

This article was translated by JIIA from Japanese into English to promote Japanese scholarly work on international relations.

JIIA takes full responsibility for the translation of this article.

*To obtain permission to use this article beyond the scope of your personal use and research,
please contact JIIA by e-mail (jdl_inquiry@jii.or.jp).*

Citation: Japan and the World, Japan Digital Library (March 2017),

http://www2.jii.or.jp/en/digital_library/world.php

Japan's Policies on Conflict Prevention and International Peace Cooperation Activities*

Toshiya Hoshino

(Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University)

There used to be a time when it was said, with a touch of irony, “The Cold War is over—and Japan won!” From the mid-1980s through the early years of the 1990s, Japan was seen as a major exporting power, and it was proud of its competitiveness in the world's markets. The Plaza Accord (1985) reached among the ministers of finance and heads of central banks of five countries (the G5) was an attempt to carry out coordinated intervention in the international exchange market, including a major revaluation of the yen, in order to correct an excessively strong dollar, but it had no effect at all in reducing the US deficit toward Japan and the trade imbalance grew even further. Seeking to put that financial clout to use, Japan, as was widely reported at length in the media, bought up major US companies and symbolic real estate. At the same time, trade friction intensified in a number of areas, as did the pressures for import liberalization and structural reform and voluntary export restrictions. That period was marked by such trends.

The pressures on Japan, however, were not limited to the economic area and fears brought on by a sense of threat and the vexations caused by the blinding pace of Japanese progress. There was a feeling that Japan was hitching a free ride because Japan itself had made no particular contribution to the maintenance of peace and stability in the international community which underlay Japan's success, and pressures toward Japan can be seen as reflecting a wariness and concern that for the Japanese, the economy was the end-all and be-all which would bring all markets to their knees. A telling incident occurred in 1987 when Toshiba Machine violated Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls (CoCom) regulations by selling the Soviet Union milling machines which would contribute to silent running by Soviet submarines. This incident heightened the image of Japan as an adherent of mercantilism which thought that even giving aid to the enemy was fine if it benefitted business.

Japan had suffered a massive loss in the Second World War, and its post-war path led it through rebuilding and a period of rapid economic growth until in 1968 it became the world's second largest economic power. Under the US-Japan security setup, the combination of light arms and equipment with priority on the economy (in other words, the Yoshida Doctrine) made such rapid economic growth possible, and Japan sought to project the image of a peaceful nation by adopting its Peace Constitution, giving itself only defensive capabilities, and avoiding becoming a military power which could present a

* This article was originally published as Toshiya Hoshino, “Funsoyobo to Kokusaiheiwa Kyoryoku Katsudo” in Ryo Oshiba, ed., *Nihon no Gaiko: Taigaiseisaku-Kadaihen* [Japan's diplomacy: external policy-challenges], Vol. 5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2013), 71-95.

threat to other countries. There were of course some in Japan who were strongly in opposition, calling up Japan's history to claim that the Self-Defense Forces were unconstitutional and that SDF activities outside Japan represented the overseas dispatch of troops. In the classroom, where Japan's children were educated, emphasis was on furthering peace by linking this to protection of the Constitution and anti-militarism. In addition, Japan used its new status as an economic power to devote an annually growing amount to official development assistance (ODA). In this sense, Japan did not try to make use of all the benefits of an orderly international community without paying some price. The problem, however, was how to clear the high hurdle of making a human contribution. Japan needed to do something to obviate the criticism that it would provide money but wouldn't provide people.

Toward the end of the 1980s, Japan's new enthusiasm for a policy of cooperation in the areas of international peace and security was due in some degree to the criticisms and pressures of the international community. At the same time, however, this reflected a move on Japan's own part to fulfill the responsibilities of its international status. The age shifted course from the "long peace" during the Cold War as cited by John Lewis Gaddis to a post-Cold War period of greater instability and unpredictability. This was the period when Japan shifted from the Showa emperor to his son, whose reign name was Heisei, and the period when Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita, in May 1988, proclaimed a new foreign policy for Japan, one that would represent "Japan contributing to the world." The crisis and war in the Gulf (1990-1991) faced Japan with the need to search for a response, which turned out to be the adoption of the International Peace Cooperation Act of 1992, also known as the PKO Law, which permitted the overseas dispatch of the SDF in a human contribution in the military field.

Around this same period, Japan experienced the arrival of the "twenty lost years," the period when the bursting bubble moved Japan's economy from strong development to recession. In terms of Japan's cooperation in promoting international peace and security, however, these two decades displayed a number of particularly notable developments regarding Japanese foreign policy and security policy. Not everything, of course, went smoothly and all according to plan, but we can trace how Japan, following its own sensibilities and approaches, responded to the needs of the international community. In this chapter, we will examine Japan's military and non-military attempts to deal with problems of conflict prevention and resolution as well as post-conflict building and maintenance of peace.

1. The dilemma of "Japan contributing to the world"

A learning experience—Contribution to peace and nation building in Cambodia

The start of Japan's full-fledged activity concerning international peace and security came through its participation in the United Nations peacekeeping operations in Cambodia (1992-1993). Looking back, we can now see that the Japanese government's approach to the problem of Cambodia had both bilateral and multilateral aspects. Among the bilateral elements were participation in a peacekeeping operation, dispatch of personnel to a multipurpose PKO force, and other activities to support Cambodia's nation building, including rebuilding after the conflict, moral support, and peace building. The multilateral aspects represented a rather total approach, such as economic cooperation (including the creation of the International Committee on the Reconstruction of Cambodia, ICORC, and holding sessions of the Cambodia Development Consultative Group, the CG) and support for the rule of law and application of law during the transitional period. In short, the Japanese approach ranged from economic and political affairs to security and legal matters, with participation in both military and non-military concerns. In this sense, Cambodia represented a true learning experience for Japan to apply in its later international peace cooperation.

In remarks at the time of the formulation of the International Peace Cooperation Act, Prime

Minister Kiichi Miyazawa noted that achieving a permanent peace in Cambodia was of extreme importance to the peace and security of Asia as a whole, and he intended to work toward early realization of a way to offer personnel cooperation to the UN peacekeeping activities there (June 15, 1992). In actuality, the “Cambodia problem” was not just a problem for Cambodia but represented a distillation of Asia’s own complex structure built up during the Cold War. If we borrow the words of a prominent scholar of international relations, Akihiko Tanaka, resolution of the Cambodia problem would have an extremely broad effect, all the way from normalizing international relations among Asia’s various regions and democratization of individual countries’ domestic systems to the interdependence of their economies and regional cooperation for economic unity (Tanaka, 2007, pp. 4-7).

