

# Japanese Diplomacy

THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP



H. D. P. Envall

# Japanese Diplomacy

SUNY series, James N. Rosenau series in Global Politics

---

David C. Earnest, editor

# Japanese Diplomacy

## *The Role of Leadership*

H. D. P. ENVALL

**SUNY**  
P R E S S

Published by State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2015 State University of New York

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, contact State University of New York Press, Albany, NY  
[www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu)

Production, Eileen Nizer  
Marketing, Michael Campochiaro

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Envall, H. D. P.

Japanese diplomacy : the role of leadership / H. D. P. Envall.

pages cm. — (SUNY series, James N. Rosenau series in global politics)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4384-5497-9 (hardcover : alk. paper)

ISBN 978-1-4384-5499-3 (ebook)

1. Japan—Politics and government. 2. Political leadership—Japan. 3. Prime ministers—Japan. 4. Personality and politics. 5. Japan—Foreign relations.

I. Title.

JQ1631.E68 2014

327.52—dc23

2014010395

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

*For Megan*





# Contents

Tables	ix
Preface	xi
Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
1 Leadership and Diplomacy	13
2 Locating Japanese Leaders	37
3 Leadership and Japan's Strategic Identity	61
4 Ōhira Masayoshi: Overdetermined Environment	85
5 Suzuki Zenkō: Laissez-Faire Leadership	111
6 Nakasone Yasuhiro: Widening Possibilities	137
Conclusion	163
Notes	177
Bibliography	217
Index	239





# Tables

Table 1	Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles	18
Table 2	Change and Scope in Leadership Visions and Outcomes	23
Table 3	Selected Japanese Leadership Strategies and Outcomes	48
Table 4	Japan's Summit Leadership	165



## Preface

In this book, I have sought to characterize how individual leaders act in international affairs and to identify how their leadership plays a causal role in the processes and outcomes of diplomatic decision making. In addition to these general aims, I have also sought to examine and explain the more specific issue of Japanese political leadership and foreign affairs. Have Japanese prime ministers—especially those who came before Koizumi Jun'ichirō—been able to pursue leadership styles not necessarily in keeping with their political environments? And have these leaders shaped the country's diplomatic processes and outcomes?

Many people provided enormous support to me in the researching, writing, and redrafting of various aspects of the book. They include William Coaldrake, Gerald Curtis, Katalin Ferber, Takeshi Nobayashi, the librarians at the International House of Japan, the Deutsches Institut Für Japanstudien (German Institute for Japanese Studies), Patricia Papa, Michal Takahashi, Adiya Lkhagvaa, Kazue Murai, Tim Letheren, Miho Yajima, Yeo Kwee Chuan, Hiroko Watanabe, Pam Wallace, Sue Gilbert, Peter Matanle, Rikki Kersten, Chizuko Horiuchi, Ansonne Belcher, Kana Moy, Sheila Flores, Satomi Ono, Ian Hall, Brendan Taylor, Amy Catalinac, Kerri Ng, Nick Bisley, Judith Brett, David Walton, Mathew Davies, Shannon Tow, and Michelle Hall, amongst many others. Several people read drafts of the manuscript at various stages and, as well as demonstrating great patience, provided extensive and very helpful comments and suggestions, especially Derek McDougall, Carolyn Stevens, Hugo Dobson, John Welfield, William Tow, and the anonymous reviewers. I am also particularly indebted to Mary-Louise Hickey, whose exceptional copyediting has made the book far more fluent than would have otherwise been possible.

At different stages through this process, I was also lucky to receive support of various kinds from organizations including the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, the John D.

and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Hitotsubashi University, Waseda University, La Trobe University, and The Australian National University.

I am eternally grateful for the ongoing encouragement of my family, especially my parents, Bruce and Diana. I am also blessed to have had the support of my Japanese host-family—Tamotsu, Toshiko, Satoshi, Tomoko, Ken, Mafuyu, and Sakura. Finally, my partner, Megan O'Donnell, who was prepared to read through numerous drafts and redrafts, has given me the inspiration without which I could not have finished the book. Despite all this help, however, I alone bear responsibility for the book's shortcomings.

Japanese words and personal names have been Romanized according to the modified Hepburn system. Japanese names are presented in the Japanese order. However, the spelling and word order for the names of Japanese scholars publishing in English are maintained as published.

Chapters 2 and 3 include material adapted from two earlier articles by the author. These are: "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan," H. D. P. Envall, *Japanese Studies*, September 1, 2008, reprinted by permission of the publisher (Taylor & Francis Ltd, [www.tandf.co.uk/journals](http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals)); and "Transforming Security Politics: Koizumi Jun'ichiro and the Gaullist Tradition in Japan," H. D. P. Envall, *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*, July 20, 2008, for which copyright is retained by the author under the journal's copyright and disclaimers policy.

# Abbreviations

ADB	Asia Development Board
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CLB	Cabinet Legislation Bureau
DLP	Democratic Liberal Party
DPJ	Democratic Party of Japan
EC	European Community
FPA	foreign policy analysis
G5	Group of Five
G7	Group of Seven
G8	Group of Eight
G20	Group of Twenty
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
IEA	International Energy Agency
INF	intermediate-range nuclear forces
IR	international relations
JDA	Japan Defense Agency
JSDF	Japan Self Defense Forces
JSP	Japan Socialist Party
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party

MITI	Ministry of International Trade and Industry
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
START	Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
UK	United Kingdom

# Introduction

## Why Leaders Are Important

Whether presidents or prime ministers, political leaders play a prominent role in a nation's foreign affairs. When attending summits, conducting negotiations, or signing agreements, they are, in effect, the nation's most high-profile foreign policy figure, its *chief diplomat*.<sup>1</sup> In the popular consciousness, one common, if circular, view is that diplomatic successes are inevitably achieved by powerful leaders while failures are the product of weak leaders. Conversely, in academia, the role of leaders in international affairs is often overlooked. While political leadership is a concern for those working in the field of foreign policy analysis (FPA),<sup>2</sup> scholars from the broader area of international relations (IR) theory have tended to focus on structural or normative explanations for international outcomes.<sup>3</sup> In particular, they have paid less attention to questions of how individual leadership styles, personalities, perceptions, or beliefs shape international politics.<sup>4</sup> As Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack note, the study of leaders has "not been attacked so much as ignored by international relations theorists."<sup>5</sup>

Understanding more about how political leadership shapes foreign policy and international affairs is especially helpful for answering some important questions concerning political leadership—and diplomacy—in Japan. Because Japan is viewed as a nation where the individual is at the mercy of the group, prime ministers have been thought of largely as reactive and weak.<sup>6</sup> The underlying assumption concerning Japan's leaders is that they have had little effect on the country's foreign policy. Constrained by a dominant central bureaucracy, their role has been to avoid scandals and, on occasion, demonstrate a little charisma. On the diplomatic front, they have often been expected just to enjoy the celebrity of leading a major world economy. Comparatively little regard, therefore, has been paid to their role in international affairs.



The arrival of Koizumi Jun'ichirō—Japan's prime minister from 2001 until 2006—demonstrated that Japanese leaders can wield influence.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, his impact on Japan and the region during these years raised doubts about this earlier orthodoxy: was past Japanese leadership as reactive as had been assumed? Previous attempts to locate Japan's leaders in their environments have arguably mischaracterized Japanese leadership. "Caricatures of national leadership style," as Richard Samuels has noted, "are, like most stereotypes, engaging but misleading."<sup>8</sup> By seeing Japanese leadership as overwhelmingly subject to structural constraints, the orthodoxy of Japanese politics has been to follow the same tendency as IR theory and ignore the role of leaders.<sup>9</sup> But what role do leaders play in shaping Japan's diplomacy?

### International Relations and Leadership

In international affairs more widely, the role of leadership is complicated by the fact that leaders must operate across multiple political environments. Domestic politics must also be taken into account, something that has long been a difficult subject for IR theory. Kenneth Waltz, for example, argues that a consistent inability to explain outcomes in IR analytically (i.e., via an examination of the interacting units of IR) suggests that a "systems approach" is required.<sup>10</sup> Waltz further suggests that, while the attributes of domestic factors vary widely throughout the world, they are functionally the same. In other words, there is a consistent repetition of similar international outcomes regardless of the types of leadership involved, thereby justifying the need for a systemic focus. John Mearsheimer similarly argues that systemic factors, such as the distribution of power and anarchy, matter the most for understanding and explaining IR.<sup>11</sup>

By contrast, others view the domestic level as vital to understanding IR. The FPA tradition has long maintained that multiple "decision structures," including domestic politics and leadership, play an important role in international relations.<sup>12</sup> James Rosenau observed the lack of consideration given to domestic politics in international relations in the 1960s, arguing that domestic politics may be a significant factor in IR outcomes and, in some cases, the dominant factor.<sup>13</sup> Those examining the role of normative factors in shaping foreign policy have also taken a domestically oriented approach.<sup>14</sup> Others have focused on the reverberation that takes place between the levels (Peter Gourevitch's "second image reversed"),

whereby the international environment shapes domestic politics which, in turn, reshape the international environment. As Gourevitch explains, “[t]hat international relations and domestic politics interact quite profoundly no longer seems to be a controversial statement.”<sup>15</sup>

Leaders are, of course, not the only participants in foreign policymaking: they operate in complex organizations, take on certain roles because of their position (rather than their personality), and contend with other political actors from all levels. Their participation in politics also depends upon how “power, preferences, and possible coalitions” are distributed among domestic actors.<sup>16</sup> Identifying the role of leaders in IR is, therefore, a problem of individual, society, state, and system.<sup>17</sup> As Valerie Hudson and Christopher Vore note, although such an approach can add considerable detail in any analysis of IR, it also means that “elegant and parsimonious theories, portrayed by . . . ‘billiard ball’ models, will prove elusive.”<sup>18</sup>

One example of such complexity is summit diplomacy. International summits involve three distinct political levels—domestic, international, and summitry. In this multilevel environment, leaders play a prominent role because they must often mediate between the different levels. When they assume the role of chief diplomat they do not relinquish their position as domestic leader, but act as the formal link between the domestic and international. When leaders spearhead foreign policy, they gain special access to information crossing between these different levels and, therefore, extra scope to shape the interplay of events.<sup>19</sup> Summits also provide a usefully contained international environment by which to examine leadership, since they limit the number of actors, locations, and issues at stake. Accordingly, after examining leadership at the macro level of political environments and strategic policy, this book uses the Group of Seven (G7) summits to explore at a micro level how leaders’ individual differences shape diplomacy. The G7 summits—later superseded by the Group of Eight (G8) and then the Group of Twenty (G20) summits—are an important form of diplomacy in which the role of leaders can be readily assessed.<sup>20</sup>

## Political Leadership

Foreign policy decision making, notes Hudson, “is dynamic and full of contingencies and creative agency.”<sup>21</sup> This makes the task of understanding the role of leadership in IR doubly difficult. It is necessary not only to establish a comprehensive, adaptable, yet parsimonious approach to

characterizing leadership, but also to explain its role in a system constantly in flux. In recent decades, the task of characterizing leadership has been taken up by scholars from numerous fields, such as political science, psychology, and management studies. Indeed, it has been argued that researchers often define leadership depending upon their own individual viewpoints and the dimensions of leadership that are most interesting to them.<sup>22</sup> James MacGregor Burns, perhaps the most noted leadership scholar of the past 40 years, argues that leadership is when “persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers.”<sup>23</sup>

Political leadership therefore is chiefly concerned with political actors, motives and purposes, conflictual environments characterized by institutional as well as ideational frameworks, and followers. These characteristics constitute the basis of what is often described as the *leadership environment*. The power of other leaders and the expectations of followers, whether formalized through institutions or informally adopted, provide the most obvious boundaries by which leaders are constrained. Rosenau explains this clearly when he describes the fate of leaders who ignore such expectations: “it is when they [leaders] continuously ignore, dismiss, or otherwise fall short of the basic expectations held by their followers that their occupancy of high office becomes tenuous.”<sup>24</sup>

### *Leadership Preferences*

To begin with, however, there are individual leaders and their “motives and purposes.” In some analyses, particularly those using two-level games approaches, a common assumption is that leaders operate as rational actors and as agents for their domestic constituencies.<sup>25</sup> Leaders are utility maximizers—with their utility often assumed, at least in the context of democratic political systems, to be closely linked to the need for reelection. Yet this assumption is subject to doubts at both the domestic and the international levels: leaders can be motivated by multiple other considerations, notably the attainment of personal policy preferences, which may be at odds with the preferences of domestic constituencies or power maximization considerations. The rationality of leaders is bounded by other factors too. Cognitive and emotive considerations—or what Andrew Moravcsik describes as “idiosyncratic ‘first image’ factors” in international relations—also combine with the inherent ambiguities or uncertainties of international diplomacy to limit leadership rationality.<sup>26</sup>

A first-image factor, according to this understanding, is the “past political history or personal idealism” that influences “individual policy preferences about the issues in question.”<sup>27</sup> The term *first image* encapsulates the political histories, psychologies, and perspectives that leaders bring to their political roles, as opposed to the state-level *second image* and the international-level *third image*.<sup>28</sup> First-image factors are particularly prevalent in diplomatic bargaining because of the way that leaders perceive, or filter, their circumstances and thereby determine their preferences. These factors in turn help shape how leaders respond to events, thereby shifting diplomatic outcomes away from what might be expected if leaders were merely agents of their political constituencies.<sup>29</sup> Even though such factors are marginalized in the study of IR, they constitute a more important focus for research in leadership studies and FPA. Rather than assume that leaders are rational actors or are merely representative of their political constituencies, scholars in these areas consider the range of factors that motivate leaders and the ways in which leaders are often at odds with their environments. Some studies suggest that leaders in diplomacy often act according to their own preferences or ideology rather than those of their constituents.<sup>30</sup>

### *An Interactive Approach to Leadership Strategy*

Beyond characterizing individual leaders, explaining leadership requires an understanding of the dynamic relationship between leader and environment, or an *interactive* model of political leadership. An interactive approach views leadership as the interaction of psychology, skills, and situation. It imagines leadership as a time-based process that is “continuous and reciprocal,” an ongoing exchange between different members in a group situation.<sup>31</sup> Individual leaders in this process can be understood as “key junctures” in the wiring of politics or, in other words, as “circuit breakers.”<sup>32</sup> The interaction between leaders and environments can differ widely, with broad historical trends often operating outside the control of leaders but nevertheless subject to leaders’ occasional capacity to change or modify these trends at key moments.

Unfortunately, the leadership studies field, like FPA, has struggled to clarify where and how leadership acts as a causative factor in politics. The failure to make clear when leadership is a process or an outcome has been critical in this regard. Many leadership scholars have focused on the different styles of political leadership (i.e., a process); yet there has also been a tendency to define political leadership as *real and intended change*

or *purposeful causation* (i.e., an outcome).<sup>33</sup> Both concepts are undeniably necessary: process without outcome is merely descriptive; outcome without process quickly becomes deterministic. However, confusing the two can easily lead to a type of circular reasoning, as is the case in much work on *transformational leadership*. Many studies create a logic whereby leadership outcomes become both a product of, and input into, their related leadership processes. Clearly, leadership needs to be seen as something that covers two distinct political phenomena: the way leaders behave, as well as what they achieve.<sup>34</sup>

### Leadership and Japanese Diplomacy

The study of leadership in Japan highlights the difficulties facing those attempting to characterize political leadership. Japan's prime ministers have the formal power to shape their country's diplomatic agenda, lay out its major foreign policy principles, and direct policy in key areas. As noted earlier, there is much to suggest that individual leaders can play a significant role in shaping Japan's foreign affairs and that studies looking into how leadership strategies operate in Japanese diplomacy should be useful for wider understandings of leadership in FPA and IR.<sup>35</sup> Glenn Hook et al. list the prime ministers who, through "moral authority," have been able to push other parts of government into achieving their diplomatic goals.<sup>36</sup> The most obvious example of a prime minister leaving a deep and long-lasting impact on Japan's diplomacy (since the Second World War) is Yoshida Shigeru. Yoshida designed and implemented a pragmatic but far-reaching postwar foreign policy framework, the Yoshida Doctrine, which allowed Japan to focus on its economy but rely on the United States for its security.<sup>37</sup>

Similar conclusions have been reached by other studies. Bert Edström finds that by noting changes of leadership and then identifying concurrent policy shifts, it is possible to see which prime ministers have had an impact on Japan's overall diplomatic orientation. Although not an assessment of the extent of leaders' "impact" on the country's "official foreign policy doctrine" or strategic identity, Edström's study identifies a number of prime ministerships that coincided with substantial changes in policy thinking. Yet he also finds that there is little "linkage" between the existence, or degree, of change, and the nature (whether strong or weak) of relevant prime ministers.<sup>38</sup> How and why leaders such as Yoshida or Koizumi are seen to have had such an influence on Japan's diplomacy warrants further study.

Although much work on domestic leadership in Japan exists, less work has been done on Japanese leadership and foreign affairs prior to the 2000s. Tomohito Shinoda's work on Koizumi's diplomacy exemplifies the attention given to the role of leaders in Japan's foreign affairs in the post-Koizumi period; for the pre-Koizumi era, only Edström focuses primarily on political leadership in foreign policy. No scholar looks specifically and extensively at the issue of leadership and summitry, although Hugo Dobson addresses the subject briefly in his book on Japan at the G7/8 summits.<sup>39</sup> Otherwise, as with leadership in the domestic sphere, scholars have often viewed Japanese political leadership at the international level as constrained and reactive. Aurelia George Mulgan, for instance, argues that poor leadership made Japan an "unreliable ally" during the Gulf War in 1991 and incapable of decisive action during the Asian financial crisis of 1997–98.<sup>40</sup>

At the macro level, a useful way to study the role of leadership in Japanese diplomacy is through the country's strategic thinking, or strategic identity, since the Second World War. Examining the role of leadership in the evolution of the country's strategic identity may indeed help explain some important puzzles of this period, particularly the fact that Japan's foreign and security policies have often not met the expectations of IR scholars with regard to normal nation-state behavior. Japan's reluctance to adopt strategic policies commensurate to its rising power, both during and since the Cold War, is particularly puzzling for structural IR theories. On the other hand, the country's intermittent process of security "normalization" is not fully explained by theories that focus on normative domestic factors. A better understanding of leadership's role in the evolution of Japan's strategic identity may help clarify these problems. Further, given the implication that domestic factors may reverberate back into the international system, as Gourevitch's "second image reversed" concept suggests, understanding Japan's strategic behavior should help provide a better understanding of international relations in both the Asia-Pacific and wider world.

At the micro level, an obvious area to study the role of leaders in Japan's diplomacy is at international summits such as the G7 of the 1970s and 1980s. First, the G7 summits have been a vital forum for Japanese diplomacy: they have fitted well with the Yoshida Doctrine's focus on economic development; have been useful for dealing with immediate international economic problems; and have also suited Japan's preference for multilateralism. Second, a focus on the G7 summits of the 1970s and 1980s allows for a detailed examination of the connections between Japanese political leadership and diplomatic outcomes before the arrival of Koizumi and subsequent reconsideration of Japanese leadership. Finally, the G7 summits are also useful case studies because they

provide consistency in the leadership environment across different leadership examples. While Japan faced a range of diplomatic challenges during the late 1970s and early 1980s, the main features of its international circumstances were relatively consistent. The country was an emerging power, about to become a major economy but still unsure of its influence in global politics; it also faced the economic and political turmoil of the oil shocks and subsequent global economic downturn. Japan's transition from a catch-up country to an advanced nation (*senshinkoku*) reshaped its thinking about its own development and its role in the world. As Kenneth Pyle argues, Japan had changed into "a pioneer seeking to chart the future course of economic, technological, and social organization."<sup>41</sup>

## This Book

### *Aims*

John Masciulli and W. Andy Knight observe that leadership is important in foreign policymaking "all of the time" as a "descriptive/explanatory/predictive variable and cause."<sup>42</sup> This book explores in detail how individual leaders operate in international affairs. First, by further developing a framework of political leadership, the book helps to characterize how leaders operate in foreign affairs and to what extent their leadership matches their domestic environments or the idiosyncratic, individual characteristics noted above. Second, the book identifies where and how leadership plays a causal role in the processes and outcomes of foreign policy decision making. What impact do individual leaders have on their environments? Drawing on these general objectives, the book examines and explains the narrower topic of Japanese political leadership and foreign affairs. To what extent have Japanese prime ministers, especially before the arrival of Koizumi, been able to pursue idiosyncratic leadership styles not necessarily in step with their political environments? To what extent have these leaders shaped the country's diplomacy as well as international affairs in Japan's immediate region and the wider world? And what are the implications of reconsidering the leadership of these earlier prime ministers for understanding Japanese leadership in foreign affairs today?

### *Method*

In order to fill such gaps—to better characterize leaders and more clearly identify their roles within their political environments—a clearer linkage

between leadership process and outcome is required. Vital to this task is the need to make use of four clearly defined concepts central to political leadership. Adapted from the leadership studies literature discussed above, these are: (1) *leadership vision* (or intended political change), (2) *leadership style* (political or leadership behavior), (3) *leadership environment(s)*, and (4) *leadership outcomes* (or effected political change).

Leadership vision comprises the values and goals of political leaders, their motivations, perceptions, biases and morality, while leadership style covers leaders' traits, skills, and behaviors, such as political tactics and techniques.<sup>43</sup> As such, they cover many of these "first-image" factors. Leadership vision and style, taken together, constitute a type of *leadership strategy*. This might be defined as an overarching agenda that combines vision and style in the pursuit of leadership outcomes in a given political environment (in this case, Japanese politics and Japan's G7 environment). The third concept, leadership environment(s), incorporates the multiple environments of international summitry, covering the domestic, summitry, and international levels of analysis. There are a number of intervening variables that come into play during the different summits. Specific economic, political, and security issues, such as oil security, trade protectionism, and missile deployment emerge in various ways. Nonetheless, the basic framework of the summits remains constant.

This leaves the question: what constitutes leadership outcomes? Political outcomes are relatively easy to discern. In Japan's summitry context, they encompass the particular outcomes of the G7 and surrounding diplomacy relevant to Japan, as well as the policies and approaches Japan adopted at these forums. Yet determining how these outcomes have been the products of individual political leadership is more problematic. In this regard, the concepts of *action* and *actor dispensability* are crucial.<sup>44</sup> Action dispensability is concerned with questions of how important a certain action is to a particular outcome (regardless of the actor). Would a different outcome have occurred if a different action had taken place? Actor dispensability is concerned with the role played by a leader's personality, preferences, or strategy in outcomes. If a different leader with different preferences had been substituted, would the political outcomes have been the same?

In examining these questions, the book moves from general theory, to broad Japanese context, and then to specific Japanese cases. The initial focus is on how political leadership is seen to function, while the subsequent aim is to explain the domestic and international environmental contexts in which Japan's leaders operate. The book then seeks to explain the role of leadership at a macro level of Japanese strategic thinking. In



particular, it looks at how leaders have shaped Japan's strategic identity since the Second World War. Finally, the book tests the role of leaders in narrower environments.

The main method employed is the comparative case study, with a particular focus on the differences between leaders in similarly structured contexts (the "method of difference").<sup>45</sup> The data used to construct these case studies is extracted from a range of material, in both English and Japanese. Primary material such as summit statements and declarations, speeches, media interviews, and so on, are widely used. Other documents include memoirs, biographies, and newspaper accounts. A variety of Japanese-language materials, including journalistic accounts of events, as well as subsequent analyses and memoirs by participants, are also referred to widely.

### *Argument*

This book makes the case for a more nuanced picture of past Japanese leadership than is currently accepted, as well as for the important role of leadership in shaping Japanese diplomacy. The first argument is that Japan's leaders have pursued leadership strategies of varying coherence and rationality, often independent of their political environment. Despite their similar life and political backgrounds, and in the face of broadly similar leadership environments, the leaders in the three case studies—Ōhira Masayoshi, Suzuki Zenkō, and Nakasone Yasuhiro—demonstrated quite distinct leadership visions and styles that reflected their own personal beliefs and preferences. This supports similar findings in the context of Japan's evolving strategic identity.

The second argument is that different Japanese leaders have shaped Japanese diplomacy in some important, and underappreciated, ways. High actor indispensability to diplomatic outcomes is present in two of the three cases examined, those of Suzuki and Nakasone. Yet the presence of high leadership indispensability cannot inevitably be linked to particular leadership strategies. Rather, leadership indispensability is best explained through the interaction of intervening factors—both individual and environmental—with this interaction at times leading to counter-intuitive but nevertheless important outcomes. This in turn points strongly to the fact that, in certain environments, individual difference can directly shape diplomacy. The results of these narrow case studies match similar observations at the macro level of Japan's strategic identity. By examining leadership as a factor shaping Japan's strategic identity and foreign policies, it is

possible to see how Japan's supposedly anomalous foreign policies (in the view of much IR theory) have been shaped by dominant norm entrepreneurs. At times of upheaval in the international order, these entrepreneurs engaged in highly effective forms of "strategic social construction" with regard to Japanese diplomacy, suggesting that their visions and strategies have been as important to change in Japan's strategic identity as systemic and normative pressures.<sup>46</sup>

In seeking to determine the role of Japanese political leadership, it is necessary to reach two findings in the case studies examined in this book. First, the case studies should show whether, or to what extent, the Japanese prime ministers pursued strategies reflecting individual factors, such as their own beliefs or ideologies outside the preferences of their political environments. Were they independent of their political environments? Did they shape the outcomes of the summits? Second, the case studies should show how the Japanese prime ministers themselves were able to play a role, if any, in shaping the summitry outcomes. How indispensable were they as individuals both to Japanese diplomacy and to the overall summitry outcomes?

Japan's prime ministers were, it must be said, unlikely to have enjoyed, or necessarily desired, a free hand in pursuing their own leadership strategies or in shaping Japan's summit policy. The studies accordingly reveal a number of constraints on Japanese leaders, such as domestic preferences or international issues. This applies both to the general study on Japan's strategic identity and to the specific studies on summits. Yet the task here is not to demonstrate that the leaders pursued entirely idiosyncratic or irrational leadership strategies or overwhelmingly drove Japanese diplomacy. The task instead is to demonstrate the significant ways in which the leaders deviated from their domestic environments, displayed leadership that was heavily bounded in its rationality, or were indispensable to particular foreign policy outcomes.

### *Outline*

The book is divided into three sections. In the first section, the theoretical, environmental, and broader historical contexts are developed. Chapter 1 introduces the broad outlines of leadership studies, extends the characterization of political leadership, and examines the multiple environments relevant to diplomatic leadership. These include the domestic, international, and summitry levels. Chapter 2 then extrapolates the general analysis of the first chapter to the specific context of Japanese political

and diplomatic leadership. Chapter 3 examines the role of political leadership at the macro level of Japan's strategic behavior from the Second World War until the present day. The second section contains the book's micro-level empirical work and consists of three case studies—chapter 4 evaluates Ōhira's leadership at the Tokyo summit in 1979, chapter 5 looks at Suzuki's leadership at Ottawa in 1981, and chapter 6 examines the leadership of Nakasone at the Williamsburg summit of 1983. Finally, the book concludes with an overall assessment of the role of leadership in Japanese diplomacy.

## Leadership and Diplomacy

In 1978, James MacGregor Burns observed that “[l]eadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth.”<sup>1</sup> More than three decades later, Burns’s statement still encapsulates the challenge facing the leadership studies field. Undoubtedly important, but somehow indistinct in its influence, leadership is difficult to capture. The failure to understand this phenomenon, however, is not for lack of trying. At the popular level, the widely held but mistaken view is that leadership equals the art of acting strongly—that to lead must be to go ahead or to direct by example. However, history is replete with examples of leaders failing through too much aggression, and strong leadership may be bad leadership if it is unethical or immoral. In academia, sociologists, political scientists, management theorists, and psychologists all study leadership, often at cross purposes. For political science too, as Robert C. Tucker notes, “leadership is an elusive phenomenon and . . . there is no consensus amongst political scientists on what it means.”<sup>2</sup>

Whereas subsequent chapters focus clearly on the Japanese context, this chapter is largely concerned with the leadership studies field. The aim is to establish the basic framework needed to understand the role of leaders in international affairs, what is known about political leadership, and how leadership in diplomacy might be most usefully understood. The chapter is broken into four basic parts. The first part synthesizes the current leadership literature so as to draw out the basic concepts that might be useful later in studying Japan. Three fundamental aspects of leadership are examined: (1) the concepts surrounding leadership, especially power, values, legitimacy, and authority; (2) the major leadership typologies from the field; and (3) the leadership *styles* used as analytical tools for understanding particular leaders. The second part then extends this leadership framework by developing the concept of *leadership strategy* as a way of assessing both the processes and the outcomes of political leadership. The

third part explains the domestic and international environmental context in which leadership operates, and also how these environments are linked. Since the book's case studies focus on the Group of Seven/Eight (G7/8) summits, this part also explores the nature of international summitry and the evolution of the G7/8 process. The chapter's final part then seeks to resolve where the leader, when acting as a nation's chief diplomat, fits within this framework.

### Conceptualizing Leadership

Burns made his observation in the midst of a boom in leadership studies in the United States in the late 1970s. Yet, as the concept has received ever greater attention, so the definitions have multiplied while the prospects for conceptual clarity have arguably declined. One count of attempts to define leadership produced 221 entries between the 1920s and 1990s.<sup>3</sup> In his guide to the theory and practice of leadership, for example, Peter Northouse outlines five approaches to the study of leadership, three broad theories, and three types of leadership.<sup>4</sup> Burns argues that leadership is being "exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers." Elsewhere, he describes leadership as when leaders induce followers "to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—*of both leaders and followers*."<sup>5</sup>

The task of defining political leadership is no less challenging. As Jean Blondel argues, "political leadership is almost certainly broader than any other form of leadership." Robert Elgie also describes in great detail the many attempts at definitions but declines to provide a definition of his own. He argues instead that, because of the thousands of definitions already in existence, and because the cultural factors surrounding leadership make anyone's definition as accurate or inaccurate as anyone else's, there is little value in further clarification. The "incremental addition to knowledge of a new definition," he suggests, "would be as near to zero as makes no difference."<sup>6</sup>

#### *Power, Values, Legitimacy, and Authority*

Understanding how political leadership has been defined does, nonetheless, provide some insight into the roles leadership might play in politics.

The interaction between authority, power, and values is especially relevant. In his definition of political leadership, Burns suggests that leadership is the “processes and effects” of power where a number of actors, with various motivations, engage with the motives of potential followers for the purpose of reciprocal benefit or real change. Political leadership, thus understood, is “*broadly intended ‘real’ change*” or “*collectively purposeful causation*.”<sup>7</sup>

Power is thus a central dimension of leadership. Any kind of leadership—but particularly political leadership—is inevitably concerned with it. As Joseph Nye argues, “[y]ou cannot lead if you do not have power.”<sup>8</sup> Likewise, Burns details humanity’s obsession with power in the twentieth century and its terrible consequences. He argues that politics is more than simply power and the use of it; indeed, there is a need to recognize that, where some humans influence others, not all these relationships are exploitative or coercive. Beyond coercion, Burns asserts, there is scope for persuasion or exchange, as well as elevation and transformation. Leadership might thus be seen as a “special form of power.”<sup>9</sup>

The task of defining power in political science unsurprisingly attracts controversy. Sometimes viewed as the capacity to “affect the behavior of others to get the outcomes you want,” power can be divided into three dimensions: influence over decision-making, agenda-setting, and preferences.<sup>10</sup> Yet because leadership also operates on a non-coercive basis, there must be some reconciliation of motive and purpose. As such, leadership is often viewed as a moral relationship and must therefore be intimately concerned with values and have moral implications. In discharging values, leaders should take heed of the implications for good conduct, equality and justice, and the well-being of followers. Burns argues that a “leader and a tyrant are polar opposites.” However, history is full of leaders who have demonstrated varying degrees of morality, thereby making any decision to exclude them from the study of leadership highly controversial. Blondel, for instance, views the exclusion of such leaders as “unjustifiable, unrealistic and indeed practically impossible.”<sup>11</sup>

In terms of how leaders use their power, two further ideas are also important. These are *legitimacy* and *authority*. The process of obtaining legitimacy and authority again involves both leaders and followers, with the latter playing a key role in “legitimizing” the former. Edwin Hollander argues that, as actors who legitimize leaders, followers have considerable power to shape leaders’ influence, as well as the style of leadership offered and, ultimately, the group’s performance. Thus viewed, followers are a major *source* of this authority. In his three models of legitimate authority, Max Weber places leaders into types depending upon the source of their

authority, whether it is grounded in rationality, tradition, or charisma. These types are in turn based on the rights of leaders under society's rules (legal authority); society's belief about established customs and leaders' roles within those customs (tradition); and charisma, or leaders' personalities, alone. The first two types of authority clearly rest on the *position* of the leader, whereas the third depends on the leader's *personality*. It is therefore possible to refer to *assigned* leadership (the first two types) and *emergent* leadership (the third type).<sup>12</sup>

### *Leadership Typologies: Agency versus Structure*

Unsurprisingly, key assumptions, methodologies, and typologies are widely disputed in this diverse field. Yet the central debate in the historical development of leadership studies concerns the role of agency versus structure. As Brian Jones asks, "[t]o what extent are the actions of leaders determined . . . by forces beyond the leader's control? To what extent is leadership dictated by structure, and to what extent is there room for independent action?"<sup>13</sup>

In its early development, the study of leadership focused first on individual political actors—the *great men* of history. This approach quickly drew criticism, however, which prompted a shift to an emphasis of structure over agency—to the *great forces* of history.<sup>14</sup> The contemporary literature has responded with a third paradigm, one acknowledging that individual personality and characteristics, as well as environmental influences, affect the processes and outcomes of political leadership. The political process, thus understood, has been described as a set of intricately wired computers where "political actors can be viewed as key junctures in the wiring, for example circuit breakers."<sup>15</sup> Much recent work on leadership takes this as a basic assumption, but differs in terms of the emphasis it places on either agency or structure.

Current approaches to leadership fall into five broad categories: the *trait*, *behavior*, *influence*, *situational*, and *integrative* approaches. The *trait* approach focuses on the various attributes possessed by leaders, notably personality, values, motives, and skills. By contrast, the *behavioral* approach emphasizes the actions of leaders and seeks to study how they manage the demands, constraints, and conflicts in their leadership roles. A key research question for this approach concerns the kinds of behavior exhibited by effective leaders. The *influence* approach focuses on leaders' interaction or influence, and is therefore concerned chiefly with the way in which leaders exercise power. *Situational* approaches focus on the

opposite end of the leader–follower spectrum: how follower dynamics affect leaders. Accordingly, they tend to place greater emphasis on environmentally focused perspectives. For example, contingency theory posits that effectiveness in leaders depends upon how suited their leadership style is to the given context. Finally, *integrative* approaches are eclectic in nature as they draw on more than one of the other four approaches.<sup>16</sup>

Studies acknowledging the role of both agency and structure generally assume “the existence of certain general leadership qualities . . . along with the variability of leadership traits according to the demands of group situations.”<sup>17</sup> This provides what is sometimes described as an interactional understanding of leadership or *interactionism*. This concept of leadership brings together the situational and trait approaches by employing three variables as analytical categories—situation, psychology, and skills—as well as the fourth variable of followers or environments. Political leaders are thus constrained by the process of government, meaning that “particular political structures” are clearly important to the outcomes of political leadership.<sup>18</sup>

### *Leadership Styles*

A key problem for the various approaches to studying leadership is classification: which leaders go where and why? The widely used transformational-transactional model of leadership seeks to classify leaders based on their leadership *style*, or leadership processes, with the model’s two basic leadership styles differing in their objectives, methods, and values.

Burns characterizes transforming leadership as an engagement between leaders and followers that raises both parties to “higher levels of motivation and morality.”<sup>19</sup> By contrast, transactional leadership, according to Burns, is “when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things.”<sup>20</sup> Transformational leadership, therefore, rests on a nonrational sentiment or emotion, whereas a transactional relationship is based upon a rational relationship of self-interest. The chief values of transactional leadership “are *modal values*, that is, values of means—honesty, responsibility, fairness, the honoring of commitments,” while transformational leadership “is more concerned with *end-values*, such as liberty, justice, equality.”<sup>21</sup> In reality, however, political leaders generally demonstrate both tendencies. As Bernard Bass notes, “[m]ost leaders do both but in different amounts.”<sup>22</sup>

The contemporary transformational-transactional model of leadership rests on six basic factors, with the first four relating to transformational



leadership and the final two relating to transactional leadership. These are: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reinforcement, and management-by-exception. Finally, there is a seventh factor that, as Northouse argues, “falls at the far side of the transactional-transformational continuum.”<sup>23</sup> This is laissez-faire leadership or non-leadership (see table 1).

The first two types of transformational leadership are *idealized influence* and *inspirational motivation*. Idealized influence, also known as *charisma* and the first factor of the transformational leadership style, has a long tradition in sociology and political science. The word charisma itself has become such an everyday term that its meaning has been obscured. Weber characterizes charisma as a special talent, a power that is divinely conferred. He refers to natural leaders as the “bearers of specific gifts of body and mind that . . . [are] considered ‘supernatural,’” in that only a select few possess such talents.<sup>24</sup> Inspirational motivation, the closely-related second factor, refers to the way some leaders communicate high expectations to followers, thereby inspiring those followers to increase their commitment to a shared organizational vision. Leaders do not need to be charismatic in order to inspire, however. In order to influence followers or other actors, many refer back to shared cultural understandings

Table 1. Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles

<i>Transformational Leadership</i>	<i>Transactional Leadership</i>
Charisma or idealized influence	Contingent reinforcement
Inspirational motivation	Management-by-exception
Intellectual stimulation Rational, empirical, existential, and idealistic	Intellectual stimulation Rational and empirical
Individualized consideration	Other types: opinion, group, party, legislative, executive
Laissez-faire	

Source: James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978); Bernard M. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (New York: The Free Press, 1985); Peter G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2007).

and symbols, assimilating to themselves those actions and values that are embodied in their society's myths.<sup>25</sup>

The second two types of transformational leadership are *intellectual stimulation* and *individualized consideration*. Intellectual stimulation focuses on problem solving and is concerned with beliefs and values rather than action. These are viewed as being either rationally, empirically, existentially, or idealistically-oriented. Indeed, the first two could be either transformational or transactional depending upon the context (see table 1), with existentially oriented and idealistically oriented intellectual leaders more clearly transformational.<sup>26</sup> Individualized consideration, on the other hand, refers to the relationship between leaders and small groups. Here, transformational leaders build links through communication techniques based on personal exchanges. These leaders aim to have followers or other actors considering not only their own interests but also the implications of their ambitions and actions.<sup>27</sup>

Whereas transformational leadership emphasizes nonrational human behavior, transactional leadership is a process whereby a leader aims to satisfy others' needs and wants in a way that causes them to pursue the leader's aims. The relationship is sometimes viewed as iterative bargaining in which participants are aware of the resources and views held by others but do not share a purpose beyond the exchange.<sup>28</sup> The rational exchange inherent in transactional leadership is sometimes described as "instrumental compliance"—with reward and punishment the central features. Compliance, however, is not necessarily automatic: leaders must be capable of delivering their side of the bargain. According to Burns, this style of leadership consists of several broad subtypes: opinion, small group, party, legislative, and executive leadership.<sup>29</sup>

The two main factors identified in this rational exchange are known as *contingent reinforcement* and *management-by-exception*.<sup>30</sup> The first of these represents the positive side of the instrumental exchange—leaders offer rewards (reinforcement) in return for certain behavior. The second represents the negative side of the instrumental exchange. It operates on a principle of leaders monitoring the behavior of others and intervening to correct this behavior only when it becomes problematic.<sup>31</sup> The processes of followership management, negotiation, and bargaining are vital to these elements of transactional leadership. Such leaders rely on their proximity to power and use their position as a broker of this power. The greater the level of protection or benefits that transactional leaders can offer, the greater the control and consensus they can be expected to demand.

## A Leadership Strategy Model

### *Understanding Process and Outcome*

Leadership is often portrayed as a way of *doing things*; yet it is also about *achieving things*. Is leadership a process or an outcome? And how should leaders be assessed? Blondel argues that the principal classification of leadership must be the *impact* leaders have.<sup>32</sup> In this respect, the transactional-transformational model, while a good starting point for assessing leaders, struggles to distinguish between impact and process because it is a style-based (i.e., process-based) model. Are leaders more transformational or transactional because of the way they behave or because of what they achieve? As with so many other aspects of leadership studies, Burns and his transformational leadership concept have had a major influence on this issue. The argument that political leadership is “real and intended change” or “purposeful causation” suggests that leadership is more than simply a process. The first part of Burns’s criteria for transformational leadership requires substantial *real* change. The second part is that these changes must be *intended* (rather than accidental).<sup>33</sup>

But how much and what kind of change is necessary for leadership to be transformational? Bass also distinguishes between transformational and transactional leadership based on the nature of the change such leadership effects. He sees a “first order of change”—a change of degree—as the product of transactional leadership facilitated by the exchange between leaders and followers. By contrast, the “second order of change”—bringing about a transformation in the attitudes and beliefs of followers—must come from transformational leadership. The key feature that distinguishes transformational leadership, therefore, is one of nature and not degree.<sup>34</sup> Thus understood, whether leaders can be transformational if they only bring about numerous instances of change is doubtful, even if these changes ultimately lead to a transformed environment. Transactional leadership can thus never bring about the quality of change required of transformational leadership.

This confusion between process and outcome is a significant weakness. Nye, for instance, is critical of the confusion surrounding transformational leadership, “because theorists use it to refer to leaders’ objectives, the styles they use, and the outcomes they produce.”<sup>35</sup> Given what is now assumed about environmental factors, if transformational leadership refers only to outcomes and not style, it becomes a social-determinist concept that minimizes the role of individuals. Furthermore, if leader-

ship outcomes are critical to defining a leadership style, the resulting conceptual model is circular: outcomes become both a product of and an input into style. Accordingly, Nye uses separate terms for styles and objectives. *Transforming* leadership refers to situations where leaders bring about change to followers' views, while *transformational* leadership refers to situations where leaders bring about change to the world at large. In some ways, however, this only adds to the confusion, since similar terms are being used to describe multiple but quite distinct concepts.<sup>36</sup>

Aurelia George Mulgan partially resolves this problem by distinguishing between two types of transformational leadership: *strong* and *weak*. Her distinction is based on the "extent of change" leaders bring about. "Transformational change, by definition," she argues, "is radical and path-breaking in its effects, literally 'transforming' rather than merely altering."<sup>37</sup> Strong transformational leadership is where leaders possess both a strong vision for change (or leadership style) and the capacity to achieve it (as demonstrated by results), while weak transformational leadership is when leaders might possess a vision but are unable to effect the change. If leaders achieve major change through a transactional leadership style, however, their leadership remains transactional. Yet this approach weakens the basis for comparison between the two styles—one leadership type is now outcomes-based (transformational) while the other (transactional) is process-based. Further, it cannot easily address the question of how leadership combining both styles might be understood.<sup>38</sup>

A more flexible approach is developed by Blondel, who divides the task of assessing leaders into two dimensions. The first measures the *degree of change* that leaders achieve. This change extends from maintenance, through moderate to large change. The second dimension adds the *scope of change* that leaders achieve. The impact of leaders on their environments can have a *wide*, *moderate*, or *specialized* scope. This means that the first dimension distinguishes leaders "depending on the extent to which they are concerned with maintenance or change in the society," while the second distinguishes between leaders by "assessing the scope and range of intervention."<sup>39</sup> Leaders may bring about change that is large but limited in its application (i.e., to a particular area of society or policy).

### *Adding Vision to Style*

If leadership outcomes can be characterized depending on the degree and scope of change involved, how might leadership processes be added to this framework? In answer to this problem, this book puts forward the concept

of *leadership strategy*.<sup>40</sup> Leadership strategy combines the two main elements of leadership—vision and style. *Vision* acts as an abridgement of the motivations, ambitions, and goals of political leaders, and covers the moral aspects of leadership. *Style*, on the other hand, is a short form for the various ways in which leaders engage in politics and pursue their goals. It therefore covers the kinds of trait and behavioral approaches examined earlier. Leaders come to power with numerous goals or intentions regarding change. Indeed, Blondel argues that leadership vision is “a general classification of the goals—or general orientations—of political leaders.”<sup>41</sup> These may change over time as leaders respond to new events or shifting follower expectations; however, they are a central part of most leaders’ approach to politics. Even the least involved laissez-faire leaders generally come to office with some form of leadership platform.

In terms of classifying leadership visions, Blondel’s model of *effected* change (leadership outcomes) can be used as the basis for a model of *intended* change. The horizontal plane would run from a wide scope of intended change on the left, through a moderate scope, to a specialized scope on the right. The vertical plane would run from a minimum degree of intended change on the top to a maximum degree on the bottom (see table 2). For example, an *innovative* leadership vision, involving a maximum degree of change to a specialized scope, would appear on the bottom-right of the table. A *conservational* leadership vision, involving a minimum degree of change to a wide scope, would appear on the top-left of the table. On the other hand, a *reassuring* leadership vision, encompassing a moderate degree of change across a moderate scope, would appear in the middle of the table.<sup>42</sup>

### Leadership Environments

How are different political environments important in shaping political leadership? Already this chapter has established that leadership is now largely understood in the field as an interactive process between individual and environment. For this book, the role played by the international summit environment of the G7 or G8 economic summits is particularly important. How Japan’s prime ministers have operated in the confined atmosphere of the summits, engaging with the leaders of the world’s major economic powers, will clearly affect the processes and outcomes of their political leadership. Yet it is also important to review the other political environments surrounding these summits, since leaders acting

Table 2. Change and Scope in Leadership Visions and Outcomes

<i>Degree of Change</i>	<i>Scope of Change</i>		
	<i>Wide Scope</i>	<i>Moderate Scope</i>	<i>Specialized Scope</i>
Minimum Change	Conservational	Paternalistic	Managerial
Moderate Change	Repositional	Reassuring	Redefinitional
Maximum Change	Revolutionary	Reformist	Innovative

Source: Jean Blondel, *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis* (London: Sage, 1987).

as diplomats are influenced by multiple political environments and their interactions.

