

# Japan's "Coalition of the Willing" on Security Policies

---

by Robert Pekkanen and Ellis S. Krauss

**Robert Pekkanen** ([pekkanen@u.washington.edu](mailto:pekkanen@u.washington.edu)) is assistant professor of international studies at the University of Washington. **Ellis S. Krauss** ([ekrauss@ucsd.edu](mailto:ekrauss@ucsd.edu)) is professor of international relations and Pacific studies at the University of California, San Diego. This paper is based on a paper presented at FPRI's January 27, 2005, conference, "Party Politics and Foreign Policy in East Asia," held in Philadelphia. The authors thank Michael Strausz for his research assistance.

In 1991, Japan was vilified by many for its "failure" to contribute boots on the ground to the U.S.-led Gulf War. Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu (1989–91) found it difficult to gain support for any cooperation with the U.S.-led coalition in that conflict. Today, Japan's Self-Defense Forces are stationed in a compound in Samuur, Iraq, part of President Bush's "coalition of the willing," and four of its destroyers are positioned in the Indian Ocean to aid the counterterrorism effort in Afghanistan. While many of the United States' NATO allies have been reluctant to aid current American security efforts, especially in Iraq, Japan has been among the staunchest supporters of American military ventures in the Middle East and of its stance toward North Korean nuclear development. As a result, Washington has moved from "bashing Japan" in the 1980s over trade policy and "passing Japan"—ignoring it in favor of the rest of Asia—to lauding it for surpassing most of American's other defense partners. Some even see Japan as having now been permanently "locked in" to American global strategy.<sup>1</sup>

Japan's contributions are of far more than mere symbolic value, reflecting real and substantial shifts in the country's security policies. Up until recently, many thought of Japan as America's "reluctant ally," a country whose pacifist citizenry and "Peace Constitution"—the "antiwar" clause of which, Article 9, proscribed any but a limited military dedicated solely to the defense of the home islands—prevented it from involvement in any U.S. military ventures. During just the last twenty-five years, a chief cabinet secretary resigned in protest when a cabinet member used the word "alliance" to describe Japan's relationship with the United States, and the National Diet, Japan's parliament,

---

<sup>1</sup> Christopher W. Hughes, *Japan's Reemergence as a 'Normal' Military Power* (ISS/Oxford University Press: Adelphi Paper 368-9, 2004).

debated whether local governments had to give permission for Self-Defense Force tanks to ignore traffic lights if Japan were being attacked.

Although party politics plays a critical role in determining Japan's security policies, it is often neglected as a factor in the transformation of those policies, which scholars tend to attribute either to external factors, such as the war on terror and the rise of China, or to domestic factors, such as the strengthening of the prime minister's legal policymaking authority. Four primary explanations have emerged:

1. *Public opinion.* Perhaps the most widespread explanation roots Japan's security policies in public opinion. Many saw pacific public opinion as the primary reason for Japan's earlier strict interpretation of Article 9.<sup>2</sup> But even as early as the 1980s there was a noticeable trend toward greater public acceptance of the Self-Defense Forces and of Japan's becoming a "normal nation" again.<sup>3</sup> It seemed that as the public's attitudes shifted, so did Japan's security policies. However, it can be questioned whether public opinion really is a brake on Japan's defense policy, if it ever was.<sup>4</sup> After all, Japan sent Self-Defense Forces to Iraq even though almost 80 percent of the Japanese public opposed the U.S. invasion—a level similar to those of European countries that did not send troops—and a slight majority also opposed sending Self-Defense Forces there.<sup>5</sup>

2. *Realist calculations.* Another explanation stems from realist international relations theory. In the new, post-Cold War international environment, the argument goes, the main factors spurring Japan's more assertive defense posture are a resurgent China and an increasingly threatening North Korea.<sup>6</sup> But do China and North Korea actually pose a greater threat than the USSR did? Chinese military capabilities still lag far behind the USSR's in 1989. Also, like all realist assertions, this one assumes a simple stimulus-response

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Yoshihide Soeya, "Japan: Normative Constraints Versus Structural Imperatives," in Muthiah Alagappa, ed., *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), pp. 228–31; and Thomas U. Berger, "From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-Militarism," *International Security*, Spring 1993.

<sup>3</sup> On public attitudes toward the Self-Defense Forces, see Michio Muramatsu and Ellis S. Krauss, "The Conservative Policy Line and the Development of Patterned Pluralism," in Kozo Yamamura and Yasukichi Yasuba, eds., *The Political Economy of Japan: Volume 1: The Domestic Transformation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), especially pp. 526–7. On Japan's becoming a "normal nation" again, see Ichiro Ozawa, *Blueprint for a New Japan: The Rethinking of a Nation* (New York: Kodansha America, 1994).