Today, Cambodia has moved beyond the stage of recovering from the conflict and is moving toward sustainable development. Juichi Inada has analyzed its trends of the past twenty years and notes that while there are still problems left for it to resolve in areas such as establishing democratic unity, we can confirm Cambodian progress in a number of respects (Inada, 2013, p. 24). Cambodia has moved toward domestic political stability by regularly holding multiparty elections and by achieving some relief from the armed conflicts among its various armed domestic factions; moving toward participation in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the international economic system and promotion of investment from abroad (including Japanese enterprises which are expanding their investment under “China + 1”); and expanding Cambodia’s tourism industry and its communication system. No one can mistake the fact that such achievements are the result of the strength of the people of Cambodia as they yearned for peace supported by the international community, including Japan.

From Japan’s viewpoint, Cambodia was by no means a case where the various countries directly involved, centering on the UN Security Council’s P5, put together a road to peace and then, when the time came to pay for Cambodia’s rebuilding, sent a bill to Japan. No, Japan was clearly present and participating from the negotiating stage and making an appropriate contribution to carrying out the peace agreement, as an example of putting its foreign policy into action (Ikeda, 1996; Kono, 1999).

To be sure, such an enthusiastic approach to the Cambodia problem and its results became a milestone adding momentum to Japan’s subsequent international peace cooperation. If the dispatch of SDF personnel was a “military contribution,” then Cambodia was the first such contribution. It was, however, participation in PKO efforts aimed at ensuring peace. In other words, under the aegis of the newly-established United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), with Head of Mission Yasushi Akashi, himself a Japanese, serving as the representative of the UN Secretary-General, Japan not only sent a SDF logistics battalion and ceasefire observers but also civilian police officers, election workers, and others, for a total of over 1,300 personnel.

These activities were accompanied by risks. Atsushi Nakata was a member of the UN volunteers, actively engaged in giving support to the elections, and Senior Police Superintendent Haruyuki Takada conducted patrols as part of the civilian police team; both lost their lives in the course of duty. The places where the two were felled by weapons were renamed Atsu Village and Haru Village. People remember the performance of the two, and schools were also built there for the education of the local children. Their last wishes were that they would remain in the hearts of later UN workers and volunteers from Japan, and they do live on today with the many professionals who are devoting their minds and bodies to their solid, sober activities around the globe.

PM Takeshita, a firm believer in the link between rejuvenation of the homeland and international peace cooperation

The preceding section makes clear just why Japan’s experience in Cambodia, as a strong reminder of

modern-day Japan's diplomacy and international peace cooperation, is viewed with such strong feelings today. The dispatch of personnel overseas as a Japanese international contribution, however, did not start with Cambodia. Even earlier, Prime Minister Takeshita launched the International Cooperation Initiative, picturing it as "Japan contributing to the world." Takeshita's concept was built from three elements, furthering cooperation for peace, strengthening international cultural exchange, and the expansion and deepening of official development assistance (ODA).

In a speech he delivered at on May 4, 1988, at a luncheon hosted by the Lord Mayor of London, Takeshita noted, "Japan takes peace as a national policy, and I believe you are aware that our Constitution also does not permit us to offer military cooperation. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that where world peace is concerned, Japan must not just stand idly by and watch. From both a political and a moral viewpoint, I believe that Japan must offer the utmost cooperation possible, and I have established a new concept of 'cooperation for peace' which will include active participation in diplomatic efforts for the resolution of conflicts, the assignment of personnel, and budgetary cooperation. We will move forward to heighten Japan's contribution to strengthening the maintenance of international peace."

At just about that same time, in April 1988, the Geneva Accords on the Afghanistan problem were instituted, and as a Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan was taking shape, the UN Security Council in May 1988 established the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP). In August of that year, a ceasefire was reached in the Iran-Iraq War, and the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) was formed. The Japanese government immediately took steps to assign one Foreign Ministry staff member to each of these missions as an administrative officer. These two examples were part of the initial period of Japan's international peace cooperation, but we may gather from his remarks cited above that at this stage, he had no intention that such assignments would go on to include SDF personnel.

Speaking of Prime Minister Takeshita, he has the image of being very domestically oriented, with his idea of rejuvenation of the homeland, so how does that tie in with the emphasis on international peace cooperation? The key to unraveling this puzzle can be found in the following message from Takeshita, his greetings at the beginning of a new year, in January 1988.

For quite a while I have been calling for rejuvenation of our homeland. This not only aims to produce a material abundance, it also aims to let Japan meet the expectations of the world by emphasizing an abundance of the heart and by allowing the Japanese themselves to build a foundation for a disciplined, well-lived life. . . . For the Japan of the future, it will be necessary for us to take contributing to the world as our basic posture and to put our abundance of life and way of living to use in the interest of the international community. Not doing so is a path we must avoid taking if we are to resolve the many frictions that are developing today, and particularly for the sake of Japan's existence and development, I believe that it is our responsibility to toil and work earnestly to make that happen. We must show ourselves willing to bear such costs, and we likely will have to share pains. Our internal affairs and external affairs are quite tied together, and I personally hope that I will live sincerely fulfilling my responsibilities.

At the middle of that month, Prime Minister Takeshita visited Washington, DC, and he concluded his speech before the National Press Club by departing from his prepared text to make the following extemporaneous statement (January 14, 1988).

Here with us today we have Ms. Chiaki Mukai, the Japanese lady who is in training at the Johnson Space Center in Houston as the first Japanese astronaut to take part in the space shuttle program. Once Ms. Mukai said to me that for an astronaut, the only place to return to is the earth, and that very much stirred my sympathy. I am constantly calling for the rejuvenation of

our homeland, and I have also pointed out that this earth is the irreplaceable homeland for all of the human race. We must change this earth from a place of confrontation and conflict to a place of dialogue and cooperation. To build the kind of Japanese and American global partnership that will contribute to such a world of peace and prosperity, we must join forces and move ahead to accomplish, one by one, the things that must be done.

On yet another occasion speaking in more relaxed surroundings (April 9, 1989, in Oita City), the prime minister said the following regarding international cooperation.

