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ABSTRACT

Seapower can be an ambiguous concept, difficult to understand and research, because it is composed of a number of factors across specialized areas, which mutually affect each other. It is a difficult duty for governments, which need national support to weave the components of seapower into a national engine for the sake of developing seapower in defence of national interests.

It can be said that alliance strategy can exert a strong influence on a state. In the Japan context, there are a lot of benefits and risks brought by an alliance. For sea powers, it may be no exaggeration to say that whether to contribute to maritime-oriented coalitions as a member nation seriously influences the fate of the nation. Each state is able to increase mutual trust thorough the operation of maritime coalitions. It would reduce the possibility of conflicts over maritime interests between member states and contribute to good order at sea. There are several external sources of instability for the Japanese islands from neighbouring countries. The location of Japan is on the frontline facing the rimland of the Eurasian Continent in which the great sea power and the great land power have to stand face to face. The United States, as the offshore balancer, has thus placed special emphasis on Japan and its geopolitical location.

The security frameworks of maritime coalitions that Japan joins or even leads are effective tools in the fight against various threats to the Japanese islands and its sea lines of communication (SLOC). The Japanese government is currently forming maritime coalitions through the activities of its navy and the Japan Coast Guard (JCG), but a fact that Japan is unable to exercise the right to collective security and places legal limitations on its maritime forces’ operations are major stumbling blocks in efforts to establish and develop the firm bond of maritime coalitions.
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### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>Anti-Ballistic Missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEGIS</td>
<td>Advanced Surface to Air Missile System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZUS</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand and U.S. (Alliance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASG</td>
<td>Abu Sayyaf Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW</td>
<td>Anti-Submarine Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWACS</td>
<td>Airborne Warning and Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDS</td>
<td>Boost Defense Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMD</td>
<td>ballistic missile defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Confidence-Building Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Coastal Safety Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Combat Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLB</td>
<td>Cabinet Legislation Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDH</td>
<td>Helicopter-equipped destroyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>guided-missile destroyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO</td>
<td>JMSDF Maritime Staff Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Europe Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>Japanese Shipowner’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>All Japan Seaman’s Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJ</td>
<td>Petroleum Association of Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSEX</td>
<td>passing exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIDEASTFOR</td>
<td>Commander, Middle East Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNFE</td>
<td>Commander, Naval Force, Far East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMNAVFE</td>
<td>Commander, United States Naval Forces, Far East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNO</td>
<td>Chief of Naval Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Guided-missile Destroyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPJ</td>
<td>Democratic Party of Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRK</td>
<td>Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOP</td>
<td>exclusively defense-oriented policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Excusive Economic Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Financial Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHQ</td>
<td>General Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA/DR</td>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEA</td>
<td>International Atomic Energy Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJN</td>
<td>Imperial Japanese Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICBM</td>
<td>Inter-continental ballistic missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>International Maritime Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>International Maritime Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>Information Sharing Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCG</td>
<td>Japan Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDA</td>
<td>Japan Defense Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>Jemaah Islamiyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMSDF</td>
<td>Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSDF</td>
<td>Japan Self-Defense Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASDF</td>
<td>Japan Air Self-Defense Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Joint Chiefs of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGSDF</td>
<td>Japan Ground Self-Defense Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>Liberal Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG</td>
<td>Liquid Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSL</td>
<td>Large Support Landing Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTE</td>
<td>Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAG-J</td>
<td>Military Assistance and Advisory Group, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>Mutually Assured Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Mine Countermeasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAO</td>
<td>Mutual Defense Assistance Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>Marine Expeditionary Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILF</td>
<td>Moro Islamic Liberation Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB</td>
<td>Main Operating Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>Mitsui OSK Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOTW</td>
<td>Military Operations Other Than War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Maritime Safety Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Mutual Security Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Maritime Safety Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPO</td>
<td>National Defense Program Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>National Police Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPRF</td>
<td>National Police Reserve Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>National Safety Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTWD</td>
<td>Navy Theater Wide Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Proliferation Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>People’s Liberation Army, Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCAAP</td>
<td>Regional Cooperation against Act of Piracy and Armed robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSI</td>
<td>Regional Maritime Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMPAC</td>
<td>Rim of the Pacific Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Search and Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>Shanghai Cooperation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLBM</td>
<td>Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOC (s)</td>
<td>sea line(s) of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Standard Missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPs</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBN</td>
<td>Nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSK</td>
<td>Diesel-powered attack submarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMD</td>
<td>Theater Missile Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMD WG</td>
<td>TMD Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCLOS</td>
<td>United Nations Convention for the Law of the Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFJ</td>
<td>United States Forces Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLCC</td>
<td>Very Large Crude oil Carriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The oceans are indispensable for the national strategy of all states, even those which are landlocked. The concept of seapower has been studied extensively and it has been pointed out that seapower serves as an important national strategic tool for a maritime state. Today, the ever-increasing significance of seapower is in little doubt. The ocean and its strategic consequences have shaped political cultures and the details of historical development of states, including Japan. In modern history, Japan’s geo-strategic orientation has been a key factor in Japan’s international political status, its national power and its strategic environment. It has been most successful when it has pursued a maritime orientation involving cooperative engagement with other maritime partner states. For maritime states, appropriate geopolitical and alliance polices are essential when considering grand strategy. This is particularly the case for a sea-girt state like Japan, because ocean space cannot be controlled by a single power, and maritime states must calculate the strategic relationship between landpower and seapower for their security and defence, as discussed in Chapter 2. Japan is currently undergoing some change in outlook, as it expands its maritime orientation beyond just its close alliance relationship with the Unites States to develop relationships with other security partnerships and to play a greater role in protecting the international maritime system upon which it so greatly depends. This thesis is the first study that takes an integrated approach to the theory of seapower and maritime-oriented coalitions with respect to Japan, and does so at a propitious time, as Japan’s maritime diplomacy widens and its international engagement grows.

Background

Sea and Power
Two essential features of the Earth are the existence of life and the existence of the sea.\footnote{Ryouhei Murata, \textit{Umi ga Nihon no Shourai wo Kimeru} [The Sea Decides Japan’s Future], Seizandô Shoten, Tokyo, 2006, p. 2.} Approximately 71 per cent of the Earth’s surface is covered by the sea, of which the surface area is 361 million square kilometres. Life arrived on the Earth over one billion
years ago,² and it still depends on the oceans; and the natural circulation of water has directly or indirectly had a strong influence on the natural environment and the quality of life for human beings. In particular, humankind has utilized the oceans since ancient times for nutrition, to carry goods, communicate and conduct political activity, including engaging in conflicts and wars.

War has often been tied closely to the sea, which has acted both as a means and a cause of conflict. In spite of this, in strategic studies, “power from the sea” rarely had been discussed in detail until the American naval officer and theorist of seapower, Alfred Thayer Mahan, began to publish in the late nineteenth century what were at the time very popular books in praise of the strategic value of seapower. At any rate, in contemporary circumstances, a large number of sovereign states have devoted themselves to developing both their naval power and maritime strategy, as there is a growing recognition of the benefits, and even necessity, of enhancing national seapower.

As a matter of fact, it has been decided already who has ownership of the land territory of the Earth, except for Antarctica, and it is difficult to change the geopolitical structure of the continents. In contrast, the world’s ocean space has not been very clearly defined in a way similar to that which pertains on land. The waters of the world’s oceans and seas surround all the continents, providing a three dimensional space for strategic activity: that is, on, under and over the sea. In regard especially to strategic and economic factors, the value of the sea has increased to a greater extent than ever before, and this value will only increase further in the future.³ Today, the significance of seapower has been widely recognized in the international community. Some of the main reasons for this trend include the increasing strategic value of marine resources; the importance of being able to advance the projection of national influence at and from the sea; the high dependence of global trade on maritime transportation; and the influence of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOSC). With this growing importance, the number of states that intend to concentrate on national activity related to the sea and develop corresponding maritime strategy is also on the rise, leading to an almost inevitable consequence that competition among countries has become more

² Ibid.
intense in the seapower development race. An island state such as Japan can hardly be immune from these pressures.

**Japan and the Sea**

Japan is an archipelago of islands located off the eastern edge of the Eurasian continent. The home islands of Japan comprise the four principal islands of Hokkaido, Honshu, Shikoku, and Kyushu. Including small and isolated islands, totally, Japan consists of over 6,800 islands.\(^4\) Japan’s total land area is about 380,000 square kilometres (only the world’s 61st largest in extent), yet it has a territorial sea of about 430,000 square kilometres, and its exclusive economic zone (EEZ) is as large as 4,489,000 square kilometres,\(^5\) the world’s sixth largest. Japan’s twelve nautical mile territorial sea, its claimed 200 nautical mile EEZ, as well as its disputed island territories are set out below in Map 1.

Japan’s land territory is marked by irregular highlands with associated clusters of volcanoes. Japan is made poor in terms of strategic or industrial resources by this topography, which imposes special conditions on its inhabitants due to the instability of the land itself. This insecure land with its 500 volcanoes provides an average of 1,500 earthquakes per year,\(^6\) and only 16 per cent of its total area can be cultivated.\(^7\) More importantly for this thesis, Japan is not only a sea-girt country poor in natural resources, it is highly dependent upon imports of natural resources and food from around the globe. As a serious matter of fact, the sea lines of communication (SLOC), which Japan’s trade relies upon, are a huge and fragile network. In addition, having the ninth largest EEZ in the world of course has created some international issues with its neighbours over both island territories and maritime jurisdiction. Taking this geo-strategic environment into consideration, there is little doubt that seapower is essential in determining the fate of Japan’s security. However, Japan has to confront a huge menu of challenges in order to maintain sufficient seapower because of various elements of uncertainty regarding the.
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\(^7\) Ibid., p. 267
security of ocean space in the Asia-Pacific region, and due to its unique domestic political circumstances which place constraints on national action uncommon to other major powers. These factors are recurrent themes throughout this thesis.

Historically, Japan was able to keep a distance from its huge mainland Asian neighbour, China, because of the sea separating them. This geography proved conducive to the development of a unique culture, even though Chinese civilization was influential throughout the region. Borrowing Chinese pictograph characters for written language, its administrative system, Buddhism and Confucianism from China, the Japanese people

---

maintained their own language, their warrior culture and their indigenous religion, Shinto. The sea allowed the Japanese to retain a certain distance from Western civilization as well. In general, Japan can academically be regarded as perhaps the only country that does not share its civilization with others. As a matter of fact, for instance, the Japanese language is unique, isolated from other languages. Shinto also is unique and deeply shapes Japan’s national character and its peoples’ way of life. Japan can be summed up thus:

An island nation further from the continent than England, with a homo
generous population and few material resources, Japan was shaped by its
geography as well as the unique history that was the legacy of this geography,
and its modern outlook on world affairs reflects that. Japan was a natural
nation-state, not one forged by drawing lines on a map or constructed from
common beliefs.

Before the Meiji Restoration, Japan had had only a few experiences of waging war
against countries from across the sea, even though war broke out frequently within the
Japanese islands. Japanese were not accustomed to war against other peoples or defeat
in “total” war.

Japan, Geopolitics and the Maritime Coalition

In the early 20th century, compared to Britain, the United States and Russia, Japan and
Germany were not self-sufficient countries, which needed to import a few extremely
necessary goods. In response to this, it could be said that Japan and Germany adopted
geopolitical perspectives, as a measure that provided a potential breakthrough to their

---

10 See, for example, Samuel P. Huntington., The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, Simon and Shuster, New York, 1996, p. 45.
12 Ibid., pp. 77-80.
14 The difference between geography, geopolitics and geo-strategy can be defined in the following way: “Geography is the physical reality, composed of mountains, rivers, seas, wind patterns, and so on. It describes the geological features of the earth, the physical attributes of the land, sea, and air enviroments”; “Geopolitics is the human factor within geography. It is the geographic distribution of centers of resources and lines of communication, assigning value to locations according to their strategic importance. The geopolitical situation is the result of the interaction of technology broadly defined and geography, which alters the economic, political, and strategic importance of locations”; and “Geostrategy is the geographic direction of a state’s foreign policy. More precisely, geostrategy describes where a state concentrates its efforts by projecting military power and directing diplomatic activity”, Jakub J.
situations. Anglo-American geopolitical concepts have been influential for many Western maritime states, whilst German geopolitics obviously focused on continental state preoccupations. While, in the geopolitics of a maritime state, national strategies for the freedom of maritime transportation and trading are considered essential, continental states tended in history to aspire for a more autarkic system to control vast land areas, such a political and economic system through land-based internal lines of communication. In Germany’s case this involved expansion and occupation of a larger areas as *lebensraum* or living space for the German continental state.

Japan initially increased its national strength based on a maritime model of geopolitics during 1890-1915, yet an Imperial Japanese Army chief of staff centred-group was fascinated with German geopolitics. The thought of the greatest authority on German geopolitics, General Karl Haushofer, had a strong influence over Japanese. As a result, Japan’s pursued an illogical national strategy, contradictory to its national geo-strategic circumstances that appear to have become a major component in the failure of Japan’s strategy of expansion on the Asian mainland. Learning from history, it can be asserted that Japan must cooperate with the rest of the world and make the core of its existence as a maritime nation, not a continental nation. It is a central argument of this study that applying a strategy of developing as a maritime state is crucial for Japan, focusing in particular on developing a maritime alliance or coalition strategy.

**Alliance with Anglo-Saxons**

After Imperial Japan won the war against the Qing Dynasty in 1895, great powers learned the reality of the weakened Chinese dynasty and then advanced, dismembering Chinese land. The continental empire of Russia was attempting to seize Manchuria and the rest of northeast Asia through the pressure of its armed forces. On April 23 1895, Russia, France, and Germany demanded that Japan retrocede the Liaotung Peninsula to the Qing Dynasty. The incident known as the Triple Intervention made Japanese fully
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17 Ibid.

18 Lim, *The Geopolitics of East Asia*, p. 44.

aware that Japan was isolated and too weak to compete against great powers. Additionally, Russia behaved aggressively for the control of the Korean peninsula, including sending military and financial advisers, securing leased territory to build a military base, and crossing the Yalu River to harvest timber. Domination of the Asian continent by Russia would have been a great threat to the newly emerging Japan. At the same time, for Britain, its interest in the Far East was endangered. As a result, Japan and Britain formed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance as a maritime alliance on the grounds of this common interest. Moreover, even though the Anglo-Japanese Alliance stipulated that each country stood neutral when the other went to the war, Britain contributed a lot to the Japanese victory over Russia by effective support, such as providing military information, helping procurement of war expenditure, using diplomatic pressure on Germany and France to make them remain aloof from the conflict, and nurturing international opinion favourable to Japan.

By the time of the war against Russia, the Japanese Navy totally had procured 152 ships (251,700 tons). Since Japan did not have enough shipbuilding skills for large warships, it placed orders for large naval vessels with foreign countries. Over 80 percent of the fleet was either constructed by Britain or relevant to Britain; especially, all six battleships were made in Britain. Throughout the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese empire received great support from the British. Especially, the Russian Baltic Fleet had to make a 20,000-mile journey to Japan due through the Mediterranean, where Britain placed a number of bases. Britain also controlled the Suez Canal. Such a long journey consumed Russian sailors and made them lose their fighting spirit.

Advocating the Open Door Policy for China, the United States also supported the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and cooperated with Japan’s policy, which can be seen in the Portsmouth peace negotiation. As the background of the victory, the framework of

20 Pyle, Japan Rising, p. 93.
23 Hirama, Nichiei Dōmei, pp. 65-66.
24 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
25 Lim, The Geopolitics of East Asia, p. 32.
26 See Hirama, Nichiei Dōmei, pp. 70-72.
Japan-Britain-U.S. cooperation as tripartite maritime coalition of Asia, Europe and America was formed. Nevertheless, Japan never completely became a maritime state or consented to join a larger maritime alliance at that time. Geo-strategically, if the Korean peninsula had become hostile to Japan, it would have been driven into a corner. In order to avoid such a desperate situation, Japan even initiated the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. The period of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance covers three treaties of alliance. All three alliances seem to be counted among the successful alliances of history.

Nevertheless, the result of the dispute between America and Japan over their individual interests in China did irreparable harm to their relationship. In addition, Britain and the United States rejected Japan’s statement of racial equality at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and forced Japan to limit its navy to three fifths of the size of the U.S. and British navies at the Washington Naval Conference from 1921 to 1922. This led to the termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance in the Washington Conference System. A series of incidents accelerated Japan’s isolation from the maritime coalition. However, not content with seizing an advantageous position on the Korean peninsula, Japan was driven recklessly to rush towards continental power by first directing itself towards the annexation of Manchuria and northern China. After the “Manchurian Incident,” Japan endeavoured to become “a continental nation,” and it joined the Axis powers as an anti-Anglo-Saxon alliance to change the situation. Japan’s presence and colonization of continental China antagonized two great naval powers: Britain, which had had a huge economic interest in China since the Opium War, and the United States which also pushed the Open Door Policy in China. Finally, the Japanese Empire began to wage a tragic war in the Asian region and the Pacific Ocean. It is said that she ran after two hares but could catch neither. Geopolitical theorist, Nicolas Spykman, explained:
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28 Ibid., pp. 146-147.
They have, however, had to contend with one great problem because of the fact that, since 1941, they have both been involved in two types of warfare, continental and amphibian, waged on two different fronts. Russian and Chinese land power and the sea power of Great Britain and the United States have forced both Germany and Japan to wage war on two fronts and in two elements at the same time.32

As has been noted, the Japanese Empire was torn between becoming a maritime state and a continental state. Since the end of the Second World War, and throughout the Korean and the Vietnam Wars, the United States became preoccupied in East Asia with confronting the Soviet Union and other communist states. Fortunately, Japan could rebuild its economy, thanks to its geographical situation, and received war-time “special procurements” and the great help of the United States, which had a strong influence on the world’s sea lanes as the greatest maritime state throughout the second half of the 20th century. From 1950 to 1952, about 70 per cent of Japanese exports were related to the war-time special procurements boom.33 Japan rushed toward economic prosperity due to the industriousness of the Japanese people and American global strategy. If it had not been for the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, concluded in 1951, Japan would not have been able to advance its economic prosperity without possessing a blue water navy. Instead, the United States has consistently been the world’s sheriff to guard not only its own the merchant fleet but also those of its allies and friendly nations since the end of the Second World War. As long as Japan’s alliance with the United States was maintained, Japan could focus on promoting its recovering economy and building its huge merchant fleet in place of a first-class navy.34

Meanwhile, sharing identities with allies is one of main factors to maintain alliances. This is one of main points of reason why this research topic has been chosen. Although close alliances or coalitions are essential for Japan’s survival, Japan is a lonesome nation in terms of identities such as religion, language, and culture, as well as its geographical location. On the basis of geopolitics, however, Japan could be classified in the group of maritime nations, and shares strategic identities and interests with
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democratic maritime states who value the benefit of free trade, even though Japan has been isolated in terms of anthropology. This point is of importance in consideration of its national strategy.

**Japan and the Maritime Coalition in the Asia-Pacific Region**

The end of the Cold War brought the emergence of strategic change in the world. As the influence of the Cold War has diminished with time, Asian countries increasingly have pursued their own security policies. As a result, power relationships in Asia are becoming instable. Many Asian nations have the political motivation and economic resources to improve their military power. It seems that Asian conceptions of war and strategy are broader and more profound than the Western conception. The diversity of Asia is extraordinary. There are so many differences among the states, such as their political systems, economic power, size and geographical nature, culture and historical experience.

Meanwhile, “The Asia-Pacific has emerged as the maritime strategic hub in the 21st century.” In terms geography, the defining feature of the region is the intersection of the vast continent of Asia with the deep waters of the Pacific Ocean connected by the Asian littoral, or as Spykman would have called it, the rimlands of Asia, complicated further geopolitically by often contested maritime boundaries. The geo-strategic environment of the Asia-Pacific region features three great landpower states: China, India, and Russia, and the seapower states of Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the countries of peninsular and archipelagic Southeast Asia, Australia and New Zealand, and the South Pacific islands nations; yet the most important player is the United States as the external “super” power, a maritime state with vast national territories which maintains a massive military presence in the region.

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid. p. 36.
The significance of the geopolitical characteristic of the Asia-Pacific region as the maritime strategic hub is rising along with the globalization of economic activities. There are numerous issues concerning the security environment surrounding Japan in the Asia-Pacific region.39 the proliferation of weapon of mass destruction (WMD), ballistic missiles and relevant technologies from Northeast Asia to the other regions; international terrorism in the region; China’s radical military expansion focusing on its navy and air force; antagonistic military relationships on the Korean peninsula and across the Taiwan Strait; territorial disputes over resource-rich islands; troubles brought mainly by Chinese naval activities; and transnational and organized illegal activities, particularly acts of piracy.

Regarding the significance of seapower and the security environment, naturally, naval construction in the Asia-Pacific region could escalate into a chain reaction of arms competition. According to U.S.-based naval consultancy AMI International, global spending for building naval platforms over the next two decades should reach US$640 billion,40 Dominated by states of the Asia-Pacific. For example, Asia-Pacific nations such as Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Singapore, South Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan could purchase as many as 80-100 new submarines over that period.41

Meanwhile, since the end of the Cold War, the world has been rapidly becoming borderless and globalized, whereas people have been becoming more and more appreciative of their national traditions and values to keep them from becoming lost within the stream of globalization. Likewise, Japanese should establish its own identity as a genuine maritime state and understand its role in the world, based on the development of a grand strategy for the future focused on seapower. In the context of the global trend, analysis of habitual behaviour of a strategic community as strategic culture is becoming popular among researchers. Analysis of seapower, which will heavily influence Japan’s future, means exactly “know yourself.” For Japan, in order to survive
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and achieve a more prosperous future in the international arena, it should enthusiastically contribute to the creation of a well-functioning security framework in the Asia-Pacific region by promoting effective maritime coalitions. A strong maritime alliance and new coalitions could enhance mutual interests both during peacetime and hostile times. These are arguments central to this thesis. Yet it has been difficult for people to study strategy and military affairs in Japan. Above all, it seems that to study geopolitics has been a sort of taboo, since, after the defeat in the Second World War, the concept of geopolitics was pushed out of Japan’s academic sphere by occupation policy.42 Colin Gray emphasises, however,

Humans may not think accurately about geography, but even geographically inaccurate thought is still geographical. Strategy and politics must be done within geography. They cannot help but be influenced by ideas, and physical constraints, that reasonably are termed geographical. Geography is inescapable.43

Even though Japan needs to respond to the current situation, this thesis takes the view that Japan has indulged in “a dream of pacifism”. According to Andrew L. Oros, there exist central tenets of Japan’s postwar security identity of domestic antimilitarism: “no traditional armed forces involved in domestic policy making”; “no use of force by Japan to resolve international disputes, except in self-defence”; “no Japanese participation in foreign wars”.44 On the basis of these tenets, there have been some common thoughts on Japan’s security in Japanese society: unrealistic pacifists, including anti-Japanese groups who aim to curtail Japan’s military power, insisting that Japan should assume an unarmed neutrality and who are utterly opposed to the revision of the Japanese constitution’s Article 9 and the exercise of the right of collective defence; people who wish to invoke Japan’s right of collective defence because “cheque book diplomacy” has a number of limitations, but who do not want to revise Article 9; and people labelled as extreme rightists by some media and left wingers who strongly insist on invoking the right of collective defence, revising Article 9, or scrapping the post-war constitution.

42 Kuramae, Aku no Ronri, p. 27.
Unless something dramatic happens, however, there is no sign of the breakdown of the status quo.45

Although a large number of Japanese people cannot shed their post-War pacifism based on Article 9 of the constitution, there are serious potential threats from the sea that might cause great conflicts around the Japanese islands in Northeast Asia, and also Japan’s SLOC, as its economic artery in the Asia-Pacific region, are potentially highly vulnerable. It is extremely questionable that a genuine sea-girt state Japan can stand up against innumerable threats alone: no single nation is able to protect and control the world’s ocean space alone. Therefore, coalition-building among maritime states has emerged as being indispensable for international security. Seapower requires maritime states to form coalitions for their mutual security.

Meanwhile, considering the globalized world, maritime coalitions can be diverse, with the role of each member becoming quite specialized. From a realist perspective, the root meaning of alliance is “shedding blood together”,46 but being dragged into the morass of long conflicts could bring ruin upon maritime states, especially commitments to any prolonged continental conflict. Although healthy military relations should be built between sea powers, open-ended, unconstrained alliance commitments thus need to be avoided. 47 In this respect, maritime-oriented states need to keep a sense of comprehensive strategic balance.

For Japan, a traditional maritime state, alliance or coalition policy is without doubt a matter of life or death.

**Research Questions**

Based on this background, the thesis seeks to answer the following questions:

45 These points will be examined further.
46 For example, James Auer observes that the Japanese government should invoke its right of collective defence. See, for example, James Auer, Oral History Interview Conducted by Koji Murata, March 1996 available at http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/japan/auerohinterview.htm.
47 Samuels, *Securing Japan*, makes this point in his conclusion chapter, esp. pp. 192 and 206. Auer, Oral History Interview, provides a counter to this view.
What is Seapower?
While being a main factor to increase the national power of a maritime state, the concept of seapower is ambiguous. It has to be made clear to discuss the security and the geo-strategy of Japan as a maritime state.

What Has a Coalition among Maritime States Meant?
The strategy of alliance and coalition are indispensable when considering international relations. In particular, it has to be significant for a maritime state to form maritime coalitions, because of the features of seapower and the significance of the interdependence network of the sea and globalization.

How Have Japan and Its Seapower Been under Threat?
In the context of discussing Japan’s maritime-oriented coalition, the seeds of threat facing must be demonstrated and how they relate to Japanese seapower. In practice, the security environment of Japan is in a critical state.

How Have Japan and Its Maritime Coalitions Worked for Security?
It can be demonstrated how maritime coalitions to which Japan belongs function effectively for the sake of the security of Japan and the Asia-Pacific region, and how Japan can contribute to its maritime coalitions and the international order.

Sources, Structure and Method
This study will be divided into three parts. The first part is on the theory of seapower and the roles of coalitions for maritime states. In Chapter 2, firstly, in order to comprehensively understand modern seapower, the components of modern seapower are outlined by referring to traditional maritime strategic thinkers such as Alfred Thayer Mahan and Sir Julian Stafford Corbett, and modern seapower experts. Even today, the importance of Mahan’s strategic thought, advocated in The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783, remains unchanged. Meanwhile, Corbett’s strategic thought insisted in his classic, Some Principles of Maritime Strategy, is more appreciated than ever. His broader and flexible vision can be put to practical use in modern strategy.
Secondly, alliances and coalitions formed by maritime states focusing on seapower are reviewed in the context of American geo-strategic thinking on the significance of alliance and coalition strategy for maritime states, including the complexity of relations between seapowers and landpowers. The discussion of geo-strategic coalitions is based on Colin S. Gray’s works, and subsequently, maritime coalition building is focused on Chris Rahman’s arguments as a conceptual pillar. Thirdly, whether the United States has a suitable qualification to be a builder of a maritime coalition or not is examined by looking at its national strength, naval power, national interests, alliance strategy and maritime strategy. The last section of this chapter focuses on how to integrate a number of factors into strategically meaningful seapower. Important keys are the people’s awareness of ocean space, and spreading and sharing a sense of common purpose and strategy. For the sake of such a difficult task, a theory, including universality to sufficiently convince opponents, is required. It could be a general strategy, suggested by Joseph C. Wylie in his great work, *Military Strategy: A General Theory of Power Control*.

The second part examines potential threats facing Japan. Chapter 3 looks in particular at possibilities of menace brought by potential adversarial countries in Northeast Asia. China is a traditional great continental power and is radically expanding its naval power with maritime interests in mind. Russia is building a continental coalition with China within the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), a grouping of Eurasian continental states. Also, importantly, Japan has a number of maritime territorial and jurisdictional disputes with its neighbours, which are discussed in detail as further influencing the need for Japan to build up its capacity for seapower. Chapter 4 analyses non-state threats to Japan’s SLOC in the Asia-Pacific region posed by piracy and maritime terrorism.

The third part discusses Japan’s alliance and maritime coalition building as countermeasures against a large number of potential threats from various actors. Firstly, Chapter 5 discusses characteristics of Japan’s alliance with the United States and describes the background of Japan’s post-War pacifism the strong influence of the U.S. Navy and its strategy over the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF), the feature
of the alliance based on navy-to-navy relations between the U.S. Navy and the JMSDF, taking U.S. global strategy into account.

Secondly, Japan’s maritime alliances and coalitions other than the alliance with United States are considered with particular emphasis on the process of building security frameworks, strategic interests and measuring Japan’s contribution. This has included building new security relationships with the likes of India and Australia, increasing its multilateral engagement with new security partners and taking a leadership role in developing regional arrangements to counter piracy.

The thesis develops and applies theories of Anglo-American geopolitics: Alfred Thayer Mahan’s geopolitical concept that insists the significance of naval power and maritime transportation capability; Sir Halford J. Mackinder’s geopolitical concept that describes historical confrontations between sea power states and land power states; and Nicholas J. Spykman’s geopolitical concept that develops the significance of the Eurasian rimland, as outlined above. In addition to taking a unique focus on Japan’s slow development of seapower strategies to ameliorate its security concerns and build its own interests, it also makes extensive uses of Japanese language sources. Although there is very little Japanese literature on the direct subject of the development of seapower and geopolitical thought, the incorporation of Japanese language sources nevertheless provides some insight into the thinking of Japanese commentators into some of the wider security problems facing Japan, and its perspectives on the outside world.
CHAPTER 2
Seapower and Coalitions

Introduction
This chapter will discuss the concept of seapower, paying particular attention to the components of seapower, and the relations between maritime states and coalitions. The first section will review the concept of seapower by introducing definitions by prominent experts on this subject and discuss the elements of modern seapower. The second section discusses the role of alliance and coalition formation in decreasing or managing the degree of the risk posed by different types of threats in the context of seapower and geo-strategy. The third section elucidates the most significant aspects of seapower and maritime strategy, and then confirms, in the main, the importance of combined forces, alliance strategy, from the perspectives of geopolitical and cultural factors, for the development of maritime strategy. The fourth section assesses the role of U.S. seapower as a maritime coalition builder.

Seapower
Definition of “Seapower”
The term, “seapower” (originally “sea power”), was coined by an American naval officer, Alfred Thayer Mahan, in his famous work, The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783, as a strategic concept, in 1890. At one time, seapower briefly meant in a sense the total sum of naval power and maritime transportation capability. Mahan coined the term “seapower”, but did not summarize his strategic thoughts in clear and succinct terms. Besides, there are a few similar terms such as “maritime power” and “sea power”. In truth, this ambiguity has intermittently created confusion. This thesis employs the use of “seapower” as a single word and as a strategic concept. A “sea power” (two words) is used as a country. This is the way it is used in Geoffrey Till’s works, the leading contemporary thinker on the subject. One of the most well-known statements on the definition of seapower is provided by the former Royal Navy officer, Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond:
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Sea power is that form of national strength which enables its possessor to send his armies and commerce across those stretches of sea and ocean which lie between his country or the countries of his allies, and those territories to which he needs access in war; and to prevent his enemy from doing the same.³

Seapower includes a broader area than before as a consequence. Currently, the concept of seapower involves more diverse areas than in the past eras. Till states: “A final advantage of using the word ‘seapower’, even if in this cautious way, is that it is a reminder of the fact that is a form of power that derives from the attributes of the sea itself.”⁴ At the present time, the maritime economy, including marine resources, is also regarded as part of seapower. In the broad sense, seapower is part of national strength; is vital for securing national interests for maritime states; and is a national strategic tool that can be attained by utilizing ocean space effectively. In regard to “maritime power”, according to Till, “For all its imperfections and ambiguities it seems best to follow the common practice of using the labels ‘maritime power’ and ‘seapower’ interchangeably.” Additionally, “Either phrase should be taken to incorporate naval interactions with the civilian/marine dimension on the one hand and with air and ground forces on the other, since all of these can have a major impact on the behaviour of others.”⁵

Meanwhile, in the matter of what constitutes “a sea power state”, according to Colin S. Gray, “a sea power” can be conventionally defined:

Traditional usage has it that a sea power is a country with a maritime, as contrasted with a continental, orientation in its strategic outlook and that depends critically upon maritime communications for its economic well-being. Such a country therefore requires a healthy measure of naval control of maritime communications for national security and has an influential sea-oriented community for the advancement of maritime aspects of the national interest.⁶

---
⁴ Till, *Seapower*, p. 6
⁵ Ibid.
Gray also states that “a naval power is simply a country with a strong navy.” He explains, although Rome, Sparta and Macedonia came to be strong naval powers, they were not true or “natural” sea powers. Furthermore, there are some confusing terminologies in regard to “power” and “strategy” in any study of seapower. These are illustrated based on strategic layers, as shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 on the next page.

**Seapower’s Basic Structure**

Mahan defined the concept of seapower indirectly, in a broad sense, stating that it “includes not only the military strength afloat, that rules the sea or any part of it by force of arms, but also the peaceful commerce and shipping from which alone a military fleet naturally and healthfully springs, and on which it securely rests.” It is essential to identify the basic structure of seapower to comprehensively explain the concept of seapower. Most importantly, seapower is composed of a large number of reciprocal and complementary factors. Some people depend on numerical judgments and prefer to assess seapower and maritime effectiveness with the rough and ready method, and are unable to see the whole picture. Such people cannot answer the needs of the times when the utility value of the oceans is increasing. Mahan claims that there are six principal conditions affecting the seapower of nations: Geographical Position, Physical Conformation, Extent of Territory, Number of Population, National Character, and Character of the Governments. Figure 3 shows “Seapower’s Basic Structure”, including the elements of modern seapower, based on the strategic thought of Mahan and Corbett, and modern experts’ works. 

---
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Table 1. Types of Control of the Sea by Area and by Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Absolute Control (Command of the Sea)</strong></td>
<td>Complete freedom to operate without interruption. Enemy cannot operate at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Working Control</strong></td>
<td>General ability to operate with high degree of freedom. Enemy can only operate with high risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Control in Dispute</strong></td>
<td>Each side operates with considerable risk. This then involves the need to establish working control for limited portions for limited times to conduct specific operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Enemy Working Control</strong></td>
<td>Position 2 reversed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Enemy Absolute Control (Command of the Sea)</strong></td>
<td>Position 1 reversed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The circulation of seapower, set out diagrammatically in Figure 3 above, is based upon the interaction between four pillars of seapower: Maritime Forces based on the navy and coast guard as a core factor together with marines and other joint operational capabilities for the maritime and littoral theatres of operations; Sea Control in ocean space; Strategic Influences on diplomatic power, trading, the marine economy, and homeland security; and Economic Strength, as a measure of the collective productive and technological capacity of the whole nation. This has been the main engine of a maritime state for the accumulation and maintenance of wealth and power. According to Peter Bender, neither maritime-oriented super states, Rome and the United States, were dependent on military genius for their imperious status. Neither relied upon a conqueror in the mould of Alexander, Ghengis Khan, or Napoleon, whose empires drastically rose, and fell, in short order following their deaths or defeats. Rome and the United States, on the other hand, had gradually and steadily accumulated and reserved their power until they were unrivalled.  

Sir Julian S. Corbett indicates that the purpose of naval warfare is required to directly or indirectly secure the command of the sea, or to prevent the opponent from securing it. Corbett stated, “Command of the sea, therefore, means nothing but the control of maritime communications, whether for commercial or military purposes. The object of
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naval warfare is the control of communications, and not, as in land warfare, the conquest of territory.”16 The fundamental difference between the object of operations at sea and at land is the point of the strategy. The former is to control maritime communication, the latter is to seize, occupy, and possibly exploit particular, specific territory.17 The essential difference between the sea and the land in terms of command is that of the significance of using of the sea for movement as “a dynamic medium”, not for possession of the sea.18 In the case of command of land, troops should permanently be stationed in the area which they need to take charge of securing, possibly with fortification.19 Maritime strategies cannot be implemented in order to continuously achieve complete control of all sea communications. Actually, without an uncontested triumph in total war, it seems impossible to establish such comprehensive command, and geo-strategy indicates where and how command of the sea is strategically most important in the conflict.20

In respect of strategic advantages, deploying decisive military power at sea and its power projection afterwards has in past experience brought strategic success to sea powers.21 The management of crucial chokepoints and littorals by navies has been considered more important for maritime states rather than using armies to seize land territory, in order to protect transportation and commerce.

Ken Booth insists, in his work *Navies and Foreign Policy*, that the role of a navy is not only to carry out military, warfighting functions, but also the diplomatic and the policing roles.22 It could not be said that the outcomes of such roles always directly link to sea control but these impacts have significant effects as strategic influences on national strategy, including economic activities. J.C. Wylie simply summarizes maritime strategy as consisting of two major parts: the establishment of control of the sea, and the exploitation of the control of the sea toward establishment of control on the
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Capable maritime forces can thus influence not only the strategic environment of the sea, but also that of the land. Maritime strategy functions not only as a war strategy: ultimately, successful maritime strategy would directly or indirectly bring advantages that could control various strategic levels in peacetime as well. The influences of being able to wield enough sea control can bring, or at least, protect, sources of national wealth for a maritime state. The military function of navies could defend the homeland and its territories from an enemy, yet still provide sufficient diplomatic and police power for less daunting circumstances. Diplomatic power, based on a sufficient level of sea control or simply potentially coercive naval presence, enables a government to negotiate terms in territorial disputes and in defending national maritime security interests. Naval policing activities can secure lives and property, including the ability to exploit marine resources. Even a naval leader of a major continental power, former Soviet admiral of the fleet, Sergei Gorshkov, stated that “sea power emerges as one of the important factors for strengthening its economy, accelerating scientific and technical development and consolidating the economic political, cultural and scientific links of the Soviet people with the peoples and countries friendly to it.” Eric Grove asserts, “The fundamental fact of twentieth-century sea power is that a country’s naval capability is a direct reflection of its sheer economic power in all senses and that that power inevitably reflects it control and exploitation of large land masses.”

The significance of a navy has been rising while the world’s tendency to depend on international shipping and marine resources has also been increasing. On the other hand, now, as in history, building ships takes many years and a huge amount of money. Developing, producing and purchasing large or expensive weapon platforms such as warships can potentially make a nation squander its national treasuries. Gray states, “ultimately the sea power, land power, air power and space power of a state is bounded by the relevant economic potential and political culture...Whether a great power is primarily maritime or continental in strategic orientation, its military strength must derive from its overall economic vitality”. In particular, naval weaponry that has the
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potential power to alter the course of battles and strategic influence, such as aircraft
carriers, advanced surface combatants like destroyers or cruisers using the advanced
Aegis combat system, and nuclear powered submarines, represent possibly some of the
most expensive pieces of machinery a state can buy. In addition, the innovation and
institutions needed to develop, build, operate and maintain advanced navies require a
substantial supply of skilled workers. Any significant maritime power must therefore be
at the forefront of science and technology, which in turn requires considerable wealth
and comprehensive economic capacity; and never more so than in today’s world of high
defence inflation and rapid technological change.

The importance of coast guards also has witnessed a remarkable rise as new menaces
such as piracy, terrorism and various transnational crimes at or related to the sea have
come to be globally recognized as significant threats to national interests and regional
and international order by governments. However, a number of governments have
suffered from a lack of finances to secure enough manpower and equipment for coast
guards. For joint operations, undertaking manoeuvres can be costly, as well as the cost
of equipment itself. Establishing military forces and conducting any operations,
including military operations other than war (MOOTW), cannot help but be expensive
projects in our times.

Throughout history, many of the most powerful Western great powers, such as the
Greeks, Romans, Vikings, Venetians, Portuguese, Spanish, French, Dutch, British, and
Americans, as a common feature rising to the surface, successfully employed the
influence of seapower as an important tool of their national (or imperial) strategy.28 In
spite of being small countries with limited populations and resources, the likes of
Portugal, the Netherlands and England were able to gain rich profits by the development
of maritime transportation and trade. In practice, maritime forces and economic strength
must be like two sides of the same coin. Naval power and economic strength inherently
depend on each other.

An adequate, not to say overwhelming, world naval force which utilized a
whole host of bases and protected an ever-growing global trade; an

expanding formal empire which offered harbour facilities for the navy and focal centres of power, together with a far larger informal empire, both of which provided essential raw materials and markets for the British economy; and an industrial revolution which poured out its products into the rest of the world, drew large overseas territories into its commercial and financial orbit, encouraged an enormous merchant marine, and provided the material strength to support its great fleets.29

The Royal Navy that emerged as the ultimate example of a blue water navy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a creature of the Commercial Revolution and the expanding international trade around that time. Meanwhile, Britain’s world power was maintained until her navy went into decline because of her relative economic erosion during the twentieth century. 30 The economic system of a maritime nation heavily relies on protection provided by the maintenance of an adequate level of sea control by its navy. According to Gray, “Historically, sea powers have tended to be commercial civilizations whose attitudes toward war have been much influenced by calculations of economic risk and of the likely balance of financial gain and loss”.31 The relationship between economic strength and naval strength is one of strong interdependence, and they are linked by the degree to which a navy can exert sea control when needed.

Thus, a navy is produced by a certain level of economic strength. Maritime communication is the bloodstream for the economic activities of a maritime state. Formidable navies ought to be able to secure a sufficient quality of sea control. This circulation has been the engine of a maritime state and it has been composed of a large number of integrated elements reflected by technological, geopolitical and community aspects. According to Corbett’s strategic thought, a key factor for the success of the national strategy of a maritime state is how seapower and a variety of constituents and conditions which influence seapower can be combined: “…the notion that Britain’s success as a first-rate Power had involved the combined interplay and exploitation of her naval, military, economic and diplomatic resources in a comprehensive policy”.32

29 Ibid., p. 157.
30 Ibid., p. xxviii.
New Elements and Power Integration

Five factors in Figure 3 support and contribute to make the “circulation” more energetic and smooth. In this chart, Geographical Position largely includes, Geographical Position, Physical Conformation, and Extent of Territory, as explicated by Mahan. Technological Capability is classified into the Community Factor, because posture toward technology could be considered to come from the capacity and culture of the people. Sea Laws have always had an influence upon international relations and maritime strategy, even before the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOSC) was enacted in 1982. Since the agreement of the LOSC this influence has only grown. International law is extremely relevant to the operation of maritime activities. Any nation pursuing its maritime interests and maritime power has to face legal restrictions and claims from coastal states, while the jurisdiction over merchant shipping is also restrictively limited on the ocean to flag states (that is, the state in which a ship is registered and whose flag a ship flies). Protecting national interests at sea largely depends on how a nation approaches and uses the law of the sea.

In comparison with Mahan’s era, the modern era, with its constant technological breakthroughs, has witnessed the emergence of new geo-strategic dimensions which are regarded as significant influences on navies and strategic factors, more generally. Such factors include the air, space and cyberspace dimensions of strategic activity. For sovereign nations, it is difficult to harmonize and integrate each component, but they have to do so for their own national security.

Major differences between Mahan’s elements of seapower and the elements of modern seapower as identified in Figure 3 above are the Power Integration and Alliance Factor aspects. Power Integration, originally mentioned by Corbett in terms of army-navy cooperation, has been one of the most vital aspects of modern seapower. Indeed, the modern naval strategist is required to have knowledge and intelligence to understand and explain the function of a navy in both peace and war, within the context of a given geo-strategic situation and mutual cooperation with other military services for joint
Importantly, modern naval battles have been, and are likely to be in the future, conducted not only on the surface of the water, but also under water, in the air and in space and cyberspace. Each geographical dimension of strategy, including space power, supports each other. Nevertheless, taking each geo-strategic aspect into consideration, there are difference strategic world views among military professionals. For example, "Where the sailor and the airman are almost forced, by the nature of the sea and the air, to think in terms of a total world or, at the least to look outside the physical limits of their immediate concerns, the soldier is almost literally hemmed in by his terrain." 

Spacepower is an essential component for national strategy and war in our current times. Unquestionably, the maritime strategy of advanced modern seapowers heavily relies on the strategic benefits which accrue from the use of outer space. Orbiting satellites can offer undisturbed global communications. Navigational satellites can provide the precise position of naval forces and guidance data to missile systems. Presently, navies are dependent on space power for communications, navigation and targeting, intelligence gathering, and meteorology. “No longer can a navy defend its ‘high ground’ with air power alone.” However, in spite of changing political communities and technologies, and in addition to the emergence of airpower and space power, the long-standing antagonistic relationship between great seapowers and land powers has not altered, even as the strategic environment has been growing more complicated.

The Alliance Factor

In order to fully ascertain the entire picture of seapower, multidisciplinary or integrated research is without doubt indispensable. Above all, the characteristics of alliances and coalitions in the theories of international relations and geopolitics must be appraised. In this study, it should be noted that an essential point in the characteristics of seapower and maritime strategy has been “interdependence”: alliance strategy and the integration
of factors. Surely, in the modern age, compared with Mahan’s era, integrating different players in the international arena, and powers and concepts in strategic studies is especially worthy of attention inasmuch as it potentially increases the effect of seapower. As mentioned above, following Booth’s conception, navies can be mainly used for three purposes. In the diplomatic role, for a maritime state, navies are capable of playing a leading role in the construction and maintenance of alliances and in coalition building.\(^{39}\) In fact, it is a key strategy for maritime states to deal with such issues: building alliances and coalitions is absolutely essential for sea powers, taking into account one determining feature of ocean space, which is that it is impossible for a single power to control unilaterally.

**The Concept of Alliance**

The concept of “alliance” has been one of the most crucial elements of the composition of international political society. George Liska insists that “It is impossible to speak of international relations without referring to alliances; the two often merge in all but name. For the same reason, it has always been difficult to say much that is peculiar to alliances on the plane of general analysis.”\(^{40}\) The study of alliances has been shaped by recent international relations studies of coalitions, organizations, integration, and community building. Moreover, the necessity to research the logical connection between national and international politics has been pointed out,\(^{41}\) and is the approach taken in this study.

Glenn Snyder defines alliances in the following way: “Alliances are formal associations of states for the use (or nonuse) of military force, in specified circumstances, against states outside their own membership.”\(^{42}\) Also, “Alliances obviously are cooperative endeavours, in that their members concert their resources in the pursuit of some common goal”.\(^{43}\) Most alliances are formed in order to unite the members’ national capabilities collectively, for their common interest. However, the nature of different alliances and the ways of collaboration can vary. For instance, according to Stephen
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Walt, an alliance may be offensive or defensive: that is, “intended either to provide the means for an attack on some third party or intended as a mutual guarantee in the event that another state attacks one of the alliance members.”

Walt continues by adding that an alliance can also be symmetrical or asymmetrical “depending on whether the members possess roughly equal capabilities and take on broadly identical commitments to each other.”

Further, an alliance may be an expedient coalition between states with very different regimes and political values, such as the World War II alliance of mutual necessity between the Western democracies and the totalitarian Soviet Union; or it may be united by states not only with similar strategic interests but also with similar ideological principles, such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Moreover, the difference between alliances and alignments should become clear. Snyder insists that the terms “alliance” and “alignment” are interchangeable, but “The broader and more fundamental term is alignment, defined as expectations of states about whether they will be supported or opposed by other states in future interactions. Alignment includes alignment “against” as well as “with”; it identifies potential opponents as well as friends.”

Notably, although alliances bring benefits to member countries, the relationship of alignment also requires alliance members to pay the costs of membership when they are called upon to do so. These costs may be in terms of financial contributions or costs related to defence preparedness or armed conflict, political costs of alignment with a particular state, whether those costs are domestic or international, and potentially a cost in the lives of one’s own service personnel. It was an irony that the collective defence provisions of some U.S. alliance systems established by the United States to protect its allies and clients against Communist encroachment during the Cold War were first formally implemented in response to an attack on the United States itself, in the aftermath of 9/11. Alliance maintenance may have been at least as important a reason to join Washington in the war against terrorism for many U.S. allies as was a sense of moral outrage or strategic necessity. Allied states must therefore calculate political pluses and minuses, and as long as they need the stability and preservation of their alliances, must take a toll in some way. This is a very basic and
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primary premise for independent states in order to ensure national survival in the fluid world order.

There are “rational” and “irrational” factors that cause alliances to collapse or endure. If one or more members can no longer justify membership in terms of an assessment of its interests, an alliance may collapse as a rational response to a new security environment or changed political circumstances. On the other hand, there are “irrational” reasons that can lead to an alliance collapsing. At the same time, in spite of new conditions, an alliance could endure because the same international security environment may seem more dangerous to a state standing outside of an alliance than it would if that state remained inside, under the alliance’s protective umbrella.

According to Stephen Walt, there are several main factors that can lead alliances to collapse, as follows: changing threat perceptions, declining credibility, and domestic politics (influenced by demographic social trends, domestic competition, regime change, and ideological divisions). Meanwhile, obvious reasons for the endurance of alliances and coalitions are hegemonic leadership, the preservation of credibility, domestic politics and elite manipulation, institutionalization, and ideological solidarity, and shared identities, including within “security communities”. Statesmen and bureaucrats must know and recollect such factors to adjust alliance policies to match the actual security environment leading to a desired outcome for national security interests. Such policy adjustment can be an important factor in deciding whether a nation prospers peacefully or even survives. In addition, benefits and costs of alliance have to be carefully considered to achieve a balance of interests when considering national security, especially when diplomatic factors must be taken into account.

It is important at this point to compare the concept of “coalition” with that of “alliance.” For example, the U.S. Department of Defense defines an alliance as: “The relationship that results from a formal agreement (e.g., treaty) between two or more nations for
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broad, long-term objectives that further the common interests of the members.”

In the meantime, the term “coalition” is defined as “An ad hoc arrangement between two or more nations for common action.” Also, “coalition action” is “Multinational action outside the bounds of established alliances, usually for single occasions or longer cooperation in a narrow sector of common interest.”

According to Snyder, larger alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the alliance against Napoleonic France can be called “coalitions.”

Snyder also states the anticipated duration of alliances:

Most formal alliances specify a duration.... Less formal arrangements, such as ententes, typically do not specify duration. In the case of ententes, that is because the conflict settlements that form the basis of the agreement are assumed to be permanent. There is also a class of ad hoc temporary arrangements, formed for a specific purpose, which are presumed to last only until that purpose is accomplished…. On a larger scale coalitions organized during wartime for the specific purpose of blocking a major aggressor — for example, the shifting coalitions against Napoleonic France. By contrast, “alliances,” as defined above, have a contingent rather than an immediate purpose: they are formed to deal with a specified event that may or may not happen at any time during their life, rather than a situation that is already occurring.

To put it briefly, it could be said that a coalition is a subset of alignments, which is relatively less formal, usually larger-sized and a shorter-period association than that of an alliance.


\[54\] Snyder, *Alliance Politics*, p. 12
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Table 2. Snyder’s List of Benefits and Costs of Alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Benefits of Alliances</th>
<th>The Principal Costs of Alliances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) to strengthen deterrence capability against attack on oneself</td>
<td>1) the possibility of unnecessary assistance offered by the ally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) to strengthen defence capability against attack on oneself, with combination of aid from the allies or successful defence when the ally’s help is forthcoming</td>
<td>2) the possibility of walking into a trap by the ally to participate in war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) to strengthen deterrence capability against attack on the ally</td>
<td>3) the possibility of a counter-alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) to prevent alliance or alignment between the partner and the rival</td>
<td>4) to exhaust alternative alliance options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) to exclude the possibility of attack by the partner</td>
<td>5) to restrict freedom of action in order to cater to the needs of the ally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) to reinforce influence on the partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maritime-led Coalitions against a Great Continental Power as a Traditional Threat

In Sun Tzu’s phrase, “Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in peril.” When a state faces off against a great foe, it has to form well-balanced alliances or coalitions, taking characteristic features of each member’s geopolitical aspect and strategic culture into consideration, and focusing on well-balanced combinations of landpower and seapower.

Rivalry between Sea Powers and Land Powers

So as to explain the significance and relations between seapower states and alliances or coalitions, it is important to review a traditional, and the greatest, threat to maritime states. It has been exceedingly unusual for a nation to attain military potential that possesses both great maritime and continental power at the same time. Although countries can be classified as being primarily sea powers or land powers, mostly they

---

56 Ibid., pp. 43-44.
are both to some extent. Although the mid and late Roman Republic and then Empire, and Byzantium in the tenth and early eleventh centuries could attain both first-class seapower and landpower prior to the modern period, such cases are rare exceptions. In fact, two major land powers, France in the 1680s and Germany in the early 1900s fleetingly achieved success in building formidable first-class navies in modern history. For them, however, simultaneously maintaining great military power on land and at sea was an empty dream. In practice, in those times, Britain changed its perception of the principal enemy from the Dutch to the French, and from the French and Russians to the Germans, due to aversions of the strengthening of the continental state’s navy, while using a balance of power strategy and economic warfare enabled by the use of flexible diplomacy; one of the special skills of a supreme maritime power.

Thus, any significant naval challenge led Britain to become increasingly hostile to the rising sea power. “The terms of dependence between sea power and land power are always specific to the geostrategic condition of the adversaries and the political character of the war as defined by the objectives of the belligerents.” Britain had enough power to be able to choose to develop significant landpower, and potentially could survive and prosper even if a continental state achieved close to continental-based hegemony. However, continental-based naval power on a broad scale in the long run caused strategic problems, in both political-diplomatic and military terms. British statesmen understood that continental hegemony would always be faced with a problem with sustaining complementary naval power. In modern times, at least, the outstanding continental state of the day has failed to successfully promote the improvement of its geo-strategic condition sufficient to secure a continental base for the building of a first-class navy. As a result, the most formidable states - that is, the great powers - can be roughly classified into either category of being primarily a maritime or continental power.
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According to Gray, the linkage relevant to seapower between rivalries of particular states and coalitions has been influenced more by geopolitical background than technological development. In history, it is a well-known fact that major wars between great maritime powers and great continental powers often broke out, since there has been a traditional strong rivalry between geopolitically opposed powers. Continental states therefore often have had an intention to expand out into the sea, and maritime states, on the other hand, have had the intention to contain the continental power’s ability to exploit the sea strategically in order to protect their own maritime-based interests, from the sea: “the great geographical realities remained: land power versus sea power, heartland versus rimland, centre versus periphery, an individualistic Western philosophy versus a collective Eastern doctrine rooted in a communal past.”

Because of the influence of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the contemporary infestation of pirates in some regions and globalization, there is a tendency to forget what the great threat to a seapower state is, but historical rivalry between maritime and continental states should not be passed over unnoticed. There are a number examples of sea power versus land power relationships that have been identified as an historical pattern: for example, Persia versus the Greeks, the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta, Rome versus Carthage, the defence of the Byzantine Empire, the rise and fall of Venice, England versus Spain, Britain versus France, the Crimean War, the American Civil War, the Russo-Japanese War, World War I, World War II, and the Cold War. It has been recorded in ancient, medieval and early modern history that continental powers consistently attained enough power to control highly strategic coastal areas in the Mediterranean, and thus to defeat maritime states. Maritime powers such as Athens, Carthage, Persia and Byzantium were defeated by continental powers such as Sparta, Rome, Macedon, and Ottoman Turkey in ancient and medieval times; nevertheless, Gray insists that these cases show how land powers learn to use the sea and threaten maritime allies, so as to counterbalance and overcome a genuine seapower, rather than
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demonstrating any inherent advantage of landpower over seapower.\textsuperscript{70}

With the passage of time, the balance between landpower and seapower has altered owing to drastic changes in technology and tactics witnessed over the past five centuries. These changes have brought clear advantages to maritime-oriented powers as strategic tools for defeating their land power antagonists.\textsuperscript{71} In modern times, post-1500 AD, to the contrary, great seapowers or sea-oriented coalitions have never lost a major war against continental foes.\textsuperscript{72} Actually, “the modern states-system has grown up on a continent surrounded by the ocean.”\textsuperscript{73} This environment favours maritime states. Also, although it was possible for continental powers to attain the persistence of seapower necessary to some extent to defeat its opponents, no land power state has been able to adequately achieve an ability to seize an opponent’s centre of strategic gravity at sea sufficient to win a major war against a maritime power.

\textit{Seapower as a Watershed}

In spite of some drastic changes in transportation technologies in modern times, superior seapower has made it possible for its possessors to form alliances to increase total strategic capability in order to be able to confront the threats posed by an opponent’s supreme continental power.\textsuperscript{74} A sea power or a maritime coalition is conferred considerable strategic advantages against a continental foe that cannot acquire sufficient seapower. Sea powers can make use of the sea as a barrier, or as a highway due to the global continuity of the sea that provides a tremendous mobility and agility for navies and merchant shipping.\textsuperscript{75}

The sea has been a vital component of major wars in the modern era: “Although great wars are usually fought and won on land, they are often decided at sea.”\textsuperscript{76} On the outcomes of wars between sea powers and land powers, Colin Gray comes to the
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following conclusion regarding maritime strategy: “First, a continental power can win a war by securing military command at sea, by achieving sea denial, or even just disputing command at sea very vigorously.”77 In light of history, a continental power has often shown the capability to develop or rent (via allies or clients) a quality and quantity of naval power sufficient to prevail over a maritime opponent in war. But unless badly damaged or defeated through a naval battle, seapowers generally would not lose such wars.78 Second, Gray argues, “for a sea power or a maritime-dependent coalition, command at sea provides the strategic conditions indispensable for success in war.”79 As it turned out, whichever state was able to achieve its own sufficient level of sea control marked a particular watershed in major wars. The key strategic factor of war between a sea power and a land power is thus the battle over command of the sea, which is “an indispensable enabler for eventual victory in war as whole.”80 Although airpower and spacepower have emerged in the modern age, the essential elements of geopolitics are always landpower and seapower, the finisher and the enabler in war.

**Continental Ally**

Traditionally, sea power states have needed alliances or coalitions formed and sustained by the advantages of maintaining the capability for sea control. Building an effective maritime coalition is the key to success for sea powers in wars against great power opponents – or even against lesser powers such as Saddam Hussein’s Iraq – as well as being able to attain sufficient sea control. Nevertheless, even though genuine maritime coalitions could indirectly weaken powerful continental foes from sea, in such a great war, it is usually necessary to apply more direct strategic pressure to defeat a great continental state.81 Against a great continental power or coalition, without land power allies, sea powers can never finish the powerful continental rival. In history, both leading maritime and continental powers have sought allies with the opposing geo-strategic potential, taking the geopolitical context of the conflict into consideration.82
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In war, therefore, as argued by Gray, superior maritime power has been, “the great enabler.” However, it has not been “the finisher” for the final victory: “maritime command is more a facilitator than a concluding executor”.  

Actually, one of the most significant reasons for building up a powerful navy is for maritime power projection. This does not deliver a decisive blow, because as long as human beings have been living on land, war requires decisive action by land forces to bring it to a genuine conclusion. Politically, geographically and strategically, everything starts from land and comes to an end on land. Accordingly, “Sea power more often needs land power to conclude a war successfully than land power needs sea power.” As a result, it would be unusual for seapower alone to successfully produce enough power to conclude a great war.  

From the lessons of history, in order to reach the decisive centre of gravity in war against a great opponent of the opposing geopolitical environment, both sea powers and land powers have had to promote the formation of alliances with states or groups of states possessing a similar geopolitical environment as the rival power. In order to achieve victories, each side must be driven by necessity to seek mixed strategies containing prerequisite maritime and continental components. This has been an essential factor for defeating the rival. Through battles at sea, great sea powers can be defeated, and through battles on land, great land powers can be defeated.

