
# U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation: Has Japan Become the Great Britain of Asia?

By Ralph A. Cossa and
Brad Glosserman

Issues & Insights
Vol. 5 – No. 3

Pacific Forum CSIS
Honolulu, Hawaii
March 2005

## Pacific Forum CSIS

Based in Honolulu, Pacific Forum CSIS (www.csis.org/pacfor/) operates as the autonomous Asia-Pacific arm of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC. The Forum's programs encompass current and emerging political, security, economic, business, and oceans policy issues through analysis and dialogue undertaken with the region's leaders in the academic, government, and corporate areas. Founded in 1975, it collaborates with a broad network of research institutes from around the Pacific Rim, drawing on Asian perspectives and disseminating project findings and recommendations to opinion leaders, governments, and members of the public throughout the region.

# Table of Contents

# Executive Summary

The depth and breadth of defense cooperation between Washington and Tokyo since Sept. 11, 2001 have been unprecedented. We have gone from Japan "bashing" and Japan "passing" to Japan "surpassing" as Tokyo in recent years has generally not only met but exceeded Washington's expectations. While Japan may not yet be the "U.K. of Asia," as once envisioned by former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, it is not too far a stretch to call Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro Asia's answer to Tony Blair.

Prime Minister Koizumi deserves a great deal of credit for the progress in the bilateral relationship, however, the improvements in the bilateral security relationship predate Mr. Koizumi, Sept. 11, and the resulting war on terrorism. The forces shaping the new strategic mindset in Japan were already emerging in the early 1990s. The first Iraq War, the 1993-94 North Korean nuclear crisis, the 1996 Taiwan Strait crisis, and Pyongyang's open hostility helped shape Japanese perceptions of the regional security environment. When combined with rumblings in the U.S. about the state of the bilateral security alliance, it became abundantly clear that both governments had to act decisively.

The turning point in the relationship occurred nearly a decade ago when then-President Bill Clinton and his Japanese counterpart, Prime Minister Hashimoto Ryutaro, issued the *U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security Alliance for the 21st Century* during their April 1996 summit meeting in Tokyo.

Since then, both governments have worked to realize their ambitions for the alliance. This has been an especially arduous process for Japan, but its bureaucrats and politicians have risen to the challenge. The results are visible in the 1997 Revised Guidelines for Defense Cooperation and several packages of legislation that modernized Japan's national security bureaucracy.

Building upon this new foundation, an influential bipartisan group in the U.S. outlined one possible and ambitious trajectory for the alliance. The 2000 Nye-Armitage Report was especially notable in that several task force members took prominent positions in the Bush administration that took office shortly after publication of the report. Mr. Koizumi, who shared many of the goals outlined in the Nye-Armitage Report, took office soon thereafter as well.

The tragic events of Sept. 11, 2001 and the onset of the global war on terror then provided political cover for what were courageous and forward-leaning security policies. Tokyo has provided unprecedented support for Operation Enduring Freedom and dispatched Self-Defense Forces to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq. The government has passed legislation that allows it to respond more effectively in a crisis.

Tokyo has also provided much-needed diplomatic and financial support for U.S. initiatives. In particular, the U.S. and Japan have worked closely to find a solution to the second North Korean nuclear crisis that began in October 2002. Japan has also been a strong supporter of the Proliferation Security Initiative.

In 2004, Japan's national security debate moved forward with the publication of the Prime Minister's Council on Security and Defense Capabilities (the Araki Report) and the National Defense Program Guidelines. They endorse an "integrated security strategy" that is more flexible and outward looking than the self-defense approach that prevailed throughout the Cold War. The Araki Report even calls the U.S.-Japan alliance "a public good" for countries in Asia. Both documents call for an ongoing security dialogue that outlines shared concerns and objectives.

The two sides took up that call in the February 2005 Security Consultative Committee meeting. It made plain that the alliance is now global in nature and will be increasingly integrated in the future. The two governments agreed on a list of common global and regional strategic objectives, which include, among others, a peaceful solution to issues in the Taiwan Strait and the peaceful reunification of the Korean Peninsula.

While significant progress has been made, outstanding issues remain. How the alliance accommodates the planned redeployment of U.S. forces as part of the Global Posture Review is a critical concern. Deployment of a missile defense system requires changes in Japan's laws banning the export of arms as well as still greater integration of the two countries' militaries. Finally, hanging over all these developments is the need to face the constraints on Japanese national security policy imposed by its constitution. Japan's attempts to forge a more equal relationship with the U.S., like its quest for "normalcy," will be increasing frustrated by the constraints imposed by the Constitution. At some point, one – the document or the nation's vision of itself – must bow to the other.

Has Japan become the UK of Asia? Not yet, but Tokyo is clearly moving in the right direction. Can the momentum be sustained? Much will depend on who succeeds Mr. Koizumi as Japan's prime minister. There are a number of Japanese politicians who share his vision for Japan, its role in the region and the world, and for a tighter, more balanced security relationship with the U.S. Recent developments provide both a framework and a foundation for continued evolution in that direction. But the speed with which Japanese policy has evolved in recent years has been very much the product of extraordinary circumstances.

The future pace is likely to slow and policy makers on both sides of the Pacific have to be prepared. It is imperative that those who agree with Mr. Koizumi strive to convince the Japanese people that their vision is correct. The biggest mistake that they could make would be to ignore the painstaking and often frustrating work needed to build national consensus on this issue.

# U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation: Has Japan Become the Great Britain of Asia?

## By Ralph A. Cossa and Brad Glosserman

The depth and breadth of defense cooperation between Washington and Tokyo since Sept. 11, 2001 have been unprecedented; the only thing that has risen faster than the level of cooperation has been Washington's expectations regarding the creation of an even more "normal" defense relationship with its longstanding ally in East Asia. While Japan may not yet be the "U.K. of Asia," as once envisioned by former Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, it is not too far a stretch to call Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro Asia's answer to Tony Blair.

Prime Minister Koizumi deserves a great deal of credit for the progress in the bilateral relationship. Partly, it's a product of the special relationship he has forged with U.S. President George W. Bush. Mr. Koizumi is an anomaly among Japanese politicians: he has campaigned as a "*henna Nihonjin*" ("a strange Japanese") and his willingness to speak bluntly and take political risks have distinguished him from many of his predecessors and most other Japanese politicians. He is one of a small, select group of Asia-Pacific leaders – Australian Prime Minister John Howard is another – who have won President Bush's utmost trust and confidence (and sincere gratitude), given his unyielding support for the U.S. war on terrorism in all its manifestations and his willingness to buck domestic public opinion to provide support to the two major campaigns in Washington's ongoing war: Afghanistan and Iraq. This has paid handsome dividends in helping to achieve what both sides generally agree are the "best relations ever," but may also raise hopes in Washington (and in certain quarters in Tokyo) that will not be easily fulfilled as both sides strive to create a more equal partnership.

The unprecedented decision by Prime Minister Koizumi to send Japanese Ground Self-Defense Force (JGSDF) troops to Iraq – which remains unstable – to help in that country's pacification and reconstruction is perhaps the most notable in a series of adjustments in the operational arrangements underpinning U.S.-Japan defense cooperation. In fact, however, the improvements in the bilateral security relationship predate Mr. Koizumi, Sept. 11, and the resulting war on terrorism. The forces shaping the new strategic mindset in Japan were emerging in the early 1990s. The turning point in the relationship occurred nearly a decade ago when then-President Bill Clinton and his Japanese counterpart, Prime Minister Hashimoto Ryutaro, issued the *U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security Alliance for the 21st Century* during their April 1996 summit meeting in Tokyo.

The 1996 Clinton-Hashimoto Summit, which signaled an official end to the "Japan-bashing" era (and predated the subsequent Clinton "Japan-passing" era), laid the foundation for the revised 1997 Defense Guidelines, which in turn set the stage for the more dramatic changes witnessed since Sept. 11. It is interesting to note that the Joint

Declaration and revised Guidelines were stimulated by events that are strangely reminiscent of more recent occurrences: a U.S.-led military campaign against Iraq and a Korean Peninsula nuclear crisis.

One need only to compare and contrast Japan's response to the previous Iraq/DPRK crises with the current ones to realize that, thankfully, it is not *deja vu* all over again. Despite justifiable criticism of President Clinton's tendency to ignore the alliance during the closing (Japan-passing) years of his administration, his Joint Declaration with Prime Minister Hashimoto lay the groundwork that their successors would build upon, especially after Sept. 11 provided political cover to move the relationship forward much faster than anyone drafting the Joint Statement or revised Defense Guidelines could have imagined.

The analysis that follows begins with an assessment of the external forces influencing Japanese security thinking since the first Persian Gulf War. It then looks at Japan's response to those events and the extraordinary progress that has been made since Sept. 11 and the launch of the global war on terror. It then focuses on the issues that Japan must face as it modernizes its national security policy and concludes with thoughts about the viability of Japan becoming "the UK of Asia."

## PRE-SEPT. 11 DEVELOPMENTS

**1991 Gulf War**. In 1991, when a global "coalition of the willing" was forming to drive Iraqi forces out of Kuwait, Japan opted out of active participation, electing instead to write a very large ($13 billion) check to help cover Desert Storm expenses. Despite this generosity (which required a tax increase to finance and accounted for some 20 percent of all outside financial support the U.S. received for the war), many in Washington criticized Tokyo for not doing more, especially given Japan's heavy dependence on Persian Gulf oil. The (George H.W.) Bush administration understood the political and constitutional constraints under which Japan was operating, but many still expressed frustration that even noncombat logistic lift support seemed to be a bridge too far for Tokyo to even attempt to cross. Americans were not the only ones to question Japan's role. When Kuwait took out an ad in *The New York Times* thanking nations that came to the country's aid, Japan was left off the list – an omission that stunned and outraged many Japanese.

On the positive side, Washington was grateful for Tokyo's assistance (albeit after much soul-searching and heated debate) in clearing mines in the Persian Gulf and its associated sea lanes once hostilities ended. This minesweeping effort can be seen as one of the first major examples of a new operational arrangement between Tokyo and Washington; it helped set the stage for greater Japanese involvement in subsequent peacekeeping operations (PKO) both within and beyond the Asia-Pacific region. The public acceptance of this mission within Japan (where it generated considerable national pride) and the broad international acceptance and support for Japan's involvement in this military activity demonstrated that non-threatening Japanese security contributions to international efforts were doable and acceptable. This opened the door for greater

involvement in PKO efforts, in East Timor and elsewhere, even prior to Sept. 11. Nonetheless, this after-the-fact support during the first Gulf War did not fully blunt skepticism about Japan's reliability as an ally once the shooting starts.

**1993/94 Korean Crisis**. Of perhaps greater concern to military planners (and those concerned about alliance maintenance) was the 1993/94 crisis that emerged on the Korean Peninsula after Pyongyang threatened to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The Clinton administration initially took a hard line, building up defenses on the Peninsula and initiating a move toward the imposition of UN sanctions against North Korea if it carried through with its threat to withdraw from the NPT and deny International Atomic Energy Administration (IAEA) inspection and safeguards at its nuclear facilities. Questions were raised about what Japan could/would do to support a UN sanctions effort and the answer seemed to be "not much!" Given that North Korea was also stating that the implementation of sanctions meant war, prudent U.S. military planners also started asking what Japan could/would do then. Disturbingly, the answer was assumed to be, "even less!."

Even worse was a reluctance on the part of Japan to even discuss the types of military cooperation that might be possible or desirable in the event of a crisis or war. Tokyo's reluctance to take up this questions was even more remarkable given North Korea's May 1993 Nodong 1 missile test in the Sea of Japan, which sent an unmistakable signal of Pyongyang's ability – and even its intent – to menace Japan. A timely intervention by former President Jimmy Carter and the subsequent 1994 U.S.-DPRK Agreed Framework allowed both sides to walk back from the brink and let Tokyo off the hook, but the practical limitations of the alliance became once again all too apparent, this time not in some remote location but in Japan's own backyard.

This, more than anything else, sounded warning bells in Washington and Tokyo, especially when combined with the (understandable) outrage that followed the tragic rape of an Okinawan school girl that further called the viability of the alliance into question. If a crisis were to erupt in the region that threatened U.S. and Japanese interests – conflict on the Korean Peninsula being the most obvious example – and Japan were to refuse to adequately support U.S. efforts, this could tear away at the fabric of the alliance. Defining "adequately support" to the satisfaction of both nations, and in a manner not threatening to Japan's neighbors, was the challenge. As former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense (and the future Deputy Secretary of State) Richard Armitage noted in early 1996, "The most important issue in the current relationship is not `how many forces?' or `what weapons systems?,' but rather `What are the U.S. and Japan going to do as security partners should the need arise?'."