If we take the Persian Gulf [during the Iran-Iraq War] as an example, there have been arguments that other places deploy minesweepers to deal with the mines that have been placed there, but for Japan wouldn't this entail dispatching troops overseas? Because of these arguments, we don't do that. From the viewpoint of the world's other countries, the one country which transports the most oil through the Persian Gulf destined for its own domestic use is Japan, but these other countries see that Japan hasn't deployed a single mine sweeper, and that is incomprehensible to them. But since we can't do something like that, instead we have tried to fulfill our responsibility by covering part of the expenses for navigation safety equipment, for example.

If you look at the process leading up to today's Japanese Constitution and Self-Defense Forces, it has been Japan's policy that it cannot participate in military affairs. And so, when peace negotiations are held, people are going to be watching to see if Japan will provide military personnel to monitor affairs, or in particular to see how Japan, which has the most experience in rebuilding after a war, will put its strengths and experience to good use, and that is why we sent young Japanese to deal with the Afghanistan problem. In the case of the Iran and Iraq problem as well, we have been able to apply our position that Japan must play an active role in achieving peace, including up to the point of dispatching personnel.

What we can take from these statements is our political leadership's belief that this globe is the common homeland for all humanity, and that having been freed from the yoke of the Cold War, we have a responsibility to look at the changing world situation and decide, albeit from a limited list of possibilities, how to go about fulfilling Japan's responsibilities to use its own particular knowledge and experience in, for example, rebuilding after war and mine sweeping. We could also interpret this as a desire to share with the rest of the world the abundance Japan has gained through its period of rapid economic growth.

Overcoming the “diplomatic defeats” of the Gulf War

Against the background of Japan's rapid economic growth and the destruction caused by the Cold War, there is something we should not overlook between Prime Minister Takeshita's world view, which could become a bit maudlin at times, and Japanese pride and emotion involving its contribution to peace and recovery in Cambodia. That is Japan's response to the crisis in the Gulf sparked by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 and the Gulf War, which represented military action taken by a multinational armed force put together by the international community to force Iraq's withdrawal and the return of the legitimate Kuwaiti government. Japan, in the name of contributing to the world, experienced the impatience of limiting its own range of actions by tying its own hands. Although Japan devoted a huge sum from its national budget—\$13 billion in total—to the multinational force in the Gulf, this Japanese contribution was dismissed by many as too little, too late. On top of this, after the war, the government of Kuwait placed ads in American newspapers to express its appreciation, but insultingly, Japan's name is nowhere to be found. This problem cannot be solved merely by calling this very cruel turn of events a “diplomatic defeat” (Teshima, 2006). What we must ask is what Japan learned from this experience and whether it has been able to put that lesson to use thereafter.

What was in particular drawn into question at the time was two interrelated points: the problem of the prime minister's political leadership as he responded to the crisis, and whether or not there was a real human contribution. With the mass resignation of the cabinet of Prime Minister Takeshita, who vaunted his international contributions, the administration of Sosuke Uno took its place, with Uno inheriting a distrust of politics caused by the introduction of a consumer tax and the Recruit insider stock trading scandal compounded by his own problems with women. Under Uno, the Liberal Democratic Party lost a large number of seats in elections for the lower house of parliament. The Gulf crisis also presented itself just during the Toshiki Kaifu administration, which had a only a weak political base at a time when the opposition parties were gaining increasing strength in the Diet, so in reality, despite the attempts of the prime minister to exercise leadership, there were self-imposed limits.

Prime Minister Kaifu canceled an already-planned state visit to the Middle East and tried to formulate policies for a Middle East contribution from his office, but work moved ahead only slowly. The state visit would have been an excellent opportunity for Japan's leadership first of all to make their way to the Middle East, work out policies directly with the leaders there, and put those policies into action, but the prime minister let this chance slip through his fingers in what might have augured some of the inept developments still to come. The ministries of foreign affairs and finance were locked nose-to-nose in disagreement over the amount of financial support to be provided and the timing of its announcement, wasting good opportunities. The United States brought up a request for transport assistance to the multinational force, but no legal basis could be found for permitting use of SDF transport. Consideration was given to chartering civilian vessels and aircraft, but the tie-up between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Transport didn't work out well. Besides which, it would have been just too ironic for civilian vessels and aircraft to be placed in harm's way where the SDF could not go.

While the activities projected for the multinational force in the Gulf would be to engage in battle, these were approved and appropriate activities authorized by the UN Security Council and were thought to be an example of the UN's basic collective security function in action. Shouldn't it be possible to contribute SDF personnel to these efforts, even as behind-the-lines support? It was such opinions that gave rise to the Kaifu administration's draft for a "United Nations Peace Cooperation Act," but the opposition parties and the media slapped it with the label of foreign deployment of SDF troops and opposed it consistently until it had to be withdrawn.

Its response to the crisis and war in the Gulf left Japan thoroughly bloodied. Hiroshi Nakanishi has pointed out (Nakanishi, 2011) that this situation, the first international incident of its sort after the end of the Cold War, revealed two weaknesses of Japanese diplomacy that still stand out today, more than twenty years later. First is the question of Japan's diplomatic identity that determines what role it will play in international politics. In other words, since WWII, Japan has not seen military force as a tool of foreign policy, but how does this relate to SDF use of arms while participating in peacekeeping or to joining with the United States in exercising the right to collective self-defense? Nakanishi aptly analyzes this question not as a technical argument on interpretation of the Constitution but as the lack of a clear consensus at the level of our identity as Japanese on selecting our foreign policies. Second, Nakanishi sees the problem of government weakness in making strategic decisions when faced with a major crisis which cannot be easily accommodated using existing structures. To be sure, there are still many antiquated attitudes which must also be conquered, such as the government's way of gathering information when faced with a crisis, the sectionalism of bureaucrats, and the relations between politicians and bureaucrats.

One fact that became plain through Japan's experience in the Gulf crisis and war is that even in the context of making a contribution to the international community, it was deemed better not to exercise the option of sending SDF troops abroad. Japan did send the SDF to the Persian Gulf, albeit after the

conclusion of the war, to conduct minesweeping activities (as part of the Gulf Dawn operations). In what was the first real SDF undertaking ever, the assignment was decided in a meeting of Japan's Security Council and the Cabinet on April 24, 1991, as a measure based on Article 99 of the Self-Defense Forces Act. The Maritime SDF unit dispatched to undertake this duty consisted of six minesweeping craft and 511 members, sailing some 7,000 nautical miles and devoting 188 days to the operation. The MSDF unit joined with eight other countries (the United States, the UK, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany, and Saudi Arabia) in a nine-country joint force and cleared away 1,200 mines that Iraq had placed off Kuwait's shores (Ochiai, 2001). While it might have been a belated gesture, this human contribution by Japan was highly rated.