Sea powers need a “rear continental state” that supports the sea power ally, not only to deliver a decisive blow to the land power opponent, but also to play the role of “distracter.” Historical experience has shown that a rear continental state would “tip the balance of power against the aspiring hegemon and keep it occupied in an expensive
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ground war.”\(^{91}\) Such a rear-continental distracter ally has been experienced in Anglo-American history: Burgundy against France, Austria against France, Prussia against France, Russia against Germany, and, in the 1970s and 1980s, and China against the Soviet Union.\(^{92}\) For land powers, other land powers have always been natural enemies. Especially, a great land power has always been the greatest threat to other adjacent land powers because of either an aggressive character or the limited strategic distances between them. However, the dominant land power has always tended to expand it naval power for the ambition of exploiting seapower. It is no wonder that this behaviour strongly alarms not only maritime states but also other continental states. On the other hand, a great maritime power’s business usually depends on a global, mutual maritime interdependence network system among littoral states for the conduct of economic activity, and her flexible strategic tool of seapower often easily attracts potential allies, regardless of whether they may be land or sea powers. However, it has to be remembered that the leading maritime state itself often must take a risk to conclude war through land battles. There is no easy way to finish war against a great continental foe.\(^{93}\)

**Maritime Coalition-Building against Various Threats**

*Ocean Space as Seeds of Strife*

Historically, human beings have attempted to expand territory to seize land, which generates wealth and power, and which can be exploited to further promote expansion through the use of advance bases and fortresses. That is why continental powers often have traditional rivalries due to fighting over territory. Meanwhile, in previous times, the ocean used to provide a natural castle wall for island states. Afterwards, as the evolution of ships continued into the mechanical and industrial ages, marine transportation came to play a central role in economic development and in power projection. The sea has been used mainly as the most useful measure of transformation. However, today, it contains diverse aspects, not only as a natural barrier and an international highway, but also as a contested arena used to seize, or at least to claim, marine resources or disputed islands. As a result, maritime states also often have become involved in international disputes over national interests involving marine
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\(^{92}\) Ibid., p. 22; and also see, Friedman, *Sea Power as Strategy*, pp. 14-32.  
\(^{93}\) Friedman, *Seapower as Strategy*, p. 114.
resources and territorial features in the maritime realm. Currently, some littoral states have shown signs of a willingness to go to war for their maritime interests, as continental powers have done on land.

In fact, although maritime cooperation to secure the network of commerce transported by shipping amongst “liberal free traders” has been a desirable condition, maritime transportation often has become the target in war. The global maritime transportation system has thus been both a strategic tool offering the advantages of flexibility and convenience to sea powers, and an extremely fragile network that navies have to defend.94

In the modern era, to make matters worse, situations at sea have been made more complicated and troublesome by a great number of conflicts within or about maritime theatres. It is undeniable that there is a strong possibility that conflicts could break out due to interests relevant to seapower among littoral states, regardless of whether they are maritime or continental-dependent powers. In addition, threats from non-state actors have become prevalent in our present time. Seeds of strife within some maritime theatres have been growing and gradually reaching potentially crisis proportions. There are a large number of threats, which maritime coalitions mainly have to deal with as follows:95 threats from disputes among nations over territorial waters due to the rising value of seabed resources and the rising value of waters as a food resource; the growing strategic significance of sea areas for power projection, sea bases and naval battles; the rising challenges to international law; pollution damaging national assets; the introduction of new technologies; the administrative and legal disputes over exclusive economic zones, international straits and territorial seas; and non-state threats upon the oceans such as piracy, terrorism, smuggling, drug trafficking, illegal immigration and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Such threats could be regarded as potential causes of serious conflicts, which should be removed through cooperation among littoral states as much as possible. Regardless of whether challenges are posed by traditional, state-based threats or newly-emerged

94 Till, Seapower, p. 11.
threats, maritime states need to build strong alliance or coalition networks in order to be able to either confront or prevent/avoid the menaces. Besides, the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention has made maritime security complicated with the establishment of maritime zones and, as a consequence, a large number of often contested coastal state regulations, which has resulted in littoral and maritime states being drawn into serious disputes. Therefore, in order to counter non-traditional threats, every possible means should be employed through international cooperation, including maritime coalition building.

**Maritime Coalition Building**

To ease tensions among coastal states and secure confidence-building measures, maritime forces who respond to emergency situations themselves have to consider needs to enhance dialogue, increase exchanges of personnel and information, create transparency, and promote habits of cooperation.\(^{96}\) Taking these aspects into account, they have to lay out situations for naval cooperation and coalition building during “normal” times, i.e., for peacetime operations. In fact, as stated clearly by Ken Booth: “warships have always had more than a fighting function”.\(^{97}\) Chris Rahman argues that there are three interrelated rationales for naval cooperation:

- Naval cooperation can be a confidence-building measure (CBM); a means of improving standardization between navies in order to facilitate basic and benign operational cooperation; and a means of building naval coalitions to undertake more complex combined maritime operations, or at least to enhance interoperability to the extent that coalition maritime operations can be conducted on an ad hoc basis when necessary.\(^{98}\)

For instance, interoperability actually makes effective maritime cooperation possible, hence navies have to regularly conduct adequate and efficient education and training. Through enhancement of cooperative habits, procedures and interoperability, a more enduring maritime coalition could be formed. Rahman states, “Such activities have been described as ‘building blocks’ towards the goal of achieving higher levels of security
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cooperation, which hopefully might contribute to the creation of a more secure strategic environment.”99

According to Rahman, there exist Levels of Naval Cooperation and Types of Naval Cooperation regarding maritime coalition building in the maritime arena of Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific.100 In terms of an inward effect, confidence-building through the formation of a maritime coalition would be enhanced by maritime cooperation divided into several stages, as summarized in Tables 3 and 4 below. Maritime operations and cooperation between navies might contribute to coalition building and thus also the building of political confidence. Navies have to meet a requirement for operational cooperation by sharing significant levels of equipment standardization and common standard operating procedures (SOPs). Efforts toward confidence-building through joint naval drills and exchanges make combined operations workable. Five levels of standardization facilitate procedural, doctrinal or technical cooperation for combined operations such as coordination, compatibility, interoperability, interchangeability, and commonality, and there exist four types of naval cooperation: combat operations; constabulary operations; benign application of maritime power operations; and enabling and/or facilitative cooperation.101

Although coalition building often is a response against external threats, Geoffrey Till discusses the idea that there are two types of maritime coalition and naval roles.102 According to Till, “national navies” are for sea control and power projection as traditional maritime roles to cope with crisis and conflicts, related to other state actors. This type involves traditional formal alliance relationships, for example, NATO and the U.S. bilateral alliances with Japan and other Asia-Pacific countries.103 Meanwhile, “collective navies” are focused on missions to counter non-traditional maritime threats,
and non-state actors, such as piracy, sea robbery, trafficking, terrorism, humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, and environmental protection roles. Both types of maritime coalition are able to contribute to the safety of the sea ways, regional stability, and to the restraint of threats.\textsuperscript{104} In short, through forming a maritime coalition, nations take advantageous effects at the same time as contributing to confidence-building within the coalition and responding to threats from outside of the coalition, such as a formidable continental power or lesser, non-state actors.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Levels of Naval Cooperation\textsuperscript{105}}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
Alliances & Allied nations have the highest degree of political commitment and operate across the entire span of maritime operations, including the highest level of training and interoperability, and encompassing war-fighting and other combat missions. \\
\hline
Coalitions & Coalition members are required to carry out some degree of political commitment and objectives, even though they do not necessarily share completely common aims. Coalitions without the same level of mutual commitment and world-views are classified into formal types formed by treaties or informal types. \\
\hline
Non-Coalition Naval Cooperation & This level of naval cooperation mainly consists of cooperation among navies without a guiding security framework of coalitions or alliances. In such cooperation, without any specific common political or strategic objectives, there is a trend toward focusing on either non-controversial issue areas or on basic interoperability requirements to facilitate cooperation in benign or constabulary missions. \\
\hline
Maritime Cooperation & In this form of naval cooperation, benign or constabulary operations are conducted by maritime forces, including coast guards, in normal conditions. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Types of Naval Cooperation\textsuperscript{106}}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{105} Rahman, \textit{Naval Cooperation and Coalition Building in Southeast Asia and Southwest Pacific}, pp. 13-14. \\
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., pp. 16-23. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
The United States as the Leader of the Maritime Coalition

**The Leading Power of the Maritime Coalition**

The vast extent of water covering the Earth cannot be fully controlled by a single power, even by a “super” sea power, owing to the large number of actual or potential threats, unfamiliar surroundings, the progress of technology, the great financial burden and the restrictions of sea laws. Sea power states tend to share fundamental common values as national identities, such as democracy and a free market economy, often shaped by common historical experiences. Without doubt, sharing political traditions serves to make alliances and coalitions closer and endure longer. Following an alliance-based national strategy clearly has been essential for maritime-dependent states. For such states, developing navy-to-navy relations as a part of naval diplomacy is actually an indispensable part of the glue with which to develop the bonds of alliances and coalitions. Ultimately, every single naval officer and sailor is an essential diplomat for national strategy.
Strategic influence derived from the promotion of confidence-building and cooperative relations between navies cannot be overestimated. Obviously, the relations among maritime states always tend towards strategic interdependence because of the features of the sea in a geopolitical sense, in regard to sharing the global ocean space, and it is preferable in view of the national profits to be earned from maintaining a free and open seaborne trading system. In naval cooperation within maritime coalitions, the degree of interoperability with the leading maritime power’s navy for combined operations between the coalition partners can be crucial, since the success of the coalition depends on the leadership of the strongest state, with the most advanced naval technology. It is also important for allies or coalition members to be able to gain confidence in the capabilities of the leading sea power. A low level of interoperability and a huge gap in naval capabilities within coalitions would create a burden for the great maritime power and the coalition itself, and actually limit potential cooperation. It is important that lesser sea power states are capable of receiving the many valuable security benefits offered by membership of alliances with the leading sea power, described in the four points below:

1) The greatest sea power has tended to possess state-of-the-art science and technology which can be integrated into its naval power for tactical, operational and, potentially, strategic advantage. In modern warfare, needless to say, technological superiority has important implications for the outcome of any combat in the maritime environment. Cooperation with a great seapower in the development of weaponry and the licence of technology cannot be overestimated for lesser seapower states.

2) Maritime hegemonic states have tended to have the capability to manage information and intelligence based on huge maritime networks. As result, by aligning with the pre-eminent maritime power means to enjoy an advantage in modern warfare, especially, in moral warfare, information warfare, and strategic psychological warfare. For instance, at its height the British maritime empire connected its naval bases through an imperial cable communications network. It made an immeasurable contribution to British
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107 See, for example, Till, *Seapower*, pp. 12-15.
maritime dominion. The French government in 1900 stated that “England owes her
influence in the world perhaps more to her cable communications than to her navy. She
controls the news, and makes it serve her policy and commerce in marvellous
manner.”

3) Maritime coalitions led by the greatest sea power can respond collectively to the
challenge of a continental power which has an ambition to exploit seapower to attain
wealth and regional or global hegemony. Moreover, such coalitions can ease tensions
among member countries and counter threats by non-state actors, through confidence-
building brought by naval cooperation and diplomacy together with the superior
maritime power. The leadership of the supreme sea power is essential to solidify the
participation of other players.

4) The greatest sea power can play the main role to secure the world’s sea lane network.
In short, it often possesses the power to strongly influence other maritime-dependent
countries. Depending on the circumstance, it is highly unlikely that lesser members of a
maritime coalition dependent on using global sea lanes would have their maritime
interests seriously damaged if the dominant sea power is fully engaged with the
protection of the system.

Such advantages would prompt many countries to conclude and maintain an alliance
with a great maritime power. In view of such purposes, maritime powers have to
carefully strive to make various contributions to the alliance with the leading power as
the pillar of the coalition, and to deal flexibly with the security circumstances. The
success of maritime-oriented coalitions depends on how much the supreme sea power
and lesser sea powers can cooperate for the protection of their common interests,
including from a geo-strategic competitor, at all times.

The United States as the Greatest Sea Power

108 Paul M. Kennedy, “Imperial Cable Communications and Strategy, 1870-1914”, English Historical
Review, lxxxvi, no. CCCXLI, October 1971, p. 448, quoted in Kennedy, The Rise and Fall of British
Naval Mastery, p. 206.
109 Ibid.
Colin Gray states that Rome was historically a rare state that possessed both first-class seapower and landpower for a while; and that in the contemporary world, America is a super state that possesses first-class strategic capabilities across all strategic environments, such as seapower, landpower, airpower, spacepower, cyberpower and nuclearpower. It is probably only natural that some attempt to compare the United States, the only super power in the modern world, with the Roman Empire which built the *Pax Romana*. The key factor for the growth of both super powers was actually their geographical condition, including being surrounded by ocean. According to Gray, however, a champion of naval power, the United States is far removed from being a “natural” sea power. Notwithstanding that America is an isolated nation owing to weak adjacent countries and the fact that in modern warfare Americans have demonstrated an inclination to favour airpower and “air-mindedness” to some degree, the vast territory of the United States leads its people to possess a continentalist’s disposition and strategic point of view. The United States is the biggest trading nation in the world, maintained by marine transportation for the most part. Hence, the ability to secure its sea lines of communication (SLOC) is critically significant for the United States and the rest of world, yet still “The American people have little direct and obvious connection with ships and have less and less personal experience of maritime travel on the social dimension to strategy; that continuing trend is not helpful to public understanding of the importance of their stake in order at sea.” The United States can thus be viewed as an “artificial sea power”.

In the strict sense, the definition of a seapower state is one that has a long coastline and heavily depends for its security and economic well-being on the sea, and includes a navy of sufficient might to secure its maritime interests (or at least has membership in a maritime coalition which can do so), and a body politic with requisite maritime understanding and consciousness.
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114 In this sense, some states, including America and Japan, are not true seapowers; but they will be regarded as seapowers in this thesis, in a general sense.
America’s geographical circumstances enable the United States to access other regions via both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Its landward neighbouring countries, Canada and Mexico, are no match for the United States: “In the north a weak Canada, in the south a weak Mexico, in the east fish and in the west fish.”\footnote{Detlev Junker, Von Der Weltmacht zur Supermacht, Mannheim, B.I.-Taschenbuchverlag, 1995, p. 18, quoted in Bender, “America,” p. 146.} Thus, most of its trading and strategic communications have had to have been based on seapower. Consequently it has global interests in spite of the strategic distance of most of the world’s populations and landmasses from the U.S. homeland. Hence the United States pursues a national strategy logically based on overseas presence and power projection capabilities in order to protect its national interests all over the world, as well as those of its allies, clients and partners.\footnote{Stanley B. Weeks and Charles A. Meconis, The Armed Forces of the USA in the Asia-Pacific Region, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW, 1999, p. 54.}

*The Road to Becoming the Supreme Sea Power*

In 1890, although the number of American soldiers and sailors were only half that of Japan,\footnote{James Cable, The Political Influence of Naval Force in History, Macmillan, London, 1998, p. 90.} then Captain Mahan wrote, “whether they will or no, Americans must now begin to look outward”.\footnote{Quoted in ibid, p. 91.} A new rising nation led by President Theodore Roosevelt sought not only wealth and power, but also the naval capability that also often follows such ambitions. Since then, this maritime-dependent country with its vast territory radically advanced its policy of increasing national power and focused on enhancing its seapower. Under Roosevelt, America deployed the “Great White Fleet”, which voyaged around the world from 1907 to 1909, stopping in Japan on the way in order to make a show of its national might. Following the conclusion of the First World War, America, which had become the world’s second greatest naval power, succeeded in making Britain renounce the Anglo-Japanese Alliance as part of the post-War settlement process which resulted in the Washington Treaty on naval arms limitation. Eventually, in 1940, when Britain was under the threat of German invasion, the United States took over the role as the global offshore balancer from the British,\footnote{James E. Auer and Robyn Lim, “The Maritime Basis of American Security in East Asia,” Naval War College Review, Vol. 54, No.1, Winter 2001, p. 40.} and then used its greatly expanded wartime seapower to defeat Imperial Japan, which had endangered and eventually attacked U.S. interests in the Pacific region. Directly after the War, in
1946, the U.S. Navy could boast almost six million tons of ships and possessed about 70 per cent of the world’s ships that were 1,000 tons or larger.120

**Conditions for Supremacy**

The United States continues to maintain the capacity to meet the requirements for maritime super power. Economic power is a source of strength that produces land power, seapower, airpower, and spacepower, comprising the many fruits of technological prowess, developed by a large defence budget in comparison to all other states, to fight a desperate game for leadership and survival in this modern world. In terms of its economic power, America accounts for around 30 per cent of the global product, even though the U.S. population accounts for only about 4.6 per cent of the world population.121

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia still maintains competence and potential in some components of national strength, mainly certain high technologies and nuclear armaments. However, in the case of the United States, not only its navy, but all aspects of U.S. conventional and nuclear military forces are exceptionally capable. These are based on the fruit of by far the most advanced technology applied to the security and strategic sectors, such as intelligence gathering, air-to-air combat, precision strike warfare, carrier and submarine operations, amphibious operations, armoured combat and special operations.122 Furthermore, U.S. administrations have continued to supply financial resources to maintain the capability for naval mastery, even though other NATO countries have squeezed defence budgets to adapt to the post-Cold War circumstances. In fact, though only the U.S. Navy was ranked as a first-class navy, or “Major Global Force Projection Navy” by Grove in 1990,123 even in the post-Cold War era, the U.S. naval budget is over U.S.$100 billion every year. U.S. military spending was over 40 percent of the world’s military expenditure in 2009124; and the U.S.
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military budget for fiscal year 2010 totals U.S.$663.8 billion,\textsuperscript{125} and that of the U.S. Navy U.S.$171.7 billion.\textsuperscript{126}

Paul Kennedy also explains several reasons why American empire has been qualified to possess formidable seapower: the United States holds dockyards which can produce the biggest and best warships in the world; there are a great number of expert engineers and craftsmen; it has been a country rich in resources; and its geographical circumstances allow U.S. armed forces access to other region.\textsuperscript{127} In terms of gross domestic product (GDP), the European Union (EU) as whole exceeds that of the United States, but it is impossible for EU member governments to collectively spend such an enormous amount of their budgets on their armed forces, including their navies. Furthermore, it cannot be said that the European Union, consisting of a number of nations, is a monolithic entity with the internal solidarity of a nation state. Besides, compared with the United States, it lacks the shipbuilding facilities to produce the greatest of warships such as U.S.-style 100,000 ton nuclear powered super carriers.\textsuperscript{128}

The U.S. Navy has about 945 ships and craft of all kinds,\textsuperscript{129} including 286 deployable warships,\textsuperscript{130} totalling approximately six million tons.\textsuperscript{131} Remarkably, the U.S. battle fleet is larger than the next 13 navies combined in terms of tonnage, and eleven of those navies are its allies.\textsuperscript{132} Moreover, geo-strategically, there are a great number of U.S. naval bases or facilities across the world such as Yokosuka in Japan, Singapore, Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, Guantánamo Bay in Cuba, Hawaií, and Guam, which enables its forces to operate as a truly global, power projection navy. The U.S. government carefully makes diplomatic efforts to maintain these bases as long as

\textsuperscript{126} Rear Admiral J.T. Blake, \textit{Department of the Navy FY 2010 President’s Budget}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{128} Kennedy, \textit{The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery}, p. xix.
possible in order to sustain the global seapower network based on its maritime alliances and coalitions, and its power projection capability. Fundamentally, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the United States became a super state through fully using the characteristics and potential of seapower as the core of its global influence making. America’s global influence is thus maintained by enhancing global reach from and at the sea. Seapower is a strategic tool that has continued to evolve and will continue to do so into future, as its importance only grows as the twenty-first century unfolds. 133

The Aircraft Carrier and Power Projection Capability

Any state in the modern world that intends to play a role of global power with the ability to engage strategically across continents is required to possess a globally capable, blue-water navy, including a serious power projection capability. Aircraft carriers have long since replaced the battleship’s position as the “capital ship” of major navies. 134 The aircraft carrier is defined by the U.S. Department of Defense as “A warship designed to support and operate aircraft, engage in attacks on targets afloat or ashore, and engage in sustained operations in support of other forces.” 135 Aircraft carriers play a vital role to protect the fleet and provide support for amphibious operations. 136

The status of the aircraft carrier was raised as aircraft cruising capacity and assault capability were improved. As a result, the earlier shortcomings of aircraft such as the small action radius and flight duration were overcome, thus enabling carrier-equipped navies to provide airpower strike capability over long distances. 137 The emergence of the aircraft carrier changed naval tactics and strategy through the transformation in mobility, speed and striking power. In terms of power projection capability, the power of a U.S. carrier battle group is the symbol of its naval mastery. Nuclear powered U.S. carriers do not require refuelling at sea and have brought tremendous endurance and

133 Till, Seapower, pp. 367-376.
134 Ibid., p. 125.
136 Till, Seapower, p. 125.
flexibility to America’s worldwide maritime strategy across the world ocean. As a result, the influence of their power projection capability is incredible. This is limited not only to the striking power of the aircraft carrier itself, but extends to the capabilities of the escort ships, including nuclear submarines, which also possess dreadful offensive strength with their cruise missile attack capability. According to Kennedy, the carrier USS Enterprise, operating off the Persian Gulf in 2002, loaded 70 aircraft and was accompanied by fifteen vessels and 14,300 officers and sailors. The cost of constructing such a flotilla might equate to about U.S. $20 billion, an amount equal to Italy’s entire defence budget.

Meanwhile, the problem with aircraft carriers gives rise to heated debate because of their cost and potential vulnerability to air and submarine attack. In order to solve the expense problem, the United States had a plan to develop the so-called “arsenal ship” that was to be capable of delivering large quantities of sea-launched missiles. The development programme, however, eventually was abandoned because the U.S. Navy decided that aircraft carriers were still a superior option in terms of cost-efficiency and tactical flexibility. Additionally, in most cases, a Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruiser and two Arleigh Burke-class missile destroyers, each equipped with a high performance and costly Aegis combat system involving sensors such as powerful radars and combat management computers and software, are deployed as part of a U.S. Carrier Strike Group (CSG). Only the U.S. Navy is able to develop such a remarkably advanced weapon system and possess such a large number of Aegis ships (around 80). Among these platforms, aircraft carriers, in particular, remain the symbol of the navy, and U.S. aircraft carriers overwhelm other countries’ carriers in terms the number, size, and capability. The U.S. Navy currently possesses by far the largest aircraft carriers and eleven CSGs.

139 Kennedy, The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery, p. xx.
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U.S. National Interests and Concerns in the Asia-Pacific Region

National Interests

Since the eighteenth century, U.S. national interests have been tied up with the Asia-Pacific region. In our time, there are several aspects vital to American national interests: to defend its homeland, citizens, military forces abroad, and interests; to prevent, deter and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical weapon attacks on U.S. interests; to ensure U.S. allies’ survival and their cooperation with the United States; to prevent development of hostile powers or failed states; to ensure the stability of the global system, including international trade, financial markets, supplies of energy and the environment; to create constructive relations, which meet U.S. interests, with powers that might turn into strategic opponents. Indeed, the contents of this list has been applied to U.S. national interests in the Asia-Pacific region: “With half the world’s population, one-third of the global economy, and growing economic, financial, technological, and political weight in the international system, Asia is key to a stable, prosperous world order that best advances American interests”. Asia accounts for 27 per cent of total U.S. merchandise trade and the amount of two-way trade between Asia and the United States annually is about U.S.$1 trillion.

The Strategic Chokepoints

Naval capabilities compensate for the disadvantages of America’s distance from the most strategically vital parts of the world, where most of its allies and strategic interests lie, especially around the rimlands of the Eurasian super-continent. As national blood vessels of military power and marine transportation, the U.S. government has termed eight international regions “U.S. Lifelines and Transit Regions”: the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea, along with the Panama Canal; the North Sea and Baltic Sea, including the associated channels and straits; the Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea,
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148 Cossa et al. The United States and the Asia-Pacific Region, p. 20.
along with the Strait of Gibraltar and access routes to the Middle Eastern areas; the western Indian Ocean, along with the Suez Canal, Bab el-Mandeb, the Strait of Hormuz, and the waters around South Africa (Cape of Good Hope) to the Mozambique Channel; the Southeast Asian seas, including the Malacca and Lombok straits, among others, as well as the SLOC that pass the Spratly Islands; the Northeast Asian seas, SLOC important for access to Japan, Korea, China, and Russia; the southwest Pacific, including SLOC access routes to Australia; and the Arctic Ocean and Bering Strait. 149 Many of these regions overlap with sea areas of the Asia-Pacific region and act as crucial chokepoints. In recent years, serious concerns seem to have affected U.S. regional interests and strategy. Principally, two concerns can be identified which impact upon regional stability in the current era, and each of these have a direct influence on American strategy and the efficacy of its seapower.

Two Concerns
The first American concern in the region has been with the rise of China, which seems to be a growing continental power that may pose a traditional threat to maritime states, and which has radically increased its influence on regional countries as a result of its growing economic strength and naval power. There is great potential for China to create regional conflict, over a number of separate issues. Among them, most importantly, the issue of conflict across the Taiwan Strait should be regarded as a serious strategic issue for the United States, and the Strait can be considered an important chokepoint located in the key position in the “first island chain” running opposite the East Asian mainland, should war ever break out with China. 150 In the Asia-Pacific region, however, Taiwan is not the only issue of potential danger, there are also several other serious strategic problems, such as North Korea’s missile strategy and nuclear development, and disputes over islands and marine resources such as those in the East and South China Seas.

However, these concerns all relate to China in one way or another, and mostly, are directly or indirectly relevant to the balance of seapower for regional security. For the United States, as the leading sea power and principal ally-protector for Japan and many

other states in the Asia-Pacific region, the advent of China’s initial assertions of regional hegemony, including the development of an increasingly formidable navy which could break the continental-maritime balance, is unacceptable. As the only global power, the United States cannot be indifferent to any major continental state which attempts to either extend its rule over the Eurasian continent or expand its power seaward to challenge the U.S. maritime defence system around any region of the Eurasian rimland, including the rimlands of Asia. A maritime state cannot submit to domination by a growing land power with an expanding navy over such crucial sea areas.\textsuperscript{151} China’s exploitation of seapower has directly had a harmful influence on allies, above all Japan, which depends completely on the alliance with the United States for its security. The United States has thus been required to protect maritime allies from threats brought about by the rise of China because such a situation is directly connected to U.S. interests and national strategy to dominate the world ocean.\textsuperscript{152}

The other menace has been the threat to maritime security by less easily defined sources, such as terrorism, piracy and natural disasters, which may require cooperation with other nations to overcome. Although America has near invincible power in terms of conventional warfare capabilities, but still even for the super power, it is extremely difficult to counter such vague, unconventional foes and threats and “non-traditional” security challenges. In terms of national power, it may be no exaggeration to say that the United States has reached the peak of its power and has more or less managed to maintain it. However, the world’s security environment has completely changed since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. There are diverse threats which have to be countered by a brand new concept, more flexible than Mahan’s ideas of large fleet actions in major naval warfare. Consequently, unlike the maritime strategy during the Cold War, the aftermath of 9/11 has required the development of a new strategy to highlight the prevention of war as well as the winning of war, and of maintaining good order upon the oceans and in the world’s littorals. This strategy has not been aimed at defeating particular state opponents.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., pp. 40-41.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., p. 39.
The United States and the Maritime Coalition

In order to protect its interests, prevent conflicts and prepare to counter enemies in the Asia-Pacific region, the United States has been attempting to enhance the capabilities of U.S. forces, mainly by the deployment to the region of long-range strike capability, streamlined and consolidated headquarters and a network of access. The overseas presence requires secure infrastructure for security matters. Permanent overseas basing with armed forces is crucial. As a consequence, allies as friendly hosts have been vital for U.S. national strategy. “It bears reemphasizing: Our military forces, both forward deployed and based at home, are only part of our military capability. Another part is rooted in the network of alliances and security relationships we have created with other nations.”

The maritime coalition has to be organized from strategic players in the region by the conduct of U.S. national strategy, as it is the greatest sea power that always can take the initiative to choose and organize allies. No matter how this is done, its alliance strategy is really vital. Former Australian Defence Minister (and current Ambassador to the United States), Kim Beazley, has asserted that a member of the U.S. San Francisco alliance system is simply unable to find any other regional or bilateral alliance strategy superior to the existing security framework. The coalition composed of maritime states is the basis of the alliance strategy for the United States. The leader of the coalition has to have the strategic and diplomatic flexibility to bring new members into the system when necessary, considering the geopolitical context of the maritime alliance strategy.

According to Lawrence Prabhakar, currently, the U.S. government is attempting to enhance the capability of the alliance network through three measures: selling U.S. arms and helping “transformation” in order to strengthen alliance capabilities in partners such as Japan, South Korea, Australia, Thailand and Singapore; assistance to develop greater
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interoperability of U.S. forces with its counterparts in Japan, South Korea, Australia, Thailand and the Philippines for the sake of maturing combined operations; constructing access points in the allied states that would allow U.S. marine and air expeditionary forces to be efficiently deployed and to fully use naval and air striking power for littoral dominance in a difficult situation.  

The Asia-Pacific region is becoming less stable due to increasing challenges to the mature U.S. security framework, especially those posed by China in the maritime-littoral security arena. For the United States, its allies and friendly nations, there are real advantages provided by strengthening the U.S.-led maritime coalition as an axis of the sum total of combined (that is to say, multinational) maritime might. Building the maritime-dependent coalition is thus the best strategy against the various threats facing the region.

The main players to ensure the endurance of the coalition must be navies due to the maritime nature of the region. Only the United States, as the greatest maritime power which can exert overwhelming influence on other country’s navies and maritime strategies, is able to exercise leadership of the maritime coalition by promoting naval cooperation. The U.S. Navy regularly conducts combined maritime drills and operations with almost every nation’s navy at various levels, many of which adopt the same or similar concepts and procedures to those of the U.S. Navy. Almost every navy, even including Russia and China, sends senior naval representatives to the biannual International Sea Power Symposium held at the U.S. Naval War College. In addition, the U.S. Navy supplies technology and armaments to friendly navies or develops advanced systems with allies. These activities have enhanced the interoperability of the United States with a great number of countries around the world. Also, as described by Sam Tangredi: “Like the U.S. dollar in international commerce and the use of the English language in the development of information technology, the U.S. Navy has become the benchmark and dominant standard for all things naval.”
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Only the United States can afford the cost of preserving the extensive logistic capability for an ocean going fleet and of attaining (and maintaining) advanced naval technologies to make a fleet adapt to the modern world.\textsuperscript{162} That is why only U.S. naval power has had the capability to forge agreement in, and to lead, maritime coalitions for the procurement of common profits in terms of strategic stability and improved maritime security. The greatest maritime power, like the United States, must take necessary measures for the prevention of a continental state’s ambition aimed at exploiting seapower and posing new threats to regional stability. As noted earlier, to defeat an aggressive land power, a sea power needs not only maritime friends, but also a continental power’s cooperation as a land power strategic partner. The United States actually has enough diplomatic power to win a land power over to its side and to site its bases in a coalition land power’s territory. To defeat non-traditional threats, the United States and maritime states need a new maritime coalition, including rivals, with a new concept such as a newly-emerged maritime coalition based on Till’s “collective navies” idea, not a traditional maritime coalition as “national navies”. These are key factors to the success of coalitions established for quite different purposes.

\textbf{The New Maritime Strategy}

The new world situation has urgently required the United States to develop a much more delicate and flexible strategy in order to cope with the innovative features of newly-emerged challenges, mainly from non-state actors. In this case, the battlegrounds would include “ungoverned” maritime zones accounting for a substantial portion of the world’s marine geographical situation. It is undoubtedly tough to precisely predict how maritime terrorism, piracy, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and drug trafficking might actually interact with one other. There are four distinct features of the new American joint maritime strategy, the \textit{Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower}.\textsuperscript{163} Firstly, the new strategy emphasizes closer cooperation between the maritime forces of the United States and those of other countries as much as possible. Secondly, unlike its strategy during the Cold War, not only the winning of war, but also the prevention of war has been regarded as an important target, including preventing the

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., p. 6.
development of non-state threats. Thirdly, the new strategy has a special emphasis on “soft power” such as humanitarian assistance and the protection and promotion of economic activities, as well as “hard power” for naval battles. Fourthly, the strategy has not expressed any concern over Chinese naval expansion, although the necessity of deploying more aircraft carriers and submarines to the western Pacific was stated clearly in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) in view of the concern about China’s naval expansion. The new concept of the maritime strategy seems to consider the participation of rivals in at least some cooperative activities. There are three main reasons that lead to United States to push ahead with such a global cooperative framework: the globalization of the world economy, with marine shipping at its centre; new vulnerabilities exposed by non-state threats; and dramatic advances in technology, especially information technology.

Admiral Michael Mullen and the 1,000-Ship Navy

Currently, American naval capability can provide extraordinary readiness to enable its forces to dispatch for various activities, operations and exercises. In spite of this, the United States further focuses on increasing the flexibility and agility of the navy rather than the combat strength of its conventional carrier battle and amphibious groups. To deeply integrate U.S. maritime forces and enhance international maritime cooperation, the concept of the “1,000-ship Navy”, advocated initially by then U.S. Chief of Naval Operations (and now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff), Admiral Michael Mullen, in August 2005, has been promoted. The concept of the 1,000-ship Navy reflects the features of the new strategy well. The 1,000-ship Navy, now renamed the Global Maritime Partnership initiative, is promoted as a voluntary global maritime network, without formal legal or encumbering ties, which is to include maritime forces, port operators, commercial shippers, and international, governmental and non-governmental agencies, working cooperatively in order to increase the level of security and safety in
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the international maritime sphere. The main objectives of the concept are to protect SLOC and to prevent terrorism. This concept can be categorized as a form of “collective navies” coalition; a type of informal “coalition of the willing”, the reflection of an idealistic view of the Global Maritime Partnership as a form of collective security.

Admiral Mullen stated the different roles for and challenges of the U.S. Navy in the following terms: “Balanced to face the challenges of our age: Piracy, drug smuggling, transport of weapons of mass destruction over the high seas, exploitation of economic rights, organized crime, and yes, terrorism. As well as not taking our eye off the requirement for major combat operations.” The U.S. Navy has evolved since the end of the Cold War to operate in the green and brown water areas, in addition to the traditional blue water emphasis, but Mullen understands that no matter how formidable the U.S. Navy is in size, there are limits to what a single power can accomplish. “Despite differences in size or structure of our navies, cooperation today is more necessary than ever before. And cooperation is growing, but we need more - much more.”

As a feature of seapower, beyond doubt, this global maritime network is not only for security, but also for the promotion of economic growth and political networking. As the only global blue-water navy, the U.S. Navy is able to take the initiative in building the naval cooperative framework with other maritime nation’s support, including leaders of shipping industries. Mullen listed ten principles considered for the Global Maritime Partnership initiative: respect for national sovereignty; participation and cooperation for common interests; focusing on security in the maritime domain, including ports, harbours, territorial waters, maritime approaches, the high seas,
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international straits, and seams between them; the significance of all participants and each member’s capabilities; the involvement of a variety of players consisting of navies, coast guards, shipping companies, and a variety of governmental agencies and nongovernmental actors; the significance of assistance for less capable nations or navies; active requests by nations or navies that need assistance; developing regional maritime networks; sharing information; and the imperative need for the cooperation in spite of the necessity of protracted effort.  

**Hurdles to Overcome**

According to Ronald Ratcliff, there are some problems to overcome for the sake of building the Global Maritime Partnership initiative: hostility among rivals, capability for responses to specific circumstances, confusion caused by relations between domestic and international law governing the seas, and the difficulty of communication. According to Ratcliff, “Nothing in this list in new, but the world’s navies have yet to find ways to resolve them.” Actually, naval officers have had to face similar problems since earlier times. One time Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral of the Fleet Chester W. Nimitz, stated the following about multinational naval doctrine:

> different supply specifications, difference communications, lack of common language national pride, different standards of living, different personal relationships…. There were also more substantive issues, including different tactics and techniques, extra time required for the establishment of integrated commands and staffs, and lack of knowledge of capabilities.  

Further, James Tritten states his opinion with no reservations:

> Military doctrine is derived from various national considerations: government policy, available resources, strategy and campaign concepts, existing doctrine, the threat, history and geography and demographics, type of government, and existing doctrine, and TTP [tactics, techniques and procedures]. It is extremely hard to see how many foreign governments
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would allow U.S. military doctrine, at strategic or operational levels, to govern the behaviour of their own national military forces.177

Such problems have to be approached carefully and slowly.

Weaving the Elements and Factors of Seapower
The key point of properly conducting seapower is how people could comprehend various factors and the complicated interactions of seapower. Seapower is composed of a range of essential elements belonging to all strategic layers interacting with each other with a sensitive sense of balance (refer to Figure 3 above). Specialists on seapower have been required to master a wide range of relevant knowledge about a number of intellectual and practical fields such as international relations, geopolitics, strategic thought, military expertise, ocean law, fisheries and sea-bed resources, shipping, and relevant technologies, because of the comprehensive nature of seapower. In practice, for a maritime state, it is truly difficult to attain formidable seapower unless all diverse factors come together into a cluster. Even though seapower has been an extremely useful, indeed vital, strategic tool and a driving power for a nation, harmonizing each strategic element is awfully difficult and requires sensitive political and diplomatic skills for successful integration.

Wylie’s General Theory for a Sea Power State
Admiral J.C. Wylie stated in his classic work, Military Strategy: a General Theory of Power Control, that a “A breadth of opinion and perspective and belief is a requirement for continuing resilient vitality in any social program.”178 In order to effectively employ seapower as a national strategic tool, a high-level theory that could weave different factors and differences of position and philosophy into true seapower is required.179 Wylie stated further that there are “certain requirements of universality and specificity and structure and inclusiveness that must be met by any general theory of strategy.” On “the business of war strategy”, Wylie pointed out as war-planning assumptions: 1) “despite whatever effort there may be to prevent it, there may be war.”; 2) “the aim of war is some measure of control over the enemy.” 3) “we cannot predict with certainty
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the pattern of the war for which we prepare ourselves.” 4) “The ultimate determinant in war is the man on the scene with a gun.” 180 In terms of a general theory, he insists

The primary aim of the strategist in the conduct of war is some selected degree of control of the enemy for the strategist’s own purpose; this is achieved by control of the pattern of war is had by manipulation of the center of gravity of war to the advantage of the strategist and the disadvantage of the opponent.181

Wylie’s theory can be converted into a general strategy for a maritime state focusing on seapower. Such an approach of using general strategy has been adopted by John B. Hattendorf, an adherent to Wylie’s theory, who states:

Strategy’s aim is to establish control while it provides a common frame of reference for the specialised work of the soldier, sailor, airman, politician, diplomat, technologist, and economist in their joint efforts to reach a mutual goal that reflects national policy and the basic interests of a nation. Strategy, as a concept, covers all kinds of conflict. It is not limited to wars or even to military application. The military or naval application of it is rarely inseparable from the broad social context within which and on behalf of which it functions as a part.182

Not only a mere government, but also a coalition builder, the United States needs to construct such a general theory – to create and maintain international frameworks for maritime cooperation, such as the Global Maritime Partnership initiative – which is convenient to harmonize diverse values, interests and capacities that a wide variety of navies and players have. This topic calls for further research to establish this sort of theory. With respect to Japan, as the primary subject of this thesis, a sophisticated theory is required to convince Japanese people, who lack awareness about their security environment and national strategy, that it is in the national interest to share a common awareness of, and a general support for, strategy for weaving together the essential elements and factors of seapower.

Each element of seapower has an essential role to play in seapower and maritime strategy. In order to weave together the various elements of seapower, it is, above all,
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important to understand the maritime approach to strategy, including its coalition-building aspects. Any state that wants to utilize seapower as a strategic tool, or to develop as a “true maritime state”, must be able to understand the features of maritime power and the global aspects of maritime strategy. Accordingly, seapower experts have to intensify activities to raise awareness for the importance of maritime power amongst both the public and political leaders through enhancing public relations activity. This will not occur unless people become aware that their homeland must be a maritime state; in Sun Tzu’s terms, to “know oneself” as a sea power state. Whether or not people have adequate understanding and consciousness of this maritime mindset will influence the fate of a sea-dependent state.

**Conclusion**

In history, seapower has maintained its position as a significant strategic tool, which secures the safety and prosperity of maritime states. In the modern age, compared with Mahan’s era, integrating different players and factors is especially significant to increase the effect of seapower. In order to create a global maritime network for peace and prosperity, the construction of maritime coalitions is crucial, in practice. Above all, coalition-building through naval cooperation is the key factor of this matter. The importance of the quantity and quality of a navy’s role at the political-strategic level has been rapidly increasing because of the need to cope with the various new threats that are appearing in the twenty-first century.

In addition, the traditional threat to a maritime state, a great continental power heading for the oceans, remains unchanged as a real possibility. To counter such an opponent, a maritime state is required to carry out a difficult strategy to build alliances and pursue a “balance of power” strategy with sea power allies to build and maintain the seapower network focusing on sea control and economic warfare to weaken the opponent. Moreover, since the advent of newly-emerged different types of threats, maritime states need to build “collective navies” to deal with this range of challenges.

Seapower can be a superb strategic tool to expand and preserve national power, yet it requires a state to commit to a great deal of policy (that is to say, political) and financial exertion to fully realize its latent power. A most important factor remains how maritime
mindedness can be nurtured in the character of the people and the government. Without a sense of common purpose in maritime strategy, effective seapower composed of the various factors outlined throughout this chapter will never be formed. Such strategic awareness is urgent for Japan, which cannot subsist without seapower.
CHAPTER 3
Seeds of Conflict around the Japanese Islands

Introduction
The greatest threat to a maritime state, as previously mentioned, is a great continental power which has ambitions to build a first-class navy for the purpose of challenging the maritime state(s) at sea. In the 21st century, Japan appears to be faced with more potential crises spurred by continental powers than ever before. This chapter will examine potential threats to Japan’s security from neighbouring states on the continent. The first section will analyse why Japan has to remain cautious of threats from China within the context of China’s strategic culture and maritime strategy. The second section will identify and discuss the development of a continental coalition and the issue of the northern territories between Japan and the other great land power, Russia, which hinders the development of friendly and cooperative relations between the two countries. The third section will explore the issue of Korea by discussing its naval power and ambitions, its territorial disputes with Japan, the geographical and historical context of Korean strategic culture, and the relevance of North Korea to Japan’s security.

The Rise of China and Growing Danger to Japan in the Maritime Arena
The strong influence that China wields on the future of international relations is inarguable. China’s robust economic growth has had a strong influence all over the world, especially among Asia-Pacific countries. The Chinese public welcomed the rise of China as a global power and declared themselves in favour of, and actively supported, the expansion of China’s economic and military power. The Chinese are confident that China will catch up with the United States as a global power in the future.1

Since 1996, China’s defence spending has increased over ten per cent every year. China has been buying weapons from Russia since the end of the Cold War. China has strongly pushed ahead with the modernization of its armed forces, especially the Chinese navy, as the core of its national strategy. Obviously, taking into consideration the issue of Taiwan, China’s maritime strategy has been carefully observed by the
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international community. A great land power state with both the capability and intent to expand naval power as a central element of its grand strategy poses one of the greatest threats to the national interests of maritime states at all times. A land power that has enough strength to head for the sea makes the balance of power in the maritime arena unstable. After the end of the Cold War, China has replaced the Soviet Union as a land power menace to maritime states from the Eurasian continent, most especially, its neighbour, Japan, a genuine sea-girt state. For sea power states, it has been demonstrated throughout history that a formidable continental power is always a potential enemy in the long run. Although the Japan Self Defense Force (JSDF) is one of the most advanced military forces in the world, it can be stated without doubt that China’s maritime ambitions and its increasing naval power clearly pose a menace to Japan’s seapower and its wider national interests. A particular concern would be the potential use of China’s submarine fleet as a primary instrument of its strategy; platforms which, as natural enemies of both merchant and naval shipping, are particularly problematic for Japanese strategic planners and policymakers.

**China’s Strategic Culture**

*Chinese World Order*

China has one of the world’s oldest civilizations, the world’s largest population, and is the largest country in Asia in terms of land area. These factors have contributed to bring about a distinctive strategic culture among the Chinese. The term “strategic culture” has been defined as follows: “a distinctive and lasting set of beliefs, values and habits regarding the threat and use of forces, which have their roots in such fundamental influences as geopolitical setting, history and political culture.” One of the most notable factors that shape Chinese strategic culture is “Sinocentrism,” which originates from a sense of superiority among the Chinese borne of its great culture and civilization, which has strongly influenced a large number of East Asian countries. It has been argued that China’s foreign relations historically have been hierarchic and non-egalitarian due to this impact of a psychology of domination of neighbouring lands and
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peoples upon Chinese culture. The graded and concentric hierarchy of China’s foreign relations can be grouped into three zones:  

1) the Sinic Zone comprised of the most close and culturally-related tributary states such as Korea and Vietnam, which used to be dominated by the Chinese empire, including Ryukyu (Okinawa), and Japan for a short period;  
2) the Inner Asia Zone comprised of tributary groups, the nomadic states and semi-nomadic people of Inner Asia. These are the people who were considered threats to the security intended to be provided by the Great Wall at times, who were not only ethically and culturally non-Chinese but also external or on the border of the Chinese civilization area;  
3) the Outer Zone consisted of the “outer barbarians”, who lived in remote places over land or sea at various distances beyond the Chinese “centre,” including the Japanese, Southeast Asians, South Asians and Europeans. who were supposed to pay a tribute to the Chinese empire in order to maintain trade relations with China.

These zones constitute what has been called the “Chinese World Order”. This mentality has been clearly etched in the Chinese psyche and has affected the country’s behaviour. For example, when King George III of Great Britain dispatched an envoy with British industrial products as gifts to the Qing Dynasty for a trading relationship in 1793, the Chinese emperor answered,

We, by the Grace of Heaven, Emperor, instruct the King of England to take note of our charge…The Celestial Empire, ruling all within the four seas…does not value rare and precious things…nor do we have the slightest need of your country’s manufacture. Hence we have commanded your tribute envoys to return safely home. You, O King, should simply act in conformity with our wishes by strengthening your loyalty and swearing perpetual obedience. 

Fear of Domestic Rebellion and External Aggression

Chinese history is strewn with wars. According to Shu Guang Zhang, from 1100 BC until the end of the Qing Dynasty (1911), there were as many as 3,790 domestic and foreign wars, as well as rebellions, that can be confirmed in China’s history. Most Chinese dynasties were overthrown due to “inside disorder and outside calamity” (nei-
luan wai-huan in Chinese); domestic rebellion and external aggression. In the security environment around the Chinese periphery, in instances where foreign powers were not subservient to Chinese power, domestic rebellions had a greater chance of occurring due to either foreign sponsorship or the use of neighbouring territories as sanctuaries by rebel groups. That is why China has had to apply diplomatic pressure on neighbouring countries to contain unsatisfactory elements hostile to the imperial regime. Throughout history, as indeed remains the case today, maintaining regime security has been a primary policy consideration for the autocratic rulers of China. According to John Fairbank, the Sinocentric world order was not relevant just to the Chinese culture area. Even though there were culturally huge differences between the Manchus, Mongols, Uighur Turks, Tibetans, and others, and the Chinese, the Inner Asia Zone had included them, because mounted soldiers from the Inner Asian Zone had a decisive power in wars until the emergence of firearms, and they gradually became rulers of all China. Therefore, the non-Chinese were classified into the zone. While the Chinese had cultural and economic superiority, it was not enough to control the nomadic peoples’ warmaking capability at times. As Fairbank insists, “In strategic terms the ‘Chinese empire’ had to be actually the great continental ‘Empire of East Asia’….”

As a matter of fact, the Chinese suffered from a sense of inferiority in military affairs. It seems counterintuitive that this factor actually shaped Sinocentrism further. That is, those in power have always had a fear of external and internal threats. Accordingly, it is not hard to anticipate that such a mental process produced a mixed sense of superiority and fear toward others, especially the warlike nomadic peoples of the great Eurasian steppe. This thinking has prodded China to adopt domineering, at times wholly aggressive, diplomatic postures towards its neighbours. Nationalism, like Sinocentrism, is also an effective political tool for policy makers to unify a vast multicultural, ethnically diverse continental empire. This is one reason why China’s neighbours historically have had to have been prepared to deal with China’s offensive diplomatic posture towards them.

The Land Power Who Fears the Sea
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Because of China’s size, defending it means defending virtually an entire continent.\textsuperscript{11} China’s land area is about 9.6 million square kilometres and with a land frontier of around 28,000 kilometres in length, adjoining North Korea, Mongolia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, Laos, and Viet Nam. China has an 18,000 kilometre coastline, looking across the seas towards Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia and Brunei. In contrast, Russia’s defence is overwhelmingly land-based, whereas the United States has focused on sea- (and air-) based defence. China, however, must defend not only its land boundaries but also its maritime borders.\textsuperscript{12} In its long history, the high frequency of civil strife and interstate wars against continental powers required China to focus its efforts on land-based security based on constructing and maintaining huge land forces. Although it seems that China’s main national security problems are concerned with arrangements to secure its land frontiers; and unlike the Soviet Union, another (former) continental giant, China had no friendly states among neighbours acting as strategic buffers.\textsuperscript{13}

China’s national destiny as a land power state has shaped typical strategic behaviour as a land power lacking buffer zones, unlike sea girt countries. Land powers generate national power from their land territories; hence, they often pursued a territorially expansionist policy of seizing land to increase wealth and/or security, and they often were driven to invade adjacent countries for such purposes: i.e., to gain power and protection. Arousing the suspicion of other continental states is an imperative habit. However, at present the Chinese government instead concentrates on building a blue water navy for the sake of pursuing ambitions based on Chinese interpretations of the lessons of Mahan’s theory of maritime strategy.\textsuperscript{14}

In Chinese history, land battles usually decided destinies of successive dynasties. Rivers were battlefields for navies. In the south, however, there were people with maritime spirits. For instance, at some time around the fourth century, the Chinese put
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compass into practical use and travelled seawards. During the end of the seventh century, the Chinese sailed the South China Sea, Celebes Sea, Banda Sea, and Andaman Sea, and then they built a Chinese settlement in each of these places.\textsuperscript{15} During the era of the Ming Dynasty, in 1405, the Zheng He-led mighty fleet which included about 27,000 men set out on an epic voyage to make a visit to Southeast Asia, the Middle East and eastern Africa at the behest of the Ming Dynasty Yongle Emperor. Zheng He conducted a total of seven such great voyages until 1433. During the Ming period, mighty fleets led by Zheng He reached Java, Palembang, Malacca, Ceylon, and Calicut on the southern coast of India. Zheng He made many expeditions and even reached the Persian Gulf and the east coast of Africa. He made over 30 countries tributary states to the Ming Dynasty.\textsuperscript{16}

Although the Ming Dynasty had a formidable navy, the Chinese continent was in turmoil and its national power and central position within Asia began to decline when European powers extended their reach to the Far East in search of mercantile profits. Over the next several centuries Chinese power and security was repeatedly challenged by seaborne powers, culminating in what the Chinese view as their “century of shame” from the mid nineteenth to the mid twentieth century; a national humiliation delivered most frequently from the sea;

In the last 109 years, imperialists have repeatedly invaded China from the Sea…470 times, 84 of these being serious invasions. The ocean has become an avenue for the aggressors to bring in their troops and haul away our wealth….The ocean is not only the basic space for human survival, but also an important theater for international political struggle….The better people can control the sea, the greater they have the sea territorial rights [which have] become inseparable from a country’s sovereignty….\textsuperscript{17}

From such historical experiences, China learned the following lessons: 1) a strong naval force is necessary for the protection of the land; 2) a nation without an understanding of

\textsuperscript{16} See Takanobu Terada, Teiwa [Zeheng], Shimiyu Shoin, quoted in Ibid.
the importance of the ocean is a nation without a future; and 3) a major sea power which is unable to protect its sea territorial right will not be undurable.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{The Land Power Who Heads for the Sea}

After the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, Chinese naval strategists were allowed to alter and develop its traditional strategy of “People’s War.” This strategic concept posited that any foe who invaded the Chinese homeland could be overpowered by a massive number of soldiers and the general population; a strategy which was supposed to be conducted by making a strategic withdrawal in order to drag the opponent deep into the vast Chinese hinterland.\textsuperscript{19} The naval strategy adopted by the Communist Party largely reflected the strategic thought of Mao’s traditional guerrilla strategy. The collapse of the Soviet Union, however, significantly diminished the possibility of any external threat that could invade Chinese territory.\textsuperscript{20}

In the 1980s, the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) after longstanding argument, finally decided to change the traditional strategy that had downplayed technological capability to one of a high-tech national defence strategy emphasizing electronics, automation, guided missiles, and nuclear power.\textsuperscript{21} Admiral Liu Huaqing and the naval thinkers struggled to reform and improve the “coastal defence strategy”, the main doctrine until early 1980s designed for guerrilla warfare against invaders from the sea and conducted by light warships, shore-based planes and submarines. Afterwards, modernization of the navy and a new naval strategic concept, the “active green water defence strategy” was adopted.\textsuperscript{22} This transformation was intended to extend China’s maritime defensive frontier to between 200 nautical miles and 400 nautical miles from the coast, even as far as the disputed South China Sea islands.\textsuperscript{23}
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Meanwhile, China’s maritime interests were steadily gaining in importance. Overall, these facts, and the growing significance of maritime interests led Chinese leaders to reconsider their maritime strategy. The impact of the performance of U.S. forces in the Gulf War drove the PLA to intensify this re-thinking of Chinese maritime strategy. Through research on modern maritime warfare by the navy, the PLA came to recognize the importance of an offensive posture in naval battles, such as attacking the enemy’s ships, blockading its islands, ports and bases, attacking its sea lines of communications (SLOC) and conducting landing operation on its soil. Furthermore, the Taiwan missile crisis in March 1996 brought home to China the might of the U.S. Navy and the significance of pre-emptive action to stop it.24 Afterwards, the Chinese navy came to consider the necessity of protecting its maritime interests beyond even the extent of the “two island chain,”25 which China is believed to have set as a maritime defence perimeter in 1997. Chinese naval strategists also believed that the navy would have to have a capability in its naval and air forces to conduct sea denial out to a distance of 2,000 nautical miles.26 As the dependence on foreign trade and the significance of marine resources increased, China underlined the urgent need to expand the range of its naval activities. Nonetheless, the defensive depth of the Chinese coast remains quite shallow and this poses serious issues for the Chinese navy and the PLA in general.27

**China’s Maritime Interests**

There are some maritime aspects which are crucial for China’s national interests.28 The first relates to maritime territorial and boundary claims, and border security issues. In February 1992, the National People’s Congress passed “The Declaration of the Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Territorial Sea” which defines Chinese maritime territorial limits. China has several longstanding territorial and other maritime disputes: over the Senkaku Islands with Japan and Taiwan; over the East China Sea with Japan; sovereignty over Taiwan; the Paracel Islands with Taiwan and Vietnam; the Spratly and
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other islands in the South China Sea with Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, Brunei and Malaysia; water areas of the South China Sea with each of these opponents; and boundary issues with both North and South Korea.  

The second aspect which is important for China’s national interests is the significance of marine resources. In order to feed the world’s largest population, significant food resources are needed. This includes securing fish for food consumption from oceanic fishing. This can be sourced from China’s vast claims to ocean jurisdiction. In 2008, China’s gross ocean product (GOP) reached 2.97 trillion yuan, an increase of eleven per cent in a year-to-year comparison, accounting for 9.87 per cent of China’s gross domestic product (GDP). China’s GOP reached 1.386 trillion yuan (US$202.96 billion) in the first half of 2009, which is an increase of 6.9 per cent over the same period of 2008, accounting for 9.91 per cent of China’s GDP. China’s State Oceanic Administration deputy director has stated that “The country’s GOP represented a further growth in the first half despite the world financial crisis, and will become one of the new economic engines in the future”.

SLOC Security and the “String of Pearls”

The close relationship between seapower and economic power has roused Chinese naval expansion and seapower network construction. Since 1993, China has been a net importer of oil as its rapidly growing economy increasingly consumes it with vigour. By 2020, it is said that China would need about 200-320 million tons of oil annually. China’s dependence on imported oil and natural gas has been increasing drastically and has led Beijing to conclude long-term agreements with energy suppliers such as Angola, Central Asian states, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Iran and other states of the Middle East, Russia, Sudan, and Venezuela.
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At the same time, China has focused on pursuing a blue-water navy capability as part of its national strategy. China drafted a “String of Pearls” strategy, “which is a term for a collective series of diplomatic and military measures aimed at acquiring access and strategic bases along more than 10,000 kilometers of sea-lanes stretching from the Middle East to China via the Persian Gulf.” China concluded agreements with the littoral states in the region to increase the number of the anchorage sites as so-called “pearls”. The “String of Pearls” strategy would allow the Chinese navy to obtain a certain degree of operational capability in the Indian Ocean which it has never had in living memory.

Many countries feel the urge to control the Strait of Malacca because of its significance as the main sea line of communication, including India, China and the United States. About 80 per cent of China’s oil imports pass through the Malacca Strait, which provides the shortest and cheapest sea route for oil shipments from the Middle East. Chinese leaders understand well, “It is no exaggeration to say that whoever controls the Strait of Malacca will also have a stranglehold on the energy route of China”. China is very suspicious of any American or Japanese intention to increase their influence over the Strait, potentially deploying their maritime forces and using the threat of terrorism as a justification. Even India has enhanced its naval presence around the region. China, the world’s second largest energy consumer, has been concerned about threats to its shipping industry and dependence on imported resources posed by maritime terrorism and piracy. The “Malacca Dilemma” remains a matter of grave concern for Beijing. The Chinese President, Hu Jintao, in November 2003, expressed concern by way of feint that “certain major powers” were ambitious to take the lead to control the Strait. As part of China’s “String of Pearls” strategy, China has been attempting to enhance its own involvement around maritime Southeast Asian states through offering assistance such as
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technical support, training, oceanographic surveys and navigational aids. 39 When an annual Straits of Malacca Conference was held in Kuala Lumpur in 2004, Zhao Jianhua, Counsellor for the Asian Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, announced that China was willing to support the littoral states on issues of maritime cooperation for the security and safety of the Malacca Strait, including on other issues such as marine environmental protection, maritime transport and navigation safety and the fight against transnational crimes at sea. 40

In September 2005, Malaysia and China concluded a Memorandum of Understanding on Bilateral Defence Cooperation. It is an important milestone for China’s strategy to secure its SLOC and the Malacca Strait. In September 2006, at the International Maritime Organization’s meeting on the “Straits of Malacca and Singapore, Enhancing Safety, Security and Environmental Protection” in Kuala Lumpur, China expressed its willingness to clearly help support the littoral states to safeguard the sovereignty and security of the Straits. 41

In addition, with the expansion of naval bases in the South China Sea, China has stayed on the offensive — including in the Spratly Islands — as the strategic passage to control sea lanes from the Strait of Malacca to the Taiwan Straits, through which about 90 per cent of Japan’s imported oil sails. 42

**Anti-Japanese Sentiment**

China did not adopt anti-Japanese strategic postures during most of the Cold War era, and certainly not after the Sino-American political reconciliation of the 1970s and 1980s. However, after a series of events which included the Tiananmen incident, the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the downfall of communism in Eastern Europe, and the break-up of the Soviet Union, China started to employ anti-Japanese statements. Increasingly, Chinese propaganda portrayed Japan as a nefarious villain in order to divert the people’s attention from democratization and any political or social activism.
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perceived as critical of the ruling Communist Party; and to appear strong with respect to its territorial disputes in the face of pressure from domestic nationalists, both within the government apparatus and without.\textsuperscript{43}

In fact, Chinese history textbooks focus on Japan’s war record until 1945 yet never mention Japanese diplomatic postures and assistance to China in the post-War era, in spite of the fact that the sum total of Japan’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) has totalled about seven trillion yen since 1979, comprising 60 per cent of the foreign aid to China in the 1980s. The Japanese government continued aid while many countries stopped their assistance even after the Tiananmen incident.\textsuperscript{44} China has also strongly opposed Japan’s bid to secure a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council, despite the fact that Japan is the second largest contributor to the United Nations after the United States, making up around 16.5 per cent of total contributions, while China’s contribution only accounted for just over 2.5 per cent of the total U.N. budget in 2008.\textsuperscript{45}

China has been extremely cautious about the possibility of a Japanese military build-up because of the latter’s economic power and advanced technology for both nuclear and conventional weapons. Chinese observers believe Japan would become a regional military power.\textsuperscript{46} The Chinese have been cautious even of Japan’s overseas peacekeeping activities. Chinese observers maintain that despite the attempts of both China and Japan to build constructive relations, seeds of strife remain. There is a range of Japanese behaviour, both past and present, which aggravate China and its diplomatic position towards Japan, such as: denying Japanese aggression in World War II and, in particular, wartime atrocities believed to be committed by Japanese forces in China; promoting Japan-Taiwan friendship; and attempting to revise Article 9 of the Japanese constitution.\textsuperscript{47} Some Chinese security analysts have regarded Japan as one of China’s
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most serious military threats in the post-Cold War period. Yet the post-Second World War behaviour of the two states has been quite divergent: whereas China has waged several wars, including initiating some armed conflicts by invading neighbours such as India and Vietnam, Japan, consistent with its post-War constitution, has studiously avoided direct involvement in armed conflict.