Largely unspoken but clearly recognized was concern not just over a Korean contingency but also in the event of a crisis across the Taiwan Straits. This became more prominent in the runup to the March 1996 Taiwan presidential elections when Beijing used a series of missile tests to underscore its warnings against potential independence movements. Alarm bells were triggered in Beijing by a visit by Taiwan's then president, Lee Teng-hui, to the U.S. for a Cornell University alumni event. The attempt to intimidate Taiwan

backfired, especially after Washington deployed two aircraft carrier battle groups to the region to demonstrate its commitment to a "peaceful resolution" of the issue. The incident drove home to Japanese that they lived in a potentially dangerous neighborhood and their own interests would be affected by instability; the Chinese missiles landed within 60 km of Okinawa's exclusive economic zone.

**Problems at Home**. Japanese thinking about security affairs was shaken by two other events in 1995. In January, a large earthquake rocked Kobe and the surrounding areas. The quake claimed 4,571 lives and injured nearly 15,000 others. While no one expects Tokyo to be able to predict earthquakes (despite spending considerable sums of money to study that question), the central government's feeble response to the tragedy underscored how ill-prepared the country was for large-scale emergencies. Three months later, a little known religious group, Aum Shinrikyo, launched a terrorist attack on Tokyo subways. The use of sarin gas killed 11 people and injured more than 3,700 others. More significantly, it highlighted Japan's vulnerability to terrorist attacks and the need to rethink fundamental national security questions.

**Pyongyang's Belligerence**. In 1998, North Korea sounded the tocsin again, this time with the launch of a Taepodong missile that flew over the Japanese archipelago (raising concerns as well in the U.S. about the threat posed by North Korean missiles). Given Pyongyang's fiery rhetoric and unrelenting hostility toward Japan, the incident made plain Japan's vulnerabilities. In March 1999, Japanese Coast Guard vessels gave chase to and fired upon vessels that were thought to be from North Korea and suspected of either spying on Japan or delivering drugs. The boats escaped. In December 2001, the episode would be repeated, except this time the Japanese would sink the vessel; when it was salvaged from the sea floor, it was revealed to be a North Korean ship that had done business in Japan.

Less than a year later, Japan seemed poised for a breakthrough in its relations with North Korea. In a typically bold gambit, Mr. Koizumi surprised the world with a September 2002 trip to Pyongyang to try to normalize that bilateral relationship. Unlike the historic 2000 North-South summit between South Korea's Kim Dae-jung and North Korea's Kim Jong-il, the Koizumi visit produced no substantive change in the relationshiop. During their meeting, Kim Jong-il admitted that "rogue" North Korean agents had kidnapped Japanese citizens (an accusation that Pyongyang had long denied and had divided Japanese domestic opinion about the North). Hopes that this confession would better bilateral relations were quickly dashed: the revelation that more than half the acknowledged abductees had died in mysterious circumstances compounded Japanese suspicions of and hardened public views about the North.

**The Second Nuclear Crisis**. Mr. Koizumi's visit to Pyongyang came less than a month before the U.S. would accuse Pyongyang of cheating on the 1994 Agreed Framework, a charge that set off a second North Korean nuclear crisis. The prospect of a North Korean nuclear device that could be mated with a missile was Japan's worst security nightmare – especially given Pyongyang's ever-more virulent verbal attacks on Japan. During the six-party multilateral negotiations to resolve the crisis, Pyongyang has frequently vented its

frustrations on Japan (and the U.S.), compounding Japanese insecurities. In addition, Tokyo's attempts to get North Korea to provide a full accounting of the fate of admitted abductees as well as other suspected cases heightened tensions between the two countries and led to a downward spiral in the relationship since October 2002.

## JAPAN'S RESPONSE

Japanese hopes that the post-Cold War world would prove more peaceful than the superpower era have been dashed. Worse, events have continually reminded the Japanese people that they live in a dangerous neighborhood and that threats to national security have been multiplying. To their credit, Japan's national security decisionmakers have acknowledged this evolving threat environment and responded throughout the 1990s.

As noted, the first step was the eventual dispatch of minesweepers to the Persian Gulf to help clean up after the war. This was followed by the Diet's passage of the International Peace Cooperation Law in June 1992 and the subsequent dispatch of Japanese peacekeepers for UN-sponsored elections in Cambodia in 1992 and '93 and East Timor in February 2002. Passage of the PKO law was especially notable given the failure of similar legislation in 1990.

The growing sense that the regional security environment was changing prompted Japanese policy makers to initiate a review of the nation's security strategy. As is typical in Japan, the first step was the creation of a high-level panel to investigate the changes that were occurring and examine possible responses. Thus, in August 1994 the Prime Minister's Advisory Group on Defense published its findings. The Higuchi Report (named after its chairman, Higuchi Kotaro) acknowledged that Japan faced new and diverse security threats, and it called for strengthening the U.S.-Japan alliance but as part of a more diversified strategy, which included participation in U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping operations and the creation of multilateral security dialogues.

In November 1995, Japan published its National Defense Program Outline (NDPO), a document that lays out the national military doctrine. The first NDPO was published in 1976; it had become clear that changes over the intervening 19 years required a new assessment of the threat environment and Japan's response to it. The new document echoed many of the views laid out in the Higuchi Report, especially its three-pronged response to threats, although it put more emphasis on the U.S.-Japan alliance than did the 1976 version and the Higuchi Report.

**1996 Joint Declaration**. The revised NDPO's support for the alliance did not dampen fears that Japan was contemplating a "loosening" of the bilateral security alliance. When combined with the Okinawa rape incident that occurred in 1995, alliance supporters in both countries redoubled efforts to tighten the security relationship. The result was the April 1996 Clinton/Hashimoto Tokyo summit meeting. Building upon the Defense Department's 1995 *East Asia Strategy Report (EASR)* – which stressed the centrality of the alliance to Washington's East Asia security strategy and the coincident U.S. and Japanese security goals and objectives in Asia – the summit represented a major effort by

both allies, and especially by Japan, to revitalize the bilateral security relationship in order to ensure its relevancy in the post-Cold War era. It also demonstrated Tokyo's increased willingness to take a more active leadership role in regional economic and security affairs.

The Joint Declaration (See Appendix A) signed by both leaders during the summit meeting committed both countries to the revitalization of the defense relationship. It recognized close bilateral defense cooperation as a "central element" in the security relationship and went on to say that "The two leaders agreed on the necessity to promote bilateral policy coordination, including studies on bilateral cooperation in dealing with situations that may emerge in the areas surrounding Japan and which will have an important influence on the peace and security of Japan." In short, the Joint Declaration recognized the need, in peacetime, to begin to define each country's respective roles and, most importantly for Japan, to develop procedures for overcoming the obstacles to performing them. Prior to this, contingency planning for a scenario short of an invasion or other direct attack on Japan was difficult, if not politically impossible.

The signing of the Joint Declaration opened the door for greater defense planning and cooperation. This was formalized at the September 1996 "2+2" Security Consultative Committee (SCC) Meeting (which brought together the foreign and defense ministers of both nations), when Washington and Tokyo both professed their commitment to "reaffirming and strengthening" the alliance. The SCC Subcommittee for Defense Cooperation was then tasked to review and revise the 1978 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation. This review was completed in September 1997.

**Defense Guidelines Review**. The revised 1997 Defense Guidelines (See Appendix B) represented a praiseworthy attempt by military planners in Japan and the U.S. to find common ground between the type support U.S. planners desired from Japan and the level of support Japan was willing and felt constitutionally capable of providing. It addressed defense cooperation under three broad general categories: cooperation under normal circumstances; actions in response to an armed attack against Japan; and cooperation in situations in areas surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan's peace and security (situations in areas surrounding Japan). The common goal was enhanced defense cooperation in the maintenance of peace and stability.

It is useful to note that the Guidelines do not *obligate* Japan (or the U.S.) to do anything new. Nor do they guarantee that Japan will provide the envisioned support under any and every conceivable circumstance. Rather, they merely provide "a general framework and policy direction." To emphasize this point, a line in the most controversial section dealing with "situations in areas surrounding Japan" notes that "in responding to such situations, measures taken may differ depending on circumstances." In other words, there is no guarantee that steps outlined in the Defense Guidelines will ever be taken. The Guidelines clearly delineated what Japan should not be expected to do – in and of itself, an important factor for military planners – but provided no guarantees of Japanese support.

The Guidelines also specifically tie Japan's support in enforcing economic sanctions to United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions although one can interpret the text as not excluding other types of sanction-enforcement operations. In this, as in all other actions outlined by the Defense Guidelines, however, nothing happens without a decision on the part of the Japanese government at the time of the crisis. The framework's boundaries were clearly delineated; only "defensive actions" were envisioned. Nonetheless, the 1997 Defense Guidelines represented an important step forward in Japan's quest to become a more "normal" nation and a more equal security partner with the U.S.

**Implementing Legislation**. Two processes then began to unfold in tandem. One was the modernization of Japan's defense bureaucracy. The NPDO recognized national deficiencies in intelligence collection and analysis in an era of new security threats. In response, in 1997 Japan opened the Japan Defense Intelligence Headquarters, which integrated various intelligence-gathering assets. The following year, Japan announced it would launch satellites that would be used, among other things, for intelligence collection.

The next step, which took several years to accomplish and in some cases was still not fully complete when the Sept. 11 attacks occurred, was the development and enactment into law of the necessary implementing legislation. The three primary pieces of legislation – amendment of the Acquisition and Cross Servicing Agreement (ACSA) to include regional contingencies; amendment of the Self Defense Forces Law to permit certain rear area support missions for U.S. forces during regional contingencies; and the creation of a Regional Contingency Law to permit non-military rear area support in Japan for U.S. forces during regional contingencies – passed the Diet in May 1999.

As the Clinton administration was drawing to a close, its final "2+2" SCC meeting (in New York, ironically on Sept. 11, 2000) featured the establishment of a Bilateral Coordination Mechanism to link Japanese government agencies with the U.S. Embassy and U.S. forces in Japan in times of war. This coordination mechanism was critical to implementing the revised Defense Guidelines, since the United States and Japan lacked a joint and combined command of the sort that manages military responses in NATO or the U.S.-ROK alliance. In late November, the Diet also passed a (watered-down) Maritime Interdiction Operations Law giving the Japanese Maritime Self Defense Forces (JMSDF) the authority to stop and search nonmilitary vessels (but only when acting in support of UN-authorized sanctions or with the consent of the ship being boarded).

**Armitage/Nye Report**. Just prior to the November 2000 U.S. presidential election, the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University in Washington published a report (on Oct. 11, 2000) outlining what a more activist U.S. security policy with Japan might look like. While the report was drafted by a bipartisan team of specialists led by Republican Richard Armitage and Democrat Joseph Nye (another former assistant secretary of defense), it was generally interpreted in Tokyo as a "Republican" plan (and, to this day, is often referred to merely as "The Armitage Report"). The report called for "excellence without arrogance" from the United States – a

theme used by candidate Bush – while suggesting a more open door in Washington for Japanese ideas and initiatives. It also encouraged Tokyo to expand its security and diplomatic responsibilities in Asia.

The most controversial aspect of the report was the observation that Japan's decision not to exercise the right of collective defense is an obstacle to alliance cooperation. This was interpreted by many in Tokyo as an endorsement of Constitutional revision. However, the report was careful to emphasize that decisions on the Constitution must be thoroughly considered by the Japanese people themselves. For the most part, the report was well received in Japan, though many questioned whether the Japanese political system, especially under a very weak and ineffective Prime Minister Mori Yoshiro, was up to the task. This question was quickly laid to rest following the surprise election of Prime Minister Koizumi in April 2001.

## THE BUSH-KOIZUMI ERA

**Pre-Sept 11.** U.S.-Japan defense cooperation has clearly been taken to a higher level under President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Koizumi. While much of the progress has been attributed to Sept. 11 – and, as previously argued, the terrorist attacks on that day provided both the impetus and political cover to move the defense relationship forward at an accelerated pace – both sides had already clearly signaled their intention to create a broader, deeper security relationship.

In fact, even before Koizumi's election, President Bush had issued a joint statement with his predecessor during Prime Minister Mori's visit to Washington that seemed to go beyond the 1996 Clinton-Hashimoto Joint Communique in pledging "a dynamic approach to bilateral defense consultation and planning." Included also was a pledge to "strengthen joint efforts to address the transnational challenges of the 21st century." (The ability of both sides to effectively handle the tragic accidental sinking of a Japanese training ship by a U.S. submarine also demonstrated that the defense and broader bilateral relationship were on solid ground.)

