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Abstract
This study aims to investigate the main discourses and practices on Japan’s approaches for agenda setting on human security. It argues that as a way of endorsing its positive and anti-militaristic image and reinforcing the basic trust mechanism created in the post-war years among East Asian countries, Japanese policy makers in the 1990s have elaborated a human security agenda centered on the country’s Official Development Assistance policy. Tokyo promoted this agenda as a new and comprehensive outlook for both itself and the rest of the region. This process then created a context, a positive sum gain paradigm, which is mutually beneficial for the participants of the relationship, promoting a more stable cognitive and physical regional environment.
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INTRODUCTION

Japan did not enter the Cold War with a smooth and a friendly image in East Asia. Tokyo’s irredentist/militaristic policies until its surrender left suspicions about the revival of Japanese militarism in many Asian and Pacific countries. Parallel to the US outlook and expectations, for rendering these suspicions together with building up a Western and cooperative image, Japan concentrated on enhancing its economic activities. With its rapidly developing economy Japan aimed to bring forth a stable regional environment, which contributed to form a feeling of security among states in East Asia. In more political sense, Japan’s US-made constitution underlined an anti-militaristic image, which to some extent also led neighboring countries gradually to change their perceptions of Japan as a threat to their own identities and security.

After regaining its economic strength, Japan developed institutional mechanisms to show its refurbish its image as a peaceful and collaborative neighbor in East Asia. One major mechanism was the Official Development Assistance1 (ODA). Providing assistance to neighboring countries in the region via ODA enabled and supported Japan’s several foreign policy objectives in addition to underline its peaceful and non-irredentist image. ODA, in this sense, was more than a foreign policy support mechanism; it was also a confidence building measure, a means for alleviating -sometimes even solving- bilateral problems, a demonstration of economic power, and also a means to build up and increase influence in various international and regional organizations. Briefly stated, Japan’s ODA policy both protected and consolidated Japan’s non-militaristic and collaborative image

---

and economic prosperity and also promoted economic and political stability in East Asia in general. ODA policy, with the 1990s, was merged with Tokyo’s human security agenda to bolster its attempts to have a peaceful and cooperative image. This comprehensive mind-set in Japanese policy-making process, in a sense, stimulated East, and particularly Southeast, Asian countries, to develop and deepen relations with Japan.

From this point of view, this study contends that as a way of endorsing its positive image and reinforcing this basic trust among the countries in East Asia, Japan has flawlessly promoted its ODA policy with the human security agenda as a new and comprehensive outlook for both itself and the rest of the region. This comprehensive outlook, in time, created a context: a positive sum gain paradigm. Positive sum gain relations constructed a mutually beneficial platform for the participants for promoting a more stable cognitive and physical regional environment.

This study is structured into two sections. Firstly, it briefly reviews major discussions on human security in international relations literature. This review enquires the different ways that human security is performed and also questions the extent of its success. Relying on this review this article examines Japan’s human security approach in the regional context. The second section investigates the construction of Japan’s human security agenda with the ODA policy.

CONTEXTUALIZING THE DISCOURSES ON HUMAN SECURITY

Human security has difficulties in definition due to its attempt to draw a comprehensive picture canvasing various notions of security, ranging from the local to the international level. The concept, for the first time, appeared in the 1994 Human Development Report by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The report underlines two main threats towards the security of human beings: first, protection from chronic threats, including hunger, disease, and repression (freedom from fear), and second, protection from sudden and harmful disruptions in the patterns of daily life—whether in homes, in jobs, or in communities (freedom from want).² According to this report, human security is centered on four main ideas. First, it should be based on a universal concern. In every part of the world, there are innumerable threats growing daily and frequently menacing people.

