

ARTICLE

Groping for an International Political Role

– Japan and Humanitarian Intervention in Self-Determination Conflicts –

玉 本 偉*

Calls for humanitarian intervention began in the eighteenth century, and they reached a peak during the early half of the nineteenth century in the Concert of Europe. It was a system of intervention designed primarily to suppress revolution. Still there were cases with strong humanitarian flavor. One such case was the five-power intervention against the Netherlands. In 1830 the Belgians rebelled against the oppressive Dutch king, and Dutch forces moved with great harshness against unarmed Belgians. The intervention, made decisive by French military force, succeeded in securing Belgian independence, and led to the guarantee of Belgian neutrality by the great powers. At the time, though, order in Europe was the logic of intervention rather than any considered concern for human suffering.

Today, human rights and their enforcement are the key references in the consideration of intervention. The international community freed from the cold war bind has rediscovered human rights - always a central concern enshrined in the United Nations charter - to begin to elevate the principle of humanitarian intervention to a basic rule. The idea of human rights is what distinguishes contemporary thought and practice from earlier experiences with humanitarian intervention.

Intervention is almost always discussed as a collective response by the United Nations or regional organizations to acts of systematic violence against sufficiently large and readily identifiable population groups. The problem, to start, is how to recognize violence that is systematic and population that is large and identifiable. The United Nations has provisions to thwart genocide, but the recognition of what constitutes genocide remains operationally slippery. In a world ordered around the principle of sovereignty, the question whether, as a general rule, human rights trump state rights cannot bear a clear and positive answer.

In time, the international community may set down practical and generally applicable rules that sanction humanitarian intervention. While self-determination conflicts continue to raise questions about the very nature of the state and its sovereign rights, for now, the less than optimum goal of the concern for humanity is to construct the ability to recognize

* Masaru Tamamoto, Senior Fellow, World Policy Institute, New York

humanitarian emergencies. Emergencies, by definition, are beyond the scope of rules, and that somehow must suffice to suspend the argument for state rights and the principle of non-interference. While most self-determination conflicts are not contingencies, for they can be foreseen, interventions in such conflicts are likely to remain contingent in the system of states. In this way, the question of intervention moves from that about rights to what is good.

Goodness, in this sense, is a matter of what is possible rather than what ought to be. In a world short of universal government, what is possible is defined largely by the power and will of the major states. The degree of cooperation and agreement among major states is to a large extent what constitutes a meaningful international community. The United Nations security council, braced with enforcement provisions, is singularly exempt from the rule of non-interference, yet each of the five permanent council members has the power of veto. State interests and national identities obviously matter in determining the manner of international intervention.

What follows is a reflection of the world's second wealthiest state, which displays no overtly recognizable crusading impulse. It is a state seemingly enjoying a complacent life of carefully crafted willful innocence of international politics following defeat in one war a half century ago. Still, Japan is a heavyweight in possession of substantial, potential international political power. And Japan has begun to position itself to play a more active role in international politics. In what way Japan, now seeking a permanent seat in the United Nations security council, may contribute to the shaping of world order is of more than passing interest. Can a Japan for so long obsessed with peace by any means come to support interventions? While interventions can take different forms, I begin with the narrow definition of the use of force, for that is the very issue Japan is in the midst of rethinking. Moreover, usually, the threat or use of force is the meaningful way to attend to humanitarian emergencies.

Japan has begun to shed its willful innocence of international politics understood to be a system of war. Since the end of the cold war, Japan gropes to define for itself a new international military role. In 1993, for the first time since the ignominious defeat in the second world war, Japanese soldiers ventured abroad to Cambodia on an United Nations peace-keeping mission. Henceforth, Japanese soldiers donning blue helmets have been dispatched to various corners of the world, including Mozambique and the Golan Heights. The Japanese armed forces hitherto designed strictly for territorial self-defense fundamentally transforms.

A narrow group of bureaucrats and politicians, who discreetly make Japan's foreign policy, leads the country toward what it calls "international contribution befitting a responsible power." This has not yet sparked a major and open national debate, but that should come soon. Meanwhile, there remains considerable skepticism among the public about the wisdom of military involvement with the world.