<sup>4</sup> Jennifer M. Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck: Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy," *International Security*, Summer 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Richard P. Cronin, William Cooper, Mark Manyin, and Larry A. Niksch, "Japan-U.S. Relations: Issues for Congress," Congressional Research Service, Report IB97004, Sept. 7, 2004, pp. 5–6; "Japanese Troops Due in Iraq, Opinion Split at Home," *Washington Post*, Jan. 18, 2004; Norimitsu Onishi, "Japan Approves Deployment of Troops to Aid U.S. in Iraq," *New York Times*, Dec. 9, 2003.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., Michael J. Green, *Japan's Reluctant Realism* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

model that treats domestic politics as a black box. It does not explain variation in the four cases we examine later in this paper—(1) the passage of anti-terrorism legislation in 2002, (2) the passage of the Emergency Measures Laws in 2003, (3) the dispatch of Self-Defense Forces to Iraq in 2004, and (4) the debate about constitutional revision in 2005. Finally, Japan's limp military response to the 1991 Gulf War came *after* the end of the Cold War.

3. *Asian concerns.* This explanation emphasizes diminished Asian objections to Japan's militarization, noting that Japan has demonstrated its relatively benign intentions through successful peacekeeping operations.<sup>7</sup> This argument assumes that Asian concerns had operated as a restraint prior to Japan's security initiatives, which is debatable. Despite Chinese objections, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi has continued to visit the Yasukuni Shrine to Japan's fallen soldiers of World War II; Japan continues to participate with the United States in Theater Missile Defense; and it continues to send mixed signals about whether it would aid the United States in a war with China over Taiwan.

4. *Domestic institutions.* Tomahito Shinoda of the International University of Japan has made a strong beginning on examining other causes of the transformation, arguing that it resulted primarily from changes to institutional structures, including electoral and administrative reforms.<sup>8</sup> However, he leaves outside his scope party politics. Institutional change needs to be connected to the wider political and party transformations that occurred only partially as a result of these reforms.

The better explanation for the transformation would link (a) the interrelated, simultaneous effects on domestic politics of a shift in the international system, (b) multifaceted changes in the party system after a major electoral reform, and (c) the strengthened prime ministership. For it was the reform of party and parliamentary politics in Japan in the 1990s that laid the groundwork for the general direction of Japanese security policy since 2000.

## The '55 System

U.S. policy toward Japan reversed course after the onset of the Cold War in 1948. Where Washington had earlier sought democratization and demilitarization—it imposed the Peace Constitution of 1947 as a means of transforming Japan into an unarmed and only lightly industrialized nation—it now desired a rearmed and reindustrialized Japan as an ally against the USSR. Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida's skillful bargaining with Washington in the early 1950s led to the signing of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, which gave the United States unfettered use of bases in Japan for operations against the USSR

<sup>7</sup> Paul Midford, "Japan's Response to Terror: Dispatching the SDF to the Arabian Sea," *Asian Survey*, Mar.-Apr. 2003.

<sup>8</sup> Tomohito Shinoda, "Koizumi's Top-Down Leadership in the Anti-Terrorism Legislation: The Impact of Political Institutional Changes," *SAIS Review*, Winter-Spring 2003.

and China, along with a partially rearmed Japan in the form of Self-Defense Forces of about a quarter million men. In exchange, Japan's military was limited under a strict interpretation of Article 9 as justifying only defensive armed forces. Most of Japan's defense, including nuclear, was entrusted to the Americans, so that Japan could concentrate on economic growth.<sup>9</sup>

But even this was too much for Japan's Left. Those liberals and Socialists who had supported the constitution and previous reforms now turned against the Americans and their anticommunist foreign policy. At the Left's forefront was the Japan Socialist Party (JSP—now the Social Democratic Party). The Right, led by two conservative parties that had disliked the Occupation's previous democratization policies as too liberal and its demilitarization policies as violating Japan's sovereign right to maintain military forces in case of attack, now strongly supported the Americans' anticommunist and rearmament goals. An institutionalized Right-Left split developed within the parliament once the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) was formed in 1955 from the two conservative parties in response to the reunification of the Socialists' rightwing and leftwing. The LDP failed to gather the two-thirds majority of seats in the Diet needed to revise the constitution, while the JSP held on to about one-third of the votes and seats.

By 1960 this polarization came to a massive confrontation over renewal of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. The Left opposed the Treaty as a violation of Article 9, but the heavy-handed tactics of Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi's LDP administration in forcing it through the Diet mobilized even moderates and leftists against the government. At one point, half a million individuals demonstrated in Tokyo's streets and the nation seemed poised on the brink of civil war.<sup>10</sup> After Kishi was forced to resign, more moderate factions assumed leadership of the LDP. The Socialists, who had been gaining strength at the ballot box and so expected to take power, also withdrew from the brink. Any issue related to defense, Article 9, and the alliance with the United States provoked intense parliamentary confrontation, and sometimes in the streets as well. A ritualized game developed in parliament whereby the LDP generally avoided such issues, instead concentrating on rapid economic growth, an issue through which it could elicit wide support. The JSP had acquired a *de facto* veto power over any security measures: they could boycott

<sup>9</sup> Kenneth B. Pyle, "Japan's Postwar National Purpose," ch. 3 of his *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era* (Washington, D.C.: AEI Press, 1996); Richard J. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and Their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 200-11. The same chapter contains an interesting comparison to Alcide De Gasperi, the Italian leader who faced a similar postwar situation to Yoshida's. On how the Yoshida Doctrine is playing out today as a "dual hedge" in the security and economic dimensions, see Eric Heginbotham and Richard J. Samuels, "Japan's Dual Hedge," *Foreign Affairs*, Sept./Oct. 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Robert A. Scalapino and Junnosuke Masumi, *Parties and Politics in Contemporary Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), ch. V ("The Crisis of May-June, 1960").