The selection of Koizumi Junichiro as prime minister dramatically increased the prospects for still deeper cooperation. Fears that Japan would prove to be a reluctant partner largely vanished amid Koizumi's talk of leading his nation toward a more "normal" role in international affairs. Seemingly taking a page from the Armitage/Nye Report, Koizumi stated that it was desirable for Japan to be allowed to participate in collective defense activities and to help defend its allies (read: the United States) in the event of regional crisis. He also noted that Article 9 of the Japanese constitution -- which stipulates that Japan shall never maintain land, sea, or air forces -- "fails to reflect reality." Koizumi's view seems to dovetail nicely with calls for a more equal relationship coming from Washington.

Washington had other good reasons to applaud the new prime minister. Shortly after taking office, Koizumi said that definitions of "rear areas" were flexible, implying that Japan might be able to provide more support for U.S. forces in a contingency than had

previously been thought. His Chief Cabinet Secretary Fukuda Yasuo also ordered studies on ways to lift restraints on Japanese soldiers participating in UN peacekeeping operations. Koizumi also expressed support for missile defense (telling the Diet in early June 2001 that the project deserves further study). In short, the trend toward enhanced defense cooperation had been set in motion well before the tragic events of Sept. 11.

**Response to Sept. 11**. Immediately after the attack, Prime Minister Koizumi went on record stating that Japan would "spare no effort in providing assistance and cooperation" in support of America's war on terrorism. He followed this up with even stronger commitments to provide intelligence and military logistical support during his late September visit to New York and Washington. During his meeting with President Bush, Koizumi said (in English, for emphasis): "We Japanese firmly stand behind the United States to fight terrorism." He then added, much to Washington's amazement and delight, that "It will no longer hold that the Self-Defense Forces should not be sent to danger spots. There is no such thing as a safe place."

Backing up these assertions, Koizumi quickly put together a seven-point program to respond to the crisis. It included measures allowing the Self-Defense Forces to provide logistical support to the U.S. military in the event of a retaliatory strike; strengthening security measures at important facilities in Japan; dispatching Japanese ships to gather information; strengthening international cooperation over immigration control; providing humanitarian and economic aid to affected countries; assisting refugees fleeing areas that might be hit by U.S. retaliation; and cooperating with other countries to ensure stability in the international economic system. In addition, the Japanese government announced that it would send warships to collect intelligence in the Indian Ocean and would provide support for U.S. vessels heading for battle stations.

At the same time, however, the prime minister made it clear that Japan would be bound by its constitutional limits and President Bush acknowledged the limits and restraints under which the Japanese operate. Bush applauded the Japanese contribution and noted "people contribute in different ways to this coalition ... resources will be deployed in different ways - intelligence gathering, diplomacy, humanitarian aid, as well as cutting off resources" to terrorists.

To almost everyone's amazement, Prime Minister Koizumi quickly delivered on his seven-point package, getting emergency legislation through both Houses of the Diet by the end of October 2001. As promised, the legislation enabled the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to provide noncombat support to the U.S. coalition and to protect U.S. facilities in Japan. It also allowed Japanese forces to fire against territorial violators. In a concession to the opposition, the bill had a two-year time limit, and required that the Diet approve any deployment within 20 days of the dispatch of the SDF. To minimize chances of conflict with the Constitution, the transportation of ammunition and arms in foreign territory was not allowed.

## NEW OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS POST-SEPT. 11

**Enduring Freedom**. This emergency legislation allowed new operational arrangements to quickly evolve. In early November 2001, two Japanese destroyers and a supply ship left home port for the Indian Ocean to provide offshore noncombat support for Operation Enduring Freedom. The only disappointment was Japan's failure, despite not-so-subtle U.S. pressure, initially to include an Aegis destroyer in its Indian Ocean task force. The Japanese Cabinet has since routinely voted to extend SDF support for the war in Afghanistan and, in a significant step forward, finally decided in December 2002 to dispatch one of its high-tech Aegis-equipped vessels to the Indian Ocean as part of that effort. Critics had argued that the protection afforded by the Aegis radar, which can track 200 enemy aircraft and missiles simultaneously and shoot down 10 targets at the same time, would appear to constitute "collective self defense," which has been prohibited by the prevailing interpretation of the Japanese Constitution.

Immediately prior to and since the March 2003 Iraq invasion, Tokyo has stepped up its logistical support for the coalition forces operating in Afghanistan. In early March, JMSDF ships began refueling Italian, Spanish, French, German, New Zealand, and Dutch warships participating in Operation Enduring Freedom, in addition to the U.S. and British vessels. This freed up U.S. logistics forces for support to Operation Iraqi Freedom. At the onset of hostilities in Iraq, the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) ordered additional air surveillance by AWACS over the Sea of Japan and stepped up air and sea monitoring of North Korea. (Similar U.S. flights operate from Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa.) The National Police Agency increased security at 174 U.S. military bases and facilities and at 162 embassies and facilities of countries supporting the United States.

In February 2004, the U.S. and Japan agreed to update the Acquisition and Cross Servicing Agreement again. Previously, the ACSA limited Japanese support for U.S. forces to bilateral exercises and training, UN Peacekeeping Operations, humanitarian international relief operations, and operations in response to situations in areas surrounding Japan. After the amendments, the ACSA would apply to a wider range of activities, such as (1) operations in armed attack situations or situations in which an armed attack is expected, and (2) operations to further the efforts of international community to contribute to international peace and security, and to cope with large-scale disasters or for other purposes. The ACSA was amended a month later to allow the SDF to provide supplies and services to U.S. Forces engaged in disaster relief operations based on the Japanese government's request, operations equivalent to transportation of Japanese overseas residents by the SDF, as well as training, liaison and coordination and other daily operations.

In June 2004, a package of seven security-related bills intended to strengthen war-contingency laws enacted the previous year finally passed through the Diet. The bills facilitate U.S.-Japan cooperation in the event of an attack, and allow the SDF to supply provisions to U.S. forces. Other laws in the package deal with protection and evacuation procedures, procedures for ship inspections in and around Japanese waters, use of public facilities to deal with emergencies, protections for prisoners of war, restrictions on travel

for foreign nationals, and the protection of cultural assets. Diet approval is required before the government declares a state of emergency.

**Operation Iraqi Freedom**. Japan did not directly participate in Operation Iraqi Freedom, but the above measures – and especially the expanded Indian Ocean refueling operations – allowed the U.S. to shift more assets to the Iraqi campaign and thus constituted significant (yet still constitutional) indirect support to the war effort. It was sufficient to have Tokyo listed on the Iraqi Freedom coalition of the willing membership list.

**Boots on the Ground**. The remaining issue to be addressed was Deputy Secretary Armitage's repeated observation about the need for Tokyo to put "boots on the ground" in Iraq, despite continuing low- (and, at times, not-so-low-) level hostilities. This was accomplished with the deployment of Japanese Self Defense Forces to Iraq to assist in reconstruction and relief in 2004. The process was put in motion with the December 2003 announcement that Prime Minister Koizumi had finally okayed a troop deployment plan, submitted by Defense Agency Minister Ishiba Shigeru, formalizing Japan's first military move into a war zone since 1945. (The long-anticipated decision was delayed by Japan's electoral calendar, in particular a November 2003 Lower House election; the public's ambivalence about deployment made delay a sensible political strategy.) Japan's air force sent an advance team of about 40 airmen to Iraq, Kuwait, and Qatar in late December to prepare the way for airlift operations by a larger contingent starting in early 2004. The decision was especially bold since two Japanese diplomats working in Iraq were murdered by terrorists at the end of November, 2003.

The Army sent some 520 medics and engineer troops to Samawah, south of Baghdad, while the Navy ferried in vehicles and heavy equipment for the troops. Another 150 air force troops provided transportation services for U.S. and other coalition forces, flying a U-4 multipurpose plane and a Boeing 747 as well as C-130s, between Kuwait, Baghdad, Basra, Balad, and Mosul. The planes are not permitted to transport weapons and ammunition for other countries (although Ishiba said they are not going to open each crate). The deployment plan also said it was okay to transport soldiers who are carrying weapons. This statement shows how far things have come but also how far they must still go, given that even seemingly simple and mundane matters like a soldier carrying his or her own personal weapon draws scrutiny. The current operating guidelines also stipulate that if combat breaks out near where they are, Japanese troops are to stop work, evacuate, report the circumstances to the Defense Agency minister in Tokyo, and await instructions on what to do.

**Diplomatic and Financial Support**. Tokyo's support for Afghanistan and Iraq has not been limited to military support only. Tokyo has taken the lead role in Afghan reconstruction efforts, drawing high praise from Washington. In his landmark speech on Asia policy to the Asia Society in June 2002 (which remains the administration's most comprehensive review of Asia policy in general), then Secretary of State Colin Powell praised Japanese support to Operation Enduring Freedom ("we could not have asked for a more resolute response") and underscored Tokyo's "superb leadership" in the Afghan

reconstruction effort. Tokyo was also praised for collaborating closely with Washington in trying to take the war on terrorism to the international financial community.

Prime Minister Koizumi was also an outspoken supporter of Washington's efforts to obtain a stronger UNSC resolution against Iraq, making numerous phone calls to lobby Security Council members. More importantly, when the UNSC fig leaf was removed, Koizumi remained firmly behind President Bush and appeared delighted when Japan was named among the "coalition of the willing" (even though no Japanese troops were committed to the war). Prime Minister Koizumi's actions, like those of counterparts Tony Blair in the UK and John Howard in Australia, required great political courage, given rising domestic opposition at the time to a war against Iraq, a fact not overlooked in Washington.

**Korean Crisis**. Japan's support to the U.S. has not been limited to Iraq and Afghanistan. Tokyo has been a steadfast supporter of President Bush's multilateral approach toward the nuclear stand-off on the Korean Peninsula. Washington, in return, continues to argue that Japanese participation is "essential," despite complaints from Pyongyang and only lukewarm support from Seoul and Beijing for a Japanese seat at the table. Tokyo has also played an important role at the regular Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group (TCOG) meetings with Washington and Seoul, urging U.S. flexibility at times, but most importantly echoing Washington's insistence that nuclear weapons cannot be tolerated in North Korea, thus providing some much-needed backbone to Seoul, which seems to have a looser definition of "will not tolerate" than its other two TCOG partners.

Seldom have Washington and Tokyo been so close in their views of how best to deal with Pyongyang. Recall that in the closing months of the Clinton administration, there was great fear in Tokyo that Washington was going to get too far out in front of Tokyo on this issue. Following an exchange of high-level visits and amid preparations for a possible Clinton visit to Pyongyang, many were concerned that Japan would be pressured to speed up its normalization process with Pyongyang, perhaps beyond a point that was politically sustainable. Conversely, once the Sept. 2002 Koizumi visit to Pyongyang was announced, there were concerns expressed that Japan might get way out in front of a more cautious, tentative Bush administration which seemed reluctant to engage in meaningful dialogue with a member of the so-called "axis of evil."

Today, however, both Washington and Tokyo appear in lock-step, with both insisting on an immediate, verifiable halt to Pyongyang's nuclear weapons programs and ambitions (and an immediate full accounting and satisfactory resolution of the abductee issue). Japan's clear pronouncements about its right, under the principle of self-defense, to take preemptive action in the event of an imminent DPRK missile launch, while not too credible militarily, nonetheless provides political support to the U.S. doctrine of preemption while also underscoring the need for close military-to-military cooperation between Washington and Tokyo. As a self-proclaimed member of the "coalition of the willing," Japan's seemingly unqualified support for the U.S.-led military campaign against Iraq also solidifies the alliance while sending North Korea a clear message that

Tokyo would no doubt be equally, if not more, willing to support Washington in dealing with threats closer to home.

North Korea is one of the issues that shows the new reciprocity in the U.S.-Japan alliance. In May 2004, Mr. Koizumi made a second trip to Pyongyang to try to jumpstart the stalled normalization talks with North Korea. During that trip, he met again with North Korean leader Kim Jong-il and conveyed to Kim that the U.S. was serious about its demand for "complete, verifiable, irreversible dismantlement" of the North's nuclear weapons programs and the benefits that would follow from compliance. Mr. Koizumi's relationship with Mr. Bush gave him credibility with Mr. Kim that few other leaders could claim. Equally significant, when the prime minister met Mr. Bush before the G-8 summit in June, he passed on the message that Mr. Kim was serious about wanting to negotiate and pushed the president to be more forthcoming with a detailed proposal to the North during the next round of Six Party Talks. It is unclear how much credit the prime minister deserves for the resulting proposal – which was more detailed than past U.S. offers – but there is no doubt Mr. Koizumi deserves some.