### *The Domestic Environment*

The domestic context in which leaders operate can be understood as an aggregation of the processes and norms of followers and other political actors. This is sometimes described as the *organizational context* of political leadership or “the broad sense of social interaction among dyads, small groups, formal organizations, institutions, ad hoc collectivities, horizontal social strata, vertical societal segments, and whole political communities.”<sup>43</sup> Within this broad context, followers as well as political opponents exist along with “all other members of a society.”<sup>44</sup> The domestic context is an environment of *extensive expectations*. Some expectations may emanate from followers close to the leader, such as political factions, whereas others may be more sweeping, such as the expectations of the public. According to James Rosenau, political environments have *formal* and *informal* expectations, the former being institutionalized expectations and the latter referring to unwritten rules and norms. These expectations, which can often be vague and contradictory, establish various opportunities and constraints on leaders’ scope for action and must generally be balanced if leaders are to remain in power.<sup>45</sup>

Formal expectations, or institutions, are a central part of modern political environments. Elgie argues that they create “patterns of leadership” and shape the positional power of leaders and thus the nature of assigned leadership. In other words, institutions are often established to constrain leaders. Accordingly, he highlights three important institutional factors shaping leaders’ political environments: (1) how resources are structured within the executive; (2) how the balance of resources

are allocated between the executive and other parts of government; and (3) how resources are structured within, and between, political parties.<sup>46</sup> Which institutional factors might be important? The manner in which leaders are elected (or dismissed) or the powers allocated to leaders while in office can shape leadership. Constitutional powers are especially important, although material resources—access to information, expert advice, and so on—also play a central role in defining leaders' capabilities. Similarly, the structure of resources between, and within, political parties shapes leadership behavior in several ways. Leaders may behave differently depending on whether they lead their political party or stand apart from it (such as in a presidential system). The level of support—the size of the majority—enjoyed by the leader's party, or coalition of parties, may limit or expand the leader's influence.<sup>47</sup>

However important these institutional structures, they can often be negated by informal expectations. Leaders are often able to alter institutional makeups or conduct politics in a way that sidelines formal structures. Often nebulous, but arguably no less influential, historical, cultural, and societal influences clearly play a role. These include the historical baggage leaders inherit, the social attitudes with which they must deal, and the expectations of the wider public. Informal factors may be quite specific, such as the role played by leadership succession, but they may also be quite broad. The existence of clearly defined, socioeconomic groups may play a role, either by limiting leaders' ability to make difficult decisions, or by opening up opportunities for them to pursue previously unattainable goals.<sup>48</sup>

### *The International Environment*

The international context is understood quite differently from the domestic context, with the key factors more strongly contested. Whereas the domestic leadership environment is based on clear institutional frameworks, the international environment is often characterized by the very absence of such frameworks, that is, by international anarchy. International relations (IR) is thus a system of "self-help," created, as Kenneth Waltz puts it, by "the coaction of self-regarding units."<sup>49</sup> This central position given to states is a feature of much IR theory, particularly realism. According to these approaches, it is the state and not the individual which is the main unit of analysis for IR. Again, Waltz argues that structures cannot be defined by every actor in international relations but by the key actors. States "set the scene" of international relations even as other actors may participate.<sup>50</sup>

For structural realists, anarchy means that the structure of the international system negates the effects of particular characteristics of states, or substate actors such as leaders. Waltz divides potential factors in international affairs into three *images*, with individual actors making up the first image, states the second, and the international system the third. As potential causes of interstate war, for example, these images equate to such phenomena as: selfishness, aggression, or stupidity (first image); the internal structure of states (second image); and international anarchy (third image). Individual leadership may vary widely even as similar international outcomes are repeated consistently. In other words, however varied individual leadership, according to Waltz, it is still all functionally the same. Offensive realists, such as John Mearsheimer, similarly argue that IR's structural factors, particularly anarchy and the distribution of power, drive its outcomes. Offensive realism "pays little attention to individuals or domestic political considerations."<sup>51</sup>

Yet many other IR approaches interpret anarchy differently. First, anarchy is not always viewed as exogenous. It is often seen as the product of interaction between norms and customs that might be expected of a society. In developing the idea of an international society, the English School theorist Hedley Bull points to the norms and rules of world politics that are established and maintained through international diplomacy.<sup>52</sup> Constructivists also argue that interaction between states is dependent on how these states—by developing identities, interests, norms, and shared meanings—construct the anarchy in which they operate.<sup>53</sup> Second, anarchy is also not universally viewed as preventing non-state actors from playing important roles. Liberal institutionalists Robert Keohane and Nye argue that, under increasing *complex interdependence* in world politics, the interaction between sub-state groups diversifies, thereby eroding the clear distinction between international and domestic that underpins state-centric views of IR. Societal groups, government agencies, and even individual political actors can play substantial roles in international affairs.<sup>54</sup>

Moreover, whereas structural realists see states as predominantly subject to systemic pressures and thus treat them as unitary actors, those working in the foreign policy analysis field view "unit-level factors and actors" as equally important. The formal and informal expectations that constitute part of the domestic environment in which leaders operate, as noted above, also influence states' international behavior. These might include cognitive and psychological traits such as perception at the individual level, bureaucratic politics, party politics, or wider societal preferences.<sup>55</sup> This focus on the sources of state behavior parallels defensive



and classical realist perspectives. Defensive realists such as Stephen Walt contend that it is not changes in the international balance of power that shape state behavior but changes in the balance of threats, suggesting that these kinds of subjective state intentions, perceptions, and beliefs also expand the scope for unit-level influence. Likewise, neoclassical realists recognize the influence of unit-level factors intermediating between the systemic factors and states.<sup>56</sup>

The potential importance of these factors raises the question of whether leadership preferences should be treated, as structural realists contend, as irrelevant to overall international outcomes. Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack argue that these assertions are in fact “empirically weak,”<sup>57</sup> a criticism that has been a feature of IR theory since the end of the Cold War. Structural theory, it is suggested, has made IR less able to predict or explain international behavior even as it has strengthened its social science credentials.<sup>58</sup> Byman and Pollack point to Walt’s study of alliance formation as highlighting the weaknesses in the structural position in terms of states balancing or bandwagoning based only on the distribution of power. During the two World Wars, states bandwagoned on the Allied powers more than on the Axis powers, even though the distribution of power favored the former. In the 1960s in the Middle East, states balanced against Syria even though its power projection capabilities were relatively modest. In both cases, it was how these states perceived the intentions of others—a balance of threats—that shaped their behavior more than a balance of power.<sup>59</sup>

### *Domestic-International Linkages*

A central challenge for those aiming to include such unit-level factors in explanations of international outcomes, however, is determining how the domestic and international levels interact. Describing a single level is not sufficient, nor is creating lists of factors or generic observations about the interactions across different levels. The key issue, to paraphrase Robert Putnam, is to identify “when” and “how” these different levels influence each other.<sup>60</sup>

The major response to this challenge has been the development of the *two-level games* concept for understanding international negotiations.<sup>61</sup> The basic idea is that the interactions between the domestic and international levels of negotiations, or summits, are comprised of leaders dealing with each other in an international game while also dealing with their respective domestic constituencies in a concurrent domestic game.

These leaders might enter into agreements at summits before seeking domestic ratification for them; however, the real process is more likely to begin at the domestic level as domestic actors bargain over acceptable compromises before the summits begin. As the leaders then negotiate at the international level, they must also keep in mind the need to get their agreements approved, or ratified, domestically. This process creates reverberation effects between the two levels in what has been described as the *second image reversed*. This idea describes the “impact of international pressures on domestic politics, and the consequences that has back on international relations.”<sup>62</sup>

It is this need for ratification that provides the link between the levels. Three broad forms of ratification can be identified: *approval*, *authorization*, and *acquiescence*. These have been used to describe: (1) ratification after summitry negotiations; (2) ratification before negotiations, such as a legislature providing a head of state broad negotiating powers; and (3) informal ratification.<sup>63</sup> Ratification also shapes the approach of domestic level actors. Because these actors cannot independently change the agreements that leaders have concluded, they must either accept or reject them wholesale. What is ratifiable at the domestic level, therefore, provides the room for leaders to negotiate agreements successfully at the international level. Often described as the *win-set*, this refers to the set of potential agreements that would *win* the approval of sufficient numbers of domestic actors when making a *yes* or *no* decision. What is acceptable domestically is likely to influence how leaders behave internationally. For example, if faced with domestic constituents opposed to a new agreement, leaders may actually enjoy a stronger bargaining position. They may be able to say: “I’d like to accept your proposal, but I could never get it accepted at home.”<sup>64</sup>

The kinds of domestic factors that shape this bargaining process are essentially those formal and informal expectations, or preferences, discussed earlier. Helen Milner refers to them as the *structure of domestic preferences*.<sup>65</sup> In terms of intentional negotiations, domestic actors, or followers, can be classified into two basic groups relating to how they view the potential international agreement. They can be dovish (favor the position taken by other states) or hawkish (oppose the positions of other states). This structure of domestic preferences may be influenced by a range of additional factors relating to the nature of the bargaining process. These include the costs of rejecting an agreement, the level of commitment entailed, or the nature of the ratification process required.<sup>66</sup> Further, domestic actors may even make decisions regarding a potential

agreement based on outside considerations and even separate bargaining. In other words, they may approve or reject an agreement with no thought for the agreement itself. They may instead make their decision based on the *quid pro quo* concessions they expect to extract in return for their consent.

### *The Summit Environment*

The specific leadership environment under examination here is the international summit. The use of summits in diplomacy is not new. Historically, summits tended to be extraordinary events held to reach landmark agreements. The practice of leaders meeting to discuss diplomatic affairs preceded the creation of embassies and overseas missions in the fifteenth century. Recently, however, they have gradually become the norm of international politics, a common feature of diplomacy. As Peter Weilemann states, “non-participation by a leader makes more headlines than participation.”<sup>67</sup> Indeed, the proliferation of the term today suggests that the concept is in danger of losing its meaning. A *summit* now refers to any meeting between heads of state or government, important politicians from differing countries, or even other non-governmental actors. This is very different from what might be described as the Churchillian view—that summits were “not only the meetings of political leaders but also the meetings of leading states.”<sup>68</sup>

It is possible to characterize summits depending on the nature of participants, how they communicate, whether their meetings have been institutionalized, or whether they have the support of a permanent administration. In terms of the participants, for example, the diplomacy taking place at a summit should be of the “highest possible level.” For communication, summits might be expected to involve face-to-face dialogue, while they may lack permanent institutional frameworks or administrations compared to international organizations.<sup>69</sup> Yet summits often do not fit into such strict criteria. For instance, given its permanent administration in Indonesia, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) summit might be viewed as a regional institution rather than a summit, despite being quite different from other regional organizations such as the European Union. Yet an ASEAN spinoff, the East Asia Summit, would still be considered a summit.

Alternative characterizations might focus instead on goals or processes. In terms of the former, summits are conducted for a range of reasons. They may be set up in order to end military conflict, establish a new political order, or facilitate cooperation or communication

between states within a particular group. Clearly identifiable and measurable results, such as the achievement of some kind of peace accord or economic agreement, however, are not always forthcoming. As Weilemann argues, many summits fit into the *orientation* category of summits which quickly become “photo-opportunity” summits.<sup>70</sup> In terms of processes, three broad types can be identified: the *serial* summit, the *ad hoc* summit, and the *exchange-of-views* summit.<sup>71</sup> The serial summit is distinguished by its recurring nature: it takes place at regular intervals, most usually annually, over an extended period. The ad hoc summit is often an area-specific gathering, although it may also develop into some kind of limited series of irregular summits based around this common theme. The exchange-of-views summit is most often bilateral, low-key, and possibly even secretly conducted.

#### THE G7/8 SUMMITS

Where do the G7 and G8 summits fit amongst these criteria? The G7/8 summits have been a mixture of competition and cooperation. The G7/8 did not emerge from an international treaty or major international conference but came into being instead as a response to a series of international crises, notably the oil shock of the early 1970s. However, the G7/8 summits were also envisaged, even in their early years, as an opportunity for ongoing informal discussions. The facilitation of economic cooperation and the management of economic problems quickly became the dominant goals of the summits. From the beginning, therefore, the summits were interaction rather than problem-based.

The G7 model first appeared at a meeting between the finance ministers of Britain, France, the United States, and West Germany in the library of the White House (thus nicknamed the “Library Group”) in 1973. The group would later be joined by Japan to form the Group of Five (G5) finance ministers. The leaders’ summit idea was again floated at a meeting of the initial four held in Helsinki in 1975, and soon after a date was set for the first summit to be held in Rambouillet. Italy was also invited to attend, while Canada joined at the following San Juan summit. In 1977 the European Community also joined as an onlooker. Subsequent summits have been held in a host of locations more or less exotic, including Williamsburg, Paris, Okinawa, Evian, and Gleneagles. Locations sometimes appear to be chosen based on their inaccessibility to non-governmental and civil society groups likely to protest against the summits. At the first Tokyo summit, various Japanese groups (e.g., the

Japan Red Army) attempted to disrupt proceedings in protest against the summit's "imperialism."<sup>72</sup>

Over the years, the G7/8 has gradually become larger and more complex. What was originally envisaged as an opportunity to hold an informal "chat," soon transformed into a process taking up much of the year. Between 1975 and 1981, the G7 consisted only of leaders' summits, albeit with others attending, such as the "sherpas." These "personal representatives" of the leaders have met regularly in the lead-up to the summits and play an influential role on behalf of their leaders. From the second round of summits, beginning in 1982, pre-summit ministerial meetings were gradually introduced whereby the finance, foreign, and trade ministers met separately. This expansion was accompanied by an increase in the number of meetings and working groups between the participants' respective bureaucracies.<sup>73</sup> Because of its early emphasis on economics, the G7/8 has variously been known either as an "economic summit" or "summit of industrialized countries." At times it has been referred to as the "Western economic summit" or the "seven-power summit."<sup>74</sup> Yet the headline issues of the G7/8 have varied widely. Despite an initial focus on macroeconomics, subsequent summits began examining microeconomic development (e.g., during the mid-1980s and early 1990s).<sup>75</sup> Security issues also began to receive more attention from the early 1980s, with nuclear deployment and arms control issues taking up a major part of discussions.

Just as the G7/8 has expanded, so have the surrounding institutions. The Group of Twenty (G20) has been the most high-profile example of such expansion. Formed out of the G8 Cologne summit of 1999 as a meeting of finance ministers and central bank governors, the G20 was a response to the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s and the elitism of the G7/8. With the global financial crisis in full swing in late 2008, and the G8 seemingly unable to develop coordinated policies, the G20 appeared better able to incorporate the new powers in the global economy (e.g., China). However, the G20's greater size makes cooperation more difficult and risks turning the summit into a "mini-United Nations" or just another photo-opportunity summit.<sup>76</sup>

### The Leader as Chief Diplomat

Where does the leader acting as chief diplomat fit into this framework? Key decision makers have a unique role in mediating international and domestic pressures because they are "directly exposed to both spheres."<sup>77</sup>

They are the sole formal link between the two levels, in effect the gate-keepers. This matches other assumptions made about the role of leaders in international affairs, particularly the idea that leaders play a significant role in establishing the intentions and strategies of states.<sup>78</sup> Despite this, the personalities, perceptions, and preferences of leaders receive less attention in the literature on two-level games than other state-level factors. Putnam, for example, assumes that “the chief negotiator has no independent policy views, but acts merely . . . as an agent on behalf of his constituents.”<sup>79</sup>

*Leadership Rationality: Perceptions, Preferences, and Strategies*

Mostly, leaders are assumed to be rational political actors. As Milner explains, executives are treated as rational utility maximizers concerned chiefly with re-election. Such utility (pay-off) maximization is an important part of rational-choice models. Under a *comprehensive rational choice* model, leaders face a clear problem, are fully informed, and have sufficient options, abilities, and time to find a resolution that maximizes their utility (i.e., that they adapt fully to this set of choices). Under a less demanding model, that of *bounded rationality*, truly rational decision-making is limited by poorly defined problems, incomplete or inaccurate information, poor skills, and limited time (nonrational factors). Behavior under these conditions may be considered to have rationality, or *intended rationality*, if the decision maker, despite environmental or cognitive limitations, is seeking to adapt to changing environments. Both kinds of rationality involve ends-means reasoning and can thus be contrasted to *irrationality*, which lacks this kind of reasoning.<sup>80</sup> Yet intended rationality can be highly constrained. Leaders are often uncertain about the views of their domestic environment concerning foreign policy, and their views can be distorted not only by a lack of information but also by wrong information, particularly where ideology plays a role. Moreover, their imperfect access to information can itself affect their political environments, by arousing suspicion or undermining confidence.<sup>81</sup>

Indeed, misperception appears to be a key challenge for leaders in diplomacy. Robert Jervis highlights how structural factors interact with individual idiosyncrasies when he argues that, because key decision makers in IR operate in an anarchical environment, they are always on the alert for “dangerous plots.” This increases the scope for misperception, since seemingly devious plots are sometimes just innocuous plans. “Beliefs,” Jervis suggests, “are much more common than the reality they

seek to describe.”<sup>82</sup> Andrew Kennedy examines the individual level of foreign policy by tracing the impact of the *national efficacy beliefs* of Mao Zedong and Jawaharlal Nehru on their country’s respective foreign policies. Kennedy looks in particular at the extent to which the strategic and diplomatic approaches of these two nations were shaped by Mao’s and Nehru’s strong attitudes toward their national military and diplomatic capabilities. Certainly, decision makers may interpret coincidental events as part of a pattern, misjudge how their own policies are perceived, or overemphasize their own significance. Expectations of behavior, whether based on past experience or accepted norms, are also susceptible to disruption, and wishful thinking is especially problematic. Finally, cognitive dissonance—the gap between beliefs and actions—provides ample scope for self-justification as actors reorganize beliefs and perceptions to better match their decisions.<sup>83</sup>

What motivates leaders in international affairs? And how might leaders’ preferences and strategies shape their behavior? “Reelection is not the only goal attributed to political actors,” Milner suggests. Some “have argued that political actors desire to implement their party program most of all.”<sup>84</sup> In international negotiations, basic terms such as dove, hawk, and agent are used to describe leaders’ preferences in contrast to those of their constituents: doves are more open to agreement than their constituents; hawks are less open; and agents have approximately the same openness. Overall, three basic alternatives for leaders’ values, objectives, and styles as they relate to international negotiations are worth noting. These are to (1) protect or increase domestic popularity; (2) shift domestic politics towards established policy preferences or ideological beliefs; or (3) pursue established ideas of the national interest. The first of these is consistent with rational choice motivations. However, the second and third factors clearly include so-called “idiosyncratic ‘first image’ factors,” such as “past political history or personal idealism,” and so highlight the need to understand the factors shaping leaders’ perceptions and biases.<sup>85</sup>

Leaders may employ a number of strategies aimed at reshaping their political environments. In response to the challenges of ratification in international negotiations, leaders may attempt either to constrict or to expand what agreements are acceptable domestically. The first is known as *tying hands*, and the second as *cutting slack*. Leaders may attempt to influence the ratification procedure by changing voting rules, amending legislation, or shifting the interests of domestic actors. *Side-payments* involve actors linking separate, unrelated political issues and exchanging

benefits across those issues in a *quid pro quo* process. Leaders may also attempt to shape the political environments of their diplomatic counterparts, since they may gain a more beneficial agreement if they can expand the scope of agreements acceptable to their negotiating counterparts. Such strategies may come with drawbacks, however. Given that leaders are not necessarily fully cognizant of their domestic environments, they may find such restructuring difficult. Moreover, if they are found to have manipulated their domestic environment or that of their opponents, they may lose credibility as negotiators. Because summits are often iterated events and not “one-off” games, leaders must balance the potential short-term gains accrued from such attempts against the potential damage to their reputation in the long term.<sup>86</sup>

### *Leadership Disposability: Linking Leaders and Diplomacy*

To what extent do these preferences and strategies shape diplomatic processes and outcomes? In the case of predominant leaders, such as Mao and Nehru for instance, this is self-evident.<sup>87</sup> Yet political environments can often be unclear or contradictory, and the role of particular leaders ambiguous. It is important, therefore, to consider Putnam’s question of “when” and “how” leaders matter. Much work in the foreign policy analysis (FPA) field has been directed toward understanding the agent-structure problem by developing structures and actors into an integrative framework.<sup>88</sup> As Valerie Hudson points out, FPA’s contribution to IR is to identify the “intersection between the most important determinants of state behavior: material and ideational factors.” Hudson sees this intersection not as the state but as “human decisionmakers.”<sup>89</sup>

Identifying variables based on individual personality has been one important part of developing a more integrative framework. Margaret Hermann, for instance, has sought to identify a number of *leadership personality* factors that affect diplomacy, including the extent to which leaders are interested in diplomacy or the manner in which they assume power. Hermann considers how a range of personal characteristics shape leaders’ foreign policy behavior, including nationalism and self-confidence, motives, decision-making style, as well as paranoia, and Machiavellianism.<sup>90</sup> Byman and Pollack also characterize leadership types and link them to foreign policy behavior. Risk-tolerant and delusional leaders are more likely to precipitate and prolong wars, while those with “grandiose visions” are more likely to overreach and “destabilize the system.” Predictable leaders, on the other hand, are more likely to establish stronger alliances.<sup>91</sup>



The process of leadership in different contexts has been an important focus of research in this area. Some scholars have sought to focus more directly on how leaders respond to political contexts, such as the constraints that could potentially shape their decision making. They highlight for instance how goal-oriented leaders tend to “selectively perceive” their environments and are consequently unable to change their views about their environments. Barbara Farnham emphasizes the *acceptability continuum* in societies and the sensitivity of decision makers to this acceptability. Hermann et al. put forward leaders’ responsiveness to constraints, openness to information, and motivation as the three chief factors that determine how sensitive leaders are to their environments.<sup>92</sup> Juliet Kaarbo sets up a framework that presents leadership style as the independent factor shaping three dependent variables: the decision process, the decision outcome, and the foreign policy output. Kaarbo concludes that any given leadership style is likely to affect the foreign policy decision-making process the most, the decision somewhat less, and the actual foreign policy output the least.<sup>93</sup>

In seeking to link personality, beliefs, or perceptions with strategic choices and diplomatic outcomes, this book makes use of two key concepts developed by Fred Greenstein: *action dispensability* and *actor dispensability*.<sup>94</sup> According to Greenstein, these two concepts are “logically distinct,” with the first addressing the importance of leaders’ actions and the second dealing with the importance of their characteristics.<sup>95</sup> Action dispensability is concerned with questions of how important a certain action is to a particular outcome (regardless of the actor). Would a different outcome have occurred if a different action had taken place? The concept thus raises the question of whether the action was made inevitable by the circumstances or whether it was the product of particular leadership characteristics.<sup>96</sup> Would the same leaders, under different circumstances, have carried out the same action? Actor dispensability is concerned with how important particular actors, with their distinct preferences and perceptions, are to certain outcomes. Under similar conditions, would different actors have acted differently? Ultimately, the two concepts help to understand “whether the actions of the *individuals in question* were necessary for the outcome to have occurred or whether the actions were ones that any similarly placed actors would have taken.”<sup>97</sup>

Working from these concepts, Greenstein also offers numerous conditions where leaders’ actions and personalities might shape political outcomes. In terms of actions, they can become more important as the nature of political environments allow scope for greater restructuring. They can

also depend upon the location of leaders in their environments. In terms of variations between actors, Greenstein suggests that the manifestation of *personal variability* can be facilitated by ambiguous environments, including environments that are new, complex, and contradictory.<sup>98</sup> Similarly, the scope for personal variability can increase when these environments contain few socially standardized sets (or accepted social guidelines). However, leader variability can become less significant the more leaders' decisions or approaches are publicly visible and, also, where leaders' personalities require outside confirmation. Instead, personal variability will be more obvious where there are fewer environmental expectations. The more involved leaders are in political affairs, the more their personal variability emerges and affects their environments. Also, personal variability is more likely to emerge when the action is more difficult or spontaneous. Finally, even where actions are basically the same, the expression of these acts (i.e., political style) could well differ when carried out by different actors.<sup>99</sup>

## Conclusion

What soon becomes clear from any study of political leadership is the diversity of the field. No dominant analytical framework exists that might be easily adopted in order to study particular leadership cases. A key objective of this chapter, therefore, has been to outline the assumptions and approaches of the various studies on leadership generally. The chapter has thus been able to show how leadership is widely viewed as an interactional and dynamic process involving leaders and followers. It has described the nature of both the domestic and international environments in which leaders operate. Domestic environments, in particular, are an amalgamation of followers' expectations of leaders, including both formal and informal expectations. The international leadership environment, on the other hand, has largely been understood as a place where decision-making is structurally determined.

The chapter has also revealed the lack of consensus over how to assess political leadership as well as the problems associated with identifying the role played by political leadership in diplomatic outcomes at different levels of analysis. To address the first of these challenges, the concept of *leadership strategy* was developed. A leadership strategy approach provides a way of assessing political leaders in a more structured way and thus helps resolve the problem of whether to understand leadership either

as a process or an outcome. To manage the levels of analysis challenge, the chapter adapted the concepts of action and actor dispensability from leadership studies in order to better identify where leaders are most likely to have an impact upon international affairs.

Nonetheless, while it is important to understand these multiple leadership environments, the basic research questions outlined in the introduction are not merely concerned with abstract leaders or environments. Rather, they are intended to examine two key features of Japanese political leadership in international affairs: (1) the extent to which Japanese leaders have demonstrated independent leadership strategies in diplomacy; and (2) the extent to which they have shaped the processes and outcomes of Japan's foreign policy and international affairs more generally. Having outlined the overall framework of interactive leadership, the book will now consider how this framework helps to understand and explain specific cases of Japanese politics and diplomacy.

## Locating Japanese Leaders

Work on political leadership in Japan since the 1980s has often viewed Japanese leaders as heavily constrained by the country's political environment, and particularly by the normative and institutional factors discussed in chapter 1.<sup>1</sup> According to this argument, Japanese political leadership has been weak and reactive and has functioned essentially as an outcome of the political environment. The epitome of such leadership was Suzuki Zenkō, subject of the second case study in this book and a leader who was noted for his consensus-oriented, unobtrusive, laissez-faire style of leadership.<sup>2</sup>

More recently, this view has become increasingly contested. From the late 1990s, those working in the area began to view Japanese leadership in more interactive terms. Important to this reassessment has been the question of whether there has been a prevalent type of Japanese leadership which matches the kind of assumptions made about the Japanese political environment. In other words, have there been different types of Japanese political leaders or, as some suggest, a dominant type? Is it true that "Japan's prime ministers since Meiji have predominantly been Suzuki types"?<sup>3</sup> In examining such questions, this chapter aims to locate Japan's leaders within their wider political contexts. It thus seeks to: (1) outline how Japanese political leadership has been understood in terms of its relationship within the formal and informal political environment; (2) review how the Japanese leadership studies field characterizes political leaders in Japan; (3) assess specific examples of historical and contemporary Japanese leadership; and (4) explain Japan's summit diplomacy and the historical role played by the country's leaders in this process.

### The "Ways" of Japanese Politics

To understand the interaction between leader and environment in the Japanese context, it is necessary, as Verena Blechinger-Talcott argues, "to

turn to the distribution of power in the Japanese political system and to the relationship between politicians, their voters, supporters, and fellow party and Diet members.”<sup>4</sup> In examining the distribution of power and the relationships between the main actors in Japanese politics, much attention has focused on the questions of who wields power. As John Creighton Campbell and Ethan Scheiner explain, “it is important to ask (1) whether anyone is in charge and, if so, (2) who that somebody is.”<sup>5</sup>

A first step is to understand how Japan’s institutional structures were formally organized under the so-called “1955 system,” which refers to the period between 1955 and 1993 when the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) dominated Japanese politics. As discussed in chapter 1, of particular importance are the structure of resources: (1) within the executive, (2) between the different branches and levels of government, and (3) within and between the political parties.<sup>6</sup> In the Japanese context, this means the structure of resources allocated to the head of government (the prime minister), including the allocation of constitutional powers and administrative resources. It also covers the structure of resources in the permanent administration of the central government, the bureaucracy, and the balance between the executive and this permanent administration. Finally, there is the structure of resources within the party of government and between the party of government and the opposition parties.

For Japan’s leaders, the structure of resources within the executive has been especially important. Yet, as Tomohito Shinoda notes, the executive power of prime ministers has not been “precisely defined by the Constitution,” meaning that prime ministers have enjoyed little in the way of specific or clearly defined constitutional powers. Instead, executive power has been “vested in the Cabinet” (Article 65), which consists of the prime minister, “who shall be its head,” and other ministers of state.<sup>7</sup> It is the Cabinet which “shall, in the exercise of executive power, be collectively responsible to the Diet” (Article 66).<sup>8</sup> Similarly, in terms of the allocation of resources to the executive under the 1955 system, the prime minister’s office is viewed as having been quite weak when compared with prime ministers elsewhere. Nonetheless, Japanese prime ministers have enjoyed a range of *emergent*, or informal, resources. Most obviously, the prime minister is the government’s chief spokesperson and has thus been able to exert influence through “agenda-setting.”<sup>9</sup>

A weakness in focusing on just these formal institutional arrangements, however, is that the divisions of power and authority are, as Chalmers Johnson argues, “always complicated by the unusually bifurcated or split-level quality of the Japanese polity.”<sup>10</sup> That is, the divide between

the often-noted visible (*omote*) and hidden (*ura*) in Japanese political life implies that real decision making in Japan, although announced at the *omote* level, is often made at the *ura* level. While this tendency can be exaggerated, it inevitably creates problems for analysis, making the task of definitive explanations of Japan's leadership relationships more difficult.

Indeed, the role played in Japanese politics by such cultural norms has been well studied. Terms such as *kuromaku* (behind the scenes political fixer) and *nemawashi* (extensive consultation or "laying the groundwork") have been used to help explain the prevalence of *consensus-seeking* and *bottom-up* decision-making in Japanese politics. Personalized leader-follower relations likewise follow some significant cultural norms, particularly *giri* (obligation), *ninjō* (personal feeling), and *amae* (dependency).<sup>11</sup> Relations between leaders and followers are smoothed by the exchange of "gifts, favors, and indulgences," according to this interpretation, and are thus influenced by *senpai-kōhai* (senior-junior) or *oyabun-kobun* (parent-child) relationships. Yet it is difficult to separate instances where politicians merely subscribe to social customs for political benefit. Former Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei acknowledged that "*giri ninjō* is important in relations among people, but the government has to consider what is in the best interests of the nation."<sup>12</sup>

There has nonetheless been a consensus amongst many scholars over which actors are the most important in the competition for power in Japan. These figures are together often referred to as the "iron" triangle of executive, bureaucracy, and party. But beyond this, many different theories have been put forward in terms of identifying which of these three is the principal political actor. The two basic schools of thought to appear on the subject have been the *centralization* and *fragmentation* interpretations, with the former arguing that political power in Japan has been centralized, and the latter viewing power as fragmented.<sup>13</sup>

#### *Centralization: Bureaucrat or Politician*

Within the *centralization* approach, the chief issue has been whether it is the bureaucrats or the politicians who have dominated Japanese politics. Those who subscribe to the bureaucracy-dominant approach argue that the bureaucracy has controlled or influenced most aspects of executive-non-executive interaction. "Who governs," according to Johnson, "is Japan's elite state bureaucracy."<sup>14</sup> Under the 1955 system, according to this argument, the bureaucracy's power stemmed from its control over law-making and the drafting of regulations. The control the bureaucracy

has had over “administrative guidance,” largely unencumbered by judicial oversight, was particularly obvious. Thus T. J. Pempel, writing in 1974, concluded that the bureaucracy was a “driving force” in Japanese policymaking, that its influence over legislation was increasing, and that its power over “non-legislative devices,” or administrative guidance, was on the rise.<sup>15</sup>

Still, while the bureaucracy wielded considerable power within Japanese politics and foreign policy under this system, especially in terms of carrying out administrative and legislative business, it does not follow that the bureaucracy controlled the political process completely. Even Johnson argues that the bureaucracy did not constitute the entire Japanese political system, but rather that it existed at the pinnacle of governance. The bureaucracy did not rule directly but rather influenced policymaking indirectly via networks throughout government and the above-mentioned “non-legislative devices.” The bureaucratic-dominant school, while conceding that the bureaucracy was not all-powerful, nonetheless asserted that the bureaucracy had been by far the most powerful actor in Japanese politics.<sup>16</sup>

The second of the centralization approaches is the party-dominance view. It suggests that, from the late 1960s or early 1970s onward, the relative monopoly on expertise enjoyed by the bureaucracy fell compared to the increasing sophistication of the LDP organization. Gerald Curtis argues that those who assume that the bureaucracy dominates decision making in Japanese politics are referring to the early part of the 1955 system when “there existed an overwhelming public consensus on the desirability of rapid industrialization and high GNP growth.”<sup>17</sup> The nature of the LDP during this time was conducive to such a role for the bureaucracy: its structure was still a work in progress and many of its senior leaders had come from the higher echelons of the bureaucracy. These so-called early years include the early postwar period and the first ten or so years of LDP rule. By the mid-1960s and certainly by the turbulent 1970s, the country’s economic, societal, and political challenges had evolved so that the bureaucracy could not find solutions independently of political involvement and had become more defensive.<sup>18</sup>

Consequently, by the 1980s, it was more widely recognized that the LDP had become the central policymaking actor. Pempel identifies a number of reasons why politicians became increasingly concerned with policy. Increasing electoral competition, more complex policy, and therefore a greater need for understanding the electoral impacts of such policy, as well as the decline in influence of former bureaucrats in politics, all

drove the LDP to take more interest in policy. Within the party, the key players on policy had become the *seisaku zoku*, or “policy tribes.”<sup>19</sup> The implication, as Kenji Hayao observed in the 1990s, was that the influence of the *zokugaiin* came to be seen as greater than that of the bureaucracy, a shift that was illustrated by the term, *tōkō seitei* (dominant party, subordinate bureaucracy). The *zokugaiin* spent considerable time working in a single area and could therefore establish even greater policy expertise than the bureaucrats, who were regularly rotated through different policy divisions.<sup>20</sup>

*Fragmentation: Nobody or Everybody*

The *fragmentation* approach, by contrast, explains Japanese politics under the 1955 system as a multitude of actors competing for power. It is possible to identify three main variations on this approach, the first of which can be described as the “cartelization” school. The basic premise is that, due to ambiguous consensus-oriented and bottom-up relationships within Japan’s political and business worlds, nobody is in charge of the country or its political system. Japan has no true power-wielders. Instead, power is shared: by the bureaucrats, who also have intensive inter-ministry rivalries; the politicians, who have their factional rivalries and pork-barreling interests; and business leaders, who finance politicians but depend on bureaucratic assistance and protection. Karel van Wolferen, writing in the late 1980s, described this as a situation where “[n]obody is boss, but everybody, in some way or other, has leverage over somebody else, which helps ensure an orderly state of affairs.”<sup>21</sup>

In a second variation, the Japanese political system is viewed as a “balance of power” between the bureaucracy on the one hand and governmental interests on the other. Under this balance, all actors find themselves politically constrained. The Japanese executive, in particular, is restricted by factors from within the ruling party (meaning the LDP under the 1955 system) and the bureaucracy. The power of central decision makers, even though they had clear authority to act, was limited. According to Aurelia George Mulgan, this was “directly attributable to the constraints imposed by a collection of informal power structures within the ruling conservative party and by an autonomous central bureaucracy.” All of these, she continues, “held power away from the political executive.”<sup>22</sup> Again, Japanese politics was characterized by multiple actors; but in this case power was held differently. Whereas the cartelization approach viewed power as having slipped through the cracks of the political system,



the latter interpretation was that power had been excessively distributed and constrained.

A third variation is the idea of Japan as a “refractive state.” According to Curtis, the Japanese state reacts to the demands of society in its policy responses, but in a way where the “managers of the state,” its politicians and bureaucrats, seek to shape these demands so that they “conform as much as possible to their own values, priorities, preferences, and organizational interests.”<sup>23</sup> Everything in this environment is pluralistic—from the demands of society to the preferences of bureaucrats and politicians. It is a political system that is characterized by strong private sector associations and a system of “multiple strong-state institutions.” Thus Japan is often described as a polity based on “patterned pluralism,” “governance by negotiation,” or “reciprocal consent.” Alternatively, it might be viewed as a “network society” or “network state.”<sup>24</sup>

All this makes determining the preferences and priorities of these actors vital to understanding Japanese politics and leadership. In this regard, the 1970s and early 1980s was a period of significant reappraisal and reform in Japanese strategic thinking. The country had emerged as a great economic power, or *senshinkoku* (economically advanced nation), after years of high growth; however, the turmoil of the 1970s was forcing its leaders to reconsider their policies. As Kenneth Pyle notes, there was “a reassessment of Japanese purpose at the outset of the 1980s.”<sup>25</sup> Most notably, earlier ideas such as *pacifism* and *developmentalism* were giving way to internationalism (*kokusaishugi*) and a reinvigorated nationalism. The former focused on Japan playing a more constructive international role and helped produce the idea of “comprehensive security” promoted by Ōhira Masayoshi. The latter was promoted by the more nationalist Nakasone Yasuhiro, who thought of Japan as both supporting and leading the international order. Nakasone spoke of a Japan that would cease being a follower nation and would instead become an international state.<sup>26</sup>

### *Environment Strong, Leader Weak*

The chief assumption from much of this analysis is that wider societal forces determine political leadership in Japan and that actor indispensability is low. Thus viewed, Japanese factional politics “has tended to breed mediocre leaders” who are, almost by definition, trapped in a dependent relationship with their followers. Strong leadership styles, such as the “typical” French style, are not rewarded and cannot function in such a decentralized and consensus-based political system.<sup>27</sup> This emphasis

on societal forces can be found in the way that informal norms—such as the personal links between leaders and their immediate subordinates described by Chie Nakane—are used to explain the methods of political interaction. According to this interpretation, politics in Japan has operated on “a shared, tacitly agreed upon and arbitrary view of reality,” or, as one political scientist has put it, “institutionalized hypocrisy.”<sup>28</sup> The exercise of official leadership creates a situation of constant irresolvable tension. As van Wolferen argues, those who are in charge formally (i.e., the prime minister and Cabinet) are not in practice allowed to use the power they are formally allocated. The result is a crisis of legitimacy. Because formal leaders are subject to the whims of the “unseen world of Japanese politics”—the *kagemusha* (shadow shoguns)—they are compromised and debased.<sup>29</sup>

Disparities between façade and reality help explain the highly critical view of Japanese leadership taken by many from the fields of political science and Japanese studies. Perhaps the most strident Western scholar in recent years, Roger Bowen, argues that most Japanese prime ministers in the postwar period have been ethically dwarfish and that “the Japanese prime ministership has seldom produced strong leaders.”<sup>30</sup> Much earlier, but in a similar vein, van Wolferen, the key proponent of Japanese politics as a highly fragmented polity, argued that “[p]olitical leaders who hanker after genuine leadership will always face an elusive yet impenetrable wall of mistrust and unceasing sabotage. No one in Japan is given the unambiguous right to rule. No one person or group of people is ever really accountable for what Japan does. Japanese leadership is thus always incomplete.”<sup>31</sup>

However, even if actor indispensability is considered to be low in Japanese politics, with political leadership viewed merely as an outcome of the political environment, this environment has not remained static. Tokuyama Jirō, writing during the prime ministership of Kaifu Toshiki, has argued that the decisive political leadership of the Meiji era gave way to the consensus-oriented leadership norms of a bureaucratic nation in the early twentieth century.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, in the two decades prior to the case studies examined in this book, several major structural changes took place, including the transformed political economy after the first oil shock in the 1970s and the political consensus that emerged after the security treaty crisis of 1960.

Nor has Japanese politics ceased evolving over the thirty years since the time of the case studies. Much attention has been paid, for example, to how changes in the relationship between the media, elections, and the

prime minister have contributed to the increasing “presidentialization” of the prime ministership. The rising importance of television news and also the print media to the conduct of elections has placed prime ministers, and the “image” they project, at the center of election campaigning and party popularity more generally.<sup>33</sup> Then there have been structural changes, including the administrative reforms of the late 1990s, which have helped consolidate political power within the *kantei* (the prime minister’s office). Some see these institutional reforms as allowing Prime Minister Koizumi Jun’ichirō to adopt a top-down leadership style on issues such as terrorism and Iraq in the early 2000s. The political upheavals since the LDP election defeat in 2009, and the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and nuclear disaster are likely to further transform Japan’s political environment.<sup>34</sup>

### Characterizing Japan’s Leaders

These discussions reveal that political scientists who see leadership as determined largely by environmental factors unsurprisingly view Japanese leadership as weak or, most often, as nonexistent. Leadership is either carried out informally, as in the practices of the *kagemusha*, or without real power or legitimacy. Reflecting these scholarly perceptions, early studies characterizing Japanese political leaders adopted a similar generalizing approach.

One of the most influential works on Japanese political leadership remains Hayao’s 1993 monograph on the Japanese prime minister and public policy. In the first major English-language attempt to define Japanese prime ministers, Hayao characterizes Japanese leadership as reactive, arguing that this is not necessarily detrimental. Japan, he suggests, cannot point to many instances of “strong, assertive leadership.” Compared to leaders from other countries, the archetypal Japanese prime minister is “a remarkably weak and passive figure.”<sup>35</sup> Hayao identifies three types of Japanese prime minister: the *technocratic*, *political*, and *reactive* types. The first is bureaucratic and thus strong on policy areas where the bureaucracy is an important actor. The second is the agenda-setting leader: adept at pushing ideological issues and pursuing major initiatives. Hayao argues that in the years prior to the mid-1990s, the first two types—which resemble transactional (contingent reinforcement) and transformational (intellectual) leadership styles—were largely absent and, therefore, the prime minister has “tended to be reactive.” Reactive leadership, thus defined, could be management-by-exception or laissez-faire leadership.

Yet Hayao's reactive typology is not necessarily definitive. Hayao himself argues that "prime ministers have often played a central part in bringing about change in policy"<sup>36</sup> and stresses the limitations to his study. He focuses only on the prime minister and public policy and not on other important areas such as party politics, elections, or Japan's international image. Additionally, he does not examine the "unique circumstances"<sup>37</sup> of particular prime ministers—for example, through a comparison of political personalities and their indispensability or otherwise to understanding particular political outcomes (as discussed in chapter 1).

How might this weak and reactive leadership in Japan be explained? In writing about "Japan's political leadership deficit," and referring to Tokuyama's work, George Mulgan argues that "Japan is a leaderless nation incapable of decisive action," citing the 1997–98 economic crisis as an example. "It was painfully clear," she argues, "that no one was in charge who could act swiftly and with sufficient command to rescue Japan's beleaguered economy from the slide that threatened to drag the global economy down with it." Likewise in diplomacy, "[s]ystemic leadership failure" makes Japan "unreliable" as an alliance partner. It is often "slow to act" as well as "prone to prevarication and stalling." The prime example George Mulgan cites is Kaifu's "dithering and dawdling during the Gulf War of 1991."<sup>38</sup>

The decisive factors, once again, are environmental constraints. Japan's leaders are viewed as "structurally limited," especially in comparison to leaders in other democracies, particularly Westminster-style versions. This makes it impossible for Japanese prime ministers to be transformational in the same way as Western leaders. Paralleling the assessment of Japanese and French leadership mentioned earlier, the implication is that the leadership environment prevents the emergence of leaders who rely on idealized influence, inspirational motivation, or transformational intellectual stimulation.<sup>39</sup>

Similar assumptions underpin George Mulgan's strong and weak transformational leadership typology (as discussed in chapter 1). These two types of leadership can be divided in terms of the scope of change effected by a leader: strong transformational leaders demonstrate both visionary leadership and the capacity to bring it about, whereas weak transformational leaders possess the first quality but are incapable of bringing about transformational change. Transactional style leaders, the argument goes, remain transactional regardless of the change they bring about. This approach is different to the typology developed here, where leadership visions and styles are treated separately from leadership

outcomes. In terms of Japanese leaders, under this typology, Nakasone, Hashimoto Ryūtarō, and Koizumi would be classified as weak transformational leaders. Koizumi fits into this category, for instance, because he failed to achieve large parts of his reform program and, most importantly, failed to break the link between the LDP and the bureaucracy, although his impact on expectations of Japanese leadership styles is arguably still being felt.<sup>40</sup> Such questions highlight the problem of making assessments regarding the extent of leadership change, and reaching conclusions about leadership types that confuse style and outcome.

Shinoda, by comparison, seeks to counter the pessimistic tone of Hayao's work by seeking out examples where prime ministers have not only been constrained by their political environment, but have also exploited that environment. Shinoda argues that there have been both successful and unsuccessful Japanese prime ministers, and that prime ministers play a critical role in the process of policymaking, notably by making use of various "sources of power" to "exercise leadership."<sup>41</sup> These sources of power can be divided into institutional and informal types (as discussed earlier). According to this argument, when these sources of prime ministerial power are combined, different types of leadership emerge.<sup>42</sup> These are the *political insider*, the *grandstander*, the *kamikaze fighter*, and the *peace lover*. They combine elements of leadership style, outcome, and ambition, as well as assessments of power, values, legitimacy, and authority.

Yet there is a lack of clear criteria by which the combinations can be assessed. Political insiders possess considerable internal influence with and strong support from their own political party. They also enjoy close ties with the bureaucracy as well as opposition parties. Their style, by implication, is transactional (contingent reinforcement), although they could also employ a transformational style based on individualized consideration. By contrast, grandstanders would be leaders who cultivate external support and so derive their influence from the public and the media, using these resources to push through their chosen policies. They would be more likely to be transformational leaders, although the likely outcomes of their leadership remain contingent on numerous other factors. Kamikaze fighters would use public support to make politically unpopular policy decisions and, it might be assumed, would be concerned with maximum change across a wide scope. Peace lovers, on the other hand, would be unwilling to risk unpopularity or party disharmony in the pursuit of policies (i.e., they are *laissez-faire* or non-leaders).<sup>43</sup>

It is important, however, to distinguish these latter approaches (even if they are pessimistic about Japanese leadership) from those approaches

that are predominantly structural. The latter approaches allow for the possibility that individual actors can influence events. George Mulgan, for instance, points to the impact that *laissez-faire* leaders can have, albeit negative, providing the Gulf War crisis of 1991 as an example of non-leadership and its consequences.<sup>44</sup>

That Koizumi's leadership, often described as "historic," promoted the shift in thinking about leadership should not be surprising. Take-naka Harukata argues that, "[o]f the postwar prime ministers, Koizumi Jun'ichirō is certainly the most powerful prime minister."<sup>45</sup> Similarly, George Mulgan, even while characterizing him as a weak transformational leader, argues that he was "like no other leader in Japan's postwar history."<sup>46</sup> Koizumi's arrival prompted studies on reform leadership in Japan and also comparisons of Japanese leadership with other international examples. Accordingly, post-Koizumi approaches—based on the premise that "leadership matters"—have sought to challenge the conventional wisdom that Japanese political leadership is not important.

In her study of reform leadership in Japan, Alisa Gaunder argues that an "exploration of when and why reform was implemented throughout the postwar period in Japan . . . demonstrates that quite the opposite is the case." In terms of reform at least, leaders have performed a "critical role" in reshaping political preferences and narrow self-interest and in shifting support away from the status quo towards reform policies.<sup>47</sup> Gaunder identifies leaders such as Miki Takeo and Ozawa Ichirō as clear examples. Their pursuit of reform, she argues, was also facilitated by "risk-taking, vision, and commitment." Miki moved quickly and made use of the media in the face of LDP opposition, while Ozawa left the party entirely in his pursuit of reform.<sup>48</sup>

### Examples of Japanese Leadership

The idea that Koizumi was less an outlier than is commonly assumed suggests that earlier studies have overlooked or over-simplified aspects of Japan's leadership. Because there have been plentiful prime ministers in Japanese politics since the Second World War, there are no shortages of examples by which to test such propositions (see table 3). From the end of the Second World War until early 2014, thirty-three prime ministers (including two prime ministers who held office more than once over separate periods) have led the country. By comparison, Australia, also a parliamentary democracy, had fourteen prime ministers over the same

Table 3. Selected Japanese Leadership Strategies and Outcomes

<i>Prime Minister</i>	<i>Period in Office</i>	<i>Leadership Style</i>	<i>Leadership Vision</i>	<i>Leadership Outcome</i>	<i>Outcome Indispensability</i>
Yoshida Shigeru	1946–1947, 1948–1954	Transactional: contingent reinforcement	Paternalistic	Revolutionary	High
Kishi Nobusuke	1957–1960	Transformational: intellectual/ idealistic	Revolutionary	Redefinitional	Low
Satō Eisaku	1964–1972	Transactional: contingent reinforcement	Conservational	Reassuring	Low
Tanaka Kakuei	1972–1974	Transformational: idealized influence, individualized consideration	Repositional	Redefinitional	Low
Fukuda Takeo	1976–1978	Transactional: intellectual/ rational	Innovative	Redefinitional	Low
Koizumi Jun'ichirō	2001–2006	Transformational: idealised influence, intellectual	Revolutionary	Reformist	High
Hatoyama Yukio	2009–2010	Transformational: intellectual	Revolutionary	Redefinitional	Low
Abe Shinzō	2006–2007, 2012–	Transactional: management- by-exception Transformational?	Reformist	Repositional	High

period (including one prime minister who held office more than once over separate periods and one who acted as interim leader after the death of the previous leader). Some of Japan's prime ministers remained in office for a number of years, but others were less lucky (or talented) and only held office briefly. From the 1950s until the 1970s, the average was four prime ministers per decade, with this figure rising to more than six per decade since the 1980s. By early 2014, the country had had seven prime ministers since 2006 (with Abe Shinzō holding office twice).

### *Cold War Leadership*

Two key figures of the early postwar period were Yoshida Shigeru and Kishi Nobusuke. Yoshida became the dominant personality of Japan's early Cold War political environment. His first stint as prime minister was brief and took place during the Occupation; however, it was during his second stint as prime minister—between 1948 and 1954—that Yoshida came to have a major influence, in particular by establishing the strategic guidelines, often referred to as the Yoshida Doctrine, that would shape Japan's foreign policies for the remainder of the Cold War. Under this doctrine, Japan would develop its economy, eschew remilitarization, and rely on the United States for security.<sup>49</sup>

Pragmatic and conservative, Yoshida is viewed less as a charismatic leader than a master tactician. Yet he has been described as “one of the most important figures in modern Japanese history.”<sup>50</sup> Few Japanese political figures, suggests Fukushima Shingo, have been “so fiercely praised and censured.”<sup>51</sup> Yoshida was the first, if not the archetypal, bureaucrat-turned-politician: deeply conservative, ambivalent about the democratization of power, and prone to an autocratic style. Richard Samuels describes him as one of those “austere, quietly conniving bureaucrats.”<sup>52</sup> Yoshida's conservative and traditional outlook suggests he did not aspire to change Japan fundamentally, but sought to bring about moderate change across a broad policy area—a type of paternalist leadership. In terms of leadership outcomes, however, Yoshida in fact achieved maximum change across the widest possible scope—his leadership was revolutionary.

If Yoshida has been the most influential of postwar leaders, Kishi has been the most intriguing—and to many also the most controversial. As a pre-war politician, Kishi was a strong statist and viewed democracy as having little use.<sup>53</sup> A strong-willed politician, Kishi regularly demonstrated scant regard for democratic processes or public opinion. He confronted unionism, attempted to revise the Constitution so that Japan could have



a military role and, in 1958, attempted to strengthen police powers. As Samuels suggests, he “was surely the equal of any realist politician in history. There was no stratagem too cynical, no ally too close to betray, in his pursuit of power.”<sup>54</sup> Yet Kishi’s style of transformational leadership meant that, while he was decisive, he was also divisive. To the wider public, his leadership style confirmed suspicions that he retained strong tendencies towards fascism and a preference for dictatorial rule. That his vision for postwar Japan was largely overtaken by Yoshida’s highlights how the outcome of his leadership was redefinitional rather than revolutionary.

