

FOR MUTUAL BENEFIT: The Japan-US Security Treaty: From a Japanese Perspective

Daizo Sakurada

Working Paper 7/97

Synopsis

Even in the post-Cold War era in which Japan faces no clear and present threats, the Japan-US Security Treaty continues to function as an 'insurance policy' against potential disorder in the region. The Treaty is not unconstitutional in the sense it infringes the peace clause of the Japanese Constitution. Neither is it beneficial only to one party as some American and Japanese critics have maintained; on the contrary, strategic benefits from the Treaty accrue to both Japan and the US, and outweigh potential costs. Japan should make good use of the current security alignment with the United States to moderate American policy vis-a-vis China.

Centre for Strategic Studies
Victoria University of Wellington
1997

© Daizo Sakurada
ISSN 1173-5473

About the Writer

Daizo Sakurada, Associate Professor of International Relations in the Faculty of Integrated Arts & Sciences of the University of Tokushima in Japan, was a research fellow at the Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS:NZ) from April 1996 until January 1997 on an Asia 2000 Foundation Fellowship.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Ambassador Terence O'Brien, Dr David Dickens, Mr Peter Cozens and Ms Mari Moroi of CSS:NZ, and Dr Gerald Chan of Victoria University, for their assistance and helpful comments. Also appreciated is the assistance provided by Professor Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, Professor Satoshi Kurisu, Ms Toshiko Kitajima, Mr and Mrs Hidemi Kitajima, Aiko and Miho Sakurada. The financial contribution from the Asia 2000 Foundation Fellowship is warmly acknowledged. The author is, however, solely responsible for the analysis and conclusions.

Introduction

The Japan-US security relationship embodied in the "Treaty of Mutual Cooperation between Japan and the United States" (hereafter referred to as the Treaty) has been one important factor contributing to the international order of Asia-Pacific. The Treaty, particularly since its redrafting in 1960, has stabilised strategic equilibrium in the region as well as the bilateral relationship between Washington and Tokyo. The Treaty served its function well during the Cold War. Originally intended to deter and repel communist expansion in Far East Asia, it ensured forward deployment of American military forces, and provided Japan with the American nuclear umbrella.

The end of the Cold War and domestic changes in both countries, however, cast doubts on the utility of the Treaty for the future. As for the United States, the Clinton Administration appears more inward-looking than the previous Administration(s); and to be largely preoccupied with economic, rather than security and strategic, considerations. Some Americans argue that the economic competition of Asian powers including Japan is threatening.¹ There is little sympathy for security treaties among American isolationists.² In Japan, the future of the Treaty has been subject to intense public debate. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, Japan now faces no immediate adversaries which could pose a nuclear threat, although a sense of uncertainty lingers.³ Massive public demonstrations against the US bases in Okinawa following the rape of a schoolgirl by three American servicemen in 1996 highlighted problems in managing the presence of US forces at the local level.⁴

Despite those factors, the Japan-US Security Treaty is indispensable for the region's stability and prosperity in the long term. This paper presents Japanese perspectives on the utility of the Japan-US Security Treaty today. First, it briefly describes the history of the Treaty, and then examines several arguments for and against it, primarily in the Japanese (and American) security literature. Moreover, it explores the implications of the end of the Cold War for security relations between the two countries. In so doing, this paper seeks to address the significance of maintaining the Japan-US Security Treaty in the post-Cold War era.

Background to the Japan-US Security Treaty

The original Japan-US Security Treaty was created by the San Francisco Peace Conference (Appendix 1). With the signing of a peace treaty with forty-eight states, Japan regained its sovereignty on 8 September 1951, ending the US-led occupation by the Allied Powers. The 1951 Treaty declared that the United States, 'in the interest of peace and security, is presently willing to maintain certain of its armed forces in and about Japan, in expectation, ... that Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression.' Thus the US demanded that Japan create her own armed forces, which today are known as Self-Defense Forces (SDF).

The 1951 Treaty included some asymmetrical provisions. For instance, it provided for US military intervention, at the request from Tokyo, in suppressing 'large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside Power or Powers (Article I).' This possibly infringed the principle of sovereign equality between nations.⁵ Above all the 1951 Treaty reflected 'the US victory in the Pacific War... and its determination to maintain its influence over Japan'⁶ in the post-WWII period.

All unfavourable elements to Japan of the 1951 Treaty were completely revised in 1960 (Appendix 2).⁷ The revised Treaty was not merely a modification of the earlier version; rather it was a new

Treaty.⁸ First, the American obligation to defend Japan was made more explicit with Article V stipulating that:

[e]ach party recognizes that an armed attack against either party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and security and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes.

In addition, Article I of the 1951 Treaty guaranteeing American military intervention in the event of Japanese domestic instability was deleted. Significantly, the two governments agreed that they would undertake occasional consultations 'regarding the implementation of this Treaty, and, at the request of either Party, whenever the security of Japan or international peace and security in the Far East is threatened' (Article IV). Moreover, Article II prodded the US and Japan to 'eliminate conflict in their international economic policies' and to 'encourage economic collaboration between them'.

Despite those improvements, strong pacifist sentiments among Japanese people made ratification by the Japanese Diet difficult. Protest against the Treaty was particularly vehement from union members, students, and opposition parties, notably the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) and the Japan Communist Party (JCP), which feared that Japan might be implicated in a US-led war in Far East. In retrospect, it seems that this outburst of anti-American feeling was due to an ephemeral revival of irrational nationalism among the public.⁹ In fact, public opposition against the Treaty once again temporarily surged during its 1970 renewal, but overall a majority of elected representatives and the Japanese people have supported it.