**Proliferation Security Initiative**. Crossing yet another threshold in military-to-military cooperation, Tokyo also became a charter member of the U.S.-instigated Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), aimed at stemming the flow of weapons of mass destruction. The PSI, first laid out by President Bush in May 2003 and formalized at a 11-nation meeting (involving Australia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, the UK, and the U.S.) in Madrid in June, is "a global initiative with global reach," under which coalition members agreed, in Brisbane in July, "to move quickly on direct, practical measures to impede the trafficking in weapons of mass destruction (WMD), missiles, and related items." The Brisbane meeting focused on "defining actions necessary to collectively or individually interdict [WMD shipments] at sea, in the air, or on the land." A third meeting, in Paris in Sept, "continued work on the modalities for interdiction, in particular effective information sharing and operational capabilities for interdiction." The 11 participants also agreed in Paris on a Statement of Interdiction Principles "to establish a more coordinated and effective basis through which to impede and stop [WMD] shipments . . . consistent with national legal authorities and relevant international law and frameworks, including the UN Security Council."

While participants have been quick to point out that the PSI is targeted at proliferation *per se* and not at any particular country, a State Department spokesman did note that Pyongyang "might find itself affected by this initiative" if it continued to "aggressively proliferate missiles and related technologies." "Unnamed Pentagon officials" were also quick to point out that the first major PSI exercise, dubbed Pacific Protector and held in the Coral Sea off the coast of Queensland on Sept 13, was aimed at sending "a sharp signal to North Korea." The Pentagon reportedly wanted to identify the target ship in this interdiction exercise as a North Korean vessel, but the Australian organizers, responding at least in part to Japanese concerns, elected instead to develop a scenario where a simulated Japanese freighter (played by a U.S. destroyer) suspected of carrying contraband chemicals was stopped and boarded by the Japanese Coast Guard backed up by Australian, U.S., and French Navy and Coast Guard ships (with the other seven

members sending observers). This was the first of a series of ten sea, air, and ground interdiction training exercises that will take place over the coming year. The long-term objective, according to Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security John Bolton, is "to create a web of counter-proliferation partnerships that will impede trade in WMD, delivery systems, and related materials."

On Oct. 26-28, 2004 Japan held a PSI drill in Sagami Bay, the 12th such exercise and the first ever hosted by Japan. Forty-four observers from 18 countries watched the drill, which involved ships from the Japanese, Australian, French, and U.S. navies, and included the interception and search of a vessel suspected of transporting sarin gas. Japan provided nine vessels and six aircraft. From his front-row seat, Mr. Bolton called the event "another momentous occasion" in the U.S.-Japan relationship and another case of Japan proving "yet again its commitment to the global war on terrorism by demonstrating its ability and willingness to use naval assets to counter proliferation." The idea of Japanese participation in such an effort – much less its assumption of this kind of role – would have been unthinkable a few years ago.

## THE NATIONAL SECURITY DEBATE CONTINUES

**The Araki Commission**. By 2004, once again, a growing sense that adjustments in security policy and the regional security outlook had outpaced Japan's security strategy prompted the government to convene a top-level panel to prepare the ground for official policy shifts. On Oct. 4, 2004, the Prime Minister's Council on Security and Defense Capabilities, better known as the Araki Commission, presented its assessment of the security environment and the appropriate Japanese response. It identified two security goals: preventing a direct threat from reaching Japan and reducing the chances of threats arising in parts of the world that could reach Japan or harm Japanese interests. Three approaches are available to Japan: self defense, cooperation with the United States, and working with the international community.

While those goals and options have existed, the Araki report is notable for stressing the need for an "integrated security strategy" that is more flexible and outward looking than the self-defense approach that prevailed throughout the Cold War. It calls for "bolstering the credibility of the Japan-U.S. alliance" and continuing to rely on extended deterrence provided by the U.S. This, the report continues, obliges Japan to acquire effective ballistic missile defense systems in cooperation with the U.S. More generally, Japan "must continually upgrade arrangements for cooperation to deal with these types of situations, and strive to enhance the reliability of Japan-U.S. cooperation in actual operations." In practical terms, that means Japan must relax its ban on arms exports, at least to the U.S. so that it can fully participate in the development and deployment of an antiballistic missile system.

A similar logic guides thinking when the commission turns to "preventing the emergence of threats by improving the international security environment." Given their shared values, it is obvious that Tokyo and Washington should work together – both consulting and cooperating – to maintain peace and prevent conflict. The report even goes so far as

to call the U.S.-Japan alliance "a public good" for countries in Asia. A closer strategic dialogue is one way of clarifying the appropriate roles for each country and creating a framework for action.

In practical terms, the report calls on Japan to embrace the "Multifunctional Flexible Defense Force concept" which would allow the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to be more versatile and take on a wider range of functions. It also outlines the structural reforms in decision making and information management that are needed to bring the integrated security strategy into being.

**National Defense Program Outline**. As in the past, the Araki Commission report anticipated a new version of the National Defense Program Outline, the fourth revision in Japan's postwar history. The document echoes much of the analysis of the Araki report, and significantly for the first time it identifies by name regional threats – China's military and nuclear modernization program and North Korea (See Appendix C).

The NDPO repeats the two security policy objectives identified by the Araki Commission, appears to confirm the shift toward a regional and international emphasis, and endorses the multifunctional, flexible approach explained in the Araki Report. It notes that Japan will "on its own initiative engage in strategic dialogue with the U.S. on wide-ranging security issues such as role sharing between the two countries and the U.S. military posture…" Japan will also "actively promote intelligence exchange, operational cooperation including that in the 'situations in areas surrounding Japan,' cooperation on ballistic missile defense, equipment, and technology exchange, and efforts to make the stationing of U.S. forces in Japan smooth and efficient."

## LOCKING IN THE ALLIANCE

The extraordinary progress in the U.S.-Japan alliance has outstripped virtually all expectations. If "Japan bashing" and "Japan passing" were the slogans of the bygone era, today we continue to experience "Japan surpassing," with Tokyo meeting or exceeding Washington's (and its own) most optimistic, forward-leaning pre-Sept. 11 expectations. The big question now is, "Can this momentum be sustained?" Despite the undeniable and unprecedented increase in defense cooperation, Washington still clearly expects more of the same from Tokyo. During his June 2002 Asia Society speech, Secretary Powell not only stressed Japan's positive contribution to regional stability (a familiar refrain) but also the alliance's role in providing "a framework within which Japan can contribute more to its own defense as well as to peace and security worldwide." Clearly Washington supports, and wants to encourage, a greater regional (if not global) security role befitting a more "normal" Japan. As Secretary Armitage noted in Feb 2004, "I believe that Prime Minister Koizumi has set a new benchmark, not just in the dispatch of Japanese Self Defense Forces to Iraq, but also in redefining Japan's role in the world."

While many Japanese share that view, the country is by no means united on the question. Alliance supporters in both countries want to avoid backsliding. To help lock in the gains that have been made, the two countries agreed at the February 2005 meeting of the

Security Consultative Committee on a statement (see Appendix D) that made plain that the alliance is now global in nature and will be increasingly integrated in the future. The two governments agreed on a list of common strategic objectives that include: promoting fundamental values such as human rights, democracy and the rule of law; consolidating the Japan-U.S. partnership to help bring peace, stability and prosperity worldwide; fighting the spread of weapons of mass destruction; eliminating terrorism; strengthening the United Nations; and stabilizing global energy supplies.

Regionally, the two countries vowed to ensure Japan's security; promote peaceful unification of the Korean Peninsula and peaceful resolution of all issues related to North Korea, including its missile programs and the abduction of Japanese nationals; develop a cooperative relationship with Beijing while encouraging it to be more transparent in its military affairs; and seek the peaceful resolution of issues concerning the Taiwan Strait; encourage Russia's engagement with the region and the normalization of Japan's relations with Russia; promote a peaceful, stable, and vibrant Southeast Asia; support various forms of regional cooperation, while stressing the need for open, inclusive, and transparent regional mechanisms; discourage destabilizing sales and transfers of arms and military technology; and help secure maritime traffic

The identification of military modernization programs -- primarily China's -- and the peaceful resolution of all issues involving the Taiwan Strait was especially important given Tokyo's previous reluctance to be explicit and risk offending Beijing. The SCC statement actually supported China's emergence as a responsible power and called on it to cooperate with the U.S. and Japan on issues of mutual concern.

The statement also called on the two countries to continue efforts to modernize the roles, missions, and capabilities of their militaries. It emphasized the need for enhanced interoperability between U.S. and Japanese forces. The need for this assessment has increased given U.S. plans for a realignment of its force structure in Japan and the continuing desire of Japanese (and many Americans) to reduce the burden created by U.S. bases on local communities in Japan.

## FUTURE ISSUES FOR JAPAN AND THE ALLIANCE

While the February 2005 SCC Joint Declaration attempts to lock in the progress that has been made during the last few years, several outstanding issues remain.

**U.S. Force Redeployment**. One concern is the rebalancing of roles and missions in the light of the redeployment of U.S. forces throughout the region (and the world). Discussions between Washington and Tokyo are proceeding although there are periodic reports of U.S. frustration with their pace. At this point, there have been reports of possible moves – such as moving some functions of the Fifth Air Force from Yokota to Guam and the transfer of the Army I Corps headquarters from Washington state to Camp Zama – but nothing has been decided. Redeployment must balance several priorities: maintaining deterrence and the ability to safeguard peace and stability in Japan and in the region; modernizing U.S. forces to reflect new operational doctrines, capabilities, and

security threats; allowing Japan to take up responsibilities in accordance with its desired regional and international role consistent with its constitution; and minimizing the burden shouldered by local communities in Japan. Much will depend on the physical location of these forces, the facilities they use, and the rights they enjoy. In other words, base relocation talks may prove to be a litmus test for Japanese intentions. The difficulties that have attended previous attempts to move U.S. bases suggest that nothing can be taken for granted, the gains of the last few years notwithstanding.

**Missile Defense Cooperation**. Prime Minister Koizumi has long been a supporter of U.S.-Japan missile defense joint research. A decision to develop and deploy such a system has been another issue, however, since the necessary command and control coordination necessary for a broad-based system to be most effective would appear to cross the (ever-shifting) "collective defense" barrier. Nonetheless, in late December 2003, Tokyo announced that it will begin building a missile defense system, citing "a spread of missiles and a rise in weapons of mass destruction" as the primary reasons behind the decision. Then Chief Cabinet Secretary Fukuda said in a statement that "Ballistic missile defense is a purely defensive - and the sole - means of protecting the lives of our country's people and their property against a ballistic missile attack." Media reports said the plan initially calls for refitting four Aegis-equipped destroyers with sea-based anti-missile rockets and purchasing advanced Patriot anti-missile rocket batteries starting in 2004. The new system will be deployed from 2007 through 2011. The government will allocate $935 million for the program in the next fiscal year beginning April. The entire program was estimated at $4.67 billion. Joint research will also continue.

A second key obstacle is Japan's 38-year-old ban on exporting weapons, their parts, and the technology to make them. Originally promulgated in 1967 to keep Japan from being dragged into the Vietnam War, the ban continues (although it was loosened in 1983 to permit some cooperation with the U.S.). Japan and the U.S. have decided to jointly develop and manufacture missiles or parts but that strategy would make no sense if Japan was unable to then sell the fruits of that research to the U.S. The Araki Report tackled the question head on and called for lifting the ban on arms exports. The December 2004 NDPO was not as straightforward, but Chief Cabinet Secretary Hosoda confirmed that the Japanese government will exempt items related to ballistic missile defense from the He said Tokyo will decide on a case-by-case basis whether to further cooperate with the U.S. on arms development and production and to export defensive equipment to countries in support of their efforts to fight terrorism or piracy.

Missile defense will have powerful implications for the bilateral security alliance. A comprehensive MD program will integrate the two militaries in unprecedented ways. Effective missile defense will require seamless communication and operability across large distances and across huge bureaucracies. It will require each military to have complete confidence in the other and is likely to result in greater transparency than either is accustomed to, not only in command and control but also in systems design.