Indeed, it is hard to underestimate Yoshida’s influence on subsequent generations of Japanese political leaders, at least until the end of the Cold War. From Kishi’s resignation in 1960 until 1974, all the country’s prime ministers came from the LDP factions most closely associated with Yoshida. As late as the 1990s, the factional descendants of Yoshida still played a dominant role within the party. Yet, even amongst these close-knit groups, a quite diverse range of leadership styles can be found.

Two leaders that illustrate this point are Satō Eisaku and Tanaka. Along with Ikeda Hayato, who was prime minister from 1960 until 1964, Satō was one of Yoshida’s leading protégés during the 1950s. Satō had been a senior bureaucrat before entering politics in 1949, rising through the party while serving in a number of important positions. Satō’s long stint as prime minister stemmed from his ability, like Yoshida and Ikeda, to circumvent the activities of other factions within the LDP. He used his connections throughout government to advance his political and policy objectives, benefiting along the way from the lack of serious, experienced rivals. Nonetheless, Satō also introduced important domestic and foreign policies, including the Reversion of Okinawa in 1972. He was later awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in establishing Japan’s so-called three non-nuclear principles.<sup>55</sup> Satō’s taciturn and low-key transactional style followed Yoshida’s bureaucratic approach to politics and was in keeping with his conservational leadership vision. Similarly, the outcome of his leadership can be best described as reassuring.

Tanaka’s leadership was very different. Not an ex-bureaucrat like Ikeda and Satō, Tanaka was born in poor circumstances, entered the construction industry at an early age, and eventually established his own business. Tanaka gradually rose through the LDP and was an immensely popular figure when he finally became prime minister in 1972. Although quickly able to reorient Japanese foreign policy after the United States announced its normalization of relations with the People’s Republic of China, Tanaka was less successful with his expansionary industrial and

economic policies. In 1974, he was forced to resign as prime minister after details of suspected corruption became public.<sup>56</sup> However, Tanaka's power did not end with his dismissal. Despite ongoing legal problems surrounding the Lockheed bribery scandal, he continued to run his own faction, which came to dominate the LDP and thereby shaped the fortunes of successive prime ministers during the 1980s, including all three leaders examined in this volume's case studies.

Tanaka had a "sly fox" [*umisen yamasen*] political party image" that allowed him to appeal to the wider public as an "everyman"; in the media he was known as the "computerized bulldozer."<sup>57</sup> Yet his authority was based not only on his own charisma but also on his transactional ability to work the system. According to Curtis, he was "the last of an old school of political bosses" whose influence depended on their ability to allocate patronage.<sup>58</sup> Tanaka thus demonstrated a complex form of leadership: strongly transformational in style, but with key transactional elements; a repositional leadership vision less ambitious than this style would suggest; and, ultimately, a modest set of leadership outcomes involving moderate change in a few key areas (i.e., redefinitional).

### *Leadership since 2000*

Japan's most famous leader in the twenty-first century, Koizumi, clearly shared a number of traits with these and other leaders, even as he was a distinctive figure in his own right. Having followed his father (and grandfather) into politics, Koizumi offered the LDP a tantalizing charismatic style of leadership in the wake of the unpopular Mori Yoshirō (2000–01). Koizumi was noted for his "political individualism" and "his unashamed willingness to stand out from the crowd."<sup>59</sup> Uchiyama Yū describes him as the "prime minister of pathos" for his emotional rather than reason-based leadership style.<sup>60</sup> He was feted by the public, not only as a reformer, but also as something "different."

As a senior factional player within the LDP, Koizumi's reform credentials could be questioned; however, his leadership style was predominantly transformational, combining idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual leadership. Not unlike Nakasone, Koizumi was prone to making bold pronouncements: there would be structural reform with no sacred cows (*seiiki naki kōzō kaikaku*) or there would be "no growth without reform" (*kōzō kaikaku nakushite seichō nashi*). His "plans for reform," he said, "would be tantamount to the destruction of the Liberal Democratic Party."<sup>61</sup> Although his reforms were stymied at times, Koizumi had a

substantial impact on perceptions of reform leadership in Japan and did much to reshape Japan's security institutions. His major reform project, and the most dramatic point in his prime ministership, centered on privatizing the postal service against the wishes of many in the LDP.<sup>62</sup> A revolutionary in terms of leadership vision, Koizumi was a reformist leader in terms of outcomes.

In contrast to Koizumi, Abe, grandson of Kishi and political "blue blood," initially struggled to achieve a coherent leadership strategy. Like Koizumi, he had roots in the LDP's traditional factional system and hailed from the same conservative faction, which had been established by his grandfather and led by his father, Abe Shintarō. Before becoming prime minister, Abe Shinzō had projected a young, strong leadership, albeit one that was considered strongly ideological.<sup>63</sup> He was known as a security hawk and constitutional revisionist. On domestic issues, Abe pushed for educational reform and what he described as a "recovery of independence" for Japan (*dokuritsu no kaifuku*).<sup>64</sup> Yet while he enjoyed exceptionally high poll ratings upon assuming office, Abe soon appeared out of touch with public expectations and was unable to prevent the economy from stalling. Eventually, he resigned in 2007 after the LDP fared especially poorly in that year's upper-house elections.<sup>65</sup>

At that point in Abe's career, his leadership might have been assessed as transactional (management-by-exception) with a reformist vision. In terms of the scope and degree of change he achieved, these would have been repositioning at most. However, like Yoshida in the late 1940s, Abe achieved what few politicians manage: a second chance at leadership. Five years after resigning, Abe regained the LDP presidency and then, three months later, led the party to victory in the December 2012 lower-house election. In his second term as prime minister, Abe has pursued a leadership strategy more transformational in style and revolutionary in vision. Constitutional revision has remained a priority, but Abe has sought to achieve major economic reform as well, something he avoided in his first term. In this respect, "Abenomics"—a combination of loose monetary and fiscal policy, along with structural reform—forms the centerpiece of Abe's leadership strategy to revitalize Japan, with its success most likely determining how the outcomes of Abe's leadership will be viewed in the future.<sup>66</sup>

In view of these diverse examples from the 1950s until today, how might Japanese leadership be assessed? For his study of Japanese and Italian political leadership, Samuels makes two significant points on the history of Japanese leaders. First, on the question of leadership roles in Japan, Samuels uses the evocative terms *spiders* and *webs* to describe the

structure–agency relationship. Webs may constrain the spiders, but spiders have ways and means to stretch the webs to accommodate their plans, and therefore “leadership intervenes between structure and outcome.” Second, in addressing the question of leadership types, he asks whether there is a “Japanese” or “Italian” way of leading or, in other words, whether there are “practices, norms, and institutions” that supposedly prevent “effective” leaders assuming office in these countries. While acknowledging that to suggest there is no such thing as a “Japanese way” of leadership is false, he makes a strong case in highlighting the many, diverse “protagonists” who have operated in Japanese political history. “Caricatures of national leadership style that focus on only one or the other,” he argues, “are like most stereotypes, engaging but misleading.”<sup>67</sup>

### Japan’s Domestic Politics, Leaders, and Diplomacy

Japan’s domestic political structures have played an important role in shaping the approaches taken by Japanese leaders to summit diplomacy. Institutionally, the influence of domestic actors and the demands of the ratification process, formal or informal, suggest that the factions and the bureaucracy have provided constraints on prime ministerial diplomacy. Yet it is the bureaucracy which has the most immediate role. In 1999, Bert Edström examined prime ministerial foreign policy doctrines in Japan and argued that, even where prime ministers establish new policy directions in their speeches, it is well known that their diplomacy has been “orchestrated by the anonymous bureaucracy.”<sup>68</sup> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), more than internal LDP or Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) groupings, even the *zoku*, has had a significant role in shaping Japan’s Group of Seven/Eight (G7/8) conduct. A central role has been played by the personal assistant to the prime minister, the sherpa, who in Japan has been the deputy minister for foreign affairs (*gaimu shingikan*). The sherpa has in turn been assisted by sous-sherpas, one from MOFA and one from the Ministry of Finance (MOF).<sup>69</sup>

Although they are often grouped together, the ministries do not constitute a single political actor. Other agencies also exert influence, particularly MOF and the trade and agricultural ministries. As a result, summits have provided an additional venue for the ministries to engage in bureaucratic battles over policy and influence. MOFA has largely been concerned with Japan’s overall diplomacy and its relationship with the United States. MOF has been more focused on expenditure commitments

likely to emerge from the summits, while other ministries, such as agriculture, have been more interested in specific area issues, such as trade protectionism. Whilst prime ministers have often followed the advice of the bureaucrats, on occasion they have battled against bureaucratic views. Prime Minister Hashimoto fought with the bureaucrats over Japan's support for China's membership of the World Trade Organization, while Fukuda Takeo overruled MOF to commit Japan to the "locomotive theory" of economic stimulus at Bonn in 1978.<sup>70</sup>

Given the G7's central place in Japan's diplomacy, the summits might be expected to have some resonance at the domestic level. Certainly, the summits have received wide press coverage, but this has generally been brief and quickly forgotten. The exceptions have been the times when Japan hosted the summit or when some crisis or drama emerged. Japan's leaders have undoubtedly behaved as if the prestige that comes with attending summits was a reward worth pursuing—they have sometimes given the appearance of staying in office just long enough to attend or host a summit. Yet it is unclear whether such prestige has produced tangible political benefits. While the connection between summit success and approval ratings would seem "to be intuitive," mere attendance is not sufficient. Indeed, the results of approval and disapproval ratings for leaders before and after the summits are mixed.<sup>71</sup> Instead, the prestige gained at summits seems to have been most useful to already high-profile leaders, and even this effect has arguably declined as the summitry process has become a normalized part of the diplomatic agenda.

The original aim of the G7 summits as a "fireside chat" placed great emphasis on diplomatic skills, and meant that being on a first name basis with one's negotiating partners was quickly established as a key ingredient in successful summit diplomacy. However, Japan's leaders are viewed as often being at the periphery of summit debates.<sup>72</sup> Political culture has arguably played some role in this feature of Japan's diplomacy, the perception being that Japan's prime ministers have internalized the consensus-seeking of Japanese politics into their leadership style and then attempted to adapt this to their diplomacy. In capturing this view, Hugo Dobson describes prime ministerial conduct on the global stage as being summarized as "the three Ss—smiling, sleeping and silent." Owing to their low-key profile, Japan's prime ministers have been said to have been trapped in international diplomacy's "silent corner." When Japan's leaders have taken the opportunity to talk, they have at times relied on scripted statements, with one result being that other leaders have during these instances "turned sideways and chatted to the leader sitting next to them."<sup>73</sup>

Indeed, a number of prime ministers have found the more spontaneous and informal summitry atmosphere difficult to contend with.<sup>74</sup> Early summit leaders, Miki, Fukuda, and Ōhira, all expressed bewilderment at the nature of the summits and disappointment at their feeling of being left out of discussions. Furthermore, within Japanese delegations, bureaucrats have often played a significant role, such as with providing keynote speeches. Reflecting the argument that their policy speeches are often developed by others, a major criticism of Japan's interpersonal diplomacy has been that few Japanese leaders have been able to "speak 'in their own words' on the various problems of the world."<sup>75</sup>

Doubts over the inherent leadership skills of some prime ministers have also been raised. Japan's Gulf War crisis of 1991, and its effect on Japanese alliance management, was discussed earlier as an example of poor political leadership.<sup>76</sup> A more recent example in the G7/8 context is that of Mori at the Okinawa summit in 2000. Mori's leadership was memorable mainly for his public gaffes and poor poll ratings. In the lead up to, and during, the summit he made a number of blunders, including not being aware of one of the major themes of the summit (the information technology revolution). Mori's lack of gravitas made taking Japan seriously as a host all the more difficult. However, another leader to be criticized for his summitry was Hashimoto, albeit for the opposite reasons. Hashimoto, who had a more confrontational political style honed in trade disputes with the US, was said to struggle with the give-and-take bargaining process of the G7.<sup>77</sup>

Yet the "silent" stereotype, when placed alongside the G7/8 record of Japanese prime ministers, is misleading. Nakasone, Takeshita, Kaifu, Miyazawa Kiichi, and Hosokawa Morihiro have all been viewed as successful summiteers.<sup>78</sup> Nakasone is thought to stand out as a leader who demonstrated "a sense of presence" at the G7. His ability to develop a personal relationship with U.S. President Ronald Reagan and other leaders meant the summits of the mid- to late 1980s revolved around the neo-conservative agenda of Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, and Nakasone. Indeed, Nakasone's achievements support Glenn Hook's argument that the "central role of the prime minister can lead to activism or reactivity depending on the ability of the politician in question."<sup>79</sup>

Koizumi is the most recent prime minister to display a conspicuous leadership style at the G7/8. Koizumi attended six summits, from the Genoa summit of 2001 to the St Petersburg summit of 2006, and was described as "a livelier summit participant than most Japanese leaders."<sup>80</sup> In a way reminiscent of the famous Reagan-Nakasone relationship—the

“Ron–Yasu” friendship—the foundation of Koizumi’s summitry was his close relationship with U.S. President George W. Bush. At the 2004 Sea Island summit in the United States, Koizumi “unilaterally” promised Bush that Japan would continue to deploy Japan’s Self Defense Forces to Iraq after the transfer of sovereignty to the Iraqi government at the end of June 2004. By the time he attended the St Petersburg summit, Koizumi had “become the face of Japan on the world stage.”<sup>81</sup>

### Japan’s International Relations and G7/8 Summitry

Japan’s participation at the summits now seems natural and obvious. Yet this was far from the case in the 1970s. Japan was only thirty years removed from its devastating loss in the Second World War and the accompanying economic and social distress. Whereas its economy had been negligible in global terms in the 1950s, however, by 1975 it constituted just over 6 percent of the world economy. Accordingly, Japan had to be included as a principal player in determining the global economic order.<sup>82</sup> These economic changes were also reflected in Japan’s domestic politics. Japan’s transition from “catch-up country” to *senshinkoku* (advanced nation) was reshaping the key ideas that had previously underpinned domestic political discourse. As Pyle argues, Japan was increasingly “a pioneer seeking to chart the future course of economic, technological, and social organization.”<sup>83</sup>

Just as the 1970s was the time of Japan’s arrival as an advanced nation, however, it was also a period of increasing global turmoil. Japan’s international politics were shaped by concerns such as oil security fears and trade relations. By the 1980s, as Cold War tensions began to reemerge after the *détente* of the 1970s, the question of alliance solidarity and missile deployments also came to dominate the diplomatic agenda. The first two of these considerations stemmed largely from Japan’s role as a major trading nation in the global economy. As a resource-poor country dependent on importing oil for its economic development, Japan was vulnerable to the oil shocks of the 1970s.<sup>84</sup> Increased oil prices contributed to inflation and slowed economic growth. They also contributed to rapidly increasing budget deficits, which were to become a major sore in Japanese politics in subsequent decades.<sup>85</sup>

As an increasingly large player in international trade around this period, Japan’s trade policies began to affect the economies of other developed nations more noticeably. The United States in particular started to

view Japan as a “major competitor,” and Japan found itself increasingly in conflict with its alliance partner on trade issues.<sup>86</sup> Bilateral relations deteriorated due to disagreements over such issues as textile, automotive, and agricultural trade. Japan’s trade surplus with the United States ballooned, and the U.S. began to invoke the possibility of sanctions.<sup>87</sup> In the 1980s, although the Reagan administration was ideologically unsupportive of government interference in markets, including international trade, the seemingly juggernaut status of the Japanese economy created strong anti-Japanese feelings and contributed to rising tensions over such issues as semiconductors, construction, and agriculture.

Japan’s major security interests were also changing as the international environment became more fluid during the 1970s. The Richard Nixon shocks and America’s normalization of relations with China had already shifted Japan’s regional strategic position. By the early 1980s, increased Soviet activity in East Asia, disputes over missile deployments in Europe, and the arrival of the Reagan administration in the United States seemed likely to further challenge Japan’s capacity to maintain its mercantilist foreign policy. Elsewhere in the world, events such as the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, the 1979 Iranian revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, as well as the issue of oil, made international affairs more volatile.

The G7 was both a challenge and an opportunity for Japan. As painful as the summits could be in terms of process, they nonetheless came to play a central role in Japan’s foreign policies. G7 summitry was consistent with Japan’s broader diplomatic approach. Moreover, it represented a modern example of Japan adapting to the established international order or, as Pyle explains, of taking “their cues from the framework that surrounds them.”<sup>88</sup> During the 1970s, Japanese decision makers, seeing that the country’s interests were closely aligned with the international trading system, found it natural to promote and protect such a system through institutions like the G7. The summits also fulfilled Japan’s great concern with “status and prestige” and, in particular, its modern goal of being “recognized as a first-rank country (*ittō-koku*).”<sup>89</sup> Finally, the summits fitted into Japan’s postwar emphasis on the Yoshida Doctrine’s objectives of developing its economic power and eschewing remilitarization. The consequent dependence on international institutions made the G7 an obvious avenue for Japan to pursue its economic interests.

Japan’s decision to join the G7 was not only for economic reasons. More immediate considerations also played a role. The oil crises had in fact given the G7 its *raison d’être*—to pull the global economy out of



recession first through the “locomotive theory” and then through the “convoy theory” of economic cooperation.<sup>90</sup> Poor growth and inflation gave the Japanese government ample cause to attempt macroeconomic cooperation with the other major economies.<sup>91</sup> For the first two prime ministers to attend the summits, Miki and Fukuda, the meetings were a key part of their international economic platforms.

Joining the G7 also satisfied Japan’s postwar appetite for multilateral diplomacy. Michael Green notes that the “multilateral impulse has been strong in Japan’s postwar foreign policy thinking, but in practice it has often been elusive.”<sup>92</sup> Multilateralism was attractive to Japanese policymakers for a number of reasons, including the opportunities it provided for autonomous policymaking, its potential in constraining China diplomatically, and the possibility it might insulate Japanese domestic interests.<sup>93</sup> Because implementing such foreign policy thinking proved difficult, the G7 became all the more significant. Indeed, along with the United Nations, the G7 was for a long time Japan’s chief forum for multilateralism. It was not until the late 1980s that Japan utilized other forums in a similar way. Groupings such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum, the Six-Party Talks over North Korea, the East Asia Summit, and Japan’s own East Asian Community idea would become prominent parts of Japan’s foreign policy. In the late 1970s, however, the G7 stood alone as Japan’s best multilateral option.<sup>94</sup>

Japan’s participation in the G7 also supported its role in East Asia. The summits allowed the country to assume a (self-appointed) role as the sole Asian representative (*ajia no daihyō*) and sole non-European or North American representative in the major global financial debates.<sup>95</sup> This was the case with the first summit in 1975 when Miki emphasized Japan’s regional role, and it was also the reason for the consistent pre-summit diplomacy Japan conducted throughout the region. Representing Asia was not only a way of advancing the region’s interests or of improving Japan’s relations in the region, particularly relations with ASEAN members. It also followed the country’s logic for multilateralism—to constrain but also to engage China. As Asia’s “representative,” Japan was able to burnish its regional leadership credentials and present itself as an alternative source of regional power while drawing China more deeply into the regional diplomatic framework. The summits also expanded Japan’s options for dealing with the United States, and were a useful forum for deciding on common policies regarding various problems, including relations with North Korea or Russia.<sup>96</sup>

Still, being the sole Asian power at the G7 created challenges. Whereas other nations, except perhaps for Russia, were common members of various regional or global bodies or alliances, Japan often found itself without natural allies. With its main non-summit link being with the United States, Japan often prepared for summits in order “to avoid becoming a ‘scapegoat.’”<sup>97</sup> Trade friction constitutes a good example of Japan’s comparative isolation at the summits. In the early years of the G7, the European and American delegations regularly expressed their displeasure over Japanese trade practices, often putting Japanese delegations on the defensive. From the perspective of Japanese journalists, the major “theme” of Japan’s participation at the summits was inevitably “to avoid the ‘Japan attacks’ by the other participating countries.”<sup>98</sup> On the other hand, while the increasingly important Group of Twenty (G20) held out the opportunity for Japan to build better coalitions within the diplomacy of global finance, it also reduced Japan’s relative diplomatic status and cancelled its ability to represent the Asian view. Other Asian powers, notably China, India, and Indonesia were increasingly able to speak for themselves.<sup>99</sup>

## Conclusion

The chief aim of this chapter has been to establish an overview of the Japanese leadership environment, albeit with an emphasis on the 1970s and 1980s. Three broad areas received particular attention: (1) the “ways” of Japan’s political environments; (2) characterizations of Japan’s leaders; and (3) the specific domestic and international environments in which Japan’s leaders have operated.

The different approaches to understanding the “ways” of Japanese politics—that is, the interaction of actors and their environment—provide a complex picture of the constraints on Japan’s leaders. This is especially the case when considering how power is distributed within the Japanese political system. Although formal institutions are the most obvious means of distributing power in any political system, numerous normative practices and expectations also shape political behavior. Japan is no exception. Although there is some disagreement over which of these is most accurate, two broad interpretations can nonetheless be identified. One view has been that political power in Japan has been concentrated, either in the bureaucracy or the dominant policy party but not in the executive. Another viewpoint has been that political power in Japan has been fragmented, split between multiple actors. Whether power is viewed

as centralized or fragmented, however, leaders have often been seen as reactive and weak.

When it comes to characterizing Japanese leaders, the chapter has demonstrated how the study of Japan's prime ministers has evolved from one of broad generalizations to a more nuanced, if complicated, interpretation. When leaders are considered more closely, as in the leadership examples discussed earlier, it becomes possible to see that Japanese leaders do in fact have a range of environmental resources, or "sources of power," available to them. It also becomes possible to see that Japan's leaders have in many instances not fitted easily into the typologies established by earlier leadership theories. Leaders have in fact pursued a range of different styles and visions in postwar Japan.

Finally, at the international and summitry levels, Japan's leaders have largely operated within the accepted parameters of the postwar foreign policy approach. They have also gained a reputation for being the "silent" members of institutional forums such as the G7, owing to the lack of spontaneity in typical Japanese summitry. This may be attributable to environmental factors, to Japan's lack of close summit partners, or to language and cultural barriers. However, there are numerous indications that Japanese leaders have played key roles in shaping Japanese diplomacy and grand strategy at different times since the Second World War. Furthermore, upon closer examination, it is again possible to make out a diverse range of leaders acting as chief diplomats through the G7/8 process, thus undermining some of the stereotypes of Japan's leaders as chief diplomats.

## Leadership and Japan's Strategic Identity

This book is concerned with two central questions of Japanese political leadership and foreign affairs. First, it asks whether Japanese political leadership shapes the country's diplomacy and international affairs more generally. Second, it seeks to identify how and when Japanese leadership might have an influence on these different outcomes. The orthodoxy of Japanese political leadership, as explained in chapter 2, has long been that Japan's prime ministers are largely reactive figures and have little impact either on Japanese diplomacy or the world at large. On the other hand, research over the past decade has pointed to conceptual and empirical weaknesses in that approach. For instance, Alisa Gaunder's analysis of how prime ministers have played a vital role in pushing forward policy reform in Japan highlights the importance of prime ministers in realigning political preferences toward particular policy agendas.<sup>1</sup>

Koizumi Jun'ichirō's brand of leadership demonstrated how Japanese leaders could play a prominent role in foreign policy. Understanding where his leadership sits in comparison to the leadership of other Japanese prime ministers, both before and after, is particularly important to understanding the overall nature of Japanese political leadership and how it has evolved. The research presented here further highlights the need to better locate Japan's past leaders within their particular environments.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the examples of Japanese leadership described in chapter 2 highlight the diversity of leadership styles and visions that have emerged in Japan over the six decades since the end of the Second World War, confirming Richard Samuels's observation that "Japanese history is filled with protagonists."<sup>3</sup>

What then can be expected of Japanese leaders in terms of their impact on the country's diplomacy and wider international affairs? One way to evaluate Japanese leadership in the country's foreign affairs is to consider what understanding leadership adds to explanations of Japan's

long-term conduct in foreign affairs, that is, to examine leadership at the macro level of national strategic behavior and the strategic identity that underpins such behavior. A key area in this respect is the puzzle of Japan's strategic behavior since the end of the Second World War and why it has deviated at times from the expectations of international relations (IR) theory. Japan's apparent abdication of strategic and security ambitions, despite the continued pressures of international politics in the Asia-Pacific, raises some perplexing questions for structural IR theories. However, regular instances of normalization (increasing its military capabilities) have confounded domestic-focused, normative explanations as well. Japan's supposed anomaly raises the question of what else, beyond systemic pressures or norms, might be shaping its strategic identity and behavior, and thus provides a useful area to study leadership as a potentially important factor. In other words, what role have leaders played in shaping Japan's strategic identity—the values, preferences, and practices of foreign affairs—and in turn the country's strategic behavior?

### International Relations Theory and Japanese Diplomacy

IR theory's struggle to explain Japanese postwar strategic behavior has been most noticeable within structural or systemic theories of realism, perhaps best exemplified by the work of Kenneth Waltz. Although Waltz did not purport to explain individual state behavior, he nonetheless anticipated at the end of the Cold War that Japanese international behavior would conform to the pressures of the changing international system. These changes, he argued, pointed toward Japan establishing its security independence and becoming a great military power (e.g., through the acquisition of nuclear weapons).<sup>4</sup> Japan's rise as a great economic power and the changing structure of international politics would provide the country with a strong motivation to develop the material capability aspect of its power. The predominance of other powers in the region, the United States, the Soviet Union, and more recently China, would lend an additional rationale for Japan to engage in power balancing. As Waltz suggested, "dependencies and perceived vulnerabilities" would "lead Japan to acquire greater military capabilities, even though many Japanese may prefer not to."<sup>5</sup>

Despite its economic size, however, Japan has made only uneven attempts over the subsequent two decades to implement such a strategy. This is not to suggest that Waltz's observations are without foundation.

Japan remained a U.S. ally throughout the Cold War, helping the United States balance against the Soviet Union, and gradually developed its own military capabilities, albeit only for self-defense.<sup>6</sup> Since the end of the Cold War, Japan has slowly been developing its security capabilities. As Christopher Hughes explains, Japan has maintained a long-term “trajectory of remilitarisation.”<sup>7</sup> This trajectory preceded the arrival of Koizumi and has persisted after his departure from politics. It encompasses a range of areas, including procurement, a shift in the civil–military relationship, increasing foreign partnerships, as well as its own strategic realignment.

Systemic forces are therefore likely to have played some role in shaping Japan's foreign policies, even if Japan's balancing of the Soviet Union was threat-based rather than power-based. Expectations that Japan would balance against the greatest power in the region, the United States, however, have largely been unmet, except in a few isolated cases, such as the battle over defense procurements under the Nakasone Yasuhiro administration in the 1980s or the push to achieve a more equidistant status vis-à-vis the United States and China under the Hatoyama Yukio administration in 2009–10. In sum, systemic pressures on Japan have been intermittent and have not been fully explained by systemic IR theories.

### *Neoclassical Realism and Liberalism*

A number of other IR theories have set out clear responses to this puzzle. In contrast to the systemic power approaches, balance-of-threat and neo-classical realism approaches view Japan's foreign policy doctrine as the product of the interaction between unit-level factors, such as intentions and perceptions, with systemic pressures, such as the regional security dilemma. In effect, they drop the unitary actor assumption held by structural realists.<sup>8</sup>

A common focus amongst this scholarship is its emphasis on *strategic culture* or *identity* as a factor shaping Japan's foreign policies. Strategic culture refers to a set of values, preferences, perceptions, and practices that shape the country's strategic policymaking. Samuels sees Japan's strategic culture and national identity as power-focused, concerned with vulnerability (*fuan*), and characterized during the postwar period by regular domestic debates in between extended periods of consensus.<sup>9</sup> By comparison, Kenneth Pyle views Japan's strategic culture as having been shaped primarily by international forces and, as result, strongly realist and conservative.<sup>10</sup> Others, such as Andrew Oros and Bhupindar Singh, use the term *security identity* rather than strategic culture. Oros, for

example, refers to security identity as a “set of collectively held principles that have attracted broad political support regarding the appropriate role of state action in the security arena and are institutionalized into the policy-making process.”<sup>11</sup> Strategic culture is a non-material, normative concept, while security identity allows for identity to interact with and shape material factors. Given its focus only on the security arena, however, a security identity is arguably much narrower than a strategic culture or a strategic identity. The preferred term here is strategic identity.

From a neoclassical realist perspective, Japan’s strategic identity has clearly shifted since the end of the Cold War. Michael Green explains Japan’s foreign policy in terms of a growing realism in the face of a more fragile region. This change, he suggests, has taken place despite the presence of clear continuities, such as a continued primacy of economics and emphasis on the U.S. alliance.<sup>12</sup> Daniel Kliman points to four domestic and international factors that have been shaping Japan’s strategic policies: foreign threats, U.S. policy, leadership, and generational change. Rising foreign threats and the possibility of abandonment by the United States establish an international environment in which Japan is less secure and more subject to intra-alliance expectations. Stronger leadership, and the arrival in politics of a generation that did not experience the Second World War, give Japan the impetus to abandon past strategic policies.<sup>13</sup>

If international pressures are mediated by a strategic identity, other strategies for coping with the security dilemma in IR become possible. One such example is *reassurance*, which is offered to explain Japan’s lack of balancing during the Cold War. According to scholars such as Tsuyoshi Kawasaki or Paul Midford, the Japanese government has pursued a policy of minimizing the security dilemma in Northeast Asia by maintaining the alliance with the United States and restricting its own defense capabilities to a modest level. Japan’s approach is based on carrying out regular or continued conciliatory acts that involve security costs without reciprocity in order to reassure its neighbors of its intentions.<sup>14</sup> Another example is the idea of *buck-passing*, which is less concerned with the security dilemma and more with intra-alliance bargaining and abandonment. Japanese security policy, this argument goes, has been aimed at avoiding abandonment by the U.S.<sup>15</sup> Other realists highlight the economic dimensions of the country’s strategic identity. Eric Heginbotham and Samuels argue that while Japan has not ignored the military dimension of its foreign policy, it has instead organized its foreign policy goals around “technoeconomic” objectives.<sup>16</sup>

Viewing non-military, and especially economic, factors as important to Japan’s behavior is also a feature of liberalism. Various liberal expla-

nations suggest that Japan has followed a pacifist course owing to: the rising importance of trade and increasing costs of modern warfare; an unwillingness to go to war as a democratic nation, especially against other democracies; or a lack of the internal inequities within modern Japanese society that often push nations into external wars.<sup>17</sup> According to liberal arguments, even as Japan has become more sensitive to international military concerns brought about by instability in the Asia-Pacific, the country is nonetheless primarily concerned with establishing a more liberal international order. This was arguably the approach that underpinned the multilateral "Asianism" of the 2009–10 Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)-led administration of Hatoyama Yukio, by which Japan sought to find a strategy more equally balanced between the United States and China.<sup>18</sup>

On the other hand, liberal institutionalism, like mercantile realism, calls attention to the role of the U.S.–Japan alliance.<sup>19</sup> Whereas other brands of liberalism tend to focus mostly on the domestic dimensions of foreign policymaking at the expense of international factors, liberal institutionalism views the alliance as creating an environment more conducive to Japan's mercantilist strategic identity. This fits with Heginbotham's and Samuels's argument that the alliance has "provided the time" for Japan to establish its mercantilist identity. The alliance, according to this argument, has played a key role in developing shared norms and values that promote peace in the region.<sup>20</sup>

### *Constructivism*

A distinctive feature of neoclassical realism, according to Gideon Rose, is that its "adherents argue that the scope and ambition of a country's foreign policy is driven first and foremost by its place in the international system and specifically by its relative material power capabilities."<sup>21</sup> Yet, as the above discussion shows and Rose also argues, even as neoclassical realists accept a strong role for the international system, they regularly allocate important roles to a range of domestic factors—"systemic pressures must be translated through intervening variables at the unit level."<sup>22</sup> Pyle's characterization of Japan's strategic identity fits this description, focusing on the role of international factors but also examining the impact of the aspirations, values, and perceptions of the country's foreign policy actors. Samuels likewise addresses the question of where the balance between international and domestic factors lies by declaring simply that "nothing is derived directly from the structure of world order or from domestic political debate."<sup>23</sup>



Neoclassical realism's loosening of the structural approach has prompted some criticism from liberals and constructivists. Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravcsik criticize neoclassical realism for dropping traditional realist assumptions in a way that makes it indistinguishable from other non-realist theories, notably liberalism. This "theoretical degeneration" thus broadens the paradigm so far that it becomes consistent with any factor that might shape state behavior.<sup>24</sup> Constructivists meanwhile argue that realist analyses clearly require "auxiliary assumptions" to have any explanatory power and that these are invariably normative or ideational, such as prestige, interest, threats, or preferences. The problem is that these assumptions all "require liberal or constructivist styles of analysis."<sup>25</sup> Without understanding such factors, the argument goes, scholars cannot know whether Japan will balance against the United States or China or, instead, adopt an entirely different approach. As Peter Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara note, "realist theory points to omnipresent balancing behavior but tells us little about the direction of that balancing."<sup>26</sup>

In charging neoclassical realists with poaching, constructivists are essentially defending their own argument that domestic organizational and normative factors have had the greatest influence on Japan's postwar foreign policies. Writing in the 1990s, Katzenstein and Okawara argued that Japan's security policies have been shaped by the structure of the state, especially in terms of the incentives it provides for particular policies, as well as by the legal and social norms that "define policy interests and the standards of appropriateness for specific policy choices."<sup>27</sup> The state structure makes it impossible for the military to become more powerful, while the norms that dominate Japanese political life include an emphasis on economics and a widespread popular anti-militarism. On this latter issue, Thomas Berger similarly argued that a domestic "culture of antimilitarism," borne out of the devastation of the Second World War, constrained any large remilitarization through the Cold War. This culture included formal institutions but also encompassed informal factors, such as a wider societal conviction that remilitarization posed a threat to the country's democracy. The emerging three-way ideological divide between rightists, centrists, and progressives over the country's military role subsequently limited the capacity of political actors to change this status quo.<sup>28</sup>

These norms, the argument goes, have been slowly integrated into the institutions of foreign policymaking over the course of the Cold War. The Yoshida Doctrine, for example, under which Japan forswore military rebuilding to focus instead on economic development, was gradu-

ally integrated into all aspects of Japan's foreign policy during the course of the Cold War. Japan's foreign policies, thus viewed, can be expected to continue upon a similar path in the post-Cold War period, and any change should occur within this framework. Where there is a revision of Japan's international roles, this will be limited to forms acceptable to the pacifist norm, especially United Nations-related activities and other multilateral bodies.<sup>29</sup>

Despite its promise, the constructivist literature has left largely unexplored the question of how norms have evolved and shaped Japan's foreign and security policies. In particular, it has struggled to identify the causal processes through which norms shape policy in Japan. Akitoshi Miyashita asks: "where do norms come from?"<sup>30</sup> It is unlikely that they appear spontaneously and, as Miyashita notes, could well simply reflect underlying factors, such as material concerns and political battles. Miyashita might also have asked where norms go, or rather, what sustains particular norms or shapes their evolution. Constructivism has also failed to explain the revisions to Japanese security policy that appear to reflect international changes, something pointed out by both Yasuhiro Izumikawa and Jennifer Lind.<sup>31</sup> Changes to Japanese security policies from the mid-1970s are problematic in this regard. If these norms, which had been so influential in the 1960s, had lost their power during the 1970s, why had this happened? The changes to Japan's security strategies since the Cold War are even more problematic. Whereas constructivists expect that Japanese security policy "will continue to be shaped by the domestic rather than the international balance of power," these developments suggest otherwise.<sup>32</sup>

### *Analytical Eclecticism*

The idea of *analytical eclecticism* provides a potential way around some of these challenges. According to Katzenstein and Okawara, "[c]ompelling analyses of empirical puzzles can be built through combining realist, liberal, and constructivist modes of explanation."<sup>33</sup> As an analytical tool, therefore, analytical eclecticism allows scholars to refer to "empirical observations, causal logics, and interpretations" from these various modes of explanation.<sup>34</sup> Arguably, analytical eclecticism is no more than constructivists poaching from realism and liberalism and thus engaging in their own version of "theoretical degeneration." Despite this, as with neoclassical realism, specific applications of an eclectic approach from a constructivist perspective can produce interesting insights into Japan's foreign policy behavior.

An important development in this area involves Oros's attempt to link identity to policy.<sup>35</sup> Oros seeks to explain how Japanese security policy has changed since the Second World War despite the country's security identity remaining fairly consistent. At first glance, this suggests that policy change has not been the product of identity change. However, Oros argues that Japan's security identity has been important because it has acted as a framework which, although constituted by political actors, can shape subsequent actors' behavior due to widespread acceptance. The established identity thus introduces a level of friction into any policy change, with political actors who seek to revise policy often forced to compromise.

Significantly, Oros seeks to extend analytical eclecticism by examining not individual factors but configurations of different factors. The idea, he argues, is not to study individual factors or variables, such as the international level, domestic politics, or normative factors, but to clarify instead how different combinations of factors coalesce to deliver particular policy outcomes. A clear focus on "evolving relationships amongst actors, institutions, and identities" is vital to this task.<sup>36</sup> For example, Yukiko Miyagi argues that when "dominant national norms are at stake," this may constrain or empower different political actors.<sup>37</sup> Despite its normative aspects, therefore, the contention that Japan's security policies have changed despite great continuity in the country's security identity means that Oros's work is not that dissimilar to neoclassical realism and also resembles the interactionist approach of leadership studies (as discussed in chapter 1).

For such a strategic identity approach to be compelling, however, some important challenges need to be addressed. First, establishing how the different factors in such a configuration might be linked and what influence they might have on each other is no easy task. Samuels's observation that nothing comes directly from either world order or domestic politics, while correct, does not offer further insight into how these two realms might be configured. Furthermore, the international order, as noted earlier, can be weak in its effects on national behavior; anarchy can contribute to different kinds of responses, such as balancing, bandwagoning, or hedging, without these behaviors deviating from the survival response expected by structural realists.<sup>38</sup> A pattern that emerges in Oros's empirical analysis is that of the international level setting the "parameters for policy outcomes" but then domestic factors shaping "the resulting policy."<sup>39</sup>

Second, like Samuels, Oros examines periods of contestation and consensus over Japan's security identity. Accordingly, establishing how identity is developed and then defended or contested is a challenge for an approach that emphasizes ideas over actors. Samuels identifies several important periods of consensus that emerged after periods of contesta-

tion over strategic values such as autonomy and prestige. These include the nineteenth-century consensus over nation-building under the slogan of “rich nation, strong army” (*fukuko kyōhei*), the early twentieth-century consensus surrounding Japanese hegemony over Asia, and the Cold War consensus underpinning the Yoshida Doctrine. Samuels then suggests that Japan today is undergoing a new period of policy contestation, but is nonetheless moving towards a new “Goldilocks consensus.”<sup>40</sup>

Oros, on the other hand, focuses on the debates following the Second World War (1952–60) and the Cold War (1989 to the present). On the immediate postwar debate, his work raises some important questions about the direction Japan's security identity took during the 1950s, especially in terms of the nature of the compromise that eventually emerged at the end of the decade. What was the combination of factors that made compromise between such opposing conceptions of state identity possible? The nature of the Cold War could have allowed Japan to move further in both directions, while the compromise eventually reached under the Yoshida Doctrine appears too complex yet still coherent simply to have emerged from a political stalemate. Why, despite resisting U.S. pressure to play a greater international role, did Japan also agree to depend on the United States for its security rather than adopt a more clearly pacifist policy and become a proper peace state?<sup>41</sup>

In terms of the post-Cold War period, Oros again stresses numerous international events that have pushed Japan further toward a “normalization” of its foreign and security policies, that is, an unwinding of the Yoshida Doctrine. Yet some of these international shocks since 1990 have had only a limited impact on the country's security identity while others have apparently left a more lasting legacy. Why is this so? The clear trend since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States has been toward greater normalization, even though the international factors that have contributed most in recent years—the ongoing nuclear threat presented by North Korea and the rise of a more assertive and powerful China—predated September 11. In the 1990s, their effects were heavily constrained by the tenets of the Yoshida Doctrine; however, since September 11, these restrictions have gradually been undermined. Did September 11 play such an important role?<sup>42</sup>

### Reviewing the Role of Leadership

This research highlights the utility of reviewing combinations of factors—material or normative—that might play decisive roles in shaping Japan's

postwar foreign and security policies. Further work is needed, however, to fill in some of the gaps in how these combinations are understood. A more agent-oriented approach might address this weakness by elaborating on the roles played by the major participants in these debates, such as the “normal nation-alists” and “middle power internationalists” identified by Samuels. Valerie Hudson’s suggestion that, at the intersection of these factors, there are “human decision makers,” is especially worthy of further study.<sup>43</sup> The potential importance of human agents, therefore, raises questions of when, how, and why human decision makers are indispensable to the development of Japanese diplomacy. Indeed, the idea of *indispensability*, as discussed in chapter 1, should be helpful here in determining whether it is actions or actors that are indispensable to Japan’s strategic identity. Were political actors able to change this identity or were they constrained by it?

The capacity for leaders to shape both policy and identity is recognized in the current literature. Izumikawa refers to the role played by “normative agents” or “norm entrepreneurs” in shaping Japanese postwar diplomacy.<sup>44</sup> Norm entrepreneurs, explain Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, engage in “strategic social construction” or the reconfiguration of “contours of common knowledge” that define politics. Political actors as normative agents do not merely make policy but also seek to define the social parameters within which policy is made.<sup>45</sup> This idea echoes the idea of leaders setting political agendas and influencing preferences. In particular, controlling what issues are acceptable as parts of the political agenda is a form of strategic social construction. Indeed, Oros argues that a security identity is taken up not because of some element of the identity itself, but because it is “*useful* to those in power.”<sup>46</sup>

In the case of Japan, the agents identified by Izumikawa include a range of political actors, including pacifists, nativists, democrats, and realists, and are drawn from policymaking circles and academia, but mostly from politics. These categories are similar to the groups identified by other scholars seeking to explain the country’s strategic debates during this period, notably those used by Samuels. The contours of common knowledge which form Japan’s security identity, as identified by Oros, include the key tenets of anti-militarism, such as having armed forces exclusively for defense and not participating in overseas conflicts. Other forms of common knowledge were added to these over the Cold War, such as comprehensive security. Izumikawa also adds the fear of entrapment to this list.<sup>47</sup>

National leaders are especially useful examples of individual agents since they are uniquely placed, as a result of formal and informal fac-

tors, to influence both norms and policy. In addition to their important domestic political role, leaders in Japan clearly play a central role in foreign policy. As the national government's chief spokesperson, Japanese prime ministers' power to set political agendas is considerable. Their formal powers as head of government, although not defined precisely in the Constitution, are also substantial.<sup>48</sup> In foreign affairs, Japanese prime ministers are the country's ultimate decision maker. While the power to manage foreign affairs is given to the Cabinet under the Constitution (Article 73), the prime minister formally heads the Cabinet. Moreover, under the Cabinet Law, it is the prime minister who is responsible for reporting on "general national and foreign relations" to the Diet (Article 5).<sup>49</sup> Thus, while Japan has a foreign minister heading the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as Tomohito Shinoda explains, it also has the prime minister directing overall foreign policymaking. Indeed, Shinoda argues that, so long as their foreign policy objectives are not in conflict with domestic concerns, prime ministers are given "relative freedom in foreign affairs."<sup>50</sup>

Still, it is important not to overlook the constraints on Japan's prime ministers in foreign policymaking. The informal factors shaping the Japanese political environment, as explained in chapter 2, shape the conduct of foreign affairs as well as domestic politics. Bert Edström's observation that the diplomacy of numerous prime ministers has been "orchestrated by the anonymous bureaucracy" suggests that prime ministers can be heavily constrained in foreign affairs.<sup>51</sup> Indeed, the debates outlined above highlight the contested nature of Japan's strategic identity since the Second World War, suggesting that prime ministers have rarely enjoyed *carte blanche* in diplomacy. Yet Edström also notes how changes in leadership have regularly produced substantial shifts in Japan's foreign policy orientation, despite most leaders since Yoshida Shigeru, at least until the 1990s, working within the broad framework of the Yoshida Doctrine.<sup>52</sup>

To assess the impact of these critical actors, leadership indispensability can be examined across two broad areas of change: (1) in Japan's strategic identity; and (2) in Japan's strategic policy. For Japan, the formation and maintenance of the Yoshida Doctrine and the Goldilocks consensus identified by Samuels provide particularly useful tests of leadership indispensability, although arguably the Goldilocks consensus has not yet fully emerged. Since by definition they shape the social context of diplomacy, Japanese norm entrepreneurs should play a significant role in the consequent policymaking and thus have a high indispensability in the evolution of the country's strategic identity and policy. Conversely, cases where political actors are indispensable only in policymaking, or where

actions rather than actors appear more important, suggest that ideational or structural factors are playing a greater role in Japan's diplomacy.

## Leadership and Japan's Cold War Strategic Identity

### *Building the Yoshida Consensus*

During the 1950s, it was not clear how the contours of the new strategic environment would evolve; Japan's strategic identity had been entirely upended by the country's defeat in war and subsequent U.S. Occupation. This period was also characterized by competing norm entrepreneurs and aspiring leaders, principally Yoshida Shigeru. In foreign affairs, as with domestic politics, Yoshida's great skill was his ability to manipulate and exert control over political circumstances, adeptly balancing competing interests, making political exchanges, and maximizing opportunities to unsettle his many political opponents. Gerald Curtis's description of Yoshida as a master statesman, politician, and bargainer highlights his success across all political spheres. Further, Oros explains how Yoshida was able to employ these different dimensions of his political personality to deliver key policy reforms.<sup>53</sup>

One of the most complex policy reforms Yoshida managed was rearmament. The Japanese government came under great international and domestic pressure to rebuild the country's military. However, Yoshida believed that this policy was too controversial given widespread left-wing opposition, and economically unwise given the state of Japan's economy. He chose instead a political approach that balanced the objectives of these competing groups, as well as those of the United States. In particular, he chose to partially rearm the country but without explicitly admitting to it so as to appease the revisionists on the conservative side of politics while also limiting the issue's propaganda value for left-wing parties. Even while frustrating the political right by offering only partial commitments, Yoshida encouraged and supported key revisionist groups in order to counter the influence of pacifists, negotiating skillfully with key revisionist politicians such as Shigemitsu Mamoru.<sup>54</sup>

Yoshida's major achievement—and the key sign that he had an impact not only on policy but also on Japan's strategic identity—was his broad approach to foreign affairs that came to be known as the Yoshida Doctrine. Under it, Japan would focus on its economy while relying on the United States for security. As Pyle explains, Japan “could look to its

long-range interests by assuming for the time being a subordinate role within the U.S. international order.”<sup>55</sup> The Korean War and America's need for allies in Asia to combat the Soviet Union gave Yoshida the necessary international leverage and he used various means (including relying on Article 9 of the Constitution) to resist U.S. pressure for Japan to do more and thereby achieve some autonomy in an otherwise highly dependent relationship.<sup>56</sup>

But was this strategic identity a creation of Yoshida or an accommodation of a range of political actors and powerful interests?<sup>57</sup> Certainly, the Yoshida Doctrine consists of both elements, but there is much evidence to suggest that the doctrine was a clear political victory for Yoshida. Few other leaders in early postwar Japan possessed the necessary combination of qualities to achieve a similar strategic construction. Even though many had powerful political backing or the support of key societal groups, they were insufficient in authority, experience, political support, tactical nous, or strategic thinking. Certainly, the balance of Japan's strategic identity reflected Yoshida's political personality and preferences more than other actors: pro-American rather than neutral or Asianist, and mercantilist rather than rearmed.<sup>58</sup> If Yoshida's role were to be removed from this period of Japanese history, it is difficult to see how the constitutional restrictions on Japan's security role would have been maintained or, alternatively, how the alliance would have survived Japan becoming a true “peace state.”