When viewed in this way, we can see that international pressures for Japan to reflect its rapid economic growth in its international contributions, Japan's own determination to make a contribution to the world, and the SDF's actual performance and effectiveness in this international assignment gave momentum to regularization of international contributions in the military area through overseas assignment of the SDF, even though this had to be done within the restrictions placed by the Constitution.

2. Conflict prevention: a non-military contribution

If it is somehow possible to forestall those wars and other conflicts which shake the international system and rob many of their lives, then it becomes unnecessary to pay the price of huge military expenditures and many lives sacrificed. The prevention or peaceful settlement of conflicts is precisely the area where diplomacy can display its effectiveness. The Cold War was a rarely encountered example of the peaceful conclusion of a situation of conflict, but from the end of the Cold War through the September 11, 2001, terror attacks on the United States which ushered in a new age of conflict, during what was mainly seen as the post-Cold War age, the international community was forced to deal with a series of local conflicts and humanitarian crises, forcefully driving home the importance of conflict prevention.

The Gulf crisis and war as mentioned above was the first large international incident after the Cold War. Assuming we may be permitted to speculate about what perhaps *could* have happened, there has been active argument about whether this crisis could somehow have been avoided. The focus has been on statements to Iraq's President Saddam Hussein by the American ambassador at a meeting held about one week before the fateful day when the crisis began. The Iraqi army had positioned a large number of tank units on the border with Kuwait. If Ambassador April Glaspie had, at this point in time, more pointedly expressed US determination regarding Iraq's strategic intentions, the crisis might have been avoided, some think. Ambassador Glaspie reported this meeting in a July 25, 1990, cable to the State Department (90 Baghdad 4237), and thanks to WikiLeaks, we now know in detail what was said. We can see that the US policy was to avoid stressing a clear commitment to the defense of Kuwait. Thus the chance to forestall the crisis was lost, and Stephen Walt persuasively makes the point that when the ambassador expressed US "friendship" to Saddam Hussein along with its "concern," in effect the United States gave the green light for the invasion (Walt, et al., 2011). The result was the Gulf War.

The end of the US-Soviet Cold War to be sure greatly rolled back the threat of global nuclear war, but at the same time, this also presented greater opportunity for local conflicts around the world to manifest themselves. While some were, like the Gulf crisis, confrontations of one country with another, the majority were caused by confrontations which until they surfaced internationally had been confined to within a country's borders reflecting the Cold War arrangement. Some were confrontations between supporters and opponents of the government, while other conflicts resulted from ethnic, religious, geographic or other differences giving rise to tragic civil war among the various domestic communities.

Three particularly striking examples of such conflicts would be Rwanda (1999), Kosovo

(1998-1999), and East Timor (1999), which strongly pressed on the international community the importance of conflict prevention. In Rwanda's case, while the international community was to some degree aware of the signs of an extreme humanitarian crisis which made political use of ethnic confrontations—Hutu extremists committing genocide primarily against the Tutsis, which claimed over one million victims—there was no swift international response. With Kosovo, conflicts and “ethnic cleansing” had long occurred on the Balkan Peninsula through disputes between the Serbian and Albanian residents, and there was discussion that the waves of conflict could sweep the area again, but the discussion did not lead to any preventive steps. Even after fighting broke out, the situation invited divisions within the UN Security Council, resulting in NATO troops using force of arms in the former Yugoslavia without authorization from the Security Council. East Timor presented a situation where three parties—Indonesia, which had annexed this region, the old colonial power Portugal, and the UN—had laid out in detail East Timor's path to independence, but after consultations with the residents via a referendum, the three parties were unable to prevent disturbances that spilled much blood. These three examples should be more than enough to create great regret in the international community at its inability to prevent the outbreak and escalation of conflict as well as demonstrating the great costs of dealing with the situation afterward. Based on such experiences, starting around the end of the 1990s emphasis in the UN and the G8 was placed on diplomatic efforts to prevent conflicts, and we should take note that Japan has been exercising leadership in conflict prevention using international contributions in non-military areas.

UN track for conflict prevention measures

The Preamble to the UN Charter notes the determination “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind,” demonstrating that fundamentally the UN is an international organization created among governments for the purpose of preventing war. In Article 1 on Purposes, it clearly states that the UN's purpose is “To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.” The Cold War started soon after the UN was established, and because of the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, the UN became unable to fulfill its fundamental function as a collective security system. When Dag Hammarskjöld arrived as the second secretary-general, he started to call for “preventive diplomacy,” and he was faced with the need to take the initiative to ensure that the confrontation between the US and Soviet blocs did not escalate into a “hot war,” with the added danger of becoming a nuclear conflict. In terms of the process that led up to forming the UN, such a need for initiative was quite paradoxical. In addition, the US-Soviet standoff made it very difficult to put together a “UN army” as envisioned by the Charter; in its place, units were formed which would come between countries in confrontation to conduct military supervision and keep the sides' forces apart, which turned into the UN peacekeeping operations (PKO). Eventually, the PKO came to play a large part in the function of preventing reoccurrence of hostilities.

During the crisis in Rwanda, Kofi Annan was the head of the Secretariat's PKO office, and for Kosovo and East Timor, he was secretary-general. He was thus directly involved in the peacekeeping activities in these locations, and he prominently stressed the cruelty of war and the importance of conflict prevention. In September 1999, Secretary-General Annan presented the UN with his annual report on his own activities, and in the introduction to that report, he raises the question of “Facing the Humanitarian Challenge —Towards a Culture of Prevention.” In his “millennium report” delivered in 2000, Annan addresses the possibility that poverty could interact with ethnic or religious confrontations to develop into civil war and points out how reduction of poverty and promotion of economic growth, respect for

human rights (including protection of the rights of minorities), and open government were related to prevention of conflicts, and further, in his report submitted to the Security Council in June 2001, he emphasizes the proactive responsibility of the countries involved in a potential conflict to prevent that conflict. He also delves deeply into basic, structural causes of conflict from social, economic, cultural, systemic, and political viewpoints and stresses applying a comprehensive approach and mobilizing governments' political will. In addition, the general sort of activities aimed at prevention had frequently been referred to as preventive diplomacy, but Secretary-General Annan also expressed these as "preventive activities" or "conflict prevention," and attention was given to the way in which Annan proposed an approach which could encompass a variety of related undertakings including preventive diplomacy, preventive development, preventive evolution (e.g., UN peacekeeping activities), and preventive disarmament (UN Document, 2001). In July 2006, toward the end of his term as secretary-general, Annan prepared a report which reviewed the state of progress over the preceding five years, noting that to some extent a "culture of prevention" had taken root but that there remained a large gap between rhetoric and reality. He strongly appealed for attention to also be directed at dealing with conflict risk factors at a global system level along with approaches for conflict prevention undertaken in the field and at the structural level (UN Document, 2006).