Diet sessions or bring them to a halt with procedural delays if the LDP attempted to get an unpopular security measure passed. Since Japan's ordinary parliamentary session is only half a year, the LDP would then be unable to pass other legislation during a session and would appear antidemocratic if it exercised its majority single-handedly.

This pattern was possible because Japan then had a multi-member district, single non-transferable vote electoral system. Unlike in single-member systems such as the U.S. House of Representatives or the UK's House of Commons, a voter in Japan had one vote, but more than one person was elected—in most districts the top 3, 4, or even 5 vote-getters. This electoral system contributed to the dominance of the LDP, the only party large enough to run more than one candidate in nearly every district. The system also encouraged a limited multi-party opposition, since minority parties could capture a seat with only 15-20 percent of the vote in a district. This enabled the JSP to maintain enough seats to remain the main opposition party, and also encouraged, over time, the growth of smaller opposition parties. These included the Democratic Socialist Party (DSP), a more centrist splinter group from the JSP; the Japanese Communist Party; and the Clean Government Party (CGP), an offshoot of a Buddhist movement that achieved some electoral success after the 1960s and also was inclined toward maintaining the security status quo and Article 9. Although the LDP and JSP both lost seats after the 1970s to these smaller opposition parties, together the Socialist, Clean Government, and Communist parties—all of which opposed military expansion—could always muster about two-fifths of votes and seats in parliament. This was enough to make the LDP leery of attempting to push through a more militant defense policy over opposition objections.

Nor was there a strong leader in the LDP who could unify his party on such issues. By pitting LDP candidates against each other, the single non-transferable vote system helped to perpetuate intra-party factionalism. In order to become prime minister, a faction leader had to ally with other faction leaders. Being beholden to these other leaders for his job weakened his power. Although the factions were not based on policy differences but on pursuit of the premier post, some factions, such as the one led by Masayoshi Ohira and Kiichi Miyazawa during the 1970s to the '90s, were more favorably inclined to maintaining the status quo on defense and not antagonizing the opposition. Therefore, the single non-transferable vote system that reinforced party factionalism and a weak prime minister also contributed to the perpetuation of the '55 system and its avoidance of controversial defense issues.

### **The End of the Cold War and New Domestic Party Cleavages**

After 1989, Japan began to transcend the old party system, which had been polarized around Cold War security issues. No event signified this better

than the surprising coalition in 1994 between the LDP and its erstwhile major ideological enemy, the JSP. The LDP lost power when about thirty of its members defected in 1993 over electoral reform issues, and the coalition that came to power (which included all of the major opposition parties except the Communists) pushed through an electoral reform bill in 1994, but then split apart when the JSP deserted to form its own “odd couple” coalition with the LDP, bringing the latter back to power. Such a coalition would have been unthinkable before 1989.

The price the Socialists paid for being able to have one of their leaders made prime minister was having to abandon their core principles: a strict interpretation of Article 9 and opposition to the military alliance with the United States and maintaining Self-Defense Forces. In return for recognizing the LDP’s interpretation of the constitution and its stance on the alliance, JSP leader Tomiichi Murayama became prime minister of an otherwise LDP-dominated cabinet. The JSP’s “public conversion” on security permitted a revision in 1995 of the National Defense Program Outline, which had not been amended since its adoption in 1976.

Trading security principles for the premiership, however, turned out to be a Faustian bargain for the JSP, for whom Murayama was able to do little except manage to finally give an apology to the Chinese for Japan’s aggression in 1937-45. Meanwhile, many supporters left the party in disgust over its abandoning its long-held principles. Had the JSP moved to the center twenty years earlier, when much of the Japanese public was beginning to do so, it could have become a viable alternative governing party to the LDP.<sup>11</sup> Instead, by waiting so long and then changing so precipitously, the JSP began its exit as a force on the political stage. In the 1996 elections that brought in the LDP’s Hashimoto Cabinet, the JSP received less than half the votes it had in the 1993 election and only three seats.

### *The New Electoral System*

The JSP’s demise was aided by the advent of a new electoral system in the 1996 election. The short-lived coalition government of 1993-94 owed much to the end of the Cold War and the JSP’s public recanting on security issues. Without these events, it is quite unlikely that either the DSP—which had split from the JSP in 1960 over differences on the alliance and defense issues and which was almost as conservative as the LDP on security matters—or the JSP would have been willing to enter the same coalition. This would have prevented the opposition coalition from obtaining enough votes to come to power and thus, in the less than a year it was in office, to accomplish two important pieces of legislation—electoral reform and campaign finance reform—that further changed the party system.