The Treaty sought during the Cold War to deter communist threats from the Soviet Union and China. As a part of its containment strategy against the USSR, Washington utilised diplomatic as well as security support from Tokyo. Washington's relationship with Beijing dramatically improved following Sino-US rapprochement in the early 1970s. Despite the absence of prior consultation by the US about rapprochement with China, Japan immediately adjusted its China policy in step with the United States, and normalised its diplomatic ties with China in 1972. As a consequence, Beijing's attitude to the Treaty became more benign, and in effect sanctioned its continuity.¹⁰

The Treaty in Japanese Security Literature

The end of the Cold War influenced the Japan-US bilateral relationship and the Treaty itself in many crucial ways. The United States emerged as the only undisputed military superpower.¹¹ The breakdown of the zero-sum bipolar structure in the international system created greater room for Japan to manoeuvre on the world stage. The disappearance of the Soviet threat and restructuring of the world order begs the question, has the value of the Japan-US Security Treaty diminished?¹² This issue is subject of vigorous debate within the Japanese strategic studies and international politics literature. Several different viewpoints are conspicuous in the anti-Treaty argument.

(a) Unconstitutionality of the Treaty?

The question of whether or not the Treaty is constitutional and consistent with Japanese domestic law has been subject to intense debate. It focuses particularly on two points: Article 9 of the Constitution (Appendix 3) and the three 'non nuclear' principles of "not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them, and not permitting their introduction into Japan".

First, Article 9, or the 'peace clause,' forbids Japan's rearmament and denies its right to collective self-defense, i.e. entering into military arrangements with foreign states. In light of this, the JSP traditionally argued that unarmed neutrality was the only legitimate security policy for Japan, and thus advocated strong anti-SDF and anti-Treaty doctrines. Nonetheless this view has had little sway over the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)-ruled governments which hold that Article 9 does not deny the right to self-defence inherent in any sovereign state. The LDP leaders argue that Japan's basic national defence policy is *senshu-boei* meaning that the SDF will only possess 'exclusively defense-oriented capabilities' and will not launch pre-emptive attacks and since the Treaty underpins this policy, neither the SDF nor the Treaty violate therefore the Constitution.¹³ Likewise, the Japanese Supreme Court has never ruled them unconstitutional.

The year 1993 marked a turning point in Japan's security policy; the JSP¹⁴ as a party gave up its anti-SDF/anti-Treaty policy when it formed a coalition government with the LDP and *Sakigake* (Harbinger Party) allowing a weak consensus on the constitutionality of the SDF and the Treaty amongst political parties.¹⁵ This, however, did not end the political debate over this issue. Some of individual political leaders and constitutional scholars still rigidly oppose the SDF and the Treaty to this day. Poll results in 1996 shows that 70.2% of constitutional scholars and 48.8% of elected representatives judge that the SDF violate the 'peace clause'.¹⁶

Second, the Government is held accountable for ignoring the 'three non-nuclear principles' in its discharge of the Treaty obligations, given the likelihood of port calls by nuclear-armed American warships. Article VI of the Treaty obliges Tokyo to guarantee the US military forces the use of facilities and areas in Japan 'for the purpose of contributing to the security of Japan and the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East (Appendix 2)'. At the same time, the Pentagon adheres to the policy of 'Neither Confirm Nor Deny (NCND)' concerning the existence of nuclear weapons with its military forces abroad. Consequently, the principle of 'non-introduction' of nuclear weapons to Japan has technically been neglected.

Japanese governments have historically used Japan's geostrategic circumstance, namely its proximity to nuclear powers such as China and Russia, to justify the nuclear deterrence provided by the Treaty. Realistically, forcing Washington to give up NCND might undermine the 'extended deterrence' of the American nuclear umbrella for Japan.¹⁷ Paradoxically, although, Japan is fundamentally anti-nuclear and supports the ultimate abolition of all nuclear weapons, it does not deny nuclear deterrence.¹⁸

(b) Reciprocity of Responsibility under the Treaty

Another line of argument prevalent in the Japanese security literature is that the Treaty only benefits Japan; the US does not have a reciprocally vested interest in honouring its Treaty obligations to Japan. A Japanese military response is permitted only when Japan itself is attacked because the Treaty limits the use of the SDF to the Far East region. The failure of Japan to shoulder its fair share of the security burden has received severe criticism from the US. The evidence often cited for the lack of Japanese defence collaboration lies in the fact that the US is pledged to defend Japan, but not vice versa.¹⁹

It is true that Japan is not obliged to send military forces to defend American sovereignty under the terms of the Treaty, but nor are South Korea and the Philippines so obliged under their treaties. Comparison of the terms of the Treaty with those of NATO might suggest the arrangement in West Europe is more 'reciprocal', but in reality it is doubtful that European NATO allies possess sufficient

military capabilities to join in repelling the attacks on the US mainland, or that the US would need them to do so.²⁰ Besides, considering fundamentally divergent geostrategic circumstances surrounding NATO and the Japan-US Security Treaty, it is misleading to compare these two security arrangements. NATO confronted Warsaw Pact forces on the same continent, directly along the Iron Curtain; on the other hand, Japan, separated from the continent by the Sea of Japan, could afford to worry less about the chance of direct military confrontation with Soviet forces.²¹ Growing rivalry between Moscow and Beijing since the early 1960s also helped decrease the likelihood of Soviet expansion to East Asia.