Beijing has never relaxed its vigilance against Japan and the Chinese Navy frequently conducts naval exercises, assuming a posture of war towards Japan. Beijing is deeply concerned with the possibilities that Tokyo would extend its military might to protect its economy, or Japan’s economic power would immediately turn into military power; or that Japan would lose confidence in its U.S. alliance and build its own arsenals, or that Japan would end its relationship with the United States due to trade-related problems and stand on its own feet as a full-fledged regional military competitor. In all these possible scenarios, Japan would emerge as a great threat in the future to China and its ruling Chinese Communist Party.

To make matters worse, since the Koizumi Cabinet was inaugurated in April 2001, various causes of conflict between Japan and China have risen to the surface and become the centre of attention in bilateral relations, such as visits made by the Japanese Prime Minister and several other politicians to the Yasukuni Shrine. There were also acts considered provocative by Japan such as Chinese vessels’ violation of Japanese waters, and longstanding issues such as the territorial dispute over the Senkaku Islands, and the conflict over maritime delimitation of their respective exclusive economic zones (EEZs) in the East China Sea. The Koizumi administration aggravated Japan-China relations already under strain due to the issue of Koizumi’s visit to Yasukuni Shrine. In April 2005, a violent Chinese crowd conducted anti-Japanese demonstrations. The mob attacked the Japanese embassy and the Japanese ambassador’s residence in Shanghai. During the same period, Chinese rioters raided Japanese consulates. China
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refused to issue an apology or to pay reparations as demanded by the Japanese government.\textsuperscript{52}

**Taiwan’s Strategic Value**

The island of Taiwan lies just 150 kilometres from the Chinese mainland and the east coast is about 110 kilometres from Japan’s Yonaguni Island. The width of the Taiwan Strait between Taiwan and China ranges from about 130 to 150 kilometres. Taiwan has a population of about 23 million and a land area of 35,980 square kilometres. The island had been occupied by Imperial Japan as part of the Treaty of Shimonoseki of 1895, the Sino-Japanese War settlement.\textsuperscript{53} After Imperial Japan’s Second World War defeat, Taiwan was governed by the Chinese Nationalist Party led by Chiang Kai-shek, effectively exiled from the continent by the Chinese Communist Party’s victory in the Chinese civil war. Since then, the Nationalist Party persisted in using the term Republic of China (ROC), even though native-born Taiwanese have preferred “Taiwan” as the name of their country. Thus, there are really two Chinas: the People’s Republic of China (PRC), called “China”, on the continent, and the ROC on the island of Taiwan, generally referred to as “Taiwan”, and not formally recognized as a state within the U.N. system. While communist China earnestly seeks to unify Taiwan with the PRC into “one China,” the somewhat politically divided Taiwanese seek international acceptance and recognition of their effective \textit{de facto} independence without necessarily pushing for full, formal, or \textit{de jure}, independence. As a complicating geo-strategic factor in their bilateral relations, the island of Taiwan is of immense importance for both China and Japan.\textsuperscript{54}
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\textit{For China}


The modernization of China’s naval and air forces has been an essential strategic factor to secure the Taiwan Strait from the PLA’s perspective. From a security viewpoint, although threats had historically originated from the continental north, China had been exposed to substantive seaborne threats since the mid 19th century. The waters around Taiwan, Hainan Island and the Zhoushan Islands are located along the south eastern coast of the mainland. From China’s continentalist standpoint, these islands form a protective wall for its coastal areas in which big advanced cities are grouped as the hubs of Chinese economic activity. 55 China’s navy consists of three fleets: the North Sea Fleet, the East Sea Fleet, and the South Sea Fleet. However, if a conflict occurs in the South China Sea, the North Sea Fleet and the East Sea Fleet have to pass through the Taiwan Strait to participate; and this same principle will apply in any case requiring the cooperation of the different fleets in a concentration of force, such as if an incident occurs in the East China Sea. 56 If China desires to advance to the sea, it can only have access to the Pacific Ocean owing to its geographical circumstances; that is through the island chain that includes Japan and, most pressingly for Chinese strategists, Taiwan. 57

The sea on the eastern side of Taiwan is deep enough for submarines to operate underwater without being detected. In order to reach the Pacific Ocean Chinese vessels need to pass through waters near Taiwan located about the midpoint between the East China Sea and the South China Sea, including via the Bashi Channel separating Taiwan from Luzon, or between northern Taiwan and the disputed Senkaku Islands. In addition, for ships of the East Sea and North Sea Fleets to transit to the Indian Ocean, they must also pass close to Taiwan, either through the Taiwan Strait itself or to the east of the island and via the Bashi Channel. Supposing that China could build a naval base on Taiwan, the PLA Navy could gain some degree of freedom of manoeuvrability in this maritime area. 58 As a result, its strategic influence could reach to maritime Southeast Asia through the South China Sea unhindered by geographical obstacles. There is a
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concern that if China achieves sufficient sea control within the South China Sea, most ASEAN countries might be put under the effective control of China.

Maritime Southeast Asia, containing the Malacca and Lombok Straits, is a region of great importance to Japan’s maritime interests and strategy. Concerning this, it would thus be a fundamental threat to Japan, too, if China achieves dominance over the Asian maritime region.

Moreover, in terms of its economy, Taiwan’s gross GDP was about US$402.7 billion in 2009. This economic potential is without doubt attractive to the Chinese. Access to Taiwanese technology may be an even greater attraction. For these reasons, Taiwan’s strategic value cannot be underestimated.

For Japan

The issue of the Taiwan Strait is important from a Japanese perspective for several reasons. First, Japan is highly dependent on marine transportation for its economic wellbeing and security, involving activities such as the import of raw materials and the export of manufactured goods. Therefore, if China seizes Taiwan, it means that China could easily control the Bashi Channel and Taiwan Strait, and the East and South China Seas, which would enable China to also throttle Japan’s economy using a naval blockade of this area. The Taiwan issue is the most paramount when considering the security of the maritime transport interests of Japan.

Secondly, many Japanese regard Taiwan as the world’s most pro-Japanese country, and there are strong cultural and social bonds between the two peoples as a consequence of Japan’s colonial rule of the island from 1895 to 1945. For example, Taiwanese who are educated in Japan take pride in this and even in speaking the Japanese language. Japanese influences can be easily discerned in Taiwanese daily life.
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Third, Taiwan has been regarded as a member of the “club” of maritime democratic states in the Asia-Pacific region. Taiwan’s democratic transition has been part of the nation-building process on the island and, as a result, has encouraged a certain degree of empathy and support from other states with similar liberal democratic political values. Maritime states need to be closely interdependent with each other for their own safety and to protect mutual interests and values. Democracy is one of the main elements of common ground by which to maintain the complex global maritime network that makes international cooperation possible. If Taiwan is subsumed by autocratic, continental China, it would mean the stunting of the development of democratization in Asia. 61 Consequently, Japan should be vigilant over Beijing’s strategies toward Taiwan and the waters of the Taiwan Strait.

**East China Sea Exclusive Economic Zones**

Tokyo and Beijing have a dispute over the delimitation of their respective exclusive economic zones in the East China Sea. China has asserted that its EEZ extends to the Okinawa Trough and the Nansei Islands, way beyond a theoretical mid point and thus encompassing a much larger part of the East China Sea than Japan would be eligible for under the claim based on the Continental Shelf Convention of 1958; while the Japanese government insists on an EEZ drawn from its baselines based on the equidistant principle: that is, with a boundary drawn at the mid point of the East China Sea. China, however, rejects the equidistance line that the Japanese government claims between China and Japan. Indeed, despite an evaluation made by Japan’s Ocean Policy Research Foundation based on its interpretation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOSC) that the total area of China’s continental shelf is 964,000 square kilometres, China insists that it can claim about three million square kilometres. 62

In the 1980s, Beijing test-drilled about 20 places for oil around the ocean area of China’s side near the equidistant line. On 28 January 1992, the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC) declared oil development open to foreign business. In the following month, China enacted and promulgated its territorial sea law claiming the
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Senkaku Islands. In 1996, a Japanese right-wing group named Nihon Seinen Sha constructed a lighthouse and requested that the Japanese government plot it on a hydrographic chart. In the same year, the Japanese EEZ was established in waters around the Senkaku Islands after the LOSC became effective, which was protested by both China and Taiwan. In November 1996, Chinese marine research vessels repeatedly violated Japanese territorial waters as it ignored warnings from the Japan Coast Guard (JCG). China’s evaluation of the prospects for oil and gas exploitation in the area around the middle of the equidistant line in the East China Sea yielded promising results. In April 1998, as a result of the potential for oil and gas development in this area, China constructed a platform for oil-well drilling and petroleum processing in the Pinghu offshore gas field, just 70 kilometres from the median line between Japan and China. Since December 1998, this facility has already delivered 450 million cubic metres of natural gas annually to Shanghai via two pipelines.

In May 2005, China completed drilling facilities at Shirakaba (Chunxiao in Chinese) and Kashi (Tianwaitian in Chinese) in the ocean area and a treatment facility at Kashi. More crucially, the facility at Shirakaba is extremely close to the equidistant line and there is a strong possibility that China pumps resources from Japan’s side of the line. In October 2005, the Japanese government proposed joint development of the areas around the line to China but China proposed a plan to jointly develop not only the Chunxiao oilfield group, but also the marine area of the Senkaku Islands and even the joint development area between Japan and South Korea. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan was deeply shocked by China’s proposal. In June 2008, China agreed to Japan’s participation in developing Shirakaba. The two governments also promised to conduct joint research by equal investment in an area north of Shirakaba and south of the Asunaro (Longing in Chinese) gas field. However, on 4 January 2009, a Japanese newspaper company, Sankei News, made a scoop with the story that China had
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unilaterally researched and developed the applicable marine area in violation of the 2008 agreement.68

The Senkaku Islands
The seabed around the disputed uninhabited islands known as Senkaku in Japanese and Diaoyu in Chinese in the East China Sea seem to be rich in oil and natural gas resources. The islands are claimed by China, Japan and Taiwan. The Senkaku archipelago is composed of five uninhabited islands and three rock reefs. The largest island among them, Uotsuri Island, is located about 410 kilometres from the Okinawa mainland and about 170 kilometres from Ishigaki Island; and is also 170 kilometres from Taiwan and 330 kilometres from the Chinese mainland (see Map 1). Currently, Japan effectively controls these islands. The gross area is only 5.56 square kilometres, with Uosturi Island comprising 3.82 square kilometres. About 248 Japanese nationals used to live on Uotsuri Island. There is an anchorage on the site, a dried bonito factory and a lighthouse built by a Japanese political group noted above. Although uninhabited since the end of World War II,69 Japan had in 1895 declared that the Senkaku islands were incorporated into Okinawa prefecture after research had determined that no other countries were in possession of the island group.70

After the war, the United States occupied Okinawa and established a government, in which the Senkaku islands was included.71 In 1961, after Toukai University Professor Hiroshi Arano published an article in a U.S. academic journal suggesting that there were rich oil and natural gas fields in the East China Sea, for the first time, the world took notice of the Senkakus. As a result, the United States became interested in this area and the vessels of the U.S. Seventh Fleet surveyed this sea area. In the 1960s, as a result of an Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) investigation, it became known that there seemed to be potential for enormous oil deposits underneath the East China Sea. In 1969 it was confirmed that the region is abundant in oil and other natural resources. As a result of the ECAFE surveys, since 1971, first Taiwanese and then

Chinese claims over the island chain were made. In 1971, the Taiwanese government announced that the islands were historically and geographically Taiwanese territories and the United States must return them as part of the San Francisco Peace Treaty. China insisted the islands were stolen by Japan due to its defeat in the Sino-Japanese War. In response to such claims, a Japanese right-wing organisation, Nihon Seinen Sha, built a lighthouse on Uotsuri Island in 1978 to stake a claim over the islands. Since then, Chinese and Taiwanese civilian organisations have sailed to the islands to protest. In the context of its claims under the Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC), China passed a new territorial sea law in 1992, setting out its claims to island territory and with an implied intent to investigate seabed resources around claimed islands and protect its claims, potentially by the use of force. Afterwards, Chinese oil exploration vessels stepped up operations around the islands.

Troubles over the Senkakus

On 2 September 1968, when Okinawa was under U.S. administration, Taiwanese ship crews, navy personnel and journalists landed on Uosturi Island. They painted in big letters a sign which read, “Viva, President Chiang” and hoisted the ROC flag. The Japanese government sent instructions to the Japanese Embassy in Taipei to file a protest to the ROC government. As a result of talks between the Japanese government, the Ryukyu government that ruled Okinawa, and the U.S. government, the ROC flag was removed from Okinawa. This was the first official recorded case that anyone other than Japan had landed on the Senkaku Islands. On 12 April 1978, a JCG patrol boat, Yaeyama, found a group of about 140 Chinese fishing boats around the sea area of the Senkakus. Sixteen of them were operating in waters northwest from Uotsuri Island. The stern warnings and expulsion orders issued by Yaeyama were ignored by these vessels. On 13 April, 40 Chinese boats intruded into the waters and staked a claim with placards. The JCG deployed ten patrol boats and seven aircraft, including two helicopters to the area. On 14 April, after Yaeyama issued a warning to a Chinese boat, one Chinese crewmember pointed an automatic weapon at Yaeyama. Yaeyama left but
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was chased by the Chinese boat for 30 minutes.\textsuperscript{78} On 13 April, the Japanese government filed a protest with the Chinese Embassy in Japan. The following day the Japanese Embassy in Beijing officially expressed sincere regret at this incident to the Chinese government. On 15 April Beijing unofficially told one Japanese politician in China that it was an accident. The Chinese, however, repeated the encroachment. Eventually, the number of violations decreased as Japan’s security precautions increased. On 18 April, all of the fishing boats left Japanese waters but continued operating in this sea area until early May. From 12 to 18 April, the number of their violations reached 357.\textsuperscript{79}

There have been many instances of incursions into the Senkaku islands. On 22 September 1996, Hong Kong activists left Hong Kong on a cargo ship to protest the activity of the Japanese political group that built the lighthouse. On 26 September 1996, JCG vessels warned and seized the ship; meanwhile, four of the passengers dived into the water about 3.3 kilometres from Uotsuri Island and washed up on the island. The boat rescued them and its captain called on the Japan Coast Guard for emergency help, but two of them were critically wounded. The leader of the activists died and the other was severely injured and taken by JCG helicopter to hospital in Okinawa for treatment.\textsuperscript{80}

On 6 October 1996, boats carrying activists from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao set sail from Taiwan. Forty-one of them intruded into Japanese waters. In response, the Japan Coast Guard sent about 50 patrol boats and ordered the intruding boats to leave the area and seized the protest boats. Two of them, however, broke through the JCG blockade and one activist managed to land on Uotsuri Island, planting both ROC and PRC flags on the island. This was the first case of Chinese protestors successfully landing on the Senkaku islands, despite the tight security. On 28 June 1998, six protest boats from Taiwan and Hong Kong ignored warnings from a JCG boat and intruded into Japanese waters around the Senkaku Islands.\textsuperscript{81} On 24 March 2004, seven Chinese activists illegally landed on Uotsuri Island and were placed under arrest by Okinawa Prefectural Police. At first, the police had planned to bring the case for prosecution;
instead, the activists were deported back to China, as Tokyo put a priority on diplomatic considerations.\(^\text{82}\)

At around 10 am on 7 September 2010, a JCG patrol ship, the 1,349-ton *Yonakuni*, was hit by a Chinese trawler about 12 kilometres north-northwest of Kubajima, one of the Senkaku Islands. The trawler collided against *Yonakuni* after the JCG vessel gave the ship a warning. About 40 minutes later, the Chinese trawler collided with the 197-ton patrol vessel *Mizuki*, chasing the Chinese ship, about 15 kilometers northwest of Kubajima. About 12: 55 pm, the trawler eventually came to a stop after JCG officials boarded the trawler in Japan’s EEZ.\(^\text{83}\) The Japan Coast Guard arrested the fishing boat’s captain on 8 September, on suspicion of obstructing public duties in connection with collisions with its patrol boats near the Senkaku Islands.\(^\text{84}\) On the following day, the coast guard sent the 41-year-old Chinese skipper Zhan Qixiong, to the Naha District Public Prosecutors Office’s branch on Ishigaki Island in Okinawa Prefecture. JCG investigators questioned 14 Chinese crewmembers. No one was injured in this incident.\(^\text{85}\) According to the Japan Coast Guard, about 70 Chinese fishing boats were operating after mid-August.\(^\text{86}\)

On 10 September 2010, the Ishigaki Summary Court in Okinawa Prefecture granted a request by prosecutors for a 10-day detention.\(^\text{87}\) Beijing made a strong protest against the incident, demanding the release of the captain.\(^\text{88}\) China announced its postponement of resumption of negotiations over joint development of gas fields in the East China Sea due to the incident.\(^\text{89}\) On 13 September, Japan returned the crew, except for the captain, to China, followed by protests in Beijing, Shanghai, and Hong Kong over the incident. China demanded that Japan again “immediately and unconditionally” release the skipper.\(^\text{90}\) Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao warned “If Japan goes its own way and
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continues with its judiciary proceedings, China will take further action,” and “Japan should bear all responsibility for the serious consequences that will arise [from its action].”

On 23 September, it was reported that Beijing was unofficially imposing an export ban on rare earth materials to Japan. Rare earths are essential materials, especially for Japan, to produce high-tech devices. China is the largest exporter of rare earth materials, accounting for 97 per cent of the world’s supply of the materials. In addition, China detained four Japanese citizens, employees of the construction firm Fujita Corporation, for allegedly videotaping military facilities. Afterward, Japanese prosecutors released the Chinese skipper, considering the relations between the two countries, although Chief Cabinet Secretary Sengoku emphasized the decision was made by the prosecutors.

Beijing can be seen to have achieved a diplomatic victory over the incident, with Tokyo giving in to diplomatic pressure to release the Chinese. However, China’s autocratic bluster met with strong international criticism.

Marine Surveys by the Chinese Navy

Okinotorishima (Okinotori Island) is located about 1,700 kilometres south of Tokyo. The “island” is a rock surrounded by a coral atoll 10 kilometres in diameter, and is actually made up of the two rocks, Higashikojima and Kitakojima. The aggregate area of the area claimed by Japan as EEZ based on Okinotorishima is about 400,000 square kilometres, which accounts for about ten per cent of Japan’s total EEZ (see Map 1). There are deposits of nickel, cobalt, manganese and copper as well as other seabed resources around the islands. The water area around the rocks is a known spawning region for tuna. This ocean area is a sea route for iron-ore and coal bulk carriers from Australia and New Zealand to Japan. Japan imports about 7.7 millions tons of iron ore (about six per cent of its annual imports) and about 16.7 millions of coal (about eleven
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per cent of annual imports) through the ocean area surrounding Okinotorishima.\textsuperscript{97}

Since 2001, China has deployed marine research vessels to the Okinotorishima ocean area without the agreement of the Japanese government. China has disregarded Japan’s protests, though a Chinese official publication praised the Japanese government for its shore protection work for the island in the past.\textsuperscript{98} China itself has actually built structures and an artificial island on some of the rocks and coral reefs of the Spratly Islands in the South China Sea, despite the fact that these rocks are submerged at high tide.\textsuperscript{99} In that case, China still constructed them and ignored the LOSC. Okinotorishima was cut and eroded away by wave action in the past, and as a result, the rocks are barely above water at high tide. The Japanese government started shore protection works in 1987. Currently it is undertaking a three-year plan of works with funding worth 28.5 billion yen. These operations commenced in March 2007 and the Japan Coast Guard has already constructed a lighthouse there.\textsuperscript{100}

There is a concern that China’s research around Okinotorishima could be used to gather data to enable the laying of mines and for submarine navigation in a case of a Taiwan contingency. Okinotorishima, which is located about 1,000 kilometres from U.S. military bases on the island of Guam, is geo-strategically important for China since it is located almost directly between Guam and Taiwan. Thus, the PLA Navy might be able to use the area around Okinotorishima to block or intercept U.S. naval forces using this most direct route to come to the aid of Taiwan in the event of a Chinese attack.\textsuperscript{101}

In 2004, Chinese officials started to announce that Okinotorishima was a rock, not an island. In response to this, Tokyo Governor Shintarō Ishihara set up an address billboard, declaring it an island in the following year.\textsuperscript{102} In March 2007, the JCG completed construction of a lighthouse near Okinotorishima. Around the islands, annually, 1,200
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ships pass by. In addition, the Japanese government is planning to construct wharf facilities near the islands to defend its territory and claimed EEZ sovereignty rights in this area.

In November 2004, a Chinese Han-class nuclear-powered attack submarine (SSN) that had left its home port of Qingdao in October, headed for Okinawa through the East China Sea. On 8 November, the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) received information on the unidentified submarine from United States Forces Japan (USFJ) and sent a P-3C ASW maritime patrol aircraft to the relevant waters around the southeast part of Okinawa. The submarine passed between Okinawa and Miyakojima (Miyako Island) and headed towards Guam. It then circled Guam at a distance of about 150 kilometres distance from the island. On its return, at 5:00 AM on 10 November, the Chinese SSN submerged and intruded into Japanese territorial waters near Ishigakijima (Ishigaki Island). After the submarine left Japanese waters, a “Maritime Security Operation”, which ordered the JMSDF to police the violated waters, was issued at 8:45 AM by the head of the Defense Agency, Ohno Yoshihori. However, the order was issued after the Chinese submarine had already exited Japanese territorial waters. The Japanese government was criticized for its slow response to this incident.

In 2004, Chinese oceanographic research vessels conducted 34 marine known research activities within Japan’s EEZ focusing on waters around the Okinawa islands, the Senkaku islands and Okinotorishima. Presumably, China investigated the seabed resources in the East China Sea and the passage from the East China Sea to the Pacific. Since the Taiwan crisis of 1996 China has been developing an appropriate maritime strategy based on sea and area denial as a countermeasure to U.S. Navy intervention in a future Taiwan contingency. Taking into consideration Beijing’s maritime strategic concept of the two island chains – the First Island Chain being Okinawa-Taiwan-the Philippine Islands and the Second Island Chain the Izu Islands-the Ogasawara Islands-Guam-Papua New Guinea – it seems that the turning point in any
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Sino-American conflict over Taiwan would be whether China could contain the U.S. Navy before the Americans could reach the Second Island Chain. For this purpose, China has been assiduously studying the sea floor of the ocean area stretching from Okinawa to Guam via Okinotorishima to be able to deploy naval mines and plan for the deployment of its submarines.\textsuperscript{108}

Further, in October 2008, four Chinese naval vessels sailed through the Tsugaru Strait to reach the Pacific Ocean. For Chinese surface combatants, it was the first identified passage through the strait. These ships navigated southward into the Pacific Ocean and passed between Okinawa Island and Miyakojima. In December 2008, two Chinese marine research vessels carried out navigation operations and sailed within the Japanese territorial waters around the Senkaku Islands.\textsuperscript{109}

**China’s Naval Power against Japan**

According to the Chinese government, China’s defence budget reached about 472.9 billion yuan and increased 15.3 per cent from 2008. It has increased on average 10 per cent annually over the last 21 years. At this rate, China’s defence budget doubles every five years. China’s official defence budget has risen 22-fold over the past 21 years.\textsuperscript{110} Analysis of 2000-2009 data shows the officially disclosed military budget of China increased at an annual average rate of 11.8 per cent, in the meantime China’s GDP annually increased 9.6 per cent on average over same period.\textsuperscript{111} China’s growing economic power cannot be helped depending maritime power. As an inevitable result, it must increase its naval power.

The Chinese navy has about 885 vessels including 60 submarines, and totals approximately 1.32 million tonnes.\textsuperscript{112} Beijing expended considerable effort to
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modernize its war capabilities, especially focusing on its naval power in preparation for littoral warfare in waters adjacent to the Chinese mainland over the past two decades.\textsuperscript{113}

Even though China’s naval power has modernized, there are still many problems. Several vulnerable points of the Chinese navy are pointed out:\textsuperscript{114} weak joint operations capability; lack of capability to secure air supremacy to continue a large-scale operation on the open sea; insufficient C4ISR systems and anti-ship search and targeting systems\textsuperscript{115}; many older-model, obsolescent submarines; lack of minesweeping capability; limited logistic support capability, and very few airborne warning and control system (AWACS) and tanker planes; and an inadequate number, according to Kawamura, of mobile short-range ballistic missiles (SRBM) to force the surrender of the Taiwanese.\textsuperscript{116} In addition, for example, compared to the JSDF, although Chinese forces outnumber Japanese forces, the JSDF is superior to the PLA with respect to technology and training, as well as, arguably, with regard to the bilateral naval power relationship\textsuperscript{117}; and in its alliance relationship with the United States, which brings many advantages, as discussed later in Chapter 5.

Kawamura asserts that now that China has begun the radical modernization of its forces, there would be some threats from the Chinese navy in the near future.\textsuperscript{118} First, is the threat of mobile theatre anti-ship ballistic missiles. If this missile were actually to be used, U.S. carrier battle groups would be threatened by this hard to defend against weapon, as would also Japan and Japanese surface naval forces. Secondly, China has shown interest in the past in purchasing the Tu-22M3 (NATO code name: Backfire) long-range bomber from Russia. This bomber can fly at Mach 2 and its radius of operation is about 7,000 kilometres. This range easily includes the Japanese islands and
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would pose a threat to Japanese sea lanes and those of its ally and other partners. Even
though no sale of this system has taken place, it is a key point to note China’s interest in
such a long-range weapon capable of striking seaborne targets. Its development of an
anti-ship version of the DF-21C medium range ballistic missile may be indicative of this
interest,\(^{119}\) and may even be viewed as an alternative to manned aircraft such as the
Backfire. Thirdly, China may build aircraft carriers. As long as the Chinese navy aspires
to be a blue-water navy, the acquisition of an aircraft carrier capability is indispensable.
In recent years, experts have carefully observed and debated whether or when China
would deploy aircraft carriers.\(^{120}\) China is believed to expect a future PLA Navy carrier
force to fulfil four roles: to protect home waters; to secure maritime interests; to secure
nuclear deterrence by protecting its SSBNs; and to project power and influence befitting
that of a great power.\(^{121}\)

Since the Second World War, aircraft carriers as the symbol of a country’s
important deterrent power have been accorded more attention. For some
historical reasons, China has not yet built aircraft carriers. But the academy
must look forward and train experts needed for the carriers. As the building
process is long, we simply cannot afford to dig wells after becoming thirsty.\(^ {122}\)

On 20 May 2009, Chinese Defence Minister Liang Guanglie stated, at talks with his
Japanese counterpart, Yasukazu Hamada, that all major powers except for China
possessed aircraft carriers; hence, China could not afford not to be without the
capability forever.\(^ {123}\) Given that Japan doesn’t possess a carrier either, Liang may have
been delivering a put down of Japan by implying that it isn’t a major power.

In 1985, China bought the former Australian aircraft carrier HMAS Melbourne to
explore China’s ambition of operating its own aircraft carrier. Afterwards, China

---

\(^{119}\) Eric Hagt and Matthew Durnin, “China’s Antiship Ballistic Missile: Developments and Missing Links,”

\(^{120}\) See, for example, Roland O’Rourke, “China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Navy
Capabilities — Background and Issues for Congress,” *CRS Report for Congress*, 23 December 2009; and
also Nan Li and Christopher Weuve, “China’s Aircraft Carrier Ambitions: An Update,”

\(^{121}\) Sumihiko Kawamura, “Chugoku Kaigun no Kūbokidō Kantai wa Itsu Shutsugen Suruka [Chinese
110.

\(^{122}\) Shen Lijiang, “The Mysterious Course of the Pilot Warship Captains,” *Jianchuan Zhishi [Naval and

purchased the ex-Soviet vertical take off and landing (VTOL) aircraft carriers *Minsk* and *Kiev*. They have been used as theme parks and have not been used for military purposes. In 1998, the *Admiral Kuznetsov*-class aircraft carrier *Varyag*, the uncompleted former Soviet carrier was sold to China by Ukraine. China has had it partly restored and refitted to be used for training the Chinese navy how to operate an aircraft carrier.\(^{124}\)

In 2007, it has been reported that the China’s Central Military Commission approved two projects to build Chinese-made aircraft carriers.\(^{125}\) The project aims to build a class of mid-sized conventional powered aircraft carriers. The aircraft carrier, derived from the *Varyag*, would carry a carrier-based version of the Chinese J-10 fighter aircraft and the Russian Sukhoi Su-33, currently in use by the Russian navy. According to the report China plans to build the first of this class of carrier by 2016 and to operate three aircraft carriers by 2020. China would take at least ten years to attain practical fighting power because training to operate carrier-based aircraft would take many years.\(^{126}\) Chinese pilots have reportedly already been trained in Ukraine and have begun take off and landing practice using a mock aircraft carrier flight deck on land. Also, China has already placed an order with a domestic company for a voltage distribution board used for the power control system of the aircraft carrier. Evidently, the aircraft carriers are being built on Changxing Island and will be deployed to the Sanya naval base on Hainan Island to control the South China Sea.\(^{127}\) The presence of Chinese aircraft carriers in the South China Sea could have a problematic, intensifying impact on the security environment of Japan and the whole of East Asia.

**Russia and the Continental Coalition**

For maritime states, a continental ally that plays the role of maintaining the balance of power on land against a rival land power is an essential factor for national strategy in order to be able to maintain the effectiveness of the irreplaceable sea power network in
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any struggle against a major continental power. This scenario is a matter of life or death for Japan. Historically, it typically has been difficult for great continental states to maintain good terms with other major land powers. However, in recent years, major land powers have been forging close security ties with each other in continental Eurasia. This possibility must be at the top of a maritime state’s list of security concerns.

Colin Gray insists that if China, Russia, Iran and other states form a continental coalition, it could challenge an American-policed Western-style world order, and in such a situation, a “Heartland” power or axis dominating Eurasia and posing a first-class menace to the maritime realm would represent Mackinder’s nightmare vision. Gray emphasizes:

Irregular warfare may well be the dominant mode in belligerency for some years to come, but interstate war, including great power conflict, will enjoy a healthy future…. Unfortunately, the twenty-first century is going to witness a new cycle, or two, of the historically familiar struggle for power and influence between great power rivals and their allies and fellow travellers. To venture a perilous bold prediction, what we can discern today appears to be the early stage of what has the potential to develop into a new Cold War.128

Although there are still a number of reasons for antagonism between Russia and China, the truism remains, “the enemy of my enemy is my friend” in international politics.129 Thus, a situation in which the two major continental powers are drawn together in coalition, despite actual and potential strategic differences, by a common opposition to American leadership of world order, may indeed be developing. This would pose a great challenge to Japan’s long-term security.

Russia

The defence budget of Russia was drastically reduced during the 1990s as a result of the country’s continued economic decline after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Consequently, Russian military strength drastically declined as well. Naturally, the Far Eastern Military District which is supposed to deal with Japan and China could not
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resist such a trend. The Soviet Pacific Fleet used to be the second strongest fleet in the 
Soviet Navy after the Northern Fleet, but a large number of naval vessels were removed 
from the register. In recent years, however, the Russian economy has recovered with 
the export of natural resources, especially oil and gas, during a period of what is likely 
to be prolonged high commodity prices for energy resources.

Furthermore, the “former” Putin administration, which adopted the slogan of rebuilding 
a strong Russian state, pushed the reconstruction of its military services. The Russian 
aircraft carrier, Admiral Kuznetsov, received major repairs and was put back into active 
service. The Kuznetsov was emblematic of this tendency. In addition, by frequently 
conducting combined military drills with other countries, Russian morale and skills 
have been gradually restored. In fact, Russia is still an active player in the geopolitical 
great power game in the Far East and in Central Asia. Then President Putin engineered 
a plan for the build-up of the Russian Navy in 2002. In October 2006, Putin approved a 
military build-up program to spend five trillion rubles for military equipment from 2007 
to 2015. In August 2008, the Russian Pacific Fleet conducted a large scale 
multinational combined drill. And expert analysts have noted that Russia has fortified 
its presence in sea areas with abundant natural resources in order to take the initiative in 
resource development.

Land Power Coalition

Unusual Relations for Land Powers

The two great Eurasian continental powers, Russia and China, share a common land 
frontier of over 7,000 kilometres. Border issues among land powers have often become 
causes of conflicts and can produce enmity among neighbours. The Soviet Union and 
China deployed huge armies on their common (and disputed) border, especially on the 
Usuri River, which was a high-tension border area. However, their relations rapidly 
improved in the late 1980s and the 1990s through both countries’ diplomatic efforts to
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solve territorial conflicts and conclude a number of agreements, as well as to strengthen relations with other Central Asian countries.

In April 1996, Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto and U.S. President Clinton announced a “Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security, Alliance for the 21st Century”; but after this, Chinese leader Jiang Zemin and Russian President Yeltsin, the leaders of the two great continental powers declared a “strategic partnership for 21st century”. It can be posited that the Sino-Russian continental partnership was formed as part of a strategy to confront the U.S.-Japan maritime alliance. Russia and China could find common benefit by forming the “partnership”: they are aiming at making the U.S.-Japan alliance weaker or divided, owing to the fact that, firstly, both China and Russia have eyes on weakening U.S. power and in a multi-polar world, it is favourable for them to maintain a “weak Japan”. In fact, it is merely wishful thinking to hope that they might support Japan’s bid to become a permanent U.N. Security Council member. Also, in July 2001, Russia and China signed the Treaty of Good-Neighbourliness and Friendly Cooperation. On 14 October 2004, the Russian President Vladimir Putin and the Chinese President Hu Jintao declared their resolution of the border issue. In this way, historically unusual circumstances that have enabled the two continental states to weaken longstanding mutual enmities were established.

Honeymoon Period

China was Russia’s close ally after the communist regime was established in 1949, yet they became bitter enemies over the ideology of communism and over border issues. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, China has been a valued customer for Russia’s arms exports. Because Beijing has given some urgency to the necessity for China to reform, reorganize and modernize the PLA, it has needed to access foreign technologies and systems to make up the shortfalls in its own levels of advanced military technology. However, since the Tiananmen massacre of 1989, most Western countries, including those of the European Union, have maintained an arms export ban because of diplomatic pressure from the United States and Japanese governments. That
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is why China has been forced to obtain such advanced technology through Russian channels. Russia is a major arms exporter and the country receiving the largest amount of Russian-made arms in recent years has been China. In 2000, a 15-year Military Cooperation Plan was concluded between Moscow and Beijing as an incentive measure for boosting arms trade, licence transfers and cooperation for research and development. In 2006, President Vladimir Putin and Hu Jintao confirmed the two countries had forged unprecedented good relations. Consequently, a honeymoon period between the two countries revitalized the Russian military industry. In addition, China has also relied on Russian energy resources for its economic growth. China’s oil import from Russia is expected to reach 20 to 30 million tons in 2010. According to Ariel Cohen, their strategic partnership could counteract a unipolar world led by the United States, and promote border demarcation, weapons sales, technological transfer, access to resources, and suppressing violent Islamic militants in Central Asia.

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is composed of China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Originally called the Shanghai Five, it was founded in 1996. After Uzbekistan acceded to Shanghai Five in 2001, it was renamed. The SCO is a form of alignment. According to Thomas S. Wilkins, “The SCO represents the correlation of multiple strategic partnership dyads into a combined institutional form; a ‘strategic partnership network’.” Strategic partnerships “are
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primarily goal-driven rather than threat-driven alignments.” A Chinese initiative, the SCO focuses on cooperation in the areas of territorial issues, anti-terrorism, energy, economics and trade, finance and education, as its primary targets. In addition, a significant SCO regional security objective is to struggle against the so-called “three evils”: terrorism, separatism and extremism. Its cooperation on energy matters commands considerable attention. For instance, establishing an energy association in the SCO was proposed by Russian President Vladimir Putin and the holding of an Energy Ministers Meeting in Iran was suggested by Iran’s President Ahmadinejad, for the strengthening of energy cooperation between countries related to the SCO.

Collectively, SCO member states account for 25 per cent of the world’s population, 23 per cent of its oil reserves, 55 per cent of its natural gas, and 35 per cent of its coal. This promotes the influence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. There is a huge gap between the military powers of the other Central Asian countries compared to the two great continental powers. Needless to say, the SCO represents nothing less than an evolving continental coalition between the two land power giants, which are nuclear armed permanent members of U.N. Security Council.

In June 2006, the SCO countries held their sixth annual summit at the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the SCO. They issued a joint statement to confirm cooperation in fighting threats posed by three evils, as well as illegal drug trafficking. In the joint declaration, the SCO, whose regimes are either established autocracies or autocratic leaning, indirectly criticized the United States by calling on Washington to respect differences in civilizations, to ban the export of democracy and social development and discard “double standards”. There was a marked wariness among the SCO states, in particular, regarding U.S. support for democratization in Georgia and Ukraine.
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The issue of uranium enrichment by Iran brought to light the problems involved in the anti-U.S. character of the SCO. Some analysts think the SCO has been gradually evolving to be a more sophisticated defence coalition aimed at responding to U.S. global influence, including its military involvement in Afghanistan. 148 It has been argued that Russia seemed to want to push the SCO toward a more defence-oriented alliance because it views the deployment of American missile defence systems as a significant threat to Russian security. 149 Russia has also indicated its intention to welcome Iran’s bid for membership in the SCO. 150 Moreover, both continental giants have been deeply concerned about the reinforcement of U.S. influence in Central Asia as a result of the process of deploying its troops to Afghanistan. As one consequence of these concerns, Russia and China have conducted war games in order to develop their strategic partnership.

The SCO’s Military Exercises

In August 2003, a total of 1,300 personnel from the five countries then comprising the SCO took part in a combined military drill held in Kazakhstan in a first phase and in China in a second phase, in order to practice dealing with “terrorism, separatism and extremism.” The four-day exercise codenamed “Coalition 2003” focused on promoting skills of planning operations to counter “intrusions by terrorists.” 151

In August 2005, the first military drill between China and Russia entitled “Peace Mission 2005” was held on the Shandong coast of China, in which 8,200 Chinese and 1,800 Russian military personnel took part. 152 Publicly, they announced that the military exercise was aimed at terrorism, not towards a third country. However, in the final phase of the drill, a naval group comprised of two submarines and seven surface warships, including the large Russian anti-submarine warfare (ASW) vessel Marshal Shapashinikov and the destroyer Burny, found and defeated enemy submarines after the
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group imposed a sea blockade. They also conducted an amphibious landing operation involving seven landing ships. Additionally, strategic bombers such as the Tu-22M3 Backfire and Tu-95MS Bear participated and launched long-range land-attack and anti-ship missiles. It seemed to envisage a scenario of attacking the JMSDF and U.S. aircraft carriers amid preparations for the invasion of Taiwan. In any case, such exercises involving significant naval capabilities could hardly be viewed as appropriate for practising supposedly “counter-terrorism” operations. Western experts did not completely deny the possibility that Peace Mission 2005 could represent part of preparations to attack Taiwan.

In August 2007, all six member countries and a total of 6,500 personnel (2,000 soldiers, 36 aircraft and 2,500 logistics personnel from Russia; 1,600 soldiers and 46 aircraft from China; and just 200 from Kazakhstan, 120 from Tajikistan, 30 from Kyrgyzstan and 20 from Uzbekistan) took part in a combined anti-terrorism military drill. For the first time, all leaders of the six nations watched the exercise, which was hosted by Russia. The exercise scenario was that terrorists had seized a small town and held hundreds of people hostage. They made a strong display of the solidarity of the SCO through their enthusiasm in performing the drill. This exercise cost Russia about two billion rubles (US$80 million).

In July 2009, Peace Mission 2009 was conducted as a combined anti-terror military exercise between Russia and China. Each side sent about 1,300 personnel from the army and air force to the exercise in Jilin Province in northeastern China, involving land forces and combat aircraft.

In September 2010, the SCO’s anti-terrorist exercises “Peace Mission 2010” in Kazakhstan involved more than 5,000 troops, 1,600 armed vehicles, 100 cannons and mortars and 50 combat aircraft and helicopters from Kazakhstan, China, Kyrgyzstan,
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Russia and Tajikistan. Uzbekistan did not take part. The 17-day joint military drills were to promote the interoperability of the SCO armed forces.

**The Issue of the Northern Territories**

For a sea power state, it is extremely dangerous to clash with not just one but two great land power states at the same time; but Japan might face such a difficult situation due not only to its growing competitive relationship with China, but also because of a longstanding territorial dispute with Russia. The closest island from Hokkaido, Kaigara Island in the Habamai islands, is 3.7 kilometres from Nozapp Point in Hokkaido and the farthest island, Etorofu, is 144.5 kilometres from Nozapp Point. The gross area of these “Northern Territories” (or southern Kuriles to the Russians) is 5,036 square kilometres (see Map 1). The largest island, Etorofu, is 3,182.7 square kilometres in size. Until the end of the Pacific War, 15 August 1945, all 17,000 inhabitants of the four islands were Japanese. By 1 January 2005, the number of Russian immigrants was 3,195 in Shikotan, 6,697 in Kunashiri, and 6,904 in Etorofu, totally reaching about 16,796. The Japanese government announced that “The Northern Territories are an integral part of Japan's sovereign territory that continues to be illegally occupied by Russia. The Government of the United States of America has also consistently supported Japan’s position”.

**The History of the Northern Territories**

In the Edo period, the Russians could not expand southward into the islands from its own Uruppu Island (located to the north of Etorofu), because the Tokugawa shogunate, which had adopted an isolationist policy, placed guardhouses in the islands to protect them from foreign intrusion. In the 18th century, Russia colonized Uruppu Island but withdrew again in 1805. Japan’s feudal government, the Edo Shogunate, conducted the research of Chishima. Since 1795, the shogunate built up the defence of eastern Yezo (Hokkaido) as a shogunate’s territory in 1799, and established a farming community
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system in Etorofu. This was the way that Japan came to take sovereignty in Southern Chishima.163

In 1855, both governments set a demarcation line between Etorofu Island and Uruppu Island. This is the origin of the border of the Northern Territories. During the Second World War, the Soviet Union unilaterally abandoned its neutrality pact with Japan.164 Even after Japan surrendered on 8 August 1945, the Soviet forces carried on the occupation operation. Indeed, all four islands were occupied from 28 August to 5 September 1945.165 All Japanese inhabitants were forced to leave this area by July 1947. In 1951, the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed, and in accordance with Article 2 of the treaty, Japan renounced its rights to South Karafuto and the Kurile Islands, but the treaty did not specify ownership of the Northern Territories. The Soviet Union, discontented with the matter, did not conclude this treaty. As a result, both Japan and Russia claim territorial rights over this area.166

In 1956, even though Prime Minister Hatoyama Ichirō failed to arrange a peace treaty with Russia and to negotiate the return of the Northern Territories, the Japan-Soviet Joint Declaration was signed and the two countries resumed diplomatic relations.167 Article 9 of the declaration stipulated that the Soviet Union agreed to return Habamai and Shikotan under the condition of the conclusion of peace accords between them, but the Joint Declaration left unsettled the matter on Kunashiri and Etorofu. After the Japan-U.S. agreement was concluded, however, the Soviet Union insisted on the possibility of the use of the islands as military bases by foreign armed forces and adopted a hardline attitude, stating that “the issue is closed”.168

The impact of the Cold War thus slowed down the process of finding a solution to this issue. In addition, the Kremlin pushed forward with the reinforcement of Kunashiri and Etorofu as military bases. In 1979, the Soviet Union deployed 2,300 soldiers and built
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full-scale bases on both Kunashiri and Etorofu. In August 1985, the Soviet Union conducted a large scale naval drill in Etorofu, Kunashiri and Shikotan, Sakhalin islands, with more than 30 submarines and surface ships. The Gorbachev administration took a softer line towards the issue which had made no progress for a long time. Russia still currently occupies Kunasiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and the Habomai group, a position extant ever since its initial invasion of the islands. Russian ground troops have been deployed on Kunasiri, Etorofu, and Shikotan Islands. Although military conflict has never erupted since the Soviets occupied the Northern Territories, there have been a great many incidents involving Japanese fishing boats and crews and Russian authorities.

**Incidents**

On 8 May 1966, a Japanese trawler boat, *Dai Jyuichi Shinyou Maru*, was fishing in waters around the northwest of Kunashiri Island. While returning home, the fishing boat was rammed by a Soviet patrol boat, which attempted to forcefully board the boat, and subsequently the fishing boat keeled over and sank. All Soviet personnel were saved and safe, but six Japanese fishermen were lost. On 8 August 1969, a Japanese squid-fishing vessel, *Dai Jyūsan Fukujyū Maru*, was hit by a Soviet patrol boat, and twelve Japanese crews died. From 1949 to 2004, for example, the total number of boats and crew arrested reached 1,249 and 8,991, respectively. Twenty-nine Japanese have been killed by gunfire and sinkings carried out by Russian border patrols.

**Strategic Value**

The Northern Territories are rich in natural resources. On 1 February 2005, the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources officially stated that there were natural resources such as oil, natural gas, gold, iron, and titanium present in the South Kurile Islands (the Northern Territories), and the Russian Far East and central governments regard the exploitation of natural resources in the South Kuriles as a strategic target. According to a local geologist, the estimated amount of oil deposits is 364 million tons around this
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Moreover, sulphur deposits on Etorofu, agate deposits on Shikotan and gravel beds in Kunashiri were also discovered. There was also the discovery of a strategic rare metal, rhenium, in three of the four islands, which is essential for aerospace industries and used as a catalyst for petrochemical processes and electronic material production. In a volcano on Etorofu, 15-20 tons of rhenium could be produced annually. Moreover, the Sakhalin state government issued a report that stated that waters off Kunashiri and Shikotan Islands could be profitable tourist resorts that could attract tourists from all over the world because waters around the two islands are suitable for scuba diving, and there are also hot springs on the islands. In fact, the natural environment of the Northern islands is largely unspoilt.

Besides, there have been prosperous marine products industries exploiting the waters around these islands since early times, because the Chishima cold current and the Tsushima warm current cross each other in Northern Territories waters. In pre-War days, Japanese used to catch sea tangle, salmon, trout, cod, pollack, king crabs and trepangs, for example. In the past, this sea area was regarded as one of three major fishing grounds in the world. The annual catch of marine resources is estimated to be valued at about US$2 billion. On Kunashiri and Etorofu, forestry (mainly coniferous trees), fish hatching (salmon and trout), a mining industry (gold, silver, sulphur) are prosperous. Japan and Russia concluded some fishing agreements but frictions over maritime interests remain.

Taking military strategy into consideration, this area was exceedingly valuable during the Cold War. The Soviet Union was concerned that if it had returned the four islands to Japan, a U.S. base would have been placed in the Northern Territories based on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty. In spite of the fact that the strategic value of the islands is no longer as important as it was in the past, Russia still takes precautions, since the Japanese government set up a SDF base in this area, which it lets the U.S. Army use. For Russia, its domination of the islands enables Russian forces to protect and control
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access around the Sea of Okhotsk, where Russian submarine fleets are deployed. From 1992 to 1993, the Russian military succeeded in drawing the Russian people’s attention to the strategic significance of the Southern Kurile Islands. As result, hard-liners opposed to resolving the issue with Japan by making territorial concessions were given a boost and further reasons to continue their anti-Japanese policy. Currently, the Russian government is trying resolve the issue by the two territory demand (i.e., by keeping just Habamai and Shikotan), but the Japanese government does not want to give an inch in its demand for the return of all four islands.

The Korean Peninsula

Korean Strategic Culture and Japan

The Korean peninsula projects southward from the Asian continent and is faced by China to the west and Russia to the north, while it is only 120 miles across the Tsushima Strait to Japan to the east. Effectively a land bridge connecting the Asian mainland and the sea, the peninsula has always been recognized for its geo-strategic significance to neighbouring great powers. Geopolitical destiny has burdened Korea with a historical legacy of humiliation and suffering. According to Kang Choi, Korea has experienced more than nine hundred foreign invasions. Of these, five incidents deserve special mention: the Mongol invasions in the thirteenth century; the Japanese invasion in the sixteenth century; the Qing invasions in the seventeenth century; the Japanese colonial occupation in the twentieth century; and the Korean War. Choi argues that the hard experience of foreign invasions has made the Korean people sensitive toward security issues and has created a fatalistic and paranoid attitude. Geo-strategically, it is to be expected that there is a possibility that Korea might suffer frequent foreign invasions. As a consequence, Koreans have needed to develop flexible attitudes against external invasions in order to keep their national identity and to protect
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their independence. In this way, strong communal identity and a highly nationalistic attitude have been created. Kang Choi asserts further that:

Such a geographical setting has made those ruling Korea very conscious about any shift in the balance of power, especially in the Asian mainland. As a small state surrounded by great powers, Korea’s security has depended on the success of the way it defines, establishes, maintains and manipulates its relations with neighbouring great powers. In part as a result of the tremendous power difference between Korea and its neighbours, Korea has acquired a tendency to emphasize the importance of political/diplomatic measures over military means and to define security in broader times.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Korea was the battleground in the wars fought among China, Japan and Russia. Japan, the winner of these wars, annexed Korea in 1910, and ruled the country and tried to assimilate it for 36 years until Japan itself was defeated in 1945. After the overthrow of the Japanese, the peninsula was divided and became part of the front line between the East and the West during the Cold War. Thus, the political status of the Korean peninsula has been at the heart of geopolitical machinations in East Asia. Because of its location, Korea has had to repel great power invasions to preserve or change the status quo to its advantage.

Geo-strategically, a peninsula which functions as a bridge from the continent to the ocean carries a crucial role for surrounding countries; therefore, regional powers invariably contest control over such a peninsula. The Korean peninsula is a typical example. Great threats to the Japanese archipelago have arisen historically from the Asian continent via the Korean peninsula. In recorded history, there have been a number of great continental powers such as the Mongol empire, the Qing Dynasty and Russia in different guises, which had ambitions of achieving maritime power. Accordingly, Japan’s security has been greatly affected by the question of whether the Korean peninsular is occupied by a pro-Japan polity or not. If the peninsula was under an ambitious land power’s control, this strategic circumstance might ensnare Japan in a fateful crisis, as occurred in the attempted Yuan (Mongol) Dynasty invasions of Japan.
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in the late thirteenth century. That is why the peninsula was called “a dagger aimed at the heart of Japan”. Actually, Japan itself has historically dispatched troops to the Korean peninsula in order to hold off land power advances. In modern times, Japan embarked upon the Sino-Japanese War to exclude the Qing Dynasty, and subsequently, eliminated Russia’s influence from the peninsula by a narrow victory over the Russians in the Russo-Japanese War. Maritime Japan always fought against great continental powers for its survival, using the Korean peninsula as a battleground and buffer. In Japanese strategic thought, the geo-strategic relationship between Japan’s security and the Korean peninsula has been akin to an immutable law.

History suggests that Korean states have had to calculate the influence of external power for their survival because of the location of the Korean peninsula as the area where formidable maritime powers and continental powers have confronted each other for supremacy. Korea has always been fearful, or at least mindful, of the shadow cast by major Asian land powers over the peninsula; hence, they came to embrace “Sinocentrism”. As a consequence, they have tended to look down on other Asian countries, including Japan, compared to the way they view Chinese civilization. The Korean peninsula has been historically surrounded by powerful countries, leading it to lean politically toward the strongest. Thus, the interplay of great power relations has been part of the Korean strategic culture. The question of a unified Korean peninsula, and whether the hypothetical unified country embraces democracy, a free market economy and a pro-American maritime order, or rather becomes dependent on a strengthening China in opposition to the U.S.-Japan alliance, would be highly significant for Japan’s future.

**The Syngman Rhee Line and the Takeshima Issue**

Takeshima (Take Island or Dokdo in Korean) is composed of two small islands, Higashijima and Nishiijma, and a few dozen rock reefs. It is a solitary island in the Sea
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of Japan located 157 kilometres from Iki Island, 220 kilometres from Shimane Prefecture and 215 kilometres from Uljin in South Korea (see Map 1). The total area of this island is 0.21 square kilometres. In pre-War times, Japan effectively controlled this island but South Korea has controlled it since July 1954 until the present. South Korea currently occupies the rock and its coast guard is stationed there.

In 1618, a Japanese shipping agent officially received the Edo Shogunate’s permission to cross over to the uninhabited island to for gather abalone and hunt sea lions. In 1904, a Japanese fishery operator, Yōzaburō Nakai from Iki Island asked the Edo Shogunate to seize and loan Takeshima in order to hunt sea lions. Then, on 28 January 1905, the Japanese government officially named the island Takeshima, which was placed under the jurisdiction of the then Shimane Prefecture in a Cabinet meeting. On 27 September 1945, General Headquarters (GHQ) established the boundary of the restraining area for fishing known as the “MacArthur Line”, but Takeshima lay outside of the area. Since then, Takeshima has been a complicated sovereignty issue. In addition, in the draft report of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Takeshima was regarded as South Korean territory. However, after the U.S. State Department admitted the legitimacy of Japan’s claim to the island, the MacArthur Line was abolished in the final plan of the treaty and Takeshima came to be regarded as Japanese territory. Although the South Korean ambassador to the United States objected to this matter, Secretary of State Dulles rejected the demand, saying Takeshima has never been treated as part of South Korea. Consequently, Takeshima was excluded from Article 2 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan on the renunciation of territorial rights.

Nevertheless, just before the San Francisco Peace Treaty became effective on 28 April 1952, the first president of South Korea, Rhee Syngman, suddenly declared a “Korean Presidential Proclamation of Sovereignty over the Adjacent Sea”, and established a boundary which included Takeshima within the “Syngman Rhee Line” on reasons of
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protecting Korea’s maritime resources. In the following year, on 12 January 1953, President Rhee issued instructions to prevent Japanese fishing boats operating within the Syngman Rhee Line. The Japanese government criticized Seoul and dispatched JCG patrol boats to the area around Takeshima after the peace treaty came into force. On account of the Korean War, South Korean forces and police exercised minimal tolerance to assert their country’s sovereignty over the area. A volunteer garrison was inaugurated as a militia organization to protect Dokdo and occupied the island from 30 April 1953. In August 1954, the South Korean government sent its coast guard to Takeshima to build a lighthouse. On 25 September 1954, the Japanese Government submitted a proposal to present the Takeshima issue to the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which was refused by South Korea on the ground that there is no territorial issue between Japan and South Korea.\(^{197}\)

In June 1965, the normalization treaty between Japan and South Korea was concluded. Furthermore, the Rhee Syngman Line was abolished and a Japan-South Korea fisheries pact was concluded, without solving the Takeshima issue. The fisheries agreement was based on the principle of flag state jurisdiction. Therefore, even though South Korean fishing boats overfished within Japanese waters, the Japanese government could do nothing about the matter.\(^{198}\) Even though South Korea entered into an agreement to crack down on South Korean fishing boats operating around Japanese Waters in 1980, the Japanese fishing industry nevertheless asked the government to deal with South Korean violations.\(^{199}\) However, under the Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC), the littoral state has jurisdiction over illegal activities which occur within its territorial sea. The amount of “losses” caused by Japan’s fish catch estimated by the South Korean government as a result of the agreement was 1,253 billion won, and that estimated by the South Korean fishing industry was from five billion to 30 billion won.\(^{200}\) In 1999, a new Japan-South Korea fishery pact was agreed which excluded the water area of Takeshima, set the EEZ and operating conditions and was concluded on the basis of the
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spirit of the LOSC. However, the two countries have a trend of growing nationalism on this issue. The South Koreans have been especially influenced by an emotive nationalism that often harks back to Japan’s colonial past on the peninsula.

The Japanese government position on the issue of Takeshima is as follows:201

1. In the light of historical facts and based upon international law, it is apparent that Takeshima is an inherent part of the territory of Japan.
2. The occupation of Takeshima by the Republic of Korea is an illegal occupation undertaken on absolutely no basis in international law. Any measures taken with regard to Takeshima by the Republic of Korea based on such an illegal occupation have no legal justification.

Still, even though the Japanese government has put forward a suggestion to the South Korean government to settle the issue in the ICJ, the South Korean government continues to refuse to entertain such a proposal.