<sup>11</sup> Gerald L. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 145-8.

The electoral reform of 1994 introduced a new, hybrid mixed-member electoral system consisting of 300 single-member districts, along with 200 (later reduced to 180) seats elected through party-list, proportional-representation regional districts, a system similar to those of several continental European democracies. Voters would get two ballots: one for an individual in the single-member district and one for the party in the proportional-representation regional constituencies, with the candidates elected based on their pre-election party-list ranking. This provided the strong link to constituents afforded by single-member districts and also proportional-representation legislators who could focus on providing public goods such as security.

The new, mixed-member system had several important consequences for the structure of Japan's party system. Such systems encourage voters not to waste their vote for any but the two largest parties, since smaller parties have little chance of picking up many seats in winner-take-all districts.<sup>12</sup> Thus it accelerated the decline of the JSP to a shadow of its former self. But the single-member district system also encouraged other small parties to reunite. Moderate center parties united into the New Frontier Party, which became the second largest and main opposition to the LDP in the 1996 election.

The mixed-member system also had significant consequences for the LDP. As a larger party, it benefited from and was able to capture a majority of seats in single-member districts. On the other hand, because proportional representation allowed even smaller parties to gain representation with a small percentage of the vote, the mixed-member system encouraged a limited multiparty system, with a couple of larger parties and a few smaller ones. This made it more difficult for the LDP to gain the majority of seats in the Diet that it had enjoyed for most of the postwar years, and therefore forced it to bring other parties into coalition with it to retain power and a majority of seats.

As it turned out, the JSP was again one of the two smaller parties the LDP chose to bring into its coalition. Again, however, the LDP dominated the Hashimoto cabinet, and because the JSP had already modified its stance on the U.S. alliance and U.S.-Japan Mutual Security Treaty, this government was able to stop the drift in the alliance that had been occurring since 1989.<sup>13</sup> In 1996, Prime Minister Hashimoto and President Clinton reaffirmed their commitment to the alliance and the Treaty, beginning a continuing process of strengthening the security relationship.

Part of this process was the passage in the spring/summer of 1999 of a revised "Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation,"<sup>14</sup> which provide the

<sup>12</sup>Duverger's Law states that the number of parties will equal the average number of representatives in districts plus 1. Thus in a single-member districts system, the likelihood is for a two-party system. Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, translated by Barbara and Robert North (New York: Wiley, 1954).

<sup>13</sup>Yoichi Funabashi, *Alliance Adrift* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1999).

<sup>14</sup>The Guidelines are available at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan's website, [www.mofa.go.jp](http://www.mofa.go.jp).



operational outline for implementing the Security Treaty and had not been revised since 1978. These laws legitimized Japan's aiding the activities of U.S. forces "in areas surrounding Japan [*shuben*] that had an important impact on Japan's peace and security," even in conflicts that did not immediately involve a direct attack on Japan. This was the first time the Self-Defense Forces were authorized to be involved in more than the defense of Japan per se. This legislation shifted the emphasis of the Security Treaty from Article 5, which focused on the defense of Japan and had always been the core of the alliance, to Article 6, dealing with regional stability, hitherto a more subsidiary purpose of the alliance.<sup>15</sup>

The revised Guidelines were only the first in a series of new security initiatives Japan took over the next five years. These included antiterrorism legislation in the wake of 9/11, which allowed it to send destroyers to the Indian Ocean; laws to allow the dispatch of Self-Defense Forces to Iraq under the rubric of the U.S. alliance rather than UN peacekeeping; and legislation to enhance the ability of the Self-Defense Forces and government to function in times of national emergency.

None of these would have been possible without the new electoral system. The hybrid mixed-member system kept the opposition parties suspended between the need to unite, in order to pool votes against the LDP, and the need to retain separate identities, by relying on the proportional-representation system to guarantee them a minimum number of seats.<sup>16</sup> The centripetal force of the single-member districts induced the smaller parties to first coalesce into the New Frontier Party; then the centrifugal force of proportional representation worked to help disband it a few years later. Meanwhile, the newly formed Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) soon attracted splinter groups and parties that stood a better chance of influence and even eventual power if they joined together—even if they had fundamental disagreements on security issues, as the Socialists and the Liberals did. The DPJ soon became the chief and largest opposition party. Like the LDP, it does better in the single-member districts than in the proportional-representation vote. The proportional-representation portion, however, supported the continuing existence of the CGP, which went into a coalition government with the LDP despite some initial differences on security matters.

The hybrid system's formal and informal alliances and constant splits transformed the basic cleavage of the '55 party system, which had been between the LDP and JSP over security and defense. Differences over security

<sup>15</sup> Chris Hughes and Akiko Fukushima, "Japan-U.S. Security Relations—Toward Bilateralism Plus?" in Ellis S. Krauss and T. J. Pempel, eds., *Beyond Bilateralism: The U.S.-Japan Relationship in the New Asia-Pacific* (Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 72.