Second, there seems to be a strong bond among the elements of human security; that is, such threats as famine, disease, pollution, terrorism, and ethnic disputes are highly likely to affect the security of human beings everywhere. Third, guaranteeing human security is easier by using early prevention rather than later intervention. Fourth, human security should be people-oriented and focused on issues of how people live in a society and to what extent they have opportunities in their social, economic, and political lives, and so on. Constructed around these four main ideas, the report identified the following seven elements, which are related to each other and, in a sense, together have formed the concept of human security: 1- economic security, 2- food security, 3- health security, 4- environmental security, 5- personal security, 6- community security, and 7- political security. Thus, in its broadest sense, human security is grounded on the security of human beings rather than the security of institutions, such as territoriality and state sovereignty. UNDP’s proposal and emphasis on human security falls into the new, in a sense widened, security understanding of the post-Cold War security. This new security paradigm was an attempt to a relative shift from a state-oriented to an individual-related aspects oriented security.

As is evident in its main ideas and set of elements, human security in the UNDP Report offers a very broad and new approach to security and development at the global level by including hunger, disease, and natural disasters as well as political violence and economic development. This report arguably underscored two important aspects of human security. First, it drew the general framework of the question of what human security should be. Second, to define threats toward human security, it referred to the principles of freedom from fear and freedom from want as separate ideas. Nevertheless, regardless of the attention given this report, scholars...
criticized it as not being able to bring about a favorable outcome and find solid ground in the UN system.

The critics argue that the report has elaborated a comprehensive but somewhat ambiguous definition of human security, although this definition has been quoted by a number of scholars in academic papers and by states in their political treatises as well. For example, Roland Paris, one of the leading academics on human security issues, states that two main problems in context limit the level of utility of the concept of human security in terms of international relations. First, the UNDP Report does not have a clear and precise definition. Human security is definitely about human beings; however, it is still unclear what human security means in practice. Second, the existing definition of the UNDP is extremely wide ranging, and at the same time, it is deep and detailed in that it includes everything from physical security to such psychological aspects as happiness. He avers that, by looking at the existing definition of the concept, it is almost impossible to determine what might be excluded from the definition of human security. Therefore, the “founding” document of the concept did not put a clear road map for practice.

Furthermore, Alex J. Bellamy and Matt McDonald tried to find a proper answer to the question of what the agenda of human security for states should include. According to them, the framework should be initially people-oriented, as also defined in the UNDP Report, to give a sense of what is implicated by the phrase “human security agenda”. In other words, the main focus should be based on humans everywhere, who have similar needs and desires. If the security of humans everywhere is addressed, then the question becomes what causes make humans insecure. Bellamy and McDonald assert that the seven elements mentioned in the UNDP Report are seen as practical starting point because human beings need shelter, health care, sanitation, food, and clothing at the basic level and the ability to participate in collective efforts without persecution. Caroline Thomas, another scholar on human security, shares these points of view while describing human security in a different way. She defines the concept as “a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which
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human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realized. Such human security is indivisible - it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another”. Although human security is based on a material ground, the nonmaterial dimension of human needs should also be addressed. As Thomas mentioned, for maintaining physical security for human beings, material sufficiency is necessary but not a completely adequate condition.

In practice, some states tend to define the concept of human security in a more restricted way. For example the Canadian government accepted a narrower definition of human security, stressing the security of the individual in the face of political violence. This approach also emphasizes freedom from fear through preventive diplomatic methods or peace-building efforts. Such a narrower concept of human security is more useful for both pragmatic and methodological reasons. This narrower interpretation also found its place in the 2005 Human Security Report: War and Peace in the 21st Century. The report contends that a narrower concept of human security should focus on “violent threats to individuals”. By focusing on a global problem, which affects more or less every country, it brings up a pragmatic approach. This narrowed approach is also considered methodologically rational because of its utility for policy analyses. For instance, the former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy argues that, although the contextual definition of the concept of human security elaborated in the UNDP Report could be a useful starting point, its inclusiveness of different types of human-related issues makes it problematic as a policy framework. He states that, in the post-Cold War world in which human security came to prominence, such a broad framework averts policy from the original focus of attention. Thus, states defending the narrower definition of human security by focusing principally on global violence (freedom from fear) became inclined to resolve human security issues in terms of humanitarian intervention and peace-conflict resolutions.