Secretary-General Annan will perhaps be remembered for the efforts he made during his term in office to reexamine the role of PKO in UN activities and to bring the idea of "people-centered" security more to the fore. Regarding the former of these two topics, Algeria's former foreign minister Lakhdar Brahimi headed the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, which in August 2000 released a report (referred to as the Brahimi Report). On the latter topic, there were two examples of UN-related bodies which issued reports. One was the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty formed jointly by the UN and the government of Canada, which in December 2001 proposed a "responsibility to protect." The other would be cooperation between the UN and the government of Japan in forming the Commission on Human Security, which issued a report in May 2003 proposing recognition of the concept "human security."

The Brahimi Report defined UN peace-related activities as consisting primarily of conflict prevention along with the three elements of creating peace, peacekeeping and peace building, and the report is notable for its call for a realistic reform of PKO and related activities. This report is highly significant for its mainstreaming of UN peace activities related to the Secretary-General's fact-finding missions and ceasefires and other conflict-prevention approaches (UN Document, 2000).

While the approaches represented by the "responsibility to protect" and the "human security" concepts may have differed somewhat, they each stand as an attempt to define new standards for the sovereign nations (governments) which are the main body of the international community to follow in directly protecting the lives, livelihoods, and dignity of the people who live in those nations. There is some overlap here with the concept of non-interference in sovereign states, and neither concept seems likely to be immediately accepted and applied. Still, the "responsibility to protect" gives the international community responsibility to prevent extreme humanitarian crises (the four varieties being genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and war crimes) and provides the option of rescuing people through military intervention under Security Council authorization should such crises occur. On the other hand, the concept of "human security" embraced by Japan from the outset excludes the use of military force while still serving to support comprehensive response to a variety of threats including "fear" (more specifically, conflicts, terrorism, creation of refugees, spread of infectious disease, environmental destruction, economic crises, destruction, and so on) and "want" (such as poverty, hunger, and a lack of education and health services) and forms of support for people's "protection" (the strengthening of governance for protection of

people's basic rights, liberty, and dignity) and "empowerment" (the strengthening of self-rule which permits one to use one's own efforts to stand up to threats and which includes people's oversight of and participation in politics and government) (Ogata, 2011, p 2). Both of these two concepts can contribute to the prevention of conflict, both by suppressing the outbreak of humanitarian crises to the greatest extent possible and by removing social inequalities and similar factors that are the root cause of conflicts.

In September 2005, the year which marked the 60th anniversary of the creation of the UN, a world summit meeting was held which gathered together the leaders of many nations and produced an output document quite worthy of note. The document stressed the peaceful settlement of disputes, reconfirmed the commitment to promote a culture of prevention of conflicts, and newly established a UN Peacebuilding Commission to promote peacebuilding after conflicts (UN Document, 2005).

Annan's successor as secretary-general, Ban Ki-moon, has also emphasized the importance of preventing conflicts. It is worth particular note that he stressed conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding and cites them as a continuum of actions, as he urges that the UN make conflict prevention an ordered, comprehensive, and consistent approach. In particular, a mediation unit has also been established in the Secretariat as part of creation of a system for early detection and peaceful resolution of conflicts.

The G8 track for conflict prevention and Japan's initiative

The way in which the major developed countries, placed in uncomfortable straits both politically and economically in their response to the conflicts which peppered the decade of the 1990s, both sought to coordinate their actions with UN efforts and also took their own initiatives has been viewed as a highly rational approach. Japan is one example. After the political frustrations of the Gulf War, Japan applied its recently-passed International Peace Cooperation Act and sought to expand its opportunities abroad, taking part in PKO and similar activities in Cambodia, Mozambique, the Golan Heights, and East Timor and in international humanitarian assistance activities in East Timor and in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) as it tried to respond to the crisis in its neighbor Rwanda. These activities were all the more for the better since they were undertaken without having to assign SDF troops. Also during the 1990s, activity picked up in the Asia-Pacific region centering on the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), which itself drew to some degree on experiences in Europe, in the attempt to develop multinational relationships of trust; in general, there was rapid growth in interest among governments and at the civilian level regarding conflict prevention. For its part, Japan, which had an inherent interest in finding non-military solutions to problems, was glad to join this trend and raise specific initiatives of its own.

Along with the track being followed in the UN, Japan also greatly appreciated the conflict prevention efforts being exerted in the G8 and itself played a leading role in those efforts. At the Cologne Summit the preceding year, considerable attention was paid to conflict prevention, and at the 2000 Kyushu-Okinawa Summit hosted by Japan, one of the important points raised by the G8 was a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention. A specific example would be the agreement reached at the G8 foreign ministers conference chaired by Japan on the "G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention." At that time, under the rubric of the Miyazaki Initiatives, the Japanese government also issued "Action from Japan on 'Conflict and Development'—Japan Development Cooperation for Conflict Prevention."

These initiatives agreed upon by the G8 foreign ministers emphasized the importance of a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention, advancing policies for specific measures on specific topics (such as small arms, conflict and development, illegal trade in diamonds, the treatment of children during armed conflict, international civilian police) and citing reinforcement of a "chronological approach" representing coordinated actions both before, during, and after conflict as well as application of policies of a

comprehensive nature covering political, economic, and social aspects. The basis for Miyazaki Initiatives was set through discussions in Weimar in October of the previous year when the G8 directors of government affairs met and were joined by civilian academics and NGO representatives, and the fruits of those discussions were given more specific detail at the G8 foreign ministers meeting held in Berlin in December.