<sup>16</sup> Karen E. Cox and Leonard J. Schoppa, "Interaction Effects in Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: Theory and Evidence From Germany, Japan, and Italy," *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 35, no. 9 (2002), discusses the effects of the two kinds of systems as well as the complicated "interaction effects" of combining them into a mixed-member system.



matters no longer cut as deeply between parties. The chief opposition party, the DPJ, is partially composed of former LDP legislators, such as Hatoyama Yukio, who are much closer to the LDP on defense than pre-reform, opposition-party Diet members had been. Security differences may be less ideological and more pragmatic, but they now run within the parties. Thus some of the former LDP members' new party colleagues are former Socialists who, while more accommodating after Murayama's compromises with the LDP of 1994, nonetheless remain more leftist about such matters than their former LDP counterparts.<sup>17</sup>

At the same time, the CGP is torn between its former, more pacifist principles on defense and the temptation to compromise with the LDP in order to stay in power. Finally, the hybrid system makes intra-party differences on defense a potential cause for further splits, especially within the DPJ. There are now numerous new options for each party on these issues. The DPJ must continually try to hammer out a defense position vis-à-vis the LDP that gives it a separate, if not too oppositional, identity, while also satisfying both former conservatives and former leftist parts of the party, who often disagree on these matters. The CGP must weigh maintaining its more dovish identity against its need to stay in power by creating common defense policies with the LDP. And the LDP, always a party that combined strong hawks and members who are more moderate on defense, can now manipulate the divisions within the other parties and identify common ground based on which they can get moderate defense initiatives passed. This new era of inter-party negotiation, intra-party compromises, and convoluted policymaking within and between the parties set the stage for new initiatives on defense. All that was still required was an enhanced role for the prime minister.

### *The New Prominence of the Prime Minister*

It is usually taken for granted that Prime Minister Koizumi has pushed his party and nation into its new, strong defense posture, enabled by new public attitudes and/or his popularity. Both of these have helped, but more important is a longer-term structural change in the role of prime minister, especially in security matters.

Up until the 1980s, the prime minister's influence in policymaking was weak. He was hamstrung by rival faction leaders, a strong bureaucracy, and "tribes" of influential veteran colleagues (*zoku*) in specific policy areas who parlayed their long experience in legislative committees into near-control over

<sup>17</sup> See Leonard J. Schoppa, "Neoliberal Economic Policy Preferences of the 'New Left': Home-Grown or an Anglo-American Import?" in Rikki Kersten and David Williams, eds., *The Left in Japanese Politics* (forthcoming, Routledge, Nov. 2005).

policy in those areas. Domestically, he was able only to throw some extra energy behind a given policy initiative.<sup>18</sup> In foreign policy, maintaining good relations with the United States and bringing back occasional “souvenirs” (*omiyage*) of concessions on trips to Washington were his main policy resources.

Even today, these characteristics are seen as continuing the country’s “leadership deficit,” limiting Koizumi’s ability to bring about economic reform.<sup>19</sup> However, particularly in the area of foreign policy and defense, the last twenty years have witnessed a strengthening of the premier’s role in Japan. These transformations began with Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone (1982–87), who used television to cultivate an image at home as a world leader and undertook unprecedented defense and security measures, such as extending the Self-Defense Forces’ protection of Japan’s sea lanes and concluding a military technology transfer agreement with the United States.<sup>20</sup>

Nakasone’s security initiatives were primarily executive decisions that did not require major legislative action, and subsequent prime ministers until Koizumi did not undertake equivalent initiatives. However, the process of carving out a separate role for the prime minister—making him less the undifferentiated creature of his party and more of an independent player—had begun. Future prime ministers, such as Motohiro Hosokawa, the popular leader of the 1993–94 opposition coalition, and Ryutaro Hashimoto (1996–98), would use similar tactics of popular appeal and exploiting Japan’s newfound economic strength to increase their power at home. As a result, the prime minister has over time become more active in parliamentary election campaigns and more extensively covered by the media, and his image now has a greater influence on elections.<sup>21</sup> He has also become more active in chairing policymaking commissions, participating in overseas meetings, and hosting foreign guests, thus giving him more policy influence and media “photo ops.” This has given him enhanced resources to exercise influence, especially in making foreign policy.

Institutional reforms have reinforced this trend. The 2001 administrative reform of the Japanese government gave the prime minister a more central role in security and crisis policymaking.<sup>22</sup> The 1994 House of Representatives electoral reform buttressed his power: by giving them more control over nominations, proportional representation strengthens the prime minister

<sup>18</sup> Kenji Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989).

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., Aurelia George Mulgan, “Japan: A Setting Sun?” *Foreign Affairs*, July/Aug. 2000, and her *Japan’s Failed Revolution: Koizumi and the Politics of Economic Reform* (Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, 2002).

<sup>20</sup> Michio Muramatsu, “In Search of National Identity: The Politics and Policies of the Nakasone Administration,” *Journal of Japanese Studies*, Summer 1987.