10 Established with the initiative of the Canadian Government in 1998, the Human Security Network comprises Austria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, the South Africa (observer), Switzerland and Thailand.
As a result, both viewpoints of human security—that is, the wider and the narrower definitions—involves sociological, cultural, and even geo-strategic perspectives. In this way, the emergence of human security is a reflection of transnational (humanitarian) norms and values in international relations, particularly with the end of the Cold War. Moreover, human security has a normative and ethical meaning in the sense of encompassing both ethical responsibilities for reorienting the security of the individual during transition periods of political communities and humanitarian obligations for states having the capacity to maintain the security of people in insecure areas.

THE GENESIS OF AWARENESS: JAPAN’S AGENDA SETTING IN HUMAN SECURITY

While the international policy environment relatively provides some global opportunities in terms of ideas, products, and services for individual states, it also imposes some constraints, in particular, in reaching a cooperative stance among states. To illustrate, the emergence of new international threats with the shift of the world scene from bipolarity to unipolarity in the early 1990s has caused new uncertainties and anxieties for states as actors in the international system. This state of uncertainty and anxiety has forced policy makers and state elites to pursue new ideas and methods in their foreign and security policies so as to improve assessing and responding to new and unfamiliar threats at the regional and international levels.

Japan is not an exception in this context, the factors listed above affected Japanese foreign and security policy priorities on a large scale. In the Cold War period, Japan tried to build a basic trust mechanism in East Asia to guarantee stability, both in terms of foreign relations and its ontological security. To this end, economic aids were conceived as a way to improve and routinize relations with neighboring countries. By doing so, Japan managed to reconstruct a different and coherent self-image and to project it both inside and outside of its borders. In fact, the Japanese policy makers aimed at compensating for military weakness with economic power to enlarge the country’s field of responsibility. For this, they brought the
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economic aid policies into the forefront. In reality, Japan could legitimately aspire to take on a more active role in the region, given the comparative magnitude of its economic capabilities. It could, at least in part, revive its pre-war regional strength. However, doing so would mean taking considerable responsibility within its area of influence. Such responsibility would, in turn, increase its level of anxiety, thus having the potential to jeopardize Japan’s newly constructed image and identity.

In the early 1990s, Japanese decision makers and state elites tried to expand the country’s positive role in the international arena by creating a more stable cognitive and physical environment. In this international setting, the concept of human security as an emerging paradigm was seen by them as the gateway by which Japan could use its anti-militaristic image both by improving mutually close relationships with neighboring countries and constructing a foreign policy agenda closely associated with the infrastructure of human security.

For the first time, the Japanese government started to consider the concept of human security as an idea for its foreign policy agenda during the Murayama Administration. In terms of social development among societies, Japanese Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama implicitly referred to this idea in his speech at the UN General Assembly Special Session of the Diet held in September 1995, where he illustrated the concept of a _healthy society_ as being one in which every citizen should be treated equally. According to Murayama, doing the groundwork for the emergence of more equal societies should be an objective in Japanese politics. That is, Japan should help developing countries create healthy societies and foster equality among their citizens. Thus, in the same way that Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama delivered his speeches, Japan has started to place greater emphasis on human-centered policies in its foreign policy orientations and tried to stimulate other developed countries in this way as well. By engaging itself in human-centered issues, Japanese government, in a sense, brought its anti-militaristic identity and positive image to the forefront of the international society and tried to insert it into a fundamental part of its foreign and security policy discourse.

As cited in the 1999 Diplomatic Blue Book of Japan, in 1998 the Japanese government explicitly adopted the concept of human security on a full-scale and started to insert specific measures into its foreign and security policy agenda. Keizo Obuchi, who became Prime Minister in 1998,
demonstrated his commitment to improving the idea of human security by emphasizing the need to consider new strategies built on economic development and cooperation. In March 1999, largely focusing on supporting the various projects of the international organizations related to the UN addressing various threats to humans, including poverty, environmental destruction, disputes, land mines, the refugee problem, drugs and HIV/AIDS, “the Trust Fund for Human Security” was established with donations from the Japanese government to the Secretariat of the UN.