Amidst these various strains of discussion, Japan noted in particular that development assistance contributed to conflict prevention and devised its own plan for action. In this action plan there was a menu of possible actions using a chronological approach, covering topics such as assistance to promote governance and market-oriented forms of economic management, emergency humanitarian assistance to reduce people's suffering during and immediately following the conflict, and assistance in rebuilding and development to check the recurrence of conflict. The Japanese action plan also emphasized the role of NGOs which could serve conflict prevention efforts, and it proposed a new framework for timely and effective emergency assistance through the later formation of a "Japan Platform" to bring together a partnership of NGOs, economic actors, and the government (the foreign ministry), each of which would bring its own particular nature and resources into play.

3. Merging comprehensive conflict prevention and international peace cooperation

The post-9/11 world and Japanese international peace activities

The September 11, 2001, terrorism which shook not just the United States but the whole world imparted many with a feeling that a more chaotic age was about to arrive. The United States, victim of these direct attacks by international terrorists, launched a "war against terrorism" in Afghanistan and Iraq. Japan, which was in agreement with the US actions, was able to pass laws for special measures beyond the scope of the existing International Peace Cooperation Act so as to permit the overseas assignment of SDF troops for a limited period of time. One example was the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Act (2001), which opened the way for Maritime SDF ships in the Indian Ocean to provide rear support to the United States and other countries as they conducted military operations against the Taliban government of Afghanistan which hid the terrorist group Al Qaeda. Other examples would be the successors to that law, the Supply Support Special Measures Act (2008) and the Iraq Special Measures Act (2003). Under the second of these two special acts, while the United States conducted preemptive attacks against Iraq under the Bush Doctrine because of suspicions that it was developing weapons of mass destruction and had ties to terrorist groups, SDF troops were authorized to be assigned to provide support to humanitarian rehabilitation in Samawah in southern Iraq.

During this period, Japan amended the International Peace Cooperation Act (2001), removing restriction on PKO activities under the existing law and permitting activities which were a normal part of a peacekeeping force's responsibilities (such as supervision of ceasefires, separation of military units, and collection of weapons) as well as expanding the range of permitted defensive activities involving force of arms. These measures thus dealt with loosening restrictions on problems which a peacekeeping force could anticipate encountering as part of its duties. In addition, in 2004 there was major revision of defensive plans which gave recognition to how the SDF's ability to participate actively in international peace cooperation activities and do so independently could contribute to the international security environment. (During this period, the Ground, Maritime, and Air SDF were active, coordinating with each other to some extent, in responding to the massive earthquake off Sumatra in December 2004 and the resultant tidal wave in the Indian Ocean, which together left 220,000 dead or missing.) Against this background, the SDF Act was revised in 2007 and the Self-Defense Agency was elevated to ministry status, while international peace cooperation activities were made a formal part of the SDF's responsibilities. (Until that

point, PKO was handled merely as incidental duties under the SDF Act's miscellaneous provisions.) There was also progress during this period on restructuring the SDF, and a new Central Readiness Force (CRF) was established in the Ground SDF in 2007 under the direct aegis of the minister of defense, to respond promptly to the full range of "international peace cooperation activities" (covering, for instance, PKO activities based on the International Peace Cooperation Act, activities conducted under the International Emergency Relief Teams Dispatch Act, and humanitarian reconstruction support activities under the Special Measures Act) as well as the transport of Japanese citizens who are overseas in the event of disaster or disturbances in other countries or other emergency situations. In these ways, Japan displayed its ability to make human contributions to the international community.

The first international peace cooperation activity which saw the dispatch of the CRF was action against the pirates in the Gulf of Aden off Somalia (2008), entailing the brand-new duty of safeguarding civilian ships. The CRF later participated flexibly in humanitarian support, recovery support, and civilian administration cooperation under the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH, 2010) and participated in the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS, 2012) and other activities.

Needless to say, behind the success of these various activities were the actions and attitudes of the SDF itself, its efforts to build up and heighten the experience and training and structure which would let it apply its military capabilities to the cause of peace. At the same time, however, much is owed to the strong willingness of the Japanese political leadership during this period, including Junichiro Koizumi who from start to finish clearly supported the war against terror gave priority to cooperation through the alliance with the United States as he maintained clear support for the US war against terror, and the first Shinzo Abe administration which promoted the Self-Defense Agency to a ministry and otherwise worked to improve Japan's mechanisms for security. In the general elections held during summer of 2009, the Democratic Party made great gains and won the right to form governments, meaning the three successive administrations of prime ministers Hatoyama, Kan, and Noda. Under these administrations, supply operations in the Indian Ocean were halted and the confusion regarding US military bases in Okinawa grew, creating friction in the US-Japan relationship and causing shifts in the strategic balance with such regional players as China, South Korea, North Korea, and Russia as well as unnecessary disturbances in order within the region. While it may seem paradoxical, this brings one to wonder whether international peace cooperation and cooperation through the US-Japan alliance are seen by Japan as part of the same undertaking.

Building peace and promoting human security in vulnerable countries

Another point for consideration is that the range of activities from the 9/11 attacks through the rebuilding of Afghanistan and Iraq, peacekeeping in East Timor, the Sudan, and Haiti, and dealing with the pirates off Somalia may all appear at a glance as different in nature, but actually, we can see that they all present a great common challenge: They all bring up the question of how, in our increasingly globalized 21st century, do we deal with the new problem of the vulnerable country, restoring its functions as a sovereign state and returning hope to the people who live there. At the same time, we are becoming aware that discussion is turning to topics of political policy such as how to ensure that peace takes root (peacebuilding), how to build a country, and how to provide human security, matters which we commonly referred to as conflict prevention and international peace cooperation during the 1990s.

In Japan, we have tended to deal jointly with such matters by taking part in missions using the SDF in UN peacekeeping operations, for example, and using ODA for non-military rebuilding and developmental assistance. At the same time, our efforts have been directed at promoting capacity building for the

states (or governments) concerned and empowerment for their peoples. Speaking during May 2002, Foreign Minister Junko Kawaguchi pointed out the importance of ensuring that peace took root in Afghanistan, while during that same month in Sydney, Prime Minister Koizumi also stated the Japanese policy of strengthening assistance to countries suffering from conflicts through cooperation in instituting a firm peace and nation building, making these the main pillars of international cooperation. Such statements demonstrate Japan's enthusiasm for post-conflict efforts at building peace and ensuring that conflict does not recur. Indeed, as part of its 2003 revision of the general structure of ODA, the Japanese government dealt with existing concerns on a global scale such as reduction in poverty and sustainable development and also added peacebuilding. These are addressed in the ODA outline as follows.

