

Let's reinforce our international solidarity for People's security!

MIWA Takashi (Japan, Saitama University)  
[takm@pace.forum.ne.jp](mailto:takm@pace.forum.ne.jp)

1. Give your watch to the Japanese Pacifist Constitution.

Japan is returning to its past posture that exercises its military power abroad, but this time as a junior partner of the U.S. Although its economic power is declining, Japan still has 15% of the world's gross domestic product. And its foreign policy has consistently put priority on maintaining its alliance with the United States in place after the end of World War II, making the bilateral ties indivisible.

It is extremely dangerous not only for Japanese people but also for people around the world to enable Japan to send its troops overseas.

Article 9 in the Japanese Constitution is known as a war renouncement clause since its enactment in 1946.

It was incorporated into Japan's postwar Constitution by the U.S. occupation force as part of security for the then war-devastated country. Washington, in those days, had compiled treaty drafts to seek Japan's demilitarization and disarmament. The GHQ of the occupation force made the aims of the treaty drafts concrete by laying down Article 9 in the Constitution. Japanese people welcomed the clause when they faced the new Constitution.

In the face of the Cold War with the Soviet Union, the United States urged Japan to conclude the military alliance, rearm and abolish Article 9. But the intended termination of Article 9 failed due to growth of an antiwar movement among the people.

After 50s. pro-American conservatives kept majority at the Diet, but they couldn't take over two thirds of each chambers, which is required for constitutional amendment proposition, till 90s. So while Article 9 has been maintained, Japan headed for rearmament in the light of a conclusion of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. Since the conservative ruling party kept stable majority, they could ratify a treaty or make a law putting off the oppositions.

Japan has now played the central role in the U.S.-led military alliance system in Asia, and the capability of its military power, known as the Self-Defense Forces, has expanded, following that of Britain.

However, the antiwar movement in Japan has imposed various defense orientated restrictions on security policies, such as the Diet resolution to forbid the

non-nuclear principles, the three principles over the export of arms and restriction of defense expenditures to up to 1% of the national budget.

Article 9 and the civil movements, which have relied on the principle of the clause, have checked the Japanese government's involvement in the U.S. military policies and its own military expansion. As a result, Japan's military power has been restricted at an imbalanced level, compared with its economic potential, while people in Japan have strongly aimed to achieve peace.

But Article 9 is now in a critical situation.

In February, the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee, established by top-ranking diplomatic and defense officials, issued an important joint statement, in which the two countries said "the U.S.-Japan Alliance, with the U.S.-Japan security arrangements at its core, continues to play a vital role in ensuring the security and prosperity of both the United States and Japan, as well as in enhancing regional and global peace and stability."

The U.S.-Japan security arrangements allow the United States to maintain its military bases in Japan only to contribute peace and security of Japan and the Far East. Thus, this joint statement shows the two countries' readiness to expand the scope of their military alliance beyond the Far Eastern region to cover the so-called arc of instability.

Secondly, the statement noted their common strategic objectives in the region are to "ensure the security of Japan, strengthen peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, and maintain *the capability to address contingencies* affecting the United States and Japan," indicating Japan will be involved in U.S. military operations in military conflicts in the Strait of Taiwan and the Korean Peninsula. This means Japan may exercise its military power in areas surrounding it.

Japan and the United States plan to issue a joint statement by their leaders sometime between this summer and next year to achieve regional and common strategic objectives, indicated in the February statement, while revising the guidelines for the bilateral military cooperation.

In the face of the development in Japan-U.S. militaristic cooperation, overseas operations have become the primary task of Japan's SDF and its initial posture as a national defense force has been gradually changed. Moreover, some lawmakers are proposing to establish a national memorial for the war dead with expectations that Japanese soldiers will be killed in the future.

Revision of Article 9 will finalize the ongoing transformation of Japan into a country that could exercise military power abroad.

country that could exercise military power abroad.