**Constitutional Concerns**. Perhaps the most important challenge for Japan is purely domestic: the limits imposed by the Peace Constitution. The most restrictive interpretation of Article 9 argues that any military is unconstitutional (that is why the military is called the Self Defense Force). This view has pretty much been abandoned, but Japan's national security decisionmakers continue to grapple with the limitations imposed by the constitution. As the preceding history makes clear, the most visible indication of that struggle is the attempt to define the scope of the U.S.-Japan security treaty. The question is, most literally, how far from the coast of Japan can the two countries cooperate without violating constraints imposed by the "defensive" nature of the constitution and without moving beyond the minimum needs for self defense? The 1996 Defense Guidelines called for action only in "situations in areas surrounding Japan." For the alliance, the question takes on real significance when contemplating a response to crises on the Korean Peninsula or the Taiwan Strait. The identification in the 2005 SCC Joint Declaration of common strategic interests in both areas makes considerable progress toward clarifying this vital question. Does it also permit action in the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, or even the Persian Gulf?

A similar controversy surrounds the issue of collective self-defense. The prevailing interpretation of the Constitution holds that Japan has the right (as does every sovereign state) to engage in collective self-defense, but that it is constitutionally prohibited from exercising that right. As a result, Japan has been unable to join UN-sanctioned collective security efforts or even to join international peacekeeping exercises except under rigorous conditions (which largely involve the elimination of most possibilities of getting involved in conflict). This restriction is the primary reason why there are no reciprocal obligations in the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty; the U.S. is required to come to Japan's defense in the event of an attack upon Japan, but Tokyo is not required to do the same in the event of an attack on the U.S. This limitation surfaces frequently; most recently it has been raised in the debate over missile defense. Some Japanese have claimed that intercepting missiles that were not targeting Japan would constitute an exercise of the right of collective self-defense and would hence be unconstitutional.

While some consider the debates to be theological in nature, they put serious limits on the U.S.-Japan alliance. Deputy Secretary Armitage noted in a May 2001 visit to Tokyo that "the lack of an ability to participate in collective self-defense, although they are signatories to a defense treaty, is an obstacle. I think it is a healthy thing for the Japanese to look at some of these things and see what is reasonable and what is not." But, while the Bush administration is clearly supportive of an increased Japanese security role, even if this requires constitutional reinterpretation or revision, Armitage and other administration spokesmen have been careful not to directly call for revision, continually stressing that this is a domestic Japanese decision

After years of "reinterpreting" the constitution to address issues arising out of new security policies, Japan appears to be addressing Constitutional questions head-on. Senior politicians now talk about revising or rewriting the Constitution. In early 2005, committees in the Lower and Upper Houses of the Diet will release reports on constitutional reform. Later in the year, a Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) Research

Committee on the Constitution will release its own findings, which should be followed by a similar report by the opposition Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ). The challenge is whether the LDP and the DPJ, the two leading parties in Japan, will be able to find sufficient common ground to table a single unified proposal.

The debate over constitutional reform extends to issues other than security policy, and these are likely to be equally contentious. It is unrealistic to expect any serious movement on formal constitutional revision for another three to five years. Nonetheless, Japan's attempts to forge a more equal relationship with the U.S., like its quest for "normalcy," will be increasing frustrated by the constraints imposed by the Constitution. At some point, one – the document or the nation's vision of itself – must bow to the other.

**The Aceh Earthquake and Tsunami**. Public perceptions of the constitutional debate are likely to have been shaped by the Dec. 26, 2004 earthquake in Indonesia and the tsunami it created that devastated Asia and parts of Africa. Japan was quick to respond to the tragedy. On Jan. 1, Prime Minister Koizumi pledged $500 million in financial assistance to the international relief effort (at the time, the largest such pledge; it was later eclipsed by other offers). Half will go to international organizations, and half will be issued in the form of bilateral aid. Tokyo has called for a moratorium on the public-debt liability of some affected countries and will help establish a tsunami warning system for Indian Ocean countries.

The unprecedented deployment of more than 1,000 Self-Defense Forces personnel – from all three services – could alter the way the Japanese public views its military potential and the role it can play. Unlike previous humanitarian missions, this deployment has been close to home and unambiguous in its intent: to relieve human suffering. Military assets once regarded with skepticism and even fear (by some) have been used to provide humanitarian relief and much-needed assistance. The deployment is consistent with the framework outlined in the Araki Report and the new NDPO, and the attempt to frame international national contributions on a par with defense of the homeland. The fact that the effort has been welcomed by the afflicted nations will also help minimize fears about the potential consequences of Japan's new military activism.

## THE 'UK OF ASIA' – OR GERMANY?

There will be continued – hopefully subtle and politically aware – pressure on Japan to continue to find new avenues of enhanced military cooperation and involvement in security matters in East Asia and beyond. "Japan can count on America, and increasingly, America can count on Japan," Secretary Armitage noted in Tokyo in February 2004, "Certainly a more self-confident Japan, with its own unique style of global leadership, can only add to that equation, both in the economic opportunities for our peoples and in advancing our shared global interests."

As long as Prime Minister Koizumi remains at the helm, such gentle pressure will be welcome and sufficient to see continued forward progress. The big issue is a purely Japanese one: constitutional revision or further reinterpretation to allow collective

defense. Since many maintain that Japan, under the UN Charter, is already permitted to exercise collective self-defense but has merely chosen not to do so, it is possible that a political decision short of reinterpretation may be the vehicle Tokyo chooses to move further forward in its quest to become a more normal nation. But, given Prime Minister Koizumi's earlier comments on the subject, one can anticipate a move toward actual constitutional revision at some point in the not-too-distant future. Washington will be cheering along the sidelines, but is likely to continue its official hands-off policy.

Has Japan become the UK of Asia? No, not yet, but Tokyo is clearly moving in the right direction. Nonetheless, it will not happen overnight, even if there is constitutional reform. The German model may (we would argue, should) first apply. During the 1992 Gulf War, Germany increased its military operations in the Mediterranean and other NATO areas to free up more non-German NATO forces to participate in Operation Desert Storm, quite similar to what Japan did, and is continuing to do, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and its aftermath. By Kosovo, Germany had taken the next step in being a full partner in a wartime coalition and few blink an eye today at Germany's active involvement in Afghanistan – it's reluctance to participate in Iraq is driven by other factors, and not by the lingering ghosts of World War II. Before Japan can become the UK of Asia in the 21st century, it must become the Germany of the last decade and finally put its own World War II ghosts to rest. It is clearly on the right track. But can the momentum be sustained? Only time will tell.

Much will depend on who succeeds Mr. Koizumi as Japan's prime minister. There are a number of Japanese politicians who share his vision for Japan, its role in the region and the world, and for a tighter, more balanced security relationship with the U.S. The developments outlined in this analysis provide both a framework and a foundation for continued evolution in that direction. But the speed with which Japanese policy has evolved in recent years has been very much the product of extraordinary circumstances. The pace is likely to slow and policy makers on both sides of the Pacific have to be prepared. It is imperative that those who agree with Mr. Koizumi strive to convince the Japanese people that their vision is correct. The biggest mistake that they could make would be to ignore the painstaking and often frustrating work needed to build national consensus on this issue.

While the primary burden falls on the Japanese, Americans have a role to play, too. It is tempting to see recent developments as heralding Japan's emergence as "a normal nation." Perhaps, but that is still for the future. It is tempting to see Japanese decisionmaking and the resulting policies as a lot like our own -- after all, we are allies, with shared values, etc**.** – but that conclusion must be resisted. It is vital that alliance managers and friends provide encouragement for Japan and nudge it forward without pushing too hard. Sensitivity to the nuances of Japanese politics and history is essential. That does not mean accepting without question any Japanese decision or policy, but acknowledging that Tokyo has its own interests and issues and that they deserve the respect and consideration afforded to any real partner.

This has been done very effectively during President Bush's first term by long-term Chrysanthemum Club members such as Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and Assistant Secretary for East Asia James Kelly. Both have left the administration, however. Their successors must prove to be equally adept at encouraging, without demanding, change and at discerning the difference between real constraints to greater security cooperation and those that reflect political convenience. Nurturing the U.S.-Japan alliance requires both patience and courage, although the appropriate mix will differ in Washington and Tokyo.

# Appendix A
## Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security Alliance for the 21st Century

**April 17 1996**

1. Today, the Prime Minister and the President celebrated one of the most successful bilateral relationships in history. The leaders took pride in the profound and positive contribution this relationship has made to world peace and regional stability and prosperity. The strong Alliance between Japan and the United States helped ensure peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region during the Cold War. Our Alliance continues to underlie the dynamic economic growth in this region. The two leaders agreed that the future security and prosperity of both Japan and the United States are tied inextricably to the future of the Asia-Pacific region.

The benefits of peace and prosperity that spring from the Alliance are due not only to the commitments of the two governments, but also to the contributions of the Japanese and American people who have shared the burden of securing freedom and democracy. The Prime Minister and the President expressed their profound gratitude to those who sustain the Alliance, especially those Japanese communities that host U.S. forces, and those Americans who, far from home, devote themselves to the defense of peace and freedom.

2. For more than a year, the two governments conducted an intensive review of the evolving political and security environment of the Asia-Pacific region and of various aspects of the Japan-U.S. security relationship. On the basis of this review, the Prime Minister and the President reaffirmed their commitment to the profound common values that guide our national policies: the maintenance of freedom, the pursuit of democracy, and respect for human rights. They agreed that the foundations for our cooperation remain firm, and that this partnership will remain vital in the twenty-first century.

**The Regional Outlook**

3. Since the end of the Cold War, the possibility of global armed conflict has receded. The last few years have seen expanded political and security dialogue among countries of the region. Respect for democratic principles is growing. Prosperity is more widespread than at any other time in history, and we are witnessing the emergence of an Asia-Pacific community. The Asia-Pacific region has become the most dynamic area of the globe.

At the same time, instability and uncertainty persist in the region. Tensions continue on the Korean Peninsula. There are still heavy concentrations of military force, including nuclear arsenals. Unresolved territorial disputes, potential regional conflicts, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery all constitute sources of instability.

**The Japan-U.S. Alliance and the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security**

4. The Prime Minister and the President underscored the importance of promoting stability in this region and dealing with the security challenges facing both countries

In this regard, the Prime Minister and the President reiterated the significant value of the Alliance between Japan and the United States. They reaffirmed that the Japan-U.S. security relationship, based on the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America, remains the cornerstone for achieving common security objectives, and for maintaining a stable and prosperous environment for the Asia-Pacific region as we enter the twenty-first century.

(a) The Prime Minister confirmed Japan's fundamental defense policy as articulated in its new "National Defense Program Outline" adopted in November, 1995, which underscored that the Japanese defense capabilities should play appropriate roles in the security environment after the Cold War. The Prime Minister and the President agreed that the most effective framework for the defense of Japan is close defense cooperation between the two countries. This cooperation is based on a combination of appropriate defense capabilities for the Self-Defense Forces of Japan and the Japan-U.S. security arrangements. The leaders again confirmed that U.S. deterrence under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security remains the guarantee for Japan's security

(b) The Prime Minister and the President agreed that continued U.S. military presence is also essential for preserving peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. The leaders shared the common recognition that

the Japan-U.S. security relationship forms an essential pillar which supports the positive regional engagement of the U.S.

The President emphasized the U.S. commitment to the defense of Japan as well as to peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. He noted that there has been some adjustment of U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific region since the end of the Cold War. On the basis of a thorough assessment, the United States reaffirmed that meeting its commitments in the prevailing security environment requires the maintenance of its current force structure of about 100,000 forward deployed military personnel in the region, including about the current level in Japan.

(c) The Prime Minister welcomed the U.S. determination to remain a stable and steadfast presence in the region. He reconfirmed that Japan would continue appropriate contributions for the maintenance of U.S. forces in Japan, such as through the provision of facilities and areas in accordance with the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and Host Nation Support. The President expressed U.S. appreciation for Japan's contributions, and welcomed the conclusion of the new Special Measures Agreement which provides financial support for U.S. forces stationed in Japan.

**Bilateral Cooperation Under the Japan-U.S. Security Relationship**

5. The Prime Minister and the President, with the objective of enhancing the credibility of this vital security relationship, agreed to undertake efforts to advance cooperation in the following areas.

(a) Recognizing that close bilateral defense cooperation is a central element of the Japan-U.S. Alliance, both governments agreed that continued close consultation is essential. Both governments will further enhance the exchange of information and views on the international situation, in particular the Asia-Pacific region. At the same time, in response to the changes which may arise in the international security environment, both governments will continue to consult closely on defense policies and military postures, including the U.S. force structure in Japan, which will best meet their requirements.

(b) The Prime Minister and the President agreed to initiate a review of the 1978 Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation to build upon the close working relationship already established between Japan and the United States.

The two leaders agreed on the necessity to promote bilateral policy coordination, including studies on bilateral cooperation in dealing with situations that may emerge in the areas surrounding Japan and which will have an important influence on the peace and security of Japan.