Shunji Taoka argues that the view that Japan does not need to defend the US is misplaced. Had the Soviet Union attacked US territory during the Cold War, not only would US forces stationed in Japan been involved, but Japan itself, would also have automatically declared its forces on the US side. Although Japan did not have the will, nor military capabilities, during the Cold War to initiate war against communist countries in the region, there was still the possibility that Tokyo could have been implicated in a conflict triggered by military confrontation in Europe if that spilled over into Asia. In retrospect, it appears that the prospect of a direct attack on Japan by the USSR was remote given the absence of offensive intention and its weak naval capabilities at that time.²²

Strategic benefits to the US accruing from the Treaty during the Cold War were in fact significant. The free use of the bases in Japan enhanced the US forward deployment capabilities for the defense of places as far away as the Persian Gulf.²³ The Treaty is not unilaterally favourable to Japan, and the US did not sign and observe the Treaty out of pure altruism. In addition, 'reciprocity' if taken literally would suggest that the SDF should station some troops in US territory to defend America.²⁴ By this sort of measurement, only Canada under the NORAD agreement can be considered to be a 'truly reciprocal' ally of the US. The Japan-US Security Treaty may not be 'reciprocal' in a strict sense, but neither is it one-sided; it has been equitable.

(c) Is Japan a Free-Rider?

Some Japanese and United States commentators contend that the Treaty gives Japan a 'free ride', and Japan's obligation to share the defence burden is long overdue. This argument was common in the late 60's and early 70's.²⁵ Its potency has declined, but there are some in both American and Japanese quarters who still maintain that Japan is not paying sufficiently.²⁶ Two empirical cases often cited are: (1) lack of Japanese burden-sharing in the 1990-91 Gulf Crisis/War, and (2) the fact that Japan's 'official' defence has remained slightly less than 1% of its GNP since 1976.²⁷ In economic terms, there is a calculation that the American 'defence subsidy' since the signing of the 1951 Treaty has saved Japanese taxpayers more than \$800 billion (measured in 1992 dollars).²⁸

However the figure of the 1% of GNP expenditure on defence is misleading. Measured in the same manner as the British and French expenditure, including the extra sums spent on the coastguard, space programme, pensions for veterans, and so forth, the 1995 security expenditure comes to 1.6% of GDP. In real terms only the US and Russia spend more on defence than Japan.²⁹ In short, the criticism that Japan has paid too little for the security provided by the alliance is not true. Official figures suggest that Japan spent almost as much as the United States on the military security of the region during the Cold War; or, using NATO calculations, about 1.3 times more than the US figure. The US military expenditure amounted to about \$300 billion in 1990, out of which, \$32.1 billion (10.6% of the total) was allocated to its military forces in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan's official defence expenditure in the same year totalled around 4.16 trillion yen or US\$30 billion; the

figure increases to \$42 billion if calculated by the NATO method, including veterans' pensions and other costs.³⁰

More illuminating is the measure of defence expenditure in per soldier ratios. This figure reflects how much a state devotes high-tech military equipment to individual military personnel. The greater the military expenditure per soldier, the more high-tech its weapons and equipment. In 1988, Japan ranked second only to the US in terms of military spending per soldier. According to Muroyama, Japan now possesses the most sophisticated conventional defence capabilities in the Asia-Pacific region.³¹ One can draw the conclusion that Japan takes its provision of military force obligations seriously.

Japan did not 'free ride' the Treaty during the Gulf War or in other periods. Certainly, the government failed to develop a solid national consensus on Japanese participation in the Allied endeavour to restore order in the Gulf in 1991. The deferred payment of a contribution to the cost of the Operation Desert Storm became a source of criticism by the US. Yet when Japan decided to pay, its contribution was significant, totalling over US\$13 billion. In addition Japan despatched a medical group to the region during the war, participated in economic sanctions against Baghdad, and provided intelligence on Iraq-Iran relations to Washington.³² Furthermore Japanese financial contributions for the US bases have steadily increased. Financial burden-sharing in security has prompted Tokyo to spend about 6 trillion yen or US \$6 billion per year (or more than 70% of total stationing costs), for the purpose of maintaining American troops. This is the highest amount paid by any of America's allies. In comparison, Germany, the third largest economy globally, spends just US\$1.4 billion per year to cover the costs for 80,000 American soldiers on its territory.³³

(d) Is the US a Free-Rider?

Muroyama contends that the US, not Japan, is free riding on the Treaty. Despite the collapse of the Soviet Union the Treaty still assures Washington of free access to bases, the exclusive privilege of hosting American forces at low maintenance cost, and 'collective responsibility' for operations using forces based in Japan. The argument thus concludes that Tokyo stands to gain little from this relationship.³⁴

The Muroyama argument garners little support from other Japanese scholars. Mainstream academics such as Taoka, echoing Japan Defence Agency arguments, counter that Muroyama overemphasises the decline in the potential Russian threat, and underestimates the sources of new instability in the Asia-Pacific region. Although the possibility of a world war is now remote, unsettled issues represented by Korean unification, Taiwan-China relations, and the Spratly Islands dispute still suggest possibility of low-intensity conflict in Asia-Pacific.³⁵

Japan-US security collaboration is undoubtedly beneficial to Japan whose economic prosperity is highly dependent on the stability of Asia-Pacific. In this sense, the reasoning of the US-as-a-free-rider is fundamentally flawed. US nuclear and conventional 'extended deterrence' sustained by the Treaty, is an insurance against potential nuclear or conventional threats from unstable neighbouring states like North Korea. The US forces stationed in Japan play the role of trip-wire; should an attack materialise the trip-wire could activate Washington's response. Likewise, US naval supremacy guarantees the security of the sea lanes in the South China Sea which is vital to Japan's economy.³⁶

(e) The Treaty Undermines Japan's Sovereignty?

