

Title: SECURITY: THE BASIS FOR QUALITY OF LIFE

Name: Mr. Brent Droste Sadler

Student Number: B0668026

Graduate Program: M.A. Global Studies

Summary:

To ask someone to define quality of life or to state the factors contributing to it, is daunting and necessarily incites a myriad of answers. Does it mean having enough money to buy those things that provide physical comfort or necessity? is it a sense of inner satisfaction or worth? The situation in which someone finds himself has much to determine the manner of their reply. However one feature seems to be constant when considering quality of life.

Quality of life means many things, but the core feature is a sense of safety or security on an individual level. Without security no amount of wealth or inner well being will provide, or be able to provide a sense of quality or value to life, the only other option is chaos. As a naval officer the past 13 years, I have been in the business of security and I have traveled extensively. What my experiences lead me to believe, is that despite varying degrees of development or wealth, a person generally feels they have a good quality of life when they have a reasonable assurance of security or protection from arbitrariness. Beyond this basic level of security, all other considerations become measures of relative prosperity concerning how one views their quality of life. Security is the basis from which all else becomes possible.

My research concerns the implications constitution revision or, specifically revising article nine, will have on the security structures in East Asia. Recent events in North Korea, missile tests and a nuclear detonation test, underlie a tense security environment in the region. Despite challenges like these, there has been overwhelming progress in economies and stability in the region. As Teilhard de

Chardin postulates, “For observers of the future, the greatest event will be the sudden appearance of a collective human conscience” and the attainment of his omega point in human development. However, what is needed for this evolutionary move to the omega point is human security on a global scale. In a small way, it is this evolution to a higher level of human existence I am pursuing in my security studies.

Introduction

The point of this essay to explain the connection between my research, Japanese constitution revision, and how it relates to quality of life. To do this I will first have to attempt to address what constitutes quality of life? Calling on recent surveys I will show that security remains a central concern in how people feel about their quality of life. From this point, I will make the argument that security is the foundation through which human endeavors spring and furthers the evolution towards a more secure and just society of man. At this point I will show that through my research I hope to see how a more militarily proactive Japan will contribute to stability through international action, as well the challenges that change poses. It is my basic contention that through collective action, more powerful nations by action of their own self-interests can, and have promoted stability that has allowed for a general improvement of the quality of life. I don't contend that this is a linear process, but I do believe it has been a progressive trend nonetheless.

Quality of life? To a auto plant worker it could mean reasonable working hours and good pay. To a nomadic herdsman in Darfur, it could mean enough water to survive and nourish his flock. The central weakness in trying to define quality of life is that it differs in which context it is being addressed. The autoworker versus the nomadic herdsman. However, it seems from numerous surveys from around the world that a central concern of people on this topic is security. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit's survey of 2005, nine factors constitute a quality of life index. These nine factors include, in order of prevalence; material wellbeing, health, political stability and security, family life, community life, climate and geography, job security, political freedom, and lastly gender equality. All these factors contribute to a overall sense of what a person's quality of life is like. However, it is with further scrutiny that it becomes clear that compared to all the other factors, it is security and political stability that carries the most weight in determining the general quality of life of a population. Again according to the Economist survey in 2005, in projecting responses to quality of life political freedom and security received a nearly double weighting than all other factors; 25.3 weighting coefficient compared to 15 for the next significant factor of health. This could be why a country like Russia with a very

chaotic domestic situation, but still fairly good standard of living ranks well below Bangladesh in quality of life; 105th versus 77th.

Looking at these nine factors in another way, it is clear that some are strictly dependant on forces beyond human control; climate and geography. However, factors such as security, material wellbeing, political freedom, and gender equality can be impacted by international action. By this reasoning, I mean to show that the actions of one nation can have a positive impact on another; though this can be negative too. It is in this realm that the broadest impacts and contributions can be made to the improvement of quality of life on a grand scale. This is not to suggest the imposition of external structures or ideals, but rather the creation of an environment that can allow for a prospering society. And I would contend, that only in a secure environment could material wellbeing being be realized, that a livelihood free of violent death becomes more likely, the community life becomes free from intricine tribal warfare and criminal violence. While there is much that can be done to improve the quality of life in the world, to attempt to do all of it is to doom the endeavor to failure.