**Incidents**

A large number of incidents have occurred related to this issue. On 4 January 1952, Japanese fishing boats operating in waters around Cheju Island, *Dai ichi Daihoumaru* and *Dai ni Daihoumaru*, were captured and the chief fisherman Jujiro Seto was shot by the Koreans. The South Korean side ignored the request of the Japanese crews to treat Seto, who died on 6 February 1952. Also, South Korea ignored the Japanese request to cremate Seto. The Japanese seamen sold their property to buy firewood, and cremated the body themselves. The rest of the Japanese crew were not provided with adequate food and were forced to put their signatures on record stating that they had violated South Korean territorial waters. Later on, it was discovered that the Japanese ships had operated on the high seas. The U.S. commander of the Fleet Escort Force blockading the Korean littoral requested talks with President Rhee, who expressed regret for the incident. On 15 January, the Japanese fishermen returned home escorted by a U.S. frigate.202
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After this incident, confrontation between the two countries escalated. On 27 June in the same year, the Japan Coast Guard in cooperation with the Shimane Prefecture drove the Korean garrison from Takeshima and put up a wooden sign signifying that it is Japanese territory; yet the Koreans returned as soon as the JCG had left. This incident triggered President Rhee to order the police to deliver mortars and rifles. Since that time, the Japan Coast Guard has never been able to land on Takeshima. Since 1956, South Korean armed police replaced the volunteer garrison as the occupying force on Takeshima.203 On 12 July 1953, when a JCG patrol boat, *Hekura*, arrived at Takeshima, it came across three South Korean vessels with about 40 fishermen, including seven who called themselves police. The JCG demanded that the fishermen who ventured onto *Hekura* leave Takeshima. However, the fishermen refused, and fired a few dozen shots when *Hekura*’s crew were trying to leave; one of the bullets hitting the *Hekura*.204 On 23 August 1954, when the JCG patrol boat, *Oki*, approached to a distance of 700 metres from Takeshima, it was shot at a few dozen times at the Nishijima cave and several bullets hit the ship. On 21 November 1954, when both *Hekura* and *Oki* approached north of Takeshima, they came under artillery fire. Artillery shells landed on the sea surface one metre from the Japanese boats. The JCG crews saw three 3-inch guns and about 15 security personnel on top of Higashijima. From the end of the Second World War to the abolition of the Syngman Rhee Line in 1965, a total of 328 Japanese vessels were captured and 44 Japanese killed or wounded by South Korean forces.205

*Values*

The waters around Takeshima seem to be rich in methane hydrate deposits, a potentially lucrative future fuel resource. In terms of fishery resources, there are mainly good catches of sardine, jack, mackerel, cuttlefish, yellowtail, flatfish, flounder, flying fish, turban shell and red snow crab. In recent years, red snow crab catches have sharply decreased because the South Koreans also fish in the same area.206 After Japan and South Korea ratified a new Japan-South Korea fisheries agreement in 1996, the waters around Takeshima were provisionally made a cooperative management area. However, Japanese fishing boats were shut out, and were not allowed to approach within a
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certain distance from the island. As a result of this, the catch of red snow crab has been sharply decreasing in Shimane Prefecture, which stated a claim to the island and started celebrating “Takeshima Day” to prevent the issue from being forgotten,\(^\text{207}\) as opposed to the Japanese government’s more cautious diplomatic approach. The South Koreans insist that Japan took possession of Takeshima in 1905 to geo-strategically hold a dominant position in the Russo-Japanese War.\(^\text{208}\)

**The Tsushima Issue**

*Tsushima and Wars in Japanese History*

Tsushima is an island located 138 kilometres from Hakata, and 49.5 kilometres from Pusan in South Korea. Tsushima’s land area is 708.66 square kilometres,\(^\text{209}\) and it has a population of about 36,000.\(^\text{210}\) One of the earliest Japanese history books, *Kojiki (A Record of Ancient Matters)*, narrates the story of two gods in Japanese mythology, Izanagi and Izanami, who bore eight islands, one of which is Tsushima. In history, several great wars were waged around the Tsushima Strait. Japan being an isolated country, such wars were important events that shaped the course of the nation in fighting foreign wars.

In 663 A.D., the Battle of Hakusukione was waged between Yamato Japan-Baekje and the Tang Dynasty China-Silla. In this war, Yamato Japan was defeated and lost its hold on the Korean peninsula. In the tenth century, pirates from the peninsula often marauded around the islands of Tsushima. In 1019, a group of 50 Manchurian pirate ships attacked Tsushima, Iki Island and the coastal region of southern Kyushu, causing tremendous damage. In October 1274, the fleet of the Mongol Yuan dynasty and Goryeo, with 40,000 personnel, attacked Tsushima and Iki Island and slaughtered many people. The Mongols, however, failed to land due to effective counter-attacks launched from the islands. In 1281, the Yuan dynasty built two vast forces to invade Japan: one composed of 40,000 departed from the Korean Peninsula and another with 160,000 left
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for Japan from the Chinese mainland.211 Again, a large number of people in Tsushima were killed by invaders. In 1419, 200 Korean Joseon dynasty warships led by Jong-mu Lee assaulted Tsushima, which was being used as a base for pirates, but they were defeated by Tsushima troops led by Sadamori Sou. In the following year, Korea dispatched an envoy to Shogun Yoshimochi Ashikaga with a peace proposal. The shogunate administration and Korea concluded a peace agreement. From that time, the issue of Japanese piracy was brought to a close, and Tsushima played an important role in trading between Japan and Korea.212

Later, when Toyotomi sent troops to the Korean peninsula in 1592 and 1597, a large number of Tsushima’s residents were inducted into the army and dispatched to the battlefields. Tsushima became the army assembly area. Before the war against Ming-Joseon, trade with Korea was the main source of income for Tsushima, but the two wars seriously affected Tsushima’s economy. In the Edo period, Tsushima Domain made efforts to construct amicable relations with Joseon and took care of diplomacy towards Korea.213

After Russia and Britain concluded the Convention of Peking in 1860, the two countries were in competition over interests in the Far East. In 1861, a Russian naval vessel arrived at Tsushima and stayed there. Russia occupied a part of Tsushima for use in conflicts with Japan. It was also strategically important for Russia as it lies within the narrow straits separating Japan (Kyushu) and Korea, and thus guards one potential route to the open ocean from the Russian Far East. As a consequence of the fact that Russia and Britain were keeping an eye on Tsushima as a geo-strategically important point, Russia had a head start on the island.214 The British monitored Russian movement there and made a strong protest to Russia. Eventually, the Russian vessel left Tsushima after the Russian foreign minister ordered it to leave because it was causing an aggravation of the international political situation.215 After the Meiji Restoration, the Japanese
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government build 30 fortresses on Tsushima in order to protect Japanese territory. And, the Tsushima Strait was the location of Admiral Togo’s momentous defeat of the Russian fleet in the Battle of Tsushima during the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.

South Korea and Tsushima

After the end of World War II, the first president of South Korea, Rhee Syngman, appealed to GHQ for control of Tsushima, but GHQ rejected the approach as groundless. There ensued a competition with the enactment of an ordinance calling for a “Takeshima Day” by the Shimane prefectural assembly and the Masan municipal assembly (Gyeongsangnam-do, South Korea). The Masan municipal assembly chose 19 June as the Day of Tsushima on 18 March 2005, in order to send the message at home and abroad that Tsushima is South Korean soil and to secure their territorial rights. In July 2008, 21 Korean military veterans made a visit to Tsushima to stake a claim to Takeshima. It provoked strong reactions from the local inhabitants.

On the other hand, in recent years, the number of Korean visitors to Tsushima has been steadily rising. The numbers have increased to about 65,000 in 2007 after the regular line between Pusan and Tsushima was launched. Some of them conduct political activities to stake Korea’s territorial claim over Takeshima and Tsushima. Tsushima residents have been plagued by their behaviour and activities.

The sea area around Tsushima, where a warm current flows into the waters between Kyushu and the Korean peninsula, is a fertile fishing ground. In the area of the Korean littoral of the Sea of Japan, catches of fish have greatly declined due to marine contamination by advancing urban-industrial society and overfishing. For this reason, South Korean fishing boats operate on the sea boundary between the two countries, and
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sometimes intrude into Japanese territorial waters. The JCG deployed to Tsushima are tasked to deal with illegal Korean fishing boats and contend with potential troubles in the area.\textsuperscript{222}

Tsushima has also suffered from the effects of the rural exodus and the number of people living on the island has been dwindling at a rate of about 1,100 annually. This is why Tsushima’s economy has to depend on tourists from South Korea, but Korean tourists tend to spend money at places that Koreans frequent. As a consequence, the impact of tourism on the economic growth of Tsushima is minimal.\textsuperscript{223} Most importantly, in recent years, there have been many cases of Tsushima’s land being sold to Korean capitalists, including the land where the monument commemorating the imperial visit lies.\textsuperscript{224} For instance, there is a JMSDF radar facility in Tsushima, with a South Korean-owned hotel right next to it. There are a lot of accommodation facilities, parking fields for motorcoaches and a dock at the site of the hotel. It is impossible to see the premises from outside because it is surrounded by walls and the sea, but boats have access to it.\textsuperscript{225} There are also two guest houses near the JMSDF facility. The Japanese are unsure of exactly how much land the Korean have acquired since many of these purchases are carried out under a Japanese name or through a local corporation established by a Korean.\textsuperscript{226}

Supposing that a conflict or destabilization breaks out on the Korean peninsula, there is a possibility that many thousands of refugees would flood the border of the peninsula and escape toward Tsushima.\textsuperscript{227} In 2008, Japanese national Diet members heightened the sense of crisis and held seminars to study the situation of Tsushima. Meanwhile, Tsushima’s city council members have started activities to encourage the Japanese government to enact a law for the defence of the island. On 26 January 2009, the Tsushima city council filed a petition with the Ministry of Defense to require a build-up of JSDF stationary troops. There is a systemic flaw in the defence of Tsushima. An effective defence system for the island needs about one standing regiment, an air unit, a
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secure practice area, the establishment of ammunition bunkers and personnel distribution. A Japanese newspaper, *Sankei News*, sent out questionnaires on land acquisition in Tsushima by Koreans to all members of each of the Diet’s two chambers, 721 representatives, and the response rate was only a little over ten per cent. The result of this survey is obvious proof of the lack of awareness of the importance of the Tushima territorial issue among Japanese politicians.228

In July 2008, 50 South Korean lawmakers introduced a resolution demanding the return of Tsushima. According to opinion polls, 50.6 per cent of South Koreans supported this resolution.229 Even though the JGSDF, JMSDF, and JASDF (approximately 700 personnel) were stationed in Tsushima, according to a report on Tsushima by the inspection party of Japanese Diet members for the protection of Japanese territory in January 2009, the JGSDF lacked live ammunition, the JMSDF has no ships based there, and the JASDF lacks even a single helicopter.230 Furthermore, illegal fishing is rampant there among South Koreans but maritime law enforcement is not fully applied to them by the JCG and Japanese police.231 Afterwards, in the same month, the Tsushima mayor and the president of the Tsushima municipal assembly visited the Ministry of Defense to present a petition to the top Defense bureaucrat. The petition demands the following reinforcement of the JSDF: for the JGSDF, the continuous station of one regiment, the deployment of a helicopter unit, the securing of a place for military drills, the construction of ammunition depot, and the securing of prepositioning space for ammunition and equipment; for the JMSDF, the preparation of the basin for warships, the deployment of patrol helicopters and missile ships; and for the JASDF, the preparation of an airport at which a large transport plane can take off and land, and the preparation of an assault course.232
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South Korea’s Naval Expansion

Currently, South Korea has ridden the crest of the regional trend of a seapower boom. Koh Young Choul asserts that there are several factors that have allowed South Korea to become a formidable maritime state. These include its geopolitical location as a peninsula with easy access to the sea, favourable coastlines for the construction of ports, shipbuilding capacity and 5.5 million people involved with ocean-related activities, the pioneering spirit to developing marine resources, and a strong political will. The second earliest Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries in the world was established in Korea. The South Korean shipping industry has maintained its top position in the world in terms of numbers of ships manufactured. Moreover, the container handling capability of Pusan port is the world’s fifth largest and the amount of marine fish landings is the eighth largest in the world. South Korea also has world-class shipbuilding capabilities that enable it to build increasingly sophisticated warships locally.233

Still, South Korea has been embroiled in an unfinished state of war with North Korea for a long time. South Korea has advanced considerably the strengthening of its naval capabilities in recent years. The South Korean navy used to be a purpose-made brown water force to deal with the North Korean navy’s small ships and mini submarines. Now, high-speed craft and patrol ships have been acquired which constitute the heart of the strength of the South Korean naval units focused on the North. In many respects, compared with North Korea’s army-based forces, South Korea still needs to reinforce its ground forces for possible high intensity land conflict. The South Korean navy was actually a low profile force until the country experienced rapid economic growth during the 1980s.234 Afterwards, South Korea’s rapid economic growth made it aware of the inseparable relationships between a strong navy and an economy tied closely to SLOC and marine resources. As a result, new warships, including Aegis-equipped destroyers,235 have been developed by South Korea’s domestic shipbuilding industry.
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According to Koh, building nuclear-powered submarines and even aircraft carriers is part of the long-term plan of the Republic of Korea Navy.\(^{236}\) Koh insists that South Korea aims to possess a blue water navy which is able to contribute to regional stability and act as a balancer of peace.\(^{237}\) In order to transform into such a navy, it has been proceeding with what has been called the “KDX Project” to build new destroyers. The KDX-1 Gwanggaetodaewang-class destroyer (4,000 tons) has capabilities to respond to three dimensions, surface, sub-surface and air warfare, with the RIM-7 Sea Sparrow anti-air missile and Goal Keeper close-in-weapon-system (CIWS), Harpoon anti-ship missile, and Super Lynx MK-99 anti-submarine helicopter. The KDX-2 Chungmugong Yi Sunshin-class (5,000 tons) sports the primary fleet air defence weapon SM-2 and the Rolling Airframe Missile (RAM) as new equipment and the hull is equipped with stealth technology.\(^{238}\) The Republic of Korea Navy plans to build six 5,600-ton KDX-2A Aegis ships between 2019 and 2026.\(^{239}\) The KDX-3 King Sejong the Great-class destroyer is modelled after the U.S. Navy Arleigh Burke-class. KDX-3, a state-of-the-art Aegis destroyer loaded with SM-2 long-range anti-air missiles, commissioned in December 2008. South Korea thus became the fifth state to possess a warship with the Aegis combat system. South Korea’s navy will build two of the three planned KDX-3 Aegis ships, and one will be launched before 2012.\(^{240}\)

In terms of submarines, three diesel submarines (1,800 tons) with very quiet air independent propulsion (AIP) systems were built under the KSS-2 project. The navy will build nine 1,800-ton submarines by 2018.\(^{241}\) Also, the KSS-3 project was announced in 2001 to build a very advanced, large 3,000-ton plus class of submarine.\(^{242}\) The South Korean navy has plans to construct six KDX-3 Aegis destroyers, nine 3,500 ton KSS-3 submarines, and three substantial Dokdo-class amphibious helicopter assault ships by 2020. Notably, it is said that South Koreans have been considering KSS-3 as a nuclear-powered boat and even the possibility of building an aircraft carrier. These
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plans have been reported to include development of a 35,000 ton-class light aircraft carrier equipped to carry 20 vertical take off and landing (VSTOL) fighters and ten anti-submarine helicopters.\footnote{Ibid.} In addition, the South Korean government is developing a naval base on the southernmost island of the Korean peninsula, Jeju Island, located at a cost of about US$850 million. When the Jeju naval base is constructed, the South Korean navy could expeditiously deploy its fleets to the east side and west side of the Korean Peninsula and defend its SLOC from the East China Sea to the Pacific Ocean.\footnote{Okabe Isaku, “‘Kankoku no Kaigun Kichi to Zousenjyo [Naval Bases & Shipbuilders of South Korea],” Sekai no Kansen [The World’s War Ship], April 2009, p. 100.} In April 2009, Seoul officially approved a plan to construct the new strategic base on Jeju Island, which can accommodate two 150,000 ton-class cruise liners and will become the home port for 20 naval vessels. These warships will compose a “strategic mobile squadron” to be launched by 2015. The mobile squadron will consist of KDX-2 destroyers, KDX-3 Aegis destroyers, KSS-2 submarines and frigates.\footnote{“South Korea Open to new naval base in Jeju Island,” The Korea Times, 27 April, quoted in The OPRF MARINT Monthly Report, April 2009, p. 17.}

**Reasons**

With such new and capable ships that might in the future form carrier strike groups, some defence analysts point out that South Korea might have the ambition to elevate its navy to blue water navy status. Currently, it already has enough naval power (about 190 vessels totalling 154,000 tonnes) to deal with North Korea’s navy (about 650 vessels totalling 107,000 tonnes). In an article in *The Honolulu Adviser*, naval and defence analyst Richard Halloran argues that the “South Korean navy has begun to remake itself from a coastal patrol force intended to foil North Korea into a blue water fleet able to project power onto the high seas, which has implications rippling out from Seoul to Singapore.”\footnote{Richard Halloran, “S. Korea Takes Pride in Navy Buildup,” The Honolulu Adviser, 1 July 2007, quoted in The OPRF MARINT Monthly Report, July 2007, p. 17.} He explains the context of this tendency as follows:\footnote{Ibid.} First, is the aim of reinforcing the honour and the prestige of the nation. On 25 May 2007, then South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun displayed feelings of cultural pride in favour of national unification by saying that “South and North Korea will not keep picking quarrels with each other forever. We have to equip the nation with the capability to defend ourselves. The Aegis destroyer could be the best symbol of that capability.”
the same time, he showed South Korea’s aspiration to become more independent from the United States on security matters: “We have to build up an adequate ability in all areas that constitute war power.”

Second, is South Korea’s contribution to its alliance with the United States. The opinions of South Koreans are split on this issue. There are some who want South Korea to continue with its alliance with the United States; and there are others who think that South Korea should take a different path from the United States for more self-dependence or to lean towards the great continental power China, with which it shares a long history. For a number of naval officers, who had experienced several combined naval operations with the Americans, the preference is to maintain the alliance with the great maritime power. An admiral has stated: “The Korean navy should build a force that can support the South Korea-U.S. alliance.” The third reason is to protect its SLOC. South Korea’s economy is extremely dependent on international trade transported by shipping. Its degree of dependence has been even higher than that of Japan. South Korea cannot conduct foreign trade through the Asian continent because of the divided peninsula.

The fourth reason is an expression of the strong sense of rivalry with Japan. South Korea still must focus its defences against a North Korea which only possesses patrol boats, mini submarines and minesweepers. Therefore, strategically speaking, South Korea does not have to consider the necessity for such an advanced navy to deal with the North. On the contrary, such naval officers perceive Japan with hostility, which is shared by the general public in South Korea. Acquiring naval power to rival the Japanese navy is South Korea’s long-cherished desire. The answer is quite obvious; considering it even has a naval vessel it has named Dokdo. In recent years, South Korea has been trying to make Tsushima into a territorial dispute with Japan, along with the issue of Takeshima. Japan, with its maritime disputes with South Korea, therefore cannot ignore Korean naval expansion. Indeed, South Korea strikes an overly
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provocative attitude towards Japan. The largest amphibious ship in Asia is named *Dokdo* (Takeshima in Japanese). A new type of submarine is named *Jeong Ji*, whose name was taken from a military officer of the Goryeo Dynasty (918-1392) who distinguished himself in battles against Japanese pirates. The first Aegis ship is named *King Sejong the Great*, during whose rule from 1418 to 1450, Korean forces were sent to Manchuria to expand the territory and fight Japanese pirates.252

At the same time, just as India is shifting its defence paradigm from the Himalayas (against China) to the Indian Ocean, by expanding its naval power, so too is South Korea shifting its paradigm from a land power-based defence strategy against North Korea to a strategy emphasizing the sea.253 According to Retired Admiral JMSDF Makoto Yamazaki, the South Korean navy intends to overtake the JMSDF’s capability, with the target year set at 2015. As a matter of fact, South Korea plans to build not only six Aegis destroyers, but also 18 submarines, more than the 16 submarines that the JMSDF currently possesses.254

**North Korea**

*North Korea’s Missile Strategy*

During recent years, concerns about the transfer and proliferation of the technology of ballistic missile have increased in the international community. In Northeast Asia, China, North Korea and Russia possess a wide variety of ballistic missiles including types covering Japanese territory. The strategic advantages of ballistic missiles include the following: relatively modest cost, capability that can easily attack important facilities even in a distant enemy’s territory, capability that let a holder nation attack with a one-sided advantage and difficulty for an opponent to defend against them, and a psychological function to provide enemy populations with a sense of dread. Therefore, a number of countries recognize the effectiveness of ballistic missiles and some are actually progressing such a missile strategy.255
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253 Ibid.
254 Makoto Yamazaki, “Kankoku Kaigun no Sosiki to Hensei [Organization of South Korean Navy],” *Sekai no Kansen* [The World’s War Ship], p. 82.
North Korea, facing allegations of nuclear development, refused to allow inspection required by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and gave notice of withdrawing from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1993. In December 1993, a U.S. National Intelligence Estimate was convinced that North Korea had already created one or two nuclear weapons.\(^{256}\) In 2002, at talks between Washington and Pyongyang, Pyongyang admitted North Korea was continuing a secretive nuclear weapon programme, even though North Korea and the United States had signed an agreed framework in 1994 in which Pyongyang promised to abandon its nuclear weapons programme; while the United States promised to provide North Korea with a light water nuclear reactor and interim fuel oil and to have no intention to attack North Korea. In October 2006, North Korea tested a nuclear weapon. Presently, it is a fact well known that North Korea possesses nuclear weapons, and various chemical and biological weapons as weapons of mass destruction.\(^{257}\)

North Korea country also exports completed missiles, and missile-related technology and parts. Its ballistic missile exports have been viewed as an important source of foreign exchange. North Korea has exported missiles and missile-related technologies to Egypt, Iran, Syria, Pakistan and Yemen.\(^{258}\) For North Korea, nuclear armament carries a different meaning. In the case of a conflict occurring on the Korean peninsula, possessing nuclear weapons takes on significance as a means by which to deter attacks by U.S. and South Korean forces. Moreover, if Pyongyang calls for suspension of hostilities after it deployed its armed forces using conventional weapons, its possession of nuclear weapons could put it in a better bargaining position. Also, North Korea could use nuclear weapons as a means to threaten surrounding countries in a game of blackmail diplomacy.\(^{259}\)

In terms of its ballistic missiles, Pyongyang gives different roles to the Nodong and Taepodong. In May 1993, North Korea conducted a Nodong flight test over the Sea of Japan. It was reported that the Nodong had a range of 1,300 kilometres, which can reach

\(^{256}\) Leon V. Signal, Disarming Strangers: Nuclear Diplomacy with North Korea, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1998, p. 90, quoted in Green, *Japan’s Reluctant Realism*, p. 120.

\(^{257}\) Ibid., pp. 35-38.


\(^{259}\) Ibid, pp. 20-21.
Honshu (the main island of Japan), which also could be used to intimidate other neighbouring countries. In August 1998, North Korea conducted the test launch of a Taepodong-1 ballistic missile over Japan and the missile fell into the Pacific Ocean. Taepodong-1 had a range of 1,500 kilometres. In July 2006, North Korea conducted the test launch of several missiles including the Scud, Nodong and Taepodong-2. The strategic targets of Taepodong missiles are Okinawa and potentially the U.S. mainland. It was reported that the missile range of Taepodong-2 was about 6,000 kilometres. The test of a Taepodong missile showed North Korea’s potential for “the real possibility of direct attack on Japan”.

North Korean Covert-operations Boats

It is said that North Korea’s total army force strength is about 1.1 million soldiers. Importantly, North Korea possesses large special units that engage in subversive activities, information gathering and guerrilla activity with 100,000 personnel. Particularly in terms of maritime security, the violation of Japanese waters by North Korean covert operations boats has remained a matter of grave concern for Japan. According to analysis of its navy, the North Korean government has been using covert operation vessels and submersibles for collecting information, intelligence activities, abduction of Japanese nationals, illegal trade, smuggling, narcotics trafficking and so on. Thirty-five per cent of Japan’s seizures of drugs from 1998 to 2002 seemed to be relevant to North Korea because of its desperation for foreign currency. In addition, Pyongyang has officially admitted to the abduction of 13 Japanese citizens in the 1970s and 1980s to instruct its spies in Japanese customs and language. Many were taken from beaches by boat across the Sea of Japan.
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262 “Kikendo ga Takamattekitara Chousen Kiki no Honshitsu [How the North Korea Crisis Increased the Danger]” Foresight, December 1998, p. 37, quoted in Green, Japan’s Reluctant Realism, p. 124.
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On 23 March 1999, a JMSDF P-3C spotted a suspicious boat in Japan’s territorial waters west of Sado Island and also two suspicious boats east of the Noto Peninsula. A JMSDF escort ship navigating near the area received the report and confirmed that the boat spotted near Sado Island and one of two around the peninsula were “unidentified” boats. JCG patrol boats and aircraft chased the boats and fired warning shots, but the unidentified vessels sped away and the JCG found it difficult to catch them. On 24 March, the then head of the Defense Agency, Housei Norota, gave the order to carry out “Maritime Security Operations”, which was the first time such an order was given since the JMSDF was first established. The JMSDF continued tracking the unidentified boats and P-3Cs dropped four 150 kg anti-submarine weapons as a warning whilst escort ships fired warning shots near the boats; but the JMSDF eventually terminated the chase after the boats left Japan’s Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ). All the pieces of evidence indicated that the suspicious boats arrived at a northern North Korean port on the morning of 25 March.

At the time that the JMSDF fired warning shots and ordered the boats to stop for violation of Japanese fishing laws, it operated its weapon based on Article 7 of the Security Operation Policemen’s Duty Performance Law with which the Maritime Security Operation correspondingly complied. According to this law, the JMSDF was permitted to shoot the hull of a vessel for self defence or as a means of emergency escape, or in the case of a person convicted of a crime with a penalty of more than three years imprisonment who escapes or makes resistance. However, the on-the-spot commander had to judge whether an opponent had committed a crime that would carry a sentence of more than three years in an intimidating situation. It was departure from common sense in international relations. In response to this incident, the JMSDF initiated new projects such as an increase of the speed of its missile boats, the establishment of a Special Boarding Unit (SBU), equipping escort ships and patrol helicopters with machine guns, development of equipment to forcibly stop boats in a
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lawful way, and improving the rate of filled vacancies to ensure there are sufficient personnel for boardings and inspections. A Maritime Interception Team (MIT) was also established and a joint JMSDF and JCG manual on coping with suspicious boats was created in December 1999. In addition, related government ministries and agencies considered the development of the law with respect to firing shots that could possibly harm opponents.\textsuperscript{272} Also, experts pointed out the need to promote cooperation between the JMSDF and JCG. There were a lot of problems between the two maritime forces such as deficiencies in the information sharing system. At any rate, on 30 November 1999, the first joint field training exercise between the JMSDF and JCG was conducted.\textsuperscript{273}

On 21 December 2001, a P-3C spotted an unidentified boat off Amami-oshima Island. On 22 December, the JCG received a report saying that it is highly likely that the boat belonged to North Korea. Patrol vessels were sent to chase it while it headed for China under the watch of JMSDF and JCG aircraft. After repeated orders for the boat to stop and after warning shots were fired, the intruding boat attacked the patrol vessels with automatic weapons and a rocket launcher. The JCG vessels returned fire in self defence. The suspicious boat was scuttled by detonation by its own crew in the East China Sea within China’s EEZ. Three JCG personnel were injured in the skirmish. The crew of about 15 from the suspicious boat were missing and three dead bodies were found in the waters nearby.\textsuperscript{274}

Despite the fact that the Japanese government has revised the Self-Defense Forces Law and Japan Coast Guard Law, which now allows Japanese maritime forces to be able to fire with intent to harm opponents within Japanese territorial waters as a result of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, they are not permitted to fire outside of territorial waters in cases not involving self defence or emergency evacuation.\textsuperscript{275} As a result of the above mentioned series of maritime incidents triggered by North Korea’s covert boat


\textsuperscript{273} See Kazuhsia Ogawa, \textit{Nihon wa Kokkyō wo Mamoreruka}, pp. 94-101. 

\textsuperscript{274} Ibid., pp. 66-70; and Japan Coast Guard Report 2003, available at http://www.kaiho.mlit.go.jp/info/books/report2003/special01/01_01.html. 

\textsuperscript{275} Ogawa, \textit{Nihon wa Kokkyō wo Mamoreruka}, pp. 78-79.
operations, organizational issues and legal loopholes in Japan’s maritime security regime were thus brought to the attention of authorities almost by accident.

**Conclusion**

China is a great land power which is attempting to upset the continental-maritime balance of power in the Asia Pacific region. China’s diplomatic posture to adjacent countries is aggressive, and in particular it focuses on sharply expanding naval strength. Japan is facing this rising power which obviously regards it as a potential enemy. To make matters worse, based on its historical experiences, successive Chinese dynasties’ diplomatic attitudes have tended to be offensive and authoritative toward other Asian countries in order to manage possibilities of civil strife. Such strategic behaviour is apparent in its strategy for securing its SLOC, the Taiwan Strait, and territorial disputes with Japan. In addition, the Chinese communist regime that cites the war against the Japanese Empire as a justification for its own reign, has made the best possible use of strong anti-Japan sentiment to manipulate control of the people. Also, in terms of conventional war capability, Japan sustains superior military might over China on some level, but China has closed the gap with remarkable rapidity. Specifically, China’s plan to build aircraft carriers for national pride without regard to the cost efficiency would send shock waves throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Japan thus has to closely monitor the development of China’s naval expansion and maritime strategy.

As mentioned in Chapter 2 of this thesis, continental balance-of-power strategy is a significant key strategy for maritime states and their seapower. Despite this, Russia and China, with Central Asian countries, may be in the process of transforming the SCO to become something approximating a military coalition. Added to this, the problem of the Northern Territories makes the continental balance of power much harder for Japan.

There is a great deal of complexity in the relationship between the Koreas and Japan. The Korean peninsula has always become involved in great power games since the importance of the geopolitical situation of the peninsula cannot be overemphasized. As a result, Korean strategic culture has appeared to side with the strong and turn on the weak historically. Therefore South Korea has exploited Japan’s diplomatic weakness in
the relations between the two countries over such issues as sovereignty disputes over
territory. Also, North Korea takes a hostile view of Japan and the United States. It can
be said that the development of North Korean missiles and secret operations from the
sea target Japan or U.S. forces in Japan.

Therefore, overall, the Japanese islands can be viewed as being surrounded by the seeds
of serious conflict. It seems to be the case that Japan requires an unprecedented state of
alert to maintain its security and sovereign interests. Why did Japan come to have a lot
of security problems mainly focused on territorial disputes with neighbouring countries?
In general, the governments of sovereign states take a realist stance based on national
interests, hence they are basically believers in the currency of power and show no mercy
to enhance and maintain the might of the nation. Japan lost the great war and its
neighbours took advantage of its subsequent weakness. If international society is ruled
by the “jungle law” of realism, Northeast Asia then represents the perfect case study.
CHAPTER 4
Piracy and Maritime Terrorism:
Non-State Threats to Japan’s Sea Lines of Communication

Introduction
This chapter discusses the issues related to the context between non-state threats and Japan’s sea lines of communication (SLOC). The first section shows relations between the globalized world economy and Japan’s shipping. The second section describes the current situation of piracy, in particular looking at pirates in the Malacca Strait and waters off Somalia; and incidents involving Japanese-related ships. The third section focuses on maritime terrorism and the cases of the terrorism in the Asia Pacific region.

Globalization and Maritime Transportation
According to Geoffrey Till, a distinct maritime system as a medium for the exchange of goods, information and ideas developed in the ancient era all over the world — in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Arabian Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Asia-Pacific, by groups such as the Vikings, in rich Islamic maritime communities and among Chinese traders. The maritime trading system expanded because of the enormous profits made from these voyages. This spirit of adventure and the promise of riches to be made from faraway territories drove early seafaring explorers to make voyages, although trading ventures involved great risks of losing ships and crews. Throughout history, marine transportation has been in most cases cheaper, faster and safer than transportation over land.

Over two-thirds of the surface of the Earth is covered by the oceans. For all nations with or without a coastline, sea routes are economic and strategic necessities that cannot be replaced. States which have possessed the power to control or influence these maritime traffic lanes have historically found themselves to be in stronger positions to determine their own destinies. The ocean is a lifeline to carry industrial resources: raw materials and their processed products to world markets. Through these processes, eventually, the current global maritime trading network has been built. In the modern period, the
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following aspects characterize global maritime transportation: 1 (1) 70 per cent of the world’s surface is covered by ocean; (2) when measured in weight and volume, over 90 per cent of international trade including most of the world’s raw materials is conducted by seaborne shipping; (3) a large number of the world’s cities and populations are positioned within 200 kilometres of a coastline; (4) international law provides for freedom of the seas, in which any nation can use the sea for purposes of trade or defence without infringement of another’s sovereignty. Today, this global exchange as a significant feature of seapower must be carefully considered.

Japan’s Dependence on Sea Lines of Communication

Vulnerability of SLOC

In earlier times, through the process of the development of shipbuilding technology and sailing, SLOC were expected to perform three main functions: carrying personnel and goods; the rapid deployment of military forces; and an information and communication function. Even after the progress of the aviation industry and electronics, maritime transportation is still regarded as a main role for the transport efficiency of bulky materials and large military forces. 4 However, one of the main features of the international dependence upon such a sea-based trading system is vulnerability. 5

The international community has been going borderless, mainly through economic and trade activities. In this trend, seapower takes a central role because of the importance of foreign trade activity conducted on the sea. In last a few decades, globalization and containerized transportation have flourished. As a result, the number of flag of convenience ships has increased. 6 Currently, it is usual that nationality of the ship owner, the flag of registry, crew, cargo, and cargo insurance, are very different. In response to containerization, mighty container vessels and ports have emerged. 7 The size of a huge container vessel is almost that of a U.S. aircraft carrier. Such a vessel can
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be managed in a limited number of mighty hub ports. It is extremely difficult for these container ships and ports to prepare for any contingency.8

Most threats to SLOC networks used to be from military movements until the end of the Cold War. However, there are currently six major causes of impediment to the flow of sea lane: natural disasters;9 maritime crime such as piracy and international terrorism; the malfunction of seaborne trade; the unilateral restriction of navigation by littoral states; the indirect damage caused by a regional conflict; and intentional attacks on SLOC by military forces. Provided that severe damage occurs around choke points or gigantic hub ports, the world’s economy would be negatively impacted due to a long recovery period. At present, acts of piracy and maritime terrorism are considered dangerous to shipping. Increasing numbers of pirate attacks sends the insurance premiums through the roof. And if terrorists sabotage a port or its command and control computer, it would cause wide-ranging economic dislocations.10

**Japan’s Sea Borne Trade**

Ninety-nine per cent of Japan’s total export and import volume is carried by shipping by volume. Japan is extremely dependent upon the import of raw materials and food. Such materials are transferred by marine transportation via the world’s sea lane network, which is cheaper and often faster than overland routes, especially for the transportation of bulk commodities. Notably, Japan’s food self-sufficiency ratio is the lowest among developed countries. As a result of rapid industrialization, Japan’s agricultural worker population decreased and food self-sufficiency declined to a low of 41 per cent in 2008.11 Japan also relies very heavily on imports of major natural resources such as crude oil (99.6%), coal (100%), natural gas (96.4%), iron ore (100%), wool (100%), cotton (100%), soy beans (95%), wheat (86%), and timber (80%).12 Japan is a nation poor in natural resources, yet it has to process large amounts of raw materials in order to export industrial products to world markets. Nevertheless, rising nations such as China
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and India fiercely compete for limited resources and such international competition makes it more expensive for Japan to obtain resources as a manufacturing exporter.

The marine transportation industry thus has to sustain this import-export cycle.\(^{13}\) Japan is a high labour cost country and attempts to cut costs are done by registering a “flag of convenience” (FOC) ship in a country with lower flag registration fees such as Panama. Without such cost competitiveness, Japan cannot maintain the economic cycle for its foreign currency earnings. Taking maritime security into consideration, using a FOC ship is a two-edged sword, because a ship’s registry country has judicial powers over the vessel on the high seas under the legal principle of exclusive flag state jurisdiction. However, a country such as Panama lacks the capacity to protect ships flying their flag from security threats on the world’s oceans. Thus, the globalization of the world economy and seapower combine to complicate maritime security interests of sea-dependent states such as Japan.\(^{14}\)

As identified in Tables 5 and 6, a large number of countries are strong trading partners with Japan. Logically, as a sea-girt country, Japan’s trading has to be heavily dependent on marine transportation. As a matter of fact, Table 7 shows that while the type of Japan’s trading becomes more multifaceted, and such trading is growing, the proportion of Japan’s trade which is seaborne remains almost unchanged, nearly 100 per cent. Namely, the total quantity of its seaborne trade and the tendency of a globalized economy are on the rise in parallel. Table 8 shows that the gross shipping tonnage of Japan has steadily increased, nevertheless the number of Japanese-flagged vessels is significantly declining. Japan’s dependence on the globalized world economy is obviously continuing to increase year by year.

In the Asia-Pacific region, notably, there are numerous threats posed by non-state players attacking SLOC for economic and political purposes. For Japan, sea lanes from the Persian Gulf to Japan by way of sea areas around the Arabian Peninsula, the Indian Ocean, the Malacca Strait, the South China Sea, and the Bashi Channel are vital to
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convey crude oil and natural gas. Japan purchases around 90 per cent of its oil imports from Middle Eastern countries. Annually, 1,400 very large crude carriers (VLCC) transit back and forth between Japan and the Middle East.\footnote{“Japan Must Keep Indian Ocean Presence: PAJ; Tembo Calls for Renewal of Special Law to Secure Oil Shipments from Mideast,” \textit{Platts Oilgram News} (online ed.), 1 October 2008.}

The Malacca Strait is one of the most important strategic chokepoints in the world’s ocean, which is vital for Japanese maritime transportation, but water areas around the strait are notorious for piracy and, potentially, terrorism. The waters off Somalia have been even more dangerous than the Malacca Strait in recent years because of savage piracy conducted for large ransoms. Moreover, even though Japan has not been regarded as a target, a catastrophe caused by maritime terrorism would be highly likely to cause Japan’s economic activity to be badly damaged. Maritime terrorism and piracy are heinous and potentially can cause massive damage to maritime trade. While China’s maritime strategy might be the biggest potential threat to Japanese shipping should hostilities between the two rival states ever break out, the Japanese government nevertheless needs to address the issues of non-state threats linked to the safety of the SLOC, with enthusiasm, as a matter of life and death for such a sea-dependent state.

However, Japan’s policy for sea lane defence is limited by the peace constitution. In order to protect sea lanes and economic activities relevant to ocean space, not only independent efforts, but also international cooperation is without doubt essential. In spite of this, the Japanese government does not approve of the use of its right to collective self-defence.\footnote{Kawamura, “Nijyūisseiki no Sea lane Bōei towa Nanika,” p. 43.}
### Table 5. Value of Japan’s Export by Destination and Commodity, 2006 (US$ million) 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Textiles</th>
<th>Chemical products</th>
<th>Metal and metal products</th>
<th>General machinery</th>
<th>Electrical machinery</th>
<th>Transport equipment</th>
<th>Precision instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>145,529</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>31,295</td>
<td>23,123</td>
<td>58,812</td>
<td>3,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>92,758</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>12,194</td>
<td>10,089</td>
<td>18,926</td>
<td>25,191</td>
<td>5,367</td>
<td>4,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>50,278</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>7,793</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>10,625</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>44,108</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8,273</td>
<td>4,577</td>
<td>8,568</td>
<td>10,803</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>3,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>36,430</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>14,077</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>22,901</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20,412</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>4,033</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>19,341</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>6,142</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>15,223</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Total</td>
<td>646,693</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>58,392</td>
<td>49,714</td>
<td>127,225</td>
<td>138,132</td>
<td>156,760</td>
<td>22,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crude oil exported from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Iran, Qatar, Bahrain, and Iraq to Japan is embarked on tankers. If terrorist groups attack such tankers, the world’s economy would descend into chaos. The U.S. Navy deploys its 5th Fleet in the Persian Gulf, and make efforts to secure the safety of the Gulf by forming multinational task forces with other NATO members and friendly states. Even though Japan imports a huge amount of crude oil from the Persian Gulf, the JMSDF takes no part in policing activities there. 18 Tankers bound for Japan from the Persian Gulf have to pass through the Hormuz Strait between Iran and Oman. If relations between the United States and Japan, already under strain, are further aggravated, it would be difficult for Japan to import crude oil from Iran. Were the United States and Iran to go to war, there is a high possibility that Japanese-related tankers would be exposed to Iran’s attack.19
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### Table 6. Value of Japan’s Imports by Source and Commodity, 2006 (US$ million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Foodstuffs</th>
<th>Raw Materials</th>
<th>Mineral fuels</th>
<th>Chemical products</th>
<th>Machinery and equipments</th>
<th>Textiles</th>
<th>Metal and metal products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>118,482</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>48,257</td>
<td>22,736</td>
<td>7,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>68,038</td>
<td>12,886</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>8,753</td>
<td>33,283</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>2,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>37,199</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36,662</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>123,709</td>
<td>22,996</td>
<td>29,827</td>
<td>66,306</td>
<td>59,491</td>
<td>84,386</td>
<td>27,975</td>
<td>8,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>All values are in US$ million.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Maritime Trade as a Percentage of Japan’s Total Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By Value (Trillion Yen)</th>
<th>By Weight (Million Ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Seaborne Trade (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63 (86.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60 (79.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54 (74.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61 (65.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>87 (71.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>103 (71.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>108 (68.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 8. Gross Shipping Tonnage of Japanese Ocean-going Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Japanese-registered Ship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Foreign-registered Ship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gross Ton (million)</td>
<td>Ratio (ton)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gross Ton (million)</td>
<td>Ratio (ton)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gross Ton (million)</td>
<td>Ratio (ton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>33,485</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>26,003</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>59,488</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>34,240</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>30,987</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>65,227</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>62,967</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>70,536</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>73,215</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>80,676</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>81,525</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>88,880</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Piracy

One of greatest non-state threats to Japan’s SLOC is piracy. Piracy has a long history. Over 3,000 years ago, a group called “the Sea Peoples” operated in the Mediterranean. Historically, pirates plagued the world; and in modern times, they have flexibly responded to changing situations. In Asian history, Chinese dynasties and Western maritime powers failed to manage the safety of marine shipping against pirates. After the arrival of modern age, the threat of piracy was not taken up as a serious issue and its presence gradually declined. Today, however, piracy has re-emerged on the international arena as a brutal maritime threat which seriously aggravates a large number of maritime user and littoral states whose SLOC are threatened by pirate activity.

Over the last couple of decades, acts of piracy have been getting more aggressive as evidenced by the use of heavy firearms and high-tech devices. Piracy is defined by the International Maritime Bureau (IMB), as follows: “An act of boarding or attempting to board any ship with the intent to commit theft or any other crime and with the intent or
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capability to use force in the furtherance of that act." In international law, piracy is defined, under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOSC), as consisting of the following acts:

(a) any illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed:
   (i) on the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft;
   (ii) against a ship, aircraft, persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State;
(b) any act of voluntary participation in the operation of a ship or of an aircraft with knowledge of facts making it a pirate ship or aircraft;
(c) any act of inciting or of intentionally facilitating an act described in subparagraph (a) or (b).

In recent years, like terrorism, piracy has been highly organized and sophisticated. It can be said that piracy is a low-risk, high-return activity. From 2002 to 2007, a total of 63 per cent of attempted and actual attacks of piracy occurred in waters off Southeast Asia and Africa. According to Martin Murphy there are seven major conditions for the piracy epidemic: legal and jurisdictional weakness, favourable geography, conflict and disorder, under-funded law enforcement/inadequate security, permissive political environments, cultural acceptability, and promise of reward. It can be said that pirates aim for financial benefits while terrorists aim to advance political objectives. However, it has been asserted that there is a link between terrorism and piracy. It is complicated even for experts to explain the connection between piracy and terrorism, since “pirates collude with terrorists, terrorists adopt pirate tactics and policymakers eager for public

29 See Murphy, Contemporary Piracy and Maritime Terrorism, pp. 12-18.
support start labelling every crime as maritime terrorism.” In practice, terrorist groups, like the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), which has a strong maritime tradition in the southern Philippines, use piracy in order to procure funds for its operations and as a camouflage.

**The Number of Pirate Attacks**

Since the IMB began to compile statistics on piracy, the global incidence of piracy peaked at 469 in 2000, as set out below in Table 9. At that time, piracy occurred frequently in the region from the Malacca Straits to the South China Sea and international criminal syndicates worked behind the scenes. In the 1990s, pirates hijacked whole ships carrying freight such as gasoline and diesel oil, because on-selling fuels was easy and it was comparatively easy to do so surreptitiously. After 2000, the number of pirate attacks began a downward trend since many Asian states heightened the sense of crisis over the growing menace of piracy. Such states attempted to improve domestic security and to strengthen regional cooperation with other Asia-Pacific states, with initiatives often proposed by Japan to share information to curb piracy. In 2005, as an impact of the Asian tsunami, pirate bases in the coastal region were damaged which led to the decline in frequency of piracy incidents.

In 2007, globally, piracy increased again compared with the previous year, especially in Africa. The number of attacks off Somalia doubled from the previous year. In terms of incidents of piracy by geographical region, the number of piracy cases has steadily decreased in the Malacca Strait since 2004, roughly correlating with the time of the establishment of the MALSINDO coordinated patrols by Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. In 2008, the number of pirate attacks around the world increased to 293 from 263 in the previous year. Notably, acts of piracy in the Gulf of Aden and in waters off Somalia have steadily increased since 2007. Japan’s shipping industry is bound up with this region. By 2009, piracy in waters off Somalia had increased by a factor of 15
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compared to 1999. As a result, the number of pirate attacks worldwide has sharply increased and has reached over 400 (see Table 9 below).

### Table 9. The Number of Pirate Attacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Malacca Strait</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Somalia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Shipping Tonnage in the Malacca Strait

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Increase-decrease Rate</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Increase-decrease Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanker</td>
<td>18,185</td>
<td>22,995</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1,19233,9</td>
<td>1,857,067</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container</td>
<td>15,295</td>
<td>29,672</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>399,508</td>
<td>10,13,552</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-on/Roll-off</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>40,468</td>
<td>59,771</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Carrier</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>13,599</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>503,176</td>
<td>138,636</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG/LPG</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>111,739</td>
<td>772,555</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo</td>
<td>23,080</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>202,577</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>53,988</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75,061</td>
<td>93,755</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2,503,755</td>
<td>3,989,321</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey included ships over 2,000 tons.

**Piracy in the Malacca Strait**

There have been serious threats to the stability and safety of maritime Asia, especially to maritime Southeast Asia and parts of the Indian Ocean, since the end of the Cold War. The distinctive feature of the Asia-Pacific region is diversity. Indeed, there are various religions, cultures, languages, historical backgrounds, geographical features, national strength characteristics, and insurgencies. Taking these features into consideration, it is
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tough to organize and combine various national players together with common goals.\textsuperscript{40} Several sea lanes intersect the maritime Southeast Asia region. Indeed, even though Southeast Asia is the hub of maritime Asia and, increasingly, considering the centrality today of Northeast Asian economies to global economic growth, the world, there are a large number of threats to the region’s sea lanes. In particular, the strategic importance of the sea lanes of the Malacca Strait, South China Sea, and Indonesian and Philippine archipelagic waters, cannot be overemphasised. The geographic features of maritime Southeast Asia, including innumerable nooks, corners and islands, enable pirates to escape and hide easily, and are thus ideal for the conduct of piracy, armed robbery at sea and other illegal activities.\textsuperscript{41} For instance, Indonesia has an 81,000 kilometre coastline. Indonesia’s islands officially number about 17,000 but even the government cannot exactly figure out how many islands lie within its territorial waters.\textsuperscript{42} Indeed, the number of islands of the Indonesian and Philippine archipelagos combined total over 20,000. This geography provides the right conditions for criminal activity at sea such as piracy or terrorism to flourish.\textsuperscript{43} Many areas of archipelagic Southeast Asia are unsafe and littoral state coast guards, marine police and navies lack the necessary capabilities to maintain peace and order; even more so on the high seas.

Not only is the Southeast Asian region at the crossroad of this vital global sea lane network, it is also a sea area where abundant marine resources lie, which could be a potential cause of territorial disputes. Especially, the complicated territorial sovereignty issues over the Spratly Islands might lead to an armed conflict among the countries concerned. Besides, half of the world’s oil and one-third of the world’s trade pass through the Malacca Strait,\textsuperscript{44} since it is the shortest route between the Indian and Pacific Oceans. It is also the main corridor of oil from the Persian Gulf and West Africa to the large consuming countries of Northeast Asia such as China, South Korea and Japan. This gives the Malacca and Singapore Straits added strategic, as well as commercial,
significance: in fact the sea area of the Strait of Malacca is the most significant strategic
choke point in the world.

The Malacca Strait is also the shortest sea route to East Asia from the Middle East, Europe, and Africa. Compared to the second shortest route via the Sunda Strait, the sea route via the Malacca and Singapore Straits makes a voyage shorter by at least 2,000 kilometres.\footnote{Zhang Xuegang, “South Asia and Energy Gateway to Stability.” [check the accuracy of this title – you should refer to the original article, not second hand via another source: it is available on-line] \textit{China Security}, Vol.3 No 2, p. 19, quoted in Rosihan Arsyad, “Cooperation to Safeguard Shipping through the Malacca Strait,” in Andrew Forbes ed., \textit{Asian Energy Security: Regional Cooperation in the Malacca Strait}, Papers in Australian Maritime Affairs No 23, Sea Power Centre—Australia, Canberra, p. 24.} If the Malacca Strait becomes impassable, the Sunda Strait between Java and Sumatra and the Lombok Strait located on the eastern side of Bali would be considered as the alternative sea routes. Lombok remains the preferred route, though, for the largest oil tankers with drafts too deep to safely navigate the Malacca Strait. Nevertheless, the navigation and control systems of both alternative straits are less well developed than those of Malacca and each is more costly to transit compared to the Malacca Strait due to the longer nautical distances involved.\footnote{Yamada, \textit{Umi no Seiji Keizai Gaku} p. 86.}

There is no doubt about the significance of the Malacca Strait with respect to both security and economic efficiency. Eighty-six per cent of oil imported into Japan passes through the Malacca and Singapore Straits.\footnote{Ibid.} Also, two-thirds of the world’s liquid natural gas (LNG) is carried through this trade route.\footnote{Susumu Takai, “Kaiyō no Antei Riyō no Kakuho to OPK [Securing Steady Use of Ocean],” \textit{Kaigai Jiyō} [Foreign Affairs], November 2006, p. 16, quoted in Robert C. Beckman, “Enhancing Maritime Security in the Straits of Malacca and Singapore,” paper presented to “Geo-Agenda for the Future: Securing the Oceans,” hosted by Ship & Ocean Foundation, 2003, p. 7.} Also, in 2008, Japan imported 96 per cent of its LNG consumption to reach 681.3 million tons, accounting for 40 per cent of the world’s imports of LNG.\footnote{The Center for Promotion of Natural Gas homepage, available at http://www.naturalgas.jp/antei/LNGimp.html} Marine accidents constantly happen in this area because there are many shallow waters, sunken rocks and foundered boats at the bottom of the strait. The port of Singapore, which handles the world’s largest amount of cargo, is located at the eastern end of the Malacca Strait. Over 90,000 ships pass through the strait annually (see also Table 10 above), and 15,000 of them are relevant to Japan:
indeed, it has the largest number of ships passing there among countries from other regions.\textsuperscript{50}

In addition, several radical Islamist groups which seek to enhance their potential to conduct terrorist operations are found all across maritime Southeast Asia: in southern Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines.\textsuperscript{51}

**Japanese Shipping Interests and Piracy in Southeast Asia**

*The Case of the M.V. Tenyu*

The M.V. *Tenyu*, a small, 2,660-ton cargo ship of Panamanian registry and owned by a Japanese company Masumoto Kisen, was loaded with about 3,000 tons of aluminium ingot at Kuala Tanjung, Indonesia and left for Inchon, South Korea on 27 September 1998.\textsuperscript{52} The M.V. *Tenyu* disappeared on the way along with its crew of two South Koreans, twelve Chinese, the captain and the chief engineer. The *Tenyu* Incident exposed problems in the practice of Japan’s maritime affairs. There are about 35,000 shipping companies in Japan, 95 per cent of which are small companies with capitalizations of less than 100 million yen, an example of which is Masumoto Kisen. Such companies usually have an overseas subsidiary, most often based in Panama; with their ships flying the flags of flag of convenience registries such as Panama.\textsuperscript{53}

The *Tenyu*’s last known location was outside of Japan’s jurisdiction and at that time, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Ministry of Transport (currently called the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism or MILT), and Japan Coast Guard (JCG) could not provide specific information on the matter. Masumoto Kisen attempted to gather information on the missing ship by contacting its insurance companies. The Nippon Foundation received information through the marine navigation control centres managed by the Singaporean and Malaysian governments that the M.V.

\textsuperscript{50} Yoshihiko Yamada, “Kaiyō Security to Kaizoku Mondai [Maritime Security and Pirate Issue],” *Kaigai Jijyō* [Foreign Affairs], November 2006, pp. 4-5.


\textsuperscript{52} Yamada, *Umi no Seiji Keizai Gaku* p. 107.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
Tenyu had not passed through waters off Singapore.\textsuperscript{54} A well-known maritime lawyer, Yoichi Ogawa, who assembled the information, told Masumoto Kisen that there was a high possibility that the Tenyu had been taken over by pirates and put forward a suggestion to consult with the IMB Piracy Reporting Centre in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. It was said that Masumoto Kisen had never even heard of the IMB before the incident and it did not occur to the missing ship’s owners that it could be a case of piracy. The IMB immediately sent detailed information on the Tenyu to every maritime-related organization across Asia.\textsuperscript{55}

In December 1998, the Tenyu was discovered at the port of Zhang Jia in China. The Tenyu was renamed SANEI 1 and had been repainted in a different colour. It was soon revealed that the Tenyu had been renamed four times since it went missing. Chinese authorities contacted Masumoto Kisen to inform the company that a ship which is similar to Tenyu has been discovered and requested Tenyu’s manufacturing number (located on its engine) to confirm the ship’s identity. Even though the ship was renamed SANEI 1 and the registry changed to Honduras, the engine number clearly identified it as the Tenyu. The Chinese government demanded from Masumoto Kisen a deposit of over US$1 million for the costs of seizing and managing the ship.\textsuperscript{56} The Tenyu was held in China until May 1999 and Masumoto Kisen paid about 20 million yen in expenses to the Chinese authorities. The ship’s 16 Indonesian crew members were repatriated to Indonesia.

Subsequent information gathered revealed that 28 pirates aboard another ship pretending to enter Yangon Port, Thailand, had assaulted the Tenyu on 10 October 1998. A subsequent investigation uncovered that two of the Indonesian crew were involved in an incident where pirates attacked a cargo ship named Anna Sierra navigating from Thailand to the Philippines.\textsuperscript{57} The South Korean Coast Guard actively conducted an international investigation of the incident since the captain and the chief engineer were South Koreans. Consequently, three South Korean trading merchants involved in selling off aluminium ingots were arrested. The aluminium ingots were sold at US$300 million

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 108.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p. 109.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., pp. 109-110.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p. 111.
by South Korean trading merchants in Singapore to a Chinese-owned commercial firm in Burma.\textsuperscript{58}

The Chinese government demanded US$1 million as the delivery cost to \textit{Masumoto} Kisen. Masumoto Kisen wasted a lot of time to negotiating with the Chinese government to lower the amount. After five months, the ship was finally returned to the company. China came under fire from the international community for the manner in which it dealt with the issue.\textsuperscript{59} The \textit{Tenyu} incident caused an economic loss in the realm of 450 million yen and the loss of the lives of 14 of the crew.\textsuperscript{60} The \textit{Tenyu} incident showed clearly that piracy can be transnational in nature, with criminal syndicates operating across a number of countries. It is therefore difficult for any single country to deal with the problem without cooperation from other states.

\textit{The Case of the Alondra Rainbow}

Another well-known incident of piracy involved another cargo carrier, the \textit{Alondra Rainbow}, which was owned by Imura Kisen, another Japanese shipping company. The \textit{Alondra Rainbow}, laden with 7,762 tons of aluminium ingots, left Kuala Tanjung Port for Miike Port in Fukuoka, Japan, on 22 October 1999. Like the \textit{Tenyu}, the \textit{Alondra Rainbow} was flagged with the Panamanian registry. On the same day, about ten pirates with guns and knives attacked the carrier and its crew members, composed of the Japanese ship captain, the Japanese chief engineer and 15 Filipino seafarers. The crew members were forced onto an old vessel and to stay there for six days, and then they were forced into a rescue raft on 29 October. On 8 November, a Thai fishing boat found the raft and rescued them. After the \textit{Alondra Rainbow} was attacked, the \textit{IMB Piracy Reporting Centre} offered monetary rewards in exchange for useful information gathered and actually obtained.

On 14 November 1999, the IMB received information that a suspicious ship resembling the \textit{Alondra Rainbow} was navigating in waters around the south of India and reported it to the Indian Coast Guard. The Indian Coast Guard chased the ship, firing warning shots,
for three days, and finally seized and held the ship. On board the vessel were fifteen pirates who were members of a piracy syndicate. After a trial, the pirates were sentenced to seven years imprisonment in Mumbai. However, 3,000 tons out of the 7,000 tons aluminium ingot cargo had been already sold by a Chinese broker. This incident was reported to the Japanese government through the Nippon Foundation and the Japan Shipowner’s Association on 27 October. Because there were two Japanese on board the missing vessel, the JCG immediately issued a navigation warning and tried to obtain information from witnesses. The JCG also made requests to the coastguards (or equivalent authorities) of Singapore, Malaysia, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Taiwan, China and South Korea, through whose waters the Alondra Rainbow was supposed to pass, for cooperation in the provision of information on the ship. Importantly, at this time, the JCG sent a large Patrol vessel equipped with a helicopter, Ryūkyū, to Southeast Asian waters to follow planning a navigation track from Japan. It was the first time that the Japan Coast Guard had sent a ship overseas for an operational investigation. Furthermore, it was highly significant that the Indian Coastguard and the Indian Navy cooperated with the IMB, a civil agency, leading ultimately to the arrest of the pirates. With this case as a starting point, Asian countries started to engage more seriously in international anti-piracy cooperation.

The Case of the Idaten

On 14 March 2005, five pirates on a fishing boat carrying AK-47 and M-16 assault rifles and rocket propelled grenades (RPG) attacked the 498 ton-Japanese tugboat Idaten in the Malacca Strait. The pirates took some of the vessel’s cargo and kidnapped three of the crew (two Japanese and one Filipino) as hostages, taking them and their tug into Indonesian waters. The Idaten is owned by the Japanese shipping company, Kondo Kaiji. At the time it was attacked by the pirates, the tug was towing a plant barge, the Kuroshio 1, from Batam, Indonesia, to Burma. The pirates assaulted the boat within Malaysian waters and then fled into Indonesian waters, making use of the national sovereignty of the surrounding states to elude the chase. The president of Kondo Kaiji talked about measures to deal with the incident with Japanese governmental
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organizations such as MOFA, MILT and the Japan Coast Guard, and then went to Malaysia with a governmental person in charge on 15 March. The following day, Idaten’s Japanese captain told them he received a phone call asking for a ransom of US$250,000. Kondo Kaiji asked a local person to negotiate for the release of the hostages, which was concluded on 17 March. On 20 March, the three hostages were taken to southern Thailand by the Thai Coast Guard. There was some speculation that there was a possibility that Indonesian anti-government forces or Indonesian military personnel were involved in the attack, because the pirates were heavily armed. It became clear that pirates in the region had potentially become a more dangerous threat to littoral states. The pirates made use of the littoral state’s respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other states. It made the investigation particularly difficult because it involved several multiple jurisdictions and multinational organizations. In fact, Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand individually conducted the investigation into the Idaten incident. Around the Malacca Strait, piracy and armed robbery against ships often have been carried out as transnational activities, which is impossible for a single nation to address alone.