The dispatch of troops abroad marked the reversal of a half century of "pacifism in one country." This momentous decision came by curious timing. Contrary to the general pattern among major powers to move toward diminished military postures with the end of

the cold war, Japan took the moment to begin to enhance the role of its military. The difference can be explained, in part, by the entirely different meaning the cold war had for Japan. (German participation in the military intervention into former Yugoslavia somewhat parallels the Japanese transformation.)

Neither the fall of the Berlin Wall nor the disintegration of the Soviet Union marked the end of the cold war for Japan. The end came with the Gulf war against Iraq. Then, the United States pressured Japan for participation in the allied war effort. That broke the cold war understanding Japan had with the United States. The cold war order of things had the United States providing a security umbrella over Japan, and Japan permitting the American use of its soil for forward military deployment. There was never any serious consideration of the Japanese armed forces fighting alongside the American. Japan did not seriously prepare for war against the Soviet Union. There was practically no coordination with its obvious geo-strategic ally, South Korea. The Japanese armed forces had been maintained at a "minimum necessary level," meaning enough to keep the American forces stationed in Japan and maintain the fiction of a "mutual" security treaty. The treaty obligates the United States to come to the defense of Japan in case of an attack, but Japan incurs no such obligation toward the United States. The treaty, the guiding light of Japanese foreign policy, had allowed Japan to distance itself from international politics and deal with the world primarily on economic terms. The United States broke this comfortable arrangement by calling on Japan to participate in the Gulf war. The price of protection went up.

Japan could not contribute militarily to the Gulf war. The Japanese constitution - written by the American army of occupation following the second world war - proscribes the exercise of military force outside Japanese territory. So, after much soul-searching, Japan made a contribution of \$13 billion toward the allied war effort, the largest monetary contribution by any country. Luckily, the war came to a relatively swift conclusion, and Japan escaped the accusation that American soldiers acting as mercenaries are shedding blood to protect the flow of oil to Japan. Immediately, Japanese policy makers, wanting not to be caught in such an awkward position again, moved to prepare for the "next Gulf war."

Parliament passed the United Nations peace-keeping operations law. By this, Japanese soldiers could venture abroad to Cambodia. Still they operated under a restricted mandate. The new law proscribes participation in peace-enforcement, that is, the use of force. Officers cannot order troops to shoot. Each soldier must decide whether the use of force is justifiable self-defense as stipulated by Japanese criminal law; a doubtful decision can lead to prosecution for murder. The peace-keeping law carefully shields the armed forces from the possibility of the use of force: Japanese troops can be deployed only if there is a cease-fire; all conflicting parties must agree to the United Nations peace-keeping operation; Japanese troops must leave immediately if the cease-fire is broken. So, in Cambodia, troops were assigned to a "safe" area, and there repaired roads. What they did, as critics pointed out, could have been better accomplished by a civilian construction company. Tactically, Japanese troops served no purpose, and the Australian general in command of the United Nations force was relieved to see them leave.

But, for Japan, Cambodia marked a fundamental reorientation of its foreign policy as

well as its national identity. Until then, Japan had sought a policy of literal adherence to the United Nations charter. The charter, product of the allied powers in the second world war that specifically names Japan and Germany as enemies, condones the sovereign use of force only for self-defense. Japan, narrowly interpreting the notion of self-defense, postured to react only to a direct attack on its territory. There was no contemplation of preventive war, and the military acquired no force projection capability. Eliminating the potential for aggression was Japan's way of atoning for the guilt of the second world war and of contributing to world order and peace.

The Cambodian expedition gave new purpose to the Japanese military. Now we can contribute money and sweat, remarked the Japanese prime minister at the time. But will blood come next? And how will the Japanese ability to spill blood contribute to world order and peace? These are questions Japanese policy makers now contemplate. If they wish to transform Japan into a country that can spill blood, they need to recreate the notion of just war in the Japanese mind.

All wars are bad and unjust - Japan has been able to afford the luxury of living by this notion for over half a century. There is simply no room to contemplate just war. Talk of just cause, competent authority, comparative justice, right intention, last resort, probability of success, proportionality and such are beyond the pale of Japanese discussion. The constitution's article nine famously declares, "The Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force to settle international disputes. ... The right of belligerency of the state will never be recognized." Constitutional pacifism has become deeply embedded in Japanese society.