Japanese ultranationalists advocate the extreme position that the Treaty is a shackle on Japanese sovereignty. They object to Japan being defended by 'a foreign power'.³⁷ The Treaty, they assert,

should be abolished. Japan should assume a fully independent line and develop its own nuclear weapons capability. Nisohachi Hyodo, for example, considers that if Japan's defence capabilities are further strengthened and a nuclear capacity (specifically a SLBM system) developed, Japan could create the capacity to deter nuclear powers such as Russia and China. Behind this assertion lurks the suspicion that it is not certain whether the US would employ nuclear retaliation against would-be opponents, if Japan should be attacked with nuclear weapons.³⁸

These Japanese presumptions uncritically assume Japan is dependent upon the US for its security, and the fear that Japan would be abandoned by the US if attacked directly. Japan's foreign policy, however, is not undermined by the Treaty. Indeed its external influence is sustained by close relations with Washington. Despite close relations with the US, Japan has always pursued an independent foreign policy.³⁹ It has never been involved in a war in the Asia-Pacific simply in support of US policy. It has developed relations with Cuba and is offering official development assistance to Iran.⁴⁰

(f) The UN Collective Security to Replace the Treaty

Some arguments suggest that the Treaty should be phased out so that a new multilateral collective security framework, preferably the United Nations collective security scheme, could be implemented. Muroyama has proposed that Japan should participate fully in a standing UN army, if created, and move in the direction of forming a 'fair, non-discriminatory and neutral' security system. The Japan-US Security Treaty would be phased out, once a comprehensive UN security system is established.⁴¹

Japanese critics retort that this idealistic proposal does not fit contemporary international realities. Reluctance on the part of other states to hand over their national armed forces to be under UN Command stifles practical attraction of the proposal. Nor is it realistic to assume that the Permanent Five of the Security Council would be willing to give up their privileged veto power and restructure the Security Council with an aim of installing a permanent multinational peace enforcement capacity.⁴²

Japanese analysts are wary of adopting European models of regional security cooperation based on NATO or OSCE in Asia-Pacific. The stability and prosperity of Asia-Pacific does not call for such a response at the present stage. States in the Asia-Pacific look to their own resources to create security. For Japan there is no better alternative to supplant the Japan-US Security Treaty.⁴³

The Post-Cold War Relevance of the Treaty

The withdrawal of the US military forces from Japan would represent a fundamental disengagement of US military commitments in East Asia; it would signify the end of American trustworthiness. Fearing Japan's remilitarisation, no state in the Asia-Pacific region, except perhaps North Korea, seeks the termination of the Treaty. Once the Treaty is abolished, Japan would be forced to consider options that Washington would currently regard as unpalatable. Japan may decide to take on a more independent strategic role in the region. The SDF could be developed to a greater potential, and could be used directly in support of its foreign policy goals. Strategic links with China and Russia could be reconsidered. Moreover, Japan might have to seriously consider a nuclear option. At the extreme both Japan and the US could grow to regard each other as hostile entities.⁴⁴ The Treaty provides a mechanism to avoid this strategic rivalry and to deepen the cooperative strategic relationship between Japan and the United States.

Today's broad consensus in Japan is that the Treaty should remain intact for the foreseeable future. With the withdrawal of US forces from the Philippines, the importance of keeping the US bases in North Asia has increased. These forces underpin not only the security of Japan but also that of Asia-Pacific as a whole. US air force units based in Okinawa, for instance, are responsible as well for the defence of South Korea.⁴⁵ The Treaty also psychologically reassures policy makers on both sides of the Pacific that the tragedy of 1941 will never occur again.⁴⁶ In addition, Japan would not need to develop her own nuclear deterrent as long as the Treaty continues.⁴⁷ It should now be seen as an insurance for *stability in the region* as opposed to that against a potential threat in the region during the Cold War.

These strategic considerations together with the 1993 JSP policy reorientation in favour of the Treaty underpinned Japanese support for US global military strategy and led to the 'reconfirmation' of the Treaty between President Clinton and Prime Minister Hashimoto in April 1996. Public opinion in both Japan and the United States endorse the present Treaty after its April 1996 reconfirmation. One survey showed that 62% of the Japanese polled consider the Treaty helpful for Japanese security while another found that 70% of Japanese people agree to the maintenance of the Treaty. Similarly, 75% of the American public and 83% of the American elite surveyed support existing security arrangements with Tokyo.⁴⁸

Japan's Asian-Pacific neighbours view the 'reconfirmation' of the Treaty in largely positive terms. The region was reassured that the Treaty would continue to check Japanese remilitarisation and any prospect of SDF participation in actual combatant operations in the Asia-Pacific region. In contrast, Beijing expressed concern.⁴⁹ Both Japan and the US were at pains to clarify that they did not intend the strengthening of the Treaty to contain or create a new balance of power against China.⁵⁰

Issues Ahead in Maintaining Security Cooperation

It is clear that the Japan-US Security Treaty is necessary for peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific in the twenty-first century. Nonetheless, there are some issues for the two governments to confront in order to effectively maintain security cooperation between Japan and the US.