The impact of Yoshida's achievement would become clear as conservative opponents of Yoshida came to dominate politics during the period 1955–60. These politicians, including Shigemitsu, Hatoyama Ichirō, and Kishi Nobusuke, attempted to revise key elements of the Yoshida consensus. They focused on constitutional revision, rearmament, and alliance realignment—with Hatoyama Ichirō, for instance, noting that it was “natural” to take up the obligation of providing for its own security as an “independent nation.”<sup>59</sup>

There were a number of factors constraining their opportunities. Conservative politics was especially split throughout this period, with the disciples of Yoshida continuing to exploit left-wing opposition to the revisionists to stymie their efforts where possible. Revisionists did not have the numbers in the Diet to enact change, and Hatoyama Ichirō's ill-health and preoccupation over negotiating a peace treaty with the Soviet Union limited their capacity to develop a coherent reform agenda. In their initial attempts to revise the security treaty with the United States, the revisionists' negotiating credibility suffered as a result of Japan's limited security



capabilities and because of their ambitions for greater security autonomy, as illustrated by Shigemitsu's proposal calling for the withdrawal of U.S. troops under a new treaty.<sup>60</sup>

Importantly, however, the complex balance in the strategic identity created by Yoshida trapped the revisionists just as it placated opposition to the alliance from the political left. From the time he became prime minister in 1957, Kishi, the preeminent actor within the revisionist camp, was especially constrained. Despite being a notably Machiavelian politician who created the dominant patronage systems that would characterize Japanese politics for decades, Kishi could not deliver more than incremental changes to the revisionists' main objectives, instead losing important battles on rearmament policies and the establishment of key security institutions. On constitutional revision, for example, Kishi had announced a policy which included the proposal to "permit revision of the Constitution and rearrangement of the national structure."<sup>61</sup> He had also been a major influence in establishing, and then chairing, the Constitutional Investigation Committee. However, due to the continued good showing by the socialists, the opposition of Yoshida's disciples in the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), and his own highhanded approach to leadership, Kishi was forced to retreat on constitutional revision and instead focus on treaty revision.<sup>62</sup>

Kishi's leadership style, and the way he went about implementing the treaty revisions, undoubtedly played an important role in his political demise and, with that, the revisionists' cause. In this sense, Kishi's leadership was also indispensable, albeit to the collapse, rather than the creation, of an alternative strategic identity.<sup>63</sup> Yet Kishi's negotiations over treaty revision demonstrate how, through the process of balancing domestic and international constraints, revisionists were gradually being pushed into accepting the dominant features of Yoshida's consensus. On the alliance, Kishi had initially argued that "[i]t is not the policy of an independent nation to have troops of a foreign country based on its soil."<sup>64</sup> Still, he came to contend that both Yoshida's cooperative stance on the United States and Hatoyama Ichirō's independent stance were possible, seeing the alliance instead as a way to increase Japanese independence. While Kishi was able to gain the support of the Yoshida forces within the LDP for revising the security treaty, the political price was the acceptance of the institutions and processes established by Yoshida. As Iokibe Makoto argues, rather than bring an end to Yoshida's influence by revising the treaty, Kishi "inadvertently played a leading role in strengthening it."<sup>65</sup>

*Working within the Yoshida Consensus*

Notwithstanding that Yoshida himself felt that some of his policies should be discarded as Japan became sufficiently strong, Kishi's experience provides an early indication of what would become a recurring pattern of postwar politics and a testament to the strength of the Yoshida Doctrine. As Samuels observes, Yoshida directed "the strong current against which all aspiring political opponents would have to swim." The story of Japan's strategic identity through the remainder of the Cold War, therefore, is one where "[m]any more drowned than made it to shore."<sup>66</sup> After Kishi's resignation in 1960, Japan's leaders became far more guided, or constrained, by the norms set out by Yoshida.

This is well-illustrated by the approach to Japan's security identity taken by a number of prime ministers during the 1970s. These leaders clearly played significant roles in shaping Japan's foreign policies and international relations in the Asia-Pacific during this period. However, as Edström observed, they worked within the Doctrine. The prime ministerships of Satō Eisaku, Nakasone, and Fukuda Takeo in particular illustrate this point. Satō guided Japanese foreign policy through a turbulent period in East Asian international relations and achieved several of Japan's major foreign objectives. Together with Nakasone as director general of the Japan Defense Agency (JDA), he pursued the idea of "autonomous defense" (*jishu bōei*) in response to U.S. demands for greater burden sharing. He also committed to supporting the United States in the event of a conflict regarding Taiwan or Korea. In terms of policy successes, his greatest achievement was to negotiate the reversion of Okinawa from the United States to Japan.

So far as the Yoshida consensus went, however, Satō's role was largely one of consolidation. He established Japan's three non-nuclear principles of not developing, possessing, or allowing the introduction into the country of nuclear weapons, a set of policies described by Nobumasa Akiyama as "snuggling-up to the pacifist line" in order to avoid a split amongst conservatives. Through this, Satō consolidated Yoshida's strategy of a mercantilist foreign policy that subsumed security questions.<sup>67</sup> The context of this choice—the negotiations over Okinawa—meant that Satō needed to ensure that the policies did not undermine talks with the United States. Accordingly, he packaged the principles with statements underscoring the importance of the U.S.'s nuclear umbrella.

Satō's role as a consolidator of Yoshida's consensus was demonstrated by his attitude toward his policies. His uncertain view of the principles,

previous record of discussing the possibility of acquiring nuclear weapons, and decision to agree secretly to allow the introduction of nuclear weapons by the United States into Japan, show how Satō subscribed to the norms of the Yoshida consensus without necessarily internalizing them. From a leadership perspective, Satō's behavior over the non-nuclear principles was an indication of action rather than actor indispensability. That is, other leaders facing the same challenges over Okinawa would likely have acted in a similar way.<sup>68</sup> Satō's actions were being shaped by Japan's strategic identity rather than his own leadership vision.

The case of Nakasone Yasuhiro in the 1980s is also cited as an example of Yoshida's consensus restraining other leaders. Nakasone, who had earlier argued for the U.S.'s military bases in Japan to be removed, gradually became a strong supporter of the U.S.–Japan alliance and, as leader, pragmatic reformist rather than revolutionary firebrand.<sup>69</sup> But other leaders who belonged to the anti-Yoshida camp within the LDP were also increasingly constrained by Yoshida's policies.

Despite being a protégé of Kishi, Fukuda pursued a less strident nationalism than Kishi. Although strongly anti-communist, unlike Kishi, he regarded the prewar military in a less positive light and was not a supporter of rearmament in the early Cold War debates within conservative politics. Nonetheless, he later considered removing Japan's limits on defense spending, oversaw the adoption of the *Guidelines for Japan–U.S. Defense Cooperation* in 1978, and argued that Japan should play a more active role in international affairs.<sup>70</sup> Yet, in following the expectations set out under the Yoshida consensus, Fukuda characterized his vision of Japan's future role as “a great peaceful power” rather than a great military power.<sup>71</sup>

Certainly Fukuda had an important, innovative vision for foreign policy (see table 3 in chapter 2). His “omni-directional diplomacy” (*zenhōi gaikō*) was intended to ensure that Japan had strong relations with all countries, including those in the Middle East. A variation of Japan's *seikei bunri* approach to diplomacy with China (i.e., separating politics and economics), *zenhōi gaikō* has been described as a type of “value-free diplomacy” or “diplomacy of no principles” under which Japan could avoid the ideological disputes of the Cold War for trade (i.e., oil) purposes. Japan's dependence on the United States for its security, as well as its closer relations with China over the Soviet Union, inevitably made the goal unrealistic. But Fukuda's diplomacy signaled that Japan was seeking to maintain at least low-key relationships with most countries despite the Cold War context. In particular, it pushed Japan to pursue new diplomatic opportunities, especially in Southeast Asia, as part of the Fukuda Doctrine.

While he had a significant policy impact on Japan's relations in Southeast Asia, as a norm entrepreneur, Fukuda did little to influence Japan's strategic identity. The Fukuda Doctrine declared that Japan would eschew a stronger military role in line with Fukuda's view that Japan had chosen "not to take the path" to being a great military power.<sup>72</sup> Instead, Japan would develop "heart-to-heart" relations with the countries in the region that focused not only on economics but also encompassed cultural, social, and political relations. Finally, it would help to strengthen the "ASEAN intraregional process" and improve its relations in Indochina.<sup>73</sup>

The continuities of the Fukuda Doctrine with Japan's now well-established strategic identity are obvious, notably the issues of anti-militarism and mercantilism. Edström suggests that the national goals present in Fukuda's policies were a "carbon copy" of the goals also set out by Ikeda Hayato and Satō. The only significant change from the original Yoshida Doctrine is the move away from bilateralism (with its emphasis on the U.S.) toward a more multilateral diplomacy, in this case toward Southeast Asia.<sup>74</sup>

### Leadership and Japan's Post-Cold War Strategic Identity

Despite this focus on the normative structure crafted by Yoshida and its influence on Japanese prime ministers over subsequent decades, neo-classical realists would also point to how the Cold War shaped Japan's, and Yoshida's, options. The continued presence of foreign threats (communism) and their impact on domestic politics, as well as the trends in U.S. strategic policy, provided a constraining but not dictating framework in which Japan's leaders operated.<sup>75</sup> Unsurprisingly, therefore, as the international relations of Asia in the post-Cold War period changed, the broad conditions under which Japan's potential norm entrepreneurs operated also shifted. Indeed, during the first decade after the Cold War, the contours of the new international system remained ambiguous, thereby creating an uncertain strategic situation for Japanese leaders. Moreover, the old strategic construction did not simply disappear but continued to shape the country's politics, even if imperfectly. Novel forms of strategic social construction were now clearly required, but the form these should take was in doubt. New norm entrepreneurs would be essential.

Japan's failure to do much more than engage in "checkbook diplomacy" as the United States pushed Iraq out of Kuwait in the early 1990s provided an early shock. In particular, it set off discussions over what would

become the “normalization” debate. That is, if Japan’s foreign policies had been shown to be abnormal during the Gulf War, what was required for the country to become a “normal nation”?<sup>76</sup> A notable figure in these discussions, and potential norm entrepreneur, was Ozawa Ichirō, then an influential player within the LDP. Ozawa asserted that Japan needed to become a “normal nation” (*futsū no kuni*) and made two key observations about how to achieve this. On the one hand, it would have to assume those responsibilities that the international community viewed as “natural.” On the other hand, it would have to cooperate more with other nations to “build prosperous and stable lives for their people.”<sup>77</sup>

This new idea of normalcy helped release some of the restrictions placed on Japan’s international role by Yoshida; for example, it allowed the country to dispatch the Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF) overseas. Yet it also created a number of policy challenges. What did a normal nation look like? How did it make use of its military forces? And how did it manage its relations with the United States? In terms of JSDF deployments, Ozawa stated that this could not be carried out “on any basis other than internationally recognized principles.”<sup>78</sup> Indeed, his idea of normal had strongly “globalist” characteristics.<sup>79</sup> Ozawa’s role in promoting these ideas, however, was notably problematic. He played a controversial role in Japanese politics throughout the 1990s, such as by bringing down the LDP government in 1993 and participating in the short-lived coalition governments of 1994. That he did not become prime minister, and therefore lacked the prime minister’s clear agenda-setting power, may also have diminished his capacity as a new norm entrepreneur. Moreover, as the 1990s advanced, the international environment, by throwing up new security challenges such as the Taiwan Strait and North Korean nuclear crises, began to play a bigger role in shaping what was strategically possible. These challenges were not always addressed by Ozawa’s more globalist normal-nation norm.<sup>80</sup>

### *A New Revisionism?*

The most significant challenge presented by the new international environment, however, came with the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. Japan’s normalization agenda quickly became more focused on hard power and wider institutional reform. Much of this change was driven by Koizumi, who has arguably been Japan’s most significant norm entrepreneur of the twenty-first century.<sup>81</sup> “It was Koizumi,” according to Hughes and Ellis Krauss, “who smashed long-standing

taboos and created the conditions for ending Japan's foreign and security policy inertia."<sup>82</sup>

Koizumi adopted a particularly inward-focused approach to security taboo smashing. His government brought the control of defense and foreign affairs more directly into political, that is prime ministerial, hands. Rounds of administrative reform meant that the role of the prime minister in politics had been changing since the mid-1990s.<sup>83</sup> Koizumi continued and intensified this trend, making more of the prime minister's new powers and adopting the top-down leadership style originally championed by Nakasone. In particular, Koizumi sought to rebalance the authority of the prime minister, the Cabinet Secretariat, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), and the JDA. From late 2001 until mid-2002, he exploited international and domestic turmoil to shift power away from MOFA. He also promoted those in the JDA who held more positive views on the greater use of the JSDF while reducing the influence of the Cabinet Legislation Bureau (CLB). The CLB had been Yoshida's key institutional vehicle for protecting his security agenda, especially the government's interpretation of Article 9.<sup>84</sup> As an agenda-setting leader, Koizumi consistently argued for constitutional revision and the strengthening of relations with the United States.<sup>85</sup>

Koizumi also attempted to transform wider societal norms regarding security. He sought to have Japan's defense institutions accepted as a more normal part of the national polity. Unaccommodating rules were reinterpreted, leading to obfuscation on such matters as collective defense, "areas surrounding Japan," arms export bans, and combat zones. Within a wider strategy of getting the media onside, he sought to promote the defense forces by speaking at JSDF graduation ceremonies, sending off the troops, and describing the JSDF as a military.<sup>86</sup> This context is also helpful in understanding Koizumi's controversial annual visits to the Yasukuni Shrine, which honors Japan's war dead (including Class-A war criminals). In Koizumi's view, he visited Yasukuni because contemporary Japan was built on those whose "precious lives were sacrificed in war."<sup>87</sup>

Koizumi's significant impact as a norm entrepreneur can be especially understood in comparison to the influence of other important figures in Japan's post-Cold War security policymaking. It is particularly apparent when understood in the context of the alternative visions pursued by Ozawa, noted above, and Hatoyama Yukio. As the new, harder-edged normalization agenda of Koizumi began to lose momentum under his LDP successors during the late 2000s, the rival DPJ began to espouse an alternative vision for Japan's post-Cold War strategic identity. Ozawa

and Hatoyama Yukio were by then key players in the DPJ, with the latter becoming prime minister in 2009. The DPJ's victory had a significant short-term impact on Japan's diplomacy, with Ozawa and Hatoyama Yukio seeking to reform the vestiges of the Yoshida Doctrine while also setting out a challenge to the normalization agenda of Koizumi.

An important area of difference was Hatoyama's more revolutionary vision for Japanese autonomy (see table 3 in chapter 2). Koizumi and his successors had sought to increase Japanese autonomy by building up hard-power capabilities and reforming security institutions, even while remaining close to the United States. Hatoyama and the DPJ, while not necessarily opposed to military upgrades, interpreted autonomy as moving further away from the U.S. and, according to Daniel Sneider, "consistently asserting the need for Japan to focus on Asia."<sup>88</sup> As Daniel Clausen explains, Hatoyama was thus the only recent Japanese leader to challenge the centrality of the alliance with the United States in Japan's strategic identity.<sup>89</sup> Instead, the DPJ pursued a brand of regional multilateralism through Hatoyama's East Asian Community idea based on the notion of *yūai* (fraternity). Following this line of thinking, Hatoyama argued, Japan should shift away from "US-led globalism," maintain its independence, and balance between the region's great power. The key to this form of diplomacy would be "open regional cooperation." In accordance with Ozawa's globalist thinking, the natural framework for this would be the United Nations.<sup>90</sup>

By the end of 2010, however, the attempt by Hatoyama and the DPJ to develop a new strategic social construction for Japanese diplomacy had largely disintegrated. Rather than achieving more distance between Japan and the United States, it instead managed to raise tensions in the alliance. Its attempts to carve out a more autonomous role in the region were then undermined by a deteriorating strategic situation. The post-Cold War international environment, which through the 1990s had only provided irregular signals to policymakers, delivered several shocks in rapid succession, in the form of North Korean attacks on South Korea, and the collision of a Chinese fishing trawler with a Japanese Coast Guard vessel near the disputed Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. Hatoyama resigned mid-year after contributing to alliance tensions over the U.S. military basing in the Japanese prefecture of Okinawa, while the diplomatic fracas caused by the Senkaku/Diaoyu dispute led Hatoyama's successors to return to a more orthodox, U.S.-focused foreign policy.<sup>91</sup>

The rise of Ozawa and Hatoyama Yukio suggests that, despite his undoubtedly significant impact on Japan's security identity, Koizumi did

not leave the same kind of legacy as Yoshida. To understand how the revisionist project fell away after 2006 and yet rose again in 2012 in much the same format, it is necessary to examine the role played by Abe Shinzō. As noted in chapter 2, Abe also projected a profile of strong leadership before becoming prime minister in 2006. But his first tenure as prime minister was unsuccessful: Abe failed to meet the public's expectations, especially on economic reforms, and resigned after only one year in office. His initial failure as prime minister, although not directly related to his actions on foreign policy, stalled the revisionist program and opened up opportunities for strategic redefinition to Ozawa and Hatoyama. This is most obvious in terms of the push to revise the Constitution, which did not generate much public interest and largely fell off the political agenda until Abe's return in 2012.<sup>92</sup> Since becoming prime minister for a second time in 2012, however, Abe has sought to overcome his earlier weakness on economic policy by developing a more visionary brand of economic leadership, often called "Abenomics."<sup>93</sup>

Yet Abe has largely continued with his earlier approach on national security. He has been a key proponent of constitutional revision, especially to Article 9. Prior to becoming prime minister in 2006, he had commented that the next prime minister "must show the leadership to put this new constitution on the political agenda."<sup>94</sup> Although Abe failed to achieve this goal in 2006–07, his government was able to pass legislation that enabled a referendum to be held on revising the Constitution. Since 2012, Abe has continued to argue that the Constitution should be revised or at least reinterpreted to remove prohibitions such as that on collective self-defense. During the upper-house election campaign in 2013, he noted that he wanted the JSDF to be constitutionally recognized and he also renewed the move against the CLB and its role as interpreter of the security-related aspects of the Constitution, a tactic which he had orchestrated under Koizumi.<sup>95</sup>

Underpinning Abe's attempts at strategic social construction has been a clear nationalism that follows on from Koizumi's efforts in the early 2000s. Abe has pursued a range of policies focused on national renewal based around patriotism and respect for tradition, as illustrated by his education reforms of 2006–07. Abe's worldview can be linked to the influence of his grandfather, Kishi Nobusuke (discussed earlier). Before becoming prime minister, Abe noted that he had more "affinity" for conservatism because of his grandfather's central role in conservative politics and in reaction to comments made against his grandfather for being a suspected Class-A war criminal.<sup>96</sup> Abe's views on Japan's colonial history, a part of



his nationalism, play a role in his ambition to move the country's strategic identity beyond what he views as its Cold War dependence. He has a long history of historical activism.<sup>97</sup> But his views on history have created problems in the region, such as in 2007 when he denied Japan's role in the exploitation of "comfort women" as sexual slaves. In 2013 he questioned interpretations of history and the "definition of what constitutes aggression" and also created controversy by visiting the Yasukuni Shrine.<sup>98</sup>

Japan's strategic identity today is thus undergoing a major challenge from the political, and often familial, descendants of the revisionists who opposed Yoshida in the 1950s. Yet this vision of Japanese strategy has already been contested by other norm entrepreneurs such as Ozawa and Hatoyama Yukio, who have promoted an alternative identity based less on military normalization and more on multilateral Asianism. The international order facing Japan is undergoing a significant transformation due to China's rise, while the wider societal norms in Japan's strategic identity have significantly changed and do not constrain leaders to the same extent as in the 1950s. Indeed, neither domestic nor international environments are likely to dictate the direction that Japan's strategic identity might take. Multiple responses to a tenuous regional environment are possible. For instance, great power competition in Asia could easily produce a new type of realism in Japanese strategic thinking, as was arguably present under DPJ Prime Ministers Kan Naoto and Noda Yoshihiko. On the other hand, if Japan takes on a greater sense of nationalism, Abe will likely have been an indispensable leader.

## Conclusion

Underpinning key shifts in Japan's strategic identity and its foreign policy behavior since the Second World War have been the choices made by political figures. At times, these choices were heavily constrained, not merely by the international system, but also by the limitations imposed by Japan's postwar strategic identity. However, when systemic pressures or, as Miyagi suggests, domestic norms have no longer been able to sustain particular configurations of strategic behavior, the choices of leaders have been indispensable to the country's response. This has been evident in the characteristics of both the Yoshida Doctrine and contemporary revisionism in Japanese foreign policy. Indeed, this chapter has highlighted the indispensability of particular leaders' visions and strategies to the characteristics of Japan's evolving strategic identity.

Identifying patterns in the combinations of factors that cause leaders to become indispensable norm entrepreneurs, however, is more complicated. In Japan's case, the two major periods most conducive to normative entrepreneurship are the early Cold War period (1952–60) and the post-Cold War period, which accords with the neoclassical expectation of the international system driving change, even if understanding the connection between the international level and the nature of the change requires a further examination of potentially mediating factors. Nevertheless, in terms of a general concept such as strategic identity, the period following an upheaval of the international order would appear to allow for a relatively free interaction between agents and their environments until these environments gradually become more constraining as a new international order is established. However, the multiple factors at play in these contexts make it difficult to offer more detailed explanations of the connections and of what makes actors or actions indispensable. In order to shed further light on such specific connections between leaders and outcomes, it is necessary to examine specific instances of leadership on policy rather than on the broader concept of strategic identity. The next three chapters, therefore, use a micro-level case study approach to examine these specific connections.



# Ōhira Masayoshi

## *Overdetermined Environment*

However hearty an eater I may ordinarily be, when I start to think about oil, all this nice food just doesn't go down.

—Ōhira Masayoshi, June 29, 1979<sup>1</sup>

The leadership role played by Prime Minister Ōhira Masayoshi before and during the Group of Seven (G7) summit held in Tokyo in June 1979 constitutes the first case study of this book. Ōhira's early poor life circumstances, successful struggle to obtain an education, and professional and political development provide a personal background from which to understand his leadership. Likewise, the tumultuous period of factional in-fighting within the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) during the late 1970s, as well as the equally turbulent international and summity environments, offer a sense of the complex nature of both domestic and international politics before and during the Tokyo summit. Taken separately, however, neither set of factors provides a sufficient understanding of the leadership strategy Ōhira would adopt toward the Tokyo summit or how influential Ōhira's role at the summit would be.

### Ōhira's Leadership: Standing Out by Hanging Back

#### *Biographical Detail*

Ōhira Masayoshi was born in 1910 to Ōhira Rikichi and his wife, Saku, in what is present-day Kan'onji City, in Kagawa Prefecture on the northern side of the island of Shikoku.<sup>2</sup> Ōhira senior was a middle-ranking

farmer who also served on the village council and local irrigation association. Ōhira described his mother, who was from a neighboring town, as a “strong-minded woman and very outgoing.” As the son of a farmer, Ōhira’s childhood was typical of rural Japan in the Taishō period (1912–26), that is, one characterized by hard work and little wealth. He later noted that “[a] farmer’s life was one continuous round of toil with very little to show for it in the end.”<sup>3</sup> Ōhira entered primary school in 1916 and high school in 1923. He hoped to enter the navy but became ill in 1926 and failed the medical examination.

The death of his father in 1927, as well as being an emotionally difficult time for Ōhira and his family, put large economic obstacles in the way of Ōhira’s education. Yet he was fortunate enough to be offered board and lodging by an aunt and so began study at Takamatsu Higher School of Commerce in 1928. It was during this time that he became a Christian, was baptized in late 1929, and engaged in extensive evangelical activities. Three years later, Ōhira graduated and began work at an Osaka-based pharmaceutical company that had close connections to his Christian faith. Although the company did not fare well, Ōhira was again able to pursue further learning thanks to two academic scholarships. In 1933 he pursued further study at the Tokyo University of Commerce (now Hitotsubashi University) while living in Kokubunji, a Tokyo suburb. Ōhira had thought of joining the Sumitomo Company upon graduation, but after doing well in the higher civil service examination began to think of a career in the bureaucracy instead.

Ōhira graduated from the Tokyo University of Commerce in 1936 and entered the Banking Bureau within the Ministry of Finance (MOF). He spent sixteen years in the bureaucracy in a variety of positions. During the years 1939–40, he headed the Economic Section of the Mongolian Border Regional Liaison Department within the Asia Development Board (ADB), a position which meant that he spent much time in Inner Mongolia. The job was a senior one for someone who had entered MOF only three years prior, but it also meant that Ōhira found himself working in a distant outpost of the Japanese empire. Seizaburō Satō, Ken’ichi Koyama, and Shunpei Kumon argue that the experience helped Ōhira develop both personally and professionally. Upon his return from Inner Mongolia, he had ceased to be the “same lonely person” who had entered MOF and had instead become a “tough and self-assured administrator.”<sup>4</sup> From his time in Inner Mongolia until 1952, Ōhira had stints at the ADB, the Budget Bureau at MOF (from the beginning of Japan’s involvement in the Second

World War), as secretary to Minister of Finance Tsushima Juichi, and in the National Tax Administration Bureau.

After his long stint in the bureaucracy, Ōhira changed course in 1952 to pursue a political career, following in the footsteps of his former MOF boss, Ikeda Hayato (who had been amongst the wave of bureaucrats to enter politics in 1949). Ōhira was first a member of the Liberal Party, before joining the LDP when it was formed in 1955. He was elected to parliament eleven times between 1952 and 1979 and served in a variety of party and Cabinet posts. These included chief cabinet secretary under Ikeda (1960–62), minister of foreign affairs under Ikeda (1962–64) and Tanaka Kakuei (1972–74), minister of international trade and industry under Satō Eisaku (1968–70), minister of finance under Miki Takeo (1974–76), and LDP secretary general under Fukuda Takeo (1976–78). Ōhira inherited what had been the Ikeda faction within the LDP—the *Kōchikai*—in 1971.

At the time of the Tokyo summit in June 1979, Ōhira had been prime minister for a little over seven months and was to continue for less than a year after the summit. Indeed, Ōhira is perhaps Japan's most infamous victim of *karōshi*, or death from overwork. From early 1979, he undertook a hectic schedule, making trips to China, Europe, and Australasia among others, as well as attending various summits. He also campaigned in two general elections, in October 1979 and June 1980. Domestically, Ōhira had endured extraordinary factional fighting within the LDP, which intensified following the October 1979 general election. On the international front, his government was still attempting to cope with the second oil shock, the deterioration of the Middle East political situation, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (December 1979). In the end, the physical demands of office were too much. During a campaign speech in late May 1980, Ōhira fell ill and was hospitalized. On June 12, 1980 his condition worsened and he died of heart failure.

### *Leadership Vision and Style*

Okita Saburo, minister of foreign affairs from late 1979 to 1980, remembered Ōhira as being by nature “a person who kept his emotions hidden.”<sup>5</sup> Similarly, Satō, Koyama, and Kumon suggest that such restraint was not merely a political persona but was a consistent part of Ōhira's personality, something he demonstrated throughout his life. As a child, for instance, he was quiet and, although studious, unlikely to raise his hand to answer

questions at school. He would mediate between his two elder brothers when they fought and was remembered by childhood friends as unassuming. As a student at Takamatsu, and an active Christian, he read widely and was particularly influenced by the religious and philosophical teachings of Satō Sadakichi, who warned against materialism and emphasized instead religion and science. Yet in his taciturn manner, Ōhira kept this part of his life a secret from his family and many of his fellow students and, although he remained keenly interested in religion and the bible, seems to have quietly lost much of his evangelicalism when he left Osaka to study. At university, he was again diligent and retiring, although in a survey he completed while job-hunting, he described himself as cheerful and unpretentious, although sometimes too sentimental.<sup>6</sup>

What kind of leader did Ōhira become? Okita's assessment of Ōhira's personality matches the general view of Ōhira as a politician (reserved, deliberate, and intelligent). One summation of Ōhira's leadership style describes Ōhira as "a man who stood out by seeming to hang back." Another notes that "his ponderous manner masked an exceptional intellect."<sup>7</sup> Reflecting in many ways his upbringing and his student and government experiences, Ōhira demonstrated two basic political personalities: his philosophical and pragmatic sides. His more philosophical side demonstrated great interest in the major policymaking and foreign policy issues of the time, particularly taxation. Ōhira, it is argued, accepted that Japan had progressed as far as it could under the "catch-up era" and thus understood the need for politics, and the LDP in particular, to modernize and develop new policies.<sup>8</sup> In attempting to drive this agenda and obtain some independence from the bureaucracy, Ōhira established the Seisaku Kenkyūkai (Policy Research Association), which had a membership drawn largely from academia and business. Underlying this approach, according to Muramatsu Michio, was Ōhira's belief that the role of politicians was to present to the public the kind of structural measures needed to achieve progress. Under his prime ministership, some major policy ideas began to receive greater prominence, notably "comprehensive security."<sup>9</sup>

Nonetheless, by the late 1970s, Ōhira was undoubtedly one of the most experienced operators in Japanese politics. His rise through the party demonstrated that he had both tactical nous and a flair for picking winners. And while he had a philosophical bent to his personality, he had also developed a highly effective and pragmatic side, which had allowed him to become a key member of the political establishment. This second dimension of Ōhira's political personality is well-illustrated by a comparison of Ōhira's and Miki's different approaches to the Lockheed scandal,

in which Tanaka, a former prime minister and factional powerbroker, was convicted of corruption for bribery and given a suspended sentence of four years (along with a fine), although he died during the appeals process.<sup>10</sup> Whereas Miki had supported the Lockheed investigations into Tanaka as a part of cleaning up Japanese politics, Ōhira adopted quite a different method. A newspaper article at the time of the Tokyo summit noted that, in attempting to avoid “Miki’s mistake,” Ōhira did not become involved in investigating the scandal personally but left the matter to be investigated by the proper authorities. Miki’s mistake had been a political one in view of the influence of Tanaka in the LDP. As the article continued, “[s]uch an attitude may seem baffling to the general public, but it won him [Ōhira] support and applause from within the LDP.”<sup>11</sup>

By the time he became prime minister, therefore, Ōhira had been at the center of factional wheeling and dealing for nearly thirty years, had worked closely with Tanaka, and defeated Fukuda in dramatic fashion at the LDP presidential election of 1978. Such pragmatism was consistent with the balance of power in the LDP in the late 1970s. At the time of Ōhira’s prime ministership, the main factions were the Tanaka, Ōhira, Fukuda, Nakasone Yasuhiro, and Miki factions, with these factions split into two groups at the 1978 LDP presidential election. On one side stood those who supported the incumbent, Fukuda (the Fukuda, Nakasone, and Miki groups), while on the other side stood those who supported Ōhira (essentially the Ōhira and Tanaka groups). It meant that if Ōhira was to become prime minister, he would need Tanaka’s factional and organizational support.

The LDP balance of power was not, however, the only reason for Ōhira’s cooperation with Tanaka. Ōhira also favored Tanaka because of their political history. Ōhira entered politics as a follower of Yoshida Shigeru in the Liberal Party and so worked with Ikeda and eventually became a key player within Ikeda’s faction. He played a role in Ikeda’s ascension to the prime ministership in 1960, seeking out the advice of Tanaka at the time. Although the two were members of different factions (Tanaka belonged to the Satō faction), those two factions had been part of the Yoshida school of ex-bureaucrats and had enjoyed a history of close cooperation. Tanaka was also a distant relative of Ikeda’s, and Tanaka and Ōhira had enjoyed a strong friendship, one that Ōhira viewed as “super-seding politics.” The two had cooperated during the transition from the Ikeda to Satō administrations, and Tanaka later backed Ōhira for the chair of the Policy Affairs Research Council.<sup>12</sup> Ōhira cooperated with Tanaka in the latter’s bid to become prime minister after Satō, and subsequently



became foreign minister. It is unlikely, then, that Ōhira looked for and received Tanaka's support in 1978 only because of circumstance. Rather, Ōhira's choice fitted into a consistent pattern of cooperation and friendship that had lasted nearly three decades.

Ōhira's independence as leader might be questioned given this dependence on the Tanaka faction, although it has been argued that Ōhira's dependence on Tanaka has been exaggerated.<sup>13</sup> Another limitation on Ōhira's autonomy as leader was the bureaucracy. Indeed, the bureaucrats were happy with Ōhira's leadership style. Senior officials from MOF and the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) responded to media questions about Ōhira in the following terms: "[w]e feel at ease with Prime Minister Ohira. He has complete confidence in us and gives us a free hand in handling our own affairs."<sup>14</sup> Ōhira himself was quoted comparing Japanese leadership with orchestra conducting: "[a] people as energetic as the Japanese hardly needs a forceful leader . . . [the prime minister] should act like an orchestra conductor or a coordinator."<sup>15</sup> Conversely, with an extensive background as a bureaucrat himself, and given his time spent at MOF, Ōhira undoubtedly enjoyed considerable insight into the bureaucracy's workings and was arguably in a better position to influence its decision making than most other political figures. Again, his inclination to step back from intervention appears to have guided his leadership style.

Ōhira's philosophical and pragmatic sides were also well-demonstrated in his foreign policy. Bert Edström argues that Ōhira was "one of Japan's most capable ministers" and that, during the turbulent year of 1979, it was "Ōhira who instituted a change of foreign policy." Ōhira's two catchwords were trust and consensus (*shinrai* and *gōi*), and he was optimistic about the potential for international cooperation to remedy many global challenges. On the one hand, therefore, he was an internationalist in the mold of Satō and Tanaka, and referred to contemporary international politics with phrases such as *bunka no jidai* (the age of culture) and *kokusaika no jidai* (the age of internationalization). Yet Ōhira was not an idealist but a "conservative at heart." His pragmatic side made him "a 'realist' much like Yoshida: he found it imperative to face the world squarely, stressing that 'a cool perception of the reality of the world' was necessary."<sup>16</sup> Much as Yoshida had been, he was seen as a realist in the sense that he believed it was vital that Japan deal with the realities of the world with "a cool perception." Ōhira's speech to the 87th Diet session in January 1979—in which he talked of "increasingly interdependent" communities, but also warned of the dangers of indulging in "optimistic dreams or policies of wishfulness"—reflected both tendencies.<sup>17</sup>

Running counter to the stereotype of Japanese leaders as lost in international affairs, Ōhira had gained significant G7 summit experience prior to the Tokyo summit, having attended the Rambouillet (1975) and San Juan (1976) summits as finance minister. Thus he had ample experience in gauging both the utility of the summits as well as their limitations. Ōhira projected a restrained but optimistic attitude toward the summits generally, and the Tokyo summit in particular. "Summits are meaningful," he argued, "because they offer a chance to meet and talk together. In some cases, a single handshake may be all that's really needed because, to ensure success, both parties entrusted with handling matters at the working level do their very best to see that all problems are solved."<sup>18</sup> However, Ōhira also highlighted the key global problems of the times, concluding that "there has . . . been a heightening of tensions arising from resource issues and nationalism and the disparity between North and South is growing larger."<sup>19</sup> As an experienced politician and statesman, Ōhira was well aware of the challenges that would emerge at Tokyo.

### Domestic Environment: Uncertainty and Turmoil

In the year leading up to the Tokyo summit, Japan's domestic political economy, like the global political economy, faced many uncertainties. In particular, as the world economic downturn accelerated, it was feared that Japan would also be affected. Yet the Japanese economy continued to recover strongly after the shocks of the second oil crisis and despite international economic turmoil. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the economic recovery of this period was different in two important ways to the recovery made after the earlier shocks of the decade. First, rather than the export-led recovery which had previously been the case, this recovery was helped by a sustained level of growth in domestic demand. Second, where the previous recovery had petered out in around a year, such as in 1976 and 1977, the recovery at the end of the decade had continued to gather momentum beyond this timeframe.<sup>20</sup> Japan's economic growth remained solid, as it had for several years. In 1977, the economy had grown by 5.3 percent and in 1978 it grew by 5 percent. The figure for the first half of 1979, seasonally adjusted at annual rates, was 5.8 percent, meaning that Japan was on target again to attain a 6 percent growth rate in 1979.<sup>21</sup> Although energy security posed problems, Japan's steady growth was more than acceptable given the state of the global economy.

The country's other chief concerns were the threat of inflation and unemployment. The inflation rate slowed during 1978, but reversed in early 1979 when there was a "significant upturn in wholesale prices."<sup>22</sup> However, this trend was not yet obvious at the time of the Tokyo summit. Changes in consumer prices had in fact been at a high in 1974 (24.5 percent) and had continually fallen in the following years to 3.8 percent in 1978. Yet fears that there would be an increase were correct, with the rate rising substantially in the second half of 1979.<sup>23</sup> Unemployment remained stable in 1979, as it had during the previous few years. After rising following the first oil shock, it changed little from 1976. The second half of the 1970s experienced a shake-out of the labor force in the manufacturing sector, although this trend slowed in 1979. There was also increasing employment in the tertiary sector.<sup>24</sup>

If the health of the domestic political economy was uncertain but encouraging at the time of Ōhira's prime ministership, domestic politics was indisputably in crisis. Much of the turmoil in Japan's politics during this period revolved around the role of Tanaka. Tanaka's leadership has been widely examined, but the most important points here concern Tanaka's role in the events of 1972, the subsequent feud between Tanaka and his archrival Fukuda, and the impact of these events on Ōhira's leadership environment.<sup>25</sup> Ōhira's prime ministership, as it turned out, would be the final round in what had become a near civil war within the LDP. From the early 1970s, until Ōhira's sudden death in 1980, the party had been engulfed in scandal, beset by international and domestic crises, and increasingly unpopular amongst the Japanese electorate. It had fought with itself more often than with the opposition.

Instability within the party is often attributed to the 1972 LDP presidential election.<sup>26</sup> Tanaka became prime minister after running against Fukuda, who had been the protégé and expected successor to the previous prime minister, Satō. Satō had set out to make Fukuda prime minister, but Tanaka set up an anti-Fukuda group known as the Getsuyōkai (Monday Club), outmaneuvering Satō to overrun Fukuda in the LDP presidential election.<sup>27</sup> Ōhira and Tanaka had been outsiders within the LDP, since both were from poor rural families. Ōhira was the son of a farmer, while Tanaka's father is most often described as either a drunk, "dissolute gambler," or "horse-trader."<sup>28</sup> In contrast, Fukuda, a graduate from the elite Tokyo Imperial University, was a former top bureaucrat. In itself, this explains much of the antipathy between Fukuda and Tanaka—that Tanaka snatched the prime ministership from under Fukuda's nose in 1972 aggravated these differences.

Tanaka had only been prime minister for two years when he was beset with the first of his many “problems” in October 1974. A weekly gossip magazine, *Bungei Shunjū*, printed an article asserting that the prime minister was involved in irregular financial transactions. The article was then taken up by the foreign press, subsequently by the mainstream Japanese media, and Tanaka was forced to resign in November 1974. It was two years later, in early 1976, thanks to a U.S. Senate committee investigation, that the Lockheed bribery scandal became public and Tanaka was accused of accepting bribes. Despite these setbacks that Tanaka subsequently faced until his death in 1985, or oddly perhaps owing to them, Tanaka put every effort into increasing his political power even while the trial was underway and became, in the words of some, a “shadow shogun” of Japanese politics. As Gerald Curtis notes, the scandal did not “force Tanaka out of politics, but rather drove him into the dark recesses of LDP power.”<sup>29</sup>

Fukuda eventually became prime minister when Miki was dumped by the LDP in 1976. However, his administration suffered because it was essentially a compromise between the stronger, but publicly tainted, Tanaka-Ōhira forces, and the weaker but comparatively upstanding Fukuda forces (although Fukuda had endured his own scandals). Fukuda, it was subsequently revealed, became prime minister after a secret deal between the party’s major powerbrokers who, in late 1976, decided that Ōhira would not contest the LDP presidency. In return, Fukuda’s term as LDP president would be limited to two years, his administration would be run by Ōhira (which became known as the “Fukuda-Ōhira alliance”), and Fukuda would agree to hand over the reins to Ōhira at the end of those two years.<sup>30</sup>

In a way familiar to politicians everywhere, however, Fukuda later changed his mind, and denied having made the agreement. After failing to persuade Ōhira not to run in the next LDP presidential election, and then having dropped the idea of a snap election, Fukuda eventually contested the presidential election in 1978. Ōhira and Tanaka agreed that Ōhira should run against Fukuda in any case, and so both Fukuda and Ōhira were nominated for the election, along with Nakasone and Kōmoto Toshio. After a shaky start to the campaign, Ōhira and his backers picked up momentum and eventually won the first vote ahead of second-placed Fukuda, who then withdrew from the second ballot. The defeated Fukuda would comment later that “after observing the primary—a primary in which money flowed with abandon and which it was widely pointed out involved ghost party members and dog and cat party members—I have

become thoroughly disgusted.”<sup>31</sup> Ōhira duly became prime minister in December 1978.

The domestic environment Ōhira faced was therefore beset not only by economic uncertainty thanks to the global fallout from the oil shock, but also by political turmoil due to the ongoing bitterness between Ōhira and his supporters within the LDP and the supporters of Fukuda. There was nevertheless a lull in intra-party hostilities in the first half of 1979, despite the unpopularity of Ōhira's support for a new tax. The Fukuda, Nakasone, and Miki camps had limited their attempts to undermine Ōhira, although many were unhappy about Ōhira's proposal to dissolve the Diet later in the year. Indeed, there was speculation that Ōhira had been instrumental in closing the Diet session abnormally early in June 1979, since this would allow him to “legitimately dissolve the Diet and call a general election” in the fall. Ōhira's logic was that, due to the relatively stable economy, the LDP looked like it might increase the number of its lower-house seats, and that the Ōhira groups would likely be able to strengthen their position vis-à-vis the non-mainstream factions.<sup>32</sup>

Although the summit was not crucial to Ōhira's success in the expected elections, it still represented both an opportunity and a significant challenge. On the one hand, it was an opportunity for Ōhira to raise his political profile and further solidify the relative stability that had emerged over the previous six months. On the other hand, failure at the summit raised the prospect of fresh instability, thereby undermining Ōhira's position and making him more vulnerable to accusations from vocal Fukuda supporters that he was a failure as the country's chief diplomat and therefore as its leader. For Ōhira, as much as for Japan, achieving a positive outcome at the summit—or at the worst minimizing the damage—had become a major political objective.

### International Environment: Oil and Revolution

The year 1979 was also a tumultuous time internationally. The Shah in Iran fell from power, setting off a new oil shock. Later the hostage crisis unfolded in revolutionary Iran when American hostages became trapped in the U.S. Embassy. Finally, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. As Robert Putnam and Nicholas Bayne note, “[i]n the course of a single year, the entire economic and political context for the summits was altered fundamentally for the worse.”<sup>33</sup> The global political economy had also deteriorated to the point where, just as in 1974, the major powers were

seriously and publicly worrying as to how they might revive their fortunes. As with the Bonn summit of 1978, circumstances suggested that the leaders of the G7 nations should coordinate any policy efforts, especially on the issues of oil and inflation. As a global recession looked increasingly likely, the prospect of renewed trade protectionism along with general concerns about growth were major topics of international diplomacy. The plight of Indochinese refugees, such as those fleeing Vietnam and Cambodia, was also a prominent issue.

Amongst all these problems, however, the challenge of oil stood out. The initial contributing factor to these trends was the fall of the Shah in January 1979. The Shah, a long-time U.S. ally, was overthrown by Islamic revolutionaries who proceeded to establish an anti-Western—and in particular anti-American—Islamic state under the leadership of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. The Iranian revolution, and the accompanying workers' strike (from late 1978), destabilized the Middle East and soured U.S.–Iranian relations. More indirectly but of even greater significance, the revolution played a catalytic role in what was to become known as the “second oil shock.”<sup>34</sup> The price per barrel of oil rose from US\$12.50 in December 1978 to over US\$30 per barrel by February 1979. By June 1979, the spot price per barrel was US\$40.<sup>35</sup>

While less dramatic than the initial oil shock of 1973, these price rises were arguably more significant because they involved a near collapse of the global oil market. From late 1978 through to 1979, the oil market was transformed from a relatively controlled, contract-oriented, and stable environment to one that was characterized by government-dominance, spot sales (non-contract sales), and mostly unpredictable pricing.<sup>36</sup> While the Iranian revolution and the oil stoppage did not significantly affect overall world oil production, their shock value—the clearly anti-Western revolution was not anticipated by Western nations—led to panic amongst oil-importing countries. After the 1973 oil shock, these countries had been conditioned to expect the worse.<sup>37</sup>

Importantly, developed countries, and especially Japan, were still highly reliant on oil imports from the Middle East, which meant that growth, employment, and inflation were all heavily affected. Putnam and Bayne describe the effect of the oil shock on the world economy as “both depressive and inflationary” (i.e., rising costs with reduced consumption).<sup>38</sup> Under these conditions, economic growth would stagnate while prices would inflate in a process appropriately termed “stagflation.” Stagflation had emerged after the 1973–74 oil shock, and by 1975 most OECD countries had fallen into a recession that was also accompanied

by inflation of 13.5 percent. Unemployment within the OECD had risen from 9 million (1973) to 15 million.<sup>39</sup> The after-effects of the first shock had, moreover, persisted until 1978–79: at the beginning of the second shock, inflation remained at an average rate of 8 percent across the OECD.<sup>40</sup> Growth across the G7 had remained stable in 1977 and 1978, but it began to fall in 1979, and then quite dramatically in 1980. Inflation also rose substantially across the G7 countries, with four G7 members suffering double-digit percentage increases in 1979—Italy led the way with an inflation rate of 14.8 percent. The shocks of 1978 and 1979 contributed to more inflation in 1980, with the only bright spot being that unemployment levels remained surprisingly steady, even falling slightly in 1979.<sup>41</sup>

Although oil dominated the international agenda in 1979, it was not the only issue. Trade protectionism continued to create friction. In April 1979, the Tokyo Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) came to a formal conclusion, finalizing more than five years of negotiations. Significant progress, however, especially in politically sensitive areas such as textiles, remained uneven. Indochina was especially unstable during this period: the Vietnam War had finished only four years earlier, Cambodia was in turmoil under the Khmer Rouge, and sporadic small conflicts had broken out. With many people displaced throughout the region, thousands of refugees attempted to escape the turmoil by boat. By June 1979, just before the Tokyo summit, it was estimated that approximately 60,000 refugees were fleeing Vietnam every month.<sup>42</sup>

Japan's own circumstances largely mirrored these wider trends. In 1979, there was a sense of "anxiety" amongst the Japanese public. A feeling of "vulnerability" characterized public and government thinking, as the oil shock triggered long-held fears in Japan over resource scarcity.<sup>43</sup> Like many other countries, Japan did not have direct access to oil supplies, nor did it have a major corporate player in the oil market.<sup>44</sup> In response to the global downturn, the government had turned to Keynesian growth strategies and promised to stimulate economic growth in order to act as a "locomotive" for the world economy. Yet Japan now needed to stabilize prices and reduce the inflationary effects of the oil shock, since the ramifications of the shock could well undermine the original pro-growth plan. The dilemma for decision makers was that if they implemented policies that were aimed at stabilizing prices, such as fiscal tightening, they could easily undermine their commitment to higher growth. Nonetheless, following the February meeting of the OECD-affiliated International Energy Agency (IEA), Japan agreed with the other nations to introduce a plan of reducing oil consumption by 5 percent, and also to adjust fiscal policy

through a rise in interest rates. In the first half of 1979, therefore, Japan was in fact shifting away from its earlier Keynesian promises.

Japan was also struggling to manage its relationship with the United States. The huge trade imbalance between the two countries, which had emerged gradually over the 1970s following massive increases in trade from the early 1960s onward, was by now putting increasing strain on bilateral relations. This imbalance had emerged largely as a result of the boom in Japanese exports. While the United States had achieved a fivefold increase in exports to Japan during this period, the Japanese had increased their exports to the United States by sevenfold. By 1980, therefore, while the U.S. was exporting US\$20.8 billion in goods to Japan, it was importing US\$30.7 billion from Japan. Indeed, during the early G7 summits—from 1975 to 1978—the U.S. deficit had grown from US\$1.7 billion in 1975 to US\$11.6 billion in 1978. The composition of trade had also changed. Japan had transformed itself from a textile-oriented exporter in the early 1960s, into an exporter of steel, ships, and cars by the late 1970s.<sup>45</sup> In the context of its perceived “global weakening,” the U.S. government had begun to react to the deficit with increasing ill-temper, with Japan increasingly seen as an economic competitor or even threat. Ezra Vogel’s work on “Japan as number one,” published in 1979, typified the American sense of economic vulnerability.<sup>46</sup>

Yet changing American influence and strategy during this period also brought new opportunities for Japan. Improving Sino-American relations, as illustrated by the normalization of relations between the two countries from January 1979, allowed Japan to improve its own relations with China, and broaden its international connections. Japan had already signed the treaty of peace and friendship with the Chinese in 1978, and continued developing trade and political relations with that country over subsequent years.<sup>47</sup> Improved relations with China did not eliminate the problem of Taiwan, however, especially in view of Japan’s relationship with the United States, and the latter’s continued backing of that island’s de facto sovereignty. Policymaking in Indochina continued to be problematic, while Japan’s relationship with the Soviet Union actually worsened. It was in this complex and threatening international environment that Ōhira progressed to the Tokyo summit.

### Summitry Environment: Keynesianism Slipping

The Tokyo summit was the fifth G7 summit. The meetings prior to Tokyo, Putnam and Bayne argue, were “recovery” summits, whereas the series



of summits beginning with Tokyo were “recession summits.”<sup>48</sup> In other words, the first four summits were a major plank in the developed nations’ response to the recession that followed the first oil shock after the Arab–Israeli War in 1973, and the nearly simultaneous collapse of the Bretton Woods monetary system. Their primary purpose was to return stability to the international political economy. The Tokyo summit was similar to the summit held at Rambouillet in 1975 in that it followed an oil shock. But Tokyo can be said to have been the first of the recession summits because the leaders who attended at Tokyo were not coordinating economic expansion, but were instead preparing for economic contraction, and dealing with the problems of stagflation. Tokyo was thus a turning point in terms of policy coordination—as Keynesianism gave way to monetarism.