The anti-military sentiment has been powerful enough to block the passage of laws governing emergencies for the armed forces. So, if an alien bomber were to appear over Japan, the Japanese interceptor cannot fire until the act of aggression is confirmed, that is, until after the bomber drops its load. Technically, the Japanese soldier maneuvering to meet an invading force must obtain permission of property owners before their land can be crossed. Japan possesses substantial military power, but society thus far remains irresolute in providing any legal provision for the exercise of that power.

The experience of the second world war has taught the Japanese that their own military had become the paramount threat to national security. The imperial military had embarked on reckless aggression that led to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Furthermore, sorry was the military's conduct toward its own people. In the horrendous eighty-four day battle of Okinawa, tellingly, the Japanese army retreated into the mountains in face of the American invasion, abandoning the people to die in the crossfire. Nearly 200,000, a third of the island's population, perished. Even worse, panicking Japanese soldiers slaughtered hundreds of innocent Japanese civilians branding them spies. The memory of the war runs deep in Japan. August, 15, 1945 - the day the country surrendered unconditionally to the allied powers, the day the overwhelming majority of the Japanese took to be liberation from death which had seemed certain - is the singular source of postwar Japanese national identity. There has appeared no convincing reason why the Japanese people should bestow upon their military the ability to spill blood again.

So, in 2000, Japan declined to send troops to the international peace-keeping operation in East Timor, pointing out that the local militias had not laid down arms. It is not legally possible to introduce troops into zones of combat, explained the Japanese foreign ministry spokesman. Japan sent money.

There is something paradoxical, perhaps even cynical, about how Japan pays for the use of force by others. For the Gulf war, Japan declared that the money is to be earmarked for medical and humanitarian purposes, and asked not to be presented with any uncomfortable accounting of how the money was actually spent. By Japanese criminal law, aiding and abetting murder is equally heinous to murder, and both acts are punishable by death. How then is paying for war different from engaging in war?

The paradox is not an entirely new phenomenon of the post-cold war era. Its logic has been embedded in Japan's security relations with the United States since the end of the second world war. The U.S.-Japan security treaty stipulates that American forces can use bases in Japan for operations outside of Japan only with the consent of the Japanese government. It is a clear fiction. There is a secret agreement making no such consent necessary. The Japanese government will not admit to its public that such an agreement exists. Throughout the cold war and beyond, American forces have used Japanese bases to fight wars in Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf and elsewhere. While the Japanese government explains to its public that the American forces are in Japan primarily, if not exclusively, for the defense of Japan, the defense of Japan is but a secondary mission of the American forces.

In this sense, Japan has been bound by a complex set of paradoxes. The world's sole victim of atomic devastation heralds non-nuclear principles - Japan will not manufacture or possess nuclear weapons, and will not allow the introduction of nuclear weapons into the country. Yet, there was little doubt during the cold war that American forces in Japan, including the Seventh Fleet with Japanese home ports, had in their possession nuclear weapons. But there certainly was no benefit in the Japanese government asking for a clarification. We understand that Japan has non-nuclear principles, announced a succession of American military spokespersons, but the United States neither confirms nor denies the location of nuclear weapons.

Another glaring paradox is the very existence of the Japanese military, perhaps the world's second largest in terms of outlay today (depending on the accounting method used). The constitution simply and clearly states that "land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained." The vast majority of Japan's constitutional lawyers deem the military to be unconstitutional. But the Japanese supreme court has maintained that the question of the constitutionality of the military is a political matter and not for the court to opine. The 1952 security treaty between Japan and the United States does stipulate, "Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense." So, arguably, the security treaty - which invites the United States to maintain bases in Japan, and which the United States imposed upon Japan as the price of independence from military occupation - has stood above the Japanese constitution, presumably the highest law of the land.