(a) US Okinawa Base Issue

The stationing of US troops in Okinawa, is increasingly difficult to sustain politically. About 75 percent of the US military facilities in Japan are concentrated in the Okinawa islands (which account for a mere 0.6% of total Japanese land area).⁵¹ Lingering memories of World War II battles still concern people in Okinawa. The islands were the only part of Japan proper to suffer from ground battles during World War II in which civilians were also required to participate in combatant activities. Over 150,000 soldiers and civilians were killed or wounded. Okinawa remains the poorest prefecture in Japan in terms of average annual income and has the highest unemployment rate of about 6% (twice the national average).⁵² There are grave concerns over crimes committed by American military personnel.

There is almost a unanimous view amongst people in Okinawa calling for the withdrawal of US forces.⁵³ The Okinawan prefectural referendum advocating the downsizing of the US bases and the redrafting of the Japan-US Status of Forces Agreement was approved by 89% of the electorate (although voter turnout was relatively low at 59%) in September 1996.⁵⁴ Reflecting the anti-US-base mood, the incumbent governor hopes to phase out all US bases in the islands by 2015.⁵⁵

On the other hand, US bases in Okinawa create benefits for the island.⁵⁶ Since 1972, over four trillion yen have been allocated to Okinawa from the Japanese central government to improve the

prefecture's infrastructure. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the prefectural budget is subsidised by Tokyo. Okinawa and Hokkaido are the only regions of Japan with a specific agency dedicated to improvement of living standards. Okinawa earns over 180 billion yen annually in revenue from US bases. US bases offer jobs to 23,000 local residents. One thousand and one hundred (1,100) Okinawans have won scholarships to universities in the US, and around 400 residents study at American university campuses in the bases. Other benefits include the establishment of the University of Ryukyus by the US government.

Okinawa's geostrategic value has grown for the US after the Cold War. The closure of the Clark and Subic Bay Bases in the Philippines has added more importance to the forward deployment of the US Marines in Okinawa.⁵⁷ In a crisis the US presence is reassuring as Okinawans found during the Taiwan Straits Crisis of 1996 where China fired missiles 60km offshore from Yonakuni Town.⁵⁸

A stable and peaceful relationship between the US forces in Japan and the local residents is vital to the smooth continuation of the Treaty. The solution of the Okinawa base issue must lie in decreasing the burden upon Okinawa residents through assisting them to grow more economically prosperous. The over-concentration of the US military facilities in Okinawa should be reduced. Relocation of the US Marines to, for example, Hawaii or the southern part of South Korea will probably be possible without diminishing effectiveness of the US forward deployment.⁵⁹

(b) Japan-US Trade Friction

Japan's trade surplus of around US \$59.3 billion makes it the largest trade surplus partner of the United States.⁶⁰ This issue currently constitutes the biggest political concern in the bilateral relationship, but the high politics of security relations represented by the Treaty and the politics of trade must be dealt with separately. Spill-over of trade irritants into security dialogue makes the bilateral relationship unconstructive, harming opportunities for the region's two biggest powers to cooperate in promoting the well-being of Asia-Pacific.

The Japan-US security cooperation is not the cause of US trade deficits with Japan. Likewise, the US deficits are not solely explicable in terms of the exclusiveness of the Japanese market and distribution system. The lack of domestic savings on the American part has also contributed to the trade imbalance. Moreover, when looking at the overall picture of financial interactions between the two countries, the US debts to Japan are not as large as they seem. Although Washington runs trade deficits with Japan, it simultaneously receives income from Japan through the host nation support of \$6.4 billion for the US forces in Japan, through payments for intellectual property rights, and for shipping. These sums partly offset the trade deficit.

The Treaty has long served as solid linkage between the two countries that encouraged them to cope with disagreements and to continue working closely together for mutual benefit. With the Treaty revised and strengthened, it is expected that Japan and the US will engage in various efforts to overcome trade friction. In doing so, they both can achieve much larger economic, strategic, and political gains.

(c) Policies vis-a-vis China

China's rise to the status of a great power is a security consideration of equal important to both Japan and the US. How to manage an emerging China in the context of collaborative security relationship with the US is the key security issue for Japan. In the eyes of the Chinese, no countries in the region pose a greater security threat, than Japan and the US. China's reaction to the 1996

revitalisation of Japan-US security cooperation is evidence enough of Beijing's sensitivities. Given the delicate atmospherics, Japan must exhibit sensibility and sensitivity to China's interests and concerns if it wishes to achieve regional peace and stability, while maintaining its security collaboration with the US.

Japan has so far managed this triangular relationship with finesse, acting as an intermediary between Washington and Beijing. One example was Japan's flexible attitude towards China after the 1989 Tiananmen Square Incident in which it played conciliator between Beijing and Western powers. Such kind of role is likely to have an even greater importance in the future. Japan can make a significant contribution to regional security through alleviating misunderstandings and relaxing tensions between the two great powers. The US Treaty provides a mechanism for Japan to play a crucial, though understated, role in moderating the behaviour of its great ally in relations with China. At the same time, it is vital that Japan keeps sending the right signals to Beijing, through appropriate channels, that its intentions remain benign and cooperative toward China as well.

Conclusion

The diversity of opinion in Japanese security literature also reflects the lack of strong consensus among the Japanese people at large as to the level of Japan's military profile and measure for its self-defense. First and foremost, the constitutionality of bilateral security arrangements framed around the Treaty will continue to be the biggest issue for Japan because amendment of the Constitution is difficult, given the people's strong attachment to the peace clause.

