Russia and China are included. The final group, including some countries called "Axis of evil" by G. W. Bush, opposed the U.S. primacy. Needless to say, these groups could be divided in different ways depending on the times and issues. Nonetheless, neither Japan nor the Japanese are against Washington's international leadership, even if we accept the fact since the term resistance is so fuzzy that the meanings and styles of resistance strategy may take different forms.

As a matter of fact, in the past, Japan sometime resisted the U. S. diplomatic demands

towards Japan. We have seen some examples of resistance in the context of Japan's alliance dilemma and trade negotiations. Though the unitary actor approach has its own merits in analyzing security issues, its capacity to analyze resistance strategy is limited, especially in the areas of economic disputes. Therefore we may need a more sophisticated approach in order to bring in domestic factors for analyzing the resistance strategy in economic disputes.

To some extent, resistance is inevitable as long as power plays an important role in the management of international affairs. However, the degree of resentment among U.S. allies at present may exceed the usual level of tolerance after the G. W. Bush administration shifted its foreign policy orientations from multilateralism to unilateralism, from deterrence to pre-emption, and from international security to homeland defense, especially after the September 11 attacks. This paper suggests that foreign opposition to the United States may increase, should the current U.S. foreign policy orientation remain unchanged. Allies' resistances could arise not out of the fact that U.S. became a sole superpower, but from the fact that U.S. foreign policy behavior appears to be seen as one based in large part on American domestic concerns and interests. Reacting to recent U.S. mood and trends, for example, U.S. European allies' leaders and public opinion over Iraq exhibited resistance and resentment in 2003-2004, which in turn might have strengthened U.S. mood and trends in American domestic politics.

If the Bush administration continues to pursue preemptive and unilateral foreign policies, some major powers including U.S. allies would adopt "soft-balancing" measures that use international institutions and diplomatic frameworks to undermine U.S. foreign policies. In fact, according to Robert A. Pape, for example, "soft balancing against the United States has begun," and he points out that "[a]t bottom, the world's major powers are reacting to concerns over U.S. intentions." Accordingly, Pape predicts that "[s]erious opposition to U.S. military policies is only likely to increase if the United States continues along its present course of aggressive unilateralism."(28)

In a similar vein, Stephen M. Walt warns that, "If anti-Americanism continues to grow,

Washington will face greater resistance and find it harder to attract support. Americans will feel increasingly threatened in such a world, but trying to counter these threats alone will merely exacerbate the fear of U.S. power and isolate the United States even more."(29)

Instead of going in such a direction, what policy should the United States choose? I believe that the United States government should pay careful attention both to international and domestic supports. To quote Barnett and Duvall, it would be better for the United States not to depend too much on "compulsory power" in international negotiations, but to use "institutional" and "productive power" for finding and achieving its foreign policy goals. This means that U.S. power will be less effective in obtaining foreign support if the United States exercises power as the influence over behavior through merely negative sanctions. On the contrary, if the United States focuses on "institutional" and "productive" power, the United States is likely to obtain greater international support, so that it could resolve international conflicts at a low cost.

On the domestic front, the U.S. government must maintain domestic support, because not only the leaders but also the public opinion of the U.S. allies now consider that American domestic support of the Bush's security policy, especially the Bush Doctrine (the security strategy based on a war on terrorism and preemptive as well as preventive measures), is likely to erode. Such a perception shared by the allies' public will weaken their credibility in U.S. security policy. Though whether the Japanese public opinion adopts such a scenario is not certain at this moment, there is Japanese concern over whether the Bush foreign policy can be sustained in the United States.

Though the case of Japan may be different from the European cases, Japan will face a similar problem when its security is at stake. In the case of the U.S.-Iraq operation, the Japanese public opinion has been torn into two groups: the first group, including the Japanese government, generally supported U.S. policy, whereas the second group, including the majority of public opinion, did not. Dealing with non-security problems such as the Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) problem, however, the Japanese government has sometimes resisted U.S. government's demand of American beef imports, in part because the

government cannot afford to disregard Japan's domestic concerns. Thus, we may be able to say that Japan does support the key U.S security policy principles as long as its national security is assured, but it is apt to resist U.S. demands in non-security issues when Japanese interests are threatened. This is because the Japanese understand that Japan's security heavily depends on the U.S. security guarantee, Japan's government is more careful in resisting U.S. demands than the United States' allies in Europe. But, when there were strong domestic demands and supports inside Japan, the Japanese government did show strong resistance vis-à-vis the United States such as the cases of the textile exports negotiations of 1970's and the FSX dispute of 1980's. However, this kind of strong resistance strategy by Japan has not been observed over the past decade, because not only has the international system shifted tremendously from the Cold War order to the post Cold War system, but also Japan's domestic political system significantly changed from the so-called 1955 system to the new one.