Quality of Life, Teilhard, and My Focus

What I have tried to do in my life's work, and with my research is to find that central feature that can fundamentally alter the dynamics and allow for an improvement in the quality of life. Like a doctor searching for a cure to a cancer, by engineering a gene that causes the body to then recognize and fight the cancer completely. Too often past attempts at improving issues like quality of life, have preferred the short term but incomplete prognosis of a biopsy. While removing the visible problem, the fundamentals remain unchanged and the cancer reappears. In this context, the cancer is instability and the high infant mortality, shortened life expectancies, chaotic family life, and impoverishment are its symptoms. The goal of improving the quality of life of people throughout the world is too difficult and complex to be addressed directly but the fundamental feature that allows it to improve must be first improved. But once this is accomplished efforts must expand into improving the other features that define quality of life such as gender equality and job

security. Security or political stability is only the first step and a foundation upon which all else can be advanced in improving the quality of life of mankind.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin believed that mankind was meant to learn from and continue the evolutionary process set in motion by Christ's sacrifice. While it may have been controversial to suggest man could learn from, and even progress beyond the lessons of Christ's sacrifice, there is much shared in my logic and Teilhard's. That is that through action of man, he may better his own lot not only spiritually as Teilhard suggested, but as I am concerned socially as concerns quality of life.

The condition of mankind has not remained unchanged, it has changed and evolved. This is not a linear process, for history is dotted with dark ages (the Greek dark ages after Mycenae, the dark ages after the fall of Rome, the Cold War of the 20th century?). However, these dark periods were not only local in scope but also short in duration. For while Europe slid backwards in the dark ages, the middle east societies surged ahead along with China. While force of arms allowed these two to advance militarily, it was the ensuing stability that allowed a booming trade to develop in the Indian Ocean and blossoming of these societies. Much like the Romans had suppressed piracy in the Mediterranean during the Pax Romana, the Muslim Caliphates did much the same in the Indian Ocean, and commerce prospered in both oceans. Through secure trade routes, commerce expanded and along with it an exchange of ideas. These ideas gave other men incentives to innovate and find new ways of not only conducting governance, trade, and science but also new ways of viewing the world in which they lived. It is interesting to note, that while societies have tried to ensure stability by closing themselves off from the world, it has always come at a price. Without the invigoration of intercourse with the outside world, Japan during the Tokugawa gradually slid backwards and increasingly obscure from the rest of the world. It is interesting to point out, that it seems clear from historical accounts that quality of life in Tokugawa Japan was better than most Europeans of the mid 1800's. My point is that Japan ran the risk of falling behind and not reaching the fullest potential of its quality of life by being isolated. Modern examples of societies that have tried to remain isolated and have regressed economically, technologically, and in a way socially was the Soviet Union, and currently North Korea.

My basic premise is that nations have an obligation to their own citizens to realize their full potential to improve their own quality of life, but then to contribute

to the betterment of mankind in general. Inevitably the powerlessness and poverty of others will effect the better off nations through movement of refugees, increases in failed states, and the spread of violence. As the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have already realized along with the United Nations in their millennium initiatives on combating global poverty, the security of the prosperous nations depends on the improvement of the lives of those living in poverty. My specialty is security, and I hope now to show how through the action of nations in international efforts can provide the stability and security necessary for the improvement of the quality of life of those in poorer countries. Specifically, how a militarily proactive Japan can contribute significantly to the improvement of global security, and as I has shown already, how this will improve the conditions for development and a general improvement of the quality of life of most of the world's people.