The Japanese government seems determined to commit itself to firm security collaboration with the US as the only viable, and clearly ideal security policy for Japan. Most recently, in June 1997, Japan and the US announced the Interim Report on the Review of the 1978 Defense Guidelines, in which Japan agreed to extend the US logistical support beyond its territory during war in north-east Asia. The arrangements were due to be finalised by the end of 1997, giving Japan the highest military profile in its post-WWII history. On-going domestic debate is in prospect over whether or not the Guidelines violate the Constitution, yet there is no prospect that Japan will reverse its current posture.⁶¹

The Japan-US Treaty will remain the centre piece of Asia-Pacific peace and prosperity in the years ahead. Mutual interests will be at stake, should the Treaty be discarded. For the US, the Treaty underpins the US engagement in the region which ensures its regional trade of up to \$394 billion per annum: the sum that translates into employment of at least 2.8 million Americans.⁶² Japan will also continue to enjoy economic and security benefits provided by the close ties with the US. The Treaty guarantees a solid political basis for a wide range of cooperation between the two countries. In those difficult times of much uncertainty in international order, Japan and the US can best ensure, by maintaining the Treaty, an ideal environment for all regional countries to pursue economic growth and political cooperation. The significance of the Japan-US Security Treaty has not declined with the end of the Cold War; the reality is quite the contrary.

APPENDIX 1

Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan, September 8, 1951

Japan has this day signed a Treaty of Peace with the Allied Powers. On the coming into force of that Treaty, Japan will not have the effective means to exercise its inherent right of self-defence because it has been disarmed. There is danger to Japan in this situation because irresponsible militarism has not yet been driven from the world. Therefore, Japan desires a Security Treaty with the United States of America to come into force simultaneously with the Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and Japan. The Treaty of Peace recognizes that Japan as a sovereign nation has the right to enter into collective security arrangements, and further, the Charter of the United Nations recognizes that all nations possess an inherent right of individual and collective self-defence.

In exercise of these rights, Japan desires, as a provisional arrangement for its defence, that the United States of America should maintain armed forces of its own in and about Japan so as to deter armed attack upon Japan.

The United States of America, in the interest of peace and security, is presently willing to maintain certain of its armed forces in and about Japan, in the expectation, however, that Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defence against direct and indirect aggression, always avoiding any armament which could be an offensive threat or serve other than to promote peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Accordingly, the two countries have agreed as follows:

Article I. Japan grants, and the United States of America accepts the right, upon coming into force of the Treaty of Peace and of this Treaty, to dispose United States land, air, and sea forces in and about Japan. Such forces may be utilised to contribute to the maintenance of the international peace and security in the Far East and to the security of Japan against armed attack from without, including assistance given at the express request of the Japanese Government to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside Power or Powers.

Article II. During the exercise of the right referred to in Article I, Japan will not grant, without the prior consent of the United States of America, any bases or the right of garrison or manoeuvre, or transit of ground, air, or naval forces to any third Power.

Article III. The conditions which shall govern the disposition of armed forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments.

Article IV. This Treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and of Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements or such alternative individual or collective security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan Area.

Article V. This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and Japan and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Washington.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

DONE in duplicate at the city of San Francisco, in the English and Japanese languages, this eighth day of September, 1951.

APPENDIX 2

Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States and Japan, signed at Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960

The United States of America and Japan,

Desiring to strengthen the bonds of peace and friendship traditionally existing between them, and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law,

Desiring further to encourage closer economic cooperation between them and to promote conditions of economic stability and well-being in their countries,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments,

Recognizing that they have the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as affirmed in the Charter of the United Nations,

Considering that they have a common concern in the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East,

Having resolved to conclude a treaty of mutual cooperation and security,

Therefore agree as follows:

Article I. The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The Parties will endeavour in concert with other peace-loving countries to strengthen the United Nations so that its mission of maintaining international peace and security may be discharged more effectively.

Article II. The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peace and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between them.

Article III. The Parties, individually and in cooperation with each other, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop, subject to their constitutional provisions, their capacities to resist armed attack.

Article IV. The Parties will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty, and, at the request of either Party, whenever the security of Japan or international peace and security in the Far East is threatened.

Article V. Each Party recognizes that an armed attack against either Party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article VI. For the purpose of contributing to the security of Japan and the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East, the United States of America is granted the use by its land, air, and naval forces of facilities and areas in Japan.

The use of these facilities and areas as well as the status of the United States armed forces in Japan shall be governed by a separate agreement, replacing the administrative Agreement under Article III of the Security Treaty between the United States of America and Japan, signed at Tokyo on February 28, 1952, as amended, and by such other arrangements as may be agreed upon.

Article VII. This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article VIII. This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and Japan in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will enter into force on the date on which the instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them in Tokyo.

Article IX. The Security Treaty between the United States of America and Japan signed at the city of San Francisco on September 8, 1951, shall expire upon the entering into force of this Treaty.

Article X. This Treaty shall remain in force until in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance of international peace and security in the Japan area.

However, after the Treaty has been in force for ten years, either Party may give notice to the other Party of its intention to terminate the Treaty, in which case the Treaty shall terminate one year after such notice has been given.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

DONE in duplicate at Washington in the English and Japanese languages, both equally authentic, this 19th day of January, 1960.

APPENDIX 3

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution

Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

END NOTES

¹For instance, 75% of the Americans polled said the Japanese economic menace was greater than the military threat of the former Soviet Union in 1990. See Shinkichi Eto and Yoshinobu Yamamoto, *Sogo Anpo to Mirai no Sentaku* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1991) p. 456.