Simply put, the United States victorious in the Second World War initially sought to

demilitarize Japan. The American army of occupation accordingly disbanded the Japanese military, and imposed upon the unarmed Japanese a "peace constitution." But with the cold war turning hot in Korea, the occupiers reinterpreted the constitution deeming that it does not proscribe Japan's inherent and sovereign right of self-defense as recognized by the United Nations. The occupiers thus ordered a hesitant Japanese government to rearm, hoping to turn yesterday's enemy into a cold war ally. Henceforth, the United States continued to pressure for Japanese rearmament, and Japan obliged, but at no time to the extent of American wishes. All the while, Japan has not altered the constitution whose preamble proclaims the "Japanese people desire peace for all time and have determined to preserve our security and existence trusting in the justice and faith of the peace loving peoples of the world." No eager volunteer in the cold war, Japan had been a conscientious objector.

The Japanese state is not the primary agent for ensuring national security. That task has been entrusted to another state. The United States today deploys seventy-five percent of its forces in Japan on Okinawa - 26,000 soldiers on 39 bases occupying 20% of the land. The small island prefecture is one giant military base. Okinawa was the only part of Japan that witnessed a ground war during the second world war. Following defeat, Okinawa remained under American military occupation until 1972, twenty years longer than the rest of Japan. It was the only part of Japan that Emperor Hirohito could not visit, so strong was the sense of betrayal felt by the Okinawans. (The emperor died in 1989.)

The concentration of American forces on Okinawa, with all the problems the presence of a foreign military entail, makes the American military practically invisible in the rest of Japan. Okinawa makes the American security connection palatable to the vast majority of the Japanese. Okinawa has allowed the rest of Japan to retreat from international politics and to live a comfortable life of constitutional pacifism. This has made the people of Okinawa into a minority of grievance among the otherwise homogeneous Japanese.

There are those who call for Okinawan autonomy. They begin with the argument that the Okinawans are racially distinct and possess their own history as an independent kingdom. Such talk finds little resonance among the Japanese. There is little sensitivity toward minority and ethnic issues. That was the stuff of empire past, and better forgotten, of an imperial Japan that claimed to be a fusion of Japanese, Koreans, Manchurians, Chinese and Mongolians. The government's unwillingness to recognize Okinawa as a minority issue translates into general insensitivity toward minority rights and claims in self-determination conflicts. In Japan's political culture that clearly stresses order over rights, the recognition of minority rights simply seems to be an unnecessary invitation encouraging disorder. But grievances do exist, and they need tending. For Okinawa's burden and sacrifice, the national government in Tokyo sends money - about \$3 billion annually in subsidies and tax breaks.

The place of Okinawa today is akin to that of the island of Dejima in Nagasaki harbor during the two and a half centuries of Japan's self-imposed seclusion from international politics. Beginning in the early seventeenth century, for domestic peace and order, Japan shunned foreign intercourse - there were no wars, domestic or international, during this time. Only the Dutch were allowed to conduct trade on Dejima; they provided useful

information about world affairs. Then in the mid-nineteenth century, the United States pried open Japan. Henceforth, Japan immersed itself fully in international politics and paid the price in 1945. Vanquished Japan, craving peace, has remained shy about re-entering international politics, and Okinawa as Dejima has permitted that shyness. Isolationism is an important theme in Japanese history.

In 1827 Britain, France and Russia intervened in the struggle between revolutionary Greece and Turkey when public opinion reacted with horror to the cruelties committed during the struggle. But this and other discrete events were insufficient to give weight of customary law in contradiction to the general rule of non-intervention. Still 1827 showed how the logic of intervention could be constructed. The European interventionist powers did not confer formal equality on the Ottoman Empire. The lack of formal recognition as a sovereign equal opens the way for contemplating how humanitarian intervention can be made permissible even legal. In today's language, "failed state" signals the attempt to strip a state of formal recognition.

In the 1930s, Japan intent on imperial expansion classified China as a failed state. There was chaos and disorder in China, strife of warlordism tearing apart the country. The Japanese intervened. They claimed their mission to be the restoration of order. They called it the "China incident." It could not be considered a war for China as a failed state was no longer sovereign - wars are conducted between formally equal sovereign powers. The incident turned into a quagmire; what followed is the history of the second world war.