<sup>21</sup> Ellis S. Krauss and Benjamin Nyblade, “‘Presidentialization’ in Japan? The Prime Minister, Media and Elections in Japan,” *British Journal of Political Science*, April 2005.

<sup>22</sup> Shinoda, “Koizumi’s Top-Down Leadership,” pp. 25–28.

and party leaders over backbenchers.<sup>23</sup> That reform, along with its companion, campaign-finance reform, also severely weakened the party factions, depriving them of power over both nominations and candidate funding. Finally, by producing coalition governments, which necessitate inter-party bargaining on policy, the hybrid system allows the prime minister and his cabinet to play a greater role in initiating and negotiating policy.<sup>24</sup>

The following case studies illustrate how these transformed domestic structural variables made possible the major security transitions of the past four years.

### **Case 1: Antiterrorism Legislation**

After the 9/11 attacks, Prime Minister Koizumi wanted to show prompt support for the United States. Japan's failure to do more than provide money to aid the coalition's cause in the Gulf War had subjected it to scathing criticism as practicing only "checkbook diplomacy" while other countries sent their young men to die for Kuwait's freedom. This time, Koizumi proposed a plan to send the Self-Defense Forces to the Indian Ocean to give non-combat support to U.S. forces operating there, to provide humanitarian aid and fund rescue and reconstruction efforts in the region and to strengthen the protection of U.S. bases in Japan. Most Japanese supported providing this aid to American military operations.<sup>25</sup>

Talks within the ruling coalition of the LDP, the CGP, and the small Conservative Party began, and a general consensus was quickly reached before the outline of the proposed new laws was even explained to the leaders of the LDP's major foreign policy committees. The top-down nature of the prime minister's and then the coalition leaders' initiative, reversing the LDP's standard pre-1990s legislative process, was clear,<sup>26</sup> and the initiative overcame the resistance of major faction leaders.

The concerns of the LDP's main coalition partner, the more dovish CGP, were allayed when the LDP compromised on some issues, most notably putting a two-year time limit on the deployment in the Indian Ocean. The CGP dropped its initial proposal that the UN had to authorize the action. By early October, the ruling coalition had agreed in principle to the bills. Intensive negotiations were then held between and among the ruling coalition and the DPJ, which also supported the legislation but had specific concerns reflecting its own divided party.

<sup>23</sup> A previous 1983 reform in the House of Councillors had also added a proportional-representation portion to that body's electoral system.

<sup>24</sup> Ellis S. Krauss and Robert Pekkanen, "Explaining Party Adaptation to Electoral Reform: The Discreet Charm of the LDP?" *Journal of Japanese Studies*, Winter 2004.

<sup>25</sup> Shinoda, "Koizumi's Top-Down Leadership," pp. 29–30.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 30–31.

In the post–Cold War climate, differences on defense issues among the parties were less intense and subject to negotiation. The former inter-party cleavages had yielded to intra-party differences within the LDP, more so within the CGP, and most especially within the DPJ. Electoral reform had necessitated complex negotiations among a tripartite ruling coalition government. It also made possible a more moderate opposition. The entire process from beginning to end was a top-down success for the prime minister and the leaders of the ruling coalition.

## **Case 2: Sending Self-Defense Forces to Iraq**

The process by which Japan wound up dispatching Self-Defense Forces to Iraq reflects similar patterns. The legislation originated with Koizumi and the cabinet in fall 2002, when informal discussions began within the cabinet secretariat. In March 2003, with the U.S. invasion imminent, the security group within the secretariat met again. In May, after the U.S. military victory, Koizumi met with President Bush and publicly promised that Japan would offer non-combat support for the United States there. There were two immediate issues to be resolved on which there was some intra-party disagreement: whether the Self-Defense Forces would be responsible for handling WMD and what the weapons transport arrangements would be. It was resolved that the law would not allow Self-Defense Forces to handle WMD, and a compromise was reached on weapons transport. But outside these councils there was less easily resolved opposition from LDP factions, whose leaders opposed Koizumi and sought to embarrass him before the upcoming LDP election for party president. Meanwhile, there was some disgruntlement within the LDP's coalition partner, the CGP, even if its official statements had been positive about the proposed bill.<sup>27</sup>

Party leadership, however, quickly moved to short-circuit the opposition and ended further discussion. Despite deep-seated LDP resistance, that party was willing to give ground on a proposed reform of the Basic Education Law in exchange for the CGP's support. Meanwhile, Naoto Kan, then president of the opposition DPJ, avoided taking a firm stand on the issue, attempting to keep his divided party's options open. On June 3 he announced a double-negative position—"We are not taking the stance that we will automatically not support necessary reconstruction in Iraq"—even

<sup>27</sup> Tomohito Shinoda, "Japan's Policy Process on Iraq," presentation given to the authors at SAIS, October 2004; *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 10, 2003; "Diet Discusses Arms and Ammunition Transportation," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 11, 2003; "Politics, Money, and Iraq Act: Led by LDP; CGP is Complaining," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 30, 2003; "Real Discussion on New Iraq Act has Begun," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 11, 2003; "Draft of New Iraq Act to be Submitted to Diet Today," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 13, 2003; "Draft of New Iraq Act to be Submitted on June 13," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 5, 2003.