**Somali Pirates**

In recent years the waters off Somalia and in the Gulf of Aden have been the focus of world attention because of their notoriety as sea areas infested with pirates. The Gulf of Aden is a seaway about 1,800 kilometres in length, much longer than the Malacca Strait. Since the Siad Barre government collapsed in 1991, Somalia has been in virtual bankruptcy due to the absence of foreign aid and the presence of ethnic conflict. Somalia plunged into a state of anarchy and it has been plagued by a prolonged civil war. It has about 3,700 kilometres of unpoliced waters and coastline. Twelve per cent of world crude oil shipments passes through the Gulf of Aden, connecting Europe with the Persian Gulf and Asia via the Suez Canal. Annually, some 22,000 ships carrying eight per cent of the world’s trade use the Suez Canal as a shortcut to link Europe with Asia, running between the Mediterranean and the Red Seas.
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route around the Cape of Good Hope, avoiding the canal, it has to travel about an extra 6,000 kilometres, which can impose an additional cost of about 40 million yen, depending on the size and type of ship and the current fuel price, and will take six to ten days longer.  

Many Somali pirates are poor fishermen or former militia members. Initially, they attacked small cargo boats navigating adjacent seas and deep-sea fishing vessels; but, since 1995 they raided bigger vessels with more sophisticated automatic weapons such as the AK47 and RPG-7 grenade launchers. Indeed, after the Iraq War, it has been easy to obtain weapons at the border zone between Saudi Arabia and Yemen and a massive amount of weapons flowed into Somalia. In 2005, off the coast of Somalia, the number of pirate attacks sharply increased from two incidents in 2004 to 35. Somali pirates are known for taking hostages and demanding a high ransom. In 2008, it was reported that Somali pirates held a total of over 800 ship crew members as hostages and received over US$100 million in ransom. Insurance costs for some ships navigating off Somalia have exponentially increased, some from US$500 to US$20,000. All containers shipped via the Gulf of Aden have been charged an extra US$23; hence the largest vessels that can hold 14,000 containers have been required to pay up to US$300,000 extra per transit.

In Somalia, being a pirate is a coveted “profession,” bringing considerable riches, with the leaders of pirate groups living in luxurious houses. Somali pirates demand much higher ransoms than the pirates of the Malacca region. One of the main reasons for this is that most pirate and armed robbery at sea attacks that take place in Malacca and elsewhere in Southeast Asia are targeted against small vessels, usually plying local or coastal trade or engaged in fishing, rather than against larger merchant ships transiting the area on international trade. By contrast, most attacks in the Somalia region are against large merchant ships, which are far more lucrative targets, with shippers and marine insurers often willing to pay considerable ransoms for the return of crews, and
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their very valuable ships and cargoes. As a consequence, many Somali coastal cities have experienced an economic boom because of the proliferation of piracy.\textsuperscript{73}

In 2007, a ship carrying World Food Program (WFP) relief supplies was attacked by Somali pirates and was robbed of provisions and the ship’s crew taken as hostages. It was reported that the hostages were released in exchange for a ransom of US$1 million, which was mediated by an Islamic religious leader. The potential linkages between pirates and Islamist militant groups have thus been a subject of some conjecture.\textsuperscript{74}

In 2008, Somali pirates gradually became even more brazen and extended their activities from the area of the Indian Ocean off the coast of Somalia further out to sea and to the Gulf of Aden. Today, the Somali pirates are armed with machine guns and other automatic weapons and RPGs. They usually operate on small boats connected to a mother ship, and attack ships making full use of the latest technology such as radar, satellite phones, the Global Positioning System (GPS), ship Automatic Identification System (AIS), and high-performance outboard motors.\textsuperscript{75} The IMB has advised ships passing by the Somali coast to stay more than 200 nautical miles from the shore; although attacks involving mother ships have taken place as far as 1,000 nautical miles from the coast. In 2008, about 20,000 vessels and about 2,103 Japan-related ships pass through Somali waters. In 2008, 130 merchant ships were attacked, with the number doubling from the previous year.\textsuperscript{76}

\textbf{Japanese Ships and Somali Pirates}

There have been a number of attacks against Japanese shipping interests in the Gulf of Aden/Somalia region, detailed below.\textsuperscript{77}

- On 28 October 2007, the Japanese-operated chemical tanker, \textit{Golden Nori}, was seized off the coast of Somalia by gunmen. The 6,253 ton tanker was carrying 10,000 tons of highly explosive benzene. One U.S. destroyer, which patrolled near

\textsuperscript{73} Masaharu Yamazaki, \textit{Somalia no Umi de Nihon wa Chinbotu Suru} [Japan will Sink in the Sea of Somalia], KK Bestsellers, Tokyo, 2009, pp. 47-48.
\textsuperscript{74} Yamada, \textit{Umi no Seiji Keizai Gaku}, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{76} “Somalia's coast: a hotbed of piracy,” \textit{Agence France Presse}, 10 April 2009
\textsuperscript{77} What can 2 MSDF ships do off Somalia?,” \textit{The Daily Yomiuri}, 1 April 2009.
sea area, hurried to the scene and tried to chase the pirates and *the Golden Nori*. The U.S. destroyer destroyed a motor boat that the pirates used to attack *the Golden Nori* with gunfire, but the pirates escaped into Somalia’s territorial waters. On 12 December 2007, eventually 23 hostages from the Philippines and South Korea were safely released after the shipowner Dorval Kaiun K.K. paid a ransom of US$1 million. The tanker was returned under the escort of a U.S. naval ship. According to the Japanese ship owner, the release was brought by its persistent negotiation and with the assistance of the U.S. and British navies. The Japanese government was not in a position to participate in the incident because the ship was registered in Panama. Ultimately, South Korea negotiated the release of the hostages. Japan could do nothing in the circumstances because of flag state jurisdiction. It was a tough negotiation because Somalia was an unfamiliar country; in particular because of the state of anarchy prevailing within the country.

- On 21 April 2008, a 150,000 ton crude oil tanker, the *Takayama*, was attacked by pirates with RPGs and machine guns off the coast of Yemen in the Gulf of Aden. After the Japanese-operated *Takayama* sent distress signals, a German frigate, which belonged to the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) comprising Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Pakistan and the United States, hastened to the ship’s location and drove the pirates away. The tanker, which belonged to a major shipping company, Nippon Yusen, was damaged, but no one was injured.

- On 20 July 2008, a Japanese-owned cargo ship, the *Stella Maris*, with 20 Filipino crew, was hijacked by gunmen in the Gulf of Aden. The 52,500 ton cargo ship was carrying 25,000 tons of lead bullion and 15,000-23,000 tons of zinc concentrates. On 26 September 2008, all crew members were released, after a ransom of US$2 million was paid.
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• On August 2008, the *AIZU*, a ship of Panamanian registry, managed by a Japanese company, was raided by two pirate speed boats.\(^{83}\)

• On 21 August 2008, a 11,920 ton chemical tanker by operated by a Japanese company, Koyo Kaiun, the MT *Irene*, was seized off the coast of Somalia by armed men. After a US$1.6 million ransom was paid, its crew of 16 Filipinos and two Russians were released.\(^{84}\)

• On 15 September 2008, the 25,000 ton chemical tanker, *Stolt Valor*, managed by a Japanese company, Central Marine, was hijacked by gunmen in the Gulf of Aden. On 16 November the hostages were released. It is said the Japanese company paid up to US$2.5 million in ransom. Incidentally, 18 out of the 22 crewmen were Indian (and two from the Philippines, one from Bangladesh, one from Russia); hence, the incident became a hot topic of conversation in India. After the *Stolt Valor* was seized, Indian maritime unions temporarily boycotted seafaring in the waters off the coast of Somalia in order to promote national awareness about Somali pirates and protest against government inaction in spite of the rising risk of merchant ships being hijacked, as was shown clearly by the piracy data.\(^{85}\) The Indian government eventually gave permission for formal anti-piracy patrols off Somalia by its warships.\(^{86}\)

• On 15 November 2008, a 20,000 ton Panama-flagged chemical tanker, MT *Chemstar Venus*, operated by a Japanese shipping company, was hijacked the Gulf of Aden. In February 2009, the crew, 15 Filipinos and five South Koreans, and the ship were released after a ransom was paid.\(^{87}\)

---


\(^{86}\) “Indian Warships to Protect Vessels from Pirates,” *The Times of India* (online ed.), 18 October 2008.

• On 23 March 2009, an automobile transport vessel, the *Jasmine Ace*, belonging to Mitsui OSK Lines, was fired at by two speed boats containing more than 20 pirates, 900 km east of Somalia and 1,500 km south of waters where JMSDF destroyers were operating.\(^8\) The 13,000 ton Japanese ship carrying 380 used cars was pursued for about 40 minutes barely escaping by taking evasive action, sailing in a zigzag movement.\(^9\) This was the first strike on a Japanese-operated ship in the region in 2009 after the dispatch of two JMSDF destroyers to waters off Somalia, a deployment discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

• The MV *Sanderling Ace* operated by the Japanese MOL shipping line was attacked by seven pirates in a small boat. An Indian Navy frigate, INS *Godavari*, received a distress signal from the Japanese car carrier registered in the Cayman Islands. A helicopter sent by the Indian naval ship fired a warning shot at the pirate boat, which subsequently escaped. There was no damage to MV *Sanderling Ace* or injury to its crew.\(^9\)

**Maritime Terrorism**

The word “terrorism” originated from the French Revolution’s “Reign of Terror,” which resulted in the execution of 12,000 people suspected as being enemies of the revolution (although terrorism as a method of warfare is as old as war itself). Modern terrorism has evolved into an activity targeting innocent civilians and economic activities.\(^9\)

Terrorism has been defined as the “deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.”\(^9\) There is also a distinction to be made between terrorism and irregular warfare: “Terrorism seeks to bring awareness to a political grievance but rarely, if ever, results on its own in political

\(^8\) “What can 2 MSDF ships do off Somalia?,” *The Daily Yomiuri*, 1 April 2009.
change. Irregular warfare by contrast, is an attempt to bring about political change by force of arms.”

Maritime terrorism has been defined by one commentator as “any illegal act directed against ships, their passengers, cargo or crew, or against sea ports with the intention to influence a government.” After September 11, maritime terrorism in the Asia-Pacific region came under much closer scrutiny. Successful terrorist attacks in this region might cause catastrophic damage to the world economy. Non-state terrorist groups have been attempting to strengthen their operational capability. In recent years, they have attained the ability to conduct their plans with advanced telecommunications, using various platforms. Furthermore, they allegedly have been waiting for an opportunity to purchase and use weapons of mass destruction (WMD). There is also a threat of terrorist cyber attack which could cause tremendous damage to information network systems in connection with marine transportation and commerce systems, and thus paralyse economic activities.

The sea and maritime transportation systems have been often used for crimes such as the smuggling of people, drugs, and weapons, piracy and armed robbery. In common with some piracy and other transnational criminal activity, the more advanced terrorist groups have often been well organized, and possess advanced equipment such as communication devices, weapons, and even aircraft. Maritime terrorist attacks could also cause pollution to the marine environment. Environmental disasters could cause considerably damage to the economic activity and hence political stability of the region.

According to Martin Murphy there are six conditions that contribute to the potential success of maritime terrorism: legal and jurisdictional weakness, geographical necessity, inadequate security, secure base areas, maritime tradition, charismatic and effective
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leadership, and state support. In spite of advanced satellite and other modern detection systems, it is still difficult to pursue terrorists and their vessels on the sea. These conditions are very similar to those of piracy. Unfortunately, it is a fact that there are a number of areas in the Asia-Pacific region which satisfy these conditions. There is always a possibility that Japan’s economic activities and SLOC will be adversely affected by maritime terrorism.

**Maritime Terrorism in the Asia-Pacific Region**

The Southeast Asian region is notorious for acts of piracy and terrorism by radical Islamic groups such as Jemaah Islamiyah (JI), operating throughout the region but with a focus of activities in Indonesia; and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and the ASG in the Philippines. JI has been known to be interested in conducting attacks on maritime targets. In 2001, even though JI was not able to carry out its plan owing to a lack of operational capacity, it had prepared to attack U.S. vessels at Changi Naval Base in Singapore. As an alternative to this plot, according to U.S. Intelligence, JI had the intention to hijack a ship in transiting regional SLOC. Also, in 2004, it was warned that JI had plans to capture a ship using local pirates.

In the southern Philippines, the MILF has targeted inter-island ferries carrying members of the armed forces and Christians for its bomb attacks. The ASG is notorious for attacking the MV Superferry 14 in Manila Bay in 2004, an attack that killed more than 100 people. Further, the Al-Qaeda network was found in possession of a video recording of Malaysian police patrols along the Strait of Malacca that showed an intent to attack shipping in the vital sea lane. In addition, the capacity of Al-Qaeda to attack ships was revealed through interrogating Abd al-Rahim al-Nashri of the terrorist network who seemed to be an expert in maritime operations. Usually, maritime terrorist attacks are conducted in narrow waters like a strait because geographical restrictions and navigational hazards force ships to navigate slowly. It is also easier for
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non-state actors to conduct attacks close to the shore rather than out on the open ocean, which requires larger, more capable platforms and greater seafaring skills. Hence, in the maritime region from the Middle East to the East China Sea, which contains strategic choke points including the Bab al-Mandeb, the Strait of Hormuz, and East Asian straits such as Malacca, Singapore, Sunda, Lombok, Makassar, Basilan, Surigao, San Bernardino, Luzon, and Taiwan, each authority has to take special precautions against terrorism.102

The waters of the Indian Ocean are also unsafe from maritime terrorist attacks. The sea area, like other regions has narrow water passages which are considered significant choke points such as the Straits of Malacca, the Straits of Hormuz, the Gulf of Aden and the Mozambique Channel, which rogue states and non-state actors may easily disrupt.103 This geographical environment is an enabling factor by which rogue states and non-state players might disrupt marine transportation. The northern Indian Ocean and areas around Indonesia are amongst the world’s most pirate-infested waters. An important aggravating factor is that most littoral states do not have sufficient capacity to ensure the safety of their sea lanes.104

The Strait of Hormuz is crucial in terms of energy security because 90 per cent of all oil exported from Gulf countries passes through the Strait.105 The American warship USS Cole was attacked in Aden in 2000. On 6 October 2002, the French oil tanker Limburg was attacked by a suicide bomber using an explosives-laden small boat near the Yemeni coast in the Gulf of Aden. These terrorist attacks by Al-Qaeda-connected extremists made the world realise the horridness of maritime terrorism. Rumours of a connection between pirates and Al-Qaeda have also persisted.106 In spite of the presence of navies from a number of countries, waters around the Gulf states still remain dangerous spots.

102 Cole, Sea Lanes and Pipelines, p. 86.
104 Ibid.
106 Cole, Sea Lanes and Pipelines, pp. 85-86.
Actually, the shadow of Al-Qaeda and the possibility of threats are still present in Iraq and in Iraqi waters.\textsuperscript{107}

In Sri Lanka, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) operated some general and some hijacked ships for the narcotics and arms trade. The drugs were carried from Burma to Turkey, and money transferred to Bangkok was arranged to purchase arms. The LTTE’s vessels conveyed the arms to the east coast of Sri Lanka via the sea area of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. These loads were then transferred to small trawlers in some uninhibited islands to escape detection at times as occasion demanded.\textsuperscript{108} This maritime transportation of arms was vital for Tamil Tiger acts of terrorism in Sri Lanka. Indian maritime forces put these sea areas under tight surveillance to capture a ring of smugglers. In 1999, in Chennai, in southeastern India, the Indian Coast Guard found and retrieved the missing hijacked Japanese bulk carrier, \textit{Kobe Queen}, which had been renamed \textit{Gloria Kopp} and had disappeared on a voyage from Istanbul to the Caribbean. This ship was investigated for being used for the drug trade, which seemed to ultimately become sources of funding for terrorists.\textsuperscript{109}

From the night of 26 November 2008 to the morning of the 29th, Pakistani Muslim extremists carried out acts of terrorism aimed at innocent civilians by using bombs and automatic weapons in Mumbai, a huge harbour city and South Asia’s financial hub located on the west coast of the Indian subcontinent. Even though the Indian Coast Guard and Navy understood the possibility of terrorists arriving from the sea,\textsuperscript{110} and the fact that the United States had warned India to be on alert for a terrorist attack via the ocean before it happened,\textsuperscript{111} a series of terror attacks killed more than 180 people.

On 28 July 2010, a double-hulled VLCC owned by Japanese shipping company, Mitsui OSK Lines, the Marshall Islands-flagged \textit{M Star}, was damaged by a blast in the Strait of Hormuz. The 160,292-ton vessel was carrying 2.7 million barrels of crude oil from the

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 112.
\textsuperscript{110} “India had warnings of attack by sea, on hotel-source”, \textit{Reuters India} (online ed.), 1 December 2008.
port of Das Island in Abu Dhabi to Japan’s port in Chiba prefecture. Even though the explosion dented the hull, oil did not spill into the Gulf. One crewmember was slightly injured.112

On 4 August, a group linked to al Qaeda, the Brigades of Abdullah Azzam, claimed in a message on jihadist websites that they had carried out a suicide attack on the ship.113 Relevant players did not rule out the possibility of the terrorist attack in this incident. Indeed, it was reported that United Arab Emirates officials believe that it was a terrorist-related explosion.114 According to the Transport Ministry, the ship’s voyage data recorder captured radar images displaying three small boats making suspicious movements around the *M Star* before the explosive impact.115 The Japanese government organized a special committee to investigate the suspected attack, examining and gathering information from the tanker with officials from the Cabinet Secretariat, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, the Japan Transport Safety Board, the National Police Agency and the Japan Coast Guard.116 According to a Transport Ministry official, “There are two major reasons (for the inspection) — to take a close look at the ship for the first time and to search for more physical evidence regarding the blast.”117 On 19 November, the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Maritime Administration said, “Government and industry sources can confirm that the claim by the Abdullah Azzam brigades ... is valid,” and “The group remains active and can conduct further attacks on vessels in areas in the Strait of Hormuz, southern Arabian Gulf, and western Gulf of Oman”.118

**Conclusion**

Compared to Mahan’s era, maritime states have an increased need to respond to the reality of a new international economy centring on globalization. Japan’s shipping
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industry relies on the feature of international interdependence in the globalization age by using the huge global SLOC network and FOC ships at a high rate. Japan’s SLOC and shipping industry is apparently vulnerable against many types of incidents. Piracy is a traditional and rapidly evolving threat to SLOC. Modern pirates are heavily-armed and cunning enough to raise complex issues related to national sovereignty due to often politically and legally problematic issues related to maritime borders. A large number of Japanese-related ships sail through the Malacca Strait. Japan cannot increase its economic strength without a serious commitment to solving potential threats to shipping in the strait. Furthermore, piracy in sea areas around Somalia has been regarded as a bigger issue by many countries. Perhaps more importantly, an act of terrorism in the maritime arena could cause a catastrophe that involves a number of innocent people and the global economy. Therefore, even though Japan has been not a main target for maritime terrorist attacks so far, it must nevertheless contribute to the construction of international maritime order, as a seapower state which lives in a world of interdependence.
CHAPTER 5
Japan’s Seapower and the United States: The Alliance with the Greatest Sea Power

Introduction
The number of analyses on U.S-Japan relations from the perspectives of seapower and navy-to-navy relations is relatively limited. In this chapter, relations between the United States and Japan will be discussed by considering the context of navies and the geo-strategy of sea power states and the true nature and the significance of the alliance between the two maritime states. It is intended here to consider the interdependent relationship based on navy-to-navy relations. The first section will examine Japan’s post-War pacifism, which is without parallel in history as a major nation. It has contrasted starkly with past history and has cast a large shadow on Japan’s security and maritime strategies. The second section will review the influence of the U.S. on the birth and development of the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) to recognize the bond and the importance of navy-to-navy relations, which have become the centre-piece of relations between the two partners. The third section will discuss how the JMSDF contributes to maintaining the alliance in the post-Cold War era. The fourth section will explore which capabilities the JMSDF lacks and needs, and which United States Forces Japan (USFJ) supplements and it will discuss why the Japanese archipelago has been vital for U.S. global strategy, based on considerations of power projection capability from the sea. The final section will focus on the friendship between the two navies based on the human interaction that is an essential foundation for the alliance.

The Loser after the Great War: Japan’s Pacifism

The Road to Catastrophe
From the perspective of the development of Japan’s seapower, Japanese strategic culture was shaped as an “island country” that preferred being an isolated country to being a “maritime state” that assertively ventured out upon the broad ocean, throughout most of Japanese history. After the Meiji Restoration, however, Japan attempted to change that strategic culture based on rapidly expanding its naval strength, akin to Mahan’s concept for survival against competition other great powers. In addition, since
1870, the Meiji administration adopted British methods for the new Japanese navy. Accordingly, a British naval assistance advisory group led by Major Archibald L. Douglas was invited to Japan in 1873 to demonstrate the development of human resources. As a result, Japan’s vanity and national power were promoted by its victories by the war against Qing Dynasty China and the war against Russia.¹

After the war against Russia, America built the large-scale naval base at Pearl Harbour, Hawaii. Japan also built up the world’s third greatest navy after the United States. As it turned out, both countries’ growing sea power set up the other as an imaginary enemy. The Japanese Empire, with its formidable naval power was ranked one of the “Big Five” at the Versailles Peace Conference after the First World War. Consequently, such a series of developments obviously provided the West with lingering suspicions,² especially apparent with respect to the United States. Eventually, Japan was deeply ostracized by European great powers, and then fell into a fateful solitude in international society.³ That Japan could not maintain the alliance with the greatest maritime state, Britain, led to deadly consequences; indeed, the Japanese descended into miserable war until 15 August 1945. During those times, Japan was dominated by political leaders who were ultra-nationalist and militarist in nature. Until the attack on Pearl Harbour, Japanese were taught such a spirit as ethics in elementary schools.⁴ The strength of the samurai tradition was reflected in practice as a Banzai charge or Kamikaze attack against stronger enemy forces and persistence under severe pressure in the Second World War.⁵

**American Policy toward Japan**

In 1853, Commodore Matthew C. Perry sailed to a point off Uraga with four war vessels with a letter from then U.S. President Millard Fillmore. His objective was to conclude a treaty and amity between the United States and Japan for the sake of using the Japanese islands as a supply-base for the American whaling industry. This
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represented a successful example of gunboat diplomacy. Consequently, the arrival of Perry ended Japan’s closed-door policy. Relations between the two countries have seemed to reflect a manifestation of their policy towards seapower, such as the Washington Conference that included the Washington Naval Treaty and the denunciation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, the Pacific War, and the conclusion of the U.S.-Japanese alliance. After two atomic bombs were dropped on the Japanese islands, Japanese traditional ethics such as Bushido (the moral code of samurai) were denied as vicious spiritual cultures by Americans who considered the occupation policy, and some Japanese who had suffered a painful experience in the war. Japanese strategic culture was drastically changed after the end of the Second World War. Since then, although Japan has depended on maritime transportation in order to focus on increasing its economic strength, it became an introverted country again with respect to diplomacy and security.

The United States effectively put the defeated nation in chains, constraining future Japanese actions through Article 9 of Japan’s post-War constitution:

**Chapter II. Renunciation of War**

**Article 9.** Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

(2) In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.7

The American victors, mainly under the direction of General Douglas Macarthur and the Occupational authority of the General Headquarters (GHQ), led the new Japan to be a peaceful democratic country characterized by an “extreme pacifism.”
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6 See Sajima, “Japan: Strategic Culture at a Crossroads”.
Japan will be completely disarmed and demilitarized. The authority of the militarists and the influence of militarists and the influence of militarism will be totally eliminated from her political economic, and social life. Institutions expressive of the spirit of militarism and aggression will be vigorously suppressed.

Disarmament and demilitarization are the primary tasks of the military occupation and shall be carried out promptly and with determination.

Japan is not to have an army, navy, air force, secret police organization, or any civil aviation. Japan’s ground, air, and naval forces shall be disarmed and disbanded and the Japanese Imperial General Headquarters, the General Staff and all secret police organizations shall be dissolved. Military and naval material, military and navy vessels and military and naval installations, and military and civilian aircraft shall be surrendered and shall be disposed of as required by the Supreme Commander.

There were a number of taboos on the security policies considered in the post-War era:

1) the exclusively defense-oriented policy (EDOP);
2) no overseas deployments of troops;
3) no military use of space;
4) no offensive weaponry;
5) no alliance or collective security arrangements that committed Japan to use force to defend others;
6) no possession or production of nuclear weapons, nor are any to be brought into Japan; and
7) no weapons exports.

In 1951, Japanese Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida signed the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty that granted key policies for Japan’s defence such as nuclear deterrence, the capability to defend against aggression, the stability of the region, and the free passage of sea lanes. The security treaty stated, “Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression, always avoiding any armament
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10 The exclusively defense-oriented policy means that defensive force is used only in the event of an attack, that the extent of use of defensive force is kept to the minimum necessary for self-defense, and that the defense capabilities to be possessed and maintained by Japan are limited to the minimum necessary for self-defense. The policy including these matters refers to the posture of a passive defense strategy in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution.
which could be an offensive threat.” The international stability of the Cold War period allowed Japan to accomplish these needs, helped by the security framework of the alliance with the United States, which possessed sufficient seapower to control the World Ocean. During the Cold War era Japan adopted pacifist policies based on Article 9 of the constitution. United States Forces Japan (USFJ) and America’s power projection capability compensated for this limitation, creating a heavy Japanese reliance upon the alliance.

At that time, Japan’s priority was policy for post-War reconstruction such as providing for the nation, general rise in living standards, and growing economic power. Although the Japanese gradually came to doubt the United Nation’s capacity for collective security to stabilize international society after the war, Yoshida recognized that the close relationship with the U.S. would guarantee a seapower-protected international trading structure, in order to secure the import of natural resources. At that point, Yoshida thought “that Japan should and could live as a maritime nation and that cooperation with (the United States) would be the best way to acquire access to the world market and its resources and to safeguard her sea routes”.

Japan’s Post-war Pacifism

The security framework in the Cold War, political West vs. East, forced the pattern of the showdown between Japan’s ruling and opposition parties in the Diet to be inflexible. The Liberal Democratic Party of Japan (LDP) was the party in power over this extended period. On the other hand, the Japan Socialist Democratic Party and the Communist Party vehemently opposed the existence of the Japan Self Defense Force (JSDF) and the alliance with the United States. Above all, characteristically, the Japanese government’s attitude toward the development of its defence and security policies was
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all the time cautious and timid due to the tenuous political situation and the restrictions of the peace constitution.\textsuperscript{18}

On the one hand, through censorship, GHQ forced the Japanese to deny the fundamental values which had shaped the policies, strategies and tactics until the end of the war and respect a Western sense of values. Additionally, in post-War Japan, groups composed of thoroughly pacifist left wingers, socialists or communists who strongly backed Article 9,\textsuperscript{19} had an impact on society. For instance, the Japanese Teachers’ Union, which could put enormous political pressure on the government, adopted a curriculum that encouraged the Japanese people in effect to worship an unrealistic pacifism, far from the realities of international society.\textsuperscript{20} This influential pressure group opposed the display of Japan’s national flag and singing of the Japanese national anthem, and will not allow teachers to foster patriotism among children in schools.

In addition, Japan is the only nation to suffer an atomic attack. The experience places most Japanese in vehement opposition to nuclear weapons. Furthermore, although it is said that the JSDF is one of the most advanced military forces in the world, high personnel expenses eat up a large part of the defence budget, which is only one per cent of gross domestic product (GDP). As another restriction, most defence equipment is domestically produced, and thus its purchase price and cost of maintenance is very high because of low quantity production. After the war, even though heavy industrial firms, the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) and influential politicians planned to revive the arms industry, the Ministry of Finance and Yoshida strongly opposed such “Defense production”.\textsuperscript{21} This situation eventuates largely as a result of the fact that such weapons cannot be exported due to the nation's three-point ban on exporting weapons. This situation strains the defence budget.\textsuperscript{22} Hence, realistically, it is impossible to possess a truly formidable navy characteristic of a “natural” maritime state within the limits of the budget.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., pp.79-80.
\textsuperscript{20} See, for example, Sajima, “Japan: Strategic Culture at a Crossroads,” pp. 83-84.
\textsuperscript{21} Samuels, \textit{Securing Japan}, pp. 33-34.
\textsuperscript{22} Kazuhisa Ogawa and Mamoru Sakamoto, \textit{Nihon no Sensō Ryoku}, [Japan’s War Power], Asukomu, Tokyo, 2005 p. 44.
The means by which to settle the problem is public understanding and cooperation about the importance of seapower, but, as mentioned above, the domestic political situation does not allow people to change their mind on defence. Actually, in terms of “sea-mindedness”, the Japanese government and public have lacked a sense of crisis of national interests in disputes over territorial waters and marine resources. How seapower impacts on the lives of people has barely been grasped. Namely, Japan has not chosen to become an independent great power in regional and global politics in the post-War years. As is known well, Japan has never waged any war in that time, sticking strictly to Article 9 of the constitution. Most importantly as a maritime state, the Cabinet Legislation Bureau’s view on collective self-defence is that Japan has the right of collective defence but that it cannot be exercised because of the prevailing interpretation of Article 9, in spite of the fact that an interdependent relationship among friendly countries is crucial for a maritime state.

On the other hand, just after the Second World War, the United States had placed high expectations on Chiang Kai-shek’s Chinese government as its junior partner in the Asia-Pacific region, but Chiang was eventually relegated to Taiwan after losing the civil war on the Chinese mainland. In the meantime, the Japanese islands burst into the spotlight as the U.S. force’s logistical base in place of the China of Chiang and his Nationalist Party. Accordingly, America assisted in the post-War reconstruction of Japan. Japan’s economy made an almost miraculous comeback through the industriousness of the Japanese people, the support from the United States and special procurements due to the Korean and Vietnam Wars. In spite of this, initially, the United States had had no thought to expect Japanese involvement in military affairs, hence Washington attempted to set up only the National Police Reserve (NPR) and the Maritime Safety Agency (MSA).

The Influence of the United States upon the JMSDF until the End of the Cold War
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The U.S. Navy devastated the Imperial Japanese Navy (IJN), and then Washington was going to force Japan to be a country without modern war making potential after the Second World War. Yet the challenge from the powerful communist block changed America’s plans. In keeping with changes in the international situation, navy-to-navy relations between the Japanese post-war navy and the U.S. Navy grew over time. For the JMSDF, the U.S. Navy is its parent, teacher and friend in many respects.

**The Birth and Development of the JMSDF**

*Maritime Safety Agency Japan*

On 30 November 1945, the IJN’s nearly 80-year history ended. In a real sense, however, the navy did not completely disappear and it continued to transport demobilized soldiers and clear the sea around Japan from mines until August 1946. These operations were useful for maintaining seamanship, organized maritime navigation, and above all, a sense of solidarity of Japanese naval personnel. As a result, it significantly contributed to the birth of the JMSDF. When U.S. occupation forces made their entry into Japan, there were over 60,000 mines in the surrounding sea areas. From the autumn of 1945, around 350 ships and 10,000 Japanese naval personnel engaged in minesweeping. Meanwhile, cholera invaded Japan when a large number of Koreans smuggled themselves to Japan in the midst of devastation and turmoil at the end of the war after an outbreak of cholera in the peninsula in 1946. From 1946 to 1950, over 200,000 Koreans entered into Japan and cholera carriers became a pressing problem. Moreover, Korean illegal immigrants who were not entitled to food rations came to trade in the black-market, smuggle and engage in other illegal activity.

For this reason, the occupying forces ordered the government to take full measures to deal with the illegal immigrant problems. As it turned out, on 1 May 1948, the MSA
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was established, effectively as a de facto Japanese “coast guard,” after the government was instructed to set up an organization modelled on the U.S. Coast Guard; and 1,415 Japanese ex-naval personnel together with 76 vessels that belonged to the minesweeping section of the Ministry of Transport transferred to the MSA.\(^\text{30}\) Although the transferred minesweepers were small and wooden, the civil affairs section of the occupation authorities and the delegates of the Far Eastern Commission from the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and Australia opposed this, arguing that the establishment of the MSA was a sign of the rebirth of the IJN. The arguments were accepted, and the MSA was limited by the following conditions: it was not to exceed 10,000 personnel, not to exceed a total tonnage of ships of 50,000 tons, no vessel was to exceed 1,500 tons, vessels were to be restricted to a maximum speed of 15 knots, and limited to only carrying small arms for maritime safety officials, and the operating area of vessels was to be limited.\(^\text{31}\)

\textit{The Korean War and Mine Sweepers}

In addition to the appearance of the Cold War, the communist victory in the Chinese Civil War and the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 became driving forces behind the changing U.S. attitude toward Japanese rearmament. General MacArthur was anxious about an internal security vacuum due to the deployment of three U.S. divisions from Japan to the peninsula after the eruption of the Korean War.\(^\text{32}\) In July 1950, MacArthur ordered the Japanese government to establish units to support the police, called the NPR composed of 75,000 men. In a letter to Yoshida, MacArthur stated:

\begin{quote}
Insofar as maritime safety in the harbors and coastal waters of Japan is concerned, the Maritime Safety Board has achieved highly satisfactory results, but events disclose that safeguard of the long Japanese coast line against unlawful immigration and smuggling activity requires the employment of a larger force under this agency than is presently provided for by law.
\end{quote}


Accordingly, I authorized your government to take the necessary measures...to expand the existing authorized strength of personnel serving under the Maritime Safety Board by an additional 8,000.33

“This act is often heralded as the beginning of post-War rearmament, the first violation of the spirit of Article 9 of the new Japanese constitution”. 34 Thus, on 10 August 1950, the NPR was established.

In the Korean War, the United States needed to remove all mines in waters around Wonsan because MacArthur planned to carry out a landing operation on Wonsan. However, in the western Pacific, U.S. forces possessed only ten minesweepers and it was extremely difficult to reinforce the corps. Rear Admiral Arleigh Burke was concerned about the capability of U.S. minesweepers and current influence mines made by the Soviet Union.35 For this reason, Burke talked with the administrator of the MSA, Takeo Okubo, and explained how skilled Japanese minesweeper corps could play an important role in the operation. The Japanese government hesitated to send minesweepers because minesweeping the sea area around the peninsula was obviously participation in combat and represented a violation of the Japanese constitution. Nevertheless, then Prime Minister Yoshida ordered Okubo to dispatch minesweepers as the U.S. requested. This matter was kept top secret.36 Yoshida sent 43 minesweepers, ten patrol boats and 1,204 men, in secrecy, with the occupation forces.37 On 2 October 1950, the Japanese minesweeping corps was developed and engaged in this activity for two months. Even though, in this period, two minesweepers sunk, one sailor died and eight were injured, U.S. naval personnel greatly appreciated the capability of the Japanese navy and gave unstinted praise. Through this process, Burke became the strongest supporter of establishing the JMSDF.38 The performance of Japanese minesweeper units just after the Korean War broke out created an opportunity for the

35 Ibid., p. 64.
37 Hirama, “55 Years History of JMSDF,” p. 149.
38 Masuda, Jieitai no Tanjyō: Nihon no Saigunbi to America, p. 110.
rebirth of the Japanese navy because this event proved the great potential capacity of Japanese navy to Americans.

Nomura Group

In January 1951, former IJN Admiral Kichisaburō Nomura and vice admiral Zenshirō Hoshina heard that America intended to rebuild Japanese land forces and take charge of navy and air forces for Japan. Nomura and Hoshina were alarmed by this situation; therefore a study group to rebuild the Japanese navy was established by Nomura, Hoshina and other ex-naval officers. The Nomura Group and Burke worked together to encourage U.S. officials such as U.S. special envoy John Foster Dulles, Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Forrest Sherman, the Commander Naval Forces Far East Charles Turner Joy, and the Commander of U.S. Pacific Fleet Arthur Radford.

In January 1951, The Nomura group consulted with Joy and Burke about a draft on rebuilding a Japanese navy. Receiving Burke’s advice, the Nomura Group revised the draft and Hoshina submitted this to Burke. Burke praised it and reported it to Sherman. Burke received a strong pledge of support for this plan from Sherman, assuming the Japanese government accepted this proposal. After hearing this, Nomura visited Yoshida to give a copy of the proposal to him. In this process, the ex-IJN officers’ efforts to create the new navy developed into cooperation between Japanese and Americans. In January 1951, during negotiations for the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, Dulles urged Yoshida to transform the NPR into an army of 350,000 personnel in order to hold out against attacks from the Soviet Union. The Nomura Group developed the detailed rebuilding plan, adopting Burke’s advice. On 3 February 1951, Nomura had an opportunity to meet Dulles at a cocktail party. Nomura had sent his private plan to him for a complete defence organization, including a total personnel strength of 205,000 (96,000 army, 39,000 air force, 40,000 navy, 30,000 other), 1,789 aircraft and 329 ships (totalling 260,000 tons). Nevertheless, Dulles had not read it through and he seemed to
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remain uninterested in rebuilding a Japanese navy, only showing interest in a ground force.45

Burke, however, strongly backed the Nomura Group. He told Dulles’ accompanying personnel the fact that Japan sincerely insisted upon the necessity of its own navy and air force and sent the revised plan written by the study group. Burke also sent it to CNO Sherman under the name of vice admiral Joy, and it then gained Sherman’s agreement. In addition, on a visit to Washington, Burke exhorted the commander of U.S. Pacific Fleet, Arthur Radford, of the need to create a Japanese navy. Burke’s endeavour worked well: Nomura and the ex-naval officers succeeded in forging strong links to the headquarters of Naval Forces Far East, the centre of the U.S. Navy in Washington and the U.S. government.46

On 17 March 1951, as instructed by GHQ, the Nomura Group submitted data, arguing the number of personnel for the remobilization of the new navy.47 According to a demand from Burke, on 10 April 1951, the study group completed the research material, including announcing fundamental policies positioned as the crux of Japanese navy rebuilding: integration of the navy with the air force and looking toward a two service defence system; intending to create an independent navy, not a subject navy of the United States; and an intention to attempt to strive for the creation of the new navy at a Joint U.S.-Japan Research Commission.48 But if the barriers were to prove insurmountable, a new organization would be established within the MSA as a temporary measure, and wait for an opportunity to become independent from there.49

After the Nomura Group showed the presentation to Burke, Burke made approaches to the American side to rebuild the Japanese navy and cooperate closely with Japanese ex-naval officers. Such sincere efforts had a strong effect on U.S. officials’ views on this matter. Indeed, during this period, Americans in Washington came to revise their former disrespectful attitude toward both a Japanese navy and air force, and it occurred to them
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that equal importance should be placed on the Japanese army and sea and air forces. On 19 October 1951, eventually, the new Supreme Commander for Allied Power (SCAP), General Matthew B. Ridgway made a formal offer to Yoshida for the loan of 68 vessels composed of 18 patrol frigates and 50 Large Support Landing Ships (LSSL).

Y Committee and the Birth of the Post-War Navy

In October 1951, as the loan of ships from the United States to Japan was arranged, a Japan-U.S. joint research committee was established to deal with significant matters, such as which organization would receive the vessels: the new Japanese navy? The MSA? Or another organization? This led to a fundamental debate on how to establish the new navy. This joint committee was called “Y Committee” in Japan. Y Committee consisted of eight ex-naval officers including former rear admiral, Yoshio Yamamoto, from the Nomura Group and three MSA officers including Yonekichi Yanagisawa, the head of the MSA. The two sides traded opposing viewpoints on the organizational structure of a revived Japanese maritime force. The ex-naval officers insisted that the new maritime force should be independent from the MSA but the MSA side held the opposite opinion, suggesting that the existing MSA corps should become the post-war Japanese navy. There were serious clashes of opinion amongst the Japanese side. As a consequence, the Japanese referred the case to the advisory group from Commander, Naval Force, Far East (CNFE) and the U.S. side of the committee for a settlement.

Finally on 13 November 1951 the Americans approved of the scheme supported by the ex-naval officers. Since they had an understanding with the ex-naval officers at some level, accordingly, Y Committee reflected the ideas of the group. Besides, the military nerve centre in Washington began to show an understanding of the utility of the
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establishment of a Japanese navy and shifted their position in support of this matter regarding the budget. Burke’s efforts paid off: the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) were conscious of the conception of rebuilding the new navy propounded by the former IJN officers through the Assistant Chief of Naval Operations. Both sides — the U.S. military and Y Committee were drawing closer. In fact, the contents of an article by Nomura that appeared in *US News & World Report* on 8 May 1952 — “Study on Defensive Plan for Japan” — coincided with the defence plan counselled by the JCS, taking into consideration the emphasis on the new navy as well as a new army.\(^{57}\) Also, according to an agenda by Y Committee, 30 personnel selected from ex-naval officers and MSA members were trained in military science and operation and maintenance by using one 1,400-ton patrol frigate and four 350-ton LSSLs. The cadre of men were dispatched to the United States to receive the education in sequence.\(^{58}\) On 26 April 1952, the Coastal Safety Force was established within the MSA, which was a core organization in the transition to the JMSDF.

Furthermore, in July 1952, the Joint Chiefs of Staff called on the Defense Secretary to convey heavy armaments and approve of the loan of LSSLs and patrol frigates to Japan immediately.\(^{59}\) On 1 August 1952, the Coastal Safety Force was transferred into the National Safety Agency (NSA), the predecessor of the Japan Defense Agency (JDA), and then the name changed to the Maritime Safety Force (MSF), the predecessor of the JMSDF. Finally, through the loan agreement with the United States, Japan would once again possess a navy.\(^{60}\) For ex-naval officers, this event meant that the maritime force became independent of the MSA and a watershed as the point of departure for the new, genuine navy.\(^{61}\)

On 28 July 1952, the Joint Chiefs asked then Defense Secretary Robert Lovett to support the building of Japan’s military strength to create a self-defence capability. As a result, on 7 August, U.S. President Harry S. Truman gave his approval to U.S. diplomatic policies dealing with Japan. Namely, this included that the United States

\(^{57}\) Ibid, pp.142-143  
\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 140.  
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should back Tokyo so that Japan itself could act in self-defence against external threats, because Japan and the United States shared mutual interests in terms of the security environment in the Far East. Still, CNO William M. Fechteler was discontented with Japan’s current defence capability. Hence, on 18 September 1952, he reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff criticism concerning the passive posture of SCAP Commander Ridgway toward the Joint Chiefs’ policies on Japanese defence forces and required them to ask Ridgway to show a willingness to improve the potential of Japanese maritime forces.62

When the Coastal Safety Force was set up it had only 43 minesweepers (8,900 tons) transferred from the MSA; and 68 vessels were rented from the U.S. Navy according to the agreement with the U.S concluded on demise charter, and resulting in the handing over of 18 patrol frigates and 50 LSSLs to Japan beginning in November 1952.63

Continued friendly relations between the United States and Japan were not only concerned with ships, but also the potential contribution of Japan’s naval aviation: Japanese naval officers were concerned about the adequacy of their naval strategy without command of the air. At that time (1951-1952), the Japanese regarded support of ground and maritime air arms as more important than that of an air force. U.S. military officers put forward a suggestion that all Japanese aircraft belong to a new organization, the future Japan Air Self-Defense Force (JASDF). Some former Japanese naval officers enlisted in it.64

On 16 October 1952, the Joint Strategic Plans Committee (JSPC), via the Joint Chiefs of Staff, urged the defence secretary to afford military assistance to Japan, and requested agreement from Secretary of State Dean Acheson.65 On 30 October 1952, Acheson told U.S. ambassador to Japan, Robert Murphy, of the budget compilation including an aid budget to the Japanese defence forces (US$521.7 million in total: 308 million for the army, $30 million for the navy, and $183.7 million for the air force), unlike former budget plans that laid emphasis solely on rebuilding the Japanese army.66
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After the Eisenhower administration entered office in January 1953, the United States further demanded rearmament from Japan. In fiscal 1953, America provided additional financial support only to the army in Japan, but it decided to offer financial aid to the army of $40 million, the maritime force of $30 million and the air force of $73.4 million in fiscal 1954. By the end of March 1953, the total number of the ships in the MSF reached 127 (30,500 tons). In the same year, the personnel increased to 10,323 and an aviation corps with four Bell 47 helicopters was set up in Tateyama, Chiba Prefecture. Such reinforcements were conducted under the influence of demands of the U.S. military, especially the U.S. Navy, for support to the Japanese defence system.

On 19 January 1953, the Commander of United States Naval Forces, Far East (COMNAVFE), John Hull, gave advice that the Japanese navy should be composed of four defensive light aircraft carriers, three anti-air cruisers, 30 destroyers, 75 escort destroyers, 50 large minesweepers, ten patrol squadrons, and so on. Notably, this conception was very similar to the plan prepared in secrecy by the Nomura Group earlier. As a matter of fact, on 23 January 1951, Hoshina handed it over to Burke. The Joint Strategic Plans Committee’s report on Japan’s defence capability was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 1 August 1953, and followed the COMNSVFE plan. Thereafter, however, there were debates on aircraft carriers and cruisers listed on the plan among the commander Hull, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and JSPC. Eventually, in February 1954, the Joint Chiefs decided to delete the aircraft carriers and cruisers from the list, taking into account the role of complicated political and social situations insisted on by Hull, such as Article 9, stirring up anti-American sentiment and attracting foreign criticism.

In May 1954, Secretary of State Dulles declared assistance to Japan on the basis of the Mutual Security Act (MSA), which was signed by Japan and the United States in March 1954. On 25 May 1954, the CNO indicated in a memorandum to the Joint Chiefs
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that Japan should have capabilities to secure its long and massive sea lanes in wartime as a self-sustaining trading nation, especially antisubmarine warfare (ASW) and minesweeping capabilities, taking threats from the Soviet Union and needs to maintain U.S. naval power in the region into consideration. In July 1954, the JDA was established as the predecessor to the Ministry of Defence and the Coastal Security Force changed its name to the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF). At this point, the JMSDF possessed 18 patrol frigates, 50 LSSLs, 43 minesweepers, and so on, totalling 302 ships (68,000 tons), and 15,808 personnel. Based on the Mutual Security Act, American-built escort ships, minesweepers, landing ships and submarines were delivered to the JMSDF, and local-procurement ships built using the U.S.-provided funds were introduced. Also, the United States provided the P-2V7 maritime patrol aircraft, which enhanced long-range patrol capability, and the S-2F antisubmarine aircraft. In terms of the cultivation of human resources, an education and training system was organized through the adoption of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, Japan (MAAG-J), and the U.S. Navy’s doctrine and tactics were also adopted. In 1957, for a training mission, the Japanese government carried out a plan to dispatch four JMSDF ships overseas for the first time: to Midway and Hawaii, including Harukaze (1,700 tons), which was the flag ship and the first domestically-produced war ship after the war, albeit facing opposition that cited the violation of the legislative resolution of 1954 that defined the restrictions of the JSDF as a reason.

The Defense Build-up Program

In 1955 Foreign Minister Shigemishu and U.S. Secretary of State Dulles discussed a six-year defence development programme preparing for a navy of 205 ships (123,900 tons). In their joint statement, “Cooperative efforts would be exerted so that conditions would be established enabling Japan to assume the primary responsibility for her own
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defence and thus contribute to international peace and security in the Western Pacific.”77 Although this plan was not approved, it created a considerable controversy in the Diet. In August 1956, a five year defence plan from 1956 to 1960 demanding 211 ships totalling 111,300 tons and 223 aircraft was proposed by the National Defense Council (NDC). Japan sustained and deepened bilateral relations with the U.S. slowly but surely: the Basic Policy of National Defense was formulated in May 1957: 1) support the United Nations’ activities and promote international cooperation to achieve world peace; 2) stabilize the people’s livelihood and establish the foundations for national security; 3) establish effective defence capabilities; 4) defend the nation on the basis of the Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements.78

In June 1957, the last three years of the programme planned in 1956 was approved by the cabinet. This First Defense Buildup Program (1958-60) called for 124,000 tons of warships and 222 aircraft for the JMSDF.79 The purpose was not only to lay the base for Japan’s defence structure. Actually, the main reason was that “The United States expressed feelings of welcome on the defence build up of Japan and would contemplate within 1958 to conduct a large-scale withdrawal of her troops stationed in Japan, and such a withdrawal would include a speedy withdrawal of all her ground forces.”80 A few days before the training mission was released, the Japanese government announced that two destroyers for the JMSDF would be built with U.S. assistance under the Mutual Security Assistance Program. In this programme, it was decided to conduct the domestic production of escort ships, submarine chasers, minesweepers, and submarines and the licensed production of P-2V7, the supply of the S-F2 from the U.S. Navy, the purchase of the HSS-1 patrol plane from the United States and the construction of advanced Tartar missile-armed escort ships.81

In 1960, two new destroyers were constructed by Japanese domestic industry, funded as “Grant-Aid-offshore procurement” (OSP). The two vessels were transferred under the Military Assistance Program (MAP). Until around 1960, over 40 per cent of the gross
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The tonnage of the Japanese navy was owned by the United States. At the end of 1961, the JMSDF possessed 218 ships (121,964 tons) and 222 aircraft. In 1960, the U.S.-Japan Security Arrangement was significantly revised, adding a “Far East clause” that more clearly codified the necessity of the closer alliance for the safety of Japan’s nautical environment and showed the collective view on the definition of “the Far East”, which included the Korean Peninsula, Taiwan and the northern Philippines. Even though the Finance Ministry and the Defense Agency had to undertake the necessary adjustment efforts on the budget, in June 1961, the outline of the Second Defense Buildup Program was officially approved by the NDC. According to Auer, then Prime Minister Ikeda, “wished it to appear that Japan was not merely reacting to United States demands, while the U.S. felt that the new level of spending indicated for the Second Buildup Plan lessened the need for direct pressure.” In the first half of this plan, the commission of the vessels loaned and supplied by the United States almost concluded and the modernization of domestic-built vessels was planned and the domestic production of aircraft such as the P-2V and HSS-2 progressed. Besides, the U.S. Navy provided the JMSDF with 217 aircraft worth $100 million. Long-range ASW patrol aircraft constructed in Japan were partly funded by $40 million in financial assistance from the United States. Aircraft lent from the United States accounted for about 40 per cent of Japan’s naval aviation by 1968.

A high-quality training manual was made with the support of the United States, as were training aids and, ammunition, costing over $115 million. The United States provided over $320 million of financial aid to the JMSDF until U.S. military assistance to Japan was concluded in 1967. MAAG-J changed its name to the Mutual Defense Assistance Office (MDAO) in 1969. This organization supported Japan in foreign military sales, including equipment and training and monitoring of the industrial security of U.S.-
designed Japanese military equipment as licensed production. The target of the Third Plan was essentially improving maritime defence power. In November 1969 the outline was approved by the cabinet. For this target, a concrete plan was created. As the priority, to secure the safety of peripheral water areas and ensure the safety of maritime transportation, the first item was planned for the reinforcement of its maritime defence capacity by constructing 56 ships totalling 48,000 tons, including 14 destroyers with surface-to-air missiles (SAMs), plus helicopters, five submarines and 60 fixed-wing antisubmarine aircraft and 33 ASW helicopters. “The First and Second Defense Program laid the foundations of Japan’s defence potential. Liken it to building a house. The foundation and the pillars have been put in the place. Next comes the wall. The Third Plan is to build the wall.” Ultimately, at the end of 1976 after the Fourth Defense Plan, the JMSDF possessed 481 ships (totalling 194,000 tons).

The JMSDF and the United States in the Cold War

Sea Lane Defence against the Soviet Navy

During the Cold War, both the U.S. Navy and the Soviet Navy had similar strategic goals such as strategic deterrence, destroying enemy maritime forces, and presence; one, however, was the complete polar opposite of the other. The U.S. Navy aimed to protect its maritime communications whilst the Soviet Navy aimed to disrupt or destroy its foe’s maritime transportation advantages. Compared with the case of a ground battle in which a garrison force must hold a fortress, protecting sea lanes from an attacking force is a much more difficult duty, sometime involving naval battle. To make matters worse, even though the U.S. Navy had never engaged mighty navies since the Battle of Midway, the Soviet Navy was about to challenge the U.S. Navy as a formidable challenger during the Cold War. At that time, Western countries were composed of states that depend on use of the sea for survival such as the United States, Western European countries and Japan. The allies were separated by the sea. By contrast, in the Eastern Bloc, the Warsaw Pact involved neighbouring countries of the

---

91 Michishita, “Jieitai no Sea Power no Hatten to Igi,” p. 236.
93 Ibid.
94 Ibid., p. 3
internal region of the European continent. So, a bipolar confrontation between sea control nations and sea denial nations emerged. The Soviets focused on developing submarine fleets that played a central role for sea denial, which led the United States to provide Japan with a large number of P-3C antisubmarine patrol aircraft. As it turned out, the JMSDF and the geopolitical position of the Japanese islands were successful in blocking Soviet ambitions to expand into the Pacific Ocean.

In the 1960s, Japanese economic strength was returning and that of the U.S. was relatively declining. Due to the whole morass of the Vietnam War, U.S. financial conditions were becoming tighter. U.S. and European defence planners were anxious about greater foreign policy and military burdens. Such sequences of events naturally made defence planners ask Japan to contribute more to achieving a favourable international security environment. As a result, U.S. President Nixon and Japanese Prime Minister Sato stated in 1969 that “Japan would make further active contributions to peace and prosperity in Asia.” By 1980, President Carter’s Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, was demanding that Japan increase its defence budget by 7.6 per cent.

Another perspective came from Hideo Sekino, a former IJN officer, who stated in the 1970s that, “the protection of the sea communications of Japan should be given first priority in the national defence of Japan, and the prevention of direct invasion of Japan should be made the secondary function of the maritime defence force of Japan”. In addition, Sekino argued that Japan was extremely dependent on vast sea lanes for the import of natural resources and had to consider a Soviet Navy attack on merchant shipping. However, Osamu Kaihara, the former head of the Defense Bureau and a secretary general of the National Defense Council, insisted that securing a huge network of sea lanes was infeasible, with the limitations of Article 9 of the constitution, public support, and JMSDF resources, against the powerful Soviet Navy. He insisted that the Japanese government should rebuild the JMSDF to resemble a coast guard.
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specialized in defending the home islands from a direct invasion.\textsuperscript{101} After the oil crisis in 1973, the credibility of Sekino’s view, which recommended that Japan enhance military strength enough to secure sea lanes as far as northern Indonesia, was further enhanced. Sekino asserted that such a defence policy would achieve a good balance between Japanese and U.S. strategy in the Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{102} After all, Sekino’s JMSDF sea lane defence plan was reinforced with driving forces such as “a long-range vision, a definite organizational preference for that vision, earnest allies in the Liberal Democratic Party and important business leaders, a government that at least did not quash the plan but kept the option open, and a geopolitical situation in which sea lane defense become attractive to Japan’s ally.”\textsuperscript{103}

\textit{The Evolution of the Maritime Alliance}

In October 1976, in order to prevent Japanese military weakness leading to a power vacuum and a source of regional instability,\textsuperscript{104} the National Defense Program Outline (1976 NDPO) was released. The 1976 NDPO stipulated guidelines for the JMSDF’s operation such as defence to deal with a direct invasion; warning and defence against threats to its coastal area; protecting ports and straits; and reconnaissance and surveillance of the seas adjacent to Japan’s coast.\textsuperscript{105} The JMSDF in total possessed 38 destroyers and frigates, and 180 maritime patrol aircraft focusing on ASW and reconnaissance by 1971. The NDPO argued for a force of 60 ASW ships, 16 submarines, two minesweeping flotillas, and 16 ASW squadrons supplemented by 220 aircraft.\textsuperscript{106} “The expansiveness of the Outline and Guidelines sealed the ascendancy of Sekino’s vision and emphasized the complementary role Japan could play in U.S. security strategy.”\textsuperscript{107}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{101} Holmes, “Japanese Maritime Thought,” p. 156.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Woolley, \textit{Japan’s Navy}, p. 69.
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The 1970s evolution of the JMSDF occurred in a strategic context of heightened American concerns with Soviet naval expansion. Japan and the JMSDF thus began to take on greater importance in U.S. global strategy. U.S. Navy concerns included the Soviet deployment of the aircraft carrier *Minsk* to the Far East and considerable reinforcement of its nuclear-powered submarine force in that theatre.\(^{108}\) In 1978, Moscow deployed land forces in the Northern Territories located to the north of Hokkaido and deployed advanced Backfire bombers to the Far East. The United States took the situation so seriously that it urged the Japanese government to build up its defence capability. At that time, the JMSDF was striving to enhance interoperability with the U.S. Navy. Over the course of the 1970s the JMSDF gained a fine reputation because of its proficiency and high morale. U.S. Navy came to count on the JMSDF as a detached force focusing on ASW as detachment forces.\(^{109}\)

Furthermore, in November 1977 the Japanese government decided to purchase 100 leading-edge F-15 fighter aircraft and 45 P-3C maritime patrol aircraft.\(^{110}\) Eventually, the JMSDF deployed a total of 100 P-3C ASW planes to prevent the Soviet Navy from passing through the Tsushima, Tsugaru and Soya Straits. Interoperability with the United States was enhanced by the fact that JMSDF P-3Cs applied the same weapons, sensors and tactics as those of the U.S. Navy. As a consequence, the two navies started to divide up time and areas to patrol between them.\(^{111}\) Information gathered by P-3C aircraft was used to advantage for the 7th Fleet. It has been argued that the Soviet Union could not sustain military expenditure to counter the cooperative system composed chiefly of the JMSDF surveillance capability complemented by the 7th Fleet.\(^{112}\)

On the one hand, in spite of being called “a continental state,” the Soviet Union had a long coast line; however, suitable characteristics for leveraging seapower were extremely limited due to geography, climate and weather. Hence the Kremlin had to
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deploy a large number of naval vessels in the Russian Far East. In order to freely deploy its naval power in the region, the Soviet Union had to use the Tsushima, Tsugaru and Soya Straits. For the United States, blockade of these straits was the most effective and efficient way to choke off Soviet naval power. Accordingly, the strategic value of the Japanese archipelagos was immeasurable in the Cold War years.\(^{113}\) Looking back, it can be said that this was a significant factor in the winning of the Cold War. Ultimately, the Japanese archipelago, situated close to the Russian Far East, made a great contribution to U.S. strategy in the Cold War era, with its advanced commercial technology and its form of democracy.\(^{114}\)

On the other hand, without the presence of the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Far East, which was able to contain other Soviet military movements, Japan’s status as a trading nation, with its high level of dependence on shipping and the worldwide sea lines of communications (SLOC), would have been in an extremely precarious position.\(^{115}\)

Even though the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty provides a platform for the alliance, there is no definite normative guideline for combined defence against armed attacks in Article 5. To deal with this issue, in November 1978, “The Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation” were agreed by the two countries. The guidelines represented a milestone in practical security cooperation. Under the guidelines U.S. forces and the JSDF would bilaterally conduct operations for the defence of waters surrounding Japan and for the protection of sea lines of communication. The JSDF would have primary responsibility for the protection of major ports and straits, for the protection of ships in surrounding waters, and for other operations; U.S. forces would support the Self-Defense Forces’ operations and conduct operations, including those which may provide additional mobility and strike power, to supplement the capabilities of the JSDF.\(^{116}\)

In May 1981, following a meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, Prime Minister Zenkō Suzuki stated:
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It is natural for Japan to defend its surrounding waters, which is (sic) our country’s back-yard. We will strengthen our defence capability in order to defend several hundred miles of surrounding waters and the sea lanes to a distance of 1,000 nautical miles.117

This statement strongly surprised U.S. high government officials. With Suzuki’s statement as a start, in 1983, the United States and Japan began a major study on sea lane defence and U.S. reinforcement.118 In this period, the Cold War was escalating and the Soviet Union deployed a great number of SSBNs and Tu-22 Backfire strategic bombers, becoming a big threat even to U.S. forces to protect the Japanese islands and sea lanes in the western Pacific.119 During the period between Prime Minister Suzuki’s suggestion and the successor Prime Minister, Yasuhiro Nakasone’s, policy to officially embody it, the JMSDF launched a plan to enhance its capacity by the newly-purchased 40 P-3Cs and advanced destroyers.120

In 1980, the JMSDF, including a helicopter destroyer (DDH), a guided missile destroyer (DDG), eight P-2J MPA and about 800 personnel participated in the U.S.-led Rim of the Pacific Exercises (RIMPAC) for the first time, to develop cooperation in maritime defence.121 By 1984, the JMSDF was sending a flag officer, four destroyers and eight ASW aircraft to RIMPAC.122 In addition, a joint declaration affirming the alliance relationship was signed in May 1981. In Yokosuka in July 1984, the commanders of the Self Defense Fleet and U.S. 7th Fleet participated as training controllers in the first combined naval exercise to involve training which employed the system of command for combined operations, as a consequence of research and development advances into combined operations plans.123
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In June 1987, a combined command post exercise was launched at the U.S. Naval War College to evaluate the effectiveness of combined operations and the defence cooperation guidelines. The close ties between the two navies made a meaningful contribution to the victory of the U.S.-led free world countries in the Cold War.