Non-interference in the internal affairs of others has been a guiding principle of post-1945 Japanese foreign policy. That is the lesson of the China incident and a reason why Japan has not posed any military threat toward Asian countries. Another guiding principle has been the separation of politics and economics. That was the way Japan sought to deal with China on the other side of the cold war divide. Japan established commercial relations with the Chinese government in Beijing. Japan could not formally recognize Beijing until 1979, until after the Sino-American rapprochement. An American condition for ending the military occupation of Japan in 1952 had been the Japanese recognition of Taipei as the government of all China.

Given the continued presence of the American military following the end of the occupation, there grew only a weak understanding in Japan that full sovereignty had been recovered. So a self-consciously half-sovereign Japan linked itself economically with a China whose sovereignty it could not recognize. In a sense, the policy of separating politics and economics was true to the liberal sensibility of *laissez-faire* that deems the legal orders of states to be irrelevant in the consideration of their membership in international society. The relatively tolerant attitude among leading powers that Japan today shows toward the questionable human rights condition in Myanmar, for instance, is the offshoot of the principles of non-interference and separation of economics and politics born of the experience with China.

Doing no harm in international politics is understood to be Japan's duty, mindful of the atrocities it committed in Asia during the second world war. Is there no room for the

more positive duty of beneficence? That neglect can cause injustice is not a driving motive of Japanese foreign policy when the quest of justice entails the use of force. During NATO's aerial bombardment in the 1999 Kosovo crisis, the Japanese government clarified its position on humanitarian intervention in self-determination conflicts thus: There is not yet an international consensus on the issue, and Japan awaits for such a consensus to form. Meanwhile, Japan promised \$100 million for the rehabilitation of Kosovo and the return of refugees "once a peace agreement is reached."

There is apparent wisdom in this meek Japanese position. Still is there no room for recognizing and reacting to humanitarian emergencies? Japan is not keen on constructing emergencies. One reason for this is social. Japanese society highly values stability and predictability, safety and order. An important task of government is to regulate society to realize such values and avert emergencies. Heavily regulated Japan works smoothly much of the time, but when emergencies strike - as in the devastating earthquake that hit the major port city of Kobe in 1995, or the current decade-long structural economic crisis - the government proves more than often to be inept. Emergencies are not supposed to happen. This curious attitude of government contrasts with America's presidential leadership style that thrives on crisis management, and it is toward the United States that Japan looks for an articulation of "international consensus" on practically all matters of international politics.

Still the world is not what it was in the 1930s. Japan certainly has changed. Behind the talk of humanitarian intervention is the effort to separate it from balance of power politics and great power ambitions. Can - or should - Japan begin to reconsider humanitarian intervention? To what extent is official Japanese thinking influenced by human rights considerations? The government's stance toward political asylum seekers is telling.

Japan was slow to join the two international conventions regarding refugees. Japan ratified the 1951 Convention Regarding the Status of Refugees in 1981, and the 1967 Protocol Regarding the Status of Refugees in 1982. Fear that opening the Japanese door would flood the country with those seeking refuge from neighboring countries (read China) was cause for the delay. True, the racially homogeneous Japanese are sensitive about accepting too many foreigners among their midst. But, more to the point, the government did not wish to antagonize China by accepting their refugees - that would be tantamount to an indictment of China.

Recently, Japan has been accepting one or two political refugees a year. The total number thus far is less than 250 - almost all of them are Indochinese who had earlier been accepted as people in "refugee-like situations" under great pressure from the international community. To contrast, the United States accepted 6,500 refugees from Bosnia in 1997 alone. No one from countries considered friendly to Japan, especially China, is likely to be awarded refugee status. The Japanese ministry of justice does not make refugee data public, claiming privacy must be protected. How many and where they came from remain shrouded in official secrecy. Human rights, as far as it can be ascertained from the recognition of political refugees, is not a significant factor motivating Japanese foreign policy. Here again, Japan does offer substantial amounts of money to UNHCR and other

international organizations for refugee care and resettlement - somewhere else.

There is no tradition in Japan of rights discourse. Heralding rights does not make for a persuasive argument. That is too abstract. What can better move society is the sense of pity, concern and care for the suffering of others.