though the Liberal and Social Democratic Parties had already decided against supporting the deployment. But pressure from within his own party continued to mount. DPJ inspection teams that had visited Iraq and intra-party study groups began to issue reports arguing against dispatching Self-Defense Forces.<sup>28</sup>

A key figure in the DPJ internal politics was Seiji Maehara, a pragmatist on security issues who favors revising Article 9. Maehara's view was that all Diet members, whether in the ruling camp or the opposition, should work together to achieve war-contingency legislation.<sup>29</sup> Talks ultimately broke down, however. The legislation was passed, supported by only the ruling coalition; two top LDP lawmakers walked out in protest.

The Iraq legislation again shows the effects of a sublimated and lessened cleavage between parties. They argued over differences of policy, not ideology or pro-defense vs. anti-defense. It also shows the intra-party divisions on these substantive issues, a coalition government that needed to achieve consensus, and top-down prime ministerial leadership that overcame resistance from factional opponents.

### Case 3: Emergency Measures Laws

The government submitted three Emergency Measures Bills (*yuuji rippou*) to the Diet on April 17, 2002. However, an opposition boycott of some Diet sessions on the grounds that there had been insufficient deliberation meant that nothing happened during the 2002 legislative session. The CGP's position during this time was described as "cautious." In April 2003, the Diet began its session with deliberations on the bills; the DPJ proposed its own version of them later that month. The parties were divided on the issues of giving the Self-Defense Forces access to private land, the definition of an emergency, and how to address security concerns such as the spy ships appearing in Japanese waters.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> "Completed," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 30, 2003; "Politics, Money, and Iraq Act;" "Government Party Helps Each Other on the Election for the House of Representatives: CGP has Influence, LDP and CGP to Endorse Candidacies without Question," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 6, 2003; "We Should be Part of Iraq's Reconstruction," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 4, 2003; "DP Accommodates New Iraq Act," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 11, 2003; "DP Waiting to See What Happens," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 13, 2003; "Is Baghdad Safe Enough for SDF? It Depends on Which Party You Ask," *Japan Times*, July 2, 2003; "DPJ Against the Draft, Act Revised, Waiting for Government Party's Reaction," *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, June 13, 2003.

<sup>29</sup> "DPJ Security Advocate Bridges Internal, LDP Gaps," *Japan Times*, June 19, 2003.

<sup>30</sup> "State to Debate Emergency Measures," *Nikkei Weekly*, Apr. 22, 2002; "Emergency Bills Back on Track," *Japan Times*, Apr. 28, 2002, and "Military Bills Put Off Until Next Diet Session," *Asahi Shimbun*, June 14, 2002; "Diet Panel Starts Debating Attack Response Legislation," *Japan Times*, Apr. 19, 2003; and "Minshuto Offers Its own Emergency Bills," *Asahi Shimbun*, May 2, 2003.

Once again, Koizumi faced opposition from his own party and the DPJ was divided. Yukio Hatoyama's group wanted to approve the LDP's proposal, even after the DPJ released its own version of the law. Former socialists were intensely critical of the LDP version. LDP and DPJ leaders met in May, and Kan and Koizumi announced agreement on compromise legislation. The LDP and DPJ were able to work out a compromise solution without the LDP's having to accede to demands by the CGP to include elaborate safeguards for human rights.<sup>31</sup>

The DPJ is clearly a party with which the LDP can work on security issues. This case provided evidence of that fact to CGP politicians, who after 2003 had to be even more mindful of a possible LDP-DPJ agreement that would leave them out in the cold.

#### **Almost Case 4: Constitutional Revision in 2005?**

Constitutional revision is another important branch of security policy in which intra- and inter-party bargaining will play a crucial role, as constitutional revision requires two-thirds majorities in both Houses of the Diet and a majority in a national referendum. However, many factors point to some kind of constitutional revision occurring in the near future. Japan's quasi-public Japan Broadcasting Corporation found in 2002 that 58 percent supported constitutional revision, up from 35 percent a decade earlier, as did a poll by the moderately leftist *Asabi* newspaper. Other papers' polls have found even stronger support, with younger people more likely to favor revision than those in their 40s and older. Polls asking specifically about revision of Article 9 and whether to allow collective self-defense find lesser but growing support. The increased salience of the U.S.-Japan alliance in today's security climate means many Japanese want more flexibility to cooperate with the United States than Article 9 appears to provide.