In fact, the JMSDF played a central role in defence cooperation between the two countries. On the premise of combined operations with by far the world’s most advanced navy, the JMSDF made a concerted effort to enhance its capability and live up to America’s expectations. Without doubt, the security partnership between Japan and the United States developed through such a close navy-to-navy relationship. JMSDF collaboration with the United States in activities such as sea lane defence thus moved beyond the thinking of the Japanese bureaucracy, as represented by the defence outline.

The U.S.-Japan Maritime Alliance and Naval Operations in the Post-Cold War Era
Following the end of the Cold War, far from a situation of world peace, a number of troubles erupted around the world, such as regional and domestic conflicts, religious and ethnic conflicts, and the proliferation of weapon of mass destruction (WMD). Such incidents of instability often threaten Japanese or American national interests, with implications for the alliance bond between the United States and Japan, which had strengthened since the end of the Second World War, as had the status of Japan in the international community. That bond was threatened by the new instability, triggering alliance crises centred on national controversies over the interpretation of Article 9 of the Japanese constitution. In this context, the JMSDF as the naval power of a maritime state that can assume an active role in the implementation of the country’s foreign policy was in a strong position to assist in ameliorating the growing sense of crisis. Such is the diplomatic value of naval power.

Chequebook Diplomacy

124 Ibid.
125 Sadō, Sengo Seiji to Jieitai, pp. 160-161.
In 1987, the Reagan Administration asked Nakasone to dispatch Japanese minesweepers to the Persian Gulf during the Iran-Iraq War. Nakasone warmed to this imperative. However, it was shelved on the grounds that Masaharu Gotōda, Chief Cabinet Secretary, showed strong opposition because of the possibility of a danger that the JMSDF would be involved in combat, and some difficulties lying ahead such as the issue of the development of a legal framework for military deployments. From 1987 to 1988, ten Japanese merchant vessels were seriously affected by attacks in the Persian Gulf and the Strait Hormuz. At that time, 55 per cent of Japan’s imported oil passed through this region. Many countries’ oil tankers were suffering from attacks or the threat of attack in the so-called “tanker war” stage of the Iran-Iraq War. As a measure corresponding to this situation, the U.S. Navy, several Western European navies, and the Soviet navy made efforts to escort and protect merchant ships passing through international waters in and around the Persian Gulf. As a logical consequence, the Japanese government was requested to participate in deploying naval ships to escort and sweep the sea for mines in cooperation with some of these other states. Japan became worried over how to deal with the situation, and then, eventually, rejected the request. Instead of contributing actual forces, Nakasone adopted “chequebook diplomacy,” namely, financial support to the U.S.-led naval operations, in the form of a “cash payment to Washington.”

**The Persian Gulf War of 1991**

On 2 August 1990, Iraqi troops made a surprise attack on Kuwait and occupied the whole land. International society responded quickly to the military invasion. The U.N. Security Council passed resolutions in rapid succession, and the United States and others, totalling 42 countries, deployed 600,000 soldiers. On 17 January 1991, Operation Desert Storm was launched by the U.S.-led coalition of forces and a cessation of fighting was secured on 28 January. Even though, on 11 April, a ceasefire was officially achieved, Japan made almost no contribution to the international arena in this period. The Japanese government stated that it would provide financial support and send a medical assistance team at the end of August 1990. Then Prime Minister Kaifu took a
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cautious stance to a possible dispatch of the SDF to the Persian Gulf, and the majority of opposition parties and bureaucrats strongly opposed it. However, Japan was looked upon with scorn by other states, despite the fact that it contributed about $US13 billion to the war effort. Far from being offered gratitude, Japan was the target of severe criticism through international society due to its unwillingness to commit its own forces even to a United Nations-sanctioned operation. Above all, the U.S. was increasingly frustrated with the gap between Japan’s response and that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries.\footnote{Sadō, Sengo Seijitai to Jieitai, pp. 171-172.}

Just after Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, USFJ Command asked the Maritime Staff Office to send Japanese minesweepers to escort the aircraft carrier USS *Midway* from Yokosuka to the Middle East in anticipation of their close relationship. However, taking into consideration the circumstance at the time that Japanese avoided a serious debate over relations between the JSDF and Article 9, it was impossible for the JSDF to operate in the Middle East, thus it was effectively limiting itself to the region around the Japanese islands.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 168-169.}

While the number of states joining the multinational force was increasing, Japan was unable to remain a spectator without personnel contributions. As the pressure increased from the United States,\footnote{Ibid., p. 169.} Japan tried to send the JASDF’s C-130 cargo planes for refugee protection in order to save its international reputation, but it was cancelled because Jordan’s domestic situation was unsuitable for operating transport aircraft and there were only small refugee numbers\footnote{Kaijyō Jieitai 50 Nenshi Hensan Iinkai, Kaijyō Jieitai 50 Nenshi, p. 466.}; and the Cabinet Legislation Bureau (CLB) was hostile to such a proposal.\footnote{Samuels, Securing Japan, p. 66.} However, the German government, which was also constrained in its ability to deploy its military out-of-area, nonetheless dispatched minesweepers and supply vessels to the Persian Gulf on 7 March 1991, exacerbating Japan’s diplomatic and alliance difficulties. Germany used to be the same position as Tokyo, sharing in the financial cost of coalition commitments without making direct
military contributions, but Japan was left increasingly isolated following the new German policy.\textsuperscript{136}

At one time during the Iran-Iraq War, America dispatched a task force as a countermeasure against Iran’s threat to make indiscriminate attacks against tankers under way in the Persian Gulf. Japan seemed to be a prime beneficiary of U.S. action. Once again, in 1991 Japan would have been blamed and isolated internationally, as a primary beneficiary of coalition efforts, while not taking any risks herself when others put the lives of their forces in danger.\textsuperscript{137} Iraq placed 1,200 mines around the coast of Kuwait. It was a serious threat to ships in the Persian Gulf. Many countries such as the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, France, and Belgium, operated minesweepers; a difficult task in the extremely hot climatic conditions of the Persian Gulf. Around that time, Japan depended on the Middle East for around 70 per cent of its oil requirements.\textsuperscript{138} In fact, as soon as the United States began to dispatch its troops to the Middle East around 7 August 1990, the naval headquarters of USFJ asked the JMSDF to send its escort vessels, minesweepers and replenishment vessels. Although the JMSDF declined the request, the Chief of Staff, MSDF, Hajime Sakuma, directed JMSDF Maritime Staff Office (MSO) to conduct a desk study on this matter. The so-called “ME [Middle East] team” evaluated the dispatch of Japanese forces, and reported the results to the JDA.\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{The First Operations}

After the end of the war, in April 1991, the Japanese government was urged to send minesweepers to the Persian Gulf by the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations, the Japanese Shipowner’s Association, All Japan Seaman’s Union and the Petroleum Association of Japan.\textsuperscript{140} After the Japan Socialist Party, which opposed the dispatch of minesweepers, was severely defeated in the nationwide local elections on 7 April and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{136} Ikari, \textit{Persia Wan no Gunkanki}, p. 25.
  \item \textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{138} Sadô, \textit{Sengo Seiji to Jieitai}, pp. 171-172.
  \item \textsuperscript{139} Ibid., pp. 131-132.
  \item \textsuperscript{140} Taosa, Ochiai \textit{Persia Wan Niokeru Sōkaik ni okeru Nichibei Kyoudou} [Japan-U.S. Cooperation for Minesweeping in the Persian Gulf], The U.S.-Japan Navy Friendship Association. [place of pub., year?]
\end{itemize}
the ceasefire was formally concluded on 11 April, the political dove, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, who procrastinated about the issue, eventually established a policy in favour of contributing a mine countermeasures complement.\footnote{Ikari, \textit{Persia Wan no Gunkanki}, pp. 26-27.} The Japanese government carefully prepared, in strict confidence to resist criticism, to send mine countermeasures force. On 16 April 1991, JDA chief Yukihiro Ikeda ordered the JMSDF to examine sending a unit. The force had to leave for the Middle East in April to avoid the monsoon season in the Indian Ocean. The JMSDF hastily prepared to arrange the unit while some parts of the Japanese media demonstrated a cool response to the dispatch, making arguments such as: “When Japanese minesweepers arrive there, minesweeping might be completed already.”\footnote{Ibid., p. 27.} On 24 April, the Japanese government officially announced that JMSDF minesweepers would be deployed to the Persian Gulf to clear about 1,200 sea mines. Finally, on 26 April, one minesweeper tender, four minesweepers and one supply vessel, involving 511 JMSDF members, left Japan for the Gulf.

The Americans provided the information the Japanese flotilla needed in order to begin minesweeping operations, such as the depth of water, tide, the situation of the sea bottom, and the types of mine involved.\footnote{Ibid., p. 79.} There were still 200 mines in the most difficult spot that Japanese minesweepers were expected to deal with. The conditions for the minesweeping operation were difficult because of the heat and funnel fumes from Kuwaiti oil fields that Iraqi forces had set fire to.\footnote{Ibid., p. 81-84.} The U.S. Navy formed a powerful support for this operation with essential intelligence and logistical assistance. Without such cooperation, the success of this operation would have been an extremely difficult task. The operation encouraged a deepening of the relationships between the two allies and also enhanced JMSDF exchanges with the Royal Navy, the German Navy, the Iranian Navy and personnel from the local Gulf states.\footnote{See Ikari, \textit{Persia Wan no Gunkanki}.}

\textit{Barely Saving Japan’s Face}
Before the dispatch of the JMSDF, China’s official news agency made a statement declaring it “a dangerous first step in sending troops overseas.”\(^\text{146}\) Compared with people in neighbouring Asian countries, the U.S. public did not show any interest in Japan’s deployment, because the primary concerns of Americans were the outcome of the war and the fate of Saddam Hussein. Indeed, the major U.S. mass media outlets allowed little space for this topic:\(^\text{147}\) “Newspapers in the United States had found space enough to criticize Japan’s hesitant responses in the fall of 1990 when the Persian Gulf crisis dominated the news, but they had little enthusiasm left to report this drastic change in Japan’s policy after war had been concluded.”\(^\text{148}\) Generally speaking, Americans watched this event with cool detachment. Typical characterizations of Japan’s policy change and subsequent deployment belittled or ignored the political difficulties involved for Tokyo, describing it, for example, as a “belated dispatch of four small wooden minesweepers two months after the hostilities ended.”\(^\text{149}\)

The international environment since the end of the Cold War has required Japan to change its security policy outlook. It is broadly said that the first impact was brought by the Gulf War.\(^\text{150}\) Japan could contribute to anything in the crisis. As a result, for example, even though Japan provided $12 billion towards war expenses, it was not on the list of the countries to which the Kuwaiti government showed gratitude after the war in an advertisement placed in *The New York Times*.\(^\text{151}\) The impact of these events can be viewed as the origin of the factors which have begun to change Japanese diplomatic attitudes. Japan was thus forced to fully realize its loss of reputation and the importance of adaptation to the standards and expectations for contributions to international stability and security by all major democratic powers after the Cold War.\(^\text{152}\)
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The JMSDF flotilla returned to its home base in October. In the words of one American analyst, “Harking back to the Korean War, Japanese forces again performed functions that outstripped U.S. Navy capabilities.”\textsuperscript{153} Although the average Japanese was not particularly interested in the operation, those who were involved in trade-related work around the Persian Gulf region understood the importance of the success of the minesweeping duties and thus were more supportive of it. And eventually, the Kuwaiti government inserted a full-page advertisement in a Japanese News Paper, The Daily Yomiuri, to express cordial gratitude in April 1992.\textsuperscript{154} Whilst Japan had been looked down on as a “rich coward” by some, the deployed JMSDF minesweepers compensated for the loss of international reputation and succeeded in maintaining at least the minimal confidence in the maritime alliance with the United States.

This issue has driven many Japanese to reconsider their security in a less stable, more uncertain world. Nevertheless, because Article 9 of the Constitution has been strictly interpreted as restricting Japan’s military capacity, government policy continues to be developed on the basis of concentrating on the capabilities of the forces to operate in a self-defence territorial mode.

9/11 and the Dispatch of the JMSDF to the Indian Ocean

Just after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, a Japanese officer noticed the difference in the situation as compared to the Gulf War, ten years previously. At that time, the U.S. government demanded that Japan contribute in such ways as sharing the cost of war and, deploying the JSDF, and harshly criticized the government for delay in taking action. However, the United States made no claim against Japan after the terrorist attacks in New York.\textsuperscript{155}

This posed a different kind of dilemma for Japan, and Japanese naval officers had a strong sense of crisis about the unforeseen emergency situation, a new experience for them.\textsuperscript{156} At the time, The United States stressed the importance of transforming the concept of coalition operations into a reality, whereby no single nation can deal with the
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innumerable contingencies without the cooperation of coalition members to share intelligence and specific geographic knowledge. U.S. policy for the new era has been one of encouraging the formation of “coalitions of the willing”. The object of each contingency would determine the members of each coalition headed by the United States. Unlike the U.S.-Japan Alliance, the U.S.-led coalitions will usually be multilateral in character, whereby each member must itself determine its contribution to operations and reconstruction support after a war or crisis, and also coordinate these with other coalition members as well. JMSDF officers thought that a possibility existed that a poor showing of support for the United States in such circumstances would cause significant damage to the alliance.

Unlike before 9/11, Japan had to make a plan for operations led by a U.S. oriented-coalition, but without explicit U.S. demands. Thus, the JMSDF made a list of possible responses to the war against terrorism and support for U.S. armed forces, including supply missions and ship inspections in the Indian Ocean and escorting U.S. carrier strike groups. Both the JMSDF and the North American Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs started coordination and collaboration without regard to the antipathy of the Defense Agency — which was concerned with the issue of the exercise of the right to collective self-defence — because both shared common perceptions of the implications of the current situation for the alliance. And to be able to carry out such support to its alliance partner, new laws would have to be enacted by the government, involving a time-consuming process.

Three days after the 9/11 terrorist attack, however, the USS Kitty Hawk, which was the 81,123-tonne carrier and could 75 aircraft, was trying to leave Yokosuka because USFJ had become extremely intimidated by the situation. Indeed, a great number of civil aircraft were flying around Haneda Airport. Accordingly, in order to securely navigate the aircraft carrier through cluttered waters that were potentially vulnerable to terrorist attack, such as Tokyo Bay, the U.S. Navy asked for a Japanese escort. The JMSDF
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wanted to show a strong political message of support that “We stand by you”; but it had never officially escorted U.S. aircraft carriers throughout the post-War era. On 18 September, the Commander of U.S. Naval Forces Japan officially called on both the JCG and the JMSDF to escort the aircraft carrier from Yokosuka to a position off Miura Peninsula, a total 30 kilometres. Hence, as expected, the JMSDF had a heated discussion with the JDA, which insisted upon the need for a new theory to handle the Diet. Ultimately, Defense Agency chief Nakatani explained at a press conference, “The act (act of the ships) constitutes survey and research needed to carry out routines under the law on the establishment of the Defense Agency”. The JMSDF and the JDA came up with an idea based on the Law to Authorize the Establishment of the JDA, suggesting that the JMSDF “has to provide warnings and surveillance in surrounding sea areas in order to use the port safely, assuming that a state of confusion would be created when Kitty Hawk departed.” In the early morning of 21 September, 26 JCG patrol vessels surrounded Kitty Hawk and two JMSDF escort ships accompanied the ship’s exit from port, positioned at the front and the rear of the carrier, respectively. Defense Agency chief General Nakatani said that “They are patrolling in waters surrounding Japan, because if a terrorist attack takes place in the region, it would cause a serious impact on the safety of Japan.”

This made the news across the U.S. media outlets due to the North American Affairs Bureau in Ministry of Foreign Affairs assiduously spreading the story. Typically, some Japanese politicians blamed the JMSDF for “getting ahead too much”. Although the JMSDF officers were prepared for the controversy, they were assisted by public support from the Americans for the role of Japanese maritime forces during the operation. Kitty Hawk later returned to Yokosuka following the conduct of carrier landing training in seas close to Japan, and subsequently it left for the Indian Ocean to support Operation Enduring Freedom: the U.S. war against terrorist forces. This time, it was escorted by 24 JCG ships without the attendance of the JMSDF vessels.
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The Anti-Terrorism Law and Indian Ocean Refuelling Mission

In October 2001, the Koizumi Cabinet subsequently enacted “The Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law” to allow Japan to combat international terrorism as a member of the U.S.-led coalition, through refuelling missions for other navies participating in maritime interception operations. The tense situation of the alliance urged then Prime Minister Koizumi to promote the enactment of the bill.\textsuperscript{168} Indeed, the JMSDF made a step toward becoming a more “normal” force as a consequence of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. On 9 November 2001, two JMSDF escort vessels and a replenishment vessel, together involving 700 personnel, were dispatched to the Indian Ocean based on the Law to Authorize the Establishment of the JDA to gather data, because the basic plan on the dispatch had yet to be worked out in spite of the anti-terrorism special measures law that had been enacted. On 16 November the plan was approved by Cabinet. And on 2 December the supply vessel \textit{Hamana} started to supply fuel to a U.S. replenishment ship in the Arabian Sea; an area which was believed to be a routine line of communication for al Qaeda terrorists. However, the JMSDF quickly became nervous operating in that stretch of ocean due to the fact that there were around 100 unidentified aircraft and 30 boats passing through the area daily. As a result of the JMSDF’s concerns, the Japanese government dispatched an Aegis ship to assist, with its extremely advanced and effective surveillance capability.\textsuperscript{169} Therefore in December 2002, the \textit{Kongō}-class Aegis escort ship, \textit{Kirishima}, was dispatched to the Indian Ocean. This inevitably fuelled the domestic controversy, however. By sharing the surveillance data gathered by the Aegis destroyer with its U.S. ally, the opposition parties accused the government of infringing the antiterrorism law. The main opposition Democratic Party of Japan opposed the dispatch of \textit{Kirishima} because its air defence capability and data sharing capabilities, in commonality with the U.S. Navy’s own Aegis-equipped destroyers and cruisers, could be linked to combat operations, which in turn could infringe upon Article 9 as the effective implementation of the right to collective self-

\textsuperscript{168} See, for example, Samuels, pp. 95-96.
defence. Even the LDP’s coalition partner, Kōmeito, and doves in the LDP itself, crossed the floor to show their disapproval.\(^{170}\)

The importance of the JMSDF’s role in the Indian Ocean was subsequently further enhanced, with JMSDF vessels supplying fuel not only to the U.S. Navy, but also to other navies such as those of Great Britain, France, and Pakistan; in all, Japan’s navy supplied naval vessels of eleven different coalition members participating in “Operation Enduring Freedom”. This naval cooperation was regarded as significant, because each naval vessel routinely needs fuel and water supplies to operate on 24-hour schedules. Without supplies on the ocean, such a vessel has to return to a port for replenishment during its campaigns, which would require an extra vessel and expose a gap in the maritime surveillance system.\(^{171}\)

The difficulty of such re-supply operations at sea, including avoiding minor collisions due to wind or waves, is largely unknown to the public; a warship and a replenishment vessel must sail side-by-side in formation for many hours. Such difficult maritime supply operations require great skill and sound training: refuelling operations require advanced techniques as both ships are navigating. The JMSDF has a proven ability to handle such operations. As a result of its Indian Ocean operations, the JMSDF has demonstrated its value not only to its ally but also to its several coalition partners by practising a technically very difficult capability that few other navies possess.\(^{172}\) Unlike the United States and Japan, not many countries have a capability to dispatch a fleet 10,000 kilometres from their home waters for such an extended period of time. In addition, during the operation naval vessels put themselves in significant danger, because the two vessels are connected by a refuelling hose and are restricted in their use of various sensors and weapons.\(^{173}\) Therefore, escort ships and helicopters have to keep
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a strict watch on the surrounding area, and should they spot unidentified ships, the JMSDF and foreign ships would share the information through a communication link.\textsuperscript{174}

Anti-terrorism and maritime security operations in the Indian Ocean by coalition navies have been successful in preventing terrorist attacks against marine transportation, and terrorist supply of personnel, weaponry, and ammunition, and in preventing terrorist activity at sea generally. At the same time, probably as a result of a collateral effect of these operations, the number of reported incidents of piracy decreased. For Japan, which is highly dependent upon the safety of sea lanes as its maritime lifeline, backing off from this mission would effectively be abnegating its responsibility, losing Japan credit with international society and, above all, producing a negative impact on U.S.-Japan relations. The dispatch of JMSDF vessels to the Indian Ocean was thus a very effective diplomatic option, as well as proving useful practical training for the JMSDF.\textsuperscript{175}

Nevertheless, the JMSDF’s Indian Ocean operations operated under severe constraints. Whilst coalition navies have been conducting maritime interception operations covering the whole area from the Strait of Hormuz to the northern part of the Indian Ocean, the JMSDF cannot participate because of the lack of its legal authority to inspect shipping.\textsuperscript{176}

\textit{The Expired Law}

Even though the ambassadors of eleven recipient navies jointly expressed gratitude to Japan and the JMSDF for the refuelling mission and called for continued efforts in this regard, and the heads of state of the United States, Germany, Pakistan, and Afghanistan directly urged Japan to continue the supply mission, it was in fact discontinued because of the expiration of the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law in November 2007.\textsuperscript{177}

After a battle between the coalition government that advocated the early resumption of the supply mission and the opposition parties that attempted to block it, JMSDF
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refuelling operations started again on 21 February. The legitimacy of the operation internationally was assured by a broad consensus in support of the coalition’s anti-terrorism activities in Afghanistan. Even China did not oppose the deployment of the JSDF for such activities. Without operations undertaken by the JMSDF, it appears that the Pakistan Navy would have found it difficult to carry out its own tasks. This is important in the larger strategic context because it is crucial for the U.S.-oriented anti-terrorism coalition to anchor Pakistan firmly to its side. Some commentators in the media think light of this JMSDF operation by calling it “a free petrol station at the sea”; whereas in fact Japan’s supply operations lighten a financial burden on Pakistan and enables Pakistani participation in coalition activities. Pakistani support to the coalition is also vital, such as when the JMSDF ships call in to Pakistan ports, where the danger of terrorist attack reaches its peak.

After the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) took control of the government in September 2009, a new liberal-minded administration never displayed a desire to extend the effective period of the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law. Therefore, on 16 January 2010, the special law finally expired and the JMSDF supply units pulled out of operations in the Indian Ocean. During the refuelling mission for eight years, the JMSDF conducted 939 operations that supplied 510,000 kilolitres of marine fuel (24.5 billion yen) to twelve nations. As an alternative for this replenishment mission, Hatoyama administration committed US$ 5 billion in humanitarian aid.

The director of international security studies at the Royal United Service Institute, London, Jonathan Eyal, has said, “If the Japanese government intends to express a return to the previous chequebook diplomacy, I am extremely regretful for this.” According to Eyal, there are two problems with this situation: Japan’s removal of its
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vessels participating in the operations against terrorism would not send a good political message, especially considering that the United States and Great Britain had decided to send additional forces to Afghanistan, and other allies of NATO were also considering reinforcement there; and withdrawing the JMSDF would give an impression that Japan was determined to lessen its security relationship with the United States. Besides, he insisted that if Japan should decrease its presence in the international arena, which of China would increase, without doubt. Provided that Japan promotes the supremacy of United Nations as an alternative to the alliance with the United States, in terms of the deployment of the JSDF, it would imply that Japan leaves its security and diplomatic policy to China, which has veto power at the U.N. Security Council.\(^{184}\)

### Missile Defence as the Modern Maritime Barrier and the Bond of the Alliance

**The U.S. and the Missile Defence**

During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union intensified their deadly arms race regarding strategic ballistic missiles. The development of ballistic missile defence (BMD), however, did not progress due to technological difficulty and the restrictions of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, concluded in 1972, based on the concept of Mutually Assured Destruction.\(^{185}\) In the final years of the Cold War, U.S. President Ronald Reagan announced the Strategic Defense Initiative, with a core plan of deploying anti-ballistic missile weapons in space. This concept set off shock waves with the Soviets and parts of international society, but the United States was unable to surmount technological challenges for the defence system in the end.\(^{186}\) After the Cold War, in the Gulf War of 1991, U.S. forces deployed Patriot Advanced Capability-2 (PAC-2) surface-to-air missiles to intercept Iraq’s Scud ballistic missiles. The deployment of PAC-2 attracted tremendous interest in the world community around that time. In addition to this experience, the fact that North Korea and Iran have been desperate to advance schemes to develop ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads drives the U.S. to eagerly develop missile defence systems.\(^{187}\)
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The current American rationale for the development of a ballistic missile defence capability has been to negate the ballistic missile-delivered nuclear weapons ambitions of the “rogue” regional power proliferators of weapons of mass destruction. As well as providing a potential defensive shield, such a capability may enable the United States to give full play to its conventional weapons capability in any conflict with a rogue state. In history, some states have accrued such strong power and then seemed to be unbeatable. It is often said that one nation cannot simultaneously retain both superb seapower and land power. In rare cases, such as the mid and late Roman Republic, the Eastern Roman Empire, Byzantium, became superstates that had a first class navy and army for a period of time.\textsuperscript{188} The U.S. can be also be viewed as a super power that possesses all forms of strategic might, as earlier elucidated in Chapter 2, involving not only the army and navy, but also airpower, nuclear power, and space power, subsumed within the land/sea classification in general.\textsuperscript{189} However, even if rogue state, whose national power is minimal compared to that of greater states, could adopt a hard line, autarkic, potentially effective foreign policy towards opponents by possessing nuclear weapons as a tool for intimidation. For this reason, defending against ballistic missiles by constructing a missile defence system has been a significant national target for America in order to maintain its position and enhance its influence as the global power.

\textit{Japan’s BMD System and Information Sharing with the United States}

From the Japanese perspective BMD is expected to deter and defend against an opponent’s ballistic missile attack and discourage rival nations from developing and proliferating ballistic missiles.\textsuperscript{190} There are some significance aspects of missile defence systems for Japan.\textsuperscript{191} A missile defence system covering the Japan islands is potentially able to prevent ballistic missiles from being used as a tool of political intimidation. If Japan can build countermeasures such as a missile defence system to protect her from the threat of ballistic missile attack, it would reinforce the credibility of the U.S.-Japan alliance and make the alliance more bilateral. In fact, assuming the Japanese BMD

\textsuperscript{188} Colin S. Gray, \textit{The Navy in the Post-Cold War World: the Uses and Value of Strategic Sea Power}, The Pennsylvania State University Press, College Park, PA, pp. 63-64.
\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., pp. 58-59.
system works well, Japan can protect not only Japanese nationals, but also U.S. facilities in Japan. Japan and the U.S. can thus be united by common strategic interests.

BMD cooperation measures have included, or potentially include, research and development of aspects of the missile defence system, to confront missile crises in the Far East. Such BMD cooperation can improve the stability of the alliance with the United States, which would lead the security environment of the East Asia to be more stable as well. Besides, not only North Korea, but China and Russia also deploy a large quantity of ballistic missiles whose firing range can reach Japanese territory. Japan thus has to prepare countermeasures to cope with their missile strategy. It is well suited to the context of Japan’s security environment, considering the constitutional limitations of Article 9 which tightly constrains Japan’s security capability in terms of using armed forces. For many Japanese, revising Article 9 is still unacceptable due to the prevalence of post-War pacifism. It is also strongly unacceptable to them for Japan to have the capability, as a deterrent, to be able to conduct even limited military strikes overseas as a deterrent, even though adjacent countries possess nuclear weapons and ballistic missile power.

Previously, the sea was regarded not only as a highway, but also as a barrier to prevent an enemy’s invasion from overseas.192 The effect of this role has been fading in relative terms as the technology of weaponry has been drastically developing, although it still makes sea power states much safer than the security circumstances of adjacent continental powers. The advent of sea-based missile defence systems might restore the ocean’s reliable role as a strong bulwark for sea-girt countries in the 21st century. It has been argued that the advantages of sea-based BMD systems are the following capabilities:193 conducting BMD operations from advantageous locations at sea where ground-based systems cannot reach; operating in forward locations in international waters without permission form foreign governments; clearer visibility relative to that ashore; and readily moving to a new maritime location as needed. Meanwhile, potential

limitations of this system include: possible conflicts with performing other ship missions, higher costs relative to ground-based systems, the availability of BMD ship quantities (i.e., numbers) for forward deployments, vulnerability to attack when operating in forward locations, and rough waters that might inhibit a crew’s ability to operate a ship’s systems.

Direct contracts between the U.S. government and Japanese companies for a Western Pacific Missile Defense Architecture Study (WESTPAC) started from 1989. Japan thus came to be engaged in the research for BMD at a very early stage. With North Korea’s nuclear test 1993, the U.S. and Japan began to implement joint development activities for BMD. In December 1993, the two governments agreed to set up a U.S.-Japan Theater Missile Defense (TMD) Working Group (TMD WG) and discussed the analysis of threats and technological difficulties. In December 1998, after the launch test of North Korea’s Taepodong-1 in the previous month, the United States and Japan agreed to start to engage in cooperative technological research on Navy Theater Wide Defense (NTWD). Four components of the interceptor missile Standard Missile (SM)-3 were chosen for the joint research: lightweight nose cone; stage-two rocket engine; advanced kinetic warhead; and two-color infrared sensor.

In June 2001, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) presented a new strategy for BMD, a multilayered missile defence system, divided into three segments: Boost Defense Segment, Mid-course Defense Segment, and Terminal Defense Segment. Taking the progress of the U.S. BMD programme into consideration, in December 2003, the Japanese government made its decision to introduce its own BMD system. Japan’s BMD system is composed of: 1) launch detection of ballistic missiles using satellite-
based and ground-based radar; 2) ballistic missile interception with Sea-based Midcourse Defense (SMD)-equipped Aegis ships in the Mid-Course Defense Segment; and 3) interception of ballistic missiles using ground-to-air Patriot PAC-3 missiles. Additionally, Command Control, Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) is required to enable integrated and organized operation of linkages between BMD sensors and weapons.199

In Japan’s BMD system, firstly, the Japanese government would receive information on the launch of a ballistic missile from Japan’s information-gathering and U.S. Defense Support Program (DSP) satellites. The U.S. launched several DSP satellites for early warning that cover the entire Earth’s surface. The Japanese government does not possess such a constellation of early-warning satellites.200 Even though Japan launched information-gathering satellites for the first time in 2003, Japan’s satellite can provide only relatively low-resolution images akin to those of commercial satellites because the government limited the use of space for so-called “peaceful purposes,” due to a 1969 parliamentary resolution. As a result the Basic Law on Space was enacted in 2008: other than its use for a military invasion, the Japanese government can make space more operational and can pave the way to possess better satellites, including a missile launch observation system. At the moment, Japan does not possess any early-warning satellites similar to U.S. DPS satellites that deliver information on the launch of ballistic missiles as a Shared Early Warning (SEW) for BMD. In January 2008, a Joint Tactical Ground Station (JTAGS) set up at the U.S. military base in Misawa commenced operations to receive information from U.S. early-warning satellites.201 Also, Japan’s phased array radar and U.S. mobile X band radar are operated to track ballistic missiles. Importantly, the U.S. information network and Japan’s BMD system have to be integrated to operate smooth combined operations between the two countries. Accordingly, the Bilateral Joint Operations Coordination Center (BJOCC) was organized to strengthen collaboration between both command centres and share information in 2006.202
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Aegis BMD

The U.S. government has regarded its Aegis ballistic missile defence as the core of the sea-based BMD programme for midcourse and terminal phase interception. The Aegis BMD system is designed to detect and track missiles of any range, including intercontinental ballistic missiles, and intercept short and medium-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs and MRBMs, respectively) above the atmosphere during their midcourse phase of flight.\textsuperscript{203} The Aegis BMD system builds on the capability of the U.S. Navy’s Aegis ship combat system, which was originally developed for defending ships against aircraft, anti-ship cruise missiles (ASCMs), surface threats, and subsurface threats.\textsuperscript{204} The Aegis system was first introduced by the U.S. Navy in 1983, focused on providing protective countermeasures for their carrier battle groups against Soviet aircraft and ASCMs. This system consists of advanced equipment such as the SPY-1 radar\textsuperscript{205}, a suite of computers running the Aegis fire control and battle-management computer programme and the Standard Missile, the Navy’s longer-ranged surface-to-air missile.\textsuperscript{206} The maximum effective range of the SM-3 interceptor missile is over 1,200 kilometre. Two Aegis destroyers can theoretically provide defensive cover over almost the whole of Japan.\textsuperscript{207}

Originally, the JMSDF’s Aegis ships were intended to strengthen the defence system for Japanese airspace and the surrounding sea areas for Japan’s sea lanes under the assumption of attacks from long-range anti-ship missiles delivered by Russian long-range bombers such as the Tu-22 Backfire.\textsuperscript{208} Currently, Japan possesses six Aegis destroyers, four Kongō-class (costing about 120 billion yen each) and two Atago-class (about 145 billion yen each). Japan has conducted a cooperative programme with the United States for researching and developing technologies for the Block II/IIA versions of the SM-3 anti-ballistic missile interceptor focusing on risk reduction for four parts of
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the missile noted above: the sensor, an advanced kinetic warhead, the second-stage propulsion unit, and a lightweight nose cone.209

U.S.-Japan BMD cooperation has been going through a process of development and sharing of advanced technologies and concepts for a missile defence system. This partnership is expected to produce improved synergies with respect to a missile defence command and control system by improving its combined operational systems and its ability to share vital information. Also, the United States anticipates Japan’s removal of the ban on military exports in order to share Japanese developments in BMD technology. The effectiveness of the U.S.-Japan alliance relationship as a result has been strongly enhanced by such cooperative activities.210 On 18 December 2007, a Japanese Aegis vessel successfully intercepted a ballistic missile target with the Aegis BMD system, with advance notice of the target ballistic missile launch time, at a combined naval drill, designated “Japan Flight Test Mission-1 (JFTM-1)” with the U.S. Navy in waters off the coast of Kauai in Hawaii.211 On 20 December 2008, without advance notice of launch time, the second test failed to intercept a missile. The third test was successful without advance notice of launch time on 28 October 2009. According to the U.S. Navy, the cost of a joint U.S.-Japanese missile defence programme is going to be in the vicinity of US$3.1 billion.212

BMD against North Korea’s Missile Strategy

When North Korea fired a stream of ballistic missiles in July 2006, the United States and Japan set up a multilayered missile-tracking system: the United States incorporated its Defense Support Program Satellite, Aegis warships, RC-135S Cobra Ball reconnaissance aircraft, Observation Island T-AGM-23, and an X-band radar deployed in Aomori; and Japan used Aegis ships, EP-3 electronic reconnaissance aircraft, P-3C and YS-11E MPAs, and its FPS-XX radar.213 Had North Korea’s Taepodong 2 missile reached as far as mainland U.S., the United States would, in principle, have intercepted

it. A Bilateral Joint Operation Coordination Center (BJOCC) was established at the Yokota Air Base to exchange information and secure close coordination between the alliance partners, but they nevertheless will need further improvements in cooperation procedures in order to be able to conduct genuinely combined operations.\(^{214}\)

The increasing threats from missile proliferation, including Chinese and North Korean nuclear-armed missiles, have made cooperation in missile defence technologies and concepts more urgent. BMD cooperation represents research and development and technology sharing arrangements for some of the most advanced and high-priced technology by the world’s two largest economies. In theory this represents a new bond that further strengthens alliance ties and has enabled their respective national capabilities to be augmented by the synergistic effects of interdependent cooperation between sea-power allies.\(^{215}\)

Ultimately, the missile did not pose a direct threat to Japanese territory. Compared to the Taepodong-1 that passed over the Japanese islands in 1998, Pyongyang increased the range of the missile so that it could reach the U.S. mainland. In 1998, the first-stage booster plunged into the Sea of Japan about 180 kilometres from the launching platform in North Korea, and the missile was delivered 1,600 km by the second-stage booster. Unlike the two-stage Taepodong-2 launched in 2006, which had an estimated the range of 6,000 km — placing Alaska at risk — the April 2009 Taepodong-2 was a three-stage rocket estimated the range of 10,000 km, meaning that it could reach as far as the U.S. west coast.\(^{216}\) In April 2009, the first-stage booster plunged into the Pacific about 320 kilometres west of Akita Prefecture (about 540 km from the launch site in North Korea). Although it was not confirmed, the second-stage booster seems to have landed over 3,000 km from the launch site.\(^{217}\) It is believed that the third-stage booster plunged into the Pacific together with the second-stage, but this has not been confirmed.

\(^{214}\) Ibid.
When North Korea launched a ballistic missile on 5 April 2009, Japan deployed a missile defence system operationally for the first time. Japan and the United States both carefully tracked the missile and analysed the tracking data. In June 2006, the United States had placed its latest X-band radar system at the JASDF’s Syariki Sub Base in Tsugaru, Aomori Prefecture. Before the launch of the missile, the U.S. forces used the X-band radar system, five Aegis destroyers and two Cobra Ball reconnaissance aircraft to precisely gather as much missile data as possible. The Japanese government deployed two Aegis destroyers with SM-3 interceptor missiles, and land-based PAC-3 interceptor missiles at five locations in Japan.

**Legal Limitation**

In future, there is a possibility that Japan might possess a BMD system that could intercept ballistic missiles in their Boost Defence Segment. At that point, however, it is difficult to tell whether the target of the missile would be Japan or not. This creates a problem for Japan that intercepting such a ballistic missile might not be regarded as the right to individual self-defence.

This incident highlighted issues of Japan’s right to collective defence. The United States gave Japan the initial information about the preparation for the missile launch sourced from its reconnaissance satellites. Despite the fact that Japan depends greatly on its American ally, it cannot exercise the right of collective defence on behalf of the United States; even though Washington has requested that Japan use its defence system to intercept any missiles fired at the United States. Tokyo remains hamstrung by its constitutional limitations.

In response to North Korea’s missile strategy, the LDP began to raise the possibility of acquiring capabilities to directly strike missile bases on enemy territory, “in order not to sit and wait for death.” As an easily identifiable threat, North Korea and its nuclear
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and missile policies have driven Japan to strengthen its alliance with the United States, and accelerated a tendency for Japan to evolve its defence policy towards that of an ordinary country. Former Japanese Prime Minister Shinzō Abe established a council of advisers to discuss the issue. The advisory body drafted a report stating that if Japan changes the constitutional interpretation with regard to the exercise of the right of collective defence, Japan could conduct four types of operations: protect U.S. vessels on the high seas; intercept missiles fired at the United States; deploy the JSDF on international peacekeeping missions; and provide rear-area support for other countries’ units in U.N. peacekeeping operations. However, Abe’s sudden resignation upset the original schedule. Therefore the report was submitted to Prime Minister Fukuda, who had succeeded Abe, and who showed negative attitudes toward the exercise of the right. In response to the launch of the North Korean, however, Prime Minister Taro Asō, who in turn had succeeded Fukuda, met to hear the contents of the report with the chairman of the panel, former Ambassador to the U.S., Shunji Yanai, in April 2009. However, more recently, Democratic Party of Japan Prime Minister Hatoyama announced that his administration has no intention to invoke the right of collective self-defence.

Despite these ongoing political difficulties, missile defence effectiveness is still discussed. This matter has the potential to be used as an opportunity to advance military technical cooperation and the right of collective self-defence, which deepens and develops bilateral relations between Japan and the United States.

The Maritime Alliance as a Mutual Complementary Relationship

Spear and Shield

Japan’s defence budget is about 4.7 trillion yen. The JSDF’s military force is totals about 227,000 personnel (JGSDF: 138,000, JMSDF: 44,000, and JASDF: 45,000). Currently, the JMSDF’s budget is about 1 trillion yen. The JMSDF possesses 148 ships,
including 16 submarines.\textsuperscript{228} The JCG’s budget is about 180 billion yen.\textsuperscript{229} It has about
13,000 personnel and 442 ships.\textsuperscript{230} There are strong doubts about whether the size of
Japan’s military and naval power could protect the Japanese archipelago and sea areas
relevant Japan’s security. On the one hand, Americans have long thought highly of the
allied navy:

\begin{quote}
Japan has the capability to defend itself against all but perhaps a resurgent
Soviet Union. They have invested a lot of money to build a very capable
self-defense force….We operate with the Japanese navy a lot; they are good.
We have mutual defense arrangements with Japan, but they really have the
capability to defend themselves.\textsuperscript{231}
\end{quote}

There are some reasons why the JMSDF’s capability did not become widely understood
by the public.\textsuperscript{232} Even though JMSDF capability steadily increased, it was concealed by
obvious U.S. and Soviet naval developments. As matter of fact, it was difficult to
precisely assess and compare the capability of the various navies. A number of defence
experts had the habit of seeing not only the JMSDF but all Japan’s armed forces as
limited by constitutional and legal constraints, and public sentiment. Also, Japan was
not perceived as a potential threat to the United States and its other allies. For example
China was perceived as a threat because it was a potentially destabilizing and
hegemonic regime, rather than as a result of its modernizing armed forces. Consequently, the People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) was noticed much more
widely than the JMSDF, which was seen as a harmless friend.

On the other hand, the JSDF has to rely heavily on U.S. forces for nuclear deterrent
power, and their role as the “spear,” through U.S. power projection capability; while the
JSDF plays a role as a “shield” in case of emergencies in areas surrounding Japan and
securing more distant SLOC.\textsuperscript{233} The main structural feature deficit of the JSDF is a lack
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of power projection capability.\textsuperscript{234} That is why the Japanese navy has developed in such an unbalanced way, as a result of Article 9 restrictions.\textsuperscript{235} When discussing Japan’s defence policy, the exclusively defence-oriented policy comes to be a constant issue. The operational capability of the JSDF is only sufficient for the homeland and the surrounding area of the Japanese islands. Additionally, the JSDF possesses no assault capability against enemy bases. Therefore, without maritime power projection capability, the JMSDF has inevitably been charged with playing the role that focuses defence as a “shield.” As a logical consequence, the U.S. Navy possesses tremendous power projection capability, with aircraft carrier strike groups playing the primary role of the “spear”.\textsuperscript{236} For an island country like Japan, comprising a widely dispersed set of archipelagos, possessing a large number of landing craft and other amphibious capabilities is essential, in view of considering flexible military actions throughout the nation’s different island groups.\textsuperscript{237}

The JMSDF thus developed the \textit{Ohsumi}-class amphibious ship (with a stated displacement of 8,900 tons — although this is believed to be an understatement of the actual displacement), which is in effect a type of flat-deck dock landing ship (LSD), substantially larger than earlier classes of landing ship such as the \textit{Atsumi}-class. However, there are only three ships in the class, and they are still relatively small and limited in capability compared to most comparable vessels in other advanced navies. The ships possess only a small flight deck area which can accommodate rotorcraft and support their continuous operations. The internal space that exists is instead designed for a docking well (from which smaller landing craft operate), and vehicle, personnel and cargo storage.\textsuperscript{238}
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During the Cold War, the JMSDF developed two main components, the Self Defense Fleet in charge of defending the sea lanes around Japan and the Regional Districts in charge of defending each assigned area and providing operational and logistical support to the Self Defense Fleet. The collaborative support of the Self Defense Fleet and the Regional Districts have been of significant assistance to the U.S. Navy’s operation, principally in regard to logistic support in the western Pacific in areas near Japan and matters related to anti-submarine warfare. The JSDF in effect is not a balanced, self-contained force at all. Accordingly, Japan has two main responsibilities in view of current strategic circumstances and immediate security concerns. The first is to provide the U.S. with military bases and facilities, and secondly, to undertake cooperative training with U.S. forces on a routine basis for the close partnership in order to immediately respond to ballistic missile launches and carry out anti-terrorism operations.

**Anti-Submarine Warfare and Mine Countermeasures**

There are extremely large gaps in JMSDF capabilities. Although two particular capabilities, anti-submarine warfare (ASW) and mine countermeasures (MCM), have attained a first-rate level, others have remained rather limited or non-existent, resulting in a highly specialised, unbalanced naval force structure. These strength and weaknesses represent the starting point for the JMSDF’s future bilateral cooperation with the United States. In fact, the JMSDF developed during the Cold War into one of the world’s leading exponents of ASW; yet its unbalanced force structure lacks many of the elements which tend to characterize truly first-class navies such as nuclear-powered submarines, and power projection assets such aircraft carriers, and assault landing craft. Unbalanced force structure afflicts not only the JMSDF, but also the JASDF, which has first-rate air defence capabilities but no long-range striking power, such as strategic bombers. Indeed, Japan has no power-projection capability for deterrent effect at all, even though it is surrounded and regarded as a potential enemy by adjacent countries which are increasing their offensive capabilities.
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However, such unbalanced capabilities reflect American demands for JSDF development over the years. Indeed, Japan possesses more than 100 P-3C, anti-submarine aircraft. The quantity of these types of weapons was increased during the Cold War as a result of U.S. requests in order to conduct anti-submarine operations to prevent Soviet transit of the Sōya, Tsugaru, and Tsushima Straits, and thus to cage the Soviet navy within the Sea of Japan should war break out, and also to maintain the security of sea lanes and strategic chokepoints in the areas around the Japanese islands. The JSDF has thus been regarded as one of the world’s most advanced forces in terms of ASW and air defence, involving such force structure elements as modern conventional submarines, ASW maritime patrol aircraft, escort ships, surface-to-air missiles, and fighter interceptors. The JMSDF has been noted, in particular, for its advanced submarines.

Another Japanese forte has been mine countermeasures. This capability has developed not only the reason that, if mines were to be laid around Japan, the country would become economically paralysed, but also in order to assure free access to the sea to U.S. Navy ships home ported in Japan. Thus, Japanese MCM forces are important to the U.S. 7th Fleet, and for supporting U.S. landing operations in case of an emergency on the Korean peninsula. Indeed, they have had the experience of removing a great number of mines sown by the U.S. Navy and air forces during the Pacific War. In 1945, in “Operation Starvation against Japan”, B-29 bombers dropped mines around the main ocean routes and ports in order to disrupt maritime traffic as part of the economic warfare campaign designed to reduce Japan’s willingness to continue the fight. GHQ launched minesweeping operations just after the end of the war. On 18 September 1945, about 350 ships disarmed by the Allied Forces and 10,000 Japanese ex-naval personnel reactivated Japan’s mine countermeasure capabilities.
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The JMSDF took over the minesweeping operation in waters around the Japanese archipelago and finished the task only in 1985. Such minesweeping operations not only served to hone Japan’s MCM skills, but also contributed to the independent recovery of Japan, post-war reconstruction and economic development.\textsuperscript{249}

*The JMSDF and the U.S. 7th Fleet*

As already noted, the central tasks of the JMSDF were anti-submarine operations, sea lane defence and maritime defence against direct attack.\textsuperscript{250} Unlike the Imperial Japanese Navy, which did not have a concept of sea lane defence, the JMSDF could concentrate on improving and strengthening the force for sea lane defence since there was no need for it to establish a new fleet for offensive operations, a role played instead by the U.S. 7th Fleet.\textsuperscript{251} The 7th Fleet is well-known as the strongest fleet in the world, with its home ports in Yokosuka and Sasebo. No country other than Japan provides a home port for U.S. warships. A naval port must meet a number of requisite conditions related to size, water depth, and various specialized facilities. In the case of home ports for the U.S. Navy, a country which provides such ports must attain a high level of industrial and technological sophistication in order to satisfy the demands of the world’s leading navy.\textsuperscript{252}

In brief, Yokosuka and Sasebo are in a different class from other ports of call and naval facilities outside the United States. Usually, the 7th Fleet is composed of about 60 to 70 ships, 200 to 300 aircraft and 40,000 navy and marine personnel.\textsuperscript{253} The 7th Fleet’s area of responsibility (AOR) is the western Pacific and the Indian Ocean, except for the Arabian Sea. In August 2006, according to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, the newly-renovated *Ticonderoga*-class Aegis cruiser upgraded for BMD, USS *Shiloh* (CG-67) was deployed to Yokosuka. The *Ticonderoga*-class cruiser’s vertical launch system (VLS) has 122 cells for a variety of missile armaments, including BMD interceptors, while the *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers’ VLS has 90 cells. Such warships can launch attacks against land targets and an opponent’s air defence system using Tomahawk...
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land-attack cruise missiles. Usually, one or two accompany the Carrier Strike Group (CSG) and depending on circumstances, the assault landing ships comprising the Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) would also accompany the CSG. The 7th Fleet thus has power projection capabilities for long-range attack and to support ground operations that the JMSDF lacks.

The Self-Defense Fleet and the U.S. 7th Fleet are leading forces of each country. The two forces usually conduct around 14 combined exercises each year, including the JMSDF’s annual naval drill, specialized anti-submarine warfare, and MCM training. Moreover, a combined naval drill without ex-ante coordination called “PASSEX (passing exercise)” is frequently operated. The number of combined naval exercises conducted by the JMSDF and the U.S. Navy is greater than any other U.S. ally, including the Royal Navy. In addition, naval officers from both navies have become linked in friendship beyond professional working relations: because both headquarters are in Yokosuka they can strengthen the close relationship through the interconnections between each level of the two organizations. As a consequence, this relationship is based on close military and friendly relations which have served as an impetus to U.S.-Japan relations.

The U.S. Pacific Fleet has listed two areas of cooperation to enhance its relations with allies. First, a commitment to anti-submarine warfare in the Asia-Pacific region is a crucial point for the Pacific Fleet. The Pacific Fleet and its allied navies have a critical mission of maintaining the stability of the region in this ocean area to secure sea lanes. For this purpose, the role of the Self-Defense Fleet is granted a great responsibility. Second is ballistic missile defence to protect U.S. allies. The Self-Defense Fleet is the only naval force which has Aegis ships equipped with SM-3 BMD missiles other than the U.S. Pacific Fleet. Therefore, the JMSDF has gained a leading role for BMD in collaboration with the 7th Fleet.

---


256 Ibid., pp. 84-85.
The JSDF has persistently been treated as possessing military potential which has complemented the U.S. forces since its establishment. In terms of power projection capabilities, the JMSDF largely depends on those of the 7th Fleet. An American defence planning document states the generic position of its naval relations with its allies clearly: "The United States will work with allies and partners to integrate intelligence sensors, communication networks, information systems missile defences, undersea warfare and countermine-mine warfare capabilities."\(^{257}\) This statement seems to reflect an exact representation of the U.S. alliance relationships.

In order to become a truly independent sea power state, Japan realistically requires a power projection capability, but considering strong public sentiment in Japan and regional opposition it is not simple for the government to build “attack” carriers and nuclear-powered submarines. Japan might not need such military power, as long as the alliance is undoubtedly solid, based on strong navy-to-navy relations. If Japan simply throws itself into the role of the shield, it would not need the weaponry of power projection capability; yet, could such a shield maintain a stable balance of power in the region? It cannot be completely denied that the possibility exists that such a defensive posture, which is highly dependent upon an alliance, may actually foment a conflict rather than create peace and friendship. As discussed earlier, in international society, and Northeast Asia, in particular, the weakest tend eventually to perish.

**The Japanese Islands as a U.S. Power Projection Hub**

After the end of the Cold War, the threat of the Soviet Union disappeared. In response to this, in 1993, the LDP, a conservative and pro-American political party, had experienced losing power for the first time since 1955. Although the LDP-led ruling coalition, including the Socialist Party of Japan, marched back into power in the following year, there were new indications that Japan’s diplomacy would create some distance from the positions of the United States. Even though the Cold War was over, far from a situation of world peace, a number of troubles have erupted around the world. There appeared to be various elements of uncertainty in the areas surrounding Japan: for

example, North Korea’s nuclear and missile ambitions, and Chinese maritime strategy, which shakes the status quo in the Asia-Pacific region.

Under the Clinton administration, which was relatively more pro-Chinese than former governments, the “East Asia Strategy Report” of 1995, produced by a team led by Joseph S. Nye, regarded the location of the Japanese islands and the maintenance of USFJ’s strength as significant for U.S. global strategy and a stable balance of power in Asia, where were still various elements of uncertainty. This “Nye Report” led to the restoration of a forward-looking relationship between the United States and Japan. In order to respond fully to the changes in the security environment, in 1996, the “Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security - Alliance for the 21st Century” intended to reconstruct the framework of security cooperation between the two alliance partners was signed by the Japanese Prime Minister Ryutarō Hashimoto and U.S. President Bill Clinton. It led the two governments to announce the “Joint Statement on U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee Completion of the Review of the Guidelines” in New York in September 1997, including defence cooperation such as bilateral training and logistic support. Furthermore, the “Law Concerning Measures to Ensure the Peace and Security of Japan in Situation in Areas Surrounding Japan” guidelines-related bills were enacted in May 1999, allowing to the SDF to provide logistic support for U.S. forces beyond Japanese territory.

At the moment, even for the United States, which possesses the greatest maritime power and power projection capability in the world, it is difficult to carry its weight around the globe due to the high demand for U.S. forces across a wide range of commitments and responsibilities; and set against a context of a navy significantly reduced in size since the Cold War and under severe budgetary pressure as a result of the spiralling cost of military technology, the financial burden of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts, and the impact of the global financial crisis and U.S. economic recession. Consequently, the
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island country ally positioned in the Far East assumes potentially great significance for U.S. global strategy.

Spykman’s Prediction

In 1942, a Yale University professor, Nicholas J. Spykman, published his signature work of geopolitical thought, *America’s Strategy in World Politics*. In spite of fact that the United States was engaged in a fierce battle against Japan in the Pacific region, Spykman accurately prophesied the rationale for a U.S.-Japan alliance, taking the global geopolitical environment into account. His clairvoyance has left an indelible impression upon today’s geopolitical circumstances.

Japanese sea power lies between the Continent of Asia and the Pacific-and, therefore, between Asia and the United States. With naval superiority in Asiatic waters, Japan can control all communications through the marginal seas of that continent from Siberia to Amoy. She can act as a buffer and balance against continental threats to the United States and against American threats to the Asiatic mainland. The United States can be effective on that mainland in a military sense only in alliance with Japanese sea power and not against it. As in the case of Great Britain, Japan’s sea power can become available as an instrument for distant operations only when the continent is balanced and Japan’s insular security assured.260

Also, during the war, he predicted even about geo-strategy with respect to a possibly hostile China:

…the dominant power in the Far East will undoubtedly be China, providing she achieves real unification and provided that Japan’s military power is completely destroyed. Russia’s strength in the north will be the only continental balance to the Chinese position. If the Western Powers are to retain any influence at all in the region, they will have to establish island bases for their power. In view of the limits which there undoubtedly are to the power resources of the Chinese state, such bases will probably be sufficient to counterbalance any future attempt of China to dominate the Far East completely.261

Becoming widely known to American elites in charge of diplomatic policy, Spykman’s thought has been influential in establishing America’s post-War geo-strategic world view, regardless of whether such officials were consciously aware of Spykman’s “rimland” concept.262 The idea of the rimland can be linked to the thinking of various geopolitical theorists and policymakers such as George Kennan’s “containment” policy, Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “arc of crisis” and “Eurasian and Balkan zone of instability,” Saul B. Cohen’s “shatterbelt” and the Pentagon’s “arc of instability.”263 Also, in Japan, then foreign minister Taro Aso advocated an ”arc of freedom and prosperity” as Japan’s diplomatic policy,264 which can be conceptually associated with the rimland theory.265

In fact, “Perhaps most important from an Asian perspective is that the United States, although not geographically an ‘Asian’ nation, is so powerful a maritime power that it dominates the ‘Rimlands’”.266 The two former enemies have, since the end of the Second World War, both come to understand the interdependence of Western sea powers, and the potential for rival land powers to pose a strategic challenge to their mutual interests. During the Cold War, compared to the European central front, the Soviet Union’s power was relatively limited in the Far East, the edge of Eurasian continent. Therefore, importantly, Japan’s geographical location played a central connective role in the U.S. strategy of leveraging the East Asian maritime chain in order to contain Soviet power. Accordingly, the United States adopted the strategy of combining East Asian allies, maritime power and nuclear weapons to counterbalance the advantage of the Soviet Union in the west of the Eurasian continent. The geographical importance of the Far East was regarded as a key geo-strategic factor in allowing the United States to exert pressure upon such an enormous land power empire.267
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Post-War Japan was powerless to defend itself against the combined military power of the continental alliance between the Soviet Union and China formed in 1950, which targeted the island country. Protecting Japan from the great land powers was actually one of main American reasons for intervening in the Korean War, as Spykman foresaw.\textsuperscript{268} The United States needed to defend Japan, a valuable industrialized country host to vital American bases. Eventually, Japan’s economic recovery was able to contribute to the recovery of other non-Communist East Asian states.\textsuperscript{269} James Auer and Robyn Lim assert, “During the Cold War, Japan was neither an economic threat to the United States nor a free rider, as so many now seem to think. To the contrary, Japan played an important role in bringing down the overextended Soviet empire”.\textsuperscript{270} In short, Japan’s geographical location has brought huge advantages to the grand strategy of the U.S.-led maritime coalition against formidable Eurasian continental powers. The Japanese islands thus have been a tool of allied maritime strategy in the great geo-strategic rivalry of the Cold War: the U.S.-Japan alliance admirably functioned to contain the Soviet Union in the Far East by exploring the advantageous geographical location of the Japanese islands in combination with the presence of U.S. forces and the potential of the JSDF.\textsuperscript{271}

The U.S. engagement strategy for the security of Asia Pacific region consists of forward deployment and an alliance strategy: two sides of the same coin. The essence of the strategy is maritime strategy. With strengthening of alliances with Japan, South Korea, and Australia, involving both bilateral, and increasingly, multilateral, military drills, the United States has been maintaining the alliance network for the stability of Asia. The alliance system is, so to speak, a maritime coalition which preserves a regional power projection capability to deter and, if necessary, contain, the potentially negative consequences of an Asian arc of instability and aggressive land powers.\textsuperscript{272} A pillar of U.S. strategic policy is its global deployment strategy based on a navy facilitated by
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scattered naval bases the world over, and its latent sea control capabilities, each an essential element in maintaining its global seapower network.