Japan is one of the world's greatest benefactors, distributing substantial sums in foreign aid. Beginning in the mid-1970s and notably through the 1980s, Japan sought to identify its role as an internationally responsible power through giving. Japanese foreign aid has come in the main as economic developmental assistance - though there was the addition of "strategic aid" to Pakistan, Turkey and Egypt prompted by American pressure for burden-sharing during Reagan's cold war. The foray into America's "arc of crisis" notwithstanding, the philosophy behind Japanese giving - not always clearly articulated by officialdom - is that economic development fosters international and domestic peace. Underlining such thinking is the assumption that the primary purpose of government is economic growth and equitable distribution of wealth, an assumption born of Japan's transformation following the defeat of its empire.

To call the export of this Japanese model a form of intervention is probably stretching the definition for no useful purpose. Still there is little doubt that the Japanese model played a critical part in the making of the "Asian tiger" economies of South Korea and Taiwan; in the redirection of the manner of government toward the recognition of the primacy of economics in southeast Asian countries after the Vietnam war; and in China's abandonment of revolutionary zeal for the capitalist road. Japan had shown what can be done and what is more desirable. And Japan has been willing to lend a hand. During the last days in the Soviet Union, some would argue for "glasnost and perestroika" pointing to the Japanese example of how advanced capitalism need not necessarily lead to imperialism, thereby subverting the Leninist dogma. Japanese model and assistance, coupled with trade and investment, have brought certain prosperity to a significant part of the world. What cannot be shown - though one strongly suspects the connection especially in east Asia - is how prosperity contributes to the dampening of conflict, both domestic and international, including self-determination conflicts. There are counter-examples, of course; ethnic conflict can explode against a background of the promise of prosperity. Sri Lanka is a case in point. Nevertheless, a strong argument can be made for how the Japanese model contributes to crisis prevention - prevention obviously being preferable to intervention - though, to reiterate, what did not happen cannot be counted.

In 1992, as the experience with the Gulf war pushed Japan toward considering a more active involvement in international politics, the government announced a new foreign aid guideline. It was Japan's effort at clarifying its international contribution short of military involvement. The guideline stipulated conditions for giving: there should be care for both economic development and the environment; aid money must not be used for military purposes; military expenditure and traffic in armaments by the aid beneficiary should be carefully monitored. Other conditions, lower on the list, included promotion of basic human rights, democratization, and transition toward market economy. Critics have pointed out, if these conditions were to be strictly enforced, in Asia, only Mongolia would be eligible for

Japanese foreign aid. So these conditions serve as encouragement toward a desired future.

China is, by far, the largest recipient of Japanese foreign aid. Since 1979 the total has come to more than \$23 billion. China harbors potential for self-determination conflicts in Taiwan and Tibet and with its Muslim population concentrated in the northwest region. If any of them were to erupt into open conflict, Japan would be hard pressed to ignore them, especially in the case of Taiwan, which in essence would be an international war. The American commitment to support Taiwan's integrity and Japan's alliance obligation to the United States will automatically draw Japan into such a conflict in one way or another. Yet there is no open dialogue between Japan and China on how to avert such self-determination conflicts. They are internal matters, China makes clear, and are not open to discussion and outside meddling. Japan can only repeat the hope they will be resolved peacefully.

There is not yet a real sense of reconciliation of past trouble between Japan and China. China harps on Japan's sins at every possible occasion, often making cynical diplomatic use, while Japan offers not quite sincere apologies. The Japanese ability to play a more active role in international politics is to a considerable degree hampered by its geopolitical and historical relations with China. Arguably, Japan would be a more vocal promoter of human rights around the world if not for the sticky Chinese connection. As the way to increased presence in world affairs for Israel runs through a resolution of the Palestinian question, the Japanese way runs through China.

The lack of overt Japanese leverage over China is evident in Japan's faint hearted opposition to China's nuclear weapons program, an important issue touching on the Japanese effort at crisis prevention. China has made clear, again, that the issue is not open to discussion with Japan, because China's nuclear weapons are designed for use only against other nuclear powers of which is Japan is not one. In reaction to the recent series of Chinese nuclear testing, Japan suspended foreign aid, but only very briefly, orchestrating a symbolic protest with no substantial effect. There is no wisdom in Japan alienating China. Between Japan and China, there is no obvious confidence building mechanism. Japan can hope that patience and restraint will continue to guide both China and itself, and manage sure-footed diplomacy as China proceeds toward more responsible and responsive membership in the international community.