In the short term, however, the leaders at Tokyo were forced by events to manage the consequences of the oil crisis. As noted earlier, nations attending the February meeting of the IEA had agreed to cut their oil demand by 5 percent. The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) subsequently raised the price of oil a further 9 percent at its March meeting, and announced that it would hold a further general meeting in June, just before the beginning of the Tokyo summit. And although the IEA later reaffirmed its commitment in May to reduce oil import demand by 5 percent, these commitments were having little real effect on the behavior of IEA members, as several governments began making decisions that contradicted their IEA commitments and further destabilized the market.<sup>49</sup> Japan, for instance, was engaged in promoting direct purchases from OPEC suppliers, but it was hardly the only offender. The sum of these actions, however, was that the summit environment in the lead-up to Tokyo was characterized more by suspicion and apprehension than by cooperation.

The oil panic and subsequent stagflation undoubtedly shifted the balance of power on international policy coordination, particularly in terms of what the leaders could achieve at the summit. The most obvious victims of this change were the Keynesians. The Tokyo summit witnessed the rise of new leaders with quite different perceptions of the kinds of cooperation possible in international economic affairs. Margaret Thatcher is perhaps the most obvious example of such a leader. It also represented the decline of established leaders who had been more convinced of the value of international cooperation, particularly U.S. President Jimmy Carter. The return of stagflation also undermined those remaining leaders who had been advocating Keynesian approaches at previous summits.

These changes can be seen in the balance of power amongst the different groups over the course of earlier summits. The first four summits had been a stage for the ongoing and relatively even battle between Keynesians and monetarists, with Canada, Italy, the United States, and the United Kingdom (UK) generally forming the “Keynesian team,” and Germany leading the “monetarists” (with quiet support from Japan and France). The two sides were relatively balanced at Rambouillet and Puerto Rico, since no new expansionary policies had been added while existing ones remained. At London it seemed that the monetarists had grown in influence as the locomotive theory ran into trouble. Yet the Bonn summit appeared to be a “late flowering” for the Keynesians as the summiteers agreed on set growth targets that would be achieved through demand management. By the time the Tokyo summit convened, the monetarists were again ascendant and the mainstream view was that Keynesianism, by ignoring inflation, had made the global economy as much or more vulnerable to oil shocks as it had been in the early 1970s.<sup>50</sup> The balance of power had in fact shifted, and those pushing for a management style of summitry were finally giving way to those who preferred a more supervisory style.<sup>51</sup>

For Japan, the new style of summitry at Tokyo threatened its attempt to balance those contradictory objectives of managing inflation as well as stimulating economic growth. And it seemed unlikely that Ōhira would be able to manage such a high-wire act. It did not help, as Daizo Sakurada explains, when “the prime minister-elect [Ōhira] emerged from a bitter power struggle, preaching against a policy widely viewed as an international commitment.”<sup>52</sup> Fukuda had originally promised at the 1977 London summit to expand the Japanese economy by 6.7 percent as part of the locomotive approach. In 1978, he had repeated this promise with a figure of 7 percent.<sup>53</sup> These promises were naturally complicated by the second oil shock: the Japanese government, already recording large budget deficits, would be forced to increase deficit-based spending in order to fulfill such commitments. Moreover, on this occasion it would be expenditure at a time when high inflation was a distinct possibility in Japan, and when Japanese productivity and investment were expected to drop sharply.

In bidding for the prime ministership, Ōhira had attacked Fukuda’s pro-growth fiscal policies on the grounds that they were a major factor contributing to the government’s increasing debt burden. It was an approach that made sense at the domestic level but created tensions at the summit level, especially with the United States—Ōhira had inadvertently given the impression that Japan was retreating from Fukuda’s promises.

U.S. President Carter wrote to Ōhira to remind him that Japan had committed itself to the growth rate in 1978, and Ōhira subsequently denied abandoning the commitment to achieve a 7 percent per annum growth rate, noting that he had merely judged that such a policy would be too difficult to achieve in light of changing economic circumstances. At the subsequent Ōhira–Carter summit held in Washington a month before the Tokyo summit, the two sides avoided specific targets. However, they agreed on the need to promote broad policies that encouraged further domestic demand in Japan in order to sustain growth, while also opening the Japanese markets to foreign products.<sup>54</sup>

Even beyond the question of dealing with opposition from within the LDP, Ōhira had to find the right policy mix to satisfy the major bureaucratic actors. Rapidly increasing oil prices threatened to create high inflation in Japan, but there was still opposition to import restrictions amongst the bureaucracy, who feared the effect that such a policy would have on economic growth and the country's earlier commitments.<sup>55</sup> The task of balancing different policy objectives and tools would be extraordinarily difficult. Japan's sherpa (the senior bureaucrat attending the summit), Miyazaki Hiromichi, in an interview prior to the summit, commented that it would be necessary to study the measures required to deal with energy price increases, particularly in demand management but also on the supply side. Both approaches, Miyazaki (the sherpa) continued, would have "to cope with inflation" and "maintain . . . a reasonable rate of growth."<sup>56</sup> Yet the fact that pursuing both objectives simultaneously would be near impossible increased the likelihood of a messy situation at the domestic level.

Ōhira faced other challenges in the lead-up to the summit. First, he had to tackle the record trade imbalance with the United States, which had reached US\$8.1 billion in Japan's favor.<sup>57</sup> The Ōhira–Carter summit was again the forum where the leaders reconciled their differences, at least temporarily, although the minimalist language of the summit communiqué reflected the difficulty of the negotiations, which were conducted by Miyazaki and Henry Owen, the U.S. economic policy coordinator. In the communiqué, the two leaders "recognized that the current account surplus of Japan and the 1978 current account deficit of the United States were not appropriate in existing international circumstances."<sup>58</sup> Second, Ōhira and, in particular, Miyazaki, had to manage criticisms concerning Japan's use of tariff barriers; in this area, that the protection issue did not materialize more visibly at the G7 summit had much to do with the efforts of Miyazaki in negotiations before the summit.

*Preparing for Tokyo*

The Japanese plan for the summit itself, and the likelihood of restrictions being sought for member countries' oil imports, was to seek U.S. support to split up the Europeans, creating a division between what appeared to be a stricter French position (i.e., greater cuts to oil imports) and the more lenient position of the British and Germans (i.e., smaller cuts). Japan would thus be able to avoid agreeing to the proposals that France had made at various European and IEA meetings during the first half of 1979. To this end, Ōhira sought to sound out the positions of the different participants, such as the British, on questions of individual targets and the timespan for quotas.<sup>59</sup> Ōhira's meeting with President Carter in May in Washington, and then again immediately prior to the G7 summit, also covered this issue. The two leaders agreed that each country should establish oil import targets for 1979 and 1980—a position that differed from the French plan to set quotas out to 1985. As Sakurada notes, "it was thought that West Germany in particular was not going to consent to the stringent French plan, since Schmidt had asked Ohira prior to the summit not to push for the setting of individual national targets."<sup>60</sup>

Ōhira was well aware of the importance of the summit. He had asked the minister of home affairs to do whatever necessary to achieve a secure summit, noting that "[i]f even one little accident occurs, the Cabinet's, and of course Japan's, dignity will suffer enormously."<sup>61</sup> In January 1979, he had argued that, given the importance of the summit as a forum for seeking international cooperation on global economic issues, Japan had to do its "utmost as host country in preparation" for the meeting, particularly in terms of working "with the other participating countries for its success."<sup>62</sup> In June, Ōhira had argued that he would be seeking international cooperation and unity at the summit, indicating that the uncertain times made it all the more important that leaders "exchange views and seek cooperation."<sup>63</sup> Ōhira's hope was that participants would "at least be able to reach a common understanding on the present economic situation in the world."<sup>64</sup> Indeed, on the first morning of the summit, Ōhira talked of world expectations that the gathering would be a success, emphasizing the "summit spirit" that had developed over the four previous meetings. While suggesting that it "would not be realistic to expect the Tokyo summit to produce a panacea in only two days of talks," Ōhira highlighted the "task facing the Tokyo summit" and the need "for all countries to grapple with the problems in concert with each other so as to take appropriate measures."<sup>65</sup>

Ōhira also involved himself in a round of preparatory meetings. He participated in five study sessions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and other ministers. He also consulted the two former Japanese prime ministers who had attended previous summits, Miki and Fukuda, as well as the opposition party leaders. While some of the ministries were concerned about the approaches that various leaders would take, Ōhira was publicly confident in the summit's chances for success, downplaying how success or failure might be measured: "[i]t [the summit] is already 80 percent successful just by having the heads of state of seven countries sitting around the same table."<sup>66</sup>

Inevitably, Ōhira was drawn into discussing oil, conceding that it would be the main issue of the summit. However, he stressed that Japan would also be promoting other issues, such as North–South relations and multilateral trade negotiations.<sup>67</sup> Ōhira also announced a government plan to present a five-point energy program for discussion at the summit. The plan would include: setting individual crude oil import volume targets in order to implement the 5 percent cut agreed at the IEA meeting; controlling spot oil prices; sharing crude oil in emergencies; developing alternative energy sources, such as coal and nuclear power; and working jointly towards a dialogue between oil-consuming and oil-producing nations.<sup>68</sup> Ōhira thus saw his task at the summit as threefold: to make sure that some form of unity would emerge from the pre-summit discord, to show Japan as a capable host, and to somehow reconcile the contradictory demands of economic expansion and inflation control.

### At the Summit: Ōhira's "Longest Day"

The 1979 summit, held in Tokyo on June 28–29, 1979, was the first chaired by Japan. Security surrounding the summit was high given the range of groups protesting against the summit, some of whom managed to cause minor disruptions.<sup>69</sup> All the G7 member nations (as well as the European Community [EC]) were in attendance. The leaders were Carter (U.S.), Valéry Giscard d'Estaing (France), Joe Clark (Canada), Thatcher (UK), Helmut Schmidt (West Germany), Giulio Andreotti (Italy), Roy Jenkins (EC), and Ōhira, who was accompanied by Foreign Minister Sonoda Sunao and Finance Minister Kaneko Ippei. The Japanese sherpa was Miyazaki.

According to Owada Hisashi, the summit was "a painful experience for Japan in terms of both substance and procedure."<sup>70</sup> First, in terms of

substance, the events during the first half of 1979 meant that an agreement on oil consumption became a litmus test for whether the summit would be viewed as a success or failure. As a first-time host hoping to achieve summit success, therefore, the Japanese government would have to facilitate an agreement that might inflict significant sacrifices on its own oil-dependent economy. Second, in terms of procedure, President Giscard d'Estaing of France proposed at the summit an oil import plan that the Japanese side believed would impose extra costs upon its own economy. The Japanese strategy relied on the United States and Canada opposing the French plan. However, the Americans and Canadians reached a compromise at a so-called "secret meeting"; Japan thus found itself surprised, embarrassed, and isolated.

### *Diplomatic Maneuvering*

On the eve of the summit, the sherpas met for a preparatory meeting to discuss oil-import levels amongst the member countries. Japan opposed the idea of specifications on oil imports pushed by the Americans and the Europeans at the meeting, and in the end no conclusion could be reached. It was decided to leave matters undecided as it would be "necessary to get guidance from the leaders."<sup>71</sup> Ōhira opened the summit with a speech warning the participants about the dangers of inflation and the effect of oil shortages on economic growth. He stated that the fight against inflation was "a vital political subject,"<sup>72</sup> and argued that the balance of payments of the G7 nations had improved considerably because of the efforts made at the Bonn summit. Ōhira presented the Japanese economy in a good light, noting that it had grown by 8.1 percent in 1978, and that the current account surplus had fallen by the equivalent of US\$2 billion (from US\$14 billion to US\$12 billion). He called on the United States to control inflation, and also pushed for the other G7 countries to minimize the effect of inflation and the oil shortage on their economic growth.

Ōhira's opening speech was the most harmonious point of the summit, which was otherwise characterized by discord. In the words of U.S. President Carter, even the initial meeting was "acrimonious." Carter's main source of irritation was the behavior of the European countries in demanding that they be counted together on oil-import agreements: "[t]heir purpose was obvious—for the Europeans to absorb the rapidly growing oil production in the North Sea and not have to count it in their own countries as imports from foreign governments."<sup>73</sup> The Europeans, however, were not the only ones pushing for special consideration at the

opening meeting. Japan also attempted to secure a guarantee that it would be exempt from long-term targets. Ōhira emphasized that, as a resource-dependent nation, Japan should receive special consideration when making agreements on oil imports.

Unfortunately for Ōhira, Japan was out-maneuvered from the evening of June 28 through to June 29 in what Funabashi Yōichi describes as "Japan's longest day."<sup>74</sup> "The failure to recognize these activities taking place beneath the surface of the summit," it has been argued, "put Ohira in a no-win situation."<sup>75</sup> The problems began on the first evening. During the second Heads of State conference, President Giscard d'Estaing submitted a proposal for each country to undertake a policy of restricting oil imports through prescribed targets until 1985. The events following the French proposal have been described as "chaotic," with leaders simultaneously breaking out into their own discussions. Ōhira had asked for opinions concerning the proposals and was about to ask each of these leaders, but was interrupted. It was this point that perhaps best marked the beginning of Ōhira's own "longest day."<sup>76</sup>

Early in the evening, at the U.S. government's briefing, Secretary of the Treasury W. Michael Blumenthal was explaining the course of discussions for each country's oil regulations in relation to 1985 oil imports, when news arrived that OPEC had again increased the price of oil, this time by nearly 25 percent.<sup>77</sup> This set off a round of quiet diplomatic maneuvering. French Minister of Industry André Giraud met with U.S. Energy Secretary James Schlesinger at the Hotel Ōkura, and reached a bargain whereby the United States would agree to a long-term oil import target (out to 1985) in exchange for Europe approving the United States' suggested quota of the highest level of imports from 1977, which amounted to 8.7 million barrels per day.<sup>78</sup>

Early next morning, the vice minister of MITI met with Giraud at the Hotel New Otani to discuss the original French proposal. When the preparation sessions finished, MOFA told MITI that a second proposal, which had been close to the French proposal, had died at the session.<sup>79</sup> According to Miyazaki, nobody supported the French proposal at the preparatory committee: "because it was not necessary to produce unfinished figures for 1985, the discussion concerned producing figures for 1979 and 1980 . . . Ultimately, though no compromise could be reached . . . it was decided to submit both plans to the summit."<sup>80</sup>

Later, however, the American, British, French, and West German leaders met for what proved to be a vital breakfast conference at the French Embassy. At this meeting the three European countries and the

United States continued a broader discussion that reaffirmed the Franco-U.S. agreement of the previous night.<sup>81</sup> The Japanese were told about this meeting, but were not given any idea as to its subject. Japanese bureaucrats later referred to the meeting as the “Tokyo Guadeloupe summit” because Japan had, in a similar fashion, not been invited to a four-power (American, British, French, and West German) political summit held in Guadeloupe in January 1979.<sup>82</sup> An alternative version of events is that MITI officials saw Giraud, who was wandering around the Hotel Okura looking to photocopy the meeting’s agreement, and managed to obtain a copy. They sent this on to MOFA and the prime minister. However, MOFA did not think it represented the same kind of plan as the original French proposal, and Ōhira did not “think it would come to much.”<sup>83</sup>

### *Crisis Averted*

The Japanese delegation was then shocked when, at the third leaders’ conference, Giscard d’Estaing immediately pressed Japan and others to keep the level of oil imports at 1978 levels until 1985: “I want the upper limit of imports until 1985 from the three countries, Japan, America and Canada, to be put in a declaration.” The United States and Canada then put forward proposals for their own countries to restrict imports until 1985, while Germany and the UK, who had previously been vocal critics of individual targets, kept quiet. Ōhira, with a frantic face, stated that he “wanted to use the lunch break and the afternoon to iron out differences on the base with the energy minister” and, therefore, wished to “reserve his position.”<sup>84</sup>

According to Funabashi, a sense of crisis pervaded the Japanese delegation at their subsequent meeting during a brief recession, with the atmosphere being one of near panic. MITI Minister Esaki Masumi and Chief Cabinet Secretary Tanaka Rokusuke are quoted arguing vehemently against the proposal: “[i]f we fall for that plan, Japan will be completely unable to achieve economic growth. There will be panic. If that happens, it will definitely develop into a political problem. That’s about it. If we fall for this, the whole cabinet will resign. We won’t be able to fight an election.”<sup>85</sup> But Ōhira continued to reserve his position, instead ordering that all efforts be made to push the figures back. The leaders then met for the lunch conference. Ōhira complained that he could not “enjoy the festivities” and that he could not “taste the delicious food” while thinking about an oil import quota. He appealed to the other leaders, saying that such a plan “would result in a serious political problem . . . [and] that



if such a thing were to occur my cabinet would not hold on.” However, Chancellor Schmidt responded that Germany would also have to pay costs if it accepted such a plan, stating that Japan should do likewise. Ōhira in turn argued that “Japan is like a child at that time when it grows the most; after the child becomes an adult, even though it’s told to wear children’s clothes, it won’t.” No agreement was reached.<sup>86</sup>

Esaki had an equally difficult time. He met with the ministers responsible for energy at the Hotel New Otani and proposed a level of 7 million barrels, stating that “at the moment Japan is in the middle of making up a seven year plan and, according to this, the level of 1985 oil import requirements is seven million barrels per day.” German Federal Minister of Economics Otto Lambsdorff responded that it was “just too big,” and that West Germany would not swallow such a plan. Taking a middle position, Giraud proposed a concrete figure for the first time—of a 10 percent rise to 5.4 million barrels per day.<sup>87</sup> Such a figure, he added, would be more than enough for Japan to maintain growth rates of around 5.7 percent, at which point U.S. Secretary of Energy Schlesinger argued that for Japan to maintain strong economic growth of about 5 percent, it would need an import level of at least 6.4 million barrels per day. Esaki battled on, maintaining the 7 million figure, but was unable to draw out any further concessions from the other nations. However, Japan was isolated and it looked likely that Ōhira would soon have to deal with the consequences of a failed summit.

Later in the afternoon, a MITI official involved in the consultations, Hashimoto Riichi, met with Schlesinger and Owen (the U.S. sherpa), and was told of an additional plan. Under this proposal, Japan would limit its oil imports until 1985 at between 6.3 and 6.9 million barrels per day, and Hashimoto was told by Owen that President Carter would support such a set of figures.<sup>88</sup> Hashimoto duly reported this meeting to Ōhira and the Japanese delegation, and it seemed clear that the French and Americans would not waver from their positions below Japan’s preferred 7 million barrels per day. As such, with one choice remaining—between the best offer of between 6.3 and 6.9 billion barrels per day and a failed summit—Ōhira accepted the new U.S. plan. At the final leaders’ meeting, he announced that, “on 1985 import restrictions, I will go along with what has been suggested by the United States.” The French reluctantly agreed to the new proposal, but reminded Ōhira that they hoped Japan would “try to keep as close as possible to the lower limit.”<sup>89</sup>

In response, and with Ōhira’s approval, Miyazaki went to Giscard d’Estaing. The two exchanged a memo stating that “Japan would make every attempt to come close to the low figure.”<sup>90</sup>

And then I received an order from Prime Minister Ōhira, and because Minister for Industry Giraud was attending the summit meeting, I went to Minister Giraud and having argued with him was caught by President Giscard d'Estaing, and I said "how about this [figure]?" and showed him the memo . . . in the contents of the memo it said that if "Japan won't go over this [figure]" then "how about this [one]," and he wrote a different plan down and passed it to me. He wrote down in English that the previous figure would not change and, in four or five words hurriedly at the end, *in order to move toward the lower figure*, and showed me.<sup>91</sup>

With this, the negotiations were complete, and an agreement had been realized. For Ōhira, at least, the last-minute achievement was a great reprieve.

### *Aftermath*

The summit itself did not finish immediately. At the post-summit press conference, Ōhira described the summit as "extremely useful," claiming that the leaders had been "able to create an extremely close human relation[ship] on the basis of the spirit of mutual support of the Summit." With regard to the oil negotiations, he remarked:

As the Prime Minister of Japan, to give the specific goal of our effort to the year 1985 has taken [a] considerable amount of courage, but recognizing the fact that we all live in a global community faced with oil anxiety, and recognizing the need for placing our economy on a stable basis well into the future, I felt it was necessary for us to agree to that statement.<sup>92</sup>

The final communiqué consisted of eight articles.<sup>93</sup> After commending the achievements of the Bonn summit, the document outlined the problems of inflation and oil consumption, detailing the agreement made to restrict oil imports on a country-by-country basis until 1985. It also proposed the replacement of oil with other energy resources, such as coal and nuclear power, and criticized the behavior of OPEC for creating "very serious economic and social consequences."<sup>94</sup> Other issues noted in the document included comments regarding economic management, GATT, and North-South relations.

Remarkably, despite arriving at the precipice of a failed summit, Ōhira found the consequences of the Tokyo summit to be fairly benign.

The media and key interest groups took a supportive attitude towards the summit and Ōhira's "performance," despite the pessimism surrounding the crises over oil import targets. "As for the most urgent of foreign policy subjects at the Tokyo summit, the Ōhira administration crossed the mountain," stated one newspaper.<sup>95</sup> The chief worry for Ōhira—that the oil issue would become a political millstone around his neck—did not appear at all. In addition to gaining the support of the LDP, Ōhira managed to gain the support of Kōmeitō, the Democratic Socialist Party, and the New Liberal Club. He avoided the embarrassment of being flatly rejected by any political party, and received the support of the Zaikai, which, although worried about the effect on the economy, hoped that the agreement would return some form of stability to the international oil markets.<sup>96</sup> Ōhira even managed to receive a boost in the polls, with a *Yomiuri Shinbun* poll showing that his approval ratings had increased from 37.6 percent to 39 percent between May and June (although his disapproval ratings also rose).<sup>97</sup>

The political world more generally accepted the difficult circumstances facing the global economy. Most Japanese politicians seemed convinced that Ōhira had achieved an optimal or near-optimal deal for the country. Instead, they focused on developments in political reform and other domestic issues which were expected to feature more prominently in the leadership battle between Ōhira and the LDP's anti-mainstream factions. Speculation largely looked beyond the particular advantages obtained by the different countries, noting instead that Ōhira had largely escaped censure for his conduct of Japan's diplomacy at the summit and would likely look for an opportunity to dissolve the lower house. As such, attention shifted to the relatively "restrained activity" of the Fukuda and Miki factions within the LDP and the likelihood—of which there was "little doubt"—of "further manoeuvrings" in the LDP.<sup>98</sup> Ōhira was publicly praised by former Prime Minister Miki for the way he settled the differences over the oil issues, although Miki criticized Ōhira for failing to address the other major issues of the summit more substantially, in particular the North–South and Middle East problems. Fukuda was also positive about Ōhira's performance, congratulating Ōhira and saying that he "did a good job."<sup>99</sup> Ōhira's narrow escape, then, might even have constituted a minor victory.

## Conclusion

Ōhira's leadership strategy consisted of a transactional style based on intellectual stimulation and a paternalistic leadership vision. His aim was

to make Japan an active, responsible, international power. Indeed, Ōhira had a vision for Japan, as illustrated by his choice to establish independent policy-development bodies, such as his Policy Research Association, which took in members from a broad range of backgrounds and not just the LDP. Yet Ōhira's vision ran counter to important preferences at the domestic level, reasonable assumptions of comprehensive rationality, and indeed his own innate conservatism. Ōhira was clearly a key player in Japan's political games and was attentive to the domestic electoral consequences of foreign policy. Conversely, as a strong believer in the importance of international cooperation, he unsurprisingly saw successful cooperation at the Tokyo summit as important in terms of both the national interest and his electoral popularity, and as part of the intense intra-party competition then occurring in the LDP. He also appeared to hold similar expectations about the other summiteers.

The study confirms important limitations on Japan's summitry. The pressure on Japan to make commitments on economic growth targets and oil-import quotas while being left out of key decision making (e.g., the "breakfast" meeting at the French Embassy), highlights the diplomatic pressure that could be placed on Japan's leaders at the summits. Yet, as much as Ōhira was a defensive leader at Tokyo, his adroit transactional and strong intellectual leadership in difficult circumstances compares well with more recent leaders, such as Abe Shinzō or Hatoyama Yukio. Ōhira's experience at the Tokyo summit demonstrated how threatening conditions across multiple political environments create an overdetermined leadership structure. This structure shifts the balance between actor and action dispensability substantially, making the former largely dispensable, but the latter indispensable. The scope for individual action was so limited at Tokyo that it would have been difficult for any political actor to adopt a different course.



## Suzuki Zenkō

### *Laissez-Faire Leadership*

Japan was represented by Zenko Suzuki, a rather provincial figure, adept in the quiet consensus-mongering of Japanese politics, but hardly equipped to assume the more active role on the world scene that Japan's economic power seemed to justify.

—Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne<sup>1</sup>

This second case study examines the leadership role played by Ōhira Masayoshi's successor, Suzuki Zenkō, during 1980–81, and particularly before and during the Group of Seven (G7) summit held in Ottawa in July 1981. Like Ōhira, Suzuki spent his early life in rural Japan, but in the fishing communities of Japan's Tōhoku region. Even more than Ōhira, Suzuki developed a strongly consensus-seeking political style, which he came to define as *wa no seiji*, or the politics of harmony. Suzuki had emerged as Japanese prime minister in 1980 as a compromise candidate following the factional conflicts within Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) politics in the late 1970s and early 1980s. At the same time, he faced an international environment just recovering from the second oil shock while also dealing with the consequences of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Suzuki, who is often dismissed as a leader, actually presents some problems for the study of leadership and international relations. Can Suzuki's leadership be characterized as non-leadership or laissez-faire leadership? And did Suzuki have any impact on the conduct of Japanese diplomacy during this period?

## Suzuki's Leadership: "Suzuki Who?"

### *Biographical Detail*

Suzuki was born in 1911 in Yamada, Iwate Prefecture, the eldest son of Suzuki Zengorō and his wife, Hisa. His father operated a fishing business.<sup>2</sup> Suzuki attended Yamada Primary School and the Miyako Prefectural School of Fisheries. His school nickname was "prodigy," due to his consistently good grades.<sup>3</sup> In 1930, Suzuki entered the Fisheries Training Institute (now the Tokyo University of Fisheries) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (now the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) and studied aquaculture.

Like Ōhira, Suzuki was educated firstly during the Taishō and early Shōwa periods. As a school boy, he loved reading stories about samurai heroes, such as Araki Mataemon and Gotō Mototsugu, and would exchange books with like-minded friends. According to the recollections of one school friend, Suzuki did not misbehave as much as some of his classmates.<sup>4</sup> Having grown up in a rural fishing community, he was perhaps initially insulated from the wider trends of Japanese society. However, when he travelled to Tokyo to further his study, he was exposed to the tremors of class conflict and rising nationalism of the 1930s. At the same time, the young Suzuki, who was immersed in the difficulties of the fishing industry during this period, was particularly influenced by the "cooperativism" of the social and labor activist and Christian, Kagawa Toyohiko.<sup>5</sup>

After graduating in 1935, Suzuki worked in fishery organizations. Indeed, before being called up for home defense in the Akita Regiment of the Japanese Imperial Army in 1945, Suzuki's career and life was immersed in an array of fishery-related organizations—the Dai Nihon Suisan Kai (Japan Fishery Association), the Zenkoku Gyogyō Kumiai Kyōkai (National Union of Fishery Associations), and the Zenkoku Gyogyō Kumiai Rengō Kai (National Federation of Fishery Associations). In 1939, Suzuki married Ogiwara Sachi, the daughter of the president of the Hakodate Fisheries School. After the Pacific War began, he transferred to the Prefectural Fisheries Association and became head of the Fisheries Department, before eventually shifting to another new body, the Chuō Suisan Kai (Central Fisheries Association).<sup>6</sup>

How might these experiences have shaped Suzuki's later approach to national politics? His upbringing in Yamada, and his schooling and early work experiences clearly meant that he entered politics as an agricultural

politician. According to Suzuki, a key factor was his experience of the 1933 Sanriku earthquake and subsequent tsunami, which caused immense damage along the Sanriku coast. The failure of government to respond caused the then 22-year-old Suzuki to feel “righteous indignation,” so that when he returned to his study and then later work he wanted to become a politician in order to “design solutions to these kinds of problems.”<sup>7</sup> These experiences, along with the influence of Kagawa, prompted Suzuki to publish articles that argued for a more cooperative approach to developing Japan’s fishing industry.

Suzuki eventually made the move to politics after the Second World War. Part of the new generation of politicians who took office after the postwar purges, the 36-year-old Suzuki was first elected to parliament as part of the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) ticket in 1947. He would later say that he was not a socialist in terms of ideology, and that he shared little empathy with JSP policy. Rather, he had entered politics from a “humanist” point of view.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, no sooner had Suzuki found his way into the JSP than he was on the move, leaving the socialists to join first the Socialist Reform Party (Shakai Kakushintō), and then the Democratic Liberal Party (DLP). Suzuki was elected as a member of the DLP in 1949, and continued with the DLP as it later became the Liberal Party (Jiyūtō). Suzuki became parliamentary vice-minister of the Home Affairs Agency in November 1952 and, two years later, vice president of the Liberal Party’s Policy Affairs Research Council (Seimu Chōsa Kai). When politics stabilized in 1955, Suzuki remained in the Liberal Party as it merged with the Japan Democratic Party (Nihon Minshutō) to form the LDP. Through the subsequent years of LDP rule, Suzuki held a number of Cabinet and party positions, including minister of posts and telecommunications, chief cabinet secretary, chairman of the LDP’s Executive Council, and minister of agriculture, forestry and fisheries. With the sudden death of Prime Minister Ōhira during the 1980 general election, Suzuki inherited the Kōchikai (Ōhira’s faction). He became prime minister to much surprise in July 1980, and continued in that capacity until suddenly resigning in November 1982. Suzuki retired from politics in 1990 (age 79) and died in 2004 (age 93).

### *Leadership Vision and Style*

Suzuki’s rise to the prime ministership was both sudden and unexpected, a strange accident of fate that owed much to Ōhira’s untimely death. However, Suzuki was a man for his time. Japanese politics in the late



1970s and early 1980s, with all its feuding, was ripe for a politician with Suzuki's leadership strategy: at best transactional and mostly *laissez-faire* in terms of style, with a political vision that was mostly managerial or conservational in terms of the wider Japanese society. That such a figure could have become prime minister would have seemed most improbable in late 1980 and early 1981.

This was especially the case for those watching developments in the diplomatic world. For such observers, Suzuki appeared out of his depth and unsuited to the challenges of the period. His only international experience before becoming prime minister was in fishery negotiations with the Soviet Union while minister of agriculture. In comparison to the worldly Ōhira, it has been noted, "Suzuki was largely ignorant about defense and foreign policy issues."<sup>9</sup> Moreover, although Suzuki had been in office for just over one year by the time of the Ottawa summit, Ottawa was his first G7 summit since the previous Venice summit preceded his appointment. Still, Suzuki was not without any diplomatic experience. Since becoming prime minister, he had attended an Association of Southeast Asian Nations conference in January 1981, a leaders' summit with President Ronald Reagan in the United States in May, and a visit to Europe in June. Yet when compared to his three predecessors—Ōhira, Fukuda Takeo, and Miki Takeo—Suzuki was Japan's most inexperienced chief diplomat to attend the G7.

Suzuki's lack of international exposure meant that his profile was lower in the other G7 countries even by Japanese standards. He was described, for instance, as "the man who doesn't speak much."<sup>10</sup> Western analysts viewed Suzuki as a passive, indecisive, and weak leader. Karel van Wolferen is particularly critical of Suzuki's leadership qualities. The bureaucrats "despised" Suzuki, who had the nickname of "tape-recorder" because the bureaucrats trained him to repeat prepared answers at press conferences and meetings. Suzuki had mastered the skill of "side-stepping" any decision making "to an extent unprecedented among postwar Japanese prime ministers." And because he avoided taking decisions to such a huge extent, van Wolferen notes, "his political passivity broke all records within memory."<sup>11</sup>

Suzuki's *laissez-faire* leadership vision and managerial style, along with his lack of diplomatic experience, meant that his prime minister-ship involved substantial costs to Japanese diplomacy even while it solved problems of LDP feuding. Suzuki's inexperience meant that he was highly dependent on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) for foreign policy direction, just as he was dependent upon Tanaka Kakuei and Nakasone Yasuhiro for domestic policy guidance. His parroting of MOFA lines

at press conferences compounded the impression that he had little real understanding of, or appreciation for, international affairs; although it was his mishandling of several controversial issues while travelling overseas which did most to damage his diplomatic standing. Suzuki's primary goal in terms of leadership vision, according to such critical interpretations, was to avoid incurring "anyone's wrath" at all costs, with the optimal way to achieve such a vision being to do "absolutely nothing."<sup>12</sup> This ambition had the side effect of reinforcing Western perceptions that Japan was a mere passenger in great power politics.

A notable example of both Suzuki's inability to manage Japan's diplomacy and Western journalists' cynicism about Suzuki, involved a press conference Suzuki gave prior to leaving on his trip to Europe in June 1981. The conference was stage-managed by MOFA, which organized the questions and their order beforehand. Suzuki duly repeated the answers he had been given despite the fact that some correspondents had rephrased their questions to change their meaning, thus causing the prepared answers and Suzuki to appear incoherent.<sup>13</sup> Bert Edström captures the press sentiment well when he argues that Suzuki was "[n]ot seen as a political thinker or strategist, his views on domestic and foreign affairs were considered shallow. . . . He was the son of a fisherman, and his policy expertise was confined almost entirely to fish." In much the same fashion, Uji Toshihiko observes in his study of the Suzuki administration that the international reaction to Suzuki's election was "Zenkō Who?"<sup>14</sup> As the face of Japanese diplomacy, Suzuki's features were unmemorable and, due to his infrequent expression of his own thoughts and views, almost unknowable.

Yet Suzuki was quite popular amongst the general public, at least initially. Although his administration seemed to arrive from nowhere, public support in the beginning was a respectable 48.2 percent, a result arguably of the smooth transition from the old Cabinet to the new as well as sympathy for the departed Ōhira. And during its first session, Cabinet popularity even rose to 58.3 percent. Both figures were quite high given the LDP's fall in popularity during its civil-war period of the late 1970s. Moreover, Suzuki continued to maintain his domestic popularity in 1981, with his approval ratings after one year of office remaining at around 46 percent. It was not until 1982 that his popularity began to fall, and his usefulness as LDP leader began to decline. The government was facing increasing administrative and fiscal troubles, as well as becoming entrapped in disputes over trade with the United States and over school textbooks with China.<sup>15</sup>

However, Suzuki's own views of politics and leadership reveal much about his leadership. Unsurprisingly, his pronouncements were vague, but

positive and conciliatory. Suzuki expressed his desire for a stable Cabinet of “total harmony” and “total energy,” promising that he would seek to achieve consensus within the party and with the opposition. He especially admired the concepts of *wa* (harmony) and *wa no seiji* (the politics of harmony).<sup>16</sup> At his first press conference as prime minister, he specifically used this term, and it was to remain an important theme throughout his prime ministership. In describing his concept of harmony, he used various phrases but relied mostly on the term *wa*, with its cultural *nihonjinron* connotations (theories of Japanese uniqueness) and Japanese groupism.<sup>17</sup>

Until now, I have followed the political principles of “whole-heartedness and sincerity.” I have, as far as possible, avoided conflict and treated matters with an attitude of seeking “harmony.” One might call this a “politics of harmony” [*wa no seiji*], although it has also been a politics in the pursuit of fairness and a politics of consultation.<sup>18</sup>

Although Suzuki was essentially a laissez-faire leader, most comfortable when avoiding the pitfalls in the wheeling and dealing environment of Nagatachō, Tokyo’s political district, he did not entirely forgo attempts at a more transformational style of leadership. This was most apparent when he attempted, despite being from the dovish wing of the LDP, to cater to Japanese nationalism and the right-wing of the LDP’s political base. On August 15, 1980, along with a number of his Cabinet colleagues, he visited the Yasukuni Shrine—the nationalist shrine which honors the Japanese war dead, including convicted Class-A war criminals.<sup>19</sup> He also assumed center stage in early 1981 to promote another cause célèbre of the political right: the return of the Northern Territories from the Soviet Union to Japan. The moves were clearly intended to please important LDP conservative constituencies; in the context of new Cold War tensions at the time, it was also possible that they might have appealed to the nationalism of the wider public. In January 1981, Suzuki announced that February 7 would be the “Day of the Northern Territories” to commemorate the Shimoda Treaty (that divided the Kuril Islands between Japan and Russia).<sup>20</sup> In taking these steps, Suzuki seems to have been attempting a leadership style based on inspirational motivation and idealistic stimulation. Indeed, his politics of *wa* also follows a type of insider transformational leadership based on individual consideration.

The main clue to Suzuki’s leadership vision may be present in the way he left office, a decision described as surprising and even “uncharacteristically decisive.”<sup>21</sup> Despite his political struggles with fiscal policy,

administrative reform, and foreign policy, Suzuki still enjoyed solid support within the LDP. Both in politics and in the press, his re-election was seen as “a foregone conclusion.”<sup>22</sup> Yet in October 1982 Suzuki suddenly resigned.

I felt that if I were to preach party harmony while personally running for the seat of party president, it would probably not be very convincing. On this occasion, I would like to bring about an administration based on true party unity—to make clear my intention to resign, to transform people’s thinking, and to strive for a renewal of the party and its methods under a new party president.<sup>23</sup>

Unlike his three predecessors, who were prepared to risk an LDP split in order to keep their hold on power, Suzuki resigned at the mere hint of political disunity. One should not overemphasize Suzuki’s altruism, however. His chief talent was, after all, a highly developed sensitivity to the LDP’s factional battles and their likely outcomes, and factional maneuvering had increased over the course of 1982.<sup>24</sup> Suzuki had sensed a change in the political winds.

### Domestic Environment: The Kaku–Fuku War

The domestic political environment that formed the background to Suzuki’s prime ministership was stable by comparison to the tumultuous 1979–80 period. Yet to understand Suzuki’s domestic environment and the reasons for this calm, it is essential to understand the factors that led to the 1979–80 conflict within the party. Following the Tokyo summit, Suzuki’s predecessor, Ōhira, had overruled the objections of LDP heavyweights and dissolved the lower house in order to call a general election. The election went badly for the LDP, however. Instead of increasing its number of seats, the party actually lost one seat; it was only when a number of independents (former LDP politicians) rejoined the party that Ōhira avoided the indignity of having to form a coalition government.<sup>25</sup>

#### *From Election Loss to Victory in Mourning*

Ōhira, it seemed, would inevitably be forced to resign, but surprisingly refused, thereby prompting his LDP opponents to mount a campaign to topple him. Ōhira’s opponents within the LDP decided that Fukuda

should run for LDP president, and thus prime minister, and so began maneuvering within the party to achieve this objective. Yet, by maintaining the support of key factions, such as that of Tanaka, Ōhira was able to defeat Fukuda in the party election to be the LDP president and the party's candidate for prime minister. When the election for prime minister was held in the lower and upper houses of the Diet, however, two LDP candidates were put forward, with Fukuda once again running against Ōhira and so splitting the party's vote. Despite the split, Ōhira prevailed for a second time, defeating Fukuda in the lower house and the JSP's Asukata Ichio in the upper house.<sup>26</sup>

Although he was able to outmaneuver the opposition—and his opponents within the LDP (who remained in the party despite backing a different candidate for prime minister)—Ōhira's new Cabinet proved unpopular with the public. Attacks from within the party, and also from outside, carried on unabated. Eventually, when the JSP submitted a no-confidence motion to the Diet in May 1980 (in the lead-up to a scheduled upper-house election), many LDP politicians failed to attend the session and the motion passed. Rather than have the Cabinet resign *en masse*, Ōhira responded by again dissolving the lower house and calling a lower-house election for the same day as the upper-house vote—a “double election.” As noted in chapter 4, it was during the midst of this campaign that Ōhira suffered his heart attack and died, leaving the LDP to rally together to run a “mourning campaign” and so gain a sizeable, if somewhat surprising, victory.<sup>27</sup>

When it came time to choose a successor to Ōhira, the tensions between the supporters of the late Ōhira and Tanaka, and those of Fukuda, made the task almost impossible. All three front-runners—Nakasone, Miyazawa Kiichi, and Kōmoto Toshio—faced opposition by significant parts of the party and were thus unelectable. The resulting stalemate forced the party bosses to compromise—to choose someone who could bring stability to the party, someone who could be all things to all people. The party unanimously backed Suzuki in July. The new leader noted, in a typically self-effacing fashion when accepting the position, that he lacked the talent for the job and that he was the first person to become LDP president without spending any money.<sup>28</sup> Suzuki satisfied the needs of the LDP for three basic reasons. First, as noted earlier, he personified the classic consensus-oriented, non-confrontational politician and could therefore navigate safely through the complex demands of LDP politics. Second, he had clearly been a loyal lieutenant to Ōhira and the other mainstream factions, most importantly Tanaka's faction. He was a candidate who would

politely step aside once Tanaka had been rehabilitated and was again eligible for the prime ministership.<sup>29</sup> Third, he was a political tactician rather than a policy leader; he would leave the key policy decisions to the other factional leaders, the *zoku* specialists, and the bureaucrats.

### *After the Storm*

Under Suzuki's stewardship, the remainder of the year passed without major incident, although signs of tension within the LDP and the wider political world, along with indications that Suzuki had little control over government, emerged in a number of areas. Economically at least, conditions had improved since 1979. Demand for petroleum had dropped over the two years since the Tokyo summit. The oversupply of oil produced a substantial price reduction, which acted as a strong economic stimulus for Japan and led to gross domestic product rising by 3.8 percent in 1980. Expectations in 1981 were for growth of 5.1 percent.<sup>30</sup> The yen was also at a low level, which made Japanese products more competitive. Predictably, strong economic growth, combined with a weaker yen, affected Japan's major trading relationships; Japan's trade surpluses, with both Europe and the United States, were high and rising in 1981. The merchandise trade surplus with the U.S. had risen from US\$6.2 billion in 1979 to US\$7.3 billion in 1980, and was on the way to US\$13.6 billion in 1981.<sup>31</sup> Meanwhile, the surplus with the European Economic Community rose to more than US\$10 billion in 1981. Unemployment, however, rose to 2.27 percent, which was considered high for Japan at the time.<sup>32</sup>

Administrative reform—namely the pursuit of smaller government—was also a major political issue during 1980 and 1981, and proved a great nuisance for Suzuki. The Cabinet needed to reduce the budget deficit after the high-spending policies of previous administrations, which meant that Suzuki was tasked with reducing spending while increasing taxation. On the prompting of Nakasone, the Cabinet set up a Provisional Commission on Administrative Reform (*Rinji Gyōsei Chōsakai* or *Rinchō*) in November 1980 and Suzuki staked his “political career” on successful reforms.<sup>33</sup> Despite including a range of individuals from business, government, the bureaucracy, media, and academia, the *Rinchō* quickly became embroiled in the politics of expenditure, taxation, and bureaucracy. A tax was proposed and rejected, and Suzuki announced expenditure cuts instead. The *Rinchō* report recommended a number of changes for fiscal “reconstruction,” but the proposed legislation was resisted by the LDP, the opposition parties, and the ministries. By mid-1981, Suzuki was once

again faced with the prospect of staring down the business community in order to raise taxes.<sup>34</sup>

Suzuki was also beset by other controversies through the latter part of 1980. First, as noted, the prime minister and other Cabinet members visited the Yasukuni Shrine on August 15. Although the Cabinet had pushed for official visits, emphasis was placed on the idea of visiting as "private citizens" in order to avoid arguments about the constitutionality of the act.<sup>35</sup> The visits were nevertheless contentious. Second, Minister of Justice Okuno Seisuke, a well-known security hawk, argued publicly that Japan needed to revise the Constitution, especially the anti-militarist Article 9. In late August he stated that "although it was a personal opinion, my hope is that there emerges from the people a call to remake an independent constitution."<sup>36</sup> The subsequent political storm was not helped by Suzuki's silence following Okuno's initial pronouncement. Third, in November, Okuno reignited the debate over the constitutionality of politicians visiting Yasukuni. This time he stated that he felt that "Article 20 of the Constitution [which guarantees freedom of religion and prohibits the state from conducting religious activities] did not go as far as prohibiting official visits [to Yasukuni] of Cabinet members."<sup>37</sup> Soon the government found itself restating that a visit by the prime minister or Cabinet members in an official capacity could violate the Constitution, and it was left to Chief Cabinet Secretary Miyazawa to state that the policy of the Cabinet was to avoid official visits to the Shrine.<sup>38</sup>

Despite these many difficulties, Suzuki survived through 1980 because the mainstream LDP factions could not decide who would succeed him. By the time of the Ottawa summit, however, this was beginning to change. The cumulative effect of squabbling over administrative reform, along with these other political controversies, had undermined Suzuki's leadership credibility. One journalist, writing just prior to the Ottawa summit, noted that previously, "despite some misgivings about Suzuki's personal qualities," the expectation was that the Suzuki Cabinet would continue. "Today, however, almost nobody in the LDP believes that Prime Minister Suzuki will be re-elected party president . . . some doubt whether the Suzuki Cabinet will even be able to last out for the remaining year."<sup>39</sup>

### International Environment: The New Cold War

The international politics of 1980 and 1981 was shaped primarily by the changing nature of the superpower relations. Between the Tokyo and

Ottawa summits, the *détente* that had developed between the United States and the Soviet Union through the 1970s had been replaced by renewed Cold War tensions. This meant that other issues and problems were often viewed now as part of this rivalry between Washington and Moscow, which in turn influenced the nature of the debates at Ottawa. In Asia, the United States had been improving relations with China through the 1970s, culminating in the normalization of Sino-American relations from 1979. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, had signed a friendship treaty with Vietnam in 1978, a move which was seen as encirclement by the Chinese, who invaded Vietnam in February 1979.<sup>40</sup>

The most obvious source of superpower tension was in Central Asia with the fighting in Afghanistan. The Soviets invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, and U.S.–Soviet relations continued to deteriorate in 1980, most notably when the United States boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. The Soviet Union had ostensibly invaded to safeguard Soviet interests, but the U.S. interpreted the move as confrontational, seeing it as the end of *détente*. This view subsequently shaped how the United States interpreted its interests elsewhere around the world, especially in the Middle East.<sup>41</sup> The U.S. placed embargoes on the export of a range of technological and strategic items to the Soviet Union, and planned to accelerate the development of a rapid deployment force to operate in the Persian Gulf. In January 1980, President Jimmy Carter pledged to treat the Persian Gulf region as a “vital American interest.”<sup>42</sup> By mid-1981, in the light of misgivings about nuclear proliferation and the missile deployment negotiations, the new Reagan administration had begun implementing an even tougher approach against the Soviet Union.