After the death of Prime Minister Obuchi, his successor, Yoshiro Mori, stressed the importance of human security at the Millennium Summit of the UN on September 7, 2000. At this summit, by organizing his discourse around two main points; he stated that the concept of human security would be one of the main pillars in Japanese foreign policy agenda. The first one is the importance of dealing with issues confronting the international community from a human-centered point of view, and the second one is the need to strengthen the functions of the UN in the new century. In his speech, he established a “wider definition” of the concept of human security by citing, in particular, conflicts, human right violations, poverty, infectious diseases, crime, and environmental destruction that threaten the existence of the international society as a whole. Another striking point in the speech delivered by Mori is the intention of the Japanese government to establish an international committee on human security to develop and heighten the human-centered approach. This proposal laid the groundwork for “the Commission on Human Security” which was established in January 2001 by the efforts of the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan and Sadako Ogata, former UN High Commissioner for Refugees.
In 2003, the human security report prepared by the Commission on Human Security strongly underscored a comprehensive approach, ranging from nation to people, and defining the terms “freedom from fear” as referring to immediate physical harm from armed conflicts and “freedom from want” as referring to the structural poverty of developing countries, frequently aggravated by the globalization.\textsuperscript{22} The commission also emphasized freedom from fear and freedom from want as supplementary part of each other. In a short period of time, the Japanese government adopted the Commission on Human Security’s policy conclusions and applied them in its newly formed human-security agenda by revising its ODA Charter in 2003. In this context, Japan’s revision policy for ODA is seen as an outcome of both the government’s desire to improve the concept of human security and of pragmatic and strategic reasons, also including the country’s own stability and prosperity.

Japanese policy makers have predominantly referred to the term “interdependency” in the new ODA Charter to stress the seriousness of the phenomenon of globalization. To put it differently, it was considered by Japan that the post-Cold War international order was highly regarded within the framework of growing interdependency, which means mutual responsibility and dependency on others. Moreover, they were aware of the globalization with economic integration at the regional and international levels. According to the ODA Charter of 2003;

\begin{quote}
(...)
As nations deepen their interdependence, Japan, which enjoys the benefits of international trade and is heavily dependent on the outside world for resources such as energy and food, will proactively contribute to the stability and development of developing countries through its ODA. This correlates closely with assuring Japan’s security and prosperity and promoting the welfare of its people. In particular, it is essential that Japan make efforts to enhance economic partnership and vitalize exchange with other Asian countries with which it has particularly close relations. (...)
\end{quote}

The human security agenda set up by the consecutive Japanese governments was actually built around a threefold approach, as they tackled this issue on three different levels: national (governmental) level, civil society level, and international level. At each level, Japan has actively contributed to solving the human security issues by focusing mainly on East Asian nations. For example, at the international level, “The Trust Fund for Human Security” and “the Commission on Human Security”, both

\textsuperscript{22} Hiroshi, ‘Ningen no anzen hoshou to nihon gaikou’, p. 47.
mentioned above, were established with various initiatives of Japanese government. Thus, aligning with its ODA policies, Japan has considered these platforms a global stage for itself in which it can play an influential role in contributing to human security as a sustainable approach to peace and regional stability. Until 2007, Japan was the sole donor financing various projects in the UN system for human-security related issues, ranging from employment, migration, conflict, and humanitarian issues to health problems like HIV/AIDS, the basic needs of education, food, and so on.\(^{23}\) Moreover, the Japanese government both provided economic aids for developing countries, especially the ones in East Asia, and contributed to their social and political developments via its ODA Programme. As a result, these initiatives increased the peace and stability in the region, and then helped ensure Japan’s own security and prosperity.

