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Narasumber : Jun Saito, Ph. D
Institusi : Former member of Japanese House Representative and member of DPJ

Question : Japan had experienced a significant political change in 2009. After a half century long rule, the LDP was forced out of power and replaced by the DPJ. But then after 3 years in office, LDP dethroned the DPJ in 2012 election. What happen actually?

Answer : LDP who has been a very pragmatic party and it did whatever it could to stay in power it changed its policy platform flexibly whenever it sensed the risk of electoral defeat in future elections second the LDP was the largest spending of pork barrel money in the world for instance back in the 1990s about 70% of the total government construction projects among OECD economies happened in the single country Japan in some years the Japanese government spend more money than on construction projects government construction projects than the US government spend on their military in terms of the gross amount that’s how the LDP stay in power such a long time almost uninterrupted.

There are several factors as to why the LDP lose, I’m actually writing a book about the end of LDP dominant that I sent to you by e-mail last week. First of all the government has almost exhausted the monetary resources out of which they could slice policy benefits to their supporters. And then recent decentralization reform hurt the party significantly because the LDP effectively committed the political organization of suicide by firing their lawyer activists at the local community levels. In Japan unlike many other democracy in the world local politicians who serve in the municipal legislatures and mayor’s for the almost paid activists for the LDP and because of the reason of the recent municipal government consolidation efforts pursued by the LDP a large number of politicians level lost jobs and because they no longer faced the electoral pressure for themselves they lost the incentive to campaign for the party. I am arguing that was the largest mistake the LDP government did.
Despite the initial surge in popularity due to great hopes for reform, The DPJ was beset by political difficulties because of two factors. One is that the DPJ had never been in power which means that they have lacked the experience of governance or government governing so I think they over promised in 2009 election campaign and was that they got into the power I think they found out that you know some of the problems that they discovered they can’t deliver so I think that is a disappointment and I think they themselves lack of self-confidence and the second sort of idiosyncratic factor is the money in politics involving Ozawa Ichiro who was the powerhouse the party secretary the former party secretary over the party and how to meocure of the Prime Minister himself and these two big figures talked to figures in the DPJ had suffered this scandal problems and suffered of a lack of popularity so DPJ getting rid of these two leaders before 2010 upper house election to reinvent the party.

Question: We see that during the 3 years of governing, it wasn’t a very pleasant time for DPJ. Moreover, DPJ lose the upper house election even after like you said their effort to reinvent the party. Instead, the LDP coalitions win more seats then DPJ. Is that the Japanese simply like LDP or their policy?

Answer: Ever since the Social Democratic Party withdrew from the ruling coalition in May 2010, Japan’s National Diet has been split, with the ruling Democratic Party of Japan and People’s New Party holding a majority in the House of Representatives but not in the upper house, the House of Councillors. And the July 2010 election for the upper house further reduced the DPJ’s strength in the chamber. Besides that, there was the tension between diplomatic commitments and democratic accountability for instance after the DPJ took the helm of the Japanese government there has been tension between the US government and Japanese government regarding what to do with the US military base on the island of Okinawa. The DPJ is committed to their supporters to relocating the military base to somewhere else on the other hand the LDP administration had already cut a deal with the US government and we faced a lot of tensions between electoral accountability and diplomatic commitments.

People didn’t necessarily like the party at all if you take a look at internationally comparable opinion poll surveys for instance the Japanese people’s in the government institutions and the politicians they elect is the lowest among OECD countries and additionally violent oppression of opposition party leader which have been absent which had been problem in many other what is called electoral authoritarian regimes. Japan was different from those types of political system. Democratic institution in particular electoral institutions are the labor contract between the citizens and the political leaders if those rules of elections are poorly designed,
citizens have difficulty getting the job they want done by the government and the Japanese example provides abundant examples of such failures.

**Question**: I’m going to ask about the thing which might be the most debatable topic in Japan, The article 9 amendment. What is DPJ view on this?

**Answer**: I think the constitution will need to be amended. Post–World War II Japan has had a hard time with the issue of how to balance the pacifist ideal set forth in Article 9 of the Constitution against the reality of our security requirements. But in terms of the overall vision, the DPJ’s position differs from what the Abe administration is aiming for with its security legislation.

In 2006 we came up with a proposal calling for creation of the Constitution. When people talk about revision of the Constitution, the discussion tends to focus excessively on Article 9 and become a debate about maintaining Japan’s commitment to peace. Meanwhile, as a practical concern, we see human rights failing to be fully protected in public administration; this reflects the fact that the present Constitution contains no provisions directly relating to privacy rights, environmental rights, crime victims’ rights, and so forth. We clarified the issues with our proposal, based on our conviction that the Constitution should be subject to constant review in this respect.