²Arthur Schlesinger, 'Back to the Womb? Isolationism's Renewed Threat', *Foreign Affairs* 74.4 (July/August 1995) pp. 2-8.

³The most recent White Paper does not explicitly consider the 'Russian threat' to Japan although it deemed it necessary to keep a close watch on the Russian Military's future. Boeicho (ed.), *Boei Hakusho: Aratana Jidai eno Taio* (Tokyo: Okurasho Insatsukyoku, 1996) p. 37.

⁴Governor Masahide Ota of the Okinawa prefecture proposed that all US military bases in Okinawa should be phased out by 2015. See his interview by Atsushi Okamoto, 'Futenma isetsu wo do miruka', *Sekai* (July 1996) esp. pp. 80-82.

⁵Fuji Kamiya, *Sengoshi no Naka no Nichi-Bei Kankei* (Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1989) p. 100.

⁶Roger Buckley, *US-Japan Alliance Diplomacy, 1945-1990* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992) p. 42.

⁷*Ibid* p. 97, and Kamiya, esp. pp. 100-101.

⁸*Ibid*.

⁹Kamiya, pp. 105-107.

¹⁰Mainichi Shimbun Seijibu, *Anpo: Meisosuru Kakushin* (Tokyo: Kadokawashoten, 1987).

¹¹Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment", *Foreign Affairs*, 70, 1, (1990/91) pp. 23-33.

¹²Shigeto Tsuru, *Nichibei anpo Kaisho eno Michi* (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1996), and E. A. Olsen, 'Sonzai riyu no kieta nichibei anpo', (trans. by Nobuko Matsuura) *Shokun* (March 1995) pp. 124-131.

¹³For the Government's position, see Japan, Defense Agency, *Defense of Japan 1995* (Tokyo: Defense Agency, Japan, 1995) pp. 60-65. The conditions for exercise of the right of self-defence are restricted to: '(a) there is an imminent and illegitimate act of aggression against Japan; (b) there is no appropriate means to deal with this aggression other than resort to the right of self-defense; and (c) the use of armed strength is confined to the minimum necessary level.' (p. 62).

¹⁴It changed its name now to the Social Democratic Party of Japan (SDPJ).

¹⁵Only the Japan Communist Party (JCP) still objects to the Treaty, and proposes the bold shrinkage of the SDF. See *Yomiuri Shimbun* October 8, 1996, p. 16., and JCP's Secretary-General Tetsuzo Fuwa's statement in the Diet reported in *Yomiuri Shimbun*, December 4, 1996, p. 13.

¹⁶*Yomiuri Shimbun*, October 8 1996. pp. 16-17.

¹⁷Eto and Yamamoto, *Sogo Anpo to Nihon no Sentaku*, pp. 602-603. They propose the principle of 'not storing nuclear weapons in Japan' as the one replacing 'not introducing' principle by mimicking the Australian position towards the American nuclear port calls issue. Their idea is worthy of adopting if the 'non-introduction' principle is criticised by Japanese neighbours as too hypocritical.

¹⁸This contrasts with New Zealand's 'non-nuclear' stance that seeks to deny the utility of nuclear deterrence and that reinforces the case for elimination of nuclear weapons.