In order to prevent conflicts in developing regions, it is important to deal comprehensively with the many causes of conflicts, and ODA is provided as part of the overall efforts so as to reduce poverty and correct disparities. In addition, conflict prevention and emergency humanitarian aid during conflicts are accompanied by a range of support from promotion of resolution of conflicts to post-conflict institution of a firm peace and nation building, comprehensively and functionally providing bilateral and multilateral support for peacebuilding efforts which can be immediately adjusted to changes in the situation.

More specifically, ODA is to be used, for example, to provide support for promoting the peace process; for humanitarian and restoration efforts such as supporting refugees and rebuilding a foundation for everyday life; for disarming and demobilizing soldiers and returning them to society (DDR) and the collection and destruction of weapons, including removal of landmines; for ensuring domestic stability and civil peace; and for reconstruction including both development of the economic society and bolstering of the government's administrative capacity. (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2003)

Another matter newly emphasized by this outline is "human security." Japan shall, the outline clearly states, carry out ODA aimed at using "people building" to increase the capabilities of regional society in terms of human security. In addition, Japan shall cooperate at every stage, from during the conflict itself through later rebuilding and development, in efforts to protect the individual and build the people's capabilities in order to ensure them a life of dignity to the greatest extent possible.

Japan has adopted a strategy of applying three factors for the establishment of peace (peacebuilding): promotion of peace, ensuring the stability and security of regions in conflict, and support for humanitarian rebuilding. Its strategy is to apply these factors to promote a comprehensive resolution of conflicts and prevent recurrence of conflict. With this viewpoint in mind, Japan has focused on Asia and has taken the lead in the G8 on support for matters such as the police and the return of former soldiers to society in Afghanistan. Japan has also been engaged in cooperation for nation building in East Timor, a ceasefire in the secession and independence conflict in Aceh, Indonesia, promotion of peace with Muslim anti-government forces in Mindanao in the southern Philippines, and promoting peacebuilding and restoration in Sri Lanka. Unless the time has come when all parties to a conflict truly want peace, it is difficult to achieve the desired results no matter how much support may be provided from the outside. In that sense, peacebuilding is a steady, solid job requiring much perseverance, but over the last 20 years, we can see that Japan, at times having to deal with legal limitations and being buffeted by changing political circumstances, has indeed been very steady and very patient as it made its repeated efforts at providing support.

Conclusion

The Cold War ended, and the Japanese economy did not remain at its peak for long. After the bubble

burst came the “lost 20 years,” the long period of Japanese economic and political stagnation. In the area of international peace cooperation, however, Japan came out of its shell and developed active diplomacy and security policies. It is undeniable, of course, that when such activities involved overseas assignment of SDF units, albeit for the proclaimed purpose of furthering peace, they were viewed with suspicion and concern at home and abroad. This problem is still present today, and it is linked to calls for the revision of Japan’s Constitution itself, with those calls again taking on vigor. History seems to have cast its spell. Shinichi Kitaoka has attacked this problem and notes that it does not involve all the classic divisions of liberal or realist, left or right, peacenik or warmonger. Instead, Kitaoka suggests, it should be dealt with on a graph with four quadrants, where the vertical axis is being positive or negative on international contributions (i.e., whether Japan should fulfill a responsibility for international security) and the horizontal axis is whether the viewer admits or denies Japan’s responsibility for its actions in the past. This is a useful observation (Kitaoka, 2009, p. 18). In the four parts of this graphic representation, there is the option for believing that Japan need not take responsibility for the war and should be negative about international contributions, while someone else might feel that Japan should take responsibility for the past but is therefore negative toward international contributions. But as Kitaoka also points out, the most appropriate road for Japan to take would be recognizing its responsibility for the past and taking an active part in making international contributions. In this sense, Japan’s international peace cooperation should find Japan facing its past while more energetically developing strategies for international peace cooperation that would reflect Japan’s strengths.

So, where should the strategy start?

The first step should be for the element represented by conflict prevention through non-military diplomacy and the element consisting of the peaceful overseas assignment of the powerful organization that is the SDF to engage in seamlessly interconnected activity under a comprehensive Japanese strategy for international peacebuilding. Conflict prevention, emergency humanitarian aid, maintaining the peace, peacebuilding, rebuilding/recovery, sustainable growth—these terms which give a fragmentary view of the activities they represent need to be unified from three viewpoints. First is the idea of rebuilding “vulnerable states,” where conflict and chaos and decay have resulted in the extreme dysfunctionality of the government. Rebuilding such a vulnerable state into a sovereign state restores its position as a primary unit composing the international system, with the result of bringing greater stability to the international order. Second is “human security” which addresses the lives, livelihoods, and dignity of the people who live in certain states. One of the most important factors in restoring peace and preventing the recurrence of conflict is going beyond the systemic question of whether a government is able to function normally. It cannot be stressed too greatly that we must ask whether the people can live their daily lives in safety and assurance which create a hope for tomorrow. The test is whether such ordinary human beings can stand on their own and participate effectively in the system of governance. Third is the factor of connection. Needless to say, building peace must be conducted autonomously by the people of that country, while it is our role to support those efforts. It is useful if Japan can offer a certain degree of leadership and initiative in this process, but it is neither desirable nor necessary that we try to take over the entire process. The more desirable course would be for international organizations, civilian societies, NGOs and others to also join the process as members of the international community and operate out of a sense of connection with the people of the country.

Given such observations, we can point to the following five elements to which Japan should pay particular attention as it goes about applying the above strategy by taking part in the various individual international peace cooperation activities: a sense of purpose, mission design, legitimacy, personnel and equipment, and budget.

The first of these is to make our goal clear as we deal with the various individual international peace cooperation activities. Is it necessary for Japan to offer concrete cooperation to a specific activity? The economic reconstruction strategy of the second Abe administration came as Japan's economy had taken an upturn toward recovery, but recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake of 2011 meant incurring heavy costs, putting the country's government finances far into the red. It was not at all simple to generate an understanding about international cooperation among people who had become more inwardly oriented, but it is the responsibility of politics to try to gain the support of the people from a broader outlook. It became desirable that the government work to develop an understanding and readiness among the people toward why it was rewarding for Japan to get involved in such problems and why it was significant to cooperate in activities in far-off Africa.