However, voices are not growing powerful enough to prevent the amendment of the war-renouncing clause. Surveys have indicated around 80% of Japanese lawmakers show positive stance for the revision of Article 9. On the contrary, more than half of the Japanese public opposes to revising Article 9, and domestic peace movements earnestly promote activities to maintain it so that they could realize cooperative and fair society. But supporters of these movements have not yet been unified, so we're stirring concern that pro-Constitution elements will diminish their Diet seats devastatingly in the next national election.

Amendment of Article 9 has been somehow prevented under two conditions. (1) Both of two major political parties in Japan -- Liberal Democratic Party and Democratic Party of Japan -- intend to revise the Constitution, but they are struggling for power right now, and they can't make a great-alliance for constitutional amendment for a while. (2) East Asian countries as well as their people remain strong cautions about Japan's stance to be a major military power in the world.

Democratic lawyers in Japan are now struggling to prevent the planned revision of Article 9, and I expect such lawyers around the world to support the efforts. As I mentioned earlier, Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution is a pledge that Japan issued to the international society, particularly to the Asian nations, when it started reconstruction efforts following the defeat in World War II. I believe all of you are guaranteed to expressing your views over the current conditions in Japan.

## 2. Let's establish global network to face new U.S. military strategy

Preventing Japan from dispatching its troops abroad means not only to seek peace in Japan and East Asia but also to check the war on terrorism led by the U.S. administration under President George W. Bush.

The United States has militarily intervened in conflicts around the world after the end of the Cold War. With the outstanding military technologies and exclusive ~~military use of outer space~~, the Bush administration has drastically changed its military strategies in the light of the development in the war on terror, which should be considered a significant transformation in the postwar era. The United States has also been promoting military realignment in a global level. We have faced dangers of the new U.S. military strategy, which focuses on preemptive attack, such as the U.S. invasions into Afghanistan and Iraq. We, as democratic lawyers, should pay attentions to the fact that the United States are now threatening the collective security system under the United Nations by promoting such military strategy. The United Nations and the Vatican have harshly reacted to the U.S. stance and we, as lawyers who seek

democracy and peace, need to take up the challenge.

I would like to emphasize the importance of establishing a global network of democratic lawyers so that we can tackle the new U.S. military strategy, and I expect this world conference to be a big step to achieve our task.

I would like to list some points that should be discussed here in order to strengthen our world network for peace.

First of all, while aiming at realizing Human Security, as stated in many documents of the U.N., we should stop expecting that the objectives of Human Security would be achieved by the Nation States and their governments. The existing crises against people's security are being caused by multi-national corporations and the governments of industrialized countries, such as the United States. Not only the victims of those crises, but also the people fighting against those powers, are not "the human" in general. In this sense, I propose that we use the term "People's Security (or securite populaire)," rather than "Human Security," to demonstrate clearly who are fighting. We have to make clear what is threatening the People's Security, and consider how we could realize such Security for the benefit of those who fight for it. Peace means the Security of the People, by the People, for the People.

Secondly, we need to immediately issue warning against such intention to ease restrictions on use of force based on the right of self-defense, as shown in U.N. Secretary General's Report, "In Larger Freedom". This report intends to secure the authority of the United Nations and to incorporate the United States, which threatens U.N. collective security system, into the U.N. system again. A report by High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, which was issued on December 2 last year and eventually led to the Secretary General's Report, is not effective enough to check the U.S. doctrine of pre-emptive attack. It is considered an imminent need to eliminate the provision about the right of collective self-defense, which has been excuses for establishing military alignment and military interventions, but the upper level U.N. officials do not seem to discuss this point. We, democratic lawyers around the world, are now required to be involved in the discussions at the U.N. Security Council in compiling new standards on the use of military force.

As the third point, I would like to propose that we support anti-U.S. base movement in areas around the so-called arc of instability. People in these areas face authoritarian and repressive governments, and they have not seen deployment of U.S. forces so far, thus their anti-base efforts are not powerful enough in many cases. We, as lawyers, have a role to play over these issues.