In 2013 the DPJ’s Constitution Research Committee started deliberations, but unfortunately we’ve been going back and forth, failing to achieve real progress. Meanwhile, the Diet’s bicameral Research Commission on the Constitution has started conducting substantive deliberations, but since the DPJ has yet to achieve an internal consensus, some people in our party have been trying to duck the issue with statements like “We won’t take part in a debate over the Constitution under the Abe administration.” I’m unhappy with this state of affairs.

As a healthy opposition party that has a clear view of the real world, the DPJ needs to get over its internal arguments about whether or not to take part in these discussions. It’s not a productive debate.

**Question**: Does it mean that the DPJ isn’t actually in total disagree with LDP regarding to the amendment of constitution? And in this case how does DPJ differ from LDP?

**Answer**: To sum it up as a slogan, we’re calling for “restraint afar, realism nearby, and active involvement in humanitarian reconstruction.” This distinction between “afar” and “nearby” is our summation of the issues, which involve both a geographical perspective and the question of whether a given situation is one that relates directly to Japan’s own peace and security.

The Abe administration, with its talk of “seamless” security, is trying to apply the same set of standards to everything, including problems that relate directly to Japan’s peace and security and problems occurring on the
other side of the globe that have no such direct connection. In terms of the structure of the current Constitution, the administration’s proposals go a bit beyond the bounds. In terms of implementation as well, the administration is overstretched, extending its reach too broadly.

On the issue of collective self-defense, the DPJ has decided that it cannot approve the Abe administration’s move to allow the exercise of this right based on the new set of three conditions it has set forth, which are extremely vague. But that doesn’t mean that our party has totally and permanently rejected exercising the right of collective self-defense. For example, Japan-US cooperation is necessary for missile defense and for dealing with situations in areas surrounding Japan. We don’t deny that there is room under the current Constitution for activities by Japan that up to now have been seen as going beyond the scope of individual self-defense in areas like these.

**Question**: The Guidelines for Japan-US Defense Cooperation were revised in 2015, How did DPJ view this?

**Answer**: The idea of revising the guidelines was an initiative proposed to the United States by Japan about six years ago, back when the DPJ was in power, and Morimoto Satoshi was minister of defense. I was serving as senior vice minister, and I traveled to the United States to present our proposal. It was unusual for the Japanese side to initiate a proposal of this sort; we did so in consideration of the fact that Japan’s security environment had changed greatly.

The last time the guidelines had been revised, which was in 1997, it was in response to various requests from the US side arising from the inadequate response to the North Korean nuclear crisis of 1993–94; the revisions were then incorporated into the Act on Measures to Ensure the Peace and Security of Japan in Perilous Situations in Areas Surrounding Japan [enacted in 1999]. This time, when we presented our requests from the Japanese side, the Americans were initially reluctant to undertake a revision targeting China.

When we proposed the revision, we weren’t totally ignoring the question of whether to go ahead with allowing the exercise of the right of collective self-defense from the outset. But we started bilateral discussions with a view to the needs of those on the front lines, and when the LDP returned to power, we passed our work on to the Abe administration, which was eager to allow the exercise of this right. That’s how the present guidelines came into being.

North Korea now has more than two hundred Rodong missiles, which are mobile and have a range that covers almost all of the Japanese archipelago. It has built small nuclear warheads that can be mounted on its missiles,
some of which can now reach as far as the US mainland. Meanwhile, China’s military power is three or four times Japan’s. These major changes have made it necessary to review the sharing of roles, missions, and capabilities in the defense cooperation between Japan and the United States.
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**Question** : What is your assessment of Prime Minister Abe Shinzo’s security policy since 2012?

**Answer** : There is one single issue that encapsulates the administration of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe that is the amendment of constitution. The problem that Mr. Abe has with the constitution is that it really wasn’t written by Japanese and when he first came into power in 2006-2007 his constant refrain was we need a constitution written by our own hands. What happened was that following the defeat of Japan the government that took over from the wartime government promulgated its own produced, its own draft of what the constitution should be with a few what we thought cosmetic changes and Mc Arthur said this is insufficient we had to change it. That was exactly what happened over the course of six days they wrote a completely a new constitution and delivered the draft to the Japanese representatives who aghast to what it said but they weren’t in a position to oppose what the US want. That is the constitution that we have today, it was promulgated in 1947 and not a single item in it. Not even a comma has been changed that time.