-
- ¹⁹Bruce Stokes, 'Divergent Paths: US-Japan Relations Towards the Twenty-First Century', *International Affairs*, 72, 2, (April 1996) p. 289. Also some Japanese experts deplore the unilateral nature of the Treaty, such as Tsuneo Yoshihara, 'Shudanteki jieiken nuki no domei wa nai' *This Is Yomiuri* (June, 1996) p. 123.
- ²⁰Shunji Taoka, 'Zainichi beigun no sonzai riyu wo tou', *Sekai* (July 1996), p. 68.
- ²¹Yoshimasa Muroyama, *Nichibei Anpo Taisei*, ge, (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1992) p. 486.
- ²²Taoka, p. 68, pp. 495-497. Muroyama, *Nichibei Anpo Taisei*, ge pp. 495-497. The arguments against exaggerating the Soviet threats in the mid-1980s, see Yonosuke Nagai, *Gendai to Senryaku* (Tokyo: Bungeishunju, 1985). The depicted scenario would still be valid if an expansionist Russia re-emerged as a potential threat for East Asia in the future.
- ²³Hikomichi Umebayashi, 'Zainichibeigun kichi no genzai to mirai', *Gunshuku Mondai Shiryo* (July 1995) p. 21.
- ²⁴Kamiya, p. 112.
- ²⁵*Ibid*, pp. 108-110.
- ²⁶For a recent treatment of this thesis, see Muroyama, *Nichibei anpo taisei jo*, esp. p. 32, Taro Takahama, 'Dosho imu ni kusabi wo ute', *This Is Yomiuri* (June 1996) pp. 108-109, 110-111, and Christopher Layne, 'Less is More: Minimal Realism in East Asia', *The National Interest* (April 1996) p. 72.
- ²⁷Yoichi Funabashi, *Nihon no Taigaikoso: Reisengo no Bijon wo Kaku* (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1993) esp. p. 201.
- ²⁸Cited in Ted Galen Carpenter, *A Search for Enemies: America's Alliances after the Cold War* (Washington D.C.: Cato Institute, 1992) p. 52.
- ²⁹*The Economist*, October 12, 1996, p. 30. *The Economist* also estimates China can possibly out spend Japan if the 'hidden costs' like military R&D should be included. Still, the No. 4 military spending power does not clearly demonstrate 'too little' contributions to the America-Japan alliance suggested by critics in the US.
- ³⁰Muroyama, *Nichibei anpo taisei ge*, pp. 491-493.
- ³¹Muroyama, *Nichibei anpo taisei jo*, p. 29. Also, Kensuke Ebata points out that the US and Japan are the only states with effective naval powers in the Asia-Pacific region. See his *Nihon ga Gunjitaikoku ni Naru Hi* (Tokyo: Tokumashoten, 1994) pp. 249-251.
- ³²Ryuichi Teshima, *1991 nen Nihon no Haiboku* (Tokyo: Shincho bunko, 1996), and Michael Blaker, 'Evaluating Japan's Diplomatic Performance', in Gerald Curtis, ed., *Japan's Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Coping with Change* (New York: M. E. Sharp, 1993) esp. pp. 16-42.
- ³³Patrick Cronin, 'The Future of the Japan-US Alliance', *Asia-Pacific Review* 2.1 (Spring 1995) p. 32., and *Strait Times*, April 19, 1996.
- ³⁴Muroyama, *Nichibei Anpo Taisei*, ge, pp. 550-552.
- ³⁵Japan, Defense Agency, *Defense of Japan, 1995* (Tokyo: Defense Agency, 1995) pp. 2-5.
- ³⁶Taoka, pp. 66-67.
- ³⁷For the classifications of Japanese Gaullists and others, see Nagai, pp. 17-27.
- ³⁸Nisohachi Hyodo, 'Nihon retto kaku heibi keikaku', *Shokun* (Oct. 1996) pp. 202-213., and idem., 'Mada kuyokuyo shiteiru anpo suhaironsha ni tsugu', *Shokun* (Nov. 1996) pp. 104-112.
- ³⁹Jun Sakurada, 'Waga Yobeiron', *Shokun* (Nov. 1996) esp. p. 150.
- ⁴⁰*Yomiuri Shimbun*, August 7, 1996, p. 1.
- ⁴¹Muroyama, *Nichibei Anpo Taisei*, ge, pp. 583-598.
- ⁴²Hisayoshi Ina, 'Nichibei anpo kankei no shorai tenbo', *Shin Boei Ronshu* 23.1 (July 1995) pp. 32, 38-39.
- ⁴³Mike Mochizuki thinks it will take '50 to 60 years' to complete the perfect collective security framework in the region. See his interview with Heizo Takenaka, in 'Okinawa, nichibei domei, amerika gaiko', *Ushio* (May 1996) p. 102. Isami Takeda in interview with Tetsuo Maeda, 'Ajia taiheiyo ni takokukan anpo wa kanoka', *Sekai* 624 (July 1996) esp. p. 54., thinks in a similar way.
- ⁴⁴Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, 'Realism of Japanese Strategy', A Paper Prepared for the Joint Conference of the Japanese Association of International Relations (JAIR) and the International Studies Association (ISA), Makuhari, Japan, Sept. 20-22, 1996, pp. 10, 22-23, fn. 38 and 40.
- ⁴⁵Taoka, pp. 65-66.
- ⁴⁶Chihiro Hosoya, *Nihon gaiko no kiseki* (Tokyo: NHK Books, 1993) p. 213.

-
- ⁴⁷Matake Kamiya, *Will Japan Go Nuclear? The Myth and the Reality*, CSS:NZ Working Paper 3/95, (Wellington, Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand, 1995).
- ⁴⁸*Yomiuri Shimbun*, April 24, 1996, p. 2, and May 3, 1996, p. 1, and May 15, 1996. *Asahi Shimbun* poll cited in Taoka, p. 61.
- ⁴⁹Inoguchi, esp. p. 89, Takeda and Maeda, pp. 42-43, and *Yomiuri Shimbun*, April 18, 1996, pp. 6-7.
- ⁵⁰Prime Minister Hashimoto and Secretary of Defence Perry agreed to further clarify the anxiety against the Treaty held by Beijing. Reported in *Yomiuri Shimbun*, December 3, 1996, p. 2.
- ⁵¹Seiichi Sakugawa, 'Okinawa no genjo to heiwakenpo,' *Gunshuku Mondai Shiryo* 184 (March 1996) p. 10.
- ⁵²Quoted in Megumi, 'Ota ryukyukokuo ni hanransu', *Shokun*, (Oct. 96) p. 32.
- ⁵³Chalmers Johnson, 'The Okinawa Rape Incident and the End of the Cold War in East Asia', *Quadrant* (March, 1996) pp. 23-25.
- ⁵⁴*Yomiuri Shimbun*, Sep. 9, 1996, pp. 1-3.
- ⁵⁵See his interview with Okamoto, 'Okinawa no mirai wa hondo no minshushugi no chikara ni kakatteimasu', *Sekai* (July 1996) pp. 78-87.
- ⁵⁶Megumi, pp. 26-34.
- ⁵⁷Seigen Miyazato, 'Nichibei anpojyoyaku no saiteigi to Okinawa', *Gunshuku Mondai Shiryo* 184 (March 1996) pp. 14-15.
- ⁵⁸Megumi, pp. 31-32.
- ⁵⁹Cited in Tsuru, pp. 150-151.
- ⁶⁰Cited in Jitsuro Terashima, 'Nichibeichu toraianguru kuraishisu wo do seigyosuruka', *Chuo koron* (August 1996) p. 35.
- ⁶¹*The Japan Times*, June 9, 1997.
- ⁶²The US Department of Defence, *United States Security Strategy for the East Asia-Pacific Region*, (Washington: Department of Defence, 1995) p. 2.