(c) The Prime Minister and the President welcomed the April 15, 1996 signature of the Agreement Between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Reciprocal Provision of Logistic Support, Supplies and Services Between the Self-Defense Forces of Japan and the Armed Forces of the United States of America, and expressed their hope that this Agreement will further promote the bilateral cooperative relationship.

(d) Noting the importance of interoperability in all facets of cooperation between the Self-Defense Forces of Japan and the U.S. forces, the two governments will enhance mutual exchange in the areas of technology and equipment, including bilateral cooperative research and development of equipment such as the support fighter (F-2).

(e) The two governments recognized that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery has important implications for their common security. They will work together to prevent proliferation and will continue to cooperate in the ongoing study on ballistic missile defense.

6. The Prime Minister and the President recognized that the broad support and understanding of the Japanese people are indispensable for the smooth stationing of U.S. forces in Japan, which is the core element of the Japan-U.S. security arrangements. The two leaders agreed that both governments will make every effort to deal with various issues related to the presence and status of U.S. forces. They also agreed to make further efforts to enhance mutual understanding between U.S. forces and local Japanese communities. In particular, with respect to Okinawa, where U.S. facilities and areas are highly concentrated, the Prime Minister and the President reconfirmed their determination to carry out steps to consolidate, realign, and reduce U.S. facilities and areas consistent with the objectives of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. In this respect, the two leaders took satisfaction in the significant progress which has been made

so far through the "Special Action Committee on Okinawa" (SACO), and welcomed the far reaching measures outlined in the SACO Interim Report of April 15, 1996. They expressed their firm commitment to achieve a successful conclusion of the SACO process by November 1996.

**Regional Cooperation**

7. The Prime Minister and the President agreed that the two governments will jointly and individually strive to achieve a more peaceful and stable security environment in the Asia-Pacific region. In this regard, the two leaders recognized that the engagement of the United States in the region, supported by the Japan-U.S. security relationship, constitutes the foundation for such efforts.

The two leaders stressed the importance of peaceful resolution of problems in the region. They emphasized that it is extremely important for the stability and prosperity of the region that China play a positive and constructive role, and, in this context, stressed the interest of both countries in furthering cooperation with China. Russia's ongoing process of reform contributes to regional and global stability, and merits continued encouragement and cooperation. The leaders also stated that full normalization of Japan-Russia relations based on the Tokyo Declaration is important to peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. They noted also that stability on the Korean Peninsula is vitally important to Japan and the United States and reaffirmed that both countries will continue to make every effort in this regard, in close cooperation with the Republic of Korea.

The Prime Minister and the President reaffirmed that the two governments will continue working jointly and with other countries in the region to further develop multilateral regional security dialogues and cooperation mechanisms such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, and eventually, security dialogues regarding Northeast Asia.

**Global Cooperation**

8. The Prime Minister and the President recognized that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security is the core of the Japan-U.S. Alliance, and underlies the mutual confidence that constitutes the foundation for bilateral cooperation on global issues.

The Prime Minister and the President agreed that the two governments will strengthen their cooperation in support of the United Nations and other international organizations through activities such as peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations.

Both governments will coordinate their policies and cooperate on issues such as arms control and disarmament, including acceleration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) negotiations and the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The two leaders agreed that cooperation in the United Nations and APEC, and on issues such as the North Korean nuclear problem, the Middle East peace process, and the peace implementation process in the former Yugoslavia, helps to build the kind of world that promotes our shared interests and values.

**Conclusion**

9. In concluding, the Prime Minister and the President agreed that the three legs of the Japan-U.S. relationship - security, political, and economic - are based on shared values and interests and rest on the mutual confidence embodied in the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. The Prime Minister and the President reaffirmed their strong determination, on the eve of the twenty-first century, to build on the successful history of security cooperation and to work hand-in-hand to secure peace and prosperity for future generations.

# Appendix B
## The Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation

### I. The Aim Of The Guidelines

The aim of these Guidelines is to create a solid basis for more effective and credible U.S.-Japan cooperation under normal circumstances, in case of an armed attack against Japan, and in situations in areas surrounding Japan. The Guidelines also provide a general framework and policy direction for the roles and missions of the two countries and ways of cooperation and coordination, both under normal circumstances and during contingencies.

### II. Basic Premises and Principles

The Guidelines and programs under the Guidelines are consistent with the following basic premises and principles.

1. The rights and obligations under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan (the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty) and its related arrangements, as well as the fundamental framework of the U.S.-Japan alliance, will remain unchanged.
2. Japan will conduct all its actions within the limitations of its Constitution and in accordance with such basic positions as the maintenance of its exclusively defense-oriented policy and its three non-nuclear principles.
3. All actions taken by the United States and Japan will be consistent with basic principles of international law, including the peaceful settlement of disputes and sovereign equality, and relevant international agreements such as the Charter of the United Nations.
4. The Guidelines and programs under the Guidelines will not obligate either Government to take legislative, budgetary or administrative measures. However, since the objective of the Guidelines and programs under the Guidelines is to establish an effective framework for bilateral cooperation, the two Governments are expected to reflect in an appropriate way the results of these efforts, based on their own judgments, in their specific policies and measures. All actions taken by Japan will be consistent with its laws and regulations then in effect.

### III. Cooperation Under Normal Circumstances

Both Governments will firmly maintain existing U.S.-Japan security arrangements. Each Government will make efforts to maintain required defense postures. Japan will possess defense capability within the scope necessary for self-defense on the basis of the "National Defense Program Outline." In order to meet its commitments, the United States will maintain its nuclear deterrent capability, its forward deployed forces in the Asia-Pacific region, and other forces capable of reinforcing those forward deployed forces.

Both Governments, based on their respective policies, under normal circumstances will maintain close cooperation for the defense of Japan as well as for the creation of a more stable international security environment.

Both Governments will under normal circumstances enhance cooperation in a variety of areas. Examples include mutual support activities under the Agreement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning Reciprocal Provision of Logistic Support, Supplies and Services between the Self-Defense Forces of Japan and the Armed Forces of the United States of America; the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement between the United States of America and Japan; and their related arrangements.

1. Information Sharing and Policy Consultations

Recognizing that accurate information and sound analysis are at the foundation of security, the two Governments will increase information and intelligence sharing, and the exchange of views on international situations of mutual interest, especially in the Asia-Pacific region. They will also continue close consultations on defense policies and military postures.

Such information sharing and policy consultations will be conducted at as many levels as possible and on the broadest range of subjects. This will be accomplished by taking advantage of all available opportunities, such as SCC and Security Sub-Committee (SSC) meetings.

2. Various Types of Security Cooperation

Bilateral cooperation to promote regional and global activities in the field of security contributes to the creation of a more stable international security environment.

Recognizing the importance and significance of security dialogues and defense exchanges in the region, as well as international arms control and disarmament, the two Governments will promote such activities and cooperate as necessary.

When either or both Governments participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations or international humanitarian relief operations, the two sides will cooperate closely for mutual support as necessary. They will prepare procedures for cooperation in such areas as transportation, medical services, information sharing, and education and training.

When either or both Governments conduct emergency relief operations in response to requests from governments concerned or international organizations in the wake of large-scale disasters, they will cooperate closely with each other as necessary.

3. Bilateral Programs

Both Governments will conduct bilateral work, including bilateral defense planning in case of an armed attack against Japan, and mutual cooperation planning in situations in areas surrounding Japan. Such efforts will be made in a comprehensive mechanism involving relevant agencies of the respective Governments, and establish the foundation for bilateral cooperation.

Bilateral exercises and training will be enhanced in order not only to validate such bilateral work but also to enable smooth and effective responses by public and private entities of both countries, starting with U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces. The two Governments will under normal circumstances establish a bilateral coordination mechanism involving relevant agencies to be operated during contingencies.

**IV. Actions in Response to an Armed Attack Against Japan**

Bilateral actions in response to an armed attack against Japan remain a core aspect of U.S.-Japan defense cooperation.

When an armed attack against Japan is imminent, the two Governments will take steps to prevent further deterioration of the situation and make preparations necessary for the defense of Japan. When an armed attack against Japan takes place, the two Governments will conduct appropriate bilateral actions to repel it at the earliest possible stage.

1. When an Armed Attack against Japan is Imminent

The two Governments will intensify information and intelligence sharing and policy consultations, and initiate at an early stage the operation of a bilateral coordination mechanism. Cooperating as appropriate, they will make preparations necessary for ensuring coordinated responses according to the readiness stage selected by mutual agreement. Japan will establish and maintain the basis for U.S. reinforcements. As circumstances change, the two Governments will also increase intelligence gathering and surveillance, and will prepare to respond to activities which could develop into an armed attack against Japan.

The two Governments will make every effort, including diplomatic efforts, to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

Recognizing that a situation in areas surrounding Japan may develop into an armed attack against Japan, the two Governments will be mindful of the close interrelationship of the two requirements: preparations for the defense of Japan and responses to or preparations for situations in areas surrounding Japan.

2. When an Armed Attack against Japan Takes Place

(1) Principles for Coordinated Bilateral Actions

(a) Japan will have primary responsibility immediately to take action and to repel an armed attack against Japan as soon as possible. The United States will provide appropriate support to Japan.

Such bilateral cooperation may vary according to the scale, type, phase, and other factors of the armed attack. This cooperation may include preparations for and execution of coordinated bilateral operations, steps to prevent further deterioration of the situation, surveillance, and intelligence sharing.

(b) In conducting bilateral operations, U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will employ their respective defense capabilities in a coordinated, timely, and effective manner. In doing this, they will conduct effective joint operations of their respective Forces ground, maritime and air services. The Self-Defense Forces will primarily conduct defensive operations in Japanese territory and its surrounding waters and airspace, while U.S. Forces support Self-Defense Forces operations. U.S. Forces will also conduct operations to supplement the capabilities of the Self-Defense Forces.

(c) The United States will introduce reinforcements in a timely manner, and Japan will establish and maintain the basis to facilitate these deployments.

(2) Concept of Operations

(a) Operations to Counter Air Attack against Japan

U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will bilaterally conduct operations to counter air attack against Japan.

The Self-Defense Forces will have primary responsibility for conducting operations for air defense.

U.S. Forces will support Self-Defense Forces operations and conduct operations, including those which may involve the use of strike power, to supplement the capabilities of the Self-Defense Forces.

(b) Operations to Defend Surrounding Waters and to Protect Sea Lines of Communication U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will bilaterally conduct operations for the defense of surrounding waters and for the protection of sea lines of communication.

The Self-Defense Forces will have primary responsibility for the protection of major ports and straits in Japan, for the protection of ships in surrounding waters, and for other operations.

U.S. Forces will support Self-Defense Forces operations and conduct operations, including those which may provide additional mobility and strike power, to supplement the capabilities of the Self-Defense Forces.

(c) Operations to Counter Airborne and Seaborne Invasions of Japan

U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will bilaterally conduct operations to counter airborne and seaborne invasions of Japan.

The Self-Defense Forces will have primary responsibility for conducting operations to check and repel such invasions.

U.S. Forces will primarily conduct operations to supplement the capabilities of the Self-Defense Forces. The United States will introduce reinforcements at the earliest possible stage, according to the scale, type, and other factors of the invasion, and will support Self-Defense Forces operations.

(d) Responses to Other Threats

(i) The Self-Defense Forces will have primary responsibility to check and repel guerrilla-commando type attacks or any other unconventional attacks involving military infiltration in Japanese territory at the earliest possible stage. They will cooperate and coordinate closely

with relevant agencies, and will be supported in appropriate ways by U.S. Forces depending on the situation.

(ii) U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will cooperate and coordinate closely to respond to a ballistic missile attack. U.S. Forces will provide Japan with necessary intelligence, and consider, as necessary, the use of forces providing additional strike power.

(3) Activities and Requirements for Operations

(a) Command and Coordination. U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces, in close cooperation, will take action through their respective command-and-control channels. To conduct effective bilateral operations, the two Forces will establish, in advance, procedures which include those to determine the division of roles and missions and to synchronize their operations.

(b) Bilateral Coordination Mechanism. Necessary coordination among the relevant agencies of the two countries will be conducted through a bilateral coordination mechanism. In order to conduct effective bilateral operations, U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will closely coordinate operations, intelligence activities, and logistics support through this coordination mechanism including use of a bilateral coordination center.

(c) Communications and Electronics. The two Governments will provide mutual support to ensure effective use of communications and electronics capabilities.