In 2000, Chinese premier Zhu Rongji made clear while on a state visit to Japan that China will henceforth not demand Japanese apology for past military aggression. This was new, and it is important in that Chinese forgiveness expands Japan's license to link economic aid with political issues - from conflicting sovereignty claims over uninhabited islands to Chinese acid rain falling in Japan and possibly to more delicate matters hitherto closed for discussion. The basic shift in China's diplomatic posture is not unrelated to growing Japanese impatience with China's intransigence in political and military matters, leading the Japanese to openly wonder why an increasingly rich China should continue to receive Japanese largesse. In Japan Zhu worked to win increased developmental assistance for China's interior regions, which lag noticeably behind the spectacular economic achievements of the coastal urban centers. Slowly, Japan acquires the ability to affect China's internal matters.

In east Asia there is no regional organization akin to NATO, EU or OAS to organize interventions, though there is in the southeast region a potential but limited forum in ASEAN. Any effective regional organization encompassing the whole of east Asia must have Japan and China cooperatively acting as leading members. But relations between the two countries have not yet reached a sufficient level of maturity and trust. In terms of intervention in self-determination conflicts, especially slim is the possibility of establishing a regional organization as long as China remains a potential object of such intervention.

Still ad hoc cooperation within the region is possible. Australian muscle and Japanese money played decisive roles in the intervention into Indonesia's East Timor. (Australia is in many ways an east Asian country.) Japan helped finance the intervention, and promised, in the by now standard phrase, reconstruction aid "once peace is established."

Japan leaned hard on the Indonesian government to accept the intervention and pave the way toward independence of East Timor. Indonesia is the second largest recipient of Japanese foreign aid; Indonesia and China together constitute the bulk of Japan's aid budget. There is no political rivalry between Japan and Indonesia as there is between Japan and China. Japanese foreign aid has a much greater impact on Indonesia than it does on China. So here is a situation in which Japanese economic aid translates into effective political leverage, resulting in a relatively swift management of the self-determination conflict that erupted in East Timor. For 2001, the Consultative Group for Indonesia, a forum for aid donors, pledged over \$5.3 billion of which Japan shouldered nearly a third. Another \$5 billion in the form of a three-year IMF loan went to Indonesia to prop the currency and buy goodwill. Japan is one of the core contributors to the Fund.

East Timor marked a major Japanese foreign policy initiative. Yet the Japanese public was little informed of the critical role their country played. The media did not accentuate Japan's role in reporting the events from Indonesia. Media in the state of "willful innocence" remain skeptical about fanning enthusiasm for an activist and interventionist foreign policy. The foreign ministry, too, did not seek publicity for its work, preferring a more or less discreet approach toward "international contribution befitting a responsible power." In part, the foreign ministry seeks to avoid domestic opposition that is likely to arise with publicity and openness. But foreign policy springs from deep social and economic forces, and it is not something foreign ministry bureaucrats can conjure in isolation for long. A more active and responsible Japan in international politics cannot be made without firm backing by society. An interventionist foreign policy carries costs, and they can add up. East Timor did not necessarily prepare Japanese society for the next or costlier intervention. It did nothing to prepare society for the possibility of having to accept the cost of dead Japanese soldiers.

As the Australian-led multi-national force moved into East Timor, the Japanese government explained why its troops could not participate. That the force was not officially an United Nations force stood as one crucial reason. The United Nations has played a more important role in Japanese thinking about security than is commonly acknowledged. And that is not a post-cold war phenomenon. After the defeat in the second world war, there arose three types of thinking on how to provide national security: unarmed neutrality espoused by the opposition left, alliance with the United States espoused by the ruling

conservatives, and reliance on the United Nations espoused by elements of both the left and right. Some of the nationalist minded in the left and right camps would make an intriguing connection between the United Nations and the Japanese military. During the early cold war era, pacifist left thinking imagined a solution for what to do with the "unconstitutional military" - donate it to the United Nations. After the cold war, rightist thinking, by no means pacifistic, arrived at the same conclusion. In both cases, the point is to separate the use of force from sovereign statehood. It is a call for the establishment of a standing United Nations armed force, to give real muscle to the only organization legally empowered to ignore sovereign claims. It is an idea also voiced by the post-cold war secretaries-general of the United Nations.