From a U.S. vantage point, the location of the Japanese islands is on the opposite side of the Pacific Ocean from mainland America. It takes over a dozen hours flying and about two weeks for a ship at a speed of 15 knots to travel from the U.S. mainland to the archipelago. As long as the U.S. secures the forward deployment of U.S. forces on the Japanese islands, which even hosts a home port for a USN Carrier Strike Group, it can drastically reduce the cost and time for the deployment of forces. The aircraft carrier’s home port in Japan enables the U.S. Navy to facilitate operations from the western Pacific to the Indian Ocean. According to a testimony by the commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, the port is worth as much as one aircraft carrier. As viewed from the centre of the island of Okinawa, on which the main force of U.S. Marine Corps are based, Sakhalin and the Siberian Pacific Ocean coastline lie north, and the South China Sea and a large part of Indochina lie south, both within a 2,000 nautical mile radius. Thus, a number of major cities in the Asia-Pacific region are in range: Vladivostok, the Korean peninsula, Hainan Island and the Philippines all are situated within 2,000 kilometres from Okinawa. It takes twelve days to sail from Okinawa to the centre of the Indian Ocean, 14 days to the U.S. base on Diego Garcia, and 16 days to the Hormuz Strait. However, it takes U.S. forces based in the continental United States 14 extra days to transit to each location. After the end of the Cold War Okinawa became the frontline American base in the region.

Annually, U.S. forces conduct a significant number of combined military exercises with allies and friendly countries. In most cases, supplies that U.S. forces use in military exercises with Southeast Asian countries are shipped from Sagamihara, Sasebo and Okinawa in Japan. And much of the materiel originally transported from the U.S. homeland is transhipped through ports and facilities in Japan.
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U.S. Bases in Japan

The Japanese islands have thus been geo-strategically vital in regard to U.S. strategy and defence requirements. There are 135 institutions and areas set aside for USFJ in Japan. USFJ accounts for 2.5 per cent of 5,458 bases and institutions globally for U.S. forces. The number of major overseas U.S. bases has been stated as numbering 28. According to a military commentator, Kensuke Ebata, if Misawa, Yokota, Camp Zama, Atsugi, Yokosuka, Iwakuni, Sasebo, Camp Courtney, Zukeran Camp Foster, Futenma and Kadena are regarded as “major” bases, then fully 39 per cent of all American major bases are located in Japan. The United States has classified overseas bases into six categories: Power Projection Hub (PPH); Joint Main Operating Base (JMOB); Joint Forward Operating Site (JFOS); Joint Cooperative Security Location (JCSL); Joint Preposition Site (JPPS); and En Route Infrastructure (ETS). USFJ’s main bases are graded as the highest category: Power Projection Hub.

USFJ has three primary roles: to be a deterrent power to secure the safety of Japan and Asia based on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty; to deter aggressive action by the region’s land powers, Russia, China and North Korea; and to maintain staging bases and deployment capability to cope with emergency situations in the Middle East. Even after the end of the Cold War, a large number of U.S. forces have been deployed to Japan. USFJ is composed of 2,751 army personnel, 19,461 marines, 5,836 naval and 13,943 air force personnel.
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USFJ headquarters is at Yokota Air Base, about 30 kilometres west of central Tokyo. In addition, separately, the U.S. 7th Fleet numbers 12,000 personnel. The site area of Kadena Air Base is 1,996 hectares and there are two broad 3,700 metre landing fields. Kadena is regarded as a Main Operating Base (MOB) because it is located near the Korean peninsula and the Taiwan Strait, and can be used as a launch base toward the South China Sea. MEF-3 in Okinawa is the only Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) placed overseas of three American MEFs. It accounts for 60 per cent of 27,000 American personnel in Okinawa. Only MEF-3 can be deployed to Asia within
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The command centre of “I Corps” (First Corps) was moved to Camp Zama in 2007. In the future, USFK army forces in South Korea will become a subsidiary of the headquarters.

Since the end of the Second World War, America has engaged in a number of wars and conflicts. U.S. armed forces have been highly dependent on its military bases in Japan in the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the Afghanistan War and the Iraq War. Without the presence of its forces in the Japanese archipelago, the United States would have been unable to support high intensity campaigns and strikes against strategic targets. During the Vietnam War, American bases in Japan directly linked to the battleground. Above all, Okinawa is stocked with a huge stockpile of weapons and acts as a central information and operating base. It has been noted that when U.S. forces used up munitions during the Gulf War, the Kadena Ammunition Storage Area also emptied: without Kadena Air Base, such sustained air operations could not have been prosecuted. Though the Japanese government contributed $12 billion during the Gulf War, it did not directly contribute to combat operations. On the other hand, as a power projection platform host to U.S. forces, it did make an indirect strategic contribution. Eighty per cent of the fuel and ammunition used by U.S. forces during the war was transported from Japan. Moreover, the U.S. Navy and Marine participants in the war were under the command of the Japan-based USS Blue Ridge. The 7th Fleet and USFJ played a central role in the Gulf War.

The naval headquarters is Fleet Activities Yokosuka, Kanagawa Prefecture. There are many facilities and areas such as Fleet Activities Yokosuka, Fleet Activities Sasebo, and the White Beach Naval Facility on Okinawa, Naval Air Facility Atsugi, Naval Air Facility Misawa, and Naval Air Facility Kadena, under control of the U.S. Navy (see Map 2 above). The 7th Fleet is under the direct command of U.S. Pacific Fleet, not USFJ; however, naval bases in Japan are practically home ports for the 7th Fleet. The flagship USS Blue Ridge and the nuclear powered aircraft carrier George Washington are home ported in Yokosuka. Yokosuka is the only base that possesses a dock large
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enough to host a full-sized aircraft carrier between Hawaii and the eastern shore of Africa. In fact, Commander, Fleet Activities Yokosuka (COMFLEACT) can provide whatever the U.S. Navy needs, except atomic reactors. This facility, in which IJN battle ships were built, has the capability to repair any American naval vessels, including aircraft carriers, and Japanese technicians have the skill to maintain the condition of the vessels. Atsugi air station located near Yokosuka is used to maintain the skills required for carrier deck takeoffs and landings. As a result of the closing of Subic Bay Naval Base in the Philippines in 1993, the functions of the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center (FISC) were also transferred to Yokosuka. FISC Yokosuka is the largest FISC in regard to management dollars expended amongst eight that the U.S. Navy possesses. It involves 16 storage plants, two refrigeration stores and 125 fuel storage tanks.

According to a military commentator, Kazuhisa Ogawa, Japan is an enormous fuel-storage depot for the U.S. Navy. There are 5.7 million barrels stored at Tsurumi, Kanagawa, 5.3 million barrels at Sasebo, Nagasaki, 0.07 million barrels at Hachinohe, Aomori, totalling 11.07 million barrels across Japan. Of such facilities under the jurisdiction of the Pentagon, including within the United States itself, the capacity of Tsurumi is the second largest and that of Sasebo is the third. Such large amounts of fuel enable the 7th Fleet to carry out tactical operations for half a year; in the case of the JMSDF, for two years. Indeed, Japan represents the U.S. Navy’s greatest oil terminal. Moreover, in addition, there are huge U.S. Army ammunition storage areas in Japan. There are three ammunition stores in Hiroshima, Akituki (Edajima), Kawakami (Higashi Hiroshima) and Hiro (Kure). The total storage capacity of these facilities is 119,000 tons. This is more than the total amount of the JSDF: 115,000 tons. USFJ army personnel number less than 2,000, composed of special forces and units for management of facilities and military intelligence. Hiroshima’s storage facility is not used only by the army, but also by the navy, marine corps, and air force. In general, such munitions are intended for use overseas, not by USFJ army personnel themselves. Furthermore, Sasebo hosts the greatest ammunition storage facility for the U.S. Navy
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and Marines in the entire area of the 7th Fleet’s sphere of activity, which stretches from Hawaii to Cape Town, a much larger area than that previously served by the Subic facility. In addition, Kadena is also a huge storage facility for the air force, defended by the largest ammunition maintenance command in the U.S. Air Force.294

The Japanese archipelago has also had a great significance as an “unsinkable intelligence-gathering vessel” for the United States.295 Japan’s location is a great place to undertake information gathering activities targeted at governments and regions regarded as destabilizing factors by the United States, such as China, Russia and North Korea. Signals intelligence (SIGINT) and electronic intelligence (ELINT) gathering based on ships and airplanes from the islands in the Far East can closely observe targets for acquisition of information.296 In Misawa, there is “the elephant cage,” the wullenweber, a type of Circularly Disposed Antenna Array (CDAA). This type of antenna, officially designated AN/FLR-9, has been placed in Great Britain, Alaska, Germany, Italy, and Japan. As the only one of the type in the western Pacific, Misawa’s elephant cage seems to be predictably effective against China.297 Its diameter is 440 metres, the world’s largest such class of antenna array. At Sobe, Okinawa, there is a smaller elephant cage, 200 metres in diameter. These huge facilities are directly linked with the National Security Agency (NSA) and seem to play a role in ECHELON, the global eavesdropping system involving Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States, known as AUSCANZUKUS.298

Anti-U.S. Base Movement in Okinawa and Relocation Plan

In 1995, a young Japanese girl in Okinawa was raped by two U.S. Marines and a U.S. sailor. This incident triggered a strong anti-U.S. base movement in Okinawa. In the following year, the two governments agreed to the return of Futenma Air Base within five to seven years.299 Since then, the issue of where to relocate the U.S. Marine Corps Futenma Air Station in Okinawa Prefecture become complicated. In 2006, Tokyo and Washington agreed on the realignment of the U.S. forces in Japan, including the
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relocation of Futenma facilities. However, after the Democratic Party of Japan took the reins of the government from the Liberal Democratic Party, Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama intended to conduct a review of the relocation plan.\textsuperscript{300} His decision upset relations between the two countries. A 2006 agreement to relocate U.S. forces in Okinawa includes a plan to transfer some 8,000 Marines and 9,000 of their dependents from their current base in Okinawa to Guam by 2014. The Japanese government agreed to pay about 60 per cent of the total estimated cost of US$10.3 billion.\textsuperscript{301} However, Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada stated, if the plan to relocate the Marine’s Futenma Air Base is unsuccessful, the transfer plan would be affected.\textsuperscript{302}

On the other hand, on 17 February 2010, Lt General Keith Stadler, the commander of the U.S. Marine Corps of the Pacific, said in Tokyo, “I want to make this clear — all of the marines standing in this room, all of my marines on Okinawa are willing to die if necessary for the security of Japan … That is our role in the alliance. Japan does not have a reciprocal obligation to defend the United States, but it absolutely must provide the bases and training that U.S. forces need.”\textsuperscript{303} Stadler emphasized the deterrence power of the Marines: “Foreign governments are watching to see whether the United States-Japan alliance is strong enough to find a solution to the current issues again and ensure that the awesome deterring power of the U.S. Marine Corps remains based on Okinawa for decades to come”.\textsuperscript{304} He also stated that Okinawa was located at the centre of an earthquake and cyclone region, hence U.S. bases were also significant for disaster relief missions.\textsuperscript{305}

\textit{Still Unequal}

To summarize, the whole Japanese archipelago has been treated as an essential strategic base in order to secure and preserve U.S. leadership throughout the Asia-Pacific region.\textsuperscript{306} Auer and Lim state:
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The United States has obligations to protect the maritime security of Japan, the world’s second-largest economy. That is a matter of great convenience to both parties, as well as to the wider region, since the U.S.-Japan security treaty provides Japan with maritime protection in ways that do not disturb Japan’s neighbours. Freedom of the sea is also an essential interest of the United States in its strategic capacity as the global off shore balancer.\textsuperscript{307}

Meanwhile, the JMSDF has grown as an advanced maritime force as a result of America’s devoted cooperation originally focused on an alliance-based maritime strategy to counter the Soviet navy. The JMSDF’s existential presupposition has thus been combined operations with the U.S. Navy. Even after the end of the Cold War, this condition has remained unchanged. Japan still lacks the capability to defend itself effectively, but the United States can fulfil that role. Japan does not have the capability to conduct and successfully conclude a significant war by itself.

Some Japanese think the Japanese islands are geo-strategically significant for American national strategy; hence it is an alliance of equals. However, at the current time Japan cannot revise Article 9 or properly remilitarize in order to be able to effectively defend itself, and so depends on the alliance with the United States for its peace and prosperity. The United States on the other hand needs the alliance with Japan for its global influence as an offshore balancer: even without the alliance Washington would not face life or death consequences for its own national security. There is a huge difference between each sense of the dependence on the alliance. It is not a fifty-fifty partnership. While it is true that Americans initially forced the abnormally constraining constitution on Japan after World War II, it is also a fact that the majority of Japanese remain strongly attached to the pacifism of Article 9: thus the constitutional amendment process is unusually troublesome.

The Navy-to-Navy Friendship as the Core of the Maritime Alliance
The U.S.–Japan alliance therefore focuses on mutual national interests, taking into consideration their respective standpoints as maritime states. Relations are based on their navies and the navy-to-navy relations that can be built by the trust of each

individual sailor. In fact, the original friendships have made innumerable contributions to the stability and preservation of the maritime alliance.

As the Master and the Apprentice

Although the U.S. Navy had been terribly damaged by Japan’s surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and then repeatedly engaged in fierce naval battles, it was sympathetic toward the former foe right after the end of the war. Compared to the U.S. Army, which conducted an occupation policy to remove the “evil” elements of Japanese political society, the U.S. Navy was much less vengeful. This posture became even more conspicuous with time.\(^{308}\) Additionally, both navies realized just after the Second World War that they had commonalities that they had learned from the Royal Navy and they came to respect each other through exchanges and naval cooperation-building in the post-War era.\(^{309}\) The original form of the executive training system was descended from the IJN; however, the JMSDF made some reference to the U.S. Navy’s education course. In March 1955, the JMSDF’s educational concepts were declared at the enrolment ceremony of the senior staff college that opened in September 1954. One was to follow the U.S. and the Royal Navy, and catch up with and overtake them. Another was to keep assistance from the U.S. Navy in various fields in mind and to maintain close liaison with the U.S. Navy as much as possible in order to focus on increasing its training efficiency in the future.\(^{310}\) The U.S. Navy took the JMSDF by the hand and taught it step-by-step, and Japanese were fast enough learners to surprise their American trainers.\(^{311}\)

Arleigh Burke

Well-known as the symbol of the friendship between the two navies, Admiral Arleigh Burke, called “the father of the JMSDF”, is held in high esteem as the benefactor of the JMSDF. Burke had experienced intense naval battles against the IJN during the war and used to be famously anti-Japanese until he first arrived in Japan, but he warmed to the Japanese people once he became acquainted with Vice-Admiral Jinichi Kusaka, who
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fought against Burke as the commander in the Solomon Sea. Above all, the encounter with Admiral Nomura had a great impact on him. Just after the Korean War broke out, Burke asked his Naval Academy classmate to introduce a teacher to learn about Japan. After Nomura had taught Japan’s history and its relationships with China and Korea since October 1950, ultimately Burke came to consider Japan and Japanese people in a favourable light.

Burke applied himself to the goal of arming the JMSDF and even sometimes overcame opposition to this alliance objective. Before Japan became the first buyer of the Aegis system that the JMSDF longed to possess, Burke acted as an intermediary again for the JMSDF in the early 1980s. Later, JMSDF personnel went to the United States to undergo training programmes for the Aegis system. After he passed away, in accordance with his will, although Burke received many decorations from numerous countries, only the Japanese decoration from the Japanese emperor, “Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun,” was displayed on his military uniform covering his body. The story is of symbolic significance in reflection of the close friendship between the JMSDF and the U.S. Navy.

As a Friend
Even after the end of the Cold War, naval drills with the U.S. Navy make a significant contribution to mutual security, because Beijing has been enhancing its naval power to confront the U.S. 7th Fleet. Since the establishment of the JMSDF, the Japanese government has taken over, borrowed and bought naval ships from the United States, it has been trained by and with the U.S. Navy and American officials concerned have praised the high level of JMSDF capability and skill. Although the JMSDF has surely observed some traditions of the IJN, it is also true that the Japanese navy partakes of the body and blood of the American navy. The JMSDF is so connected to the maritime forces of its U.S. counterpart, that it is in effect not really a self-contained and independent organization at all.
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In the post-Cold War period, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, following the honeymoon period between the two countries during the Reagan-Nakasone relationship, U.S.-Japan relations became obviously strained because of economic and trade issues. In the first Clinton presidential term, the U.S.-Japan relationship fell into its worst shape. Above all, it was damaged badly by the Office of the United States Trade Representative’s tactics of pressing Japan to buy U.S. products with a focus on achieving particular numerical goals. Meanwhile, people in charge of security affairs in both states shared a common sense of crisis about the situation. Ultimately, such people were able to save the day for the alliance due to the relation of trust between the Pentagon and the JSDF built by the large number of combined exercises.316

Even though the main potential enemy changed from Russia to China, the alliance and relations between the two navies remained strong. In March 2004, The Bush administration made its position clear on the dispute over the territorial dispute with China over the Senkakus.317 U.S. official deputy spokesman, expressed that the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty applied to all territories under the jurisdiction of the Japanese government, including the Senkaku archipelago. This statement meant that the United States had changed its publicly announced policy on this dispute from that of the Clinton administration, which took an equivocal attitude.318 In addition, in January 2005, the JGSDF sent 125 personnel based in Nagasaki Prefecture to San Diego, California, to participate in an island defence combined exercise with the U.S. Marine Corps on the assumption of a possibility that China might invade the Senkaku islands.319 Furthermore, in November 2006, the JMSDF and the U.S. Navy conducted a military exercise to simulate an operation to regain a chain of islands in the East China Sea.320 Approximately 90 JMSDF ships and 170 aircraft and more than ten U.S. vessels, including the carrier Kitty Hawk, joined this politically significant drill.321
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It is notable that many pro-Japan Americans who make exertions to improve U.S-Japan relations are from the navy or have naval backgrounds, such as James E. Auer and Richard L. Armitage. Naturally, armed forces that assume the role of national defence are vital organizations, even though many Japanese cannot understand it, or quite the contrary, reject the value of military forces. If maritime forces from states that strongly rely on seapower are able to deepen the bilateral bond between their own countries through their cooperation, as matter of course their relations and alliance based on such forces are more likely to be solid and dependable. Such is the nature of the maritime alliance.

**Conclusion**

In spite of the above observation, it is hard to argue that Japan has taken full advantage of seapower throughout its history, despite the fact that it has had to live together with the sea as an island country and was aggressive with an expanding navy during its era of colonial expansion. Yet American-led allied powers destroyed the Japanese Empire after it got too involved with the Eurasian continent. After Japan was defeated, the Japanese people lost the traditional spirit that did not fear death. On the contrary, the Japanese became people who place life above anything else and pacifists who cannot even conceive of a state of war, because of the backlash from its experiences of the Pacific War and a result of the victorious nations’ post-War policies towards the occupied Japanese nation. This confirmed mentality has been a heavy drag on Japan’s seapower and maritime strategy, which requires quick responses in diplomacy. Japanese thus needed a sense of balance on security and military matters, not something extreme. It therefore concluded its alliance with the United States, choosing to live as a maritime state under the umbrella of U.S. naval mastery. After the Second World War, during the Korean conflict and the Vietnam War, the United States was preoccupied in East Asia to contain the Soviet Union and communism. Fortunately, Japan was geographically situated to hold the trump card, allowing the recovery of the economy as a result; with the U.S. quickly providing assistance to its former adversary in order to bolster its own global Cold War defences.
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Whilst the U.S. Navy crushed the IJN, it was also instrumental in establishing the JMSDF after the war. As a genuine maritime state in terms of geography, Japan needs an autonomous naval force but still the Japanese lack the will to change the inflexible security policy of the post-War era, symbolized by the certain legal restriction of Article 9 of the constitution. In practice, the JMSDF was originally created based on the premise of combined operations with U.S. forces. Unless the situation changes, Japan undoubtedly cannot live without its maritime alliance with the United States based on close navy-to-navy relations between the JMSDF and the U.S. Navy. Japan and the JSDF heavily count on the offensive capabilities of the United States to maintain the balance of power in East Asia due to the constraints on its own force development under Article 9. Even though the bond of friendship between the two navies is the root of the enduring alliance, it is nevertheless hard to provide the JMSDF with an opportunity to be active on the international stage due to these limitations based on prevailing interpretations of the constitution.

At any rate, as long as the U.S. maintains its global power projection capability as the offshore balancer, and does not hesitate to commit forces to the World Island, Japan faces no choice but to maintain the close alliance for its continued survival and prosperity as a genuinely isolated country, geographically and culturally. In practice, it is essential for maritime states to have such close alliances because seapower networks cannot be maintained without strongly interdependent relations among the networked maritime states. Above all, collaborative relations with the greatest maritime state are priceless in a wide range of fields related to seapower. However, although the Japanese islands are essential geo-strategic bases for U.S. global strategy focusing on sea control and power projection capabilities throughout the Asia-Pacific region and potential confrontation with Eurasian continental powers, it remains something of a “unilateral” alliance, whereby a Japan that is unable or unwilling to exercise the right of the collective self-defence in a crisis might lead the alliance to collapse, taking the reality of international politics into account. The issue could ultimately be deadly to a sea-girt Japan faced with a number of actual or potential threats from continental Eurasia and to its vital sea lanes.
CHAPTER 6
Japan and Maritime Coalition Building in the Asia-Pacific Region

Introduction
This chapter describes Japan’s maritime coalition-building activities conducted in the Asia-Pacific region as a response to a variety of often disparate threats described in Chapters 3 and 4. As already established, these range from low-level non-traditional security concerns with general good order at sea and to the types of unconventional threats to global supply chains posed by pirates and terrorist groups, as identified in Chapter 4, through to hedging against strategic pressures from state-based competitors driven by territorial or other maritime disputes and even the seaward expansion of would-be continental great power hegemons, as outlined in Chapter 3.

The process of maritime coalition building undertaken by Japan follows something of a hedging pattern: the relationships being forged are relevant to most, or even the entire, spectrum of threats and challenges faced by Tokyo. These coalition relationships thus often are equally valuable in dealing with the less strategically dangerous good order at sea issues through the “collective navies” type of approach, yet may also have utility as ways of building deeper security relationships with states with similar strategic interests at sea in guarding against the emergence of an aggressive continental challenger to geopolitical order, including on the oceans. In this latter sense, the relationships being developed with the likes of Australia and India, outlined below, may be viewed as building blocks towards strengthening Japan’s strategic position and adding further layers of security relationship around the core of the deep alliance partnership with Washington described in the previous chapter.

The discussion that follows thus outlines the following aspects of Japan’s coalition-building and alignment-strengthening activity: the developing maritime quasi-alignment with Australia, a valued friendly country for both Japan and the United States; the other developing quasi-alignment with India, which has a strong influence on the Indian Ocean as the world’s maritime highway; the deepening engagement with the Rim of the Pacific Exercise (RIMPAC) as a traditional naval coalition activity amidst ongoing
globalization; participation in the Proliferation Security Initiative “coalition of the willing” for countering proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD); Japan’s regional initiatives against piracy; and participation in the multinational naval coalition against Somali pirates.

The Quasi-Alignment with Australia

Australia and Japan share a number of similar values and strategic interests. Geographically, Australia is located in the southern hemisphere opposite Japan. Being alliance partners of the dominant maritime power, both countries can potentially derive mutual benefits from closer maritime strategic cooperation.

Australia: the Alliance-dependent Maritime State

Australia and the Asia-Pacific Region

Australia is the only nation that occupies a whole continent and its remote location lies far from the current main theatres of war and potential major armed conflict. It is not easy for adversaries to dispatch an expedition to Australia given the maritime characteristic of its security environment.¹ Australia, as an island continent, needs guaranteed access to efficient shipping to secure its survival and prosperity. However, there are some scholars who question calling it a maritime state in terms of its national character, arguing instead that “Australians are a coastal people with a continental outlook, an island-nation with an inward focus.”² In the past, such a perspective set up a confrontation in Australian military thinking between continentalists who valued a defence policy and strategy focused on physical defence of the territory of the continent itself and its immediate maritime approaches, and navalists and maritime strategists who valued a maritime-focused defence.³ In recent years, however, the Australian government has seemed to well analyse and understand the security environment since

¹ Robyn Lim, “Australia’s Stake in Asia Pacific Regional Security,” in Peter King and Yoichi Kibata, eds., Peace Building in the Asia Pacific Region: Perspectives from Japan and Australia, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1996, p. 76, and see also, the Prime Minister of Australia The Hon. Kevin Rudd MP, The First National Security Statement to the Australian Parliament, 4 December 2008.
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the end of the Cold War and “know themselves,” namely, its status as a “medium sea power” and what that means for its overall defence posture and force structure development. Australia’s 2009 Defence White Paper solidifies the trend towards a more capable, mobile, naval and maritime-capable defence force.⁴

In *Australia’s Maritime Doctrine*, the importance of the security and stability of the Asia Pacific have been emphasised for Australia’s national interests, considering that major powers such as the United States, China and Japan have been regarded as the key players which have strongly influenced the regional arena. Also, the security and stability of maritime Southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific have been considered direct factors relevant to Australia’s security interests. Above all, relations with adjacent countries, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, are deemed to be permanent factors that are crucial matters for ensuring the security and stability of Australia’s strategic environment.⁵ In maritime Asia-Pacific, in terms of security, Australia strategically understands that some points should be carefully handled: avoidance of unnecessarily stimulating strategic rivalry between the United States, China and Japan; prevention of the emergence of any dominant actor that threatens Australian strategic interests; maintenance of a benign environment in Southeast Asia, mainly in the maritime arena; prevention of the presence of extra-regional military forces that might hamper the pursuit of Australia’s strategic interests; and prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.⁶ Also, the 2009 Defence White Paper develops a perspective on the regional strategic environment similar to those mentioned above and emphasizes the threat of non-state actors, the rise of India, and implicitly pinpoints the role of China’s strategic development as a primary risk factor for overall regional stability.⁷

---


⁶ Ibid., pp. 31-32.

Australia and the Alliance

In view of Australia’s geopolitical environment, including its vast territory and dependence on the maritime network for economic prosperity, security, and defence, the government must attentively cope with the allocation of its limited population and demography for defence. Moreover, it seems obviously difficult for Australia alone to maintain all aspects of military technological capabilities and developments.\(^8\) Australia has been under the formal protection of the super state, the United States, since the signing of the ANZUS Treaty of 1952. In the 1980s, Australian defence policy put an emphasis on “self-reliance” and reduced dependence on great powers for national defence, but it was insufficient to match the scale or variety of actual or potential threats and challenges faced by Australia to its national security interests.\(^9\)

A medium power such as Australia needs effective cooperation with other countries for the sake of reasonably obtaining sufficient technology, manufacturing and logistic support, without the excessive exhaustion of national strength, in order to secure enough national strategic capability in case of war.\(^10\) It is difficult to imagine Australia dominating a significant opponent alone as a military power either in wartime or in peacetime. As a consequence, the stability of its security environment and the pursuit and maintenance of national interests depends on finely honed teamwork with allies and friends. The Australian government shows no compromise on its principle of contributions to coalition operations by the Australian Defence Force (ADF) on issues or conflicts involving national interests. Actually, the Australian government repeatedly emphasises the significance of relations with the United States as a super power: “The United States will remain the dominant global economic, technological and military power at least for some decades … Through its military presence in the region and its bilateral and alliance relationships with key players.”\(^11\) The ADF, without access to U.S. capabilities, technology, and training, simply could not be the advanced force that it is today, and must be in the future, without the expenditure of considerably more money.\(^12\)

\(^8\) *Australian Maritime Doctrine*, p. 33.
\(^10\) *Australian Maritime Doctrine*, p. 33.
\(^12\) *Defence White Paper 2009: Defending Australia in the Asia Pacific Century*, pp. 93-94.
Also, in terms of the maritime aspect, the Australian government emphasizes the greatness of U.S. seapower and the alliance with the United States.

**Australia-Japan Strategic Partnership as Part of the U.S. Maritime Alliance Network**

*The History of Australia-Japan Relations*

Australia’s concern over the rise of Japan as a military power started after the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). As might be expected, the emergence of Japan as the victor in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) further aggravated Australia’s concerns with respect to Japan. During World War I, the Imperial Japanese Navy (IJN) assigned the battlecruiser *Ibuki* to the Indian Ocean to search for German naval vessels. The ship, at the request of its British ally, then escorted Australian and New Zealand troops heading to reinforce the war effort in Europe as far as the Suez Canal. In World War II, however, Japan and Australia were on opposing sides. Australian memories of Japanese air raids on Darwin in the northern part of Australia, the Japanese midget submarine attack on Sydney Harbour, Japanese treatment of prisoners and the Battle of Rabaul, in particular, are still remembered, especially in Australian public consciousness.

After the Second World War, while Australia was wary of China and Indonesia, Japan gradually emerged as a friendly power. Each became important pillars of the U.S. anti-Soviet and anti-Communist alliance system in the Pacific. Although erasing war memories may be difficult for Australia, especially for the older generation of Australians, its relationship with Japan is currently becoming closer and more mature at the strategic level than at any time since it was forged during beginnings of the San Francisco alliance system in 1952, despite lower level diplomatic frictions over issues such as whaling and conservation of tuna stocks. The same is true of the economic relations between the two countries. In the 1960s, Japan concluded a long-term contract for importing raw materials from Australia. After Australia became estranged from Britain in terms of the economic relationship once Britain joined the European Economic Community in 1973, Australia placed greater emphasis on further improving

---


14 See, ibid., pp. 59-65.
relations with Japan.\textsuperscript{15} In 1976, the Basic Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between Australia and Japan was concluded.

In July 1996, the United States attempted to invigorate the alliance with its “closest ally,” Australia. The purpose of the United States was not only for the reinforcement of its alliances with Japan and Australia, but also due to its desire to enable a revolution in military affairs (RMA) and its programme of defence “transformation”. Since 1996, the strengthening of Japan-Australia relations was encouraged. Indeed, their dialogue on security was raised to a higher level of conference.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1997, the Japan-Australia Partnership Agenda was formally adopted, a concrete achievement of the cooperation process. Among the items listed in the Agenda included expansion of exchanges between the Japan Self-Defense Force (JSDF) and the Australian Defence Force, and Australia’s expression of strong support for Japan's permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council. In April 2001, the Australia-Japan Conference for the 21st Century was held in Sydney. The “Sydney Declaration for Australia-Japan Creative Partnership” reconfirming the significance of the reinforcement of strategic and political relations was announced at the Conference.\textsuperscript{17} Their connection thus began to develop into an indirect coalition through close mutual alliance security ties with the United States.

The U.S.-Japan-Australia relationship has been shaped by cooperation in the war against terrorism and the Indian Ocean tsunami relief operations in 2004. There was ground breaking security cooperation between Japan and Australia in Iraq. The Australian government sent hundreds of troops in order to protect members of the JSDF deployed in Iraq involved in reconstruction efforts in the city of Samawah, because of the limitation imposed upon the JSDF’s activities by Article 9 of the Japanese


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
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Australia’s decision to dispatch troops to Iraq to protect Japanese military engineers did not just assist in the rebuilding of Iraq, but probably more significantly, also served to build a much stronger relationship between Australia and Japan. Eventually, in a March 2007 meeting in Tokyo, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Australian Prime Minister John Howard signed an agreement to reinforce security cooperation. This is a milestone for Japan, being the first defence pact of any kind other than the U.S. alliance. The agreement with Australia established an annual meeting among the defence and foreign ministers of the two states. As is general knowledge, there was a close relationship between Japan and the United States, on the basis of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty; while the United States and Australia have the ANZUS Treaty. The prime ministers of Japan and Australia declared that “the strategic partnership between Japan and Australia is based on democratic values, a commitment to human rights, freedom and the rule of law, as well as shared security interests.” After the joint declaration the first Japan-Australia Joint Foreign and Defense Ministerial (“two-plus-two”) Meeting was held in Tokyo in June 2007, when the Japanese and Australian foreign and defence ministers reaffirmed their cooperation with the United States and for regional security. The meeting especially focused on North Korea’s nuclear and missile programmes and North Korea’s abductions of Japanese citizens; the significance of close cooperation to press China to contribute to the stability of the international system and promote disclosure of information on the reinforcement of its military strength; and on continuing work to address urgent international security challenges such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and North Korea.

Shared Values

There exist reasons, advantages and links relevant to account for the close ties between Australia and Japan, with the U.S. connection constituting the core. Most importantly,
Japan and Australia are both maritime-dependent countries that have placed relations with the greatest sea power, the United States, at the centre of their national strategies. Taking into consideration the fact that Japan and Australia both rely to a high degree on the sea, there is no doubt that maintaining close relations with the United States, which continues to impart a strong influence on the world’s oceans on the basis of overwhelming maritime power, is a crucial factor in their respective national strategic thinking. Indeed, they have been essential partners for the United States in the security framework in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan and Australia have been referred to as the northern and southern anchors of the free world, at least in the western Pacific. In addition to being highly sea dependent and part of a maritime-based American alliance network, they are also both democratic states which respect Western political values. It has been said that war seldom breaks out between mature democracies. Accordingly, the establishment of sophisticated democratic alliances seem to be an effective means by which to promote the maintenance of peace amongst their members.

Both Japan and Australia presently share a number of common interests brought by safely utilizing major choke points and SLOC guaranteed by the protection afforded by U.S. military power. Among major sea lanes in the Asia-Pacific region linked to Japan, the Oceania, South Pacific, and eastern Pacific regions are comparatively safer than others, because the influence of U.S. maritime power together with close allies such as Australia and Canada pervades the ocean space of these regions, and contributing to the overall security of sea lanes. In addition, Australia and Japan work together to enhance maritime border safety and counter-terrorism efforts, and to address disaster relief through international cooperation and security frameworks. Australia’s geographical location, a relatively short distance to Southeast Asia’s major straits and to

---

the South Pacific (compared to Japan), places where Japan also has important national interests, is strategically significant from a Japanese perspective.

In terms of technology, they both depend upon sophisticated military technology developed with and provided by the United States. Both states are also among the few countries in the Asia-Pacific region, perhaps the only ones, which can fully adjust to, or successfully develop, RMA-capable defence forces. These three nations possess highly capable, modern military forces, while many Asia-Pacific countries cannot afford such military-technological prowess in terms of both quality and quantity, and also lack the technical expertise or sophistication even to contemplate such modern capabilities. In a region dominated by the seas, composed largely of such maritime geographical features as vast sea areas and a large number of islands, the three maritime states are increasingly willing and able to work together as team for the safety and security of the region as a whole. For example, they conducted prompt international relief operations after the Asian Tsunami at the end of 2004.

Additionally, North Korea’s nuclear and missile strategies are common threats for both Japan and Australia. The diplomatic attitude of the former liberal regime of President Roh in South Korea, which tended to distance itself from the United States and Japan, seems to be one of the reasons that led Washington, Tokyo, and Canberra to form their trilateral security arrangement. Other common concerns that probably prompted the formalization of trilateral talks into the Trilateral Security Dialogue were uncertainty over China’s strategic path, WMD proliferation and maritime security. The potential threat of the use of ballistic missiles in a range of different scenarios, but particularly linked to North Korea, clearly was an important factor. With respect to this threat, Australia hosts shared military surveillance and intelligence gathering centres with the United States which, among other things, receive information from early warning satellites used for ballistic missile defence. Sharing significant information is one of the most important factors in maintaining close relations in an alliance and, through such centres Australia contributes to the U.S.-led project to establish operational missile

26 Lim, *Australia and Maritime Security*.
defence systems.28 Given the common concern, however, amongst all three states with North Korea’s missile and nuclear programmes, there surely exists the potential to deepen the trilateral relationship in the future to also involve missile defence cooperation.

Australia, however, has had some political reservations about the Trilateral Security Dialogue with respect to avoiding offending China. This created some difficulties when the possibility was raised of expanding the dialogue into a quadrilateral mechanism involving India as the fourth party. Australia, sensitive of China’s reaction, especially after taking part in multilateral naval exercises involving the four prospective parties, was quite clumsy in its undiplomatic rejection of the idea, potentially offending Japan and India instead.29 Nonetheless, the deeper naval and maritime security cooperation already set in train seems set to continue.

**Cooperation for the Pacific Islands**

Australia is geographically the key player in the context of strategic interests in the southwest Pacific, which Japan also regards as important for its own national interests. The Japanese government regards its relations with Pacific island states as significant for several reasons. Historically, the island states have tended to be pro-Japan and to support Japan in international organizations and forums. Because Japan was formerly the mandate power for Micronesia, there are a sizable number of Japanese descendants in those islands. This region is popular with Japanese tourists. In addition, about 80 per cent of the tuna and bonito consumed in Japan is caught in the exclusive economic zones of the Pacific island states, a huge area which in total is twice the size of China’s land territory. These waters include vital sea lanes for the maritime transport of natural resources from Australia to Japan. The security and stability of this region is important because of its pelagic fisheries and its SLOC role in marine transport. As a result of this significance for Japan, in 2008, Japan’s bilateral development aid to Pacific island nations reached a total of about US$70 million.30 In the fifth Pacific Islands Leaders
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28 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
Meeting, held in Hokkaido in 2009, the Japanese government announced that it will carry out an approximately 50 billion yen cooperation programme with the Pacific islands states over the next three years.\footnote{Ibid., p. 949.}

Also, for Australia, the southwest Pacific region is a neighbourhood whose stability and security are connected directly to its national interests; hence, relations with such island countries are vital matters for Canberra. As a consequence, Australia, together with New Zealand, makes considerable efforts to preserve friendly relations with the region, exercising initiatives to encourage peace, stability, development, and to exert Australian influence and promote other Western interests in the region.\footnote{Thomas Lum and Bruce Vaughn, \textit{The Southwest Pacific: U.S. Interests and China’s Growing Influence}, CRS Congress Report, 6 July 2007, p. 19.} In the southwest and central Pacific, the Australian government has attempted to build cooperative relations with, and capacity within, each island country, especially emphasizing the importance of maritime surveillance and enforcement for the national and economic security of all regional states. Australia has implemented this policy primarily by using the Pacific Patrol Boat project run by its Defence Cooperation Programme, whereby Australia built, and assists in the maintenance and training for, 22 patrol boats gifted to twelve island states for fisheries enforcement, as well as providing ongoing maritime surveillance support.\footnote{Chris Rahman, \textit{Naval Cooperation and Coalition Building in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific: Status and Prospects}, RAN Sea Power Centre and Centre for Maritime Policy Working Paper No. 7, Sea Power Centre, RAAF Fairbairn, Canberra, October 2001, pp. 44-48.}

In addition, Australia has placed considerable importance upon stability operations in the region, especially in the wake of 9/11, with a focus on the RAMSI mission in the Solomon Islands. Relations with its adjacent country, Papua New Guinea, which occupies about 80 per cent of the total land area of the southwest Pacific, is crucial for Australia’s national security. The Australian government cooperates with the Papua New Guinea government to promote law and order, enhance border security and improve economic management capacity.\footnote{Lum and Vaughn, \textit{The Southwest Pacific}, p. 20.}
In the Pacific Islands Forum summit held in Okinawa in 2006, the Japanese government emphasized the significance of relations with countries that are pro-Japan, which constitute important partners for the consolidation of Japan’s diplomatic power base in the international arena. The summit was attended by 14 countries and two districts, including Australia and New Zealand. The Japanese government set four areas of priority as its objectives to support the Pacific island nations based on the “Pacific Plan” adopted at the 2005 summit held in Papua New Guinea: namely “economic development”, “sustainable development”, “good governance” and “security”; and to these four areas was added “people to people communication and exchange” as Japan’s fifth priority.35

The Quasi-Alignment with India

The Indian Ocean is of great strategic importance, and in recent years has drawn unprecedented attention from the international community. As a consequence of this importance and growing maritime security concerns and regional naval developments, the Indian Ocean littoral’s leading power, India, aspires to be a major naval power to a greater extent than ever before. Japan, as a maritime state, has been watchful of the situation of the Indian Ocean as the world’s maritime highway in the context of the rise of India and China and its own SLOC security. Thus, developing a security partnership with India could be of enormous functional benefit for Japan for geo-strategic reasons.

The Indian Ocean and Indian Maritime Power

The Significance of the Indian Ocean in the International Arena

It is clear that the Indian Ocean maritime theatres of littoral South Asia, Southeast Asia, and southwest Asia and the Middle East, have emerged as vital strategic maritime choke points which cannot be ignored. Since the late fifteenth century, the great European seafaring powers, Portugal, the Dutch and the English (eventually the British), secured naval supremacy over the Indian Ocean. Seaborne trading between these European powers and their Indian colonies was strategically important for their status as naval

super powers. It has certainly been the case that Mahan’s theory of maritime strategy has been applied to the Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{36}

As established by the Indian analyst, Lawrence Prabhakar, the regional maritime dynamics of South Asia can be defined in terms of five factors. First, the geopolitical significance of the South Asia region has increased to encompass the whole of the Indian Ocean, as a zone of actual and potential conflict and resources. In addition, this region is located as a central geo-strategic position, control of which might allow the exertion of a strong strategic influence on Central Asia, continental China, and maritime Southeast Asia and the oceanic SLOC.\textsuperscript{37}

Second, its contiguity with the Indian Ocean and its sea lanes, which are paths used for an enormous amount of seaborne trade, make the region highly strategically significant.\textsuperscript{38} Its security environment is a matter of life and death not only for Asia-Pacific countries, but also for the whole of the global economy. The gross area of the Indian Ocean is 73.44 million square kilometres. The Indian Ocean region is comprised of 30 littoral states, eleven landlocked states and 1,286 islands, containing a third of the world’s population, and a quarter of its land mass. Indian Ocean region states possess three-fourths of world oil reserves, mostly controlled by just five Persian Gulf states. The region is also the location of 70 per cent of the world’s natural disasters.\textsuperscript{39}

In this region, the Indian subcontinent juts out into the ocean and the South Asian giant, India, holds an ever growing geo-strategic influence over the Indian Ocean. The waters of the Indian Ocean hosts the passage of almost half of the world’s seaborne trade.\textsuperscript{40} From a geo-strategic view, India is located between the regions of production and


\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
consumption, with the major oil suppliers, the Gulf Arab states, as the origin of the maritime traffic. Half of the world’s containerized cargo, one-third of its bulk cargo and two-thirds of its oil shipments transit the waters of the Indian Ocean. It has been posited that in the event that one major Indian port is closed for three months because of terrorist activities, US$5 billion would be lost in overseas trade.41

Third, there is wide-ranging littoral space around the Indian Ocean region that holds enormous promise for maritime access and basing.42 The location of India is able to bring strategic benefits to India. This geo-strategic advantage enables Indian forces to observe the widespread area from its Lakshwadeep Islands in the west to the Great Nicobar Island in the east, and to deploy Indian naval forces for long-range military operations.43 Small Indian archipelagos in the Andaman Sea, the Andaman and the Nicobar Islands, enable the Indian Navy to be able to block the Malacca Strait, if it ever wanted to. The Chagos archipelago, including the island of Diego Garcia, is home to the largest U.S. naval base outside of the United States, which includes a logistics hub and a strategic air base surrounded by the ocean area.44 In the northwestern part of the region, the Arabian Sea connects two of the world’s most significant choke points: the Strait of Hormuz, the only sea passage available to transport oil from the Persian Gulf; and the Red Sea, the route from Asia to Europe through the Suez Canal and contains the major oil port of Yanbu in Saudi Arabia.45

Fourth, intense competition in nuclear and missile deployments between India and Pakistan has increased the level of tension within this region and has brought the attention of extra-regional powers in a combination of both diplomatic and strategic intervention. The development of nuclear and missile strategies in this region have led extra-regional actors to develop and apply strategies to counter WMD proliferation and build missile defence capabilities.46

41 Ibid.
42 Prabhakar, “Regional Maritime Dynamics in Southern Asia in the 21st Century,” p. 82.
Fifth, extra-regional naval presence aims to pursue one or a combination of the following objectives: regional power projection capability, the securing of seabed resources, SLOC security, sea-based nuclear deterrence, or sea-based missile defence. The external powers which have shown significant interest in the Indian Ocean are the United States, France, Russia, Great Britain, China and Japan. These players understand that deploying considerable maritime power is essential to support and protect the benefit they derive from merchant shipping in the Indian Ocean region.

The Rise of India as a Maritime State

In recent years, as the strategic significance of India has been broadly acknowledged, controversy has arisen as to whether it is primarily a land power or a sea power state. In India’s history, aggressors have always invaded the country by force. Ever since the country gained independence from its suzerain in 1947, India has been fighting a land war in the north. In fact, the Indian government adjusts the departmental budgets to the end that its land force budget receives far more than what the navy and air force receive. Indeed, the Indian Army has a reserve force of about one million, making it the second largest land force after China’s approximately 1.1 million. In these years, however, the current Indian navy has increasingly captured the attention of the international community. India’s increasing naval budget shows that its strategic directions have changed to some extent to the ocean and the SLOC from concentrating almost solely on the territorial defence of its Himalayan borders. The Indian Navy now possesses about 150 ships, totaling 344,000 tons.

India is the only industrial nation and the overwhelming regional power in South Asia. India possesses nuclear weapons and medium-range ballistic missiles. It has been pursuing an ambitious space strategy focusing on the future. The Indian Navy is the only regional seagoing force in the Indian Ocean region with organic fixed-wing air
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47 Ibid., p. 83.
51 Defense of Japan 2009, p. 83.
power; and has operated carriers for decades. India is nine times larger than Japan in terms of land area and its population is the second largest in the world. The situations strongly linked to the maritime arena in the Asia-Pacific region radically elevate India’s international status and the significance of the Indian Navy. Unless they are strategic competitors, states which have stakes in the Indian Ocean by necessity are required to forge a better relationship with India and its maritime forces: as explained in earlier chapters, there is a strong interdependence character that shapes the international relations of seapower. The Indian Navy is aiming to become a blue water navy by establishing a Far Eastern Naval Command (FENC) based at Port Blair in the Andaman Islands, located between the Bay of Bengal and the Malacca Strait. FENC plans to have a chain of anchor stations and three main bases larger than the former U.S. base at Subic Bay in the Philippines. India has plans to expand its naval capability by increasing its number of major surface combatants from 39 to 46 by 2015.

India has been advancing its naval expansion plans by modernizing its conventional submarine force and developing nuclear powered submarines which may eventually carry part of New Delhi’s nuclear deterrent; buying and building new aircraft carriers; and several classes of missile-equipped surface combatants. There are two major reasons why India has been focusing on strengthening its navy. First, India shares maritime boundaries with Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, the Maldives and Sri Lanka. There are outstanding boundary issues with two of them, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Second, securing SLOC from the energy-rich Middle East to the energy hungry nations of East Asia is crucial as a naval mission. Compared to Japan, India is a rich country in terms of natural resources; however, India’s domestic natural resources and energy cannot meet domestic consumption. The alpine topography of the northern India borders makes India almost like an insular continental country which must heavily depend on the shipping routes for economic activity. Political friction with Pakistan also means that India’s SLOC with the Persian Gulf is potentially vulnerable to disruption by its neighbour. Ninety-seven per cent of India’s
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trade by volume and 70 per cent of its energy imports rely on marine transportation.\textsuperscript{59} Therefore, although the sea lane from the Middle East to India is becoming more significant, the SLOC is located to the south of Pakistan and has been a vulnerable point for India’s security.\textsuperscript{60}

\textit{India as a Counter Balance against China}

\textbf{Still the Long Time Competitor}

On the one hand, in recent years, relations between India and China have become closer due to their economic relations. In fact, the two Asian giants agreed a “strategic partnership” for peace and prosperity on 11 April 2005.\textsuperscript{61} In May 2006, a Memorandum of Understanding of Defence Cooperation was concluded by their respective defence ministers, and the Indian and Chinese navies conducted a low-level combined naval exercise at sea. There has also been exchange of high level military visits.\textsuperscript{62} On the other hand, there have been long-standing issues which continue to create tension between the two countries. China illicitly transferred nuclear technology to Pakistan, including the supply of reactor designs, weapon grade plutonium, 5,000 ring magnets and the Khusba reactor, which has helped to train hundreds of Pakistani nuclear engineers.\textsuperscript{63} An industrial furnace has been built to cast the bomb core. Furthermore, China consistently opposes the Indian bid for permanent membership of the U.N. Security Council.

Importantly, there has been the continuation of the long-pending issue of the territorial dispute between the two nations over Arunachal Pradesh.\textsuperscript{64} Relations between India and China might be improved in some respects, but still the fact of their competitive strategic relationship is undeniable. American security experts have steadily accepted the perception of the importance of a confident India as a U.S. strategic partner in the Indian Ocean region to act as a counterweight to the rise of Chinese regional hegemony. India can be anticipated to play a balancing role as a continental power against China.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{61} “India and China seal ‘strategic partnership,’” \textit{International Herald Tribune}, 12 April.
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid.
Both scenarios hold serious concerns about the rise of a China which has ambitions to increase its naval power projection capability and space power for military use, including an increased naval presence in the Indian Ocean. Geo-strategically, the location of the Indian subcontinent is significant for any maritime-based coalition that may wish to constrain Russia or China, two formidable continental powers.65

Building a navy creates huge costs, which make it difficult to also increase the land and air power of the state without substantial extra amounts being dedicated to the defence budget. But China’s naval expansion has almost reached the level whereby its capability is sufficient to exert its influence upon the Indian Ocean. For India, the gross naval power of the JMSDF and the U.S. Seventh Fleet compared with China’s maritime capability is effective for the stability of its security environment. Nevertheless, as a rising great power with its own ambitions for regional influence, India is unlikely to want to cede responsibility for its maritime security to foreign powers, even potential coalition partners. For China, close relations between India and Japan can be compared to placing it in a position between the devil and the deep blue sea: a strategic dilemma on at least two fronts.

Sino-India Stand off at Sea

India is concerned over an increasing Chinese naval presence because ports in Burma could threaten India’s naval position and operations around the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, as part of China’s “string of pearls” maritime strategy.66 A number of Indian naval experts and commentators expressed serious concern about the possibility of naval facilities and ports under development by China being capable of enabling the Chinese navy to achieve a sea denial capability against India.67 The growth of China’s trade volume with Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan has increased in pace and China has steadily developed relations with the four South Asian countries in various areas during the last decade.68 In order to deal with the maritime strategy of the great continental power, China, which is rapidly strengthening its naval power and engaging

66 See, for example “India bids to rule the waves”, Asia Times (online ed.).
67 Ibid.
Indian Ocean littoral and insular states to secure its SLOC, the Indian Navy has been aiming to become a genuine blue water navy. China’s forging ahead in the Indian Ocean is without doubt a serious problem for India.\(^6^9\)

Additionally, it is becoming more important for the rising two Asian giants, India and China, to extend their influence to the Malacca Strait for geo-strategic reasons. Currently, about 40 per cent of India’s maritime trade navigates through the Malacca Straits.\(^7^0\) The Indian government is keen to send its naval forces to ports in Southeast Asian countries as part of its naval diplomacy and conduct combined naval exercises with the navies of Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand.\(^7^1\) India is the longest-involved outside power in conducting activities around the Malacca Strait. The Indian and Singaporean navies operate naval anti-piracy drills annually. India has carried out combined exercises with Indonesia since 2004 and with Thailand in 2005. India has been forging closer ties with Singapore, Vietnam, Australia, Japan and the United States, and increasing its naval presence around the Andaman Sea.\(^7^2\) In fact, in recent years, India has vigorously pursued an omni-directional foreign policy through the use of its navy. In 2005 and 2007, the Indian naval task groups even deployed to the Far East and conducted naval drills with Japan, South Korea and Russia.\(^7^3\) In 2000 and 2007, the Indian Navy conducted combined exercises with the Vietnamese navy and with the navies of Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and the Philippines in 2007. Such naval diplomacy fuels Beijing’s suspicions “with respect to the implications of New Delhi’s ‘Look East’ policy, often described in anti-Chinese terms.”\(^7^4\)

### The Development of India-Japan Relations and Maritime Cooperation

There are a large number of common interests with which to promote friendly relations between India and Japan.\(^7^5\) Both remain on friendly terms with the United States at the moment, although the international situation of the Cold War jeopardized such relations.
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between India and the United States in the past. For Japan, so highly dependent on American seapower, this point is essential to its approach towards India. Furthermore, historically, cultural exchanges between India and Japan have been advanced since ancient times, such as the introduction of Buddhism from India. Even though India waged war against Japan during “the Greater East Asia War” as a part of the British Empire, India’s attitude towards Japan has been consistently magnanimous since the end of the war.

Both states can cooperate closely in mutual support in order to increase the number of permanent members of the U.N. Security Council; and seek the position, together with Brazil and Germany, as the Group of Four (G4). Japan is willing to support India’s civilian nuclear programme. Since 2003, India has been the biggest recipient of Japanese yen loans. In 2008, yen loans to India totalled 236 billion yen. Besides, a number of joint projects involving a vast amount of money, including construction of a railway and road network between New Delhi and Mumbai, are in the planning stage. In addition, both are democracies and possess highly advanced judicial systems.

For Japan, the importance of relations with India has rapidly increased in all aspects: for diplomatic, economic, and security reasons. As mentioned above, geo-strategically, the location of the Indian subcontinent is important for their mutual strategic relationship with respect to China. Both hold serious concerns about the rise of China, particularly its naval ambitions, and both are able to join hands in pressing ahead with the threats to maritime security. Securing sea lanes in the Indian Ocean as an essential leg of the world’s most vital maritime expressway is extremely important for Japan. This sea lane lies well outside of the 1983 concept of 1,000 nautical mile sea lane defence. In earlier times, Japan had agreed within the context of its alliance to take responsibility to secure sea lanes within the area of 1,000 miles from the Japanese archipelago. Beyond 1,000 nautical miles, Japan relied on U.S. seapower and the efforts of other American allies.
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During the Cold War, there was a perception of cool relations between India and Japan, but steadily the two countries have opened up new opportunities for maritime security cooperation. First, Japan’s dispatch of minesweepers to the Persian Gulf in 1991 and participation in the U.S.-led coalition left a good impression on India, which is geographically close to the Persian Gulf and builds bilateral naval cooperation with its neighbouring countries.82

India and Japan began to cooperate on sea lane security stretching back to the ASEAN Regional Forum of 1996.83 Although India’s nuclear test in 1998 seriously damaged diplomatic relations momentarily, the recognition of the importance of India as a potential strategic partner meant that the collaborative relationship has since normalized and further developed. For example, in 1999, when the Japanese cargo vessel Alondra Rainbow was hijacked, the Indian Coast Guard cooperated closely with the Japan Coast Guard. In fact, this occasion was the first instance of teamwork between the maritime forces of the two countries.84

In August 2000, when Japanese Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori made a visit to India, the two countries agreed to build up a “Japan-India Global Partnership in the 21st Century.” In December 2001, when the Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee visited Japan, the two countries signed the “Japan-India Joint Declaration”, which consists of high-level dialogue, exchanges in the information and communication technology field, joint counter-action against the proliferation of WMD and terrorism.85 As a matter of fact, Japan sent JMSDF ships to the Indian Ocean with India’s assistance to counter the threat of terrorism, following the 9/11 attacks against the United States.86 Furthermore, some sorts of naval cooperation such as port visits and regular visits and combined exercises between the two maritime safety authorities (coast guards) began. Surely, both countries have a deep mutual understanding of how the safety and security of the
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international sea routes are significant and beneficial to each state’s interests. Moreover, the two countries’ maritime forces have slowly but surely intensified bilateral cooperation through warship port visits, senior officials’ visits, training exchanges and the five coast guard exercises based on the Asia Maritime Security Initiative 2004.

Recently, India and the United States have sustained and deepened their good bilateral relationship by conducting a number of combined military exercises, such as “Cope India” and “Malabar.” This tendency in Indo-U.S. relations has encouraged a cooperative relationship between India and Japan. Thus, in December 2004, just after the Indian Ocean tsunami, Indian, Japanese, Australian and U.S. forces cooperated in disaster relief operations as a team. In April 2005, at the Japan-India summit meeting in India, Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh signed the Japan-India Partnership in the New Asian Era: Strategic Orientation of India-Japan Global Partnership Joint Statement, which included a recognition of the significance of maritime security and the cooperation between the Indian Navy and the JMSDF. It has been argued that “[T]he most significant achievement of Prime Minister Koizumi’s visit to India in 2005 is the paradigm shift with regard to the positioning of India within Japan’s Asian diplomacy.”

In December 2006, Indian Prime Minister Singh and the Japanese prime minister, Shinzo Abe, confirmed that because the two countries both have enormous EEZs and wide-ranging maritime interests, they can cooperate together toward curbing piracy by building capability, developing technology and sharing information between their maritime forces. They approved regular exchanges between the two coast guards through meetings of the heads of the coast guard organizations, reciprocal visits of coast guard ships and combined exercises. The two leaders also welcomed the signing of a Memorandum on Cooperation between the Coast Guards and Regional Cooperation

Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP). In the words of Abe:

The Pacific and the Indian Oceans are now bringing about a dynamic coupling as seas of freedom and of prosperity. A “broader Asia” that broke away geographical boundaries is now beginning to take on a distinct form. Our two countries have the ability - and the responsibility - to ensure that it broadens yet further and to nurture and enrich these seas to become seas of clearest transparence.

In April 2007, Japan, India and the United States held a trilateral naval exercise off Tokyo for the first time. Five months later, adding Australia and Singapore to the group of three, they had major war games in the Bay of Bengal. In 2007, the Malabar war games were hosted by India and also involved Australia, the United States, Singapore and Japan. In Tokyo, on 22 October 2008, Taro Aso and Manmohan Singh announced the Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation between Japan and India, and emphasized the importance of the relations between the two countries and their common commitment to democracy, open society, human rights and the rule of law. The security agreement involves information exchange, cooperation between maritime forces, the safety of sea lanes, and the fight against terrorism and transnational crime. In this security cooperation agreement, notably, the role of both maritime forces has been regarded as significant to secure SLOC. Previously, only the United States and Australia have had such a security pact with Japan. And, in April 2009, the Indian Navy launched a high-skilled exercise, “Malabar 09”, with their counterparts from the United States and Japan in the waters off eastern Okinawa.

On 29 December 2009, in India, The two prime ministers, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama announced a joint statement, the “New Stage of Japan-India Strategic and Global Partnership,” to confirm
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that the two countries would push forward the development of the “Strategic and Global Partnership” signed in April 2005. The two governments also forged the Action Plan to advance security cooperation based on the Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation between Japan and India issued in October 2008.\textsuperscript{96} The Action Plan includes: the reinforcement of the Global and Strategic Partnership; annual sub-cabinet/senior officials 2+2 dialogue (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense of Japan and the Indian counterparts); Maritime Security Dialogue; Regular meetings between the Ministers of Defence; annual bilateral naval exercises; multilateral naval exercises; cooperation in anti-piracy operations between the Indian Navy and the Japan Self Defense Force, Coast Guard operation; and a shipping policy forum.\textsuperscript{97}

Nevertheless, despite these developments, it is unclear how the JMSDF can develop cooperation with the Indian Navy outside of goodwill visits and combined naval training due to the constraints of Article 9 of the Japanese constitution.

