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Abstract
This article aim to seek after Japan’s Foreign Policy on the threat issues come from external cause, which are North Korea and China. The problems that Japan will respond to are the issue of the raising military strength of China and the launch of ballistic missiles by North Korea in 2021. This article will use the national interest theory and foreign policy theory on how the defence development is done by Japan. The defence development of Japan itself is shown on the Japan’s new proactive pacifism.
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1. Introduction

Japan’s security identity has been shifting and elusive. Despite its historic image as an ultra-nationalistic militarist state during the Pacific War, Japan became a pacifist state following defeat in WWII and extensive disarmament during the occupation era. The Japanese government was resolved to protect its security by ‘trusting in the fairness and faith of the world’s peace-loving peoples’, based on the values of the so-called Peace Constitution (NDL, The Constitution of Japan). However, with the commencement of the Korean War in 1950, Japan began strengthening its self-defence capabilities in response to US requests. Although being a member of the US-led alliance system throughout the Cold War, Japan did not contribute military forces to either the Korean or Vietnam Wars. Despite the volatile international security situation throughout the Cold War, Japan did not achieve military normalization and never sent its Self-Defence Forces (SDF) overseas, even for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (UNPKO). These achievements demonstrate that Japan is not only retaining its security identity as a pacifist state based on the Peace Constitution, but is also evolving into a normal state with normal military capabilities commensurate with its economic might.

Meanwhile, China’s future is probably the most urgent topic in what is quickly becoming the world’s most significant region. The military build up, China’s military modernisation has included the purchase of weapons systems that increase the People’s Liberation Army’s (PLA) ability to project force beyond China’s borders. China aims to turn itself into a military powerhouse by the early twenty-first century, probably in order to impose regional hegemony.

Another threats Japan has faced this year is the new type of ballistic missiles has been launched in 2021 by North Korea. Not only ballistic missiles, but North Korea proceeding with ballistic missile development, military trends, including nuclear and missile development, pore grave now at an extremely rapid pace. North Korea’s development on ballistic missiles had been imminent threats to Japan’s security.
Furthermore, Japan has not established official relations with North Korea since after they defeated in World War II and after the war in Korean Peninsula. Due to many obstacles around early 1990s and 2000s, Japan has not established normal relation, yet again, with North Korea. In September 2002, a one-day highest point was held in Pyongyang between Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi furthermore, North Korean pioneer Kim Jong-il, the very first between the heads of the two nations. Koizumi and Kim quickly seemed to break longstanding impasses on a few issues and consented to restart reciprocal standardization talks, however the discussions thusly slowed down, because of two turns of events: North Korea's clear affirmation to U.S. authorities in October 2002 that it had a mystery atomic weapons program based on the course of uranium enhancement; and famous shock in Japan at Kim Jong-il's affirmation that North Korea grabbed 13 Japanese during the 1970s and 1980 and carried them to North Korea to live.

2. Literature Review

2.1. National Interest

There is no more war. This sentence might be accepted by some people but behind that sentence there is deeper meaning. Even if there is no more war, every country has their own goal that they need to achieve in order to maintaining the security of the country. In order to maintain their security, country will do every aspect from defence and diplomacy to gain their national interest. The fact that every country cannot ignore the need of defence and diplomacy in their policy is very real. Every actor that play a part in the diplomacy need to know the way to gain national interest. If the national interest is achieved, it means the country can secure their security, domestically and internationally.

Since the views of realism on foreign policy and national interest focuses on the interest of state, it can be argued that realism seems to ignore the importance of global interest or human interest. For realists, sovereign states remain the major actors in international politics. Talking about national interest, some experts said that a national
interest cannot be separated from foreign policy. National interest remains the main reason for countries to involve in international relations and have international cooperation with other countries (Munafrizal Manan, 2017). National interest is very important to state’s foreign policy. The importance of national interest is that it can be a guide or way for a state to reach their goals, whether it is international goals or domestic goals. Humphreys (2015) words quoted by Dermawan on his paper stated that the national interest concept strongly relates with a realism view in international relations, where security becomes the primary goal. As the generation changes, the concept of national interest also change within the time. Through many research, national interest concept affected by other issues like ‘supranational interest’. This situation is now considered by actor of defence diplomacy when it comes to the implementation of foreign policy.