For Japan today, the issue is not simply avoiding the loss of Japanese soldiers. Social sentiment is such that the state cannot allow its soldiers to kill. Japanese soldiers on loan donning blue helmets are still Japanese soldiers, and the idea of them killing is simply unacceptable. Will Japan ever be able to spill blood for humanitarian purposes? As things stand, the only conceivable way is by individual Japanese volunteering to join a standing United Nations force or, with the soldiers' consent, permanently donating part or whole of the Japanese armed forces to the United Nations. How likely is such an outcome? A major stumbling block to Japan seriously considering such a move is the United States, final guarantor of Japan's national security, which certainly does not harbor that kind of enthusiasm about the United Nations' possibilities.

A series of events in the year 2000 signaled Japan reconsidering its national identity and role in international politics. Parliament passed a law recognizing the familiar flag of the red sun as the national flag. Until then, enough people in Japan had identified the flag with shame of the country's behavior in the second world war and could block such a recognition. The new act of parliament repositions the flag as a normal symbol of the country's independence and sovereignty. The grip of an onerous past eases.

Parliament also managed to establish for the first time a committee on the constitution. For a half century the constitution could not be touched much less reasonably discussed. There had been political deadlock between rightist forces that sought to reject the constitution as "American-imposed and alien" and leftist forces that embraced the constitution of "peace and democracy." Now the parliamentary committee can begin to clarify the "constitutional paradox" of the armed forces. It presents an opportunity for Japan to consider something very fundamental about statehood and ask the questions: what is the military for? do we need a military? The constitutional review is likely to take some time, five perhaps ten years. It will turn into an open, national debate, for any constitutional amendment requires a majority vote of the people in a plebiscite. We shall see how much of the constitution's pacifistic spirit will be retained, or through a new constitution, a Japan transforming itself into a "normal" state with the usual claims to the sovereign right of the use of force.

Also in 2000, Japan agreed to a new guideline for the security treaty with the United States. By this, the Japanese military commits to providing logistics and rearguard support for American forces operating out of Japan. This marked a fundamental revision of

the security treaty and another gross violation of the constitutional spirit. Now, short of front line action (and where that line may be is not always clear), the Japanese military can become involved in America's war. Is this a prelude to Japan becoming a "normal" state?

Pulling in the other direction were events in the Asian continent. The warming of relations between north and south in Korea, symbolized by South Korean president Kim Dae-jung's visit to Pyongyang, greatly eases Japan's security concerns. Also, Kim Dae-jung, as with Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji, announced that he will no longer ask for Japanese apologies. Finally Japan is being freed from the sins of empire past by the primary victims. This paves the way for more direct and open discussions in the region about security, and building confidence and trust. (So lacking was trust, until very recently, Japanese songs were banned in South Korea.)

As South Korea, China and even North Korea become increasingly enmeshed in world capitalism, and as their manner of governance becomes more receptive to popular needs and wants, and less authoritarian, there should be decreased concern in Japan about military security. The continuation of these positive trends in the Asian continent will surely affect the tone of Japan's constitutional review. It will also loosen the almost blind Japanese security dependence on the United States. As a more peaceful and confident environment develops, Japan may come to ask for the withdrawal of American forces from Okinawa, for a security relation without bases. Japan then will feel fully sovereign and independent, finally recovering what many deem to have been lost with the defeat in the second world war. What then will be Japan's attitude toward the use of force?

"Groping for an International Political Role"

日本の主体性と民族自決紛争に対しての人的介入の可能性を考察したものである。戦後日本外交、帝国主義からの教訓、国際政治からの意図的孤立、冷戦の構造と心理、日米安保条約、憲法平和主義、国連主義、国連平和維持活動、主権と武力行使、人権と武力行使、非介入の原則と人的非常時、国民の反軍感情、正戦の概念、政治力としての国際経済支援、中国の持つ意味などの複雑な関連性を解明する。この論説は2000年12月にデンバー大学主催の国際会議“Self-Determination, Security and the United Nations”で発表した。