**RIMPAC**

The Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercise is a large-scale multinational naval and maritime exercise hosted by the Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, involving navies from allied and other Pacific nations. In 2008, the world’s largest maritime exercise, which was the twenty-first RIMPAC exercise since 1971, brought together maritime, air and ground forces from the following ten countries: Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, the Netherlands, Peru, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Britain and the United States; and involved the participation of over 35 ships, six submarines, and more than 150 aircraft.\textsuperscript{98} In the exercise, participating warships and aircraft conducted reconnaissance, minesweeping, maritime interception, amphibious warfare, air defence, and anti-ship and anti-submarine attack missions.\textsuperscript{99}

**RIMPAC and Japan**

Joining RIMPAC offers four advantages to the JMSDF. First, it enables the JMSDF to be able to conduct training in circumstances where there is a possibility of being “attacked” from multiple threats composed of aircraft, submarine and surface forces.

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid.
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Second, it promotes tactical skills by allowing the JMSDF to learn new tactics and fighting methods from the U.S. Navy. The third advantage imparted by participation in RIMPAC is that it offers the opportunity to analyse the ability of relevant weaponry and up skill relevant personnel by conducting missile firing and torpedo launching exercises using evaluation facilities for guided weapons which are much larger and provide more flexibility for live-firing than areas surrounding Japan. Finally, it promotes not only a common operational doctrine and combined operations behaviour with the U.S. Navy, but also friendly ties with the navies of other countries. Participant countries are thus able to build not only naval capabilities, but also mutual relationships of trust. This is the true value of multilateral naval exercises.

In general, RIMPAC has planned to enhance the tactical capabilities and interoperability among participating forces in various maritime operations. Importantly, participating countries are able to improve capabilities for SLOC security and their combined response capabilities in various conflicts at sea. This U.S.-led large-scale drill has been conducted biennially since 1971, when the Vietnam War was coming to an end, in order to prevent the Soviet Union’s attempt to expand southward. The JMSDF first participated in the exercises in 1980. RIMPAC had two main purposes during the Cold War: to enhance the solidarity of the U.S.-led maritime alliance system and the strategic potential of participant navies.

After the end of the Cold War, U.S. forces shifted their attention to regional conflicts, mainly to so-called military operations other than war (MOOTW) or “peace operations,” including rescue missions and ship inspections, in order to make a display of solidarity amongst its global maritime coalition and to practice the protection of maritime order in the Pacific Ocean region. Immediately after the Cold War, the United States regarded “rogue states” as potential enemies, such as North Korea, Iraq and Iran. The scenario of the military exercise therefore changed from assuming the likelihood of large-scale wars
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to that of regional conflicts like the Gulf War of 1991. According to then U.S. Vice Admiral Jerry Unruh, the experience of the RIMPAC 1990 was actually useful for the Gulf War in 1991, because multilateral exercises like RIMPAC had focused on the enhancement coalition interoperability, thus improving the ease of cooperation among navies participating in the conflict. Although about 50,000 personnel on the average joined the RIMPAC exercise from 1980 to 1990, the number declined to about 30,000 in 1992, reflecting Cold War drawdowns and a lowered threat environment.

However, the JMSDF could only undertake cooperation relevant to U.S. forces, and could not join multinational force cooperation during RIMPAC because of the government’s interpretation of the constitution, arguing that to do so would represent the exercising of the right to collective defence, which is forbidden in the prevailing constitutional interpretation. For example, in RIMPAC 2000, the JMSDF did not take part in a drill to rescue refugees, despite the drill including not only U.S. soldiers and other countries’ doctors, but also the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and U.N. Children’s Fund (UNICEF), because conducting such activities could fall within the definition of the exercise of the right of collective defence if a scenario of conflict were to erupt during the exercise requiring the use of force. As a result of the re-examination of this controversy, the JMSDF was able to join multilateral humanitarian mission exercise scenarios in 2002 with the approval of the government. Still, however, there are a great number of similar legal limitations applying to Japanese forces in multinational activities.

**RIMPAC as a Traditional Maritime Coalition**

Although a long time has already passed since the end of the Cold War, RIMPAC has not lost its original meaning of a multinational coalition maritime exercise against unfriendly states. North Korea has criticized the Americans for still continuing RIMPAC even though the Cold War has long finished and the Soviet Union is no more, and has observed that it has been becoming larger in scale under the guise of fighting.
terrorism. According to North Korea, the true purpose of the military exercise is to crush “anti-imperialist” independent countries, including of course North Korea itself as the first target, to maintain the hegemonic status of the United States.\(^\text{109}\) Just before RIMPAC 1994, Pyongyang’s media daily Minju Choson criticized the United States, Japan and South Korea for enhancing their solidarity through the exercise to counter North Korea and its nuclear proliferation strategy. Even though American and Japanese officials stated that the exercise is a regular naval exercise, and not a special one, two U.S. aircraft carrier battle groups, along with Japanese and South Korean forces, were on the same side and operated a tactical exercise against the opponent, a fleet of Canadian and Australian warships and aircraft.\(^\text{110}\)

RIMPAC’s North Korea-targeted exercises in these years have made a contribution to improving relations between the United States, Japan and South Korea. Meanwhile, when Japan teamed up with South Korea in the war game for the first time, it was viewed with suspicion because of the suspicion that it represented a violation of the Japanese constitutional ban on the exercise of the right to collective defence.\(^\text{111}\) Despite this, defence cooperation guidelines between the United States and Japan were revised in 1997 to include emergency inspection of ships on the high seas by the JMSDF. However, the JMSDF could not carry out such operations, because the Diet in Japan had yet to pass legislation to allow Japan to provide help to the United States for military emergencies in the area surrounding Japan.\(^\text{112}\)

RIMPAC 1998 was based on the following scenario. The Hawaiian islands were divided into two countries: the so-called “Blueland,” a small wealthy nation and a democracy with an economy based on tourism and international trade; and “Orangeland,” a large agrarian nation and a dictatorship with a weak economy.\(^\text{113}\) Orangeland’s huge military forces were equipped with Russian, Chinese and Western weaponry, with large air forces including both strike and air defence aircraft, a navy with a medium-size
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surface ship force and a large submarine force, and a highly mobile medium-sized army. The weakness of Orangeland’s forces was a static, centralized command structure. In the exercise scenario, the area around the two countries was unstable because Orangeland had ambitions to seize the territory of Blueland for geopolitical and economic benefits and unify it with Orangeland, insisting that they share a common culture. In these exercises, the Japanese forces assayed their ability to assist in enforcing a naval blockade as part of the revised U.S.-Japan strategic guidelines. The implications of the scenario were that a U.S.-led coalition could use some of these skills in order to break a future Chinese blockade of Taiwan.

Despite the fact that the United States arranges a large number of regular exercises in the Pacific region, most of them are not open to non-allies or non-coalition member outsiders, especially China and Russia. In particular, China was not even invited to observe the large-scale drill in 2008. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, China, in particular, and potentially Russia, are the main imagined opponents for some maritime or air manoeuvres hosted by the U.S. armed forces. Chinese and Russian aircraft and submarines are assumed as warning targets for the U.S.-oriented maritime coalition. In fact, during RIMPAC in years past, a Taiwan Strait crisis scenario was assumed in the drills. Additionally, the Americans regard information leaks about advanced technology and tactics as a matter of grave concern. Indeed, the United States has become nervous about such issues because weapons which are products of highly-advanced technology have been deployed to the Pacific region, such as stealth fighters, cruise missiles, Aegis destroyers and the newest nuclear submarines. In 1998, China and Russia sent senior officers as observers to RIMPAC for the first time since RIMPAC began. Although Russia was invited to join RIMPAC as an observer in 2004 and 2006, it did not send any personnel. In 2008, Russia finally accepted the invitation. Meanwhile, China was not invited to RIMPAC in 2008. In practice, for U.S. Pacific Command, direct military-to-military contact with China has been forbidden because of
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The Evolution of the Maritime Coalition

The Japanese government initially avoided participating in RIMPAC, due to the issue of the right of collective-defence, since not only the United States but several other counties participate in the exercise. In May 1979, the United States approached the JMSDF to garner its interest in taking part in the war game.\footnote{Kaijyō Jieitai 50 Nenshi Hensan Iinkai [Editorial Committee for the 50 Years History of the JMSDF], Kaijyō Jieitai 50 Nenshi [the 50 Years History of the JMSDF], Bōeichō Kaijyō Bakuryō Kanbu [Japan Defense Agency Staff Office], Tokyo, 2003, p. 139.} The Maritime Staff Office asked the United States the scenario for the naval drill, and stated that if the JMSDF participated in RIMPAC, it would team up only with U.S. forces, and the communication system had to be prepared with this point in mind. After repeated negotiations, the United States accepted these conditions. After considerable discussion between the Japan Defense Agency and the Cabinet Legislation Bureau, it was concluded that even if other countries’ forces participated in the military training, as long as it was genuine combat training, the participation of the JSDF would not violate the Japanese constitution and the Self-Defense Forces Law.\footnote{Ibid.} After the vehement argument over whether it was unconstitutional or not in the Diet, the government overcome the situation by submitting its official view based on the aforementioned advice from its bureaucrats.\footnote{Ibid., p, 139-140.}

In recent years, Japan has become less sensitive to the JMSDF’s activities within RIMPAC. For example, in RIMPAC 2006, there was an important step to promote interoperability among participant navies by using the Combined Enterprise Regional Information Exchange System, which enabled all ships involved in the exercise to access a common information network. Prior to 2006, the JMSDF had to use a separate communications channel to limit its participation to bilateral cooperation with the
United States only, but since 2006 it has been using the common system to communicate with all other participants.124

Proliferation Security Initiative

There are various rules pertaining to each of the maritime jurisdictional zones under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOSC), such as the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone (EEZ), and the high seas. In order to maintain law and order at sea, every state and organization is required to promote close multinational and bilateral cooperation. Each authority concerned must foster mutual cooperation based on relations of trust with regional countries for the prevention of transnational crime and terrorism. Since September 11, the United States has played a strong leadership role in order to fight terrorism globally through the organs of the U.N. and the G8; through regional bodies such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF); and through bilateral cooperation.125

In December 2002, U.S. President George W. Bush proposed the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) as a security framework for international cooperation to prevent the transfer of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and materials and technology related to WMD, including nuclear arms and ballistic missiles, in accordance with international law and each country’s domestic laws. As outlined by Michael Richardson, the PSI was intended to:

- expand the reach and effectiveness of this effort, not only geographically, but across the diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement and military communities, and within the private sector; improve the quality exchange of information related to illicit WMD shipments
- enhance practical cooperation to disrupt shipments.126

PSI activities are classified into two general categories: meeting (general meetings and expert’s meeting) and training for Maritime Interception Operations. The initiative was launched with eleven countries in May 2003. Currently, more than 90 countries have reputedly announced their support for the PSI and joined PSI-related activities. Despite the more than 90 countries that take part in the initiative, still a number of countries including China, India, Indonesia, and Malaysia are unwilling to join the security framework for the alleged reason that the PSI might contravene international law and because the United States has not ratified the LOSC.\textsuperscript{127} The initiative is acutely aware of the issue of North Korea’s proliferation activities, and also those of Pakistan and Iran. Actually, the PSI has arguably already achieved success, for example, dismantling the A.Q. Khan nuclear proliferation network in 2004.

\textbf{The PSI and North Korea}

North Korea announced its intention to unilaterally withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in January 2003. It became known that Iran had built large-scale atomic energy plants in August 2002 and also that it repeated uranium enrichment and plutonium separation without informing the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Investigations uncovered Pakistan’s Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan’s network of nuclear proliferation activities, feeding and swapping technologies and materials between rogue state proliferators such as North Korea, Iran and Libya for profit. As a result, the presence of an established black market for nuclear weapon technology became apparent and the existing non-proliferation regime proved inadequate. The PSI therefore was advocated by the Bush administration as one tool with which to solve this pressing issue.\textsuperscript{128} Especially, North Korea was suspected of being involved in Khan’s black market of nuclear-weapons technology, and exported its ballistic missiles to Egypt, Iran, Syria, Libya, Pakistan, Yemen and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). To make matters worse, it is reported North Korea exported uranium hexafluoride to Iran and Libya.\textsuperscript{129}
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Indeed, it is said that Pakistan’s Ghauri ballistic missile and Iran’s Shahab-3 are based on North Korea’s Nodong. Promotion of the PSI by the United States has been one way to apply pressure to prevent the proliferation of North Korean mass-destruction weapons and has evidently played a successful role in making Libya, Egypt and Yemen exercise their self-control not to purchase missile-related technology from North Korea. North Korea has used exports of missile technology to bolster its foreign currency earnings; hence, the PSI could damage a significant source of its income.130

**Japan and the PSI**

Japan has the opportunity to contribute to the suppression of the spread of WMD in East Asia and thus also contribute towards regional stability by taking part in PSI activities. The United States has particularly large expectations for the alliance with Japan regarding PSI activities in the region, while attempting to reduce its own military forces on the Korean peninsula through its technology-driven process of defence transformation. For the sake of strengthening the maritime alliance, Japan’s active participation in PSI is unmistakably valuable.131 The Japanese government has thus been making concrete efforts to support the PSI by hosting international exercises for PSI maritime interception operations, actively participating in multilateral PSI exercises hosted by member countries as much as possible and urging Asian countries to support the PSI through its diplomatic outreach activities.132

**North Korea and Japan**

On 20 May 2003, at a U.S. Senate committee hearing, North Korean defector, Bok Koo Lee, who used to work at a munitions plant testified as follows: 1) ninety per cent of North Korean missile parts originated in Japan; 2) the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan was concerned with the development of North Korean missiles; 3) the North Koreans imported these parts from Japan using a passenger ship called *Man Gyong Bon* every three months, which shuttled between Niigata in Japan and Wonsan in Korea.
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North Korea. Although the Japanese government half expected that the *Man Gyong Bon* carried money, technology, and goods, as open secrets, it never took effective precautionary measures and failed to tighten its security procedures against such activity. After the North Korean abduction issue offended Japanese public opinion, the Japanese government enacted the revised Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Control Law in February 2004 to control the flow of money and a special law regarding a ban on port calls by specific ships in June 2004, while it was reinforcing Port State Control powers aimed at *Man Gyong Bon’s* activities. Consequently, it was significant that Japan itself, with its close geographical position to North Korea, hosted multinational exercises from the perspective of international cooperation to strengthen the counter-proliferation regime.

*Japan and Multinational Cooperation for the PSI*

In April 2003, Australian navy, police, customs and special forces, using a helicopter and boats, investigated a 4,480-ton freighter named *Pong Su* off the New South Wales coast involved in a plot to smuggle 125 kilograms of heroin worth 16.7 billion yen. This ship was built in Japan in 1980 and belonged to a shipping company under the control of the operations division of the Workers Party of Korea, which has been linked to the abductions of Japanese nationals. Ship records of the *Pong Su* showed that it has changed ownership several times and it seems that North Korea bought it in the latter part of the 1990s. Since at least 1976, North Korea has had a hand in the international drug trade to earn foreign exchange, such as methamphetamine and heroin sneaked into Japan, Taiwan, China and Russia. Even though no WMD material was found on the *Pong Su*, income illegally obtained from drug trafficking and counterfeiting activities
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has became the main resource for North Korea to develop its nuclear and ballistic missile programmes.\textsuperscript{139}

In September 2003, the U.S.-led maritime interdiction exercise named “Pacific Protector” was conducted in the Coral Sea, off Australia’s north-eastern coast. The exercises were aimed at training PSI member countries to stop and board suspicious ships carrying illegal weapons or component materials for WMD.\textsuperscript{140} The United States, Japan, France and Australia actively participated in the exercise, and Britain, Spain, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland and Portugal were observers, while South Korea and Russia declined to join. According to participant countries, this initiative is not aimed at any specific target although one of its main purposes has clearly been North Korea’s nuclear ambitions and proliferation activities.\textsuperscript{141} Australia regarded Japan’s participation as essential, especially in the face of the need to inspect Japanese-registered vessels outside its territorial waters and avoid any legal issues between the countries. Actually, the Japanese government sent a JCG boat to conduct multilateral ship survey exercises with other coast guard and naval ships for the first time. At this time, the Japan Coast Guard encountered a problem of not possessing an eavesdrop-resistant communication line with other forces.\textsuperscript{142}

In October 2004, the Japanese government hosted, with the JCG and JMSDF, a three-day maritime-interdiction exercise named “Team Samurai 04” off the coast of Sagami Bay and near the Port of Yokosuka. It was the first PSI exercise in Asia, focusing on law enforcement activities, and to be conducted in accordance with national legal authorities and relevant international legal frameworks. Vessels and aircraft from Australia, France, Japan and the United States joined the drills and 18 countries observed the exercises.\textsuperscript{143} Nevertheless, China and the South Korea turned down the
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invitation to join the drill to prevent the relationship with North Korea from being irreparably damaged. In Team Samurai 04, the scenario for the drill assumed an American-registered ship attempted to tranship sarin-related material to a Japanese-registered ship. First, JMSDF P-3C anti-submarine patrol aircraft spotted the suspicious ship, and then a JCG patrol ship chased and brought the Japanese ship into a nearby port. Finally, warships from Australia, France and the United States confiscated the goods.144 The participation of a JMSDF escort ship in the PSI for the first time was well received by the international community. Also, in Team-Samurai 04, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines, and Cambodia from the Asia-Pacific region took part in PSI training activities for the first time. The participation of four non-core-group countries was welcomed for the purpose of promoting understanding of the PSI among other countries.145

A three-day maritime exercise called “Pacific Shield 07” was hosted by Japan in 2007 involving seven countries, Japan, Australia, Britain, France, New Zealand, Singapore and the United States, and involved ten vessels and four aircraft off Izu-Oshima Island and at the Ports of Yokosuka and Yokohama. This exercise was conducted as part of the PSI. Although China and South Korea declined again to participate in the drill in consideration of relations with North Korea, senior officials from about 40 countries observed it. From Japan, a total of 650 JMSDF and JASDF personnel with a destroyer, a P-3C patrol aircraft, and airborne warning and control system (AWACS) aircraft took part in the drill. The exercise was conducted based on a scenario of chasing suspicious vessels, boarding and inspecting them and seizing the alleged chemical materials.146

In addition, the annual Asian Export Control Seminar has been held in Tokyo since 1993 in order to promote international cooperation countermeasures against WMD proliferation in the Asia-Pacific region through strengthening export controls. Japan has also hosted the Asian Senior Level Talks on Non-Proliferation (ASTOP) since 2003. Additionally, on 18 June 2004, Asian coast guard agencies unanimously adopted the
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Asian Maritime Security Initiative 2004 (Amarsective 2004) at the Heads of Asian Coast Guard Agencies meeting in Tokyo. The Amarsective 2004 meeting announced pledges and responsibilities of coast guards and areas of regional and technical assistance and information sharing, in order to address issues of piracy, terrorism and criminal acts at sea.147

Problems
Japan has to play the leading role in promoting the PSI to contribute towards the stability of the Asia-Pacific region, which faces the potential threat of maritime terrorism using WMD and the actual threat of North Korea’s WMD, particularly its nuclear weapons programme. As a regional maritime power, it is incumbent upon Japan to exercise a leadership role in the PSI in both the operational and outreach activities.148 Nevertheless, there are major problems for Tokyo to resolve such as legal issues and organizational structures so that Japan can contribute effectively to the PSI and the solidarity of the maritime “coalition of the willing”. At the international level, the international legal framework against WMD proliferation is constrained by political factors and it is difficult to criminalize such activities internationally by the strengthening of related international law using multilateral treaties and effective U.N. Security Council resolutions.149 China, in particular, and Russia to a lesser extent, have generally opposed strong international legal measures that may materially harm the interests of their client states such as North Korea and Iran. Washington also, whilst in favour of stronger measures, has opposed formal treaties due to the political compromises and time factors involved; hence, its preference for informal mechanisms such as the PSI.150

Domestically, as a practical matter, the JCG takes the lead role in putting the PSI into action and the JMSDF provides indirect support, but there has been a delay in enacting the necessary domestic legislation. For instance, unless a suspected ship is Japanese, the JCG cannot take action on the high seas or in another state’s waters based on the
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150 This preference was clearly stated in The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, March 2006, p. 46.
principle of flag state jurisdiction. Many longstanding problems must be resolved for Japan to conduct defensive action on the seas.\textsuperscript{151} The JMSDF can conduct boardings and ship inspections only after it has been ordered to take defensive action on the seas and if the activity is based on the “Act on Ship Inspection Operations in Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan” rules.

In Team Samurai-04, the JCG could chase and inspect only Japanese-registered ships on the high seas; otherwise it would be considered an infringement of flag state jurisdiction. While the Act on Ship Inspection Operations in Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan in 2000 was enacted, the JMSDF has never had experience with inspecting ships and it was not allowed to fire warning shots with live ammunition and conduct combined international actions.\textsuperscript{152} In Team Samurai 04, it assumed the scenario of the training without the declaration of defensive action on the seas, but not at the time of actual crisis. Besides, only hypothetical Japanese and U.S.–registered ships were inspected, not flag of convenience ships. In the exercise, the Japanese government could not contribute realistically to the multilateral PSI exercise scenario because it was the first time undertaking such activities and it had to be carefully coordinated across governmental offices and ministries.\textsuperscript{153}

Legal limitations apply not only on the sea, but also in the airspace, as the Japan Air Self-Defense Force (JASDF) can only take measures against the encroachment of Japanese airspace in the context of the legal constraints applying to the PSI. The JASDF can deal with foreign aircraft that invade Japanese air space, not Japanese aircraft or foreign aircraft once they have left Japanese airspace. Despite the general appearance of a unified position by the Japanese government, related government ministries and agencies such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Japan Defense Agency and the JCG, found it difficult to compromise in the details of the PSI.\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{151} Yoshihiko Yamada, “Kaiyō Security to Kkaizoku Mondai,” \textit{Kaigai Jiijyū} [Foreign Affairs], November 2006, pp. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{152} Takano, “WMD Kakusan eno Kokusaiteki Torikumi to Nippon no Taïō: PSI wo Chûsin ni,” pp. 120.
\textsuperscript{153} Yano, “PSI ni Okeru Nihon no Taiou,” p. 28.
\textsuperscript{154} Ibid., p.31.
Maritime Coalitions against Non-state Threats

As the countries in the Asia-Pacific region have been gaining economic strength, it seems that the extent of interdependence among them has also grown. The stability of the sea lanes is a matter of life or death for regional states, but the SLOC are a huge and fragile network. Littoral naval operations have become crucial to deal with threats posed by non-state actors. Illegal acts on the sea usually occur in coastal waters or in narrow channels. Without a sophisticated and networked system of surveillance and response for operations in real time, maritime enforcement authorities cannot respond to such incidents. Moreover, taking “the transnational nature of such crimes and the differing approaches and capabilities of littoral nations,” without cooperation among the countries concerned, it would be difficult to combat such maritime threats.155

The Japan Coast Guard and Piracy

IMO

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) was established as a specialized agency of the United Nations to deal with maritime safety and the prevention of marine pollution. In response to increasing concerns over the escalation in the number of piracy incidents, the IMO established a working group in 1993 which consisted of experts from Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore to investigate the situation of damage incurred as a result of piratical acts in maritime Southeast Asia. This group filed a report on measures to prevent piracy, sea patrol by the littoral states along the Malacca Strait, to the IMO’s Maritime Safety Committee.156 The Committee as a result drew up “MSC/Circ. 622—Recommendations to Governments for preventing and suppressing piracy and armed robbery against ships” and “MSC/Circ. 623—Guidance to shipowners and ship operators, shipmasters and crews on preventing and suppressing acts of piracy and armed robbery against ship”, and circulated them to member states.157 Furthermore, an IMO Assembly resolution on anti-piracy cooperation was adopted at the IMO Congress held in September 1993. Whilst the number of piratical acts decreased in the short term, piracy intensified again in 1995.158 As a consequence, MSC/ Circ. 622 and

156 Yoshihiko Yamada Umi no Terrorism [Maritime Terrorism], PHP Kenkyuujo, 2003, p. 95.
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623 were revised and the “Code of Practice for the Investigation of the Crimes of Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships” was issued at the seventy-third Maritime Safety Committee meeting in December 2000 and circulated to members as MSC/Circ. 984.\textsuperscript{159}

\textit{Japan’s Efforts}

As part of Japan’s efforts to support international efforts to improve the safety and security of shipping and push its own security concerns as a highly maritime-dependent state, the JCG endeavoured to establish events for communication with multilateral institutions. These events have included periodic high-level meetings among maritime safety authorities in the Asia-Pacific region and under the auspices of the North Pacific Coast Guard Forum (NPCGF).\textsuperscript{160} Meanwhile, there are deficiencies in the capacity of many regional coastal states to take effective action to secure their maritime zones and even to cooperate effectively with other states in the fight against piracy and other sea-based or ship-related crime. This is especially the case with respect to the region’s developing states with large maritime zones of jurisdiction such as the archipelagic states of Indonesia and the Philippines, which are so important for international (and Japanese) seaborne trade, and it will take time to improve the situation. Therefore, it becomes essential for a country which depends very heavily on SLOC for its survival, like Japan, to assist littoral states in this effort. Maritime capacity-building thus has become an important part of Japan’s regional diplomacy and security-related cooperative activity in consideration of the benefits which accrue to Japan, given its own sea dependence, and due to its ability to positively contribute to a regional and international maritime-based order which features such a high degree of interdependence; and nowhere is this more so than in its own wider region.\textsuperscript{161}

Japan has played a prominent role in regional anti-piracy initiatives and assisted in the establishment of the security framework that enables Japan at the same time to exert political influence from a broad foreign policy standpoint. As is well known, JSDF activities have been strictly limited because of the limitations of the Japanese constitution. In practice, just as it is difficult for Japan still to behave like a “normal”

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., p. 129.
power in world politics, it is logically also difficult for the JMSDF to operate “normal” naval diplomacy. Therefore, instead of using its armed forces, the JCG has been the Japanese government’s preferred instrument with which to actively engage in regional security diplomacy and capacity building through cooperation with the region’s littoral states for improved maritime safety and security.

Japan’s efforts against piracy have in part been aimed at enhancing Japan’s security role in the regional and international spheres as part of a broader process to achieve the ardent wish of Japanese political conservatives and nationalists to promote Japanese power and influence as a “normal” great power and to guard against the maritime challenge posed by rival states, especially China. However, China has been unwilling to participate in any regional multilateral security framework which facilitates the normalization of Japanese foreign and military policy; although it did join the multilateral ReCAAP anti-piracy agreement and organization, discussed below.

In spite of this, Japan faces the usual difficulty in attempting to construct an effective multilateral security framework, whereas its policy towards bilateral initiatives has been paying off little by little, such as bilateral exchanges of aid and training exercises with Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore. Each regional country recognizes the need for the establishment of a maritime law-enforcement agency like the Japan Coast Guard or the U.S. Coast Guard. On 30 November 2005, the Malaysian Maritime Enforcement Agency (MMEA), modelled on the JCG, was established. As a countermeasure against piracy in the sea areas around Southeast Asia, Japan dispatches JCG experts facilitated by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), to individual countries, including Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaysia to support the establishment or development of maritime law-enforcement agencies and the nurturing of talented people.
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When the *Tenyu* incident occurred in 1998, as discussed earlier in chapter 4, although the international shipping division of the Maritime Bureau in the Ministry of Transport took charge of dealing with the issue of piracy, it was difficult to gather adequate information. The number of Japanese ships affected by piracy according to the international shipping division’s data was only two, but the actual number was twenty according to the results of the questionnaire survey of Japanese shipping companies conducted by the Nippon Foundation. Furthermore, the Nippon Foundation came to cooperate with the International Maritime Bureau Piracy Reporting Centre in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, for intelligence ties. Nevertheless, this did not prevent the *Alondra Rainbow* incident from happening in October 1999. This incident involved at least eight nations: Japan, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, Vietnam and China. Through the investigation of this incident, the international community established the existence of international piracy syndicates and realized at the same time the need for international cooperation to deal with the issue. The Japanese government saw this case as a serious problem. The Japanese Prime Minister, Keizou Obuchi, tasked Youhei Sasagawa, the administrative director of the Nippon Foundation with establishing options to cope with the issue of piracy. In November 1999, at the ASEAN summit in Manila, Obuchi advocated holding a conference among coast guards from every regional country.

In April 2000, the Foreign Affairs Regional Conference on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships was held in Tokyo. Representatives from coast guard organizations and maritime industry from Asian countries participated in this conference, and come to an agreement, issuing the Asia Anti-Piracy Challenge 2000, focusing on coordination and cooperation with other countries to share information toward anti-piracy efforts, implement increased security cooperation and strengthen human resource development. After the conference, cooperative relations were forged among Asian coast guard organizations. The JCG has in fact been taking a pivotal role in anti-piracy experts’ meetings held in Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines and
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Thailand. In fact, in November 2000, a JCG patrol boat made port calls to India and Malaysia and bilateral anti-piracy exercises conducted. Since then, bilateral cooperation of this sort has certainly been making progress.

In September 2001, at the initiative of then Japanese Foreign Minister Kohno, for the sake of following up the conference, the Japanese government sent a mission on piracy and armed robbery against ships as a government research group composed of members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Transport, the JCG, and JICA, to the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia. The mission exchanged views on regional cooperation to deal with such threats, following up on the international conference held in Tokyo, and discussing the issue of closer at-sea patrol cooperation. In addition, it proposed a plan for cooperation and support for measures against piracy and solicited the reaction of each nation about the demand for such measures. As a consequence, the following forms of cooperation were carried out: mutual visits by patrol boats, meetings among experts, the exchange and nurturing of talented people, technological support, hosting officers from regional coast guards at the Japan Coast Guard Academy, and holding seminars on regulations against offences at sea.

Furthermore, in November 2001, the then Prime Minister Mori appealed to participating nations at the ASEAN+3 summit in Singapore to convene an Asian cooperation conference on combating piracy and armed robbery against ships. As a result, in October 2001, a conference was held in Tokyo. In addition, at a later ASEAN+3 summit in Brunei, the then Prime Minister Koizumi advanced the idea of constructing a legal framework to promote regional cooperation as a counter to piracy. Afterwards, the ASEAN countries, China, South Korea, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh began to negotiate on drafting a cooperative agreement under the leadership of Japan. In 2004, a high-level marine police conference that discussed the entire gamut of maritime security
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issues, including anti-piracy and maritime terrorism, was held in Tokyo. The Nippon Foundation, which has developed an awareness of the problems of securing Japan’s SLOC, defrayed the expenses for the meeting.\textsuperscript{176}

\textit{ReCAAP}

A process of several years of political lobbying and diplomacy by successive Japanese leaders culminated in November 2004, with the conclusion of the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating against Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP). The result of several international conferences over the past several years, the ReCAAP agreement has subsequently been ratified by 17 countries: Bangladesh, Brunei, Burma. Cambodia, China, Denmark, India, Japan, Laos, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam.\textsuperscript{177}

This agreement creates an information sharing system on piracy and attempts to strengthen partnerships among coast guard organizations through building an international cooperation network. In addition, regarding information sharing, it was decided that the ReCAAP Information Sharing Centre (ISC) would be established in Singapore.

ReCAAP was the first-ever large-scale cooperation by Asian countries to counter piracy and to establish an official operations centre administered by full-time permanent staff members.\textsuperscript{178} Malaysia supports the concept of ReCAAP, nevertheless it opposed the location of the ISC in Singapore, which could rival the position of the Piracy Reporting Centre in Kuala Lumpur, which is managed by the International Maritime Bureau in London.\textsuperscript{179} Although Malaysia and Indonesia were included in the 16 countries that agreed the framework of the ReCAAP in 2004, they have not ratified it because they have lingering concerns that the agreement might violate their sovereignty within the Malacca Strait, located largely between peninsular Malaysia and the Indonesian island of Sumatra.\textsuperscript{180}

\begin{footnotesize}
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In September 2006, ReCAAP came into force, after being ratified by the eleventh country. The ReCAAP ISC has made significant progress in research and analysis, capacity building, and engagement and cooperation with other organizations that handle piracy and armed robbery. As a result, the ReCAAP ISC is highly-regarded internationally by organizations such as the International Maritime Organization as a model of intergovernmental cooperation that the rest of world could follow to counter piracy. The cost of running the centre is financed largely by Singapore. Japan is the second largest contributor. In practice, IMO Secretary-General Mitropoulos has said that,

The ReCAAP ISC, in collaboration with the IMO, have a role to play in addressing the situation off the coast of Somalia, for instance in raising regional awareness, sharing its experience in Asia in promoting regional cooperation at the government-to-government level; and promoting regional capacity-building efforts, including the facilitation of technical assistance from regional governments.

However, the sense of caution and existing rivalries among the littoral states are major impediments to sharing information regarding counter-terrorism and anti-piracy efforts. There was also much debate and competition among the littoral states over the issue of where the ReCAAP ISC should be built. The information sources of ReCAAP are 15 Focal Points (one place in each of the 14 member countries and one in Hong Kong), which are linked to the ISC in Singapore. In addition, the ReCAAP Information Sharing Web is composed of Focal Points that exchange information each other. Each Focal Point is placed in the Coast Guard, Maritime Police, Ministry or Agency in charge of marine transportation and maritime affairs or navy.

The ReCAAP ISC president is currently from Japan’s foreign ministry. Japan has been playing a leadership role in terms of anti-piracy countermeasures. Serving as the Centre president means that Japan has been shouldering weighty responsibility for maritime security in the region. To carry out this role, Japan must maintain reliable maritime
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security enforcement capability. Also, Japan needs to use its diplomatic power to encourage Indonesia and Malaysia to join the arrangement. Although this has yet to occur, in May 2005, in Tokyo, Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi and Indonesian President Yudhoyono, after discussions on maritime affairs which focused on matters relevant to the Strait of Malacca, announced the Japan-Indonesia Joint Announcement on Maritime Affairs which confirmed the significance of the security and safety of the Strait of Malacca, and cooperative maritime security against piracy and criminal acts at sea. And in December 2006, at the Japan-ASEAN Summit Meeting, member countries agreed to start a dialogue against terrorism, and then at a following meeting in June 2007, the Japanese government announced that it would make a major contribution to regional stability and maritime security which was regarded as one of the biggest concerns in the region.

Japan and the Maritime Coalition against Somali Pirates

International Cooperation for the Maritime Security

In response to threats from piracy off Somalia, on 2 June 2008, U.N. Security Council Resolution 1816 authorizing maritime security operations in Somali waters conducted by other countries was adopted. This resolution was formulated by France and the United States, and co-sponsored by Australia, Canada, Denmark France, Greece, Holland, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Norway, Panama, Spain, and Britain. Furthermore, U.N. Security Council Resolution 1838 to strengthen Resolution 1816 was adopted on 7 October 2007. It aimed to press for each country to send warships and maritime patrol aircraft for anti-piracy efforts off Somalia. As a result, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) dispatched seven warships to escort the transport vessels of the U.N. World Food Programme on 24 October 2007. On 8 December 2007, the European Union decided to send a flotilla to the area. It seems that the maritime security operation was not only against piracy, but also against terrorism because narcotics produced in Afghanistan were smuggled to Somalia via Pakistan. Dispatching naval
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ships to waters off Somalia aims to thwart the activities of the Taliban and other terrorist groups and to choke off funds to these groups.  

A Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF), composed of Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Pakistan and the United States, focused on protecting merchant ships around the Gulf of Aden. In October 2007, a North Korean ship called the MV *Dai Hong Dan* traded gunfire with pirates but was outnumbered. The U.S. Navy saved the North Korean ship. The United States won international acclaim because it rescued the ship regardless of whether is was a friend or foe. Canada sent naval vessels to the sea off the coast of Somalia to protect ships transporting the World Food Programme’s supplies for refugees. Germany, which constrains the use of force by law, send a maritime patrol aircraft to the U.S. base located in Somalia’s neighbour, Djibouti, and the German Shipowner’s Association urged the German government to ease conditions for the use of weapons by the German Navy. On 21 April 2008, a Japanese crude oil tanker, *Takayama*, was rescued by a German Navy destroyer. On 26 December 2008, China dispatched two destroyers and a replenishment vessel to the sea off Somalia. It was reported that China’s operational dispatch of warships to across oceanic distances was the first time since Zheng He in the Ming Dynasty. On 12 January 2009, Chinese navy destroyers escorted a Taiwanese merchant ship. It was a great opportunity to make an appeal to the international community for the “One China Policy”. Also, on 30 January, the Chinese navy repelled Somali pirates to rescue a Greek ship. Through such international contributions by its navy, China showed its presence in the Indian Ocean as a great power. According to Chinese media, as of 1 June 2010, the Chinese navy deployed off Somalia had escorted a total of 803 ships, and saved 13 foreign merchant ships from pirate attacks.
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Debate over the Law

While other countries actively contributed to maritime security in the area, Japan had to wrestle with domestic legal disputes. The Japanese Communist Party insisted that missions against Somali pirates should be operated by law enforcement bodies and that the dispatch of the JMSDF would contravene the constitution. The Social Democratic Party also insisted that the JCG rather than the JMSDF should be deployed. 196 Despite these arguments, in March 2009, Japan participated in the international task forces involving the United States, China, Russia and India, with the deployment of two JMSDF destroyers equipped with two patrol helicopters and two speed boats and about 400 JMSDF personnel and eight JCG officers. The mission was to counter pirates who attack ships in the Gulf of Aden, which connects to the Suez Canal, based on the Maritime Patrol Activities provision in Article 82 of the Self-Defence Forces Law in situations beyond the capabilities of the JCG. 197 The eight JCG officers embarked to process judicial matters should they need to stop and arrest pirates, including gathering evidence and legally processing suspects. 198

As usual, the debate on the war-renouncing Article 9 of the constitution in the Diet had to be heatedly conducted in order to be able to dispatch the two destroyers to waters off Somalia to join the international maritime coalition against piracy. The Japanese government insists that the operations against Somali pirates do not violate the constitutional ban on using force to settle international disputes. 199 Regarding an international contribution, the government would always be pushed to constitutionally interpret the difference between the use of arms and the use of force. 200 The mission of JMSDF vessels off Somalia to deal with pirates was completely different from operations that it had undertaken before. It means that the role of the JSDF is changing from “rear area support” to “front line support” in overseas missions. 201
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Somali pirates possess rifles, machine guns and rocket launchers that have a range of more than two kilometres. The rules of engagement of most other countries allow these states to counter such pirates. Meanwhile, the JMSDF has serious disadvantages in terms of using weapons. Japanese destroyers escorted Japanese ships and drove away suspicious boats coming close to foreign ships with their loudspeakers and searchlights.\(^{202}\) Supposing that a suspected pirate boat approaches a Japanese ship, JMSDF vessels were told to contact and warn the boat to change course or fire a warning shot. Nevertheless, there were guidelines such as the firing of warning shots by a machine gun on the surface of the water about 50 metres in front of a pirate vessel.\(^{203}\) JMSDF personnel were concerned about the possibility that warning shots fired at the water’s surface could ricochet. Actually, there is a high probability that close-range shooting would injure or kill people.\(^{204}\)

Importantly, there were serious problems related to international cooperation for Japan from a moral standpoint. JMSDF vessels are only allowed to guard Japan-related ships which meet any of the following four conditions: a Japan-registered ship; a ship operated by Japanese shipping companies; a ship carrying Japanese cargo; or a ship with Japanese nationals on board.\(^{205}\) In 2007, the *Golden Nori*, a Panama-registered chemical tanker owned by a Japanese company, was hijacked by pirates. A U.S. Navy destroyer received a distress signal from the *Golden Nori* and could, if necessary, sink the offending pirate boats. Meanwhile, if the JMSDF destroyers received a distress call from a non-Japan-related ship, the destroyers would send a helicopter for a reconnaissance mission in the first place but they can only use arms for a shot in self-defence or an emergency evacuation. It was difficult for the JMSDF destroyers to deal with ships boarded by pirates. Even if a JMSDF destroyer encountered pirate ships attacking a civilian ship without Japanese links, it would only be able to alert the situation to the naval ships of other countries.\(^{206}\)

\(^{202}\) Ibid.
\(^{203}\) Ibid.
\(^{204}\) Ibid.
\(^{206}\) What can 2 MSDF Ships do off Somalia?, “*The Daily Yomiuri*, 1 April 2009

278
Need for More Cooperation

According to the Japanese Ministry of Defense, it takes about five days for the JMSDF to conduct a round trip escort of ships in the extensive patrol zone. The JMSDF is able to guard five or so ships at any given time as best as it can. In brief, supposing JMSDF vessels carry on guarding about five ships in each operation, it will be able to escort a total of ten ships in five days or about 730 ships a year. However, according to the Japanese Shipowner’s Association, 2,103 ships Japanese-related ships navigated the area in 2008. Therefore, the JMSDF has an ability to escort, at best, only one-third of these ships. In practice, the Japanese Shipowner’s Association consistently asked the Japanese government to dispatch JMSDF vessels to waters off Somalia for the sake of contributing to the safety of its ships on the high seas. It seems obvious that Japan, so greatly reliant on maritime transportation for its economic activities and overall national security, has to contribute to maritime security in the area with more cooperation with other maritime forces.

The government further decided to deploy at least two P-3C maritime patrol aircraft with 100 JMSDF and 50 GSDF personnel to patrol waters off Somalia. In practice, both the U.N. and the IMO, as well as the informal international coalition, seemed to need and accommodate the P-3C aircraft, of which the JMSDF possesses over 100. In fact, the JMSDF needed to protect a broader area effectively such as the route via Cape Town, a sea lane in which the _Jasmine Ace_ was attacked by pirates. In order to monitor this vast area, the Japanese government decided to send P-3C aircraft that provide surveillance information to navies participating in the anti-piracy operations. The Japanese government had to promote mutual cooperation with a large number of navies, including the navies of Turkey and Kenya, with which the JMSDF has never held exercises. In such a framework of maritime policing actions, the building of trustful relations is significant, with the accumulation of persistent efforts for mutual cooperation for the stability of the maritime area. Thus, on 11 June 2009, the two P-
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3C aircraft started warning and surveillance activities in the Gulf of Aden, which has accounted more than 75 percent of such operations by aircraft there.\footnote{Somalia Oki· Aden Wan ni okerru Kaizoku Taisho ni kansuru Kankei Shōchō Renraku Kai [The Committee of the Japanese Government Related Ministries and Agencies on Counter-Piracy in off Somalia and the Gulf of Aden], 2010 Nen Kaizoku Taisho Report (Counter-Piracy Report in 2010), January 2011, p. 15.}

Also in June 2009, the Anti-piracy Measures Law was newly enacted in Japan to send two destroyers to Somalia, legally enabled to protect any vessels, and not only Japan-affiliated ships.\footnote{“Antipiracy law authorizing SDF protection of any ship enacted,” Kyodo News (online ed), 19 June 2009.} In comparison with the Maritime Patrol Activities provisions in terms of use of weapons, under the Anti-Piracy Measures Law the MSDF can use weapons for the self protection, the protection of others, and preventing interference with official duties. In addition to Maritime Patrol Activities, weapons can be used to forcepirated vessels to stop under the Anti-Piracy Measures Law. However, it is extremely difficult to interpret and distinguish between such laws, which have created a certain legal uncertainty.

Japanese Prime Minister Taro Aso exercised personal leadership to promote the act, despite a great number of opposition politicians who expressed concern that maritime operations carried out under the new law would be unconstitutional.\footnote{“Antipiracy law authorizing SDF protection of any ship enacted”}  

Table 11. Use of Weapon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maritime Patrol Activities</th>
<th>Counter-piracy Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By applying Article 7 of the Act concerning Execution of Official Police Duties, the use of weapons can be allowed only when it is used for self-protection, the protection of others, or for preventing interference with official duties, to such an extent as is considered reasonably necessary in accordance with the situation</td>
<td>In addition (to Maritime Patrol Activities), when countering acts of piracy, including such acts as approaching excessively close to a ship or following a ship, if any party perpetrating such acts of piracy continues their acts despite the countermeasures of others, and there are reasonable grounds to believe that no other means are available to stop the passage of the ship in question, the use of weapons is permitted to such an extent that is considered reasonably necessary in accordance with the situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

\footnote{Somalia Oki· Aden Wan ni okerru Kaizoku Taisho ni kansuru Kankei Shōchō Renraku Kai [The Committee of the Japanese Government Related Ministries and Agencies on Counter-Piracy in off Somalia and the Gulf of Aden], 2010 Nen Kaizoku Taisho Report (Counter-Piracy Report in 2010), January 2011, p. 15.}
Australia is geopolitically important for allies such as Japan and the United States because of its geographical location. Australia’s strategic proximity to the Pacific island nations, Southeast Asia, and the Indian Ocean is important for allies for the securing of SLOC. Australia is one of the few mature and developed countries in the Asia-Pacific region and a reliable member of the U.S. alliance network. Australia also could become a more reliable partner for Japan, including within the context of the emerging trilateral relationship. And India is increasing its national strength and naval power steadily like China, and it enjoys a highly advantageous position within the Indian Ocean. Regarding balance of power strategy, India is the only nation in Asia that Japan can expect to be opposed to China, the great land power heading for the sea. Japan therefore has a great opportunity to forge a bilateral relationship of trust with India based on their interdependence as sea powers.

Japan has demonstrated that, despite the limitations of its constitution, it has still been prepared to increasingly utilize its seapower to participate in and build coalitions to both enhance good order at sea and general maritime security, and also to hedge against unfolding strategic dangers from rogue states and potentially from the expansionist Chinese continental giant. It has been shown in this chapter that Japan has been active in establishing its seapower credentials to push its national interests and influence in a number of ways and in a number of forums, including in informal coalitions such those related to the PSI and anti-piracy cooperation off Somalia, deepening its cooperation with other navies in multilateral settings, such as in Malabar and RIMPAC exercises, and taking the lead in establishing multilateral anti-piracy measures and maritime security capacity building in Southeast Asia.

In Southeast Asia, for example, the Japanese government has led with the JCG to urge littoral states to cooperate for anti-piracy since the 1990s. The fruits of this diplomatic activity are ably demonstrated by ReCAAP, which produces a steady flow of successful effects. In practice, the number of piracy incidents has decreased in waters around the Malacca Strait since the system of ReCAAP started to work.

On the whole, the maritime coalitions are working well and are so essential for Japanese security. Nevertheless, Japan’s post-War pacifism and legal restraints upon the use of its
military rooted in Article 9 of the constitution still hampers and disrupts Japan’s naval diplomacy, including in the course of confidence-building within maritime coalitions. This domestic political inertia leaves Japan potentially vulnerable to a great variety of threats at or from the sea. Thus, while Japan has taken some strides to use its seapower to engage more widely with the outside world as a normal great power, its effectiveness in doing so remains hampered, both leaving gaps in its provisions for national security and potentially frustrating its ally and a growing number of international security partners.
CHAPTER 7
Conclusion

Findings
The value of ocean space cannot be overestimated. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to
develop and maintain the power derived from exploitation of the sea. This thesis clarifies seapower’s structure, viewed as an abstract concept, demonstrating its real-world application, and so modernizing the concept that was originally advocated by Alfred Thayer Mahan. Seapower is composed of a number of factors across specialized areas, which mutually affect each other, as conceptually developed in Chapter 2. In order to comprehensively grasp seapower, a state must consider various strategic thought and relationships, the theory of geopolitics, and other various factors.

This research has also attempted to discuss the relationship between seapower and alliances and coalitions, a topic which has not been discussed adequately in recent years. One of the most important features of maritime states is mutual dependence. Maritime states have shaped this character through a long history of mutual economic interaction, developing, using and protecting the vast network of seaborne trade. In the realm of security issues, in addition to a traditional threat from a great continental power that attempts to attain a far more prominent seapower status, the emergence of new non-state threats have increased the value of maritime coalitions in the age of globalization. Even though building maritime alliance networks or coalitions seems the best way to deal with such various security problems, it is no simple task. Whether the coalition will work or not largely depends on the leadership of the leading maritime state, which is naturally qualified to be the leading power of the coalition. In the contemporary world that equates to America, as discussed in Chapter 2.

In terms of both economic and security aspects, no single actor can control the ocean and deal with all problems facing the global maritime system. A genuine sea-girt state, Japan, is no exception. Northeast Asia, the location of the Japanese archipelago, is definitely a potential conflict zone. And the safe and successful function of Japan’s huge sea lines of communication (SLOC) network in the Asia-Pacific region is unable to
operate without cooperation with a large number of other stakeholders. As a response to such maritime challenges to its fundamental well-being and security, Japan’s national strategy in this security environment has been to initiate a process of maritime coalition building involving not only its traditional American ally but also new strategic and security partners.

Since the end of the Second World War, however, Japan’s peace constitution has severely restricted its use of military operations. This was not especially problematic during the Cold War as Japan focused on its economic recovery under the protection of the U.S.-led alliance network. In the later stages of the Cold War, though, as Japanese economic strength grew, it was increasingly required to contribute to the safety of the region through its military contribution to its alliance with the United States. In this process, with the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) as a pillar, the complementary military relationship with the United States was strengthened.

In terms of the elements of seapower discussed in Chapter 1, the United States has provided a number of the components of seapower: military technology in the post-War era; landpower such as the deployment of its Marines and providing military training to the Japan Ground Self-Defense Force to enable them to acquire the ability of marine forces; land and sea-based airpower; spacepower, which brings global communications capability; sea control capabilities which help secure Japan’s huge SLOC network; and security frameworks such as the construction of maritime coalitions. The United States remains the greatest seapower, providing leadership for maritime coalitions. On the other hand, Japan provides its great location to act as a power projection hub for U.S. seapower. The United States and Japan both regard a rising China as a potential menace and securing SLOC in the Asia-Pacific region continues to be a vital factor for their economic activities. Relations between the two nations are thoroughly complementary and they share mutual interests as democratic maritime states.

Since the end of the Second World War, the U.S. Navy has functioned as the “father” of the JMSDF, has provided various weaponry, technology and fighting ships, has trained Japanese sailors for modern warfare, and has established strong cooperative ties with the JMSDF to confront formidable enemies. Relations between the two navies are
similar to a blood relationship. Their cooperation has strengthened the alliance on many occasions, and extricated the alliance from critical situations. As discussed in Chapter 2, their relations have proved that the navy-to-navy relationship is at the core of alliances between maritime states.

Still, in the different strategic circumstances now confronting Japan, the old constraints have limited Japan’s ability to pursue its national interests and its use of seapower for those ends. Thus Japan continued to limit its participation in the defence of the international maritime system even after the end of the Cold War, despite being highly dependent upon that system. This stance did not enhance Japan’s international reputation. However, slow change started to occur as Tokyo increasingly understood how its reputation was being eroded and as the security situation at sea began to deteriorate, both as a result of growing disorder on the oceans as shipping vulnerabilities to non-state threats increased, and as strategic factors changed, with the rise of new naval powers placing particular pressure on Japan to defend its own maritime rights and interests. As a result of this process, Japan’s security policy is showing change towards a more “normal” direction. The Japan Self-Defense Force has even been frequently allowed to be deployed overseas.

This process has been extensively documented in this thesis, and it is the argument of this study that Japan will need to continue and deepen this process of naval and maritime engagement and coalition building in order to safeguard its national security as the century unfolds. The number and potential seriousness of the challenges Japan faces at sea make this process a strategic necessity. Such engagement may even serve to ameliorate some of the rivalries currently under way.

For example, there are grave bilateral issues between Japan and South Korea, and the South Korean navy also has long-simmering rivalry with the JMSDF. However, if the two countries re-establish a common perception of threats and the two navies deepen exchanges through maritime coalition-building activities such as RIMPAC exercises and even bilateral processes, they could more effectively face common challenges together.
In a geo-strategic sense, reliable, long-time friend Australia and rising India could be potentially significant allies for Japan. In the Asia Pacific region, many stakeholders have been jolted by China’s military expansion and its gains in influence. Precisely because Japan is in such a situation, it has to intensify relations with such like-minded states and needs to move the relationships to another level from the slowly developing “quasi-alignments” described in Chapter 6 in order to solidify its position as a maritime state. Japan has increasingly used not only the JMSDF, but also the Japan Coast Guard in a strategy of maritime-centred international diplomacy to further Japanese security interests and contribute to the maintenance of the international maritime system in a way that befits the world’s second largest economy, a leading member of the democratic West and a major power in its own right.

**Implications**

This thesis has made the current situation of Japanese seapower easily understood by analysing it within the context of the broader concept of seapower. The analysis has revealed serious and widespread problems for Japan as a seapower, which have been very complicated to overcome. Such issues are summarized in the following tasks.

**Cooperation with Anglo-Saxon Seapower**

Japanese diplomatic analyst Hisahiko Okazaki insists that in past centuries Anglo-Saxon seapower has broken down rivals since it defeated the Spanish Armada in 1588. In the twentieth century, Anglo-American alliances have defeated Germany twice, Japan and the Soviet Union. They have embodied the superiority of seapower in the maritime world of the Columbus Era. Nations which choose to become a partner of the Anglo-Saxon seapower states also have been blessed with prosperity, including Japan and Germany after their defeat in World War II, France in the 20th century, and Holland after the Anglo-Dutch Wars.\(^{216}\) On the basis of learning from the history, it seems obvious that Japan must cooperate with the rest of the world and make the core of its existence a geopolitical orientation as a maritime state. It seems that following a geo-strategic alliance as a sea power state is the road to success for Japan. Okazaki asserts that Japan has enjoyed the prosperity and the peace of the Pacific Ocean, maintained

\(^{216}\) Hisahiko Okazaki, *Taiwan Mondai wa Nihon Mondai* [Taiwan’s Issue is Japan’s Issue], Kairyusha, Tokyo, 2008, pp. 264-265.
once as part of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and then under the Japan-U.S. security arrangements in the post-War era.\footnote{217}

According to Robyn Lim, Japan has to select from among three options for its security policy:\footnote{218} deepening alliance with the United States by taking a major role in the maritime coalition; gaining China’s favour as a tributary state; or going down a path towards independence. Taking the history and the actual situation of Japan, the Japanese appear to have only one choice, as argued throughout this thesis.

Two Issues in Japan’s Maritime Policy

Mainly, two issues are pointed out in Japan’s maritime policy. One is related to Japan’s administrative organization. The Japanese government has taken a long time to construct a comprehensive approach in establishing a framework to deal with issues relevant to its ocean space, since Japan’s policy toward the sea was captured by vertically-segmented administrative system. Traditionally, the development of comprehensive maritime policy came very late when compared with its Asian neighbours.\footnote{219} The Basic Act on Ocean Policy was enacted in 2007 and a Headquarters for Ocean Policy launched, demonstrating how far the Japanese government had moved in giving maritime issues the prompt attention required of a maritime state.

Mahan stressed the importance of “character of the government:

\begin{quote}

The government by its policy can favour the natural growth of a people’s industries and its tendencies to seek adventure and gain by way of the sea; or it can try to develop such industries and such sea-going bent, when they do not naturally exist; or, on the other hand, the government may by mistaken action check and fetter the progress which the people left to themselves would make.\footnote{220}
\end{quote}
Mahan believed that the rise and fall of sea powers strongly depended on the governmental factor, because he knows some countries were not able to achieve naval adequacy, in spite of favourable geographical conditions: “the final outcome had not been geographically determined but decided by human action.”

The other issue is more fundamental. The Japanese public have obviously only a limited interest in ocean space. In order to nurture maritime-mindedness among the people, the fundamental review of education to bring the existence of the sea closer to young Japanese is essential through elementary and secondary school education. The research system of university and graduate school has to be improved for the deeper exchange of military personnel and the academic community. The concept and theory of seapower can be difficult to study because of its multidisciplinary nature. In particular, Japanese educational institutions do not have in place the kind of environment necessary to study fields of research related to seapower such as geopolitics and military strategy.

Most importantly of all, the Japanese government must clearly present long and mid-term concepts and strategies to integrate all of the various aspects of seapower into a discernable whole.

**Wake to Reality**

Above all else, the greatest problem for Japan’s seapower is its Community Factor discussed in Chapter 2, especially Character of the People and Character of the Government. In fact, these are the elements among elements, the source of seapower and Japan’s orientation as a sea power state. The reason why Japanese maritime forces are imposed with tremendous constraints on promoting maritime coalition-building and confidence-building measures among navies is that the Japanese government cannot change the interpretation of the right of collective defence, and the majority of Japanese remain preoccupied with unrealistic one-country pacifism under the protection of America’s formidable military power: this cannot avoid being labelled irresponsible.

---
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The Japanese people thus need to promote changes in the national consciousness, even though there would be considerable difficulty in the realization of this objective. A bill for an “Act on Procedures for Amendment of the Constitution of Japan” was passed into law under the Abe administration in 2007 and the law comes into effect in May 2010, but the controversial issue on the revision of Article 9 of the constitution would be kept on the shelf for the foreseeable future, unless there were to be extreme circumstances.

Japan as a nation deeply reflects on the defeat of the Second World War and has been in self-imposed chains of post-War pacifism. Yet the balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region is changing, where rising nations expand and modernize their military strength, and a great number of potential roots of conflict exist, perhaps to upset Japan’s interests and even its own sovereign territory. Japan has not performed its duty as a major power sharing in the great responsibility to secure international society. It is difficult for people from other countries to understand the atmosphere created by the post-War pacifism in Japan’s society. It is not so easy for Japanese to officially speak about the realism of international relations and the importance of military preparedness. In general, it is difficult and regarded as a kind of taboo for Japanese to study military affairs, and the type of geopolitical thought that many blame for the Japanese Empire’s headlong rush to war.

Additionally, as a major problem, not only are most ordinary Japanese unaware of the gravity of the situation, but also there are some who want Japan to remain in the trap of unrealistic pacifism, both domestically and abroad. There has been an invisible “Berlin Wall” within Japan. It is probably true to say that the “Cold War” is not over yet for Japan and the Japanese. In this circumstance, how can Japanese people know the significance of seapower and maritime strategy?

Chapter 2 argues that the general theory advocated by J.C. Wylie could be used to integrate a variety of factors to operate seapower effectively. Nevertheless, in Japan’s case, far from being just a theoretical construction for seapower, it is a very practical and urgent matter. Without a response based on seapower and maritime coalition building to its unfolding international circumstances, Japan will be severely challenged in the coming decades.
If Japan becomes more conscious of being a maritime power, it would be forced to open its eyes to global realities, including current and emerging difficulties and threats in the maritime arena. Such a situation would require Japan to enhance international collaboration and increase its own contributions, in both economic and security terms, as a member of a maritime-oriented coalition.

Despite his image as an aggressive strategic thinker, Mahan noticed that it was “improbable that control [over the seas] ever again will be exercised, as once it was, by a single nation.” According to Jon Sumida’s analysis, Mahan thought that democracy makes it difficult for governments to win enormous military appropriations because popular governments have a tendency to adjust their budgets for prosperity during peacetime, unlike during the height of the British Empire. Indeed, the economic and commercial form of seapower states tends to cultivate democratic forms of government. Considering not only military might, but also geographical factors, a single maritime state cannot achieve sufficient capabilities to satisfy sea control alone. Japan must therefore attain the various factors of seapower across the broad spectrum of attributes discussed in this thesis. In particular, Japan must enhance its maritime coalition-building and its alliance with the United States, factors which could enable it to build a prosperous and stable Asia, and maritime and naval cooperation with other states which also respect an open economic, and free political and legal order, in preparation for a new maritime age that may promote prosperity and globalisation, and prevent the morass of conflict.
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