In fact, a common phenomenon is that Japan’s contribution to human security does not include humanitarian intervention policies. These policies, strongly adopted by the Canadian government, have not been preferred by the Japanese policy makers and are still seen as far from the agenda of Japanese foreign and security policy. In contrast to the Canadian discourse, for example, the concept of human security does not allow for Japan sending its troops to conflict areas because of incompatibility with an interventionist foreign policy based on an understanding of human security that refers to freedom from fear. The historic context of Japan prevents it from engaging in interventionist foreign policies adopted by some countries led by Canada. Briefly stated, while Canada focuses on a peacekeeping framework of human security-related issues by pursuing military intervention on humanitarian grounds, Japan builds its human-security agenda principally on development aid. Moreover, Japan is one of the most significant supporters of decisions and initiatives taken by the Commission on Human Security. For the last fifteen years, the Japanese policy makers have often used the concept of human security and set aside large amounts of economic and human resources to implement their broad version of human security. Such an orientation was strengthened by appointing Sadako Ogata as the President of the Japanese International Cooperation Agency and creating a US $200 million Trust Fund for Security aimed at fostering human security, especially projects carried out by UN agencies. In conclusion, for Japan, human security was seen as a way to take a more active role in regional and international security without posing a threat to its alliance relationship with the US and to its constitution.

CONCLUSION

Japan has made great efforts towards spreading the idea of human security both at the international and regional levels. The principle motivation behind the human security agenda setting was the strong desire to show Japan itself as a more active actor in the international and regional arena without undermining its peace-based constitution. To put it another way, Japan has developed a human security agenda in which its economic power has been used as an instrument to exert influence on other regional actors. This agenda formulation is also considered as a result of an effort to offset the perceived threats from China’s growing influence in East Asia. Thus, the consecutive Japanese governments have used the ODA policies through its human-security agenda as a policy tool both to offset perceived threats and to preserve the constructed basic trust mechanism among actors in the region.

In the post Second World War period, according to Japanese “pragmatic” policy makers and state elites, achieving trust-based bilateral and multilateral relations in the regional context in terms of positive sum gain was only possible by pursuing non-militaristic and peaceful initiatives in Japan’s foreign and security policy agenda. Accordingly, Japan preferred to keep its military at a very moderate level and to follow constructive and positive policies throughout the Cold War by following strong relations with Washington under the US–Japan security alliance system. Moreover, in the post-war period, the discourses elaborated by other states in East Asia strategically helped to build up Japan’s non-militaristic identity and stance. This was possible only by exerting pressure and compelling Japan to take certain decisions in a more positive way. To summarize, Japan seemed to have made rational decisions and to have learned from the past, thus transforming its identity and behaviors to adapt to a rapidly changing regional environment. It was able to modify its biographical narrative and routines and to reshape its relations with East Asian countries according to the new post-war international order in a relatively short time.

From 1992 on, at the center of the ODA was the intent of preserving basic human rights and freedoms. In addition to human rights perspective, after the revision of the ODA in 2003, its perspective was reformulated by including human security-related issues. The revised version of the ODA and Japan’s Medium Term Policy on the ODA in 2005 has comprehensively explicated how Japan approaches human security issues in terms of ODA. No doubt that new realities and threat perceptions that emerged after the end of the Cold War forced Japanese policy makers and state elites
to adjust to a new regional and international order. After four decades of strong economic growth, Japan seemed to possess the tools necessary to enhance its position while remaining aligned with the US. In the post-Cold War period, Tokyo was able to shape its strategic cognitive and physical environment from a position of economic leadership in East Asia without having to remilitarize. The human security outlook of Japan, in this sense, meant “positive sum gain”, which was mutually beneficial for the participants of the relationship, thus creating a more stable cognitive and physical environment. Furthermore, the concept of human security was seen by the Japanese policy makers as the gateway through which Japan could positively use its passive image as an economic giant but a military dwarf both by refining mutually close relationships with East Asian countries and by constructing a foreign policy agenda closely associated with the infrastructure of human security.

Japan tried to strengthen its non-militaristic position in the region by seeking cooperative and peaceful relations with significant others and by forming a human-oriented foreign and security policy agenda. Japan in the post-Cold War period has taken more responsibilities than ever to maintain ontologically secured environment for states and peoples at the regional level particularly in economic and human security areas. Although the Japanese policy makers did not reach a full consensus with other regional actors on solving human security issues, these various efforts made by Japan should be seen as positive contributions toward maintaining positive sum gain by both parts and strengthening cooperative and trust-based relations in East Asia.
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