2.2. Foreign Policy

As the author write about the national interest, it cannot be separated from foreign policy. Foreign policy is a set of broad goals that influence a country’s actions and relationships with other countries. Domestic factors, the actions or behaviour of other nations, or ambitions to achieve certain geopolitical designs all impact the formation of foreign policy. Foreign policy is as important as national interest. If national interest is the guide or way to reach state’s goals, foreign policy is the instrument that will be needed by every state’s actors to reach the state’s goals. In order to aim the foreign policy, state’s actors have to use diplomacy as their tools. Diplomacy that actors used can be in any form like war, alliances, or international trade that may be manifestations of it.

Jackson and Sorensen Statement quoted by Manan said that realists agree that foreign policy is only to serve national interest in the realm of international politics. Realists see foreign policy and national interest in terms of the struggle for power and the survival of state. This means every state has to struggle to gain the power in order
to reach their goals, which is maintaining the security. Foreign policy can be in any form from climate change, human right, culture and many more.

There is contrast on realism and liberalism where liberalism belief that logical principles might be applied to foreign policy. Liberalism had their own vies on foreign policy and national interests with optimism (Munafrizal Manan, 2017). Even after many years, the concept of foreign policy has been defined by many experts in many ways. Hence, they are certain that foreign policy is concerned with behaviour of a state towards other states (Bojang AS, 2018).

3. Previous Studies

The first study that the author will take as references is from Daisuke Akimoto, A Theoretical Analysis of Japan’s Changing Security Identity, which will offers theoretical analysis of Japan’s vague security identity through the lens of analytical eclecticism as suggested by Peter Katzenstein in 2008. The reason the research employs analytical eclecticism is because it reconfirms that existing theories of orthodox international politics (classical/neo-liberalism and classical/neo-realism) and existing alternative approaches (constructivism) are incomplete in themselves, but are mutually supplemental within an eclectic research method. In an attempt to prove the applicability of analytical eclecticism and to investigate Japan’s changing security identity, which this paper proposes four theoretical models of Japan’s security identity (a pacifist state, a UN peacekeeper, a normal state, and a US ally) (Daisuke Akimoto, 2013).

The second paper is taken from International and Domestic Challenges to Japan’s Post-war Security Identity: ‘Norm Constructivism’ and Japan’s New ‘Proactive Pacifism’ written by Andrew L. Oros. On his article, Andrew said that Japan today is widely portrayed as on the verge of a significant identity shift that could lead to dramatic new security policies. Yet, Japan’s first formal national security strategy, adopted in December 2013, proclaims repeatedly Japan’s long-standing ‘peace-loving’
policies and principles. So, Andrew drew a question on why a conservative government with high levels of popular support not pursue policies more in line with views widely reported to be central to its values and outlook. Then the answers lies in Japan’s long-standing security identity of domestic antimilitarism, an identity under siege to a degree not seen since its creation over 50 years ago, but as evidenced in Japan’s new national strategy document one that continues to shape both the framing of Japan’s national security debates and the institutions of Japan’s post-war security policy-making process. Some relational approaches to identity construction illuminate challenges to Japan’s dominant security identity, but a focus on domestic institutions and electoral politics offers the best course for modelling identity construction and predicting its future resilience (Andres L. Oros, 2015).

4. Research Methodology
4.1. Research Methodology

This research will use qualitative methods are descriptive, which is a study that will explain factors that occur in various phenomena. Descriptive research is a research that describes problems, circumstances, symptoms, and policies and actions.

4.2. The Scope of Research

The author will apply some limitations in this research so it will focus on the research of the phenomenon which becomes the object of research. This research will focus on how Japan foreign policy after several years of World War II which became a big impact on Japan’s national interest. The author will focus on two countries which Japan fully aware of its threats to their national interest.
5. Result and Discussion

5.1. Pacificism Constructivism

Non-material domestic variables such as national identity and culture received little attention in post-World War II international relations theory. Theory grew more structuralize, gravitating toward generally unvarying systemic characteristics in order to derive what were thought to be universal national interests. After the World War II which attacked Hiroshima and Nagasaki made Japan “return” to the region with a new appraisal of Southeast Asia in Japan’s strategic calculations. In a previous policy paper, published in January 2013, it showed that Japan’s security role in the region is experiencing a significant change. After experiencing on military defeat on WW II, Japan chose to remain peace and silent about military activity, either it is domestic or international activities.