By contrast, many Europeans, particularly the French and Germans, responded by admonishing the Soviets while continuing economic and political relations.<sup>43</sup> Splits, such as those over East–West trade, were a feature of the West’s approach to the Soviet Union during this period. While the United States sought to employ economic sanctions against the Soviet Union, the Europeans were less enthusiastic; trade with the Soviet Union was much more important for continental Europe than for the U.S. European leaders were also suspicious of U.S. calls to implement sanctions after President Reagan reversed an embargo on U.S. grain sales to the Soviet Union. Many Europeans were skeptical about the effectiveness of economic sanctions and thought little of the argument that sanctions would force the Soviet Union to “bear the brunt of its economic shortcomings.”<sup>44</sup>

Tensions between the two superpowers were also stoked by the political upheavals elsewhere in the world. For instance, the Soviet Union



responded to strikes in Poland by closing the border between East Germany and Poland, and building up its military presence in the area. In December 1980, President Carter expressed deep concern over this build-up, and in late January 1981, new U.S. President Reagan warned the Soviet Union against invading.<sup>45</sup> Superpower antagonism, particularly over Afghanistan and Indochina, also spilled over into Asian affairs. In East Asia, Sino-American rapprochement was seen as a counter to increasing Soviet power in Central Asia, although any improvement in relations between the United States and China was complicated not only by events in Indochina but also by Taiwan. While ostensibly committing itself to the policy of the Carter administration, the new Reagan administration was split on how to manage its relations with China, especially over the sale of arms to Taiwan.<sup>46</sup>

Differences over Afghanistan and such matters also exacerbated other disagreements over arms negotiations and missile deployments. These issues had been in play since the 1970s but, with new Cold War tensions, surfaced anew. In 1976 the Soviets had decided to deploy intermediate-range missiles to central Europe, a decision which panicked West European governments. After some hesitation, the United States responded in 1979 by deciding to deploy Pershing-2 and cruise missiles to Europe while simultaneously pursuing arms negotiations with the Soviet Union.<sup>47</sup> By late 1980 and early 1981, European anxiety about Soviet deployments had morphed into opposition to U.S. deployments and a vigorous peace movement. At the same time, American ambivalence about the need to deploy missiles had been replaced by an ambition to gain military superiority over the Soviets. In November 1981, President Reagan advocated the zero option—the cancellation of the deployment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) missiles provided that the Soviet Union withdrew its missiles from the region—in order to ease the rising Euro-American tensions. Nevertheless, much of 1981 was consumed by arguments between the United States and its NATO allies, particularly West Germany.<sup>48</sup>

Although less dramatic than geostrategy or ideology, the question of fiscal policy also emerged as an irritant in trans-Atlantic relations. In its efforts to counter high inflation, the Reagan administration had adopted a tight monetary policy involving extremely high interest rates along with an expansive fiscal policy. By the end of 1980, U.S. interest rates had reached more than 20 percent, and were maintained at that level throughout 1981. As a result of this policy, the U.S. dollar also appreciated, rising by around 30 percent in the year to August 1981. High interest rates and

the rising dollar placed other governments, particularly the Europeans (and especially the French), into what Robert Putnam and Nicholas Bayne describe as an “unwelcome dilemma.” On the one hand, if these countries allowed for their respective currencies to fall in value to the U.S. dollar, they would be faced with strong inflationary pressures. On the other hand, if they sought to tighten monetary policy in order to support their currencies, they would be increasing the likelihood that their economies would suffer from significant deflationary pressures. Then French Minister of Economy and Finance Jacques Delors described American interest rate policy as “comparable to a ‘third oil shock.’”<sup>49</sup>

Unlike at the 1979 Tokyo summit, concerns about energy, especially oil, had largely disappeared by mid-1981. The global recession that followed the second oil shock quickly reduced the demand for oil so that prices rose more slowly in 1980 before beginning to fall in 1981. However, economic issues had not completely disappeared. East-West trade remained a controversial subject, while new problems had also emerged. Whereas they once worried that the dollar was too weak, G7 leaders now worried that it was too strong. Economic growth was sluggish and unemployment remained high throughout 1981, especially in Europe.<sup>50</sup> One economic issue that remained from Tokyo was the perennially bitter subject of trade protectionism. Once again, Japan was in the spotlight. Owing to America’s growing trade deficit, US politicians continued to scrutinize Japanese trading practices and viewed Japan as having the most unfair trading practices of all America’s allies. In 1981, they were especially focused on Japan’s automobile exports to the United States. In May, for instance, Japan and the United States negotiated the model for quotas as part of the voluntary agreement on Japanese automobile exports. Yet despite these talks, trade-related tensions persisted and awaited Suzuki’s placation in Ottawa.<sup>51</sup>

### Summit Environment: Into the Deep End

Compared to Tokyo, where it had been the host nation under pressure to achieve a successful summit, Japan made less effort to find a consensus at Ottawa. The government did leak some rough guides to its intentions for this meeting, especially on its desire to raise free trade and North-South problems. Japan was particularly keen to promote the second issue, given that a major developing nations’ summit was to be held later in the year, and it wanted to advertise its North-South credentials at Ottawa while

ensuring that its ideas were in keeping with other G7 nations. The major challenge of the summit, therefore, was to repair the problems in Japan's relationship with the United States, notably those that had developed in the wake of Suzuki's meeting with Reagan in May 1981. Trade relations had also been a sore point between the two countries, but it was security that had dominated Suzuki's U.S. visit as well as domestic politics upon his return to Japan.

Suzuki's previous meetings with Reagan in May 1981 set off a domestic political quarrel over the nature of the alliance with the United States, particularly whether it was "military" in nature and whether it covered security eventualities beyond Japan's immediate vicinity. Suzuki's lack of experience and verbal ineptitude on foreign policy matters exacerbated the dispute. The background to the May summit was the government's plan to establish a defense force capable of repelling limited, small-scale aggression in the *Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation* of 1978. Little progress had been made in the subsequent three years, and the Carter administration had attempted to prod Japan into increasing defense expenditure, an approach that the Reagan administration continued. Yet the Japanese were reluctant partners. When U.S. Senator Orrin Hatch attended a conference on security in Tokyo in late 1980, he was criticized for America's attempts to inch Japan in the direction of making greater contributions to the alliance.<sup>52</sup>

At their May meeting, Suzuki controversially had accepted the term "alliance" to describe the relationship when the two leaders recognized "that the *alliance* between the United States and Japan is built upon their shared values of democracy and liberty." In appreciating the importance of burden sharing, the two leaders also stated that they "acknowledged the desirability of an appropriate division of roles between Japan and the United States." Suzuki agreed in the communiqué "that Japan, on its own initiative and in accordance with its Constitution and basic defense policy," would "seek to make even greater efforts for improving its defense capabilities in Japanese territories and in its surrounding sea and air space, and for further alleviating the financial burden of U.S. forces in Japan." According to reports, Suzuki repeatedly stressed to Reagan that if Japan increased its defense spending, this would cause political turmoil and lead to a socialist government.<sup>53</sup>

Suzuki also discussed the communiqué and the meeting in an address, entitled "A New Japan-US Relationship and the Role of My Country," which he gave at the National Press Club in Washington. Along with trade issues, Suzuki covered the U.S.-Japan relationship in

the light of heightened Cold War tensions and the “undesirable trends” of international politics. The first of these trends (of which there were three) was the threat posed by Russia’s military buildup to the security of Western nations. Suzuki argued that the free world must “confront” such developments to maintain peace and security, and, moreover, that it was essential for “Japan and western Europe [to] establish a long-term and comprehensive strategy to guarantee such peace and security.”<sup>54</sup> To do this, the free world needed to combine its “political, military and economic” responses for its “peace strategy.” Suzuki qualified such broad strategies, however, with the caveat that “each country respectively should fulfill an appropriate role,”<sup>55</sup> by which he meant a non-military role for Japan. This impression was reinforced by his repeated use of “as far as possible” when outlining Japan’s cooperation, and his somewhat defensive tone when detailing areas where Japan was actively engaged.

Suzuki seems to have been following the advice of then Counselor of International Relations in the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) (or effectively director of intelligence), Okazaki Hisahiko. Okazaki, who was involved in drafting Suzuki’s press club speech, reminded Suzuki that he had already made such statements in the Diet the previous year.<sup>56</sup> Okazaki later recalled that Suzuki gave the speech at the press club in a “relaxed manner” and was greeted with “cheers and an ovation.” Suzuki was “very happy for its success” and it was only later, when he began reading the stories in the news, that he saw how the events were being interpreted. In light of all the peaceful statements and caveats that he had added to his meeting with Reagan, Suzuki “basically said,” according to Okazaki, “that he wasn’t a bad child.” Yet Suzuki made another promise during his U.S. visit in May, which clearly added to the political storm: he committed Japan to protecting the sea lanes between Guam and the western Philippines. In his meeting with Reagan, Suzuki agreed that Japan would commit itself to defending its “surrounding sea and air space.” At the National Press Club afterward, Suzuki confirmed in response to questions that this meant Japan would protect its sea lanes out to 1,000 nautical miles. According to Michael Green, this “was enough distance to help bottle up Soviet naval forces in the Sea of Okhotsk and to defend against Soviet bombers and submarines as far south as the Philippines.”<sup>57</sup>

Why did Suzuki agree to this commitment? Moreover, why did he characterize the relationship as an “alliance,” despite the domestic political implications? In keeping with the dominant view of Suzuki’s foreign policy skills, Green makes the following argument:

Suzuki himself probably did not fully digest the meaning of what he said, but he had been prepped to make the statement by key Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) officials and members of the defense *zoku* ("caucus") in the Liberal Democratic Party who had worked closely with counterparts in the Reagan administration and knew exactly the implications of what Japan's acceptance of sea-lane defense would mean.<sup>58</sup>

Green characterizes these moves on the part of MOFA, the JDA, and the defense *zoku* as part of the wider movement in the late 1970s and early 1980s to increase Japan's contribution to the U.S. alliance as well as the country's own defense spending. Concerning Suzuki, Green stated his view of the situation more explicitly at a U.S.–Japan security seminar held in Tokyo in January 2001: "it was Suzuki Zenko, who was tricked by people like Ambassador Okazaki, into saying sea lane defense."<sup>59</sup>

The incongruity between international commitments and domestic conditions soon became apparent. When Suzuki returned to Japan he was roundly criticized by the press and opposition for committing Japan to this controversial policy and for referring to the U.S.–Japan relationship as an "alliance." Suzuki quickly retreated from his commitment to Reagan, contradicting the May summit by saying that the "alliance relationship does not include a military side." Suzuki stated that the confusion had merely been the result of a discrepancy with MOFA over the preparation of the joint communiqué. However, a political sacrifice was nonetheless seen as necessary, and the task fell to Foreign Minister Itō Masayoshi, who resigned to take responsibility for the "confusion." Itō would point out, however, that "of course the Japan–US Security Treaty encompasses military matters."<sup>60</sup>

Later in May, former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, Edwin O. Reischauer, added to the alliance controversy when he commented that, although the United States would not "introduce" nuclear weapons into Japan, both sides had already agreed that U.S. ships carrying nuclear weapons could stop at Japanese ports or "transit" through Japan. Since the "transit" of weapons appeared to constitute a *de facto* breach of Japan's non-nuclear principles (of not making, possessing, or introducing nuclear weapons), it added to common perceptions in Japan that the government was not being sincere or transparent to the public about its alliance dealings.<sup>61</sup> The drama continued when the U.S. Ambassador, Mike Mansfield, would neither confirm nor deny to the press the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in any location, a stance that forced Suzuki to embark on a charade

of publicly stressing that the government still adhered to its non-nuclear stance. Soon, other American political figures were suggesting that Japan should have a greater military role as it was receiving a “free ride” on the United States for its security; it was ultimately left to Mansfield to rescue Suzuki by commenting that the alliance did allow the United States to use bases and airfields in Japan “at no cost to us.”<sup>62</sup>

The episode damaged Suzuki politically. First, it undermined his position with the LDP’s hawkish members, whose influence was increasing along with the new Cold War tensions. Second, it did not endear Suzuki to the new, similarly hawkish, Reagan administration. Third, it weakened Suzuki’s image as a security dove, thus opening him up to increased criticism from the opposition and the moderates of the LDP. Finally, the mishap compromised Suzuki’s claims to a reputation as a competent chief diplomat. Domestically, much of the policymaking continued to be controlled by the “old hands” of the LDP and the bureaucrats. Yet the alliance fiasco suggested that in the international and summit environments, choosing the leader was not an incidental consideration. Suzuki’s *laissez-faire* leadership style had a major impact on Japanese diplomacy, and given that Ottawa was imminent, Japanese policymakers might have been justifiably worried about the type of agreements that might emerge accidentally from Canada.

In the lead-up to the summit, Suzuki attempted to repair some of the diplomatic damage. He sought to have a side-summit with Reagan at Ottawa, and Chief Cabinet Secretary Miyazawa announced that Suzuki would promise to Reagan that Japan would “do its best” to achieve its defense build-up plans. Yet Suzuki would also tell the president that a more drastic revision to Japan’s defense program would not be possible.<sup>63</sup> On Asia, Suzuki followed Japan’s well-established approach of portraying itself as a representative of the region. To this end, Foreign Minister Sonoda Sunao met to discuss regional issues with various ambassadors from Asian nations.<sup>64</sup> Suzuki announced Japan’s intention to double its development assistance over five years, and its desire to find a solution to Cambodia’s troubles.<sup>65</sup>

Overall, Suzuki followed Japan’s traditional low-profile approach closely, emphasizing the summit’s consultative nature. This was especially apparent on East–West trade, where Suzuki was attempting to contain the ire of Reagan, contribute to a unified Western position, while also avoiding any trade bans on the Soviet Union. Japanese officials preferred “a rather vague and unfocused assemblage,” and that to “expect a summit such as this to launch anything completely new and specific would be

disturbing.”<sup>66</sup> Nonetheless, he also sought to use the media to communicate Japan’s main summit objectives. Media appearances such as on the Japanese television station, TV Asahi, represented a chance for the prime minister to allay the fears of LDP politicians and the U.S. administration about his likely performance at Ottawa. Suzuki said that he expected that the summit would reflect the tense international environment and focus more on “political issues.” He defended Reagan’s tough stance toward the Soviet Union and said that he would meet with Reagan to reconfirm the details of the May summit, which he thought had gone “really well.”<sup>67</sup> Referring to his favorite political idea, “harmony,” he also noted that he felt the purpose of the summit was to “reach a consensus on the current international situation and on security matters.” His views were widely reported in Japan.<sup>68</sup>

### *Background on Summiteers*

The leaders who attended the Ottawa summit were Pierre Elliott Trudeau (Canada), Reagan (U.S.), François Mitterrand (France), Margaret Thatcher (UK), Helmut Schmidt (West Germany), Giovanni Spadolini (Italy), Gaston Thorn (European Communities), and Suzuki. Suzuki was accompanied by Sonoda (Foreign Affairs), Watanabe Michio (Finance), and Kikuchi Kiyooki (sherpa). Reagan, Mitterrand, Spadolini, Thorn, and Suzuki were all newcomers, while the departure of Carter meant the end of the difficult Carter–Schmidt relationship.

Instead, the stormy U.S.–German relationship had been replaced by a new, although similarly difficult, Franco-American relationship between Mitterrand and Reagan. Although these two leaders had both come to office on the back of popular discontent and were both tougher on East–West security issues than their predecessors, in most other ways the “affable conservative homilist” and “contemplative socialist intellectual” were exact opposites.<sup>69</sup> The clash between Reagan and Mitterrand was not only due to personality differences; the two leaders also represented their respective countries’ changing and diverging economic and foreign-policy interests. The demise of détente, to be replaced by superpower animosity, had already begun in the late 1970s. Economic trouble and this shift to the right hinted at a more forthright form of American diplomacy. Reagan was a conservative, pro-small government, hawkish president. By contrast, Mitterrand was implementing a program of high spending on government welfare, wage increases, and nationalizations. French economic plans depended upon a benign economy in the medi-

um-term and, in particular, low inflation. The French therefore hoped to persuade the United States that its high interest-rate and high-dollar policies were damaging the global economy. In the end, the G7 would expose the often contradictory interests and attitudes of these two leaders: Mitterrand's "moralistic Gaullism," it was soon noted, could do little but "clash with Reaganism."<sup>70</sup>

Reagan's approach to summit diplomacy also suggested that Ottawa would be different. Perhaps because of his own leadership strategy, Reagan sought to avoid binding commitments while also driving for more confrontational and politically oriented policy breakthroughs. As the U.S. sherpa of the time, Myer Rashish, noted, "there will be no concrete conclusion, no numbers in the communiqué, no specific policy agreements."<sup>71</sup> The administration also had what has been described as "a fundamentally different assessment of Soviet policy from most Europeans." Compared to their European counterparts, Reagan and much of his administration saw the Soviet Union as more militarily dangerous, but also more economically vulnerable.<sup>72</sup>

### At the Summit: Head Down, Treading Carefully

The Ottawa summit, beginning on July 20, 1981 and concluding the following day, was hosted by Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau at Le Château Montbello, a hunting resort near Ottawa. Trudeau was resigned to a "getting to know you" meeting, according to Putnam and Bayne, and so allowed some of the difficult topics and points of contention between the participants to be set aside. Trudeau's pessimism was based on two factors. First, only Schmidt, Thatcher, and Trudeau himself had previous experience at G7 summits, and many of the other leaders intended to use the summit merely to get acquainted. Second, the ideological division between the leaders, especially Reagan and Mitterrand, made agreements unlikely from the outset. Fresh to international diplomacy, these leaders were less likely to see the benefits of modifying their policies.<sup>73</sup>

This helps explain Trudeau's decision to invite Suzuki to give the opening address. Ostensibly, Trudeau asked Suzuki to make the opening speech because Japan had the best performing G7 economy: Suzuki could tell the other summiteers how his country had overcome the second oil shock. Canada and Japan also shared a desire to push the North-South debate and thereby send a promising message to the North-South summiteers who were meeting in Cancún after Ottawa. But Suzuki also



represented the safest way to establish a harmonious beginning for the summit.<sup>74</sup> Suzuki spoke for around twenty minutes. He discussed free trade and macroeconomics and expressed Japan's fears about a possible split between Europe and the United States over Soviet as well as economic policy. He also promoted the idea of a "comprehensive security policy," arguing that Japan should adopt a role that focused on economic cooperation as part of its opposition to communism. Comprehensive security would be part of a broad political, economic, and social opposition to communism and Soviet power that would not just rely on military capabilities. Suzuki also discussed Third World problems, committing Japan to increase its development assistance. Finally, he voiced his preference to the other summiteers for the politics of *wa* (harmony).<sup>75</sup>

As there had been indications that the Europeans would seek to single out Japan for harsh criticism on trade and economics, Suzuki attempted to preempt any open criticism of Japan at the summit. He expressed Japan's support for a diverse and open trade system, but went on to suggest that the summit was not the place for talks about trade. He was, he stated, "strongly opposed to the insertion into this summit's communiqué of even the slightest wording on trade restrictions," arguing instead that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was the appropriate forum. Accordingly, Japan would support discussions there but not at Ottawa. He also argued that accusations of Japanese protectionism were unfounded, suggesting that "even amongst foreigners who openly recognize the quality (*yūshūsei*) and competitiveness of Japanese products, there is a myth about the closed nature of the Japanese market." The Japanese market was, however, "by no means less open than the markets of other countries," and in any case Japan would continue to work toward importing more.<sup>76</sup>

Suzuki's use of the "comprehensive security" concept was arguably an attempt, given his recent history on the subject, to limit the amount of attention that strictly military-related security problems might receive. It was aimed at avoiding the mistakes of Suzuki's May summit with Reagan. If the concept itself could be broadened, so might the discussions, leaving less time for the more controversial topics such as defense buildups and thus less chance that statements made at the summit might have domestic consequences. Accordingly, Suzuki contended that, "although it is important to protect the military balance" as a response to the Soviet actions, "it is most important to reactivate our [Western] economies, which are currently mired in a range of problems, and increase the vitality of the whole [Western] economy." He then put forward his strategy to pursue

such objectives: it was “an effective ‘comprehensive security strategy’ for the West.”<sup>77</sup> In particular, Suzuki emphasized information sharing, economic cooperation, and a strong focus on the Third World “beginning with Asia.”

The comprehensive security concept also allowed Suzuki to introduce to the summit what Sakurada calls his “pet political philosophy”—*wa*. *Wa*, as already noted, can mean simply peace, as in international peace, but may also mean friendship, amity, harmony, a spirit of harmony, or a spirit of unity. A common Japanese phrase is “*wa no seishin*,” meaning “spirit of harmony,” while the character is also used in words that refer to Japan (as in *yamato*, “ancient Japan,” or *yamato damashii*, “the Japanese spirit”).<sup>78</sup> Although it is doubtful whether much of its cultural significance transmitted clearly to other participants, the way Suzuki used the term says much about Suzuki’s leadership. Suzuki described his view of the summit using *wa* in the following terms:

It is most important at this summit that we deal with issues with the spirit of harmony [*wa no seishin*] as a basic theme. In ancient Japan, there was a tradition that says “to do with honor is to be near to harmony [*wa*].” Simply, *wa* is to aim for a spirit of solidarity and cooperation. A basic theme of this summit is how we can take this spirit of “*wa*” and deal with the political and economic difficulties that threaten world peace and prosperity. In no way does “harmony” mean to have complete agreement; it does not mean that points of difference do not exist. Rather, it is to have a general agreement that embraces diversity.<sup>79</sup>

In terms of his leadership at the summit, Suzuki was worried that Ottawa might create further divisiveness amongst the member countries. Chastened by his experience with Reagan in May, he hoped for a summit that would pass lightly over such disagreements—especially if it involved Japan. For Suzuki, a successful summit would lead to a polite, if meaningless, result. Moreover, pushing this kind of harmonious coexistence was—if Green’s assessment of how MOFA dealt with Suzuki’s laissez-faire leadership is recalled—one of the few subjects of which the Japanese mandarins were comfortable to leave in Suzuki’s hands. Further, in terms of his domestic leadership, Suzuki must have used the term given its very limited international resonance with a largely domestic audience in mind. As noted earlier, Suzuki had begun his prime ministership with the idea

of the politics of harmony. That he was using a similar expression in the rarefied atmosphere of great power summitry suggests that he felt that it was a good method by which to promote the Japanese way of politics and thus his own leadership style. He would believe himself, as leader and chief diplomat, to be showcasing Japanese values rather than giving in to American demands.

### *Communiqué Summitry*

The leaders and other ministers, holding separate meetings on the evening of the summit, decided to release a statement on political issues. From the next morning, they discussed macroeconomic issues and trade problems, as well as currency and finance problems. The topic for afternoon discussions was North–South problems, with the push for this coming from Canada and Japan in what Kikuchi describes as a “Japan–Canada teamwork play.”<sup>80</sup> The leaders also discussed the Middle East and Cambodia situations, and agreed to issue a statement on terrorism. Although France had previously opposed punishments in the form of suspending air-flights from Afghanistan, the election of Mitterrand had led to a change in position. Overall, however, the day was colored by a preoccupation with great power political issues—particularly on the part of Reagan—notably the Soviet military buildup and the military balance between the communist and democratic blocs.

On the second day, the leaders turned to negotiating the wording of the communiqué, although talks again returned to East–West issues during the morning. Reagan’s stance on the Soviet Union was considerably tougher than the approaches suggested by the Europeans or the Japanese. Reagan hoped to have clauses on such matters as export controls, management of East–West trade, and coordination of Afghanistan policy inserted into the communiqué; however, the Europeans, particularly Schmidt, were less enthusiastic. Suzuki adopted a typically ambiguous position: Japan understood the American view but worried that Western countries would not be able to stay unified behind such a tough position, as had been the case with Afghanistan. Furthermore, if bans were implemented quickly without consultation, Suzuki said that he would be unable to explain this to the Japanese people.<sup>81</sup>

The debate over the communiqué continued during the afternoon session. Although the United States had prepared an extended alternative clause on East–West trade, a compromise was reached over lunch and an

additional, but less direct, clause was inserted. There was some controversy over free trade amongst Western countries. Thatcher and Thorn took Japan to task over non-trade barriers and other similar trade problems, including Japan's reluctance to buy European manufactured products. They also attempted to have a clause inserted in the communiqué that would ask for cooperation on preventing excessive exports into concentrated sectors, a move also aimed at Japan. Suzuki and his fellow delegates vehemently opposed such a clause and, with the support of the United States and West Germany, managed to keep it out of the communiqué.<sup>82</sup>

The final declaration included five main points: the economy, relations with developing countries, trade, energy, and East–West economic relations. The governments committed themselves to improve economic policy and outlined their commitment to helping developing countries. A general commitment to GATT was reaffirmed, as was a commitment to reducing countries' oil dependency. Finally, on the East–West problem, the summiteers promised to improve coordination on trade and the control of "strategic goods and related technology" with the Soviet Union.<sup>83</sup> Two further brief documents were produced as a result of the summit's focus on political and security issues: the "Chairman's Summary of Political Issues," and the "Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism." In these documents, the leaders addressed issues relating to broader East–West relations, the Afghanistan problem, and terrorism.<sup>84</sup>

Suzuki and the Japanese delegation managed to influence a number of minor points in the final declaration. An expression of concern about the implications of an increasing world population was included, as was a statement supporting the efforts of emerging countries to "develop human resources, including technical and managerial capabilities."<sup>85</sup> The statement that G7 countries should aim to reduce public borrowing boosted Suzuki's hopes for administrative reform and smaller government in Japan. On the other hand, the European preference for managed trade did not appear in the declaration, although Suzuki was fortuitously saved on this front by the United States and to a lesser extent, West Germany. The leaders expressed in the final declaration their conviction that they were "equal to the challenges" facing them, while Suzuki's favorite cultural term, *wa*, also found its way into the final document. On the issue of international cooperation, the leaders stated that: "[w]e will move forward together and with all countries ready to work with us in a spirit of *cooperation and harmony*."<sup>86</sup> Yet the cooperation and harmony which eventually appeared in the communiqué were by necessity the outcome of lowest-common-

denominator agreements. For those looking for a more substantive summit, this would have been disappointing if not surprising.

### *Aftermath*

Following the summit, Suzuki was able to announce to the press that the confirmation of free trade was a significant point and a “message to the world.”<sup>87</sup> However, he was forced to reject the proposition that the political statement arguing for a defense buildup was evidence of the West pressuring Japan. While recognizing that the balance of power needed to be maintained against the Soviet Union, he asserted that Japan would continue to develop its defense policy independently, and that Japan had no intention of developing into a strong military power.

Two results from the summit were pleasing to the prime minister: (1) that the other leaders only criticized Japan mildly for its trade practices; and (2) that this criticism did not find its way into the final declaration. A front page heading for the *Asahi Shinbun* noted “Anti-Japanese criticism erased.” The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) stated that Japan was morally bound to increase imports but that Ottawa would “not obligate Japan to take any new policy measures.” Miyazawa also claimed the summit as a success, emphasizing that Japan did not need to take any particular actions as a result of Ottawa. Indeed, he argued that any accusation that Japan’s trade practices were unfair was “groundless,” and based on information from the 1960s. The director-general of economic affairs in MOFA, Fukuda Hiromu, observed that Suzuki had debunked the “myth” that Japanese markets were “tougher” for foreigners to enter than other markets were for Japanese.<sup>88</sup>

Although it was not strictly part of the G7 summit, Suzuki had advertised during the lead-up to Ottawa that another U.S.–Japan meeting would be held. This meeting was intended to smooth over the differences that had emerged from the earlier Washington summit in May and reaffirm the joint communiqué of that meeting. Accordingly, Suzuki met with Reagan on the morning of the summit’s second day, with the official line from Japan suggesting that the meetings were “amicable” and that they confirmed “the need to maintain dialogue and harmonious relations” between Japan and the United States. Publicly, the Japanese expressed a belief that Suzuki and Reagan had “succeeded in improving the Tokyo–Washington relations which had been strained;” Suzuki claimed Reagan had not taken up defense matters and that “[n]o gaps remain between us.”<sup>89</sup>

## Conclusion

As was the case with Ōhira at the Tokyo summit of 1979, constraints on Japan as a result of its diplomatic isolation were clearly present at Ottawa in 1981. Suzuki's troubles at the May bilateral summit with President Reagan, and then again at Ottawa, support the long-held criticism of Japan's leaders as being unable to "speak" for themselves.<sup>90</sup> Suzuki's failure to engage in the main debates at Ottawa was therefore not only the result of his failures as prime minister, but also represented Japan's diplomatic dependence on the United States. Overall, Suzuki's strategy consisted not of a transactional leadership style but of a *laissez-faire*, or non-leadership, style in which leadership was almost completely turned over to other political actors. His vision was at best "managerial," in that it was based on the objective of facilitating only the minimal necessary change. Yet Suzuki was also able to pursue his personal political beliefs at the summits. In fact, even as Suzuki implemented a managerial non-leadership strategy, his success at setting out his political philosophy (the politics of harmony) for the world's leaders highlights the capacity of leaders to inject non-rational elements into their leadership styles and insert these styles into their diplomacy.

Despite his *laissez-faire* style of leadership, Suzuki oversaw some important changes to Japanese security policy while prime minister. The breaking of a taboo in describing the U.S.-Japan relationship as an "alliance" and the extension of Japan's alliance role to include defending its sea lanes out to 1,000 nautical miles were the two major developments. These were not policies that Suzuki actively pursued, but were instead facilitated by the lassitude allowed to the bureaucracy by his style of non-leadership. That these changes were successfully made raises some important questions about what different leadership styles might make possible in terms of leadership outcomes. In contrast to James MacGregor Burns's contention that leadership must be "intended change," it suggests that leadership cannot always be best understood this way, but is something broader.<sup>91</sup>

In terms of the sea-lane commitment, Suzuki's decision set in train intra-alliance negotiations over how the Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF) would carry out these new roles and propelled changes in Japanese maritime defense thinking through the 1980s. Following the May 1981 summit, the United States was quick to lay out its new expectations of the JSDF. In response, Suzuki sought to create some distance between himself and his commitments as well as to place constraints on the conduct of any potential JSDF operations; however, the Japanese government nonetheless

agreed to increase the Maritime Self Defense Force's air surveillance capabilities. Indeed, in the years following Suzuki's sea-lane commitment, especially after Nakasone became prime minister, there was a steady upward trajectory in Japan's capabilities for sea-lane defense.<sup>92</sup>

Nevertheless, even as Suzuki facilitated some major shifts in policy, his diplomatic missteps clearly hindered Japan's capacity to pursue key national interests at Ottawa. This failure was further demonstrated at the Versailles summit the following year. By repeating his managerial leadership approach, Suzuki failed to exert influence on the major questions under debate, especially the East–West trade issue. Japanese business interests, in particular, viewed progress in the Japanese–Soviet Sakhalin oil project as an important foreign policy goal, which was threatened by the potential new sanctions and trade credit restrictions on the Soviet Union proposed by the Reagan administration. Despite the issue's importance, however, Suzuki was unable to convince Reagan that the project should be exempted from any new restrictions, a failure that received widespread censure in Japan.<sup>93</sup>

## Nakasone Yasuhiro

### *Widening Possibilities*

As Japan is not a member of NATO, and is a country having a peace constitution and non-nuclear principles, it has conventionally been our policy to keep silent on such issues. In this case, however . . .

—Nakasone Yasuhiro  
Williamsburg Summit, May 1983<sup>1</sup>

In this final case study, the focus shifts to Nakasone Yasuhiro's leadership from late 1982 until the Group of Seven (G7) summit held in Williamsburg in late May 1983. Like his two predecessors, Ōhira Masayoshi and Suzuki Zenkō, Nakasone also had a rural upbringing, although in more affluent circumstances. In terms of leadership strategy, Nakasone demonstrated a more assertive, less conciliatory approach to politics than either Ōhira or Suzuki. His leadership vision, in particular, was characterized by a strongly nationalist sentiment, even as his leadership style was highly pragmatic. A key factor shaping this juxtaposition in Nakasone's leadership was the domestic political circumstances of the early 1980s, notably the influential role played by former Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei. At the international level, however, Nakasone's more assertive leadership played an important role in the way he successfully established a strong relationship with U.S. President Ronald Reagan and thereby moved Japan closer to the center of G7 diplomacy, especially on the issue of missile system deployments.



## Nakasone's Leadership: Hawk or Weathervane?

### *Biographical Detail*

Nakasone was born in 1918 in Takasaki City, Gunma Prefecture. He was the third of six children—a middle child—and claims to have been a “quiet, easy child,” ascribing other characteristics, such as naughtiness, to his elder brother, Kichitarō. His father was Nakasone Matsugoro, who had inherited the family's silk business before moving to Takasaki to establish a timber business. His mother, Yuku (formerly Nakamura), came from a family of wealthy merchants and farmers and was, according to a proud Nakasone, “strikingly beautiful.”<sup>2</sup> Nakasone began his schooling at Takasaki North Primary School, progressing to Takasaki Middle School and then Shizuoka High School. Nakasone was sufficiently gifted academically that, after graduating, he was able to enter the law faculty at the prestigious Tokyo Imperial University (now the University of Tokyo).

Nakasone claims to have been “too prudent and too timid” to become involved in ideological debates at the university. Yet his recollections suggest that he was well aware of the political and social upheavals shaping Japan at the time; he was obviously well aware of the nationalist mood and the rise of militarism in the country. Nakasone became a student of Professor Yabe Teiji, who sought to harmonize the “traditional Japanese character with modern political science.”<sup>3</sup> In addition to reading novels and haiku, he enjoyed historical philosophy and read from such scholars as Ōrui Noburu and Nishida Kitarō. Compared to other prime ministers, Nakasone's policies or political approach contained a feeling for historical and strategic viewpoints, reflecting this early reading.<sup>4</sup> While at university, Nakasone sat and passed the civil service entrance examination, and was also accepted into the Naval Paymaster's School. Nakasone describes passing his university, civil service, and navy examinations “without a hitch,”<sup>5</sup> despite the deep effect his mother's death had on him in his final university year.

Upon graduating in 1941, Nakasone entered the powerful Home Ministry (Naimushō), before joining the Imperial Navy as a *shukei chūi* (paymaster sub-lieutenant). He graduated from the naval accounting school in August, just months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and joined the cruiser *Aoba*. He then went to Kure Chinju naval base, where he was the leading paymaster to the construction corps, before being posted around Southeast Asia, and then finally to Taiwan. He was in Taiwan until November 1944 when he returned to Japan to work at the naval armaments department at Yokosuka. In February 1945, Naka-

sone married Kobayashi Tsutako, the younger sister of a colleague in the navy. His wife's father had been a geological surveyor and her mother had been an activist with connections in the political and bureaucratic worlds, including links with Hatoyama Ichirō. Nakasone was demobilized at the end of 1945 with the rank of *shukei taii* (paymaster lieutenant) and returned to the Ministry of Home Affairs.<sup>6</sup>

In an autobiography, Nakasone comments on the horror of war, recalling being attacked by U.S. bombers while at an airfield in Mindanao, and by a Dutch destroyer while off the coast of Borneo. Nakasone's own war record has not been without controversy. Accusations have been made, for example, that as a navy paymaster he established "comfort stations" (i.e., Japanese military brothels where women, from colonies or captured territories, were forced into sexual slavery). Yuki Tanaka states that "comfort stations in Balikpapan were set up by Nakasone Yasuhiro, later Japan's Prime Minister, who was then a young paymaster of the Japanese Navy troops stationed in Balikpapan." Tanaka and others cite a 1978 piece contributed by Nakasone to an edited collection on the navy in which he commented that he had built *ianjo* or comfort stations for Japanese soldiers.<sup>7</sup> Because the Japanese force had been large, soldiers and navy employees were often found gambling or assaulting local women; according to Nakasone, he "went to great lengths and even built comfort stations." They "packed into them like sardines."<sup>8</sup> Later, however, when interviewed on the subject, Nakasone denied that they were used for forced prostitution but, as far as he knew, were simple recreation facilities. He also noted that "we have expressed our sympathy for those who underwent such experiences and we feel sorry."<sup>9</sup>

Although he briefly returned to the bureaucracy after the war, Nakasone was politically aware and strongly opposed to the rise of communism in Japan. He thus resigned from the bureaucracy and sought to enter politics. To further his political activities and ideas, he established the Blue Cloud School (Seiunjuku), a support group with a strongly nationalistic, anti-communist outlook, and stood as a candidate for the Democratic Party at the 1947 elections. Supported chiefly by returned soldiers and purged conservatives, Nakasone developed early the kind of theatrical politics for which he would later become famous. He won a seat in the House of Representatives for the Gunma electorate. As a member of the wing on the conservative side of politics opposed to Yoshida Shigeru, he joined the Kōno faction.<sup>10</sup>

Nakasone's senior political career began in 1959 when he was appointed to the Cabinet for the first time, becoming director of the

Science and Technology Agency under Kishi Nobusuke. However, it was not until 1965 that he gained more substantive influence. The leader of his faction, Kōno Ichirō (before Kōno, the faction had belonged to Hatoyama), died, and Nakasone was subsequently able to recruit and then build his own faction out of the Kōno faction.<sup>11</sup> In the Liberal Democratic Party's (LDP) ever competitive "game" of factionalism, Nakasone proved a capable, even talented, practitioner.<sup>12</sup> He was appointed director general of the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) in 1970, a position from which he could speak on the taboo subject of Japanese defense policy. In keeping with his political history, he adopted a nationalist style, arguing in Japan's first defense white paper that Japan should have a more autonomous national defense (*jishu bōei*).<sup>13</sup> He later held various positions in the Cabinets of Tanaka, Miki Takeo, Fukuda Takeo, and Ōhira, before taking up the important position of director general of the Administrative Management Agency under Suzuki. After Suzuki's resignation, Nakasone became president of the LDP and prime minister in November 1982.

At the time of the Williamsburg G7 summit, Nakasone had only been prime minister for approximately six months, although he was to lead Japan for more than four years after the summit. In 1987, after promising not to introduce new taxes, Nakasone saw his popularity plummet when he reversed his position and proposed a value-added tax. He stepped down in November 1987, to be replaced by Takeshita Noboru. His post-leadership political career was also lengthy if at times beset by controversy. In 1988–89, he was implicated in the "Recruit" scandal, in which many major LDP figures had been found to have received unlisted shares and cash donations from Recruit Cosmos, a job-placement and recruitment company.<sup>14</sup> Although Nakasone briefly resigned from the LDP, he was nonetheless able to hand over his faction, eventually return to the party, and later act as an elder statesman of Japanese politics. Finally, he was forced to retire by Prime Minister Koizumi Jun'ichirō before the lower-house election of 2003.<sup>15</sup>

### *Leadership Vision and Style*

Nakasone was arguably the most prominent Japanese political figure of the Cold War period. In this sense, he contended with other leaders as the dominant figure of postwar Japanese politics such as Yoshida, whose policies he vigorously opposed; Kishi, with whom he shared both a deep nationalism and great opportunism; and Tanaka, upon whom he depended heavily as prime minister. Since he had little in the way of political

(factional) power, Nakasone achieved prominence largely thanks to his political style. He adopted stridency as a default position on many public issues, particularly defense and administrative reform, and cultivated an alternative leadership ideal for Japanese politics. In his memoirs, he spelled out his views on leadership:

The prime minister, by exercising his power under the present constitution, can occupy a stronger position, within his country, than the US president. The prime minister bears ultimate responsibility; he does not play a supporting role to a power bearing emperor. He is in a position to manage both state affairs and diplomacy through the exercise of leadership powers considerably stronger than those he enjoyed before the war.<sup>16</sup>

Nakasone linked this image of leadership with his own prime minister-ship. As he notes in his memoirs, “[w]hen I became prime minister I was open about my conviction that, ‘The prime minister of Japan should be a presidential style of prime minister,’ and I ran my administration accordingly.”<sup>17</sup>

At the heart of Nakasone’s political personality lay a battle between ambition and ideology, a battle in which ambition prevailed at key points over the course of his career. Certainly Nakasone was known as a hawk (*taka*) because of his nationalist, right-wing views, and he was an early leader of the “New Right” of LDP politics.<sup>18</sup> But his ambition was also always there alongside his ideology. When Nakasone reached the pinnacle of politics he had assembled thirty-two notebooks listing the things he wished to do once in office. And, as Takashi Inoguchi explains, “his eagerness to become prime minister led him to acquire those skills of maneuvering and manipulation that warrant the nickname [of weathercock].” The term weathervane or weathercock (*kazamidori*) referred to Nakasone’s tendency to follow in the direction of the prevailing political winds. Nakasone argued that being a weathercock took a rare ability—such leaders had to stay grounded in order to see how political circumstances were changing and thereby adjust. “Those who become weathercocks,” he suggests, “are truly courageous people.”<sup>19</sup> Even while espousing a nationalist ideology, Nakasone was flexible and pragmatic in his political behavior.

Whether hawk or weathercock, Nakasone was undoubtedly fond of the dramatic, since his public profile—and therefore political power—depended upon it. He often attempted the unusual or bizarre in order to gain publicity or broadcast a controversial message. During his time

as president of Takushoku University between 1967 and 1971, at one of the university festivals, he claims to have drunk “fresh snake’s blood to encourage . . . [the students].”<sup>20</sup> At other times, however, his behavior was not always well received. In his infamous “intelligent society” speech, Nakasone argued that many of America’s problems were due to the racial inferiority of African Americans (amongst others), a remark which led to a diplomatic row with the United States.<sup>21</sup> In 1951, he petitioned General Douglas MacArthur to end the Occupation. Then a young politician, he asked, “[w]hy is the sovereignty on domestic administration and diplomacy—not to say military defense—not yet returned to us?” And later, “it is impossible for a general, however sagacious, to subjugate a modern nation craving for freedom of personality under occupation for more than five years solely by his personal character.”<sup>22</sup> John Welfield’s assessment of Nakasone’s approach to politics is that “Nakasone, at heart, was neither a great admirer of the West nor an Asianist, but a Japan-centred nationalist, profoundly racist in his outlook.”<sup>23</sup>

Nakasone’s leadership style was formed out of the inner contest between the idealist and the realist in his personality. While he promoted the idea that the prime minister was powerful, as illustrated by the earlier quote from his memoirs, Nakasone was undeniably constrained by the nature of Japanese politics throughout his career. He was never free to follow his own path, but depended heavily on the power of others, especially Tanaka, who was the political midwife to the Nakasone Cabinet. Nakasone naturally describes this dependence, especially in terms of the appointment of numerous figures from the Tanaka faction, as an opportunity to show leadership.

When I became prime minister and formed my first cabinet I chose men of note from the Tanaka factions: men such as secretary general Nikaidō [Susumu] and chief cabinet secretary Gotōda [Masaharu], and appointed them to central positions within the political structure. For this my cabinet was attacked as a “Tanakasone cabinet” or a “Lockheed shift.” But I had in mind the strategy of Admiral Togo when confronted by the Baltic Fleet. The formation of this [Nakasone’s] first cabinet was likewise, the seizing of a chance.<sup>24</sup>

Rather than reinforce Nakasone’s image as a maverick, however, the “Tanakasone” Cabinet confirmed the view of Nakasone as a weathervane. The reality was that Nakasone had no choice but to appoint many of Tanaka’s lieutenants to the Cabinet.

Many commentators who focus on elements of this broad style often make exaggerations of the vision. Roger Buckley, for instance, argues that "Nakasone has proved to be the sole prime minister in the post-Tanaka era who would confidently stamp his imprint on events at home and abroad."<sup>25</sup> Others, focusing on his narrow political influence and the realities of the vision, note that in terms of his political legacy, Nakasone is "remembered for leaving immense tasks ahead."<sup>26</sup> J. A. A. Stockwin, commenting on attitudes toward Nakasone's leadership at the time, nonetheless contends that "it seems reasonable to argue that there was a Nakasone flavor to most of the policy initiatives undertaken during his period as Prime Minister."<sup>27</sup> In 1982 and 1983, Nakasone undoubtedly represented a complete break from Suzuki in terms of political style, the forthright Nakasone overshadowing the "unassertive" Suzuki. In a sense, Nakasone's leadership was a rescue mission. When he took over as prime minister, Kenneth Pyle argues, the country's diplomacy was in "disarray" as a result of the "weak and vacillating" policy approach of his predecessor, Suzuki.<sup>28</sup>

### Domestic Environment: Textbooks and the "Tanakasone" Cabinet

Nakasone's chance to become prime minister came as a result of errors by Prime Minister Suzuki and the unraveling of the LDP bargain that had resulted in Suzuki's prime ministership. Suzuki was facing speculation over his leadership by 1982, with the widely circulated opinion, attributed to Kishi, being that "almost anyone would be better" than Suzuki.<sup>29</sup> His program on administrative and fiscal reform had fallen prey to bureaucratic politics. Most notably, the government chose to defer key decisions—involving the privatization of key industries, including the railways, tobacco, and telephone industries—for "further study." The Provisional Commission on Administrative Reform (Rinji Gyōsei Chōsakai or Rinchō), which had been set up in 1980 to push forward these reforms, had aimed to commence the "major implementation" of the reform program by March 1983 (when the commission was to disband). However, this was described as "a commendable objective but unrealistic in the Japanese environment."<sup>30</sup>

The 1982 Sino-Japanese textbook controversy also highlighted Suzuki's leadership weaknesses. The controversy began when major Japanese newspapers printed reports that the Ministry of Education had forced a revision in high school history textbooks to depict Japanese actions in China during the Second World War as less aggressive. Although some

newspapers later retracted their stories and issued apologies, the story was picked up in the Chinese media, which used it to humiliate Suzuki when he visited Beijing in late 1982. Following Japanese apologies, the problem receded internationally; however, it continued as a domestic issue, furthering divisions within education circles, especially between right-wing LDP conservatives and left-wing teacher unions. Much as with other issues, the inarticulate Suzuki was unable to calm or negotiate between the different groups.<sup>31</sup>

As noted in chapter 5, Suzuki's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine had also created controversy. His decision not to distinguish whether it had been a private or official trip then widened the row from a tussle over war memories to a constitutional debate over the separation of state and religion. Even more perplexing, diplomatically, was the fact that Suzuki's visit took place in the midst of the textbook controversy. The opposition parties responded by submitting a no-confidence motion in the Diet. Although it was defeated, Suzuki was forced to give a press conference to deny any connection between the two controversies and explain how he would better manage relations with China and South Korea.<sup>32</sup>

Finally, in the background was the figure of Tanaka and the Lockheed scandal. In reality, Suzuki could do little to shape events involving Lockheed, and the scandal surrounding Tanaka continued through the year. In June 1982, two politicians were convicted for their role in the affair. Revelations of cash being transferred between shadowy figures and Tanaka featured prominently in the news and it looked increasingly possible that Tanaka might be convicted. Suzuki, dependent on Tanaka for his position, faced even more pressure from Tanaka's political opponents within the party, notably Fukuda. It seemed that the fragile balance that had held within the LDP since 1980 would be undermined and the "Kaku-Fuku" war would resume.<sup>33</sup>

#### *Suzuki's Demise, Nakasone's Arrival*

By late 1982, therefore, the compromise decision to appoint Suzuki had reached its use-by date, and Japanese politics was prepared for a change of leadership. In this regard, although Suzuki was inept at judging the wider political mood, he never lost his sense for LDP politics. Thus, in October 1982, he suddenly declared his intention not to run for re-election as LDP president, once again emphasizing the importance of harmony within the party.<sup>34</sup> Suzuki's declaration forced the LDP to act: either to break the deadlock or to find another less accident-prone compromise leader.

The key figures in this process were Tanaka and, to a lesser degree, Kishi and Fukuda. Before October 1982, Tanaka continued to support Suzuki as prime minister, but once Suzuki had resigned he shifted his support to the third mainstream faction—Nakasone. Meanwhile, Kishi had been campaigning for the removal of Suzuki and a reduction in the influence of the Tanaka faction. He threw his weight behind the anti-mainstream politician, Kōmoto Toshio (successor to Miki's faction). Fukuda, still feuding with Tanaka, naturally preferred to have his successor, Abe Shintarō (Kishi's son-in-law), become prime minister, but floated a compromise deal whereby the prime ministership and LDP presidency would be split between the Nakasone and Fukuda factions. The mainstream factions preferred to avoid a primary election for the presidency, whereas the anti-mainstream factions saw such an election as their only hope to stymie a Nakasone prime ministership. When Nakasone rejected Fukuda's compromise agreement, however, an election became unavoidable. Fukuda subsequently "lent" some of his faction members to Nakagawa Ichirō, and the conditions for an election were met. In the end, despite the expectations of political figures such as Kishi (who thought that Kōmoto in particular had a strong chance), Nakasone won easily.<sup>35</sup>

Having won with the backing of Tanaka, Nakasone depended for his political life on the goodwill of Tanaka's faction. This was reflected in the number of Cabinet positions Nakasone gave to Tanaka faction members, who ultimately came to dominate the Cabinet and made it entirely deserving of its nickname, the "Tanakasone cabinet."<sup>36</sup> The most important political position, chief cabinet secretary, which was often reserved for a member of the prime minister's faction, was given to the well-connected Gotōda, a key lieutenant of Tanaka. Five other ministers were Tanaka faction members, while two further ministers, although ostensibly independents, were aligned with Tanaka. The individual role played by Tanaka was doubly important given the way in which the faction viewed Nakasone. As David Williams notes, the loathing of Nakasone within the faction, particularly amongst its senior members, was such that without Tanaka's support, Nakasone's lengthy time as prime minister "would have been unthinkable."<sup>37</sup> Nakasone's whole political style was at odds with the traditional methods of senior Tanaka politicians such as Takeshita. Moreover, in supporting Nakasone, Tanaka was delivering a message to his faction: he was not ready to hand over control of the faction to others or give up on the idea of becoming prime minister once again. In the meantime, he would not countenance a member of his faction, such as Takeshita,



becoming prime minister. As Gotōda argues, “Tanaka Kakuei himself truly didn’t want to put forward a candidate from his own faction.”<sup>38</sup>

New to the job, Nakasone had little time to shape domestic politics in the run up to Williamsburg and so took a cautious approach, focusing on foreign policy and defense. Even in this brief period, however, Nakasone could not resist some grand rhetoric or controversial symbolism. In January 1983, when speaking to the Diet, he stated that Japan was on the brink of momentous change; the country was, he suggested, “at a great turning-point in post-war history.”<sup>39</sup> Three months later, he visited the spring festival of the Yasukuni Shrine, and announced that he would at some point visit the shrine in an official capacity.