Second is active participation in the specific design of an international peace cooperation mission. In the part, Japan viewed participation (in terms of providing personnel) in UN PKO activities as Japan's international cooperation, but this consistently resulted in Japan having to chase after events and being largely unable to demonstrate initiative. On international diplomatic stages such as the UN or the G8, activities always began with competition over what would be included on the agenda. The UN Secretariat seems to see its own role in the process as the important function of designing the missions. And the P5 permanent members of the Security Council seem to think it wholly natural to use the UN in their own diplomatic and security strategies and propose mission designs with that in mind. If it is important for us to engage not just in debate within the UN but in seeking to make a contribution to peacebuilding and prevention of recurrence in certain specific conflicts, then it is also important that we participate actively in gaining peaceful agreement starting from the mission design level. We need to be aware that so long as Japan is concerned only with participation in an already conceived design, we will be late getting involved in the process.

This problem is very closely tied to the third of these five elements: legitimacy. When Japan's domestic political parties, both those in power and those out of power, seek to get involved in certain specific cases of international peace cooperation, they display a remarkably passive stance consisting largely of engaging in rumors about, for example, whether the UN Security Council had reached a decision or whether there had been a request from a particular UN body. But it goes without saying that Security Council decisions are "created." Except when Japan happens to be filling one of the non-permanent seats on the Security Council, its information about the internal Council activities comes largely from comments in the waiting rooms by P5 staffers. It would be desirable for Japan to take early steps toward reform of the Security Council so that it can participate in Security Council decisions more stably. Japan is one of the few countries which take part in UN diplomacy most honestly and dependably and is trusted by many UN member states. It is also important strategically that Japan play an active leading role in UN decisions from the standpoint of its own interests as well as the broad interests of other countries and the people living in the countries under examination.

For the fourth element, personnel and equipment, it is essential to provide the personnel (including civilians) and equipment needed for international cooperation, and that the personnel have been given repeated training to develop their knowledge and skills. It is highly desirable to work toward realization of constructive civilian-military cooperation which can contribute to conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and sustainable peace and development.

Last is something which actually must come first, financial resources. In order to make investments in carrying out the activities discussed above dynamically and meaningfully, even while doing so economically, it is important to secure budgets for diplomacy and defense which provide some measure of leeway.

It can be hoped that Japan, as a country of peace, will take responsibility for clearly positioning conflict prevention and international peace cooperation as part of its diplomatic and security strategy, so that it can make contributions to the world in the most effective manner.

References

- Tadashi Ikeda, 1996, *Kanbojia Wahei e no Michi—Shogen Nihon Gaiko Shiren no Gonenkan* [The Road to Peace in Cambodia—Testimony on Five Years of Japan’s Diplomatic Trials], Toshi Shuppan Publishing.
- Juuichi Inada, 2013, *Kanbojia no Fukko Kaihatsu Purosesu to Nihon no Enjo/Toshi* [The Rebuilding and Development Process in Cambodia and Japan’s Assistance and Investment], Senshu University’s Annual Social Studies Report, No. 47.
- Sadako Ogata, 2011, “Hitobito o Torimaku Kyoi to Ningen no Anzenhosho no Kaihatsu” [Threats to People and Development of Human Security], *Kokusai Mondai* [International Problems], No.603.
- Taosa Ochiai, 2001, “Operation Gulf Dawn,” October 2001 (<http://www.mofa.go.jp/msdf/mf/touksyu/yoakenosakusen.pdf>).
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2000a, *Funso Yobo no Tame no G8 Miyazaki Inishiativu* [The Miyazaki Initiative for Prevention of Conflicts], July 2000 (http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofa/gaiko/summit/ko_2000/documents/initiative.html)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2000b, “Funso to Kaihatsu” ni Kansuru Nihon kara no Kodo (Akushon · furomu · Japan)—Kaihatsu Bunya ni Okeru Funso Yobo no Kyoka no Tame no Nihon no Kyoryoku [Action from Japan concerning “Conflicts and Development”—Japan’s Cooperation for the Purpose of Strengthening Prevention of Conflicts in the Field of Development], July 2000 (http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofa/gaiko/prev/action_fj.html).
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2003, *Seifu Kaihatsu Enjo Taiko* [Outline of Governmental Development Assistance].
- Shin’ichi Kitaoka, 2009, “Kokuren Gaiko no Kasseika kara, Nihon Gaiko no Kasseika e” [From Activation of United Nations Diplomacy to Activation of Japanese Diplomacy], *Gaiko Foramu* [Diplomacy Forum], November issue.
- Masaharu Kono, 1999, *Wahei Kosaku—Tai Kanbojia Gaiko no Shogen* [Building peace—The testimony of foreign policy towards Cambodia], Iwanami Shoten.
- Akihiko Tanaka, 2007, *Ajia no Naka no Nihon* [Japan in Asia], NTT Publishing.
- Ryuichi Teshima, 2006, *Gaiko Haisen—130 Oku Doru ha Suna ni Kieta* [Losing Diplomacy—13 Billion Dollars Disappears in the Sand], Shinchosha.
- Hiroshi Nakanishi, 2011, *Wangan Senso to Nihon no Gaiko* [The Gulf War and Japanese Diplomacy], December 6, 2011 (<http://www.nippon.com/ja/features/x00202/>).
- UN Document, 1999, A/54/1, Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization, August 31, 1999.
- UN Document, 2000, A/55/305-S/2000/809, Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, August 21, 2000.
- UN Document, 2001, A/55/935-S/2001/574, Prevention of Armed Conflict Report of the Secretary-General, June 7, 2001.
- UN Document, 2005, A/RES/60/1, 2005 World Summit Outcome, October 24, 2005.
- UN Document, 2006, A/60/891, Progress report on the prevention of armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General, July 18, 2006.
- Stephen M. Walt, “WikiLeaks, April Glaspie, and Saddam Hussein,” *Foreign Policy*, January 9, 2011

(<http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/01/09/wikileaks-april-glaspie-and-saddam-hussein/>).
WikiLeaks, Viewing cable 90BAGHDAD4237, SADDAM'S MESSAGE OF FRIENDSHIP TO
PRESIDENT BUSH (<http://www.wikileaks.ch/cable/1990/07/90BAGHDAD4237.html>).