(d) Intelligence Activities. The two Governments will cooperate in intelligence activities in order to ensure effective bilateral operations. This will include coordination of requirements, collection, production, and dissemination of intelligence products. Each Government will be responsible for the security of shared intelligence.

(e) Logistics Support Activities. U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will conduct logistics support activities efficiently and properly in accordance with appropriate bilateral arrangements.

To improve the effectiveness of logistics and to alleviate functional shortfalls, the two Governments will undertake mutual support activities, making appropriate use of authorities and assets of central and local government agencies, as well as private sector assets. Particular attention will be paid to the following points in conducting such activities:

(i) Supply. The United States will support the acquisition of supplies for systems of U.S. origin while Japan will support the acquisition of supplies in Japan.

(ii) Transportation. The two Governments will closely cooperate in transportation operations, including airlift and sealift of supplies from the United States to Japan.

(iii) Maintenance. Japan will support the maintenance of U.S. Forces equipment in Japan; the United States will support the maintenance of items of U.S. origin which are beyond Japanese maintenance capabilities. Maintenance support will include the technical training of maintenance personnel as required. Japan will also support U.S. Forces requirement for salvage and recovery.

(iv) Facilities. Japan will, in case of need, provide additional facilities and areas in accordance with the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and its related arrangements. If necessary for effective and efficient operations, U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will make joint use of Self-Defense Forces facilities and U.S. facilities and areas in accordance with the Treaty and its related arrangements.

(v) Medical Services. The two Governments will support each other in the area of medical services such as medical treatment and transportation of casualties.

**V. Cooperation in Situations in areas Surrounding Japan that will have an Important Influence on Japan's Peace and Security (Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan)**

Situations in areas surrounding Japan will have an important influence on Japan s peace and security. The concept, situations in areas surrounding Japan, is not geographic but situational. The two Governments will make every effort, including diplomatic efforts, to prevent such situations from occurring. When the two

Governments reach a common assessment of the state of each situation, they will effectively coordinate their activities. In responding to such situations, measures taken may differ depending on circumstances.

1. When a Situation in Areas Surrounding Japan is Anticipated

When a situation in areas surrounding Japan is anticipated, the two Governments will intensify information and intelligence sharing and policy consultations, including efforts to reach a common assessment of the situation.

At the same time, they will make every effort, including diplomatic efforts, to prevent further deterioration of the situation, while initiating at an early stage the operation of a bilateral coordination mechanism, including use of a bilateral coordination center. Cooperating as appropriate, they will make preparations necessary for ensuring coordinated responses according to the readiness stage selected by mutual agreement. As circumstances change, they will also increase intelligence gathering and surveillance, and enhance their readiness to respond to the circumstances.

2. Responses to Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan

The two Governments will take appropriate measures, to include preventing further deterioration of situations, in response to situations in areas surrounding Japan. This will be done in accordance with the basic premises and principles listed in Section II above and based on their respective decisions. They will support each other as necessary in accordance with appropriate arrangements.

Functions and fields of cooperation and examples of items of cooperation are outlined below, and listed in the Annex.

(1) Cooperation in Activities Initiated by Either Government. Although either Government may conduct the following activities at its own discretion, bilateral cooperation will enhance their effectiveness.

(a) Relief Activities and Measures to Deal with Refugees. Each Government will conduct relief activities with the consent and cooperation of the authorities in the affected area. The two Governments will cooperate as necessary, taking into account their respective capabilities.

The two Governments will cooperate in dealing with refugees as necessary. When there is a flow of refugees into Japanese territory, Japan will decide how to respond and will have primary responsibility for dealing with the flow; the United States will provide appropriate support.

(b) Search and Rescue. The two Governments will cooperate in search and rescue operations. Japan will conduct search and rescue operations in Japanese territory; and at sea around Japan, as distinguished from areas where combat operations are being conducted. When U.S. Forces are conducting operations, the United States will conduct search and rescue operations in and near the operational areas.

(c) Noncombatant Evacuation Operations. When the need arises for U.S. and Japanese noncombatants to be evacuated from a third country to a safe haven, each Government is responsible for evacuating its own nationals as well as for dealing with the authorities of the affected area. In instances in which each decides it is appropriate, the two Governments will coordinate in planning and cooperate in carrying out their evacuations, including for the securing of transportation means, transportation and the use of facilities, using their respective capabilities in a mutually supplementary manner. If similar need arises for noncombatants other than of U.S. or Japanese nationality, the respective countries may consider extending, on their respective terms, evacuation assistance to third country nationals.

(d) Activities for Ensuring the Effectiveness of Economic Sanctions for the Maintenance of International Peace and Stability. Each Government will contribute to activities for ensuring the effectiveness of economic sanctions for the maintenance of international peace and stability. Such contributions will be made in accordance with each Government s own criteria.

Additionally, the two Governments will cooperate with each other as appropriate, taking into account their respective capabilities. Such cooperation includes information sharing, and cooperation in inspection of ships based on United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(2) Japan's Support for U.S. Forces Activities

(a) Use of Facilities. Based on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and its related arrangements, Japan will, in case of need, provide additional facilities and areas in a timely and appropriate manner, and ensure the temporary use by U.S. Forces of Self-Defense Forces facilities and civilian airports and ports.

(b) Rear Area Support. Japan will provide rear area support to those U.S. Forces that are conducting operations for the purpose of achieving the objectives of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. The primary aim of this rear area support is to enable U.S. Forces to use facilities and conduct operations in an effective manner.

By its very nature, Japan s rear area support will be provided primarily in Japanese territory. It may also be provided on the high seas and international airspace around Japan which are distinguished from areas where combat operations are being conducted.

In providing rear area support, Japan will make appropriate use of authorities and assets of central and local government agencies, as well as private sector assets. The Self-Defense Forces, as appropriate, will provide such support consistent with their mission for the defense of Japan and the maintenance of public order.

(3) U.S.-Japan Operational Cooperation. As situations in areas surrounding Japan have an important influence on Japan s peace and security, the Self-Defense Forces will conduct such activities as intelligence gathering, surveillance and minesweeping, to protect lives and property and to ensure navigational safety. U.S. Forces will conduct operations to restore the peace and security affected by situations in areas surrounding Japan.

With the involvement of relevant agencies, cooperation and coordination will significantly enhance the effectiveness of both Forces' activities.

**VI. Bilateral Programs for Effective Defense Cooperation under the Guidelines**

Effective bilateral cooperation under the Guidelines will require the United States and Japan to conduct consultative dialogue throughout the spectrum of security conditions: normal circumstances, an armed attack against Japan, and situations in areas surrounding Japan. Both sides must be well informed and coordinate at multiple levels to ensure successful bilateral defense cooperation. To accomplish this, the two Governments will strengthen their information and intelligence sharing and policy consultations by taking advantage of all available opportunities, including SCC and SSC meetings, and they will establish the following two mechanisms to facilitate consultations, coordinate policies, and coordinate operational functions.

First, the two Governments will develop a comprehensive mechanism for bilateral planning and the establishment of common standards and procedures, involving not only U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces but also other relevant agencies of their respective Governments.

The two Governments will, as necessary, improve this comprehensive mechanism. The SCC will continue to play an important role for presenting policy direction to the work to be conducted by this mechanism. The SCC will be responsible for presenting directions, validating the progress of work, and issuing directives as necessary. The SDC will assist the SCC in bilateral work.

Second, the two Governments will also establish, under normal circumstances, a bilateral coordination mechanism that will include relevant agencies of the two countries for coordinating respective activities during contingencies.

1. Bilateral Work for Planning and the Establishment of Common Standards and Procedures. Bilateral work listed below will be conducted in a comprehensive mechanism involving relevant agencies of the respective Governments in a deliberate and efficient manner. Progress and results of such work will be reported at significant milestones to the SCC and the SDC.

(1) Bilateral Defense Planning and Mutual Cooperation Planning. U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will conduct bilateral defense planning under normal circumstances to take coordinated actions smoothly and effectively in case of an armed attack against Japan. The two Governments will conduct

mutual cooperation planning under normal circumstances to be able to respond smoothly and effectively to situations in areas surrounding Japan.

Bilateral defense planning and mutual cooperation planning will assume various possible situations, with the expectation that results of these efforts will be appropriately reflected in the plans of the two Governments. The two Governments will coordinate and adjust their plans in light of actual circumstances. The two Governments will be mindful that bilateral defense planning and mutual cooperation planning must be consistent so that appropriate responses will be ensured when a situation in areas surrounding Japan threatens to develop into an armed attack against Japan or when such a situation and an armed attack against Japan occur simultaneously.

(2) Establishment of Common Standards for Preparations. The two Governments will establish under normal circumstances common standards for preparations for the defense of Japan. These standards will address such matters as intelligence activities, unit activities, movements and logistics support in each readiness stage. When an armed attack against Japan is imminent, both Governments will agree to select a common readiness stage that will be reflected in the level of preparations for the defense of Japan by U.S. Forces, the Self-Defense Forces and other relevant agencies.

The two Governments will similarly establish common standards for preparations of cooperative measures in situations in areas surrounding Japan so that they may select a common readiness stage by mutual agreement.

(3) Establishment of Common Procedures. The two Governments will prepare in advance common procedures to ensure smooth and effective execution of coordinated U.S. Forces and Self-Defense Forces operations for the defense of Japan.

These will include procedures for communications, transmission of target information, intelligence activities and logistics support, and prevention of fratricide. Common procedures will also include criteria for properly controlling respective unit operations. The two Forces will take into account the importance of communications and electronics interoperability, and will determine in advance their mutual requirements.

2. Bilateral Coordination Mechanism. The two Governments will establish under normal circumstances a bilateral coordination mechanism involving relevant agencies of the two countries to coordinate respective activities in case of an armed attack against Japan and in situations in areas surrounding Japan.

Procedures for coordination will vary depending upon items to be coordinated and agencies to be involved. They may include coordination committee meetings, mutual dispatch of liaison officers, and designation of points of contacts. As part of such a bilateral coordination mechanism, U.S. Forces and the Self-Defense Forces will prepare under normal circumstances a bilateral coordination center with the necessary hardware and software in order to coordinate their respective activities.

**VII. Timely And Appropriate Review Of The Guidelines**

The two Governments will review the Guidelines in a timely and appropriate manner when changes in situations relevant to the U.S.-Japan security relationship occur and if deemed necessary in view of the circumstances at that time.

# Appendix C

## New Guideline for Japan's Future Security and Defense
## Japan to Enhance Security Partnership with the U.S.

Embassy of Japan
December 21, 2004

On December 10, the Security Council and Cabinet of Japan approved the "National Defense Program Guideline for FY 2005 and After" (the new NDPG) and the "Mid-Term Defense Build-up Plan (FY2005-FY2009)" (the new MTDBP).

Japan stipulated the "National Defense Program Guideline for FY 2005 and After," since it recognized the need to set new guidelines for shaping Japan's future security and defense capabilities in the midst of today's security environment, which poses the challenge of dealing with new threats such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles as well as international terrorist activities and various other situations that affect peace and security.

As for the cooperation with Japan's alliance partner, the Guideline states not only that the Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements are indispensable to ensure security of Japan as well as peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, but also that the close cooperative relationship based on the arrangements with the United States plays an important role in facilitating international efforts to address effectively the new threats and situations. From this point of view, it states that Japan will proactively engage in a strategic dialogue with the United States on wide-ranging security issues such as bilateral role-sharing and military postures including the U.S. force structure in Japan, while working to enhance unity between our perceptions on the new security environment and the appropriate strategic objectives.

In addition, Japan will continue to strengthen the Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements by actively promoting measures such as information exchange, operational cooperation including that in the "situations in areas surrounding Japan," cooperation on ballistic missile defense, equipment and technology exchange, and efforts for smoother and more efficient stationing of U.S. forces in Japan.

Basic points of the Guideline are as follows:

* Objectives of the new NDPG (National Defense Program Guideline for FY 2005 and After)

In the new NDPG, Japan elucidated its vision for its future defense forces premised on the basic principles of our security policy. The Guideline upholds two security policy objectives: (a) to prevent any threat from reaching Japan and, in the event that it does, to repel it; and (b) to improve the international security environment in order to prevent any threat from reaching Japan. Especially regarding the latter objective, it is made clear that improving the international security environment is one of the major pillars of security policy of Japan, whose prosperity and growth depend indispensably on maritime transport security.

The Guideline points out that it is necessary to combine in an integrated manner Japan's own effort and cooperative efforts with an alliance partner and the international community. At the same time, it states that Japan will continue to firmly uphold that basic principles of its defense policy that have been maintained under the Constitution.