And yet, when Japan's government cannot accept U.S. demands, the government may adopt different strategies besides resistance. For instance, the government could adopt a wait and see policy in such cases as the BSE problem of the past few years. Despite what the Japanese government's decision to cooperate with U.S. missile defense research looks like, in reality it is more like a wait and see policy, too. In another issue in the security area, a replacement problem of the U.S. Futenma Air Station in Okinawa, an agreement has not yet been reached between the two governments almost ten years after they started the negotiations, another case where the Japanese government cannot make a final decision. And yet, these are not cases where the Japanese government intentionally adopted either evasion or modification strategies. They are more likely the results of local, domestic and international disagreements as to when and how the Japanese government resumes beef imports from the United States, and as to where and how the government transfers the U.S. Air base. When the two governments decide to settle these questions, it would be desirable for the United States to exercise power in the way Barnett and Duvall suggest. That is to say, if the U.S. government succeeded in persuading Japan's domestic opinion to accept

enlightened U.S. national interests, the Japanese are likely to adopt U.S. demands. However, if the United States fails to convince them, the allies, Japan in this case, may adopt either a resistance strategy or balking, because they may feel they have to react over U.S. foreign policy goals and style even if they are not necessarily reacting over U.S. primacy.

Notes

1. See for example, Bice Maiguashca, "Introduction. Governance and resistance in world politics," *Review of International Studies*, (Special Issue), Vol. 29, No. 1, 2003, pp. 3-28.

2. Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, eds., *Power in Global Governance*, London: Cambridge University Press, 2005, especially chapter 1, and Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 59, Winter 2005, pp. 39-75.

3. Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," p. 69.

4. Ibid., p. 53-55.

5. Ibid, p. 23

6. David M. Malone and Yuen Foong Khong, eds., *Unilateralism and U. S. Foreign Policy: International Perspectives*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2003.

7. Niall Ferguson, *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press, 2004, p. 25.

8. Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Continuity of International Politics," in Ken Booth and Time Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, New York: Palgrave, 2003, pp. 348-353.

9. Michael Mastanduno, "Incomplete Hegemony and Security Order in the Asia-Pacific," in G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *American Unrivaled: The Future of the Balance of Power*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002, pp. 181-210.

10. Robert Keohane, A*fter Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984, pp. 34-35.

11. Ibid., p. 46.

12. Ibid.

13. Ferguson, *Price of America's Empire*, p. 209, pp. 212-3.

14. Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

15, Keohane, pp. 243-259.

16. G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraints, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

17. Ibid., p. 54.

18. Ibid., p. 266.

19. The discussions in this section are based on Jitsuo Tsuchiyama, "Why Japan is allied? Politics of the U.S.-Japan Alliance" in Saori N. Katada, Hans W. Maull and Takashi Inoguchi, eds., *Global Governance: Germany and Japan in the International System*, London: Ashgate, 2004, pp. 71-85. For more detailed analysis of Japan's alliance policy, see J. Tsuchiyama, *Anzenhosho no Kokusaiseijigaku: Aseri to Ogori* (*International Politics of Security: Anxiety and Hubris*), Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 2004, chapters 9 and 10.

20. Seizaburo Sato, "The Foundations of Modern Japanese Foreign Policy," in Robert Scalapino, ed., *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

21. Kazuo Ogura, *Chugoku no Ishin to Nihon no Kyoji* (Chinese Prestige and Japan's Pride), Tyokyo: Chuokoronshinsha, 2001, chapters 16 and 17.

22. Alexander L. George, "Domestic Constraints on Regime Change in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Need for Policy Legitimacy," in Ole R. Holsti, Randolph M. Siverson and Alexander L. George, eds., *Change in the International System*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1980, pp. 233-262.

23. Henry A. Kissinger, *A World Restored*: *The Politics of Conservatism in a Revolutionary Era*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957.

24. Ikenberry, *After Victory*. For detailed discussions on legitimacy in international order, see Ian Clark, "Legitimacy in a Global Order," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 2003, pp. 75-95.

25. For more detailed discussions, see my "The End of the Alliance?: Dilemma in the

U.S.-Japan Relations" in Peter Gourevitch, Takashi Inoguchi, and Courtney Purrington, eds., *United States-Japan Relations and International Institution After the Cold War*, San Diego: University of California, San Diego, 1995, pp. 3-35.

26. David Skidmore, "Understanding the Unilateralist Turn in U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 1, July 2005.

27. Atsushi Kusano, *Nichibei Masatsu no Kozo* (The Structures of U.S.-Japan Frictions), Tokyo: PHP Research Institute, 1984.

28. Robert A. Pape, "Soft Balancing against the United States," *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1, Summer 2005, pp. 7-45, p. 44 and p. 45.

29. Stephen M. Walt, "Taming American Power," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 5, 2005, pp. 105-120, p. 117.