Japan has proven to be a popular case study in testing and verifying the usefulness of the constructivist frameworks in explaining state domestic and foreign policies. Japan is now more interested in, and concerned about ensuring the safety of the sea lanes than at any other time and more than any other regional actor. Moreover, the invasion of, or a surprise attack against Japan must be from the sea or air. Japan may surrender and be occupied. Likewise, considering the Japanese SDF and the U.S. forces stationed in Japan, the USSR would not seriously plan to attack any country in East Asia. In essence, the presence of U.S. forces in Japan as well as the U.S. commitment to defend Japan functions as a deterrent force against China invasion and are a significant element in East Asian calculations.

5.2. Japan Deals with China

In 2021, China has become a big country which competes with U.S. The Improvement of China in every aspect has made Japan anxious with its military strength. Since the end of World War II, Japan has defeated in their military which is known that Japan is limited to develop their military capability. Even though Japan is surrounded by big
area of waters, it does not really mean Japan has strong capability in their military in this generation. Japan before World War II known to have colonized many countries either in South East Asia region or East Asia region. Their capability back then s very well-known and feared by the colonized country. Hence, as the generation changed, their military capability also changed.

As China’s influence and presence in the area expand, there are worries that it may restrict innocent passage (as generally defined) across major marine zones. This would limit Japan’s and its allies’ ability to conduct military surveillance and halt the advance of Chinese nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines based in Hainan. Furthermore, China’s military modernization at its peak right now. By the next generation, it is presumably that China intend to build a military super power fir themselves, which will create regional hegemony. With the advantages China have now (defeat U.S.), they will creating military dominant position on Asia, firstly in East Asia region.

As a result, Japan whom has limited military capability only has small chance to defeat China, if there is a war created by China military. In order to maintain Japan’s interest; maintain strong solidarity and close cooperation, Japan creates military agreement and cooperation with ASEAN countries, these arrangements are built on the record of Japanese non-traditional security assistance. The launching of security assistance is to gain capabilities for the developing countries to deal with security issues and more importantly to prevent security problems from occurring or worsening.

5.3. Japan Deals with North Korea

For a variety of reasons, Japan’s participation in the present situation over North Korea’s nuclear weapons programs might be important. Most notably, Japan has promised North Korea a large-scale economic aid package to pay for Japan’s colonization of the Korean Peninsula from 1910 to 1945, similar to what it offered South Korea when Tokyo and Seoul normalized ties in 1965. The aid will be supplied after the nations agree to restore relations, a step that Japan has now linked to resolving the
nuclear problem. According to reports, Japanese officials are contemplating a package of $5-$10 billion, a colossal figure for the North Korean economy, who’s overall GDP is believed to be in the $20 billion level.

Japan and North Korea have pledged in the Pyongyang Declaration to “abide by all relevant international accords in order to fully address the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula.” Since the revelations about North Korea’s uranium nuclear program were made public in October 2002, Japan indirectly have insisted that full normalization could not take place until after the nuclear issue was resolved. The Diplomat said that after Pyongyang’s bug fix and updating of its nuclear development attempts in the early 1990s, Japan started taking North Korea’s nuclear weapons and ballistic missile development into serious security consideration. In August 1998, North Korea launched a Taepodong ICBM that flew over northern Honshu (Japan’s largest island) and landed in the North-western Pacific.

Therefore, Japan and U.S. launched a joint research and the development on BMD systems then later refer as Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3). By experiencing a nuclear attack; Japan chose to create a back up to secure their state’s security.

6. Conclusion

In the face of rising tensions with China and North Korea, Japan is extending its strategic footprint in Southeast Asia. As part of a larger push to boost its soft power, Tokyo is ramping up its security collaboration. This mix of economic aid and military cooperation is the beginning of an ASEAN-friendly smart power strategy.

In dealing with North Korea nuclear weapons, Japan decided that it is the best to seek help from U.S. which will help not only East Asia countries but the whole Asia to help them in order to create region security by joining in military cooperation.

However, the success of strategic involvement in the area will be determined not just by internal resolve, but also by crucial external issues such as China’s future attitude in the region and the US’s willingness and ability to respond. While Japan is now more involved in regional security, it is also more vulnerable. To defend its
interests between the two big powers, Tokyo will need to devise a consistent and long-lasting diplomacy.
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