Second, the LDP appears determined to push for a revision to coincide with its fiftieth anniversary. The conservative *Yomiuri* newspaper, for example, found in 2002 that 55 percent of Diet members favored revision of Article 9, up from 41 percent five years earlier. A survey it undertook in 2004 found that support had grown to overwhelming levels, and 84.5 percent of legislators in both houses supported constitutional revision. A *Mainichi Shimbun* survey that year found that 78 percent of Diet Members supported revision; this included 96 percent of LDP members, 80 percent of CGP members, and 73 percent of DPJ legislators (every member of the Communist Party and the JSP-successor party, the Social Democratic Party of Japan, was opposed). In the Diet, as with the general public, support for revising Article 9 is lower—30 percent for Clause 1 (the renunciation of war) and 43 percent for Clause 2 (the renunciation of war potential). With Koizumi's term as prime minister ending in September 2006, it is not hard to imagine a sustained push from the

<sup>31</sup> "LDP Seeks Early End to Talks on Military Emergency Bills," *Asabi Shimbun*, May 10, 2003.

prime minister's office in 2005. He announced in August 2003 that the LDP would formulate plans for the revision and repeated this as a campaign pledge before the Lower House elections in 2003. Reports on five-year-long studies by each of the House of Representatives' and the House of Councilors' commissions on the constitution are expected this spring.

Clearly, the exact provisions of any amendment to Article 9 will be subject to inter- and intra-party bargaining. Within the LDP, some merely want to produce a native document, even if Article 9 is only modestly rewritten, while others are more concerned with liberating Japan's security policy from constitutional constraints. Across the aisle, some liberals in the DPJ strongly resist any revision, but several party leaders, including prominent DPJ legislators such as Ichiro Ozawa and Yukio Hatoyama, are already on the record as favoring revision.<sup>32</sup> In January 2004, then DPJ President Kan announced that his party would work on its own proposal for revision, to be completed by 2006. Current DPJ President Katsuya Okada touched on the issue briefly in July 2004 in a Washington, D.C. speech, though the party distanced itself from his remarks. The CGP has expressed an interest in the creation of new rights in the constitution, such as "environmental rights," which would ease logrolling with the LDP.

## Conclusion

The end of the Cold War, shifts in public opinion, different perceived external threats, diminished regional constraints, and institutional reform may have been the necessary conditions for Koizumi's security policies, but they are not alone sufficient explanations without an examination of party politics.

Without the structural changes in party politics brought about by electoral reform and the new role of the prime minister, abetted by other institutional reforms, the antiterrorism bill and the Iraq bill could not have passed. Even though the DPJ contains pacifist former JSP members, it hews to a much more centrist line. In part, this is determined by its need to appeal to the median voter in a revamped electoral system. Consider the case of Seiji Maehara, so important to the formulation of DPJ policy in the cases above. Yukio Edano, another prominent young DPJ legislator, describes him as "neither a hawk nor conservative. He's a realist and a politician who emerged after the so-called 1955-system era."<sup>33</sup> A political career like Maehara's only became possible after the end of the '55-system—the changes in the party system and parties themselves wrought by electoral reform are responsible for pragmatists like Maehara, instead of ideologues, making security policy for the

<sup>32</sup> Ichiro Ozawa even penned "A Draft Proposal for Revision of Japan's Constitution" in the influential journal *Bungei Shunju* in September 1999. Hatoyama made his proposals in 1999, while he was DPJ president, also in *Bungei Shunju*. "Acknowledge the SDF as Armed Forces," October 1999.

<sup>33</sup> "DPJ Security Advocate Bridges Internal, LDP Gaps" *Japan Times*, June 19, 2003.



leading opposition party. Further, only the splits and recombinations among the parties brought about by the electoral system made possible the emergence of a moderate opposition party like the DPJ.

Inter-party dynamics are another crucial part of the story. Coalition government itself concentrates policymaking at the level of party leadership. Were the LDP ruling alone, Koizumi might have faced a vastly different reaction to his innovative decision-making. Furthermore, according to an LDP minister familiar with the making of security policy, JSP and LDP participation in the Murayama coalition government was another critical step. This coalition forced JSP members who eventually migrated to the DPJ to become more pragmatic and willing to deal within their new party.<sup>34</sup>

Table 1. Summary of Case Studies

Case	LDP-CGP Bargain	LDP-DPJ Bargain	Public Opinion	Passage
Antiterror Legislation 2001	Yes. LDP concession on legislation.	No	Pro	Yes
Emergency Measures Law 2002	No	No	Mixed	No
Emergency Measures Law 2003	No	Yes	Mixed	Yes
Self-Defense Forces dispatch to Iraq 2004 (passed 2003)	Yes. LDP-CGP logroll.	No	Con	Yes
Constitutional revision 2005?	Likely	Almost certain	Pro	?

The sequencing and interrelationships of these factors was crucial.<sup>35</sup> The end of the Cold War diminished domestic party cleavages, making possible the coalition government that passed the electoral reform, which in turn strengthened and expanded the role of the prime minister, allowing for the further diminution of the '55-system cleavages. The new intra- and inter-party dynamics create tensions in policymaking that will work themselves out differently case by case, with the only certainty being compromise: no one among the prime minister, the opposition, and the LDP rank-and-file will get everything they want on any issue.



<sup>34</sup> Interview with LDP House of Representatives Diet member, Aug. 26, 2004.

<sup>35</sup> On the importance of timing and sequence in creating a particular pattern of political outcomes, see Paul Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), pp. 54–78.