Immediately before the summit, the main domestic issue was whether the LDP would call a lower-house election concurrent with the scheduled upper-house one, a “double” election. Tanaka, with a much stronger political organization behind him, hoped for a double election so that he would increase his power and thereby stymie attempts to remove him. The other factions naturally opposed this move, and it was only just before Williamsburg that Nakasone finally decided to eschew the idea. Only the upper-house election went ahead as scheduled for June 1983, a month after the summit. Since campaigning got underway just after Nakasone returned from Williamsburg, the election looked like it might be something of a test of Nakasone’s foreign and defense policies. However, public interest in the election was low and, as much as Nakasone championed diplomatic issues, the Tanaka scandal remained the dominant topic of domestic politics.<sup>40</sup>

### International Environment: Trade and Missiles

International politics prior to Williamsburg was not in crisis as it had been before Tokyo in 1979; however, many of the problems that emerged in world politics around that time were still to be resolved. To begin with, the superpowers were increasingly antagonistic. The Soviets and Americans were now competing more keenly on a range of issues and in numerous theaters around the world: on missiles and trade, and in South America, Europe, the Middle East, and East Asia. The dominant issues were no longer economic—political leaders were now worrying less about trade and energy and more about weapons and war. When issues such as trade, growth, and monetary policy were discussed, they were often mentioned in the context of security, as illustrated by the debates over

East–West trade as a part of overall relations with the Soviet Union. Most significantly, 1983 was to be dubbed “the year of the missile.”<sup>41</sup>

This shift from economics to security was in part due to the brightening prospects for the world economy. Global economic growth had stagnated in 1982, with all the G7 economies declining. Growth in Canada, Germany, and Italy was particularly poor. In the first half of 1983, however, all G7 countries (bar Italy) enjoyed growth in real gross domestic product, with the economies of Canada, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States growing more strongly than continental Europe and Japan. Inflation remained a problem in some G7 countries, notably France and Italy; however, most of these countries, especially Canada, Germany, and the UK, saw a large fall in their inflation rate from 1982 and the beginning of 1983.<sup>42</sup>

The recession had clearly affected public policymaking among the major powers. In June 1982, the French devalued the franc, froze wages and prices for four months, and implemented a range of deflationary policies, including higher taxes, and social spending cuts. In March 1983, they carried out another currency-devaluation and made further cuts to government spending. The French policy shift was a matter of bringing the economy into line with the country’s major trading partners. For its part, the United States had begun to relax monetary policy in July 1982. In contrast to the French, its policy was shaped not by complaints from the other G7 members, but by domestic considerations—fears of further recession and a banking crisis—along with concerns of an impending developing world debt crisis in late 1982, especially in South America.<sup>43</sup>

Trade relations also remained problematic. In poor economic conditions, many nations used trade barriers to protect domestic industries, and also increasingly managed trade through bilateral agreements. In February 1983, the European Economic Community and Japan agreed to limit certain Japanese exports to Europe. The two countries whose trading patterns changed significantly were the United States and France: the former went from having a current account surplus of US\$6.3 billion in 1981 to a deficit of US\$8.1 billion in 1982, while the latter went from a US\$4.7 billion deficit in 1981 to a US\$12.1 billion deficit in 1982. For the United States, the situation became even more drastic in 1983 as the country recorded a US\$40.8 billion deficit.<sup>44</sup>

While the issue of East–West trade, which had so disrupted the Versailles summit (see below), continued to trouble relations amongst the Western powers—particularly French companies that ran afoul of the U.S. trade embargo on the Soviet Union—the major source of tension in

East–West relations stemmed from the deployment of new missile systems in Europe. The issue of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) had already manifested at the Ottawa summit in 1981. In fact, the problem had emerged as early as 1976 when the Soviets deployed SS-20 intermediate-range missiles to central Europe, leading to a U.S. counter-deployment of Pershing and ground-launched cruise missiles to Western Europe. By the 1980s, however, the Europeans were less anxious about the Soviet Union and increasingly opposed further U.S. missile deployments—a diplomatic split which the Soviet Union attempted to widen. In November 1981, only months after the Ottawa summit, Reagan proposed a “zero option” to resolve the missile dispute: the United States would not deploy new medium-range missiles to Europe if the Soviet Union dismantled its medium-range SS-4, SS-5, and SS-20 missiles. In February 1982, when the United States presented a draft treaty for the zero-option proposal to the Soviet Union, the Soviets responded with a counter-proposal involving a two-thirds reduction in deployments, which was in turn rejected by the U.S.<sup>45</sup>

By Williamsburg, security diplomacy was dominated by the INF issue. In mid-1982, the United States and the Soviet Union had made further proposals for deployment reductions (notably the idea of ceilings), but while neither country dismissed these out of hand, no agreements were reached. Negotiations resumed in Geneva in January 1983, with the United States again stressing its zero option, but also indicating that other offers might be acceptable. Unfortunately, negotiations then became hostage to deteriorating wider superpower relations and a tougher approach from the U.S. In March, Reagan referred to the Soviet Union as the “evil empire,” and in May obtained funding from Congress to develop a new nuclear delivery system, the MX intercontinental ballistic missile, even as he endorsed a “build-down” proposal (an interim-term proposal involving missile-deployment reductions on both sides).

The talks, in addition to stretching the American administration to its limits, challenged the solidarity of the major Western countries. As Robert Putnam and Nicholas Bayne point out, the controversy divided the G7 countries in some fundamental areas, a division which the Soviet Union inevitably sought to exploit. Whereas the Europeans sought a flexible approach that would produce a successful agreement, the United States was more intent on maintaining nuclear parity or gaining superiority *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union. In Europe, those countries with independent nuclear forces, such as Great Britain and France, refused to allow their independent forces to be subject to any superpower agreement. By con-

trast, those countries without nuclear forces were willing to disrupt these small nuclear forces if it would facilitate a compromise with the Soviets. Lastly, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)–Japan relations soured as the Japanese complained that agreements over INF in Europe could well push the Soviet missile deployment problem into Northeast Asia, thereby heightening tensions in Asia.<sup>46</sup>

### *Trade and the Alliance*

Japan felt itself squeezed on both trade and security issues. First, its current account surplus was attracting increasing international attention in 1983. Whereas the current account of other countries went from surplus to deficit during this period, Japan's current account surplus continued to increase, from US\$4.8 billion in 1981 to US\$20.8 billion in 1983. Japan's most important trading relationship, with the United States, was also on an upward trend.<sup>47</sup> Whatever the realities of Japan's trading relations—whether Japan simply made superior products or was “free riding” behind mercantilism—the trade balance now became a major diplomatic problem. The Europeans and Americans viewed Japan's trading practices as unfairly exploiting their goodwill, by dumping its cheap products in their relatively open markets, and then blocking their exports to its own heavily protected market. From late 1981, the Japanese government made a greater effort to change this image and assuage European and American unhappiness. In December 1981, for instance, it announced that tariff cuts, which had been promised in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) Tokyo Round, would be implemented in the new fiscal year. Yet both the U.S. and European governments expressed disappointment at a perceived lack of substance in Japanese promises, which prompted the Japanese government to make further conciliatory efforts. These efforts included a Japanese proposal to act on over two-thirds of U.S. and European complaints.<sup>48</sup> At the end of January 1982, the Japanese government had approved the elimination of a number of non-tariff barriers in order to make it easier for foreign companies to access the Japanese market.

The deterioration of superpower relations—along with an apparent rise in Soviet influence and corresponding decline in American influence in East Asia—increased Japanese concerns over self-defense. The government feared that long-term trends were moving the region away from the U.S. sphere of influence. On one side, America had suffered a ruinous involvement in Vietnam, had retrenched strategically from East Asia following the “Nixon shocks” of 1971, and had pledged under the

Jimmy Carter administration in 1976 to withdraw forces from the Korean peninsula. At the same time, the Soviet Union had increased its military activities in Northeast Asia, supported Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia in 1979, and invaded Afghanistan in the same year.<sup>49</sup> Where the Japanese had previously worried about being entrapped in the U.S. alliance, from the early 1970s onward Japan had begun to doubt America's commitment to regional security.

The United States and Japan had attempted to bolster the alliance from the late 1970s. Japan had revised the defense guidelines in 1978 and laid out new joint security commitments at the Reagan-Suzuki summit in 1981. Yet new developments in late 1982 and early 1983 created an even more unsettled environment. In December 1982, Japanese newspapers reported that the Soviet Union had deployed MiG-21 fighter jets on Etorofu Island in response to the U.S.-Japan planned deployment of F-16s to Aomori (a northern Japanese prefecture) by 1985. In February 1983, the U.S. Department of Defense announced that a new Soviet SS-20 (strategic missile) base had been opened at Barnaul, south of Novosibirsk. At the same time, the number of Soviet military aircraft detected in Japanese airspace had risen to 939 in 1981, followed by a further 929 in 1982, tripling from the 305 detected in 1975.<sup>50</sup>

Europe was also of concern. The government worried about the implications for regional security of the mooted redeployment of Soviet theater nuclear weapons from Europe to East Asia as a result of the INF negotiations. The Soviet Union announced, in response to the planned F-16 deployment, that it would shift some of its intermediate-range missiles to East Asia in response to "recent Japanese moves." The United States subsequently had to reassure the Japanese that "no deal would be made at Japan's expense."<sup>51</sup>

The division of Europe and East Asia in U.S. alliance politics highlighted a potential bifurcation of the Western bloc, a separation that worked against Japan in particular. Countries operating in a multilateral environment, such as the Europeans and North Americans, enjoyed a strategic advantage over those operating on largely bilateral lines (i.e., Japan). Despite America's attempts to reassure Japan, the Japanese government remained concerned that the country's marginal status, compared to the countries of NATO, meant that it had little or no influence on European INF negotiations. From the Japanese perspective, security in multilateral Europe could well be achieved at the expense of security in Northeast Asia.<sup>52</sup>

### Summit Environment: Righting a Capsized Ship

Although there were many issues on the summitry agenda in 1983, two fundamental problems dominated in the lead-up to Williamsburg. Inherent to the summitry process itself, these problems centered on: (1) the doubts surrounding the usefulness of Williamsburg as a medium for diplomatic progress in view of the problems experienced at the 1982 Versailles summit; and (2) the continuing diplomatic feud between France and the United States. The global economy had been in the middle of “a great recession” at the time of the Versailles summit, while the summit itself was conducted amid the controversy of Israel attacking Lebanon and the UK fighting a war against Argentina.<sup>53</sup> The leaders struggled to achieve two days of barely polite dialogue, and much of what was agreed quickly fell apart, leading to further bitter exchanges during the second half of 1982.

The Americans and Europeans had adopted different positions on most issues at Versailles, with the U.S.–French relationship becoming particularly antagonistic. The most significant of the disagreements, however, concerned East–West trade and monetary policy. On East–West trade, the summiteers struggled to find common ground between the Europeans’ more conciliatory view and the U.S.’s more hardline view on the issue of limiting credits and credit subsidies to Eastern countries. The ultimate wording on East–West trade in the summit’s declaration was weak, and in any case the participants quickly abandoned it.<sup>54</sup> Germany argued that the Versailles summit’s proclamations did not affect it, while France announced that it continued to reject U.S. attempts to have France participate in economic warfare against the Soviet Union. The Reagan administration, which viewed such statements as a threat to its credibility, reacted by extending its sanctions on the Soviet Union. In turn, the Germans expressed “dismay,” while French President François Mitterrand stated that, “[w]e wonder what concept the United States has of summit meetings when it becomes a matter of agreements made and not respected.”<sup>55</sup> Much the same process was repeated on the issue of monetary policy—the leaders struggled to construct even a vague declaration, which in any case fell apart soon after the summit. France hailed the agreement as a “reform of the international monetary system,” but the United States declared that no change had been made and that the French had failed to “read the fine print.”<sup>56</sup>

Described as a “classic failure of diplomacy” where “neither side fully understood the depth of feeling on the other side,” the effects of the

Versailles mistakes were profound. There was even talk that the G7 itself was in danger. Officials began to consider scrapping the summits, with one sherpa noting that “[w]e cannot have a rerun of Versailles. If we do, we could well see the collapse of the whole institution.” Much of the blame was placed at the feet of an overbearing bureaucracy. The failure was seen as a product of the “summitocracy” having escaped from the control of their political masters. Accordingly, in early 1983, the United States announced that Williamsburg would be a more top-down, less structured summit. Reflecting the wish to break away from the highly detailed and pre-planned summits (a summitry style not favored by Reagan), Williamsburg would be a summit of “general directions.” In comparison to Ottawa, and certainly Versailles, the preparation for the Williamsburg summit thus began later and, rather than focusing on substantial issues, addressed logistical and protocol issues and also media relations.<sup>57</sup>

Most significantly, the summiteers attempted to reduce bureaucratic influence by decentralizing the preparatory process. Counterintuitively perhaps, the governments agreed that they would enlarge the bureaucratic process surrounding the summit in the hope that this would reduce the bureaucratic pressure on the summit itself. Accordingly, they passed East–West economic issues to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and other organizations, monetary and macroeconomic policy issues to the finance ministers, and trade issues to the trade ministers. The leaders would instead focus more clearly on the headline issues, making it possible—in theory—to conduct vigorous debates at the ministerial level without creating unnecessary diplomatic crises.<sup>58</sup> They also committed to working harder and more calmly in pursuit of resolving their trade and economic dispute, with France and the United States in particular attempting to limit their antagonism.

The leaders were aided in their efforts by two key factors. The first was a more receptive political economy. Since Versailles, the French had devalued the franc, while the United States had relaxed monetary policy and begun reducing the budget deficit. Both sides also pulled back from their positions on East–West trade. By November 1982, the United States was softening its previously harsh approach, and from December 1982 the two began extensive diplomatic negotiations to avoid major conflict over trade matters at Williamsburg.

The second factor was the changing nature of leadership at the summits. Some leaders were new to the G7 while other previously powerful leaders had seen their fortunes and influence decline. On balance, these changes made the G7 more conservative. Helmut Schmidt was succeed-

ed by Helmut Kohl, and Suzuki was succeeded by Nakasone. Margaret Thatcher, while leaving early for a general election, was no longer preoccupied with war. Conversely, Mitterrand, who was in any case increasingly the black sheep of the summitry process, had been weakened as a result of France's deteriorating economy. The conservative bent of the Williamsburg leaders was reflected in the Reagan administration's new optimism: Reagan went to the summit, "convinced that the political realities abroad were moving in his direction."<sup>59</sup>

### *Japan's New Summitry*

Japan also brought a new style of summitry to Williamsburg. Suzuki, now replaced by Nakasone, had failed to show the kind of transformational leadership needed to engage in the major conflicts at Versailles; his "quest for 'harmony,'" it was suggested, "made Japan's position on the divisive issues less visible." Japan's opposition parties naturally criticized Suzuki's performance, while business, although generally positive in its view of the summit, was very unhappy with Suzuki's inability to protect Japan's interests in East-West trade, principally the Sakhalin oil project. The change of leadership to Nakasone gave Japan a leader described as more "articulate and more activist," especially on the security issues that would become prominent at the summit. For his part, Nakasone quickly confirmed that he would adopt a higher profile at Williamsburg.<sup>60</sup> Nakasone focused his diplomacy on Japan's interests in East Asia and the U.S. alliance. He visited South Korea in January 1983 and, as the first Japanese prime minister to visit that country in the postwar period, sought to smooth over tensions following the textbook crisis. Importantly, he agreed to supply US\$4 billion in aid to South Korea over seven years.<sup>61</sup>

During his visit to the United States in January 1983, Nakasone also sought to revive the bilateral relationship, which had been damaged after Suzuki's poor diplomacy two years earlier. Nakasone sought to reset the relationship's symbolic foundations. At a breakfast meeting with the *Washington Post*, Nakasone stated that "Japan is what I would call an unsinkable aircraft carrier and as such will not allow incursions by foreign military planes." Like Suzuki's use of the term "alliance," the term "unsinkable aircraft carrier" was also controversial, and Nakasone initially claimed that he had not used it, suggesting instead that he said "large aircraft carrier" (*ōkii na kūbo*) rather than "unsinkable aircraft carrier" (*fuchin kūbo*). In later accounts of the episode, he admitted that he had used the term "unsinkable" but then described it, in his 1999 memoir, as



an “inappropriate” translation.<sup>62</sup> Regardless of the term, the intention was unambiguous: Japan would implacably support the United States. Nakasone also sought to reinforce the policy side of the alliance. The prime minister made headlines, and distinguished himself from his predecessor, by stating that Japan needed to take “complete and full control of the straits commanding the approach to Moscow’s Far Eastern naval bases.”<sup>63</sup> This extended Japan’s commitments well beyond Suzuki’s promise in 1981 to monitor sea lanes between Guam and the western Philippines.

The effect, or possible fallout, was felt at both international and domestic levels. Nakasone’s standing in the eyes of the Reagan administration rose to a level that Suzuki could never have dreamed of achieving, as a more substantial role for Japan appealed to the U.S. government’s view of how the Western alliance should operate. Domestically, however, Nakasone’s stance grated badly with the still cherished ideals of pacifism. Although the Japanese public harbored fears about Soviet forces, they weighed these fears against older worries about Japanese remilitarization, the fear that, as Chalmers Johnson puts it, “once rearmament has begun, it will be very difficult to contain or stop.”<sup>64</sup> But Nakasone ploughed on undeterred. In February 1983 he stated, at a House of Representatives Budget Committee session, that Japan would play the “shield” to America’s “spear” and that it was in Japan’s interest that U.S. offensive capabilities against a common adversary were maximized.<sup>65</sup>

Nakasone also attempted to resolve Japan’s other great diplomatic weakness—its susceptibility to European and U.S. criticism over trade. During his January visit, he sought to impress on the United States that Japan was deeply serious about trade reform. And he again employed a high-profile style, ordering his new Cabinet to open up the Japanese market to more imports. While his rhetoric was grand, in reality his policy followed his predecessor’s approach. Suzuki had already announced tariff cuts on 217 items along with alterations to import quotas, a decision which had allowed Japan to avoid censure at Versailles. Under Suzuki, Japan’s other tactic had been to push the trade problem to GATT. Thus, at Ottawa and Versailles, Japan argued for a GATT ministerial meeting to take over the issue of trade liberalization. However, the GATT ministerial meeting had broken up in November 1982 with little to show for its efforts, and Japan continued to face censure from the United States over trade. By Williamsburg, therefore, very little real change had occurred, and Nakasone still faced a potentially embarrassing debate over trade.<sup>66</sup>

Diplomatic preparations for Williamsburg were completed in late April and early May 1983. Just as with previous prime ministers, in seek-

ing to promote Japan as “Asia’s representative” at the G7, Nakasone travelled through the region to promote Japan’s role as a regional leader, visiting Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. During these visits, Nakasone played down any possibility of Japan emerging again as a military power. Domestically, Nakasone had to deal with parts of the LDP and the union movement which hoped that the G7 leaders might create a new locomotive policy to stimulate economic growth.<sup>67</sup>

Nakasone also undertook a series of consultative meetings with other parts of the government and presented his basic stance to the media. This process, conducted just two weeks before the summit, involved several meetings and a press conference. Discussions with the key ministries produced a list of five key objectives for Japanese summitry: non-inflationary growth, free trade, the development of solutions for North–South problems, structural adjustment, and the promotion of science and technology. Meetings within the LDP led to the announcement that, while Japan was firmly in the Western camp, it would nonetheless encourage President Reagan to relax Cold War tensions. Japan would also “play an active role as a ‘bridge’ (*kakehashi*) between North and South in development issues.”<sup>68</sup> Meetings were also held with Minister of Finance Takeshita and Minister of International Trade and Industry Yamanaka Sadanori, as well as with several prime ministerial predecessors, including Kishi, Miki, and Fukuda.

### At the Summit: Center of Attention

Prior to the official opening, Nakasone met with President Reagan for a U.S.–Japan leaders’ summit, with part of the meeting becoming an impromptu 65th birthday party for Nakasone. The two leaders also talked about trade and North–South issues, a possible Soviet-American summit, as well as Association of Southeast Asian Nations fears that the United States would withdraw from Asia. Nakasone also gave Reagan his baseball analogy of the bilateral relationship.<sup>69</sup> “I told the President,” Nakasone noted in his memoirs, “‘You be the pitcher and I’ll be the catcher. Sometimes the pitcher has to listen to what the catcher has to say.’” When foreign journalists asked why Nakasone was such a strong supporter of the president, he answered that it was “[b]ecause I like John Wayne.”<sup>70</sup> The meeting was presented as one of optimism and unity. Other figures such as Abe, Takeshita, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and

Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige also made public statements. Abe, for instance, stated that Japan fully supported Reagan's initiative to reduce the number of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. And U.S. officials were equally enthusiastic about the meeting, although they expressed some concern over trade issues. Baldrige, for example, noted that, although the United States appreciated Japan's market opening measures, problems still existed.<sup>71</sup>

The leaders at the Williamsburg summit—held between 28 and 30 May 1983—were Reagan (U.S.), Mitterrand (France), Pierre Elliott Trudeau (Canada), Thatcher (UK), Kohl (West Germany), Amintore Fanfani (Italy), Gaston Thorn (EC), and Nakasone. Nakasone was accompanied by Abe (Foreign Affairs), Takeshita (Finance), Yamanaka (Ministry of International Trade and Industry), and Motoso Moriyuki (sherpa). The summit's opening ceremony was a public diplomacy bonanza, with the leaders being driven to the venue in horse-drawn open carriages. Yet not everything went smoothly. Nakasone's arrival, together with Reagan, was accompanied by a song entitled *Gunkan Māchi* (a popular Second World War song). As Hugo Dobson notes, this song had been played without controversy for Suzuki at Ottawa; however, owing to Nakasone's more outspoken attitude on military issues, the tune was criticized both by international journalists attending the summit (notably the Koreans) and by the Japanese press at home.<sup>72</sup>

Nakasone made up for this controversial side of the summit's opening, however, by achieving what would become a famous form of public diplomacy: a photo shoot for the prime minister or "photograph diplomacy" (*hishatai gaikō*).<sup>73</sup> Nakasone adeptly positioned himself beside Reagan for the leaders' photograph, thereby managing to insert himself into the center of the photograph and, symbolically at least, into the center of summitry discussions. Such a pose went entirely against previous Japanese practice in which prime ministers such as Suzuki or Fukuda for example would stand awkwardly at the side of official photographs. In this act alone, Nakasone achieved two of his major objectives for Williamsburg: to put on show the new sense of unity between Japan and the United States, and to highlight his own statesmanship. Nakasone, it has been regularly observed, "showed a rather un-Japanese assertiveness at Williamsburg."<sup>74</sup>

Although the summit began formally with a dinner, proceedings actually began with a series of bilateral meetings between the leaders. Nakasone met with Fanfani, Mitterrand, Thorn, Kohl, and Thatcher, with discussions covering both relatively straightforward issues, such as the topic of cultural exchanges discussed with Kohl, as well as trickier sub-

jects, such as missile deployments. Nakasone told the Europeans of his concerns that a missile pact could threaten Japan and Asia, but also stated that Japan nevertheless supported the deployment of missiles to Europe and, more specifically, the implementation of NATO's 1979 decision to deploy Pershing-2 missiles at the end of 1983. The discussions also covered trade; Thorn told Nakasone that, while recent Japanese measures to open its economy were welcome, there remained a number of areas to be addressed. Thorn's spokesman was quoted as saying that Europe wanted tariffs reduced on a range of exports, and quotas either increased or dismantled entirely.<sup>75</sup>

At the formal dinner to begin the summit, the leaders focused on the issue of INF. There was general agreement on the deployment of missiles, but little on whether to issue a joint summit statement expressing this view. The UK and West Germany clashed, with Thatcher pushing for an especially forceful statement and Kohl, although agreeing with the deployment, hoping for an arms control agreement. Trudeau and Mitterrand were also particularly critical of Thatcher's position. The French position was one of supporting the deployment of missiles while strongly opposing any release of an official G7 statement until after other (i.e., economic) matters had been discussed. If France voted against a statement, the West German view was that it would also be unable to give its support. Nakasone clarified Japan's five defense principles while strongly supporting the U.S. position, arguing a global approach to the INF issue was necessary, and speaking out in support of Thatcher. Reagan argued that it was a period of great crisis for the West and that sacrifices had to be endured. At the conclusion of discussions, there was majority support (which included Nakasone) for a statement; it was a significant victory for Reagan.<sup>76</sup>

The next day began with Nakasone addressing the other leaders. In this wide-ranging speech, he touched on all of Japan's pre-summit policies, calling for the West to maintain free trade, stabilize foreign exchange rates, and help developing countries. He repeated his call for the G7 leaders to demonstrate the "strong unity of the Western democracies" and stressed the need to achieve "sustained economic growth without inflation." On the theme of leadership, Nakasone argued that "[t]he fight against unemployment and protectionism cannot be achieved without the power of political leadership of each country." Lastly, he spoke about Asia and developing countries, arguing that "without the prosperity of the South there can be no prosperity of the North."<sup>77</sup>

During the meeting, the leaders focused largely on Western economic problems and grievances. France, Italy, and the UK raised the topic

of U.S. budget deficits and interest rates, telling Reagan that rates and deficits had to be reduced to maintain the global economic recovery. A Japanese official was quoted as saying that the atmosphere was cooperative, while a U.S. official described it as "conciliatory rather than critical." These views were contradicted, however, by the French, who described the discussions as "cool," while the media reported that France and Italy had confronted the United States over its budget deficits, but that Reagan had avoided making commitments. The leaders also discussed the controversial issue of East-West trade: in line with the preceding twelve months' diplomacy, the United States took a much softer stance.<sup>78</sup>

Unfortunately for the French and other European delegations (although Nakasone and the Japanese delegation would have been pleased), their hope that the summit would focus on economic issues would be dashed during the afternoon session. Reagan decided to alter the agenda, moving to have the G7 publish a statement on political issues *during* the summit rather than together with the economic declaration at the end. The Europeans saw this as a ruse to deflect them from raising their economic demands, and Mitterrand was reported as being particularly unhappy. Although he did not necessarily oppose the deployment of missiles (he had publicly supported the plan earlier in 1983), Mitterrand opposed turning the supposedly economic summit into a political one. The French also expressed their opposition to extending the geographical scope of the Western alliance beyond Europe; the French foreign minister argued that "[d]iscussing these problems with Japan is like discussing them with the whole world."<sup>79</sup> In spite of the opposition, however, Reagan had his way: the summiteers returned that afternoon to the issues of missiles and a declaration.

That evening, Shultz clarified what the "Statement at Williamsburg" (Declaration on Security) would look like. It would be much the same as previous Western pronouncements, with the difference being the highly symbolic inclusion of Japan and France. The statement was a landmark event for Japan, which would now be publicly declaring that its security interests were aligned closely with the other major powers.<sup>80</sup> For Nakasone and the Japanese delegation, Western indivisibility on security provided some reassurance against the greater encroachment into East Asia by the Soviet Union since the late 1970s. The statement contained seven clauses. Clauses 1 and 7 outlined the general stance of the G7 nations. In the first clause, the leaders committed themselves to "defend the freedom and justice on which our democracies are based." To do this, they would "maintain sufficient military strength to deter any attack," although such

forces would “never be used except in response to aggression.” Indeed, in Clause 7, the leaders committed “to devote our full political resources to reducing the threat of war.”

Between these general clauses, the remaining five clauses detailed the G7's position on arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union. In the second clause, the summiteers reaffirmed their commitment to negotiate arms reductions with the Soviet Union. Clause 3 stressed that any arms control agreements needed to be based upon “the principle of equality” and also needed to be “verifiable.” The clause also outlined the various negotiations in which the West hoped to achieve results. These included the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) talks, the INF talks, chemical weapons, the reduction of forces in central Europe, the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions talks, and the Conference on Disarmament in Europe. Clause 4 emphasized the need to “pursue these negotiations with impetus and urgency,” and asserted that attempts to divide the West would fail. Clause 5, after repeating the wish that a balanced agreement be reached shortly, contained the threat that if negotiations failed, the concerned countries would continue with the deployment of the U.S. systems at the end of 1983.<sup>81</sup>

Yet it was Clause 6 (stressing that any negotiations had to be conducted globally) that was the most important clause, especially for Japan. It read:

Our nations are united in efforts for arms reductions and will continue to carry out thorough and intensive consultations. The security of our countries is indivisible and must be approached on a global basis. Attempts to avoid serious negotiation by seeking to influence public opinion in our countries will fail.<sup>82</sup>

The phrasing itself was general, but the statement was significant because it included Japan *indivisibly* within the larger group of advanced nations. The G7 leaders could thus present a united stance on missile deployments which would patch up previous divisions. Although the statement posed obvious domestic risks in the Japanese context, it nevertheless represented an opportunity for Nakasone to redefine Japan's role in this Western alliance symbolically and, in doing so, gain considerable global prestige for Japan. It conveyed the message that Japan clearly stood at the pinnacle of international diplomacy, and that its interests would be part of the debate. By successfully supporting Reagan against the Europeans, Nakasone was able to play the role of global statesman. For Japan, as Kazuhiko Togo

notes, it was likely the first time since the Second World War that the country had “sent a clear message of her own, regarding an issue of global magnitude in the security area.”<sup>83</sup>

### *Aftermath*

Despite the agreement on the security declaration, work remained on the summit's overall declaration. Thus, on the following morning, another plenary session was held for the leaders to finalize the details of this declaration.<sup>84</sup> In reality, however, little needed to be done. The diplomats had already prepared much of the ground, while the leaders, especially Mitterrand and Reagan, had agreed already on much of the detail. Mitterrand was understandably unhappy that these economic wins had been overshadowed by the political losses, but since Reagan had controlled the agenda as summit host, the French had little choice but to abide by Reagan's decisions. The main text, which was read out by President Reagan, contained an introduction, ten brief clauses, and a concluding statement; an annex entitled “Strengthening Economic Cooperation for Growth and Stability” was also attached but not read out. This annex “reaffirmed” the objective of achieving non-inflationary growth of income and exchange rate stability through economic convergence. It also expressed a commitment to reinforce “multilateral cooperation with the International Monetary Fund” and laid out an approach for achieving this objective.<sup>85</sup>

The declaration noted that many challenges faced the industrialized nations and expressed a “dedication to democracy, individual freedom, creativity, moral purpose, human dignity, and personal and cultural development.” The ten clauses covered a range of issues, with international economic cooperation (Clauses 2, 3, 5), and concerns about developing nations (Clauses 4, 6) receiving the most attention. The first clause dealt with economic policy amongst the G7 nations, and included the aim of pursuing monetary and budgetary policies conducive to “low inflation, reduced interest rates, higher productive investment and greater employment.” Clause 7 dealt with technology development; Clause 8 covered oil; and Clause 10 discussed the environment. In light of the Versailles failure, Clause 9 on East–West economic relations was unsurprisingly neutral, with summiteers simply agreeing that “East–West economic relations should be compatible with our security interests.”<sup>86</sup>

Nakasone continued to enjoy the limelight at the final press conference. First, he “reaffirmed his support . . . for the scheduled deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe” later that year.<sup>87</sup> He also argued that Japan,

although not a formal member of the NATO alliance, was nevertheless politically bound with NATO. He particularly emphasized “deterrence and balance” as the way to keep the peace. When asked if he was ready to return home after making such controversial commitments, Nakasone responded that he had been doing only what he “thought was right,” and denied that the announcement would lead to military participation with NATO.<sup>88</sup> Another official dinner was held that evening and the summit concluded with a departure ceremony the following morning. Nakasone left Williamsburg and travelled to New York, where he attended various receptions, before returning to Japan.

Nakasone’s diplomacy at the Williamsburg summit has been described as “a landmark in the growing Japanese involvement in global politics—one of the most notable achievements of Western summitry.” Strangely, however, Nakasone’s diplomacy, despite pushing the boundaries of what was seen as politically possible, did little to damage the LDP’s electoral fortunes. Given that his popularity rose after the summit, according to one poll, from 34 to 40 percent, it arguably even benefited the party.<sup>89</sup> In the upper-house elections of June 1983, the LDP gained only one seat less than it had at the 1980 upper-house elections.<sup>90</sup> Nakasone’s position at the summit did not much influence the result, it is argued, because diplomatic and security issues played only a minor role in the election.<sup>91</sup> By contrast, when the country went to a lower-house election seven months later—this time in the midst of the scandal surrounding the conviction of Tanaka for corruption—the LDP suffered a major setback.

## Conclusion

All three leaders examined in these case studies exhibited leadership styles and visions that were generally based on long-established patterns of behavior developed over entire political careers and even lifetimes. Of the three, however, it was Nakasone who displayed a range of leadership styles and visions that were the most contradictory. Nakasone’s strategy—while clearly based on a transformational leadership style that relied heavily on idealized influence and intellectual motivation—also comprised key transactional elements. These sometimes made Nakasone appear more the hard-headed pragmatist, willing to concede power to the more powerful Tanaka, than the presidential-style political visionary. That the nickname, the “weathercock,” became a popular description of Nakasone, highlights this complexity. Likewise, Nakasone’s leadership



vision often verged on revolutionary but, perhaps owing to his pragmatic instincts, in reality tended towards a more modest reformism. As with Ōhira, the major non-rational features of Nakasone's leadership were his strongly-held intellectual and ideological beliefs.

These central elements of his leadership strategy were well demonstrated at the Williamsburg summit. Nakasone took an approach almost diametrically opposed to Suzuki's by adopting a form of diplomatic grandstanding or "photograph diplomacy." Through this, Nakasone managed to obtain for Japan a high-profile, diplomatic stature that few, if any, other Japanese leaders could have achieved. In this respect, the relationship Nakasone skillfully developed with Reagan over the course of 1983 and beyond, but especially at the Williamsburg summit, was a key factor in the prime minister's ability to promote Japanese interests. Nonetheless, it is worth considering how Nakasone might have fared in an environment such as that which characterized the Tokyo summit; the challenges of the oil crisis at Tokyo were arguably far more intractable and overwhelming than the security problems Nakasone faced at Williamsburg. Conversely, the Ottawa summit, although much less challenging, may well have not provided the appropriate opportunities for a leader such as Nakasone to shine on the summitry stage.

## Conclusion

“Finding the right place for individuals,” Richard Samuels presciently notes, “is an old problem for political analysis.”<sup>1</sup> The main aim of this book has been to explore how individual actors, and not just abstract social forces, play a role in international affairs. Working from the assumption that leadership is an interactive phenomenon, the book has identified and explored leadership’s role in shaping diplomacy at both the macro level of strategic identity and the micro level of summit diplomacy. In particular, it has developed the concepts of leadership strategy (comprising leadership vision and style), leadership environment(s), and leadership outcomes. Two tasks have then formed the basis of this exploration of political leadership: (1) how to characterize leaders and the extent to which they can pursue independent, distinct leadership strategies; and (2) how to determine the extent to which leaders shape diplomatic outcomes.

The role of Japanese political leadership in foreign affairs provides a useful field in which to examine these issues. The evolution of Japan’s strategic thinking delivers a broad canvas for studying how leadership interacts with other social forces over an extended period. Conversely, Japan’s involvement in the Group of Seven/Eight (G7/8) summits presents a well-defined series of case studies that make in-depth investigation more manageable. Accordingly, the book has sought to answer two questions of Japanese political leadership and diplomacy. First, to what extent have Japan’s prime ministers pursued independent, distinct, leadership strategies? And second, to what extent have they influenced or shaped Japan’s diplomacy more widely?

The book’s central claims have been that past Japanese leaders have pursued more complex leadership strategies, as the country’s chief diplomats, than is generally recognized. The leadership strategies of the prime ministers examined in the three case studies exhibited differing degrees of rationality and coherence. They also consisted of distinct leadership

visions and styles, reflecting the leaders' personal beliefs, preferences, and (mis)perceptions as much as, if not more than, rational domestic considerations. This book also suggests that, contrary to what is generally recognized, Japan's prime ministers have had significant influence as Japan's chief diplomats well before the arrival of recent leaders such as Koizumi Jun'ichirō. As the chapter on Japan's strategic identity underlined, Japan's prime ministers have played important, and overlooked, roles in shaping the nation's strategic thinking since the Second World War. Influential leaders have not only included early postwar prime ministers such as Yoshida Shigeru but also more recent leaders such as Koizumi and Abe Shinzō. The case studies also showed that, while particular leadership styles or visions could not be linked to specific diplomatic outcomes, the prime ministers played important roles in shaping Japan's diplomacy at the G7 summits (see table 4). Japanese leaders had an impact well before Koizumi's arrival as prime minister in the early 2000s. Significantly, the influence of Japanese prime ministers on the country's diplomacy depended upon the interaction between contingent environmental and individual factors that increased or reduced their indispensability.

### Characterizing Leaders and Environments

The first principal finding of this book is that Japanese political leadership in foreign affairs cannot be easily typecast, is not "rational" in the usual sense, and cannot be viewed as simply representative of domestic preferences. A typical Japanese leadership strategy did not emerge from the case studies, even amongst leaders with similar experiences and outlooks. Although the three leaders examined shared a number of similarities, they nonetheless demonstrated quite divergent leadership styles, visions, and preferences. Even the two most similar leaders in the study—Ōhira Masayoshi and Suzuki Zenkō (who at first glance both appeared to be transactional leaders)—differed in terms of style and vision. Nakasone Yasuhiro's leadership was different again, thus showing that Japanese leaders were more than capable of constructing a predominantly transformational leadership style.

Significantly, the case studies did not support the suggestion that leaders merely act as agents of their domestic environments.<sup>2</sup> While a *laissez-faire* (or non-leadership) style might be expected to resemble the domestic structure of preferences most closely, Suzuki's *laissez-faire* leadership demonstrates how even non-leadership can produce perverse out-

Table 4. Japan's Summit Leadership

<i>Prime Minister</i>	<i>Summit</i>	<i>Leadership Style</i>	<i>Leadership Vision</i>	<i>Leadership Outcome</i>	<i>Outcome Indispensability</i>
Ōhira Masayoshi	Tokyo, 1979	Transactional: intellectual stimulation	Paternalistic	Managerial	Low
Suzuki Zenkō	Ottawa, 1981	Laissez-faire	Managerial	Innovative	High
Nakasone Yasuhiro	Williamsburg, 1983	Transformational (idealized influence, intellectual)	Reformist	Innovative	High

comes that diverge from structural preferences. Ōhira's and Nakasone's leadership also often ran counter to both important preferences at the domestic level and reasonable assumptions about rational leadership. The case studies highlighted how the leaders' capacity for rationality was limited in numerous ways—by poorly defined problems, limited access to information, and significant time constraints. Personal characteristics and experiences, cognitive abilities and political styles, as well as ideologies, attitudes, and (mis)perceptions also restrained their understanding and at times overcame the leaders' intended rationality.

Although their rationality was not comprehensive, however, the leaders still exhibited significant elements of intended rationality. All three pursued political objectives such as re-election and, most obviously, competition for personal power within the Liberal Democratic Party's (LDP) factional framework. Even where the choice of leadership strategy was to opt for non-leadership, this was in fact a partially rational response to domestic political turmoil and the need for conciliatory, consensus-seeking leadership. The leaders were all aware of the likely implications of failed summitry for their own political prospects, a perception that arguably made them adopt more cooperative or conflict-avoiding approaches at the summits.

### *Leadership Styles, Visions, and Strategies*

The leaders in the three case studies employed a complex mix of transactional and transformational leadership styles. Ōhira was not a transformational leader. He did not possess extraordinary talents, nor did he cultivate relationships that were strongly emotive. Instead, Ōhira's chief strength was his ability to define problems and interests, then negotiate effectively to achieve outcomes. To identify Ōhira as a transactional leader only, however, is to misunderstand his political style. Ōhira, in fact, followed a strongly intellectual style of transactional leadership that was less existential or idealistic and more rational and empirical. At first glance, Suzuki was also a transactional leader. Accomplished at deal-brokering within the LDP, he was widely known as someone who could skillfully mold together divergent interests and ambitions. Yet Suzuki did not engineer his way to the prime ministership; rather, he fell or was pushed into the job because of LDP factionalism. By marginalizing himself in decision-making processes during his trip to the United States in May 1981, Suzuki in fact demonstrated not transactional leadership but laissez-faire leadership. Nakasone, by contrast, adopted a leadership style

far removed from the Japanese cultural stereotype. More of a nationalist, Nakasone was outspoken on a range of issues, notably defense. Even as a shrewd operator and known political weathervane, Nakasone was predominantly a transformational leader who relied heavily on idealized influence. At Williamsburg in particular, he sought to insert himself into the middle of proceedings through “photo diplomacy.”

In terms of leadership vision, Ōhira, Suzuki, and Nakasone pursued differing political objectives ranging from the highly vague and non-confrontational to the notably nationalistic and assertive. Demonstrating the first of these approaches, Suzuki largely avoided putting forward any kind of clearly identifiable vision. His “politics of harmony” concept came closest. At most, his vision was managerial—one of minimal change in both degree and scope. At the other end of the scale, Nakasone developed a vision that was intended to appeal to a more chauvinistic Japanese world view. This vision was formed around constitutional revision, as well as on such issues as defense and patriotism, cultural pride, and international assertiveness. Nakasone did not pursue a leadership vision that was entirely revolutionary, instead focusing on bringing about a maximum degree of change across a moderate scope. In terms of vision, therefore, Nakasone was a reformist. Between these two poles stood the cautious, internationalist Ōhira, whose use of internationalization (*kokusaika*) was an early instance of the postwar political establishment trying to construct a new international role for Japan. But Ōhira was not a revolutionary leader. Rather, in seeking to build upon Japan’s postwar achievements, his leadership vision was largely paternalistic.

The case studies also reveal that general leadership strategies and particular policy preferences were often closely related. For Ōhira, a successful summit could be used to block challenges from political opponents, particularly Fukuda Takeo. Despite the potential economic damage from a failed summit, Ōhira had limited his options prior to the summit in an attempt to marginalize domestic opponents such as Fukuda. Having attacked Fukuda for his international commitment to Japan sustaining a high growth rate, Ōhira was forced to deny reneging on this policy and so became captive to these same commitments. Conversely, Suzuki had few summit preferences. His lack of experience or interest in summit diplomacy, along with his traditional dovish beliefs, meant that he was unsuited to the harsher realities of the new Cold War. Instead, his political stake in a successful Ottawa summit was largely derived from his multiple failures at the May 1981 summit with President Ronald Reagan. Suzuki was trying to avoid trouble. His strategy, while broadly rational,

was bounded by the significant cognitive and motivational flaws in his leadership. Conversely, Nakasone's strongly held views on national identity, autonomous defense, and an international role for Japan flowed easily into the summits. His calls for Western democracies to stand unified, for Japan to contribute to the anti-communist effort, and for the country to remain close to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) not only brought a new dimension to Japanese diplomacy, but closely followed his own long-held ideological views.

### *Leadership Environment(s)*

Both basic environmental structures and the presence of other intervening factors were important to the processes and outcomes of the case studies. In terms of basic environments, the three leaders operated across broadly identical political structures during the different summits. Yet beyond these basic structural similarities, a range of intervening factors clearly shaped specific circumstances. Domestic politics shifted significantly across the period in question, as did the political contexts of the international and summitry levels. Japan's domestic political environment forced the leaders to direct their leadership strategies initially inwards; here, the rational actor re-election motive, although not the only consideration, clearly played a significant role. The three cases demonstrate in particular how the domestic environment was often the starting point for diplomatic negotiations—as leaders sought negotiating authority—as well as the concluding point, as leaders sought popular approval.

These domestic demands produced leaders with at least some transactional leadership traits. Interaction between the leaders and different domestic preferences, however, varied in significant ways. First, it was shaped by the closeness of a particular domestic actor to the prime minister. As would be expected, wider societal groups broadcast their preferences through the media or political lobbying, whereas smaller political groups, especially within the LDP, interacted much more directly with the prime ministers. Second, actors in the domestic environment also responded differently to changes at the international and summitry levels, depending upon how their political preferences were affected by such changes. Trade and economic discussions at the summit affected domestic politics more regularly, and to a greater degree than debates on defense and alliance policy, except where these discussions crossed into previously sacrosanct areas, such as the U.S.–Japan alliance and the Japanese Constitution. At this point, their impact became nationwide.<sup>3</sup>

The most consistent feature of the international environment was the bipolar nature of world politics. Yet even as the strategic situation in Europe could be described as bipolar, the conditions in East Asia had become more complex from the early 1970s onward. Japan's strategic resources for dealing with changing international relations were limited; as a nation heavily dependent upon energy imports, Japan was especially vulnerable after the oil shocks. Also, notwithstanding improved Sino-American relations, Japan lacked natural allies in the region (except for the U.S.). Whereas Japan today, despite its economic difficulties, is an established advanced nation, in the 1970s it was still climbing toward great power status, a transition that was still little understood, either by Japan or the world at large. Because Japan was a rising state and not an established greater power, its prime ministers often appeared to be at the mercy of wider international trends.

Just as the intervening character of international relations shifted during this time, so did the nature of G7 summitry. In particular, new approaches to summitry, which emerged in the late 1970s, began to dominate the G7 around 1983. With regard to economic issues, the G7 moved from a period of international cooperation characterized by demand-management to a period characterized by *laissez-faire* consultation. As a result of the oil shock and the subsequent economic downturn, the 1979 summit retained elements of Keynesian-style economic cooperation. Yet this approach was soon replaced by monetarist arguments, as the sum-miteers' new focus moved toward a style based on individual management and consultation (i.e., a more supervisory summit).<sup>4</sup> This was not the only shift, however. From 1979 onward, because of increasing security problems, the primacy of economic debate at the G7 was eroded by the increasing emphasis placed on political and security issues, which gradually became the summits' keynote themes.

Overall, because Japan's position as a rising power in international relations and as the sole Asian member of the G7 remained consistent, Japan and its prime ministers faced similar strategic challenges at all three summits. First, there was the ever-present concern about relations with Washington. Coordination of diplomacy with the United States was a paramount concern for every Japanese government. Second, Japan often found itself engaged in a kind of deflective diplomacy, with its summit delegations regularly forced to defend the country's export practices or rebut criticism over protectionism. Third, because Japan was the sole Asian power at the summits, and was thus not a member of the European clubs or of NATO, it often suffered from diplomatic isolation.



## Leadership and Summit Diplomacy

The second principal finding is that Japan's prime ministers had a significant influence on the country's diplomacy, as well as on international affairs, especially of the Asia-Pacific region. The two concepts developed in chapter 1—action and actor dispensability—are particularly important in revealing the leaders' impact in summit diplomacy.

Ōhira's predicament at Tokyo suggests that this was the most overdetermined of the three summits and that the indispensability of Ōhira as a political actor was low. As an experienced transactional-style leader, Ōhira was adept at the kind of political horse-trading prominent at Tokyo. However, the tough nature of the negotiations undermined Ōhira's plan to achieve a successful diplomatic result via low-key and carefully planned summitry, making his commitment to a successful summit a significant bargaining weakness. Any alternative actor, regardless of their leadership style or vision, would have come under the same intense pressure. Further, Japan's isolation at the summit was largely the result of the country's position internationally and within the G7. Finally, the pressure to achieve a successful summit was a consistent feature of much Japanese diplomacy during this period, particularly when Japan was host.

On balance, Ōhira avoided any major error either way and achieved probably the least painful of all possible agreements. He did so by creating some ambiguity in Japan's commitment and, accordingly, some space for domestic constituents and international counterparts to interpret the result differently. Yet the improbability of any other action being successful reconfirms that, in contributing to the summit's diplomatic outcomes, Ōhira's effective role as a political actor was small. The leadership outcome for Ōhira's case was minimal in both scope and degree; it was, at best, managerial. Significantly, this result matched Ōhira's paternalistic leadership vision and was not entirely inconsistent with his transactional leadership style. All this highlights Ōhira's low actor indispensability.

As a study of *laissez-faire* leadership, Suzuki's case would also suggest he had little effect in terms of diplomatic outcomes. Yet the interaction between environment and leader in Suzuki's case make for a complex and, at times, contradictory set of outcomes. On the one hand, a combination of intervening and leadership variables opened up the scope for leadership influence by undermining the usual practices of foreign policymaking. This made Suzuki's leadership potentially more important. On the other hand, Suzuki's leadership style was especially ill-suited to this environment. Two years earlier, his idiosyncratic leadership style might

have otherwise been cancelled out by an overdetermined set of political environments. At Ottawa, however, there was considerably more scope for individual political leadership to play a role. In this more loosely structured environment, Suzuki soon became a liability.

Despite this, there is ample evidence from Suzuki's diplomacy before and during Ottawa to reach the counterintuitive judgment that Suzuki's leadership weaknesses in fact increased his indispensability to Japan's diplomacy. According to assessments by Okazaki Hisahiko and Michael Green, Suzuki's *laissez-faire* role as chief diplomat played a key role in controversial decisions, such as recognizing the U.S.–Japan relationship as an alliance and committing to protect Pacific sea lanes.<sup>5</sup> Were the central actor in this episode changed—for instance to Ōhira or Nakasone—it is unlikely that such a policy would have passed. Ōhira would likely have not agreed, while Nakasone's nationalism would likely have made such a controversial policy politically impossible. Although these policy changes were narrowly focused, they were innovative not only in terms of its impact on Japan's defense posture, but also in relation to its influence on the U.S.–Japan alliance and regional security. Overall, the degree of actor indispensability in Suzuki's case is surprisingly high.