Amending the constitution especially article 9 is a two stage process, well actually three stages because both the house of representatives and the house of councilors has to pass an amendment by a two-thirds majority before it is put before the people. This is outlined in the article 96 of the constitution. And indeed Mr. Abe came into office promising both his supporters and also the nation at large that he was going to make changes that were going to make it possible to amend the constitution. Through various manuvers, LDP is putting in together the pieces to make changes in the security policy, which is the reinterpretation of article 9.

**Question** : Well I understand that Japan’s security policy is gradually changed and not stagnant. And in 2012 when LDP back into power, Mr. Abe has made it clear that he hasn’t given up with the amendment even if we know that this is not favorable in the eyes of the Japanese. where is this come from?
Answer: There are many facets behind Japanese security policy, national interests, diplomatic pressure from the US, constitutional constraints on the military brought on by Article 9 of the constitution and in recent years, regional security threats, and the emergence of a functional two-party political system.

Question: I really interested when you said that the regional security threat and the emergence of a functional two-party political system have something to do with Mr. Abe’s security policy. How is that so? What kind of effect those two variables have in security policy?

Answer: If you ask Japanese wartime generation regarding the amendment, they will say that the article 9 is what keep Japan away from war because they believe that we have paid so much to US so that they should do their job on keeping Japan safe. And if someday there is a nuclear war break somewhere they believe that Japan will be fine. But now, the security environment has changed dramatically in East Asia. Japan is surrounded by hostile and aggressive neighbors, threatening Japan every single day with their nuclear and growing armies. Recently, we have this tragedy involving Japanese civilians being killed by ISIS, so Japan has to respond with security environment. Japan can’t just depend to US, when the US has signaled that their control over East Asia is weakening due to China’s rising and North Korean nuclear, Japan have other choices but to be strong.

Question: and how about the political system you mention before?

Answer: Japan has two-party political system ever since we change the election system. Under the new election system, the parties can’t win the election just by holding particular area, so they have to seek another supporter. And LDP understand this very well, they begin to put their concern in security policy since 1996 in order to gain a new basis of supporter so they can win the election. Actually, I’m not an expert in this area so I can’t tell you much about this but I’ll give you my friend’s contact who can give you information regarding to this topic.

Question: Thank you sir. Well, back to the regional threat you mention before. How important is it to amend the constitution when Japan has already had SDF and like you said that they can make changes in the security policy just by making the reinterpretation?

Answer: Every single changes in Japan security policy is strictly bind to article 9. What LDP do in order to have SDF and then the security environment become really serious with China's expanding economic, military and political power and its aggressive intrusions into Japan's territory, the increasingly hostile North Korea as well as territorial disputes with South
Korea. And it’s reinvigorated the debate over what is it that the SDF can do and that debate always come back to article 9 which is very clear and definitive you’ll not have offensive weapons you’ll only have defensive it will only be internal, it will not be to project power or military might outside of the bounds of the Japanese archipelago and it won’t be directed in any way or manner towards offensive war.

**Question**: Isn’t that the 2015 reinterpretation said? I guess the article 9 is even stricter than what you just recite at least on a literal level.

**Answer**: Absolutely. You are right, when he first came in power 2006 he talked about the constitutional amendment and then backtracked off of it he tried revising article 96 and that’s really an important article in the constitution as it describes the mechanics of how you go about amending the constitution. Abe need two-third majority in both house in order to push the referendum and amending the constitution. But no government has ever had two-thirds majorities in both house or at least stable ones and so this process has never been put into the test. The first thing that Abe proposed was let’s change article 96 and which is let’s change the requirement of article 96 to something less than two-thirds. That was floated it lasted for about 2-3 weeks as an idea and then it’s been abandoned. After that the government shifted gears entirely and went right into reinterpreting the article 9 which is something that the US has always advocated as a fallback position in terms of getting Japan more involved in international affairs on a military level. Just to reinterpret the constitution and that’s what the Abe claims in 2014. Reinterpretation just give you the incremental change and LDP and his basis of supporter are looking for something that’s broader and more expensive. So the amendment is still important.

**Question**: I understand that Japan is seeing China and North Korea as a threat for the national security. Then do you think that China and North Korea have big impact towards Mr. Abe’s security policy?

**Answer**: The state of China’s armed forces and North Korean missiles has proved to be threatening to justify an upgrade of Japan’s military capabilities beyond the development of a defensive missile defense system. In this case, North Korea is seen as the most threatening one, so the impact of their nuclear test on Japan has been widespread. First, it brought the US-Japan alliance closer as President Bush vowed to defend Japan, South Korea and other American allies with the full range of deterrent and security commitments. The US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice visited Tokyo soon after the test in an effort to tighten the noose around Pyongyang in cooperation with Japan, and also to affirm Washington’s alliance.
commitments. Mr. Abe termed Rice’s visit as reassuring and said he would work towards further strengthening the partnership.

Second, the perceived potential threat from North Korea and China change the fundamental character of Japan’s defense and security policies and has so far led to an upgrade of the country’s defense capabilities and equipment. To be sure, Japan has spent $48 billion on defense in 2008 and its armed forces and its coast guard for that matter and its military is equipped with state-of-the-art military equipment. North Korea’s threat to resume its nuclear program and the missile launch has the potential to revive the inner-Japan discussions and debates to boost up the country’s defense capabilities to deal with North Korean military threat.

Part of Japan’s defense establishment will continue to use the military threat from North Korea and China as justification to request an upgrade of Japan’s military capabilities. And North Korea’s missile launch ‘help’ to keep these debates alive and relevant within Japan’s policymaking circles. North Korea’s military threat will all the same continue to partly shape the security strategies.
Question : What is your assessment of Prime Minister Abe Shinzo’s security policy? what is the driver of the security policy?

Answer : I think one of the reasons why Mr. Abe proposed for a radical security policy is about the changing of Japan’s security environment recently, however the dramatic changing of his security policy is not being so much about the threats from other countries. The party was taking different position in security policy since we have the dual party system. They promised to make Japan stronger and safer for the citizens by amending the constitution and break the long pacifist culture of Japan.

Question : I understand that Japan had changed their election system in 1994 which shaped the party system from the dominant one party system into two party system. But how this has something to do with the security policy?

Answer : Under the 1955 system, we only have LDP as the dominant party in Japan. Then it changed after the opposition decided to form a big coalition to topple LDP in the middle of economic crisis and the defection of LDP’s member. They did won the election even if LDP still got the biggest votes but they couldn’t form the government. The new government decided to change the election system which is why we have the dual party system today. Under the new system, LDP realized that they couldn’t win the new election with the same way they used to use, moreover with a series of scandal being exposed to the public. LDP is a coalition of hereditary political families and big businesses so that their policy is focused on infrastructure and development which dedicated to pay back their supporter. But under the new system, they have got to find a new basis of supporter even if it means that they would lose some of their current supporter. And ‘fortunately’, Japan had experienced a series of threatening moves from the neighbors with China military modernization and the North Korean nuclear test which shocked the citizens. LDP was taking advantages from this situation by making use of citizens’ fear to make a safer Japan while fixing the economic condition. When the current government had a hard time due to the economic crisis and didn’t do any significant effort to stop the threat,
LDP comes with the new formulation of policy and manage to win the election.

**Question**: Are you saying that behind LDP’s security concern lies the agenda of winning the election and not really about the security environment surrounding Japan?

**Answer**: Under the 1955 system, LDP tend to put Japan’s security as US obligation, but when the new election system was being implemented for the first time in 1996, they changed their stance in security policy after witnessing how the threats had a great impact to the citizens. I’m not saying that the threat don’t really matter because LDP couldn’t use this as political promise without their existence. It just that the security policy is not being so much about the threats but also the mission to gain the new basis of supporter and winning the election.

**Question**: Well I understand that LDP was starting to put their concern on security policy since 1996 as part of the strategy of winning the election. But how this new basis of supporter like you mention, has this great impact to put LDP back in power?

**Answer**: Since the implementation of the current constitution of Japan, We have political extremism to the right and left which managed to influence public opinion in certain topics. In this case, we are going to talk about the influential right extremism groups. This may be hard for foreigners to understand that there is a Japanese democracy with the Emperor at the very top and Japanese have had this system for thousands of years. When the WW II ended, the alliance came in dismantled Japan’s military and wrote us a new constitution which ensured that Japan would never get so powerful again. And for the nationalists, this was the moment that everything was lost, Japan was brought into its knees, stripped of the pride and national values. The right extremism group believed that the constitution was made to weaken Japan and they want to make Japan to be strong again by replacing the current constitution.

**Question**: Does it mean that they become the so called new basis of supporter for LDP to back in power since they are really concern to make Japan stronger like before?

**Answer**: I have to tell you that the right extremism groups have many different types and they are a very visible phenomenon in Japan because some groups like Uyoku Dantai is such a demilitarized and basically pacifist society over all that these highly militant and cosplay people who dress up often in Japan military uniforms of the pre-1945 era they stand out there, you can see them all over Japan but more in central Tokyo because of the
presence of various embassies. They are always protesting against the Russian embassy, they are always protesting against the Chinese embassy from time to time. If you’re going to the Chinese embassy or toward the South Korean embassy or the Association of South Korean and residence. You will see these groups. Now, it’s not going to be a lot of people except on certain days. August the 15th is one of their favorites.

**Question**: They often have demonstrations?

**Answer**: They do show up a lot. But that’s their really big day that you see them also the day that the, what is called the commemoration day for Dokdo, for the island in the Sea of Japan which Japan says is Takeshima where however there are Korean police officers and the in fact the Koreans are having a military exercise right now. Defending them against a possible Japanese invasion. It’s a very strange situation there where the exercises against North Korea have been stopped, but the exercises defending against Japan are still there and their point of views and it’s not entirely unreasonable. That is South Korean point of view is these right-wing groups. Not Japanese coast guard, not Japanese military but these right-wing groups will or possibly can make a political pint. And then we would have a situation and they do have a history of doing that frequently land on the senkaku islands even though the government tries hard to keep everybody off those islands in any way possible very frequently. They get there frequently as a protest against the Chinese government and they certainly make their noises about dealing with the Dokdo-Takeshima. But they are not just about territoriality. They certainly do make a lot of noise. They have on top of their vehicles which are painted black either buses or vans. They crank those decibels up that has these speaker on there which it’s illegal. There is a dance that happens, they are playing patriotic music from the pre-1940 motor and there’s someone screaming through a microphone at some implications about return our island, stop insulting our country, stop insulting our Emperor if they’re passing in front the Asahi Shimbun. And they use sound as a means for their primary of trying to intimidate people.

**Question**: Why in this hierarchy of components of Japanese politics does this extremist right groups hold place of some consideration?

**Answer**: Saying that Japan has been weakened in the post-war era and if it wishes to be respected, if Japanese wish to be protected they have to reawakened the fires that existed inside the Japanese spirit. We are proud people, we aren’t defeated and there are all kinds of subgroups that sometimes engage in rather dispirited alterations between themselves. Various flavors. Frequently having to do with how closely to coordinate with the US, Some
are ultimately hate the US, others see themselves as defenders of this post-war order where Japan is okay weak and we need a big brother in the US and so all kinds of flavors and many of them had are go back all the way to Meiji period in terms of their ancestry so these are all kinds of devided groups. What makes them interesting of course is there one relation to some politicians both in terms of they have tried to intimidate certain politicians, certainly what they tried to do with to one group tried to do with to one group tried to do to PM Takshta though was a time that clearly they were pro to where he was and loudly protest but also because they are also the clearly the support of some of Japan’s very prominent right conservative. We would have to say surreptitiously of our own governer Koukei because she clearly receive the very conservative nationalist vote. A few years back, we have general Tamagami of the Self-defense air forces. He cashiered for writing an essay, arguing that Japan did nothing wrong prior to 1941 or 1945 and that everything that happened was entirely okay. Which is not okay for an active duty officer to write that kind of statement and he was forced to retire. He came back as a politician and in the Tokyo’s governor’s race, he absolutely stunned everyone by getting 600.000 votes. Where did these people, where they come from, why would they vote for him, he’snow currently in deep guano for you know dipping into his campaign finance funds for personal use and he’s probably gonna go to Jail. But that’s 600.000 in the cosmopolitan city of Tokyo it tells you something, there is an electorate there, that electorate clearly went to Koike. No one wants to talk about that but you know it’s there. The right-wing group does provide votes, it may not provide muscle like it did in the pat but certainly they can intimidate in many cases particularly the teachers union is dominated by the communist party.

Question : I understand that this extremist group have a significant role in Japan’s politics. But some sources stated that this right extremist group have a relation with Yakuza? How do you think about it?

Answer : As I told you that the right extremism groups have many different types. Some groups play the part as right extremist as cover for their Yakuza style activities. But others have wonderful ideals despite being under the wing of the Yakuza. There are many of them are in fact simply subdivisions of major gangster gangs organization. They were clearly organized to provide cover for illegal activities under the ages of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. You might be able to break up a yakuza meeting but you can’t break up our far right-wing meeting because that’s protected by the articles in the constitution of freedom assembly. So certainly there is an image not only violence but of criminality associated with many of the right-wing groups it hasn’t helped by the fact that almost all of the assassination that
have been carried the very few that have been carried in the post-war era are by members of these war right-wing groups. Left wings attacks on major figures hardly existed but in terms of the head of socialist party who was assassinated by a 17 year old right wing on live television have been very famous incident. These right-wing group have been seen as the reinforces are a tacit patriotism then we all have to adhere to and they’re the ones who make the historical revisionism. The idea that Japan did nothing wrong and it was just one other imperial.