* Specific Measures

In an effort to meet those objectives, the Guideline provides that Japan will do its utmost to prevent any threat from reaching the country by employing all available means. In the event that these efforts fail to prevent a threat from reaching Japan, the Government as one will take an integrated response by swiftly making appropriate decisions and by having all the relevant organizations cooperate properly. The Guideline clearly states that in order to protect Japan and its people, it is necessary to utilize all available means by integrating the capability of relevant organizations such as the Self-Defense Forces, the police and the Japan Coast Guard. At the same time, it provides that Japan will carry out diplomatic and other activities to improve the international security environment as a part of its own efforts to prevent emergence of threats.

With regard to Japan's defense forces, the ultimate guarantee for its national security, the Guideline states that, while inheriting the elements of the Basic Defense Force Concept that still remain valid, future

defense forces must be capable of effectively responding to the new threats and situations as well as of actively participating in international peace cooperation activities in which the international community cooperatively make efforts to improve international security environment. Taking into account the stringent fiscal conditions that remain while roles that defense forces have to play are multiplying, the Guideline states that Japan's future defense forces should be made multi-functional, flexible, and effective through the rationalization and streamlining.

* Importance of Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements

As for the cooperation with Japan's alliance partner, the Guideline states not only that the Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements are indispensable to ensure security of Japan as well as peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, but also that the close cooperative relationship based on the arrangements with the United States plays an important role in facilitating international efforts to address effectively the new threats and situations. From this point of view, it states that Japan will proactively engage in a strategic dialogue with the United States on wide-ranging security issues such as bilateral role-sharing and military postures including the U.S. force structure in Japan, while working to enhance unity between our perceptions on the new security environment and the appropriate strategic objectives.

With regard to cooperation with the international community, the Guideline upholds that Japan will use Official Development Assistance (ODA) strategically and promote participation in international peace cooperation activities. A clear description of the relation between such activities and the improvement of international security environment is one of the highlights of the new NDPG.

Regarding the defense forces of the future, the Guideline emphasizes the need to respond effectively to the new threats and situations, and states that Japan will appropriately organize and deploy highly responsive, mobile defense force units in accordance with the character of the units and Japan's geographical characteristics, in order to respond to various situations, such as ballistic missile attacks; attacks carried out by guerrillas and special operations forces; invasion of islands; patrol and surveillance in the surrounding sea and air areas; response to the violation of airspace, intrusion of armed spy ships, and large-scale and/or nuclear, biological, chemical and radiological disasters. The Guideline provides that when such situations actually take place, in accordance with situation and role-sharing, defense forces will respond in smooth and close collaboration with the police and other relevant organizations to seek seamless response to the situations.

As regards the preparation for full scale invasions of Japan, the Government made the decision to undertake a drastic review to significantly reduce personnel and equipment earmarked to cope with that contingency, based on the judgment that a full scale armed invasion of Japan has become less likely in the foreseeable future. At the same time, however, considering the fact that the essential goal of our defense forces is to counter large-scale aggression, and that restructuring defense forces cannot be completed in short period of time, the Guideline states that Japan will maintain the most basic capabilities of its defense forces, while taking into account developments in neighboring countries and making use of technological progress.

With a view to improving the international security environment, the Guideline provides that Japan will establish infrastructure and make necessary arrangements to engage adequately in international peace cooperation activities. It also states that Japan will strongly promote activities for international peace and stability such as through security dialogues and defense exchanges.

As for the arms export control, Japan will firmly maintain the policy of dealing with the issue carefully, in the light of the basic philosophy as a peaceful nation on which the Three Principles on arms exports is based.

However, regarding the cases related to the ballistic missile defense system, when Japan decides that it will engage in joint development and production, from the viewpoint of contributing to the effective operation of the Japan-U.S. security arrangements and are conductive to the security of Japan, the Government will not apply the Three Principles on arms exports under the condition that strict control is maintained.

In addition, through the formulation process of the new NDPG, questions were raised as to how to handle cases on joint development and production with the United States (other than those related to the ballistic missile defense system), as well as cases in supporting counter-terrorism, counter-piracy and in other efforts made by other countries. The handling of these cases will be decided on a case-by-case basis, in the

light of Japan's basic philosophy as a peaceful nation, which aims at avoiding the escalation of international conflicts.

Japan will conduct the necessary study on how Japan's international peace cooperation shall be based on the new NDPG. At the same time, it will study and subsequently take necessary legal and other measures for Japan's various security and defense policy agendas including positioning of international peace cooperation activities in Self-Defense Forces' mission priorities, and operational issues pertaining to the ballistic missile defense systems.

Considering the importance of clearly indicating the target defense force level in the mid- to long-term, the new NDPG clarifies the vision for the defense forces in the next ten years. However, in order to better adjust our defense to the changing security environment, the NDPG stipulates that it will be reviewed in five years time considering the security environment at that time and be revised as necessary.

* The new MTDBP (Mid-Term Defense Build-up Plan (FY2005-FY2009))

The new MTDBP was adopted to realize the defense forces that Japan should possess stipulated on the new NDPG. As for the total amount of the defense related expense necessary to implement the plan, the target of the new MTDBP is about 24.24 trillion yen based on the cost in FY 2004.

# Appendix D
## U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee Joint Statement

Washington, DC
February 19, 2005

1. United States Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld hosted Japan's Minister for Foreign Affairs Nobutaka Machimura and Minister of State for Defense and Director-General of the Defense Agency Yoshinori Ohno in a meeting of the Security Consultative Committee (SCC) in Washington, DC, on February 19, 2005. They addressed security and alliance issues facing the United States and Japan, as well as other aspects of the relationship.

**Working Together on Challenges Facing the World Today**

2. The Ministers noted the excellent state of cooperative relations between the United States and Japan on a broad array of security, political, and economic issues. They looked to expand that cooperation, recognizing that the U.S.-Japan Alliance, with the U.S.-Japan security arrangements at its core, continues to play a vital role in ensuring the security and prosperity of both the United States and Japan, as well as in enhancing regional and global peace and stability.

3. The Ministers underscored the importance of U.S. and Japanese leadership in providing international assistance to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the broader Middle East – efforts that are already producing results. The Ministers lauded the successful cooperation between the United States and Japan with other countries in extending wide-ranging assistance to those who suffered from the earthquake and the subsequent tsunami disaster in the Indian Ocean.

4. The Ministers recognized that cooperation and consultation between the United States and Japan have been pivotal in promoting nonproliferation, particularly through the Proliferation Security Initiative. They welcomed the success of multinational interdiction exercises hosted by the United States and Japan and by others.

5. The Ministers expressed their confidence that ballistic missile defense (BMD) enhances our ability to defend against and deter ballistic missile attacks and dissuade other parties from investing in ballistic missiles. Taking note of achievements in missile defense cooperation, such as Japan's decision to introduce ballistic missile defense systems and its recent announcement on its Three Principles on Arms Export, the Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to close cooperation on policy and operational matters and to advancing U.S.-Japan cooperative research in BMD systems, with a view to possible cooperative development.

**Common Strategic Objectives**

6. The Ministers discussed the new security environment in which new and emerging threats, such as international terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their means of delivery, have surfaced as common challenges. They recognized that deepening interdependence among nations in a global community means that such threats can affect the security of nations worldwide, including the United States and Japan.

7. While noting that these threats are also emerging in the Asia-Pacific region, the Ministers also emphasized that persistent challenges continue to create unpredictability and uncertainty. Moreover, they noted that modernization of military capabilities in the region also requires attention.

8. The Ministers strongly urged North Korea to return to the Six-Party Talks expeditiously and without preconditions, and to commit itself to complete dismantlement of all its nuclear programs in a transparent manner subject to verification.

9. Based on this understanding of the international security environment, the Ministers concurred that both Governments need to work closely together to pursue common strategic objectives through their respective efforts, implementation of the U.S.-Japan security arrangements, and other joint efforts based on the alliance. Both sides decided to hold regular consultations to

coordinate policies in accordance with these common strategic objectives and to update these objectives as the security environment requires.

10. In the region, common strategic objectives include:
    - Ensure the security of Japan, strengthen peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, and maintain the capability to address contingencies affecting the United States and Japan.
    - Support peaceful unification of the Korean Peninsula.
    - Seek peaceful resolution of issues related to North Korea, including its nuclear programs, ballistic missile activities, illicit activities, and humanitarian issues such as the abduction of Japanese nationals by North Korea.
    - Develop a cooperative relationship with China, welcoming the country to play a responsible and constructive role regionally as well as globally.
    - Encourage the peaceful resolution of issues concerning the Taiwan Strait through dialogue.
    - Encourage China to improve transparency of its military affairs.
    - Encourage Russia's constructive engagement in the Asia-Pacific region.
    - Fully normalize Japan-Russia relations through the resolution of the Northern Territories issue.
    - Promote a peaceful, stable, and vibrant Southeast Asia.
    - Welcome the development of various forms of regional cooperation, while stressing the importance of open, inclusive, and transparent regional mechanisms.
    - Discourage destabilizing sales and transfers of arms and military technology.
    - Maintain the security of maritime traffic.

11. Global common strategic objectives include:
    - Promote fundamental values such as basic human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in the international community.
    - Further consolidate U.S.-Japan partnership in international peace cooperation activities and development assistance to promote peace, stability, and prosperity worldwide.
    - Promote the reduction and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their means of delivery, including through improved reliability and effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and other regimes, and initiatives such as the Proliferation Security Initiative.
    - Prevent and eradicate terrorism.
    - Coordinate efforts to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations Security Council by making the best use of the current momentum to realize Japan's aspiration to become a permanent member.
    - Maintain and enhance the stability of the global energy supply.

**Strengthening of U.S.-Japan Security and Defense Cooperation**

12. The Ministers expressed their support and appreciation for each other's efforts to develop their respective security and defense policies. Japan's new National Defense Program Guidelines (NDPG) emphasize Japan's capability to respond effectively to new threats and diverse contingencies, Japan's active engagement to improve the international security environment, and the importance of the Japan-U.S. Alliance. As a central component of its broad defense transformation effort, the United States is reorienting and strengthening its global defense posture to provide it with appropriate, strategy-driven capabilities in an uncertain security environment. The Ministers confirmed that these efforts will ensure and strengthen effective security and defense cooperation as both countries pursue common strategic objectives.

13. In this context, the Ministers underscored the need to continue examining the roles, missions, and capabilities of Japan's Self Defense Forces and the U.S. Armed Forces required to respond effectively to diverse challenges in a well-coordinated manner. This examination will take into account recent achievements and developments such as Japan's NDPG and new legislation to deal with contingencies, as well as the expanded agreement on mutual logistical support and progress

in BMD cooperation. The Ministers also emphasized the importance of enhancing interoperability between U.S. and Japanese forces.

14. The Ministers concurred that this examination should contribute to these consultations on realignment of U.S. force structure in Japan. They decided to intensify these consultations in a comprehensive effort to strengthen the alliance as the bedrock of Japan's security and the anchor of regional stability. In this context, both sides confirmed their commitment to maintaining deterrence and capabilities of U.S. forces in Japan while reducing the burden on local communities, including those in Okinawa. The Ministers directed their staffs to report expeditiously on the results of these consultations.

15. The Ministers also stressed the importance of continued efforts to enhance positive relations between local communities and U.S. forces. They emphasized that improved implementation of the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), including due attention to the environment, and steady implementation of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) Final Report are important to the stable presence of U.S. forces in Japan.

16. The Ministers, noting that the current Special Measures Agreement (SMA) will expire in March 2006, decided to start consultations on future arrangements to provide appropriate levels of host nation support, bearing in mind the significant role of the SMA in supporting the presence of U.S. forces in Japan.

# Appendix E
# About the Authors

**Ralph A. Cossa** is President of the Pacific Forum CSIS. He is a political-military affairs and national security strategy specialist with over 25 years of experience in formulating, articulating, and implementing U.S. security policy in the Asia-Pacific and Near East-South Asia regions. He is the author of numerous books, journal articles, and op-ed pieces in *The Japan Times, Korea Times,* and the *International Herald Tribune.* He is a retired USAF Colonel and a former National Security Affairs Fellow at the Hoover Institution. He is a member of the ASEAN Regional Forum's Experts and Eminent Persons Group.

**Brad Glosserman** is the Director of Research for the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu and a contributing editor to *The Japan Times*, writing extensively on policy issues and international affairs. Previously, Mr. Glosserman was on the Editorial Board and the Assistant to the Chairman for *The Japan Times* concurrently. His comments and analysis appear regularly in newspapers throughout the Pacific Rim. Mr. Glosserman holds a J.D. from The George Washington University and an M.A. from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.