Japan and a Global Role

This past weekend Prime Minister Abe traveled to Beijing to meet with the leadership of China. After so long a rift over issues of nationalism (Yasukuni Shrine visits, history book controversies, and territorial disputes) it seems that ties may be on the mend. That these two rivals have chosen to pursue trade instead of military confrontation is significant. One argument for this change in great power competition is the threat of nuclear war; or rather the peace that nuclear weapons have imposed on conflict between great powers. The best example for this feature of modern military affairs was the Cold War; many times the world was a hair's breath away from nuclear war, but thankfully was always just averted. Because of this, competition between great powers has become largely economic in nature. To be sure, there remain some very scary situations in the world that could lead to great power warfare; Kashmir and North Korea being the most notable.

My research focuses on the possibility that a more proactive Japan in international efforts will further the cause of security. Japan has grown economically, and pursued a very generous program of financial aid throughout the world since its postwar economic miracle. Yet, despite this economic aid conflict has remained a constant threat to the progress in improving the lives of those living in lesser

developed regions. Despite massive amounts of food aid, still many starved in Somalia in the early 90's as armed gangs hoarded and controlled distribution of those supplies. It is a situation that is familiar to many places international aid is sent. Only with the necessary force can the aid be guaranteed to reach those most in need and provide for the most basic of human security needs. Currently the African Union and United Nations efforts in Darfur are woefully under funded and manned. The result is a continuation, often in the presence of these forces, of continued violence and atrocity.

The solution to such inadequacies is not a international police force, or taking international action in every violent conflict. The situation and conditions must dictate when such action is warranted. That is not only impossible, but to attempt such would be counter productive. Conflicts such as that in Darfur today clearly warrant action, as did timely action in Rwanda. Those countries willing and able to affect effective peace-enforcement are woefully limited. The United States has demonstrated not only its ability but its willingness several times to partake in peace-enforcement operations; the Balkans, Somalia, East Timor. Japan too has shown an increasing desire to partake in these same types of operations; Cambodia, East Timor. However, there remains a significant impediment to an expanded role of Japan in peace-enforcement operations. This impediment is the peace clause of article nine in the current constitution.

Globalization, Security and the Importance of Peace-Enforcement

While the focus of my research is the impact constitution revision may have, it is important to understand the context of this change and globalization represents perhaps the single most important trend in world affairs today. My thought on globalization is that it offers the world a tremendous prospect; world peace and prosperity for all peoples of the world. The only requirement is that governments respect the rule of law, adhere to principles of free trade, and ensure a sufficient level of security such that trade can prosper. Countries that had done this, have demonstrated a remarkable success rate; recent examples include South Korea, India, and China. Yet, there are governments that are threatened by the transparency required of them in order for Globalization to succeed. Notable examples of this

group include Iran, and North Korea. Additionally, September 11, 2001 demonstrated to the world that there are people violently opposed to Globalization. The world's unanimity in reaction to this event, underlines a fundamental aspect of that day; it was an attack not on a nation or a people, but on a system. A system that has fostered greater prosperity, and freedom through integration of the world's economies.

What the terrorists of September 11th hope to accomplish is to disconnect an entire region, the Middle East, from the global economy. The result of this divide would be devastating to all nations, and certainly not lead to improved prosperity of the people in the Middle East. The reason they seek this goal is to recreate a middle age Islamic utopia, and rightly fear that the people of the Middle East, if allowed access to the prosperity of the outside world, would opt out of that presumed utopia. However, potential instability (the real enemy of Globalization) is not limited to the Middle East, for there are countries in South America and large portions of Africa that have yet to integrate themselves with the world economy successfully. In short, the world is split into two opposed camps; those who seek to isolate and subdue their people and economies, and those who seek greater prosperity and security through integration with the world's economies.

My focus is not on Globalization, but rather how Japan can adapt to better safeguard the advances made, and promote future successes in the on going trend of Globalization. A trend that has fostered more accountable governments, a respect for the rule of law vice authoritarianism or violence, and due to greater economic interdependencies has all but eliminated the threat of large-scale nation state war. Much work has been done in the past ten years on the merits, consequences, and future of Globalization; I introduce them to underline the importance of Globalization to Japan's continued security and prosperity. This is because the terrorist have targeted a system that has served Japan well, and led to her being one the most prosperous nations of the world. Should Globalization fail, the consequence would be a poorer world fractured, and in sometime violent competition. Violence that can reach any place as demonstrated on September 11, 2001.

Japan has a significant stake in the success of Globalization, and cannot afford to see it fail. Yet, Japan has not done all that it can nor should do, due to self-imposed limitations inherent in its constitution. A corner stone to the success of free trade is security. Economies do not flourish in a war zone, and investors tend to view

unstable governments or regions as bad investments. Thus the first step in ensuring Globalization succeeds is to ensure freedom of the seas, and a degree of security that enables vigorous trade and investment. Japan's constitution, however, has by and large prevented meaningful involvement with United Nations peacekeeping operations, and actions of collective defense. So if Japan is to fulfill its United Nations Charter obligations, and realize its full nation-state potential, the pacifism of the current constitution needs to be overcome. Trends since the first Gulf War seem to indicate there is serious consideration to significantly revise or amend the current constitution. How this is done and what the revisions include or don't include, will have a significant impact on the role Japan plays in the world.

Is there really a problem with Japan's constitution anyway?

First question to ask is if the Japanese constitution is in fact "broken." To answer this question, I will focus on one aspect of a document that has served Japan well in its post war recovery; article nine. Up till the end of the cold war, Japan's constitution, especially article nine, had been reinterpreted over time to address a threat from the Soviet Union. During Japan's post war recovery and the cold war, article nine's limitation to Japan's minimum self-defense was adequate. However, following the cold war, and then the rise of international terrorism, the dynamics have changed. The foe today is instability and unaccountable, irresponsible governments, not an ideological threat such as communism. Japan's first test in the post cold war era was the Gulf War in 1990-1991.

Japan's response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, has been called "Japan's Defeat of 1991." Coalition members, acting under United Nations mandates, contributed not only money but also military forces with the goal of ousting Iraqi forces from Kuwait. This coalition acted in collective self-defense as obligated to do as member nations under article two of the Charter of the United Nations. While the Japanese government debated the constitutionality of providing physical support, the war ended. It was in fact, six months after hostilities ended that Maritime Self Defense Force mine sweepers were sent to the Persian Gulf. For many nations, Japan's financial support, appreciated as it was, was not enough and when it

finally took action in support of United Nations resolutions; it was too late to make an appreciable impact.

On the heels of the first Gulf War, Japan's ability to support United Nations mandates and contribute to security was again challenged. This time, in support of a comprehensive peace accord in Cambodia in 1992. With a peace accord in place, and thus assurances that Japanese forces would be in a non-hostile environment, Japanese security forces were dispatched. Significant gains in establishing a semblance of peace were achieved. However, when the Khmer Rouge broke the peace accord and reinitiated hostilities, Japan nearly reversed all its past successes in Cambodia. Tensions in Japan were heightened when two Japanese nationals, part of United Nations efforts, were killed. Despite popular demands to remove all Japanese support in Cambodia, Prime Minister Miyazawa's government held firm and was able to maintain Japanese forces in Cambodia. The opposition party's contention at the time was that without a peace accord in place, Japanese forces would necessarily need to use force for self defense, and being outside the Japanese home islands, beyond the limits of minimum self defense, and therefore unconstitutional. Since the Gulf War, various bills in the Diet have addressed constitutional issues regarding United Nations operations. These efforts attempted to clarify Japanese military support in peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts. However, there remains a constitutional impediment to sending Japanese forces into a situation where a peace accord either cannot be agreed to or there are no parties to agree to it. Examples of this situation tend to involve ethnic violence or where indigenous governments or rebel organizations have little or no control of their own forces; think Darfur in Sudan, and Haiti.

Starting with the first North Korean nuclear crisis of 1995, then the Taiwan crisis in 1996, and culminating in North Korea's Taepodong missile launch in 1998, significant weakness in the United States-Japan security arrangement became apparent. During the nuclear crisis, it became evident that should hostilities become inevitable in Korea, Japan was not legally able to support those operations (rear area support) as being outside the realm of Japan's minimum self-defense. With a significant United States presence in Japan, any regional crisis involving the United States will certainly obligate Japan to providing rear area support. As new defense guidelines were being drafted to address possible hostilities in Korea, the Taiwan

Crisis of 1996 occurred when missiles launched from People's Republic of China warships, landed in waters just north of Taiwan. Debate on how Japan should respond to a regional conflict gained added attention, but remained unresolved until 1998's Taepodong missile launch. This event triggered a wave of public support to more broadly interpret the limitations of Japanese support should a regional crisis occur. New defense guidelines, started three years previous, were rapidly approved. Yet, the issue of collective self-defense continues to be viewed as unconstitutional despite Japan's obligations under the United Nation's charter. In fact, questions remain today as to if Japan would be able to respond to another North Korean missile launch in a timely manner due to interpretation of article nine.

The most recent challenge to Japan's employment of defense forces has been the war on terror. On September 19, 2001 Prime Minister Koizumi announced clearly and unmistakably Japan's support in this fight. Later in October the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures bill was passed. Most important, and critical to the United States' operations in Afghanistan, was a clear intention to provide "rear area support." In fact, Self Defense Forces shuttled fuel and supplies to United States Naval forces in the Indian Ocean carrying out offensive operations in Afghanistan. This clearly was a dramatic change from Japan's response to the Gulf War in 1990-1991. I believe this also represented the maximum extent to which article nine of the constitution could be interpreted. Additionally, Japan's self defense forces are in Iraq providing assistance and security in a non-combatant role. Seeing as how prevalent violence continues to be in that country, it may only be a matter of time before this presence is withdrawn.

To summarize, interpretation of Article Nine continues to limit the use of force to minimum self-defense, and prevents Japan's participation in collective self-defense and most peacekeeping operations. In fact, the nature of peacekeeping has changed so much that these operations would be better described as peace enforcement. If the threat of violence prevents Japan from involvement in United Nations actions, then Japan will not be a participant in alleviating the biggest challenge to continued prosperity, instability.

Changing article nine while not forgetting the lessons of World War Two

Due to the experiences of World War Two there is a very keen awareness of Japan's military potential and limits placed on its employment by the constitution. China, for one, has been a routine and outspoken critic of Japan. Any change to the constitution or revision of article nine, will certainly draw the ire of many Asian countries. However, this shouldn't prevent Japan from making needed changes to its constitution. Nonetheless, Japan should address these countries' concerns and assure the world such changes do not premeditate a resumption of militarism. In reality, the Japanese people will be the greatest guarantor preventing a return to militarism, and because of public concerns, the wording of any new constitution would reflect that.

The pacifism of post World War Two Japan has too long prevented fulfillment of obligations as a member of the United Nations. Specifically, Japan's inability to partake in "peace enforcement" operations, and collective defense. By changing article nine in such a way as to allow full participation in United Nations operations and collective self-defense, a tremendous obstacle would be removed. This change need not alter the basic premise of Article Nine, revocation of war as an aggressive means to settle disputes. However, the right of belligerency should be renewed to bring the constitution in to agreement with the Charter of the United Nations.

Just as before the Meiji Constitution was ratified, there are numerous proposals present for a new or revised constitution today. Unlike the Meiji Constitution, the final choice of what direction Japan takes inevitably rests with the Japanese people. If an excessive pacifism endures, Japan will continue to be a less than full member of the United Nations. An outcome that would threaten Japan becoming a permanent member of the Security Council. On the other extreme, if a too nationalistic stance is taken and is viewed as a return to militarism, relations with other Asian nations maybe set back unnecessarily. Clearly, it is my hope that a middle ground is found that allays concerns over militarism, while removing impediments to Japan's right of collective self defense.

How does a revised article nine impact security agreements with the United States?

A key component of Japan's defense policy has been centered on the U.S. security arrangement. U.S. bases in Japan provide not only deterrence to aggression against Japan, but also a platform for projecting stability throughout the region. Japan has benefited tremendously from this arrangement. In the beginning, it allowed a devastated Japan to focus its resources on recovering from the ravages of World War Two. Later, this relationship fostered the spread of trade throughout Asia via the security and stability assured by the presence of United States military forces. This trade in turn has provided opportunities for Japanese business to expand and continue to prosper. The concern with this arrangement today centers on regional crisis, and what support Japan would provide to U.S. forces involved in such contingencies.

Two scenarios that best define this issue, potential conflict between North and South Korea, and a crisis between the Peoples' Republic of China and Taiwan. In both situations, U.S. forces would be obligated to respond should either situation become violent. In turn, any U.S. military action would most likely deploy from bases in Japan. This poses a dilemma, since the mere presence of so many U.S. forces in Japan would make it a target for attack. Would Japan provide support for such contingencies? What would Japan's reaction be should Japanese forces come under attack providing "rear area support" to U.S. forces?

It seems from details of recently revised defense guidelines, that Japan has every intention of providing "rear area" support for U.S. actions in either situation; Taiwan and Korea. Yet, like the support provided during the fight in Afghanistan, there is an inherent limit to how much can be expected. Since Japanese forces are limited to non-combatant roles, and deployed only to areas far from hostilities their impact and contribution will remain limited. Perhaps even at a critical moment where their participation may prove critical. When the conflict comes closer to home, say between the Koreas, then every place in Japan could be within range of hostilities. Without a revision to the constitution, "rear area support," vital to contingencies in both Taiwan and Korea, will remain questionable as beyond minimum self-defense.

The way ahead and consequences for inaction

Looking to the future, and what role Japan seeks to play, the first question that must be answered is: Will Japan play an active and positive role in supporting “peace enforcement” operations and collective self-defense? If the answer is yes, and I believe that events over the past fifteen years have conditioned the Japanese public for this role, Japan will accept and seek a role in line with the U.N. charter. Accepting this role does not immediately imply a return to militarism. However, some Asian countries will protest vigorously any change to Japan’s constitution regardless of intentions. Rather than disregarding these countries’ concerns, Japan would be obliged to engage and educate the rest of Asia of its intentions. A more engaged and supportive Japan of United Nations operations is good for all countries, since it adds another capable nation to promoting security and stability. Japan would be in fact, removing the last vestige of the post war era, and take a key step to becoming a more “normal” nation.

Failure to make changes will have a direct impact on Japan. One, a prosperous nation such as Japan not meeting its U.N. obligations will make its membership as a permanent member of the Security Council challenging. Japan’s pursuit of membership on the Security Council will undoubtedly draw attention to the shortcomings of Japan’s constitution, and must be addressed before any change to the U.N. Security Council. Two, without an expectation of support in regional contingencies, the U.S.-Japan security arrangement will remain strained. In the highly unlikely event that this security arrangement falter, the cost to Japan for maintaining an equally capable force to replace the U.S. presence will be tremendous, and will only draw more suspicions from neighbor countries. The result being a less stable East Asia, and possibly, though unlikely ensuing arms races. Lastly, and most importantly, the promotion of Globalization and the rule of law depend on exporting security and stability. Without Japan playing an active role in this, the chances of more failed states increases, with ensuing violence and terrorism.

It is too early to discern which course Japan will take in revising its constitution. However, it is promising to see so much debate, concern, and optimism concerning this topic in Japan. My research is ongoing, and currently I am attending seminars at the U.N. University, Keio University and pursuing a M.A. in Global

Studies with the goal of gaining a fuller appreciation of the dynamics surrounding the constitutional debate in Japan. I strongly believe a more proactive Japan in support of peace-enforcement and collective security would be a tremendous advance for the betterment of the lives of many people in the world. Through international actions the developed nations with the ability can help bring the stability and security necessary to allow the growth of strong economies, and stable governments that are not only accountable to their people but responsive. The result of such efforts could be over the future years a better quality of life for all people, and a move towards Teilhard's omega point.