The third case study highlights how, even where many of the same environmental trends are present, changes in leadership strategy can produce quite different outcomes. Nakasone's leadership style provided cover against the normal constraints of the LDP. That Nakasone was an anti-establishment figure, already disliked by the leaders of the other mainstream factions, increased his autonomy in foreign affairs, since he felt less bound by the strings of mutual obligation. Likewise, his proclivity to speak his mind not only came naturally but also compensated for his factional weaknesses by allowing him to draw upon public support for certain policies. Unlike Suzuki, Nakasone was capable of both transactional and transformational leadership, meaning that he could be bold at the summit without unduly disturbing the LDP.

In this instance, the contrast between Nakasone and Suzuki reveals the indispensability of Nakasone as a political actor at the Williamsburg summit. Nakasone chose to maximize the opportunities presented by the kind of “getting-to-know-you” dialogue now in favor at the summits in order to showcase Japan's more forthright diplomacy. The international environment that allowed for this bold leadership strategy was already in place in 1981, suggesting that had a Japanese leader pursued a similar strategy at Ottawa, Japan's diplomacy would have been quite different. Overall, Nakasone can be said to have brought about a significant

degree of change, albeit across a fairly specialized scope, meaning that the leadership outcome in this case was innovative. Japan's diplomacy at Williamsburg, however, can only be understood through the indispensability of Nakasone's leadership.

### *Understanding Leadership Indispensability*

These studies suggest that there is little correlation between actor indispensability (when outcomes depend upon crucial leader characteristics) and particular leadership types. Japan's prime ministers in the case studies engaged in quite distinct leadership strategies; yet no obvious pattern of leadership indispensability emerges as a result of particular styles or visions. Policy changes were delivered by transformational and laissez-faire leaders and by leaders with expansionist as well as minimalist leadership visions. Coherence between the different elements of leadership strategies (i.e., how well a leader matched a leadership style with a vision) also had little effect on outcomes. Although incoherent strategies have been found elsewhere to contribute to negative leadership outcomes, in these case studies there was no clear relationship between how well leaders constructed their strategies and the significance of the outcomes produced.

Understanding leadership–environment interaction clearly provides a better understanding of particular instances of where, how, and to what extent leaders shaped diplomatic outcomes. In terms of environmental constraints, the case studies confirm a number of observations already made about the limitations to Japan's summitry. Constraints stemming from diplomatic isolation were clearly present, with few natural partners at the G7 outside the United States. Even as Japan's economy grew, its political profile remained small compared to the other players, who were more adept at placing joint diplomatic pressure on Japan. Several confounding factors, however, may limit the applicability of these studies to other historical periods. The emergence of the G7 took place during the economic turmoil of the 1970s and just at the time that Japan "came of age" as an international player. Although all the members of the G7 were exposed to the economic challenges presented by the oil crises, Japan was especially vulnerable given its high energy dependency. The shift to security concerns in the early 1980s likewise challenged Japan's ability to act internationally in view of the restrictions (many self-imposed) on its security role and its dependence on the United States.

It is possible to see how some of these environmental constraints might combine with individual leadership traits to constrain Japanese

diplomacy. The common observation that Japan's leaders were unable to "speak" for themselves in the one-to-one diplomacy of the G7 summits accentuated the country's environmental constraints and made Japan more likely to pursue "low key" diplomacy at the summits.<sup>6</sup> Similar patterns in Japanese diplomacy and amongst its prime ministers can also be found well into the 2000s.<sup>7</sup> Yet the case studies reveal examples where Japan's leaders enjoyed autonomy in terms of negotiating, agenda-setting, and ratification. The summits' "getting-to-know-you" dynamics, while creating pressures on the leaders to be active diplomats, also saved them from arduous ratification requirements. Instead, they were able to seek approval in the public statements of other key politicians, as well as the broad support of the public and the media.

One proposition of the foreign policy literature is that, when intervening factors contribute to complex, ambiguous, contradictory, or crisis-hit environments, they can allow leaders a greater freedom to influence outcomes. This is because the usual practices of diplomacy are suspended.<sup>8</sup> The role of leadership in the evolution of Japan's strategic identity since the Second World War, as explained in chapter 3, was particularly important during periods following an upheaval of the international order. Greater ambiguity allowed leaders greater scope in their capacity as norm entrepreneurs to reshape their political environments. Although such leaders might struggle against competing norm entrepreneurs and other interests, they were less shackled by clear international pressures or the friction imposed by an already established security identity. This applied to Japan during the early years of the Cold War and also appears to be the case during the post-Cold War period.

Yet the proposition is less well supported by the case studies. Ambiguous environments at the macro level seem to have been underdetermined and thus an aid to political leaders in their strategic social construction. Conversely, at the G7, the more crisis-like summits tended to be overdetermined, thereby providing less scope for leader autonomy. At the micro level of the international summit, crises may have presented leaders with numerous policymaking options, but they also consisted of numerous environmental expectations or established social constructions.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, overdetermined environments with multiple expectations (cf., simply ambiguous strategic environments) appear to have reduced the indispensability of individual leadership. Under crisis conditions, the actions of prime ministers may be shaped more by environmental demands rather than individual traits. This characterizes Ōhira's experience at the Tokyo summit in 1979. Less crisis-like environments were

less determined and so provided more scope for leaders to shape political outcomes. This is what occurred in the cases of Suzuki and Nakasone.

The case studies, however, raise an important observation which questions traditional definitions of leadership outcomes. In chapter 1, it was noted that leadership outcomes are often viewed as “the extent of real and intended change achieved by leaders’ interactions with followers.”<sup>10</sup> Thus defined, leadership outcomes must be intentional and not simply accidents. This certainly applies to the role played by leaders as norm entrepreneurs in the formation and revision of Japan’s strategic identity. However, the definition fits uneasily with interactive understandings of leadership, under which the interaction of circumstance and individual traits can play as big a role as intention. According to the “intended change” definition of leadership, an outcome produced by *laissez-faire* leadership cannot be viewed as leadership even in cases where the nature of that leadership proves indispensable to the outcome. Although it may be impossible to understand the outcome without acknowledging the influence of a particular leadership strategy, such a case would not meet this definition of leadership. Given the central role played by leadership strategy in the Suzuki case, the idea of leadership only as intended change may require review.

### Japanese Leadership and International Relations

Finally, what can these findings contribute to international relations (IR) theory? With the aim of simplifying understandings of international politics, much IR theory makes use of the unitary actor assumption to dispense with substate factors. Focusing on material systemic factors means that IR theory can present more parsimonious explanations for state behavior. This is well illustrated by the “billiard ball” analogy used to explain how states behave in the international system, as has been the approach in particular of structural realism within IR. Yet, while structural theories provide great insights into the pressures created by international relations, as a result of not considering domestic factors, they have been unable to explain significant parts of international politics. Other approaches do focus on domestic-level factors, particularly constructivist theories which emphasize the role of norms in defining appropriate strategic behavior. They view norms as being integrated into those institutions that shape a country’s foreign policies and, eventually, the strategic identity of the state itself. However, constructivist theories often struggle to identify the

ways in which such norms actually shape the changes that might take place in a state's foreign policy. Like structural theories, constructivism can often misunderstand state behavior as a result of overlooking other factors, particularly international pressures, but also the issue of agency at the domestic level.

The aim of this book has been to examine this question of agency, not merely with respect to norms, such as Japan's strategic identity, but also in terms of more concrete diplomatic outcomes. Both should be important parts of understanding how the international relations of the Asia-Pacific in particular operate. Gourevitch's concept of the "second image reversed" suggests that, even as the international system influences domestic politics, the domestic level in turn shapes the international system. Accordingly, the politics of Japan, as a major power in the region, should be expected to play a significant role in shaping the region's international relations. If a proper understanding of this interaction is missing, however, any analysis of the region's international relations can also be expected to contain gaps.

By making use of the foreign policy analysis (FPA) tradition, this book has sought to fill one important gap: political leadership. If leaders play a mediating role between the different political levels involved in foreign policy—the second and third "images" of IR theory—then their perceptions, beliefs, ideologies, ambitions, and behavior should also be important. As much of the work in this book makes clear, these "idiosyncratic 'first image' factors" can be crucial to foreign affairs.<sup>11</sup> The role of Japan's prime ministers in the country's G7 diplomacy certainly follows this pattern, as does the broader role of Japan's prime ministers in the formation of the country's strategic identity.

This suggests that better explanations of state behavior can sometimes be derived only by examining the interactive dimensions of leadership. In other words, the when, how, and why of some foreign policy decisions can only be understood by focusing on the "who" and "where." Japan's supposedly anomalous postwar strategic identity becomes more understandable when viewed as the outcomes of particular leaders' strategies for managing Japan's changing international environment. Likewise, the case studies examined here can also be more readily understood as the consequence of particular leader-environment interactions. Why did Japan agree to a substantial increase in its regional security role in 1981 despite no major shifts in international pressures on this role and considerable domestic opposition to any such decision? Why in 1983 did it suddenly stand up for Western unity in the face of Soviet missile threats

when it had previously ignored similar opportunities to do so? And why in 1979 did it accede to such a tough agreement on oil imports following the second oil shock, despite the potentially significant domestic costs?

The further challenge in this type of theory is the inevitable complexity of the contingencies involved. As Valerie Hudson notes, "critiques of FPA have centered around the impossibility of tracing all influences on a given decision, or even on decision-making in the abstract."<sup>12</sup> At the micro level of international summitry, individual and environmental factors combine to create dynamic, fluctuating subjects not easily captured in any single study. Nevertheless, concentrating on the role played by leaders as chief diplomats, either at the micro or macro level, provides important advantages for research on foreign policy and international relations. Even as they operate within the constraints of domestic and international politics, leaders fundamentally remain "human agents" in international affairs. They are more than inanimate material forces, abstract political structures, or ideational factors. As Hudson points out, focusing on leaders allows for a closer examination of this "individual action" without denying these other influences. Although this book has discussed the limits that environments can place on leadership, it has also revealed the need at recurrent intervals to examine agency to explain diplomacy and foreign affairs. To overlook individual action is to ignore the reality of IR: that it is humans who create ideas and policies, instigate conflict or cooperation, or take part in the great events of history.<sup>13</sup>

# Notes

## Introduction

1. See Tomohito Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan's Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007), 18.

2. For good examples from the FPA literature, see Margaret G. Hermann, "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders," *International Studies Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (1980); Raymond Birt, "Personality and Foreign Policy: The Case of Stalin," *Political Psychology* 14, no. 4 (1993); Jonathan W. Keller, "Leadership Style, Regime Type, and Foreign Policy Crisis Behavior: A Contingent Monadic Peace?" *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (2005).

3. Ariel Ilan Roth, *Leadership in International Relations: The Balance of Power and the Origins of World War II* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 4–5. IR scholars do examine the agency-structure problem. See Alexander Wendt, "The Agency-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory," *International Organization* 41, no. 3 (1987); Walter Carlsnaes, "The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis," *International Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (1992); Gil Friedman and Harvey Starr, *Agency, Structure, and International Politics: From Ontology to Empirical Inquiry* (London: Routledge, 1997).

4. Keller, "Leadership Style." On ideas, perceptions or learning, see Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976); Jack S. Levy, "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield," *International Organization* 48, no. 2 (1994).

5. Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In," *International Security* 25, no. 4 (2001): 110.

6. Kenji Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993); Karel van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power: People and Politics in a Stateless Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1989).

7. Richard J. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003); Alisa Gaunder, *Political Reform in Japan: Leadership Looming Large* (London: Routledge, 2007);



Yū Uchiyama, *Koizumi and Japanese Politics: Reform Strategies and Leadership Style*, trans. Carl Freire (London: Routledge, 2010).

8. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children*, 352.

9. H. D. P. Envall, "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan," *Japanese Studies* 28, no. 2 (2008).

10. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, 1979), 68.

11. John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 10.

12. See Joe D. Hagan, "Does Decision Making Matter? Systemic Assumptions vs. Historical Reality in International Relations Theory," *International Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (2001).

13. James N. Rosenau, "Introduction," in *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, ed. James N. Rosenau (New York: The Free Press, 1967), 4.

14. For example, see Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

15. Peter Gourevitch, "Domestic Politics and International Relations," in *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons (London: Sage, 2002), 309. For the "second image reversed" concept, also see Peter Gourevitch, "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics," *International Organization* 32, no. 4 (1978).

16. See Robert D. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 442; Helen V. Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 16.

17. Colin Wight, *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 178.

18. Valerie M. Hudson and Christopher S. Vore, "Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," *Mershon International Studies Review* 39, no. 2 (1995): 211.

19. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 432–33.

20. *Ibid.*, 427–69.

21. Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 166.

22. Gary Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2010), 20.

23. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 18.

24. James N. Rosenau, "Followership and Discretion: Assessing the Dynamics of Modern Leadership," *Harvard International Review* 26, no. 3 (2004): 15.

25. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 435–36.

26. Andrew Moravcsik, "Introduction: Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining," in *Double-Edged Diplomacy*:

*International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, ed. Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993), 30.

27. Ibid.

28. On “images” of international relations, see Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

29. On strategic culture, see Alastair Iain Johnston, “Thinking About Strategic Culture,” *International Security* 19, no. 4 (1995). For leadership perceptions, see Joseph Masciulli and W. Andy Knight, “Conceptions of Global Leadership for Contextually Intelligent, Innovatively Adaptive Political Leaders,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Political Leadership*, ed. Joseph Masciulli, Mikhaila A. Molchanov, and W. Andy Knight (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 95–97. For a study on the psychopathological personality variables of Joseph Stalin’s leadership, see Birt, “Personality and Foreign Policy.”

30. For example, see Peter B. Evans, “Building an Integrative Approach to International and Domestic Politics: Reflections and Projections,” in Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 403–4. See also Margaret G. Hermann, “When Leader Personality Will Affect Foreign Policy: Some Propositions,” in *In Search of Global Patterns*, ed. James N. Rosenau (New York: The Free Press, 1976); Hermann, “Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior.”

31. Francis J. Yammarino and Bernard M. Bass, “Person and Situation Views of Leadership: A Multiple Levels of Analysis Approach,” *Leadership Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1991): 122.

32. Fred I. Greenstein, “Can Personality and Politics be Studied Systematically?” *Political Psychology* 13, no. 1 (1992): 108.

33. Burns, *Leadership*, 413–15.

34. See Joseph S. Nye, *The Powers to Lead* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 64–65.

35. Tomohito Shinoda, *Leading Japan: The Role of the Prime Minister* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000).

36. Glenn D. Hook et al., *Japan’s International Relations: Politics, Economics and Security* (London: Routledge, 2001), 49–50.

37. Gerald L. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 7; Kenneth B. Pyle, *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), 228–29; John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy* (London: Athlone Press, 1988), 91–92.

38. Bert Edström, *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 177–79.

39. See Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy*; Edström, *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine*; Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004).

40. Aurelia George Mulgan, "Japan's Political Leadership Deficit," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 2 (2000): 183–84.
41. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996), 68–69. See also Gerald L. Curtis, "Japanese Security Policies and the United States," *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 4 (1981): 853.
42. Masciulli and Knight, "Conceptions of Global Leadership," 96.
43. On leadership vision, see Jean Blondel, *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis* (London: Sage, 1987), 83.
44. Fred I. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 40–57.
45. Jonathan Hopkin, "Comparative Methods," in *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, ed. David Marsh and Gerry Stoker, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 252–53.
46. On strategic social construction, see Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 909, 910–11.

## Chapter 1

1. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 2; Georgia Sorenson, "An Intellectual History of Leadership Studies," in *Reflections on Leadership*, ed. Richard A. Couto (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2007).
2. Robert C. Tucker, *Politics as Leadership* (Columbia, MI: University of Missouri Press, 1981), 10.
3. Joseph S. Nye, *The Powers to Lead* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), x.
4. Peter G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2007).
5. Burns, *Leadership*, 18, 19, emphasis in original.
6. Jean Blondel, *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis* (London: Sage, 1987), 15; Robert Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies* (London: Macmillan, 1995), 4.
7. Burns, *Leadership*, 434, emphasis in original.
8. Nye, *The Powers to Lead*, 27.
9. Burns, *Leadership*, 11–12.
10. Nye, *The Powers to Lead*, 27. On the first dimension, see Robert A. Dahl, "The Concept of Power," *Behavioral Science* 2, no. 3 (1957): 201–5. On the second dimension, see Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," *American Political Science Review* 56, no. 4 (1962). On the third dimension, see

Steven Lukes, ed. *Power* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986). For the moral implications of leadership, see Burns, *Leadership*, 426.

11. Burns, *Leadership*, 3; Blondel, *Political Leadership*, 86.

12. For Hollander's arguments, see Edwin P. Hollander, "Legitimacy, Power, and Influence: A Perspective on Relational Features of Leadership," in *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*, ed. Martin M. Chemers and Roya Ayman (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1993), 29. For Weber, see Max Weber, "Types of Authority," in *Political Leadership: A Source Book*, ed. Barbara Kellerman (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986), 232; Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, 2 vols., ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), 1: 246–54. For more on these different types of leadership, see Nye, *The Powers to Lead*, 37–38; Northouse, *Leadership*, 5–6; Gary Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2010), 202–12.

13. Bryan D. Jones, "Causation, Constraint, and Political Leadership," in *Leadership and Politics: New Perspectives in Political Science*, ed. Bryan D. Jones (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1989), 4.

14. On the "great men" of history, see Thomas Carlyle, "The Leader as Hero," in Kellerman, *Political Leadership*, 8. See also Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 6. For a critical view, see Herbert Spencer, "The Great Man Theory Breaks Down," in Kellerman, *Political Leadership*, 12–13.

15. Fred I. Greenstein, "Can Personality and Politics be Studied Systematically?" *Political Psychology* 13, no. 1 (1992): 109.

16. On contingency theory, see Francis J. Yammarino and Bernard M. Bass, "Person and Situation Views of Leadership: A Multiple Levels of Analysis Approach," *Leadership Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1991): 122. For more on integrative approaches, see Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 30–34.

17. Another situational approach is leader–member exchange theory, which conceptualizes leadership as an interactive process between leaders and followers. See Northouse, *Leadership*, 151. On the needs and goals of followers, see Burns, *Leadership*, 19. On general leadership qualities, see Tucker, *Politics as Leadership*, 14.

18. Lewis J. Edinger, "The Comparative Analysis of Political Leadership," *Comparative Politics* 7, no. 2 (1975): 257; Lester G. Seligman, "The Study of Political Leadership," *American Political Science Review* 44, no. 4 (1950): 914–15. For the four variables, see Mostafa Rejai and Kay Phillips, *Loyalists and Revolutionaries: Political Leaders Compared* (New York: Praeger, 1988), 4. Regarding continuous and reciprocal leadership relationships, see Yammarino and Bass, "Person and Situation Views of Leadership," 122; and Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 5.

19. Burns, *Leadership*, 20. Although the term "transforming" leadership is sometimes used (e.g., by Burns), the more widely used term, "transformational" leadership, is used here. Northouse identifies James Downton as having conceived

of the term transformational leadership, although it is long associated with charisma and thus the work of Weber. See Northouse, *Leadership*, 176. See also James V. Downton, *Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process* (New York: The Free Press, 1973). For other definitions, see Bernard M. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (New York: The Free Press, 1985), 20; Hollander, "Legitimacy, Power, and Influence," 41.

20. For this definition of transactional leadership, see Burns, *Leadership*, 19. See also Hollander, "Legitimacy, Power, and Influence," 32.

21. Burns, *Leadership*, 426, emphasis in original.

22. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 22, emphasis in original.

23. Northouse, *Leadership*, 186.

24. On its current use, see Nye, *The Powers to Lead*, 60; Weber, *Economy and Society*, 2: 1112.

25. For inspirational motivation, see Northouse, *Leadership*, 183; Michael R. Carey, "Transformational Leadership and the Fundamental Option for Self-Transcendence," *Leadership Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (1992): 222. On values, actions, and myths, see Ann Ruth Willner, *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 62.

26. Key features of intellectual stimulation include comprehension, conceptualization, and discernment. See Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 99. For a comparison of existentially oriented and idealistically oriented intellectual leaders, see Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 110–12.

27. Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass, "Individual Consideration Viewed at Multiple Levels of Analysis: A Multi-Level Framework for Examining the Diffusion of Transformational Leadership," *Leadership Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (1995): 202.

28. For an overview of different leadership styles, including transactional leadership, see Francis J. Yammarino, William D. Spangler, and Bernard M. Bass, "Transformational Leadership and Performance: A Longitudinal Investigation," *Leadership Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1993): 84. See also Burns, *Leadership*, 19–20.

29. For "instrumental compliance," see Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 201. See also Burns, *Leadership*, 311. On small group leadership, for instance, see Burns, *Leadership*, 257–397.

30. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 121–49.

31. Ibid., 135. See also Yammarino, Spangler, and Bass, "Transformational Leadership and Performance," 84.

32. Blondel, *Political Leadership*, 28.

33. Burns, *Leadership*, 413–15.

34. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 3–4; James MacGregor Burns, *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness* (New York: Grove, 2003), 25.

35. Nye, *The Powers to Lead*, 64.

36. Ibid., 64–5.

37. Aurelia George Mulgan, "The Leadership Role of the Prime Minister and Party," *Policy and Society* 23, no. 1 (2004): 6.

38. There are a number of other approaches. Glenn Paige outlines a model of leadership behavior based on minimal (conservative leadership), moderate (reformist leadership), and maximal (revolutionary leadership) change. Another approach categorizes leadership styles based on the extent to which they are *successful* or *effective*. See Glenn D. Paige, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership* (New York: Macmillan, 1977), 103; Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, 52.

39. Blondel, *Political Leadership*, 94.

40. H. D. P. Envall, "Abe's Fall: Leadership and Expectations in Japanese Politics," *Asian Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 2 (2011): 152–3.

41. Blondel, *Political Leadership*, 83.

42. See *ibid.*, 87–97.

43. Paige, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*, 113. See also Edinger, "The Comparative Analysis of Political Leadership," 257. For more on the aggregation of processes and norms, see Tucker, *Politics as Leadership*, 14; Burns, *Leadership*, 119.

44. Paige, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*, 99.

45. James N. Rosenau, "Followership and Discretion: Assessing the Dynamics of Modern Leadership," *Harvard International Review* 26, no. 3 (2004): 15.

46. Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 191, 13–20; Blondel, *Political Leadership*, 6. On institutions as constraints, see Kenneth P. Ruscio, *The Leadership Dilemma in Modern Democracy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2004), 4.

47. Burns, *Leadership*, 322–25; Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 15–20.

48. On informal expectations, see Rosenau, "Followership and Discretion," 14–17. See also Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 21–23.

49. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, 1979), 91.

50. *Ibid.*, 94.

51. On leadership as functionally the same, see Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 232. Regarding the three images, see Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, chapters 2, 4, and 6. For Mearsheimer's argument, see John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 11.

52. Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 163–66. For more on the English School, see Ian Hall, "Still the English Patient? Closures and Inventions in the English School," *International Affairs* 77, no. 3 (2001), 11.

53. Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992). See also Ian Hurd, "Constructivism," in *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2008), 303–4. For a discussion on problems of norm adoption and use in a contemporary international context, see Mathew Davies, “ASEAN and Human Rights Norms: Constructivism, Rational Choice, and the Action-Identity Gap,” *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2013).

54. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 3rd ed. (New York: Longman, 2001), 29–31.

55. Walter Carlsnaes, “Foreign Policy,” in *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons (London: Sage, 2002), 332, 336–41. On decision-makers’ perceptions, see Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 14–15. On bureaucratic politics, see Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: HarperCollins, 1971).

56. For Walt’s arguments, see Stephen M. Walt, “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power,” *International Security* 9, no. 4 (1985): 8–9. See also Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, 320–22. Regarding neoclassical realists, see Carlsnaes, “Foreign Policy,” 336–7; Gideon Rose, “Neo-classical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy,” *World Politics* 51, no. 1 (1998): 146–47.

57. On these criticisms, see Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack, “Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In,” *International Security* 25, no. 4 (2001): 111–14.

58. Ariel Ilan Roth, *Leadership in International Relations: The Balance of Power and the Origins of World War II* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 144–45.

59. Byman and Pollack, “Let Us Now Praise Great Men,” 114; Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 263–64.

60. Robert D. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games,” *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 427.

61. Ibid. A key study on this issue remains Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam, eds. *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993).

62. Peter Gourevitch, “Domestic Politics and International Relations,” in Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, *Handbook of International Relations*, 309–10.

63. On ratification, see Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics,” 427–36; Andrew Moravcsik, “Introduction: Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining,” in Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 27. In terms of public approval as a form of ratification, see Helen V. Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 73.

64. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics,” 440 (see also 437 for Putnam’s win-set concept). Debate continues on this question. See, for example, Jongryn Mo, “The Logic of Two-Level Games with Endogenous Domestic Coalitions,” *Journal of Conflict* 38, no. 39 (1994); Ahmer Tarar, “Constituencies and Preferences in International Bargaining,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (2005).

65. Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, 16.

66. For example, see *ibid.*, 17; Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 449.

67. Peter R. Weilemann, "The Summit Meeting: The Role and Agenda of Diplomacy at its Highest Level," *NIRA Review* 7, no. 2 (2000): 16.

68. *Ibid.*, 17. For the "Churchillian" view and for even older recorded examples of summitry, see David H. Dunn, "What is Summitry?" in *Diplomacy at the Highest Level: The Evolution of International Summitry*, ed. David H. Dunn (London: Macmillan, 1996), 14, 3.

69. See Weilemann, "The Summit Meeting," 17; Dunn, "What is Summitry?" 15–18.

70. Weilemann, "The Summit Meeting," 18; Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 452.

71. G. R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (London: Prentice Hall, 1995), 84.

72. Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: Routledge-Curzon, 2004), 33, 35.

73. Peter I. Hajnal, *The G7/G8 System: Evolution, Role and Documentation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 19–20; Nicholas Bayne, "Are the World Leaders Puppets or Puppeteers? The Sherpas and Decision Making within the G7/8 System," in *Decision Making Within International Organizations*, ed. Bob Reinalda and Bertjan Verbeek (London: Routledge, 2004), 139–42; Nicholas Bayne, *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts the 21st Century* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 5–6.

74. Peter I. Hajnal and John J. Kirton, "The Evolving Role and Agenda of the G7/G8: A North American Perspective," *NIRA Review* 7, no. 2 (2000); Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 28–29; Hajnal, *The G7/G8 System*, 1.

75. Hajnal, *The G7/G8 System*, 20–21.

76. John J. Kirton, "The G20 Takes Centre Stage," in *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten*, ed. John Kirton and Madeline Koch (London: Newsdesk Communications, 2008), 16; *Economist*, "A Modern Guide to G-ology," November 13, 2009.

77. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 431–34.

78. For leaders as the formal link between the two levels, see Andrew Moravcsik, "Armaments Among Allies: European Weapons Collaboration, 1975–1985," in Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 160. Regarding the role of leaders, see Byman and Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men," 133–36; Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 7.

79. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics," 456. See also Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, 20–21; Peter B. Evans, "Building an Integrative Approach to International and Domestic Politics: Reflections and Projections," in Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 403–4.



80. See, for example, John Forester, "Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through," *Public Administration Review* 44, no. 1 (1984): 23–24; Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1957); Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 40–41; Bryan D. Jones, *Politics and the Architecture of Choice: Bounded Rationality and Governance* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001), xi–xii.

81. On leaders' lack of knowledge of their domestic environments, see Evans, "Building an Integrative Approach," 409–11; Keisuke Iida, "When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, no. 3 (1993). On access to information and other actors, see Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, 21–22.

82. Jervis, *Perception and Misperception*, 320–21.

83. Andrew Bingham Kennedy, *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru: National Efficacy Beliefs and the Making of Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Jervis, *Perception and Misperception*, 319–406.

84. Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, 34.

85. Regarding leaders' values, objectives, and styles, see Moravcsik, "Introduction," 30. On leaders' preferences, see *ibid.*, 37.

86. For more on these strategies, see Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, 109; Moravcsik, "Introduction," 25; Andrea K. Grove, *Political Leadership in Foreign Policy: Manipulating Support Across Borders* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 5–8. On leaders' attempts to shape the counterparts' environments, see Moravcsik, "Introduction," 29. Regarding the iterative nature of international negotiations, see Evans, "Building an Integrative Approach," 399–411.

87. Kennedy, *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru*, 5; Margaret G. Hermann et al., "Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals," *International Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (2001): 83–85.

88. Walter Carlsnaes, "Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis," in *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, ed. Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 96–97. See also Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 38–39; Margaret G. Hermann, "When Leader Personality Will Affect Foreign Policy: Some Propositions," in *In Search of Global Patterns*, ed. James N. Rosenau (New York: The Free Press, 1976), 327–28; Margaret G. Hermann and Joe D. Hagan, "International Decision Making: Leadership Matters," *Foreign Policy* 110, Spring (1998): 125; Byman and Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men," 109.

89. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 7.

90. Hermann, "When Leader Personality Will Affect Foreign Policy," 328–32. See also Margaret G. Hermann, "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders," *International Studies Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (1980): 7–14. For other studies, see Margaret G. Hermann and Charles F. Hermann, "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry," *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1989): 365–73; Juliet Kaarbo

and Margaret G. Hermann, "Leadership Styles of Prime Ministers: How Individual Differences Affect the Foreign Policymaking Process," *Leadership Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1998).

91. Byman and Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men," 136–40.

92. For more on how leaders "selectively perceive" their environments, see Hermann et al., "Who Leads Matters," 87. Regarding the acceptability continuum, see Barbara Farnham, "Impact of the Political Context on Foreign Policy Decision-Making," *Political Psychology* 25, no. 3 (2004). For leaders' responsiveness to constraints, see Hermann et al., "Who Leads Matters," 89–95. Jonathan Keller refers to constraint "respecters" and constraint "challengers." See Jonathan W. Keller, "Leadership Style, Regime Type, and Foreign Policy Crisis Behavior: A Contingent Monadic Peace?" *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (2005): 206–7. Others consider the role of leaders' perceptions of public opinion. See Douglas C. Foyle, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Elite Beliefs as a Mediating Variable," *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1997).

93. Juliet Kaarbo, "Prime Minister Leadership Styles in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Framework for Research," *Political Psychology* 18, no. 3 (1997): 571–77.

94. Fred I. Greenstein, "The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to Clear Away Underbrush," *American Political Science Review* 61, no. 3 (1967): 633–36; Fred I. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 40–57; Raymond Birt, "Personality and Foreign Policy: The Case of Stalin," *Political Psychology* 14, no. 4 (1993): 608–9.

95. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics*, 48.

96. See Jerrold M. Post, *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 18.

97. See Fred I. Greenstein, "Can Personality and Politics be Studied Systematically?" *Political Psychology* 13, no. 1 (1992): 117, emphasis in original.

98. On the importance of leaders in ambiguous situations, see Margaret G. Hermann and Charles W. Kegley Jr., "Rethinking Democracy and International Peace: Perspectives from Political Psychology," *International Studies Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (1995): 515–16.

99. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics*, 40–57.

## Chapter 2

1. This chapter is in part an extended revision of an article published in 2008. See H. D. P. Envall, "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan," *Japanese Studies* 28, no. 2 (2008).

2. For example, see Karel van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power: People and Politics in a Stateless Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1989), 147.

3. Jin Igarashi, "Nakasone Moto Shushō ni Okeru Riidaashippu no Kenkyū," *Revaiasan* 5 (1989): 168 cites Peter Tasker, *Insaido Japan*, trans. Sasano Yōko (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1988), 267.

4. Verena Blechinger-Talcott, "Shifting Incentives for Political Leadership," in *Japan's Politics and Economy: Perspectives on Change*, ed. Marie Söderberg and Patricia A. Nelson (London: Routledge, 2010), 72.

5. John Creighton Campbell and Ethan Scheiner, "Fragmentation and Power: Reconceptualizing Policy Making under Japan's 1955 System," *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 9, no. 1 (2008): 91.

6. Robert Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies* (London: Macmillan, 1995), 13–24.

7. Tomohito Shinoda, *Leading Japan: The Role of the Prime Minister* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 46; Elgie, *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*, 137. On different interpretations of the allocation of powers, see Kensuke Takayasu, "Prime-Ministerial Power in Japan: A Re-Examination," *Japan Forum* 17, no. 2 (2005): 166–68. See also *Cabinet Law*, Article 2(1).

8. Honda Masatoshi, *Gendai Nihon no Seiji to Gyōsei* (Tokyo: Hokuju Shuppan, 2001), 60.

9. Shinoda, *Leading Japan*, 47–60. On the assessment that Japan's prime ministers have been comparatively weak, see Frances McCall Rosenbluth and Michael F. Thies, *Japan Transformed: Political Change and Economic Restructuring* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 112.

10. Chalmers Johnson, *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 159.

11. For example, see Bradley M. Richardson, *The Political Culture of Japan* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974). On these cultural concepts, see Shigeko N. Fukai, "The Missing Leader: The Structure and Traits of Political Leadership in Japan," in *Political Psychology in Japan: Behind the Nails that Sometimes Stick Out (and get Hammered Down)*, ed. Ofer Feldman (Commack, NY: Nova Science, 1999), 173. For an analysis of *giri*, *ninjō*, and *amae*, see Chie Nakane, *Japanese Society* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973); Takeo Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence* (Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1971).

12. Quoted in Gerald L. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 13. On personalized leader–follower relations, see Bradley M. Richardson and Scott C. Flanagan, *Politics in Japan* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1984), 181–87.

13. Campbell and Scheiner, "Fragmentation and Power," 90–91.

14. Johnson, *Japan: Who Governs?* 13.

15. T. J. Pempel, "The Bureaucratization of Policymaking in Postwar Japan," *American Journal of Political Science* 18, no. 4 (1974): 664. On administrative guidance, see also Chalmers Johnson, *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925–1975* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982), 265–74.

16. Takashi Inoguchi, "Kanryōsei no Rekishi Kara Mita Nihon Seiji," *Revi-Asian* 18 (1996); Masaru Kohno, *Japan's Postwar Party Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 21–25.

17. Gerald L. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 244.

18. Michio Muramatsu, "Patterned Pluralism Under Challenge: The Policies of the 1980s," in *Political Dynamics in Contemporary Japan*, ed. Gary D. Allinson and Yasunori Sone (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 64.

19. T. J. Pempel, "The Unbundling of 'Japan, Inc.': The Changing Dynamics of Japanese Policy Formation," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 13, no. 2 (1987): 289–90.

20. Kenji Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), 147. For more on *zoku*, see Takashi Inoguchi and Iwai Tomoaki, *Zokugin no Kenkyū: Jimintō Seiken o Gyūjiru Shuyakutachi* (Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha, 1987), i, 99–101; Campbell and Scheiner, "Fragmentation and Power," 92–93; Leonard J. Schoppa, "Zoku Power and LDP Power: A Case Study of the Zoku Role in Education Policy," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 17, no. 1 (1991). See also Honda, *Gendai Nihon no Seiji to Gyōsei*, 71; Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics*, 115. For an argument on increasing political influence, see J. Mark Ramseyer and Frances McCall Rosenbluth, *Japan's Political Marketplace*, paperback ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 121–41.

21. van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, 54, 48–53.

22. Aurelia George Mulgan, "Japan's Political Leadership Deficit," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 2 (2000): 183.

23. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics*, 60.

24. Ibid., 59–60. See also Michio Muramatsu and Ellis S. Krauss, "The Conservative Policy Line and the Development of Patterned Pluralism," in *The Political Economy of Japan Volume One: The Domestic Transformation*, ed. Kozo Yamamura and Yasukichi Yasuba (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987).

25. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996), 4.

26. Ibid., 21, 67. On comprehensive security, see J. W. M. Chapman, Reinhard Drifte, and I. T. M. Gow, *Japan's Quest for Comprehensive Security: Defence, Diplomacy, and Dependence* (London: Frances Pinter, 1983), xiv–xviii. For critiques of Nakasone's thinking, see Pyle, *The Japanese Question*, 94–95; Gavan McCormack, *The Emptiness of Japanese Affluence*, rev. ed. (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2001), 173.

27. Fukai, "The Missing Leader," 179; Kyōji Wakata, *Gendai Nihon no Seiji to Fūdo* (Tokyo: Mineruva Shobō, 1981), 125–30; Takashi Inoguchi and Paul Bacon, "Japan's Emerging Role as a 'Global Ordinary Power,'" *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 6, no. 1 (2006): 7. For a study of Japanese factions, see Uchida Kenzō, *Habatsu* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1983).

28. Nakane, *Japanese Society*, 66–67; van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, 235; Roger W. Bowen, *Japan's Dysfunctional Democracy: The Liberal Democratic Party and Structural Corruption* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2003), 23.

29. van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, 295; Bowen, *Japan's Dysfunctional Democracy*, 29.
30. Bowen, *Japan's Dysfunctional Democracy*, 27–28.
31. van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, 295.
32. Jirō Tokuyama, “The Leaderless State,” *Japan Echo* 18, no. 4 (1991): 39.
33. Ellis S. Krauss and Benjamin Nyblade, “‘Presidentialization’ in Japan? The Prime Minister, Media and Elections in Japan,” *British Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 2 (2005).
34. Tomohito Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan's Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007), 64. See also H. D. P. Envall, “Transforming Security Politics: Koizumi Jun'ichiro and the Gaullist Tradition in Japan,” *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 8, no. 2 (2008), [www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2008/Envall.html](http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2008/Envall.html); Gerald Curtis, “A Time of Drift: Can Japanese Politics Be Saved?” *East Asia Forum Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (2012).
35. Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister*, 26.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., xi.
38. George Mulgan, “Japan's Political Leadership Deficit,” 183–84.
39. Aurelia George Mulgan, “The Leadership Role of the Prime Minister and Party,” *Policy and Society* 23, no. 1 (2004): 7; Inoguchi and Bacon, “Japan's Emerging Role,” 7.
40. Alisa Gaunder, *Political Reform in Japan: Leadership Looming Large* (London: Routledge, 2007), 121.
41. Shinoda, *Leading Japan*, xvi.
42. Ibid., 205.
43. Ibid., 205–9.
44. George Mulgan, “Japan's Political Leadership Deficit,” 184.
45. Takenaka Harukata, *Shushō Shihai: Nihon Seiji no Henbō* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2006), ii.
46. Aurelia George Mulgan, *Japan's Failed Revolution: Koizumi and the Politics of Economic Reform* (Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, 2002), 49.
47. Gaunder, *Political Reform in Japan*, 2–3.
48. Ibid., 132–34.
49. See Kenneth B. Pyle, *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), 228–29; Richard J. Samuels, *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 34–36.
50. Pyle, *Japan Rising*, 226.
51. Fukushima Shingo, *Nihon no Seiji Shidō to Kadai* (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1992), 151.
52. Richard J. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 348, 346. See also J. A. A. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan* (London: Routledge,

2003), 257–58; Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics*, 7; Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister*, 9.

53. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children*, 142.

54. *Ibid.*, 230.

55. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*, 219–20. On the Reversion of Okinawa, see Junnosuke Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, trans. Lonny E. Carlile (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 100–4. Regarding the three non-nuclear principles, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 43.

56. Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 139–44, 152–54; Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*, 238–39.

57. Fukushima, *Nihon no Seiji Shidō to Kadai*, 238; Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*, 238.

58. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics*, 83.

59. George Mulgan, *Japan's Failed Revolution*, 48. On Koizumi's early media strategies, see Ikuo Kabashima and Gill Steel, "How Junichiro Koizumi Seized the Leadership of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party," *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2007): 106–9.

60. Uchiyama Yū, *Koizumi Seiken: "Patosu no Shushō" wa Nani o Kaeta no ka* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2007), 12. For the English version, see Yū Uchiyama, *Koizumi and Japanese Politics: Reform Strategies and Leadership Style*, trans. Carl Freire (London: Routledge, 2010), 11–12.

61. On these terms, see George Mulgan, *Japan's Failed Revolution*, 55; Koizumi quote from page 49.

62. Naofumi Fujimura, "The Power Relationship Between the Prime Minister and Ruling Party Legislators: The Postal Service Privatization Act of 2005 in Japan," *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 2 (2007): 236.

63. On Abe as a "blue blood," see *Agence France Presse*, "In Japan, Politics is a Family Affair," September 17, 2006. For the leadership style projected by Abe, see Derwin Pereira and Kwan Weng Kin, "Will Abe Learn to Rock and Roll?" *Straits Times*, October 1, 2006. See also H. D. P. Envall, "Abe's Fall: Leadership and Expectations in Japanese Politics," *Asian Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 2 (2011): 149–70.

64. Abe Shinzō, *Utsukushii Kuni e* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2006), 29.

65. See Bryan Walsh, "The Abe Enigma," *Time Asia*, September 11, 2006; *Japan Times Online*, "Upper House Showdown," July 30, 2007.

66. *Oriental Economist*, "How Many Arrows has Abe? MOF, BOJ Press Abe to Reverse Second Arrow," 81, no. 4 (2013): 1–4.

67. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children*, 351–52. For a not dissimilar view, see Ian Neary, "Leaders and Leadership in Japan," in *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, ed. Ian Neary (Richmond, UK: Japan Library, 1996).

68. On the prime ministerial speeches and foreign policy directions, and the linkage between leadership change and foreign policy change, see Bert Edström, *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 177–78.

69. Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: Routledge-Curzon, 2004), 154–55; Nobuhiko Shima, *Shunō Gaikō: Senshinkoku Samitto no Rimenshi* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū Publishing, 2000), 168.

70. On the role of the bureaucracy, see Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 154–55; Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 133.

71. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 150.

72. For example, see Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits* (London: Heinemann for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1984), 149.

73. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 141; Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 69.

74. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 141–43; J. D. Armstrong, “The Group of Seven Summits,” in *Diplomacy at the Highest Level: The Evolution of International Summitry*, ed. David H. Dunn (London: Macmillan, 1996), 43.

75. On interpersonal relations, see Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 141–43. Regarding leaders’ capacity to speak for themselves, see Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 47.

76. George Mulgan, “Japan’s Political Leadership Deficit,” 183–84.

77. On Mori’s summitry leadership see Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 142. Regarding Hashimoto, see Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 60.

78. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 145–52.

79. On Nakasone’s summitry, see Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 49–56; Glenn D. Hook et al., *Japan’s International Relations: Politics, Economics and Security* (London: Routledge, 2001), 360.

80. Nicholas Bayne, *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts the 21st Century* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 92.

81. On the Sea Island summit, see Nao Shimoyachi, “Koizumi’s Iraq Pledge Signals New Chapter for SDF,” *Japan Times Online*, June 11, 2004.

82. Daizo Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy: Japan’s Seven Power Summit Diplomacy*, Country Study No. 6 (Toronto: Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, 1988), 1.

83. Pyle, *The Japanese Question*, 68–69.

84. Donald W. Klein, “Japan 1979: The Second Oil Crisis,” *Asian Survey* 20, no. 1 (1980): 42–43.

85. See J. Rey Maeno, “Japan 1973: The End of an Era?” *Asian Survey* 14, no. 1 (1974): 52; Johnson, *Japan: Who Governs?* 25–26, 29–30.

86. See Akira Iriye, *Japan and the Wider World: From Mid-Nineteenth Century to the Present* (New York: Longman, 1997), 168–69.

87. Maeno, “Japan 1973,” 57–59. On trade disputes in the late 1970s, see I. M. Destler and Hisao Mitsuyu, “Locomotives on Different Tracks: Macroeconomic Diplomacy, 1977–1979,” in *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*, ed. I. M. Destler and Hideo Sato (Lexington, MD: Lexington Books, 1982).

88. Pyle, *Japan Rising*, 50, see also 49–65.

89. *Ibid.*, 64.

90. Hook et al., *Japan’s International Relations*, 349.

91. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 90.
92. Michael J. Green, *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 193.
93. *Ibid.*, 195–200.
94. On Japan's multilateralism in the Asia-Pacific, see Derek McDougall, *Asia Pacific in World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007), 94–95.
95. Hugo Dobson, "Japan and the Changing Global Balance of Power: The View from the Summit," *Politics* 31, no. 1 (2010): 34.
96. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 165–75; John J. Kirton, "The G7/8 and China: Toward a Closer Association," in *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-first Century*, ed. John J. Kirton, Joseph P. Daniels, and Andreas Freytag (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001); Hugo Dobson, "The 2008 Hokkaido–Toyako G8 Summit: Neither Summit nor Plummet," *Asia-Pacific Journal*, 48-5-08 (30 November 2008) <[www.japanfocus.org/\\_Hugo\\_Dobson-The\\_2008\\_Hokkaido\\_Toyako\\_G8\\_Summit\\_neither\\_summit\\_nor\\_plummet](http://www.japanfocus.org/_Hugo_Dobson-The_2008_Hokkaido_Toyako_G8_Summit_neither_summit_nor_plummet)>.
97. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 27.
98. Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 176.
99. Dobson, "Japan and the Changing Global Balance of Power," 33–34.

## Chapter 3

1. Alisa Gaunder, *Political Reform in Japan: Leadership Looming Large* (London: Routledge, 2007), 2–3.
2. H. D. P. Envall, "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan," *Japanese Studies* 28, no. 2 (2008).
3. Richard J. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 351.
4. Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of International Politics," *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993): 64.
5. *Ibid.*, 65. See also Kenneth N. Waltz, "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *International Security* 25, no. 1 (2000): 33.
6. Eric Heginbotham and Richard J. Samuels, "Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy," *International Security* 22, no. 4 (1998): 176–77.
7. Christopher W. Hughes, *Japan's Remilitarisation*, Adelphi series 403 (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2009), 139–42. On Japan's recent strategic realignments, see Tomohiko Satake and Yusuke Ishihara, "America's Rebalance to Asia and its Implications for Japan–US–Australia Security Cooperation," *Asia-Pacific Review* 19, no. 2 (2012): 12–16; H. D. P. Envall and Kerri Ng, "Okinawa, the US–Japan Alliance, and Asia-Pacific Security," *ANU–MASI Policy Background Paper* 11 (2013): 2–3.



8. Bhubhindar Singh, *Japan's Security Identity: From a Peace State to an International State* (London: Routledge, 2013), 21–22. Regarding balance of threats, see Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987).

9. For more on Japan's strategic culture, see Richard J. Samuels, *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 6, 186–89.

10. Kenneth B. Pyle, *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), 24–27.

11. Andrew L. Oros, *Normalizing Japan: Politics, Identity and the Evolution of Security Practice* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008), 9. See also Singh, *Japan's Security Identity*.

12. Michael J. Green, *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 4–8, 32–34.

13. Daniel Kliman, *Japan's Security Strategy in the Post-9/11 World: Embracing a New Realpolitik* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006), 2–4.

14. Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, "Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy," *Pacific Review* 14, no. 2 (2001): 223; Paul Midford, "The Logic of Reassurance and Japan's Grand Strategy," *Security Studies* 11, no. 3 (2002): 21–33.

15. See Jennifer M. Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy," *International Security* 29, no. 1 (2004).

16. Heginbotham and Samuels, "Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy," 192–93. For a study of Japanese "technonationalism," see Richard J. Samuels, *"Rich Nation, Strong Army": National Security and the Technological Transformation of Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).

17. Jeremy D. Mayer, "International Relations Theory and Japanese Pacifism: Why Didn't Tokyo Go Ballistic Over North Korean Nukes?" *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* 15, no. 2 (1996): 54–55.

18. Concerning Japan and the liberal international order, see Thomas U. Berger, "The Pragmatic Liberalism of an Adaptive State," in *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*, ed. Thomas U. Berger, Mike M. Mochizuki, and Jitsuo Tsuchiyama (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007), 261. In terms of the Hatoyama Yukio administration and Asianism, see H. D. P. Envall and Kiichi Fujiwara, "Japan's Misfiring Security Hedge: Discovering the Limits of Middle-Power Internationalism and Strategic Convergence," in *Bilateral Perspectives on Regional Security: Australia, Japan and the Asia-Pacific Region*, ed. William T. Tow and Rikki Kersten (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 62–64; Daniel Sneider, "The New Asianism: Japanese Foreign Policy Under the Democratic Party of Japan," *Asia Policy* 12 (2011): 106–10.

19. Mike Mochizuki and Michael O'Hanlon, "A Liberal Vision for the US-Japanese Alliance," *Survival* 40, no. 2 (1998).

20. Heginbotham and Samuels, "Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy," 173; Mayer, "International Relations Theory and Japanese Pacifism," 55.

21. Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics* 51, no. 1 (1998): 146.

22. Ibid.
23. Pyle, *Japan Rising*, 22; Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 6.
24. Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24, no. 2 (1999): 7.
25. Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism," in *Rethinking Japanese Security: Internal and External Dimensions*, ed. Peter J. Katzenstein (London: Routledge, 2008), 36.
26. Ibid.
27. Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policies," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (1993): 86.
28. Thomas U. Berger, "From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-Militarism," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (1993). See also Thomas U. Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 204–5. Regarding wider societal attitudes, see Glenn D. Hook, *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan* (London: Routledge, 1996). See also Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
29. Singh, *Japan's Security Identity*, 18–19.
30. Akitoshi Miyashita, "Where Do Norms Come From? Foundations of Japan's Postwar Pacifism," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 1 (2007): 101.
31. Yasuhiro Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan's Security Policy," *International Security* 35, no. 2 (2010): 128; Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck?" 115.
32. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security*, 204.
33. Katzenstein and Okawara, "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism," 41.
34. Peter J. Katzenstein and Rudra Sil, "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism," in Katzenstein, *Rethinking Japanