

## Japan's Role in UN Peacebuilding Efforts: Prospects for Cooperation with the United States

Toshiya Hoshino, Osaka University  
Yuji Uesugi, Waseda University

April 20, 2015

Victoria K. Holt, US Department of State (Discussant)

Yuki Tatsumi, Stimson Center (Moderator)

**Tatsumi:** Good afternoon, thank you for coming for our lunch seminar today. My name is Yuki Tatsumi. I am a senior associate here at the Stimson East Asia Program. This year is a very big year for Japanese diplomacy. This year is the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II and one of the key pillars of Japan's postwar foreign policy is Japan's engagement with the United Nations. In recent years Japan has begun to actively participate in various peacekeeping operations and post-conflict construction and related work. This is one of the growing industries for Japanese diplomacy. Prime Minister Abe just recently in his speech also reaffirmed that Japan's robust engagement with the United Nations, especially in the area of peacekeeping, remains one of the key foreign policy priorities. So this seminar is our attempt to begin to appreciate what Japan has been doing in this area, because I think a lot of the audience in Washington just simply does not know Japan's activity in this area. So hopefully this conversation will help us all better understand what Japan has been up to and what its plan is now and what Japan plans to do in the coming years.

We have a terrific panel. Start from my immediate right is Dr. Toshiya Hoshino. He is the Professor at Osaka University. He actually was my predecessor at the Embassy of Japan in Washington D.C. when he was also the special assistant for political affairs. I had the position, becoming one of the two people behind him. So it is a privilege to have him on the panel. He has a long-standing work on Japanese foreign policy particularly with the UN policy in general. So we look forward to hearing his views on how he sees the recent development. Following him is Dr. Yuji Uesugi. He is my college alumnus. He is a graduate of International Christian University in Tokyo. Currently, he teaches at Waseda University in Tokyo as a professor. He actually has an interesting career, having participated in all of the election monitoring, and also he has worked on the projects at the Hiroshima Peace Research Center to train Japanese and other people from other Asian nations to be able to have the capacity to participate in the various peacekeeping and the reconstruction missions. So he will tell us a little bit about that. And I am particularly happy to have Victoria Holt as a discussant. She is currently a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of International Organization, but in her previous career life, she was my old colleague at the Stimson Center. It is great to have you back, Victoria. When we were at the old location, we were working together then. So the order is, I will turn to Dr. Hoshino first, and then Dr. Uesugi and then Ms. Holt will say a few words also. Then we will open up for question and answer session, so without further ado.

**Hoshino:** Thank you very much Yuki and I am very appreciative of the Stimson Center today and thank you for gathering on this subject – Japan's Role in UN Peacekeeping Efforts: Prospects for Cooperation with the United States. I have a double major, actually one is Japan-US relations and the other one is Japan-UN, United Nations relations. She kind of mentioned my career at the Japanese Embassy in Washington, DC: that was more than around twenty-five years ago. More recently, I was on the Japanese Mission to the United Nations, directly working on Japanese policy at the United Nations, and one of the areas of particular priority for Japan is certainly this post-conflict peacebuilding. This is a question of transforming those countries which experienced serious conflicts into peace-loving

countries. This is exactly the path that Japan has gone through after World War II, and so Japan considers, we tend to double our image of recovery, reconstruction and changing from war-zone country, conflict-zone country to more peace-loving country. So that I think is partly the reason why we tend to focus on this issue. And Dr. Uesugi Yuji, who is my friend, he has particularly been working on this issue for many years, so I ask for him to talk about the details and case studies.

Today I will talk more about the general picture to why we consider peace building very important. Another particular attention that Japan tends to focus when we work on peace building is human perspective. We the Japanese government tends to use "human security." I am actually tempted to use another term because I am out of the government, so I offer a more scholastic perspective. I'd like to say that the United Nations was originally conceived as an organization to maintain international peace and security, right? Everyone knows that. This is about peace and security among states, right? So my additional perspective is to add one more layer to emphasize the main tendency or advancement of human peace and security. So from my perspective, human security for the Japanese government to say is a bit limited. That is partly the reason why I attempted to propose a new idea and advance human peace and security. But anyway that there is no change or no doubt that the Japanese government wants to look at the individual peace and security in the context of post-conflict. As Yuki said at the very outset, this year marks the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II. Whenever we look at Japan's policy towards the United Nations and also the post-conflict peacebuilding issues, I think it is important to put Japan's position in the context of that kind of history, although there is a lot of history discussion surrounding Japan. But I also would like to raise that point as well.

I think there are several things that have changed over the years, and there are certain things that Japan has not changed over the years. I mean in the past seventy years. Something that Japan has not changed or the world has not changed over the seventy years is Japan's emphasis on peace. This is the constitution of Japan. Although as you know, Prime Minister Abe is very much interested in revising the constitution, but that is an effort to modify and adjust the constitution's language, particularly the language of the constitution towards the actual reality and what we are going to do in this world. My understanding is that it does not necessarily change the entire spirit or the direction of Japanese constitution, which is that Japan tries to pursue peace in the world. So I consider Japan's peace-loving position as a constant rather than a variable. Although there are some discussion on the constitutional revision and criticism, but I would like to distinguish the spirit part and the modification part. Secondly, Japan-US alliance, I think, is one of the realities which is considered a constant for the past seventy years. I have to make several adjustments, because the first Japan-US treaty was signed in 1951, so less than seventy years. Immediately after the war, the United States came to Japan and occupied and then at that time we started our dialogue and the constitution is one of the outcomes of it. Anyway, Japan-US relationship is another constant factor during the last seventy years. And the UN-centric policy of Japan: Japan joined the United Nations in 1956. Japan applied to the United Nations in 1951 but because of the Cold War context, Japan was not allowed to join until Japan normalized its relations with the Soviet Union, which happened in 1956. That was the reason why 1956 December, is the day of Japan's accession. But since then and even before that, Japan wanted to be a part of the United Nations. So these are the three constants Japan has been doing over the years.

So what has changed over the past seventy years? Suddenly after World War II, the United States was a prominent power. And at that time there was a country called Soviet Union. The Cold War and the rivalry was actually a very important factor in the post-war history. Soviet Union is no longer there and we saw the period or the moment of the unipolarity of the United States, but I hate to say in front of my American audience that US power is weakening. That I think is something that we see. I want to see a strong US as it is always an important stability factor in my perspective, but that is not necessarily the

case. This is one kind of change, which is somehow related to the other side of the coin, which is China is rising. So that kind of superpower or major power distribution, allocation of powers among all the powers – that I think is one of the changes over the seventy years. And Japan became the second largest economy in the UN, and Japan hoping to be a permanent member of the Security Council I think is another kind of change over the seventy years. The nature of conflict has changed, as you all aware from international conflicts to intra-national conflicts and now non-state actors that are very active. So the type of problems we need to address has changed significantly, right? We often have a discussion of global commons, so that the new field of diplomacy and politics has expanded from land, sea, and air to the cyberspace and other space. That is another big change.

But I would like to mention a couple of more changes. One is that China and Russia, those are two permanent members, who are supposed to be the guardian of the key principles of the United Nations Charter, are now changing the policy and more willing to change and willing to take the position even to change the orders by power. That I think is a kind of change from the guardian of the principle of the UN Charter to countries who are willing to overlook that kind of thing. Last one which is rather ironic, is the history issue came to become a problem in quite recent time because that has not been an issue over the past probably fifty years after World War II, but suddenly during these twenty years, the history issue became very prominent. So that is kind of ironic. So there are some factors which have not changed over the years and there are some factors which have changed over the years. So what we have at stake is that we need to look again at the international order. I suddenly believe that the 1945 order is sometimes in trouble. Some key principles we need to maintain, the international peace and security is certainly important so we need to spend some time on that, but at the same time, as I told you earlier, non-state actors are appearing, and there are so many vulnerable states which can power terrorism so that those countries have to be strengthened. So what we are seeing are very weak states and actually very strong people. We have to take the new balance and put new factors into the international order. So we need to question and reinvent the international order based on the reality of 2015, in the context of 2015. That means I believe that Japan is a defeated country, the United States and Allied countries are the victor countries – that kind of dichotomy should be overcome by now, because this is a history of seventy years old. We have to look at the relationship more in today's context. The new order certainly should include not just the activities of the nation-states or the governments but civil society and other non-governmental organizations. In order to see everything, I think that the US-Japan alliance continues to be an important pillar of Japan's foreign policy.

Let me conclude by highlighting what has Japan done and emphasized over the years in Japan-UN policy, because I did not plan to go over all those issues. Besides the post-conflict peace building, suddenly Japan used its official development assistance for the social economic development of weak states, and the conflict prevention, peacekeeping, post-conflict peace building, national reconciliation and democratization. I think those are the areas where Japan played certain roles, and the details of peacekeeping activities and peace building efforts I think Yuji will talk about. Disarmament and non-proliferation, Japan as a country which experienced nuclear, atomic bombs. That certainly places nuclear disarmament and disarmament in general an important area of promoting peace. Non-proliferation in general and non-proliferation of North Korea is an area worth close attention. Together with the U.S., anti-terrorism is an area of great interest to us. And disaster prevention, relief and humanitarian assistance and etc.: those are I think what Japan has emphasized. Finally, I think in order for Japan to play a more positive role under the new phrase that Prime Minister Abe would like to talk these days, that is *sekkyokuteki-heiwa-shugi*, which literally translated as proactive contribution to peace based on the principle of international cooperation. But whenever we say proactive contribution to peace, some neighboring countries, because of the history issues, will criticize Japan that it is going to remilitarize. No.

Whenever China and Korea would like to raise the issue of history that is their efforts to contain Japan. That is containment [inaudible]. Japan is not necessarily trying to become a military superpower, but trying to play normal activities in the international contribution based on the principle of international cooperation. So probably what we need to do as Japanese policy recommendation, I think the improvements of Japan-China relationship and Japan-Korea relationship is an important step for us to play a more positive role if not proactive role in international contribution. Thank you very much for your attention.

**Uesugi:** Good afternoon, I am Yuji. I did my master's study at George Mason University, focusing on conflict analysis and resolution more than twenty years ago. It is nice to be back here. As Professor Hoshino laid out the most strategic policy level talks, my task will be more practical based; maybe what Japan has been doing on the ground. Particularly I will be focusing on the Japanese effort toward human resource development, particularly in the field of civilian peacebuilding. I was asked to speak basically three topics, three issues. First one is about Japanese policy regarding human resource development for peacebuilding. And second topic relates to the actual record of achievement, what we have been doing. And finally is the relationship or the cooperation with the United States. I would like to confess that in Japan, the people who are dealing with Japan-US relationship and the people who are dealing with so-called UN or more global issues are kind of separate. They are different groups of people and they rarely communicate.

**Hoshino:** We are the only exception.

**Uesugi:** Probably we are the only exception who has a double major. I would like to emphasize that although they look like totally different issues, but as our joint conclusion. One conclusion would be that those UN-related issues or global issues and those Japan-US relations have a lot of points in common. It would be a great thing that we need to find the nexus between these things. First of all, I would like to talk about some of the origin of Japan's peace building efforts. That goes back to 2002 when the Japanese government asked Mr. Yasushi Akashi who headed the UN peacekeeping mission in Cambodia. After that, he was head of the UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force) in the former state of Yugoslavia. And he was the head of the advisory group for the Japanese government and he came up with the report called the Report of the Advisory Group on International Cooperation for Peace. And there he recommended that the Japanese government should create a training system for human resources so that more Japanese will be able to work in the field of international peacekeeping and peace building. He also highlighted that the Japanese government has to develop efficient and comprehensive development, training and recruitment and dispatch of the human resources on this issue. I think since then the Japanese government is trying very hard to realize that recommendations.

I have been for the past eight years being involved in the human resources development for peacebuilding commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. And that program was first launched by Aso Taro, the foreign minister in 2006. When he was a foreign minister, he made a public speech titled "A School to Build Peace Builders" and often in Japan we called it Terakoya Speech. In the speech, he said that in order to build and maintain peace, a larger number of civilians are necessary. And it is the civilians that Japan wants to send out in increasing numbers in the future. Normally, when we talk about proactive contribution to peace, our focus is on the expansion of the Japanese self-defense forces' involvement in the peacekeeping operations or other overseas operations. But Foreign Minister Aso underlined that it is the civilians that the Japanese government want to increase the numbers. I do not know whether it is true or not but at least partially true. Following such a statement, the Japanese government set up the human resources development program for human resources development for peacebuilding. And most recently, the current Prime Minister Shinzo Abe stated in 2013 in the General

Assembly of the United Nations that Japan must continuously cultivate our human resources appropriate to the United Nations activities. He endorsed our program for human resource development publicly in the UN. Also, last year, at United Nations, Prime Minister Abe again stated that Japan intends to cultivate further in terms of both quality and quantity our human resources; we will contribute to the international community. Similarly, the foreign minister, now Fumio Kishida, also talks about that human resource development for peace building is one of the special activities that is related to proactive contribution to peace. And I have brought brochures of the human resource development and I am going to pass it out. You can take a look.

So now, I am going to talk about the specific program. It started in 2007 and we have conducted for the last eight years and we have trained 164 Japanese and 138 non-Japanese. Initially, non-Japanese only included people from East Asia and Southeast Asia. But gradually it expanded to Central Asia, Middle East. Last year, we start recruiting trainees from Africa. We have one from Somalia, one from Mali and others. That training program, about thirty will be recruited each year, they have six weeks of training experience in Hiroshima. After that for most of the Japanese, they will be given the opportunity to work as a UN volunteer in the specific missions everywhere. I would like to give you some of the statistics. In the year 2013, one participant went to India as the Child Protection Officer for UNICEF, one went to Ecuador as a project analyst for the UN Women, two went to Egypt, one for UNCR, the other for WHP, another went to Kazakhstan for OHCHR, Zimbabwe for UNDP, Sudan for WHP, Senegal for UNCR, Palestine UNICEF, Bangladesh UNDP, Timor-Leste UNDP, the Philippines, United Nations Resident Coordinator Office, Vietnam UN office, Myanmar WHP, Laos UNICEF and Rwanda UNDP. So about fifteen Japanese, all of them now work in UN organization. Most of them are in peacebuilding conditions. And also I have statistics, 85 percent of former trainees are now working in the field of peace building. Some work for the Japanese government. Some are working for UN organizations, some work for Japanese international corporations, agencies, NGOs, private sectors and some in universities. According to statistics, 85 are remaining in the field of peace building. I think that is what we consider a kind of successful rate. Also it has been only eight years so we will never know if they would get promoted and then become a secretary-general or a special representative of the secretary-general, but they are working very hard. A first-year participant is now working in the Democratic Republic of Congo and her position is something related to woman rights promotion and protection, and she is now working at P5 level. So I think our alumni are working very hard to climb up the ladder.

This program has very little linkages with the United States. We have worked initially with Canada. They have the Pearson Peacekeeping Training Center; we had the initial cooperation. In Sweden, they have the Folke Bernadotte Academy that also trains peacekeepers. So initially we collaborated with Canadians and Swedish. And also sometimes we have Australians come in and help us. But very little official linkages with the United States. Maybe because, even in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, those working with US issues and those who working with UN issues are quite separated. Maybe they did not want to step into somebody else's territories. I do not know. However, I would like to highlight a couple of things that have cooperation with the United States in the area of peace building and peacekeeping. One is called G4, a global peace operation initiative and jointly the Japanese government and US government organized senior mission leaders trainings for the past three times since 2009. In that training opportunity, about twenty-five officials from the military, civilian and the police got together and they were able to train together. My training program is only focusing on civilians. We also visit the Japanese self-defense forces to have specific training. However, we did not mix these two different kinds of people. We have not yet able to realize the participation of the police force, so that is kind of maybe shortcoming of the program. But this G4 actually complements and allows the 3D approach, the military, civilian and the police to work together.

Also, very recently, the United States set up a program called African Peacekeeping Rapid Response Partnership, I think it is known as APRRP. The United States tries to involve in the capacity building of the African partners in rapid development capabilities and I think our government also tries to supplement some of the US work in this regard. And one of the recent developments can be found that Japanese government donated 3.8 billion yen, which is roughly about 35 million US dollars to the UN. So the UN can purchase equipment, particularly engineering equipment so that they would be used in Africa. Because it will take a longer time to ship these engineering equipment from Japan to Africa. But if it were already positioned, it would have more rapid capability. Prime Minister Abe last year in the UN, he stated that the rapid deployment of PKOs is a particularly urgent challenge especially in Africa. In this regard, the African Peacekeeping Rapid Respond Partnership which the US announced as a must is highly significant and Japan will support this partnership. As its new commitment, Japan is prepared to provide engineering equipment in Africa through the trust fund in the United Nations as well as training and operating these machines effectively. So this already became implemented.

I think those are the things I wanted to share. For one thing, about our human resource development: last year, we have had the third party review of our eight years of program and one of the reviewers was Professor Hoshino. And he has submitted a recommendation for the reform to the foreign minister, and we expect that this year they will have some major changes. Although we have continued this program for eight years, I am not sure whether we will continue, what will be the next, but according to my knowledge, the Japanese government has a very positive evaluation on our efforts and they are going to build upon it and would expand much further. So we expect the Japanese government commitment to the field of human resource development in peace building is going to be enlarged. Thank you everyone.

**Tatsumi:** Thank you Uesugi-san. So I am unfortunately not any of the exceptions. I am primarily working on the US-Japan relations. I am learning so much today and I am going to push myself to learn even further by turning it to Victoria.

**Holt:** Thank you very much, Yuki. Thank you for having me back and it is nice to see you at the Stimson Center and to see some old friends and audiences. I hear a problem to be fixed because from where I sit, partnership and dealing with peace and security is a no.1 objective and Japan is such a key strategic ally on a bilateral level, both in the UN system. And there is no reason there should not be a robust and deep conversation. So what I thought I might do since I am the respondent, just to give some observations that might kick off in bigger conversations here. We know the prime minister's visit is coming. So it is a very timely discussion to have.

First of all, I would say look at the strategic environment we are in and look at how much the multilateral system and the UN specifically is being asked to do. And I'll turn in a minute to peacekeeping, but if you just pay attention to the Security Council, my staff likely to remind me it is increased to 20-40 percent in the number of meetings and products just in the last year. So whether it is dealing with foreign terrorist fighters, the scourge of Ebola in West Africa, the political instability in Ukraine or what was happening in Libya, the violence in Yemen or Syria, let alone the places we do know the soldiers on, who are trying to bring justice in Guatemala or dealing with humanitarian crisis, which my humanitarian friend likes to remind me, I think we are up to five levels three emergencies. It feels like a moment where these partnerships are front and center to our foreign policy dealing with peace and security as well as humanitarian issue and long-term concerns about, whether it is counter-violent extremism or [inaudible]. So I just say that when you look at the relationship on a financial basis. I think combined our two governments pay well over a third, heading over forty percent I think of the budget for the UN system roughly speaking and that to include peacekeeping operations. So is there a need, absolutely. So some of the specifics perhaps. I will note that Japan has led, I've already noted in a few

areas. Financial I just touched on and increasing operationally. And over the last twenty years, this deepens, the civilians and even now some of the defense forces that have been willing to be deployed to missions in the field. I am thinking most recently in December of 2013, when the crisis struck in South Sudan, we knew there were Japanese engineers who were being put to work immediately, both trying to rebuild the compounds the UN created that were been flooded by civilians seeking protection but also trying to help out with the new troops coming in. When push came to shove, there is also a quite famous story that when the UN run out of ammunition, Japan offered up theirs. So cooperation in the field, cooperation in the international community.

I do want to talk a bit about peacekeeping. Because while many feel that it is a tool that has been around since the founding of UN, it is really the last twenty, twenty-five years where we see it take part in conflicts where gate to peace is fragile and sometimes get rough back. Whether it is in Congo, Lebanon, Haiti, Liberian, Cote d'Ivoire, South Sudan, Sudan, Mali, Central African Republic or others, I forgot if I mentioned Somalia: we see a real need for partner, and also as you mentioned, human resources. These missions are high-demand: sixteen today, over 130,000 individuals serving in the UN. That is a mix of civilian, police and military. So Japan's contribution I think over the last twenty-plus years is almost 9,000 people, if you count everybody. The human resource point, we already talked about, peace operations initiatives. Peace builder is critical, missions will not succeed without [inaudible] and police as well. So I just to want to flag that is another major contribution that we are aware of and support to these field operations where we have a deep and mutual interest. But now I am going to flag something maybe we can look forward and to see how we could even deepen that relationship both on a bilateral but also on a multilateral basis. As briefly mentioned, Vice President Biden hosted last fall, at the opening of the UN General Assembly, a summit on Peacekeeping and we invited countries to come and talk about how they could contribute better to UN operations. I am very pleased that Japan was co-host with us and the secretary-general of that event. Over thirty countries participated and made pledges to say we are going to help fill gaps in current missions. We are going to support more in rapid deployment [inaudible]. Well, we just announced less a month ago that President Obama will chair a follow-up summit this fall. So we are going to look to work with countries like Japan to solve some of the problems. I mentioned the operation issue. We also need, the UN needs engineers, logistician, medical capability – sometimes, it is the enablers that make these missions succeed. That is an area where I think Japan has offered to train the governments, to provide support to Africa and maybe even deepen its own contributions to UN missions to make a sizeable and meaningful contribution. Sometimes also just even participating in the UN system, there is something called the UN Standby Arrangements system, just a simply way of having countries say that they could offer to future operations. The secretary-general has the most high-level panel to look at UN reform and brief this summer, we think it is going to try to give life to some of the enterprise like the Standby Arrangement system. So perhaps one thought is Japan and other countries could contribute by listing what they could offer to the UN and key missions. So whether it is training and support, providing civilian, police or military, helping with the civilian peace builders, enablers and logistics or overall supporting UN reforms. I think there is a very abundant and deep relationship both on the bilateral relationship and together in the UN system. Particularly since Japan may be elected to the Security Council since it is running for the next term. And we all share together the 70th anniversary of the UN which is coming. We [inaudible] critical issues exactly, which is climate change, post-2015 development. There is a peace-building review, there is a review of women peace and security and I think across all of these, we have many common interests. Thanks for a few thoughts.

**Tatsumi:** Thank you Victoria, this is terrific. My head is bursting. So I am going to turn to you to ask some smart questions. If you could identify yourself before you ask a question so the panelists know who you are. It is greatly appreciated. With that, I will open the floor.

## **Q&A**

**Question 1:** Rust Deming, SAIS. Thank you very much. I enjoyed your discussion. I am glad to see that the UN still enjoys a high priority in Japanese foreign policy. My question is on Charter reform. What is going on now? There is a burst of groups over the years. Japan has formed a group of four with Germany, Brazil and India. Is there something happening or is it dead in the water. Is Japan pushing it all, is this something for example Prime Minister Abe is going to put on agenda for his meeting here or is it still a backburner issue or something like that?

**Tatsumi:** Any takers?

**Hoshino:** This is about Security Council reform and the attendant is very well informed because Japan is working with Germany, India and Brazil, forming a group of four, which was established in 2005 and then continue working in that framework. This 60th anniversary 2005, but the program did not apply. The government considers 2015 this year, the 70th anniversary another year to keep the momentum going. So two things, one is these four countries are trying to work together to push this momentum going, to make some sort of tangible result by the end of this year. Hopefully, the second UN session in fall 2015. Of course, US support is very critical; China support is also very critical. What is difficult is the support actually from African countries. Because African countries' positions on this are still very much divided, looks like a uniform African position, but African position is somewhat unrealistic, that I think is a problem. So there are movements toward Charter reform and Security Council reform. But how African countries can perform realistically is one test. Another one is how much we can produce kind of texts because what we have been doing over the years. The countries were very close to reform in 2005 because we have a text to put that on the table to be voted on. Although at that time, the Japanese government decided not to put it into voting but now I think we have brothers from president in the General Assembly, who is willing to put those arguments in some sort of concrete text. So whether we could make a text for discussion or not is another test, whether we can make progress this year. That is what I think.

**Question 2:** I am Dennis Halpin from the US-Korea Institute. I also was the INR analyst on Cambodia for a while. One of the professors mentioned Cambodia was the poster boy for UN peacekeeping at the beginning of the post-Cold War era. You mentioned how Japan, this was one of first countries that [Japan] had a leading role. Japan also has been one of main founders for the genocide tribunal. I went on the staff delegation three years ago visiting the tribunal. There were all sorts of problems there between the Cambodian judiciary, international judiciary. There was corruption; misuse of funds, there was also the problem that I am reading Strangio's book *Hun Sen's Cambodia*. If you look at Cambodia, 25 years later, it is not the poster boy for peacekeeping, you have the flawed election in 2013, you have textile workers getting shot last year. Hun Sen is the longest ruler in Asia, and he is not what we called a democrat. So my question, since Japan has such a leading role both in peacekeeping in Cambodia and in the tribunal, and also Hun Sen is going to bring the tribunal to a close there is not going be further trial as I understand after the Duch trial for Tuol Sleng and then Khieu Samphan and Nuon Chea. But no more trials. Two questions, how does Japanese taxpayer look at all the money that Japan has spent in Cambodia through peacekeeping, through the tribunal through civil society building? And it doesn't seem to have turned out very well, what are the lessons that can be learned from Cambodia going forward.

**Tatsumi:** Tough question.

**Uesugi:** I think there is a lot of negative development as you have pointed out, but at the same time I think the general atmosphere in our development community as well as I think general public concern. Cambodia is still a successful story in the sense that they are no longer in our radar screen for the fragile state or failed state or a threat to international peace and security. Maybe we have some human rights issues and others. But normally our government kind of highlights the fact that for example, the Cambodians demanding sentiment is now because they want to develop their skills and they can actually use their skills for other mission in other parts of the world as kind of the highlight as the success story of South-South Cooperation. Also JICA as now kind of conducts a review on JICA effort in this area. So I think one of the review is the Japanese government helped Cambodia to be a player in the international peace and security areas. As far as I know, we have Mr. Noguchi, who participated in the tribunal. I think Japanese stance is more, I do not know the right term, but generally more long-term things and we are trying to be the sun rather than the north wind, and trying to navigate the Cambodians, trying to respect local initiatives rather than thinking that you could do that and that. That kind of approach, we are trying to promote and it is better and probably more sustainable than outsider coming in and tell them what to do, kind of approach, particularly in the justice-related issues.

**Hoshino:** If I may, I think Cambodia is a case which always tells us the lesson that we need patience; serious attention to see the country become a normal, peace-loving country and government with good governance. But Japan's engagement: Japan has a special attachment to Cambodia maybe because our experience during World War II. But also Cambodian people are very close, capable to Japanese people. That kind of thing is one factor. But another one is that from Japanese foreign policy perspective, Japan's engagement with Cambodia did not start from PKO but much earlier than that. When I was involved in the political mediation to bring the party to the table and making them agree with the peace accord. So I consider that is a model of Japanese engagement with any conflict in the future. Although I agree with Dr. Holt that there is no one size fits all formula for conflict resolution, peacekeeping and peace building. But Japan's engagement with Cambodia is a case where Japan engaged in political reconciliation, mediation, peacekeeping mission, and judiciary support and post-conflict peace building kind of support. Putting ODA on one side, and peacekeeping operation on the other side, try to use all the available tools to bring the countries to a better direction. Although we certainly require patience; there are some setbacks of course. But since Cambodia is now a member of the ASEAN country and now there is peer pressure from neighboring countries, things are moving in the positive direction. If Japan, other countries and United Nations were not involved, things would have been much more worse. This is a question of relativity in the sense, but thank you very much, we have to be very, you know – it takes some time to see the results and performance of the country in question. Thank you.

**Tatsumi:** Victoria, relating to Hoshino-san's comments just now. If you were not serving the Department of the State, let's say we have you back at Stimson, and 25 years from now, had we known what we know now back then? If you were to do the study of a scholar, what are the areas you would focus on? You do not have to share your conclusion or perspective. But what are the areas that you might focus on as a lessons learned process?

**Holt:** Well as a government official, I am not allowed to answer hypotheticals. So I can say from where I sit now even. You know it is interesting, peacekeeping is still a relatively new enterprise, and Cambodia was one of the sort of burst of missions that were created right at the end of the Cold War. So from like very late 80s, early 90s about 95 and as you recall during that period, many of us were here then, it did not all go well. Genocide happened on foot watch. Rwanda was then. In Sierra Leone, there was an intervention after the collapse of the UN mission. And then the UN went back in. It took us years to get

it right and it took a military intervention. So there is a real sense of ameliorate recalibration. So what came out of that are some lessons that I think I would continue to take away. Which is, missions are multi-dimensional. They could just be military or police. But when peace agreements are shaky, you need an early strong diplomatic push to keep shoring it up and in some cases to create peace. And you could not look the other way about what has happening to civilians. Violence against civilians in and of itself can delegitimize peace agreements, whether it is peacekeeping mission literally for the international community directly, you have to think about their security. I do not know enough about the Cambodia case, but it is part of that sweep in mission. Looking forward, I forgot exactly how you phrase the question – there is some scholarship which I am not as attuned to as I was that says a lot of these tools did not exist 25 years ago, so judging them on 100 percent success is not quite an accurate measure. Maybe one academic has argued that if you get between a third to two thirds right, that is a third to two thirds that is in much better shape than it would have been. Can you refine and reform the tools? Absolutely. That is an ongoing enterprise, and I think that is something what our government really cares about and we are not comfortable just sitting back and say it is ok. Which gets back to why in our case, the president is going to host a summit and [inaudible] and trying to end corruption and support mechanism.

**Question 3:** Jun with [inaudible]. This is a question for deputy assistant Holt. There is a little dispute, or disagreement on Japan's peacekeeping for the last several years. It is still the case the main claim made by China or South Korea has getting some sympathy among the international society, even in the United States as you can read today's *New York Times*. So why do you think it is still the case even though Japan has been claiming that we are a peace-loving nation, but it seems that there is still mistrust. Do you think it is because of miscommunications? Or Japan is kind of responsible for part of it? What do you think Japan can do to strengthen its position, its claim that Japan is a peace-loving country? Thank you.

**Holt:** It is not for me to comment on what the government's point of view is. I am sorry I cannot. I could speak to what we see Japan is. And that is it is playing an important role on the world stage, and trying to engage with the broad concept of peace building, which has many different ways to express. I think you have to get into much more specifics to make that judgment.

**Question 4:** My name is Miyagi and I am with Jiji Press. [inaudible] I would like to ask Ms. Holt about US government position on the enlargement of the membership of UN Security Council. If my memory is right, I think in 2005, U.S. government was highly reluctant to endorse G4 position on security council expansion. What is the position of the current US government?

**Holt:** So we are open in principle to a modest expansion of the UN Security Council. We do not think that should include the modification or change [inaudible]. We think the inter-governmental negotiation process is going in a fruitful way to trying to pursue those kinds of changes. As far as Japan goes, as you know we have stated this before, the United States looks forward to a reformed UN Security Council that includes Japan as a permanent member.

**Question 5:** I am Benjamin Self, Vice President of the Mansfield Foundation. Formerly here at the Stimson Center also, it is great to see some old friends up there. Thank you. First on Cambodia. I want to suggest that it is not even as good as it seems because a lot of what the peacekeeping arrangements, Hoshino-Sensei has explained carefully, Japan's involvement in bringing together and brokering the Paris Agreement in 1991 was the end of Cold War, the end of the proxy struggle between the great powers outside Cambodia. We are not really dealing with that peace-building situation, proxy wars. We are dealing the internal conflict that we did have between the Khmer Rouge, the senior forces and the Hun Sen government. My point is that what we succeeded in doing by ending the outside struggle was

somewhat removing some of the fuel that we outsiders have put into that before. You said it would be worse if the outside world had not been involved, but it might not been as bad had the outside world not been involved early on in the conflict stage. My real question deals with the third part of your discussion, US-Japan cooperation, which I would love to see and I have been advocating for decades now. But I am wondering how much does it worth investing in given the huge list of the problems Victoria gives us, the problems of the world US and NSC are dealing with and the number of the broad initiatives. You mentioned the UN Peace Review, the UN Women Peace and Security Review, the existing processes that we already invested in. How much does each of you think that it is worth establishing some special US-Japan process that would take more staff time both from the alliance managers and global system mangers to try to strengthen or should we just rely on existing bureaucracies?

**Hoshino:** I think there are so many issues, but I'd like to see Japan more actively involved in various phases of conflict resolution, brokering peace building, peace keeping. I do not know how much communication with the US side, even if we are advocating, [inaudible]. But if the US power as I said, is declining and the U.S. is hoping to see certain burden sharing, Japan has not been ready, but now Japan is getting more ready and Mr. Abe particularly with his proactive contribution to peace. So I think the time is getting right, probably better than the past ten years. So I think it is not too late to start bridging this US-Japan cooperation, and also Japan-US-UN one, Yuji used the term nexus very rightly. I think Japan is now more or less ready, probably that kind of recommendation was a bit too premature many years ago but I think the timing is now better than before. So I would like to see Japan more actively involved in the process together with the United States.

**Uesugi:** Maybe in a strategic sense or a policy level, Japan and the U.S. will involve politically but when it comes to the field level operations. For UN peacekeeping operations, the U.S. does not deliberately send troops. We only send one but that was one mission. So the meeting point, we do not have many. That is one thing. But as Dr. Holt pointed out, as an enabler of the operation, the two governments have already collaborated a lot and maybe can expand our cooperation further. But on the field, I have been working in the East Timor, we have JICA, we have USAID, but they never I think cooperate or coordinate direct activities. Also, probably what we are doing is quite similar. EU is doing their own things and Japan is doing our own thing. One approach is that our government has been pushing for the past several years is so-called All-Japan Approach. Self-defense forces, JICA, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ODA, NGOs and even the Japanese private sector can work together to produce multiple effects. But with that kind of view, it sometimes eliminates collaboration with other donors. That could be a thing that we can change. Although our government said that All-Japan Approach does not exclude other actors, but at the exact term All-Japan kind of encourages us to find partners that are Japanese actors, no so much in others.

**Hoshino:** I have to mention one thing. One of the reasons why I said Japan is now ready to play a positive role in conflict resolution and peace building and employing all the available measures except for the military intervention, which is clearly restricted by the Japanese constitution. Only thing I miss from my perspective is Japan's involvement, decision-making process in the mandate of peacebuilding, peace keeping, which is done in the UN Security Council without Japanese participation. Only when Japan is a non-permanent member already, there is opportunity, but most of the time Japan is outside of it. So in order for Japan to be fully engaged in and employing all these available measures except military intervention again. I think for Japan to participate in the Security Council discussion regularly, the people in Japan and government will be much more happier and also comfortable doing this.

**Holt:** Just an observation, we work with Japan and many governments on both bilateral and multilateral sides simultaneously. So you already noted whether it is the global peace operation program or the [inaudible] program, each governments on both sides met Japanese scholars as well as the international associations, there is a level which you said technically, people meet all the time from these countries. But I will say for us, this is a conversation that is happening in Washington where you meet with people from Japan, we do not just say bilateral issues here. We do talk about these multilateral issues, we do talk about South Sudan. We do talk about what is happening in the larger UN system. So that is not a judgment on whether you need a separate mechanism, but we are not going to wait for one to have that conversation.

**Question 6:** Thank you. I am Janine with Voice of Vietnamese Americans. Thank you for the very informative discussion, so I would like to focus back to Southeast Asia and its relationship with the relationship between US, Japan and UN at the policy level and also on the field level. So you were talking about the policy level, security and human welfare I would say in peacebuilding. Whether you see Japan is right now in its role of security, supporting and sustaining security in the South China Sea and East China Sea, especially in its relations with Vietnam and with South Korea. On the field level, whether you see Japan is helping human development, the Vietnamese civil society inside Vietnam and in Southeast Asia, especially with us Vietnamese-American here in America. With the coming TPP I would like to ask in which way you think does Japan endeavor to ensure that we are included in the TPP agreement because Southeast Asia is also important to Japanese economy as well. And I believe Vietnam can cooperate with Japan in many different ways, especially with demography, with age group and in many different ways. And I hope that you pay more attention to help developing the civil society and people development between Vietnam and Japan. I hope that it happens. And we are getting the U.S. State Department Dr. Holt, I would like to hear from you what is the plan to help between the US, Japan and Vietnam and whether you hope that Vietnam could step up to support peace building situation in Southeast Asia.

**Tatsumi:** I will ask you to hold your thoughts and I will go to Wada-san and then I will ask you to answer the questions.

**Question 7:** Thank you, my name is Wada and I am with [inaudible]. My question is for all of you to consider, [inaudible] is there an area that you think the government could cooperate [inaudible] Japan and the United States?

**Tatsumi:** A very big question and a very specific question. Which one would you like to tackle first?

**Hoshino:** The question Vietnam, I think the South China Sea issue is pretty much like the East China Sea issue, which is more like a noodle bowl type of question. I think there are certain legal instruments which govern how we draw the line how we claim the territories, I think whatever way you know that is the sort of issue that one objective instrument is rule. I think if there are some movements against that kind of agreement or rule, I think that is something to be careful. You used the term human development; I think that is a very important concept because we tend to measure the country's economic welfare by the gross domestic product, GDP, GNI and all that. Human Development Index is a factor which involves welfare cost, education cost, access to medical care and all those things. So in order to look at the health of people on the ground, I totally support that kind of approach. National data alone only from GDP and GNI type of thing is limited. And Wada-san's question on areas of cooperation. There are so many I think, so it is very difficult to identify one or two, but I still consider that disaster relief and humanitarian assistance is an area that Japanese people is quite supportive. Actually Yuji-san is an expert on that field. So I think those areas is one, how about that?

**Uesugi:** Actually I was planning to say that. If we are to focus in the region, Asia-Pacific, HADR is one binding issue between the U.S. and Japan but also it can involve China, South Korea and others. Because we have experienced typhoon Haiyan and how military cooperation can actually help people. That is kind of an area in the Asia Pacific, and obviously, we have hotspots all over the places. Post-US withdrawal from Afghanistan is a key and Ms. Madame Ogata said that Afghanistan had been the forgotten country, and that kind of provided the safe haven for Al-Qaeda and Taliban. If the US is going to withdraw, let them fight, what is going to happen. We have invested so much in the Afghan reconstruction, so we still need to keep an eye on Afghanistan. Even though right now other notorious actors are on the scene, the Taliban is not so focusing on the area.

About Vietnam, the Vietnamese government is now trying to send their troops to UN peacekeeping and one thing the Japanese government has been trying to do is to help the Vietnamese to come to Japan, visit our training facilities to be able to learn UN peacekeeping operations. In fact, one thing that they feel that Japan is the ideal place is because of political and legal constraints; soldier's practice has been very restrictive in terms of shooting and others. Vietnam also would like to learn not-robust peacekeeping operations, but more Japanese-style of not-robust peacekeeping operations. And also our government, particularly the Defense Ministry has been advocating for what we called capacity development. With that in mind, the Vietnamese peacekeeping capacity development is one thing that we can expand. You pointed out the importance of the civil society, and I agree, we have been working with the civil society in ASEAN countries. For example, in the Mindanao Peace Processes, we had the official peace negotiation led by Malaysian negotiators, Japan and ASEAN, contributing to the international monitoring team. But at the same time, as second-track diplomacy, we have been organizing the civil societies, gathering and then they have played important roles.

Actually a Pilipino peace negotiator was my former colleague in Hiroshima University. She graduated from Tokyo University, and then she was a professor at Manila. She was a visiting fellow at Hiroshima University and we organized second-track peace initiatives. And after she has done it, she went back to Philippines and joined as a peace negotiator and that kind of process has been really helpful. And Japan's position is quite unique, we were able to work with the Philippines government because of our long-term relationship, but at the same time, we happened to be somewhat trusted by the rebel group so we were able to play an important role. I was one of the international experts who joined the Mindanao Peace Process and I have to suggest the so-called transformation of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front to the police forces in the Mindanao process. This kind of civil society, second-track approach is a very essential supplement to some of the formal negotiation. I have not yet seen a positive involvement of the Vietnamese civil society. I have participated in a number of civil society activities at the ASEAN gathering, but most of the Vietnamese are coming from the government sectors, like diplomats and others. Even in our training program, the Vietnamese participants are all from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. That is one of the challenges – how we can identify the civil society in government work these days.

**Holt:** I think your question is what's new that we should emphasize?

**Ueda:** Yeah. You already said that Japan and the United States bilaterally but also multilaterally have been cooperating and talking about new ideas. But if there any, again this may fall into the area of [inaudible].

**Holt:** I can be very specific. I mean what I am saying is news for us that the president will host an event on peacekeeping. Why? Because we are very worried that what we are asking the UN and multilateral system to do, the system cannot support it fully. It is the greatest number ever for peacekeeping,

130,000 around the world and that is [inaudible]. There are serious gaps, so we ask the UN to give us a much clearer sense of the gap they face. We just published in February a list of missions that have current existing gaps and enablers, things exactly what Japan is good at, whether it is medical, engineers, logisticians, things that make the missions work. We also asked sometimes the police inform the police units. So the UN has put this list themselves, they added two other categories: one, we sent it out after the experience in South Sudan, when the Security Council authorized 5,000 troops right after the crisis in December, 2013, to go in and reinforce the mission, a rapid response. How long did that rapid response take? Anybody? It was not done within a year. So lessons tell us that is not Ok. So we need a system to respond rapidly and effectively. So the UN is starting to identify what is a rapid response employs. The third category, I think actually, this is somewhat related to the conversation that we had about Vietnam joining the peacekeeping, which is, how do you expand the pool of countries that contribute. For a lot of Europeans coming out of commitments in the Balkans, Afghanistan and Iraq; the experience of Latin countries in Haiti, which has been quite successful, and some going to Africa, the Asian countries, many of them have been dominated the peacekeeping, thinking about what is work and what hasn't, we think the pool of peacekeeping has to grow, in at least two ways: one, countries that are able and capable are serving under chapter 7 authority where environments may not be permissive, think about Mali, or Somalia, or even Central Africa Republic or Eastern Congo or South Sudan where [inaudible] to peace. That is really important that there are countries who contribute to [inaudible]. But also peace building, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, Haiti, parts of their mission where the real task is working with an emerging government and civil society to make sure the rule of law, human rights stick and the security takes hold. So we have both on our hands, but also the numbers are growing so much so much. So this is really new for us. We do not usually have a president commit to this, so we will be asking the governments of the world, including Japan, to stand with us trying to strike from the system The UN has started the conversation with its gaps. And that relates also to why I mention Vietnam, if we get the governments to contribute, we would encourage the UN to develop a more strategic approach for the fourth generation and plan because countries who want to join do not just show up on the doorstep, "I am here, give me my blue helmet," they are going to say what is the command and control, what is the language, what is the medical requirement, do I get evacuated if I get hurt, can I deploy with somebody else, how do I sustain, etc. So the UN recognizes that some governments take a quite few years to understand how to work through these challenges. Every country has a problem and [inaudible]. Many have a saying on this. So that is another reform that we push now probably because new joining countries need to go through that process. And we want to make it easier for contributors. In the end, this means UN could be better at matching capacities to missions. You know if you got a unit that does not do well in a dangerous environment, send them to a post-conflict environment.

**Wada:** In that context, sorry, I have a follow-up question, Professor Hoshino mentioned his desire that Japan play a more role in the decision-making level of peacekeeping, peace building. What kind of support the U.S. can offer, primarily in the idea of the [inaudible] not necessarily [inaudible] in decision making and [inaudible].

**Holt:** Well, I think, maybe two observations. One, which is countries recognize the conversation about the mandate, it can be fairly [inaudible] for countries interested and for the countries specifically, and they can become part of the political conversation. Or if you are contributing to a mission, there are friends of the peacekeeping mission who are usually consulted, literally, they designed and got involved. I would make another observation, which is, it is sometimes a mandate, but it is also what happens next, how it is interpreted, how it is operationalized, what the leadership looks like, what do they think the priorities are, who comes to the mission, and that mix, because there is a lot of flexibility beyond the written mandate on how the mission is designed and implemented. And I think frankly a lot of

governments who engage on that level can have a lot of sway over how it is designed and get supported. I think what our countries both share is we are not on the top list for the numbers for peacekeeping, but we are deeply invested in the individuals in these initiatives [inaudible]. We do a lot of military operations in places like South Sudan, and they meant a lot to us. We sent them in very effectively in small units, small groups, not units, individuals. So I would say the conversation is not just literally on Tuesday while you are writing the mandate, who is in the room. It is a much broader conversation [inaudible].

**Hoshino:** And that is very important point. In order to make a reasonable mandate, I think the analysis of the local situation is very important. Sometimes mandate of course is a political process, but the first thing we need to do is to understand what actually is going on on the ground. I think Japan and the United States are capable, if we are not doing enough, of analyzing better the situation on the ground, because we academics can contribute, there are so many areas, experts in the United States and others. That kind of information gathering can make correct conflict analysis. That will contribute to introducing a reasonable and workable mandate. That is something that should be a direct effort jointly from Japan and the United States.

**Tatsumi:** Thank you so much. We are right at two o'clock. I promised Victoria that I will let her go back to work promptly at two. Thank you all very much for joining us today. We will have a similar seminar about five months later, the week before the leaders' speech starts at UN. On November 17, I am going to have three additional panelists to delve a little bit more this time on human security, post-conflict reconstruction and what the Japanese role is in this new initiative. Hopefully, I will see many of you joining us for that session. Thank you very much for Hoshino-san, Uesugi-san and Victoria, it is great to have you for the discussion today. Thank you very much for coming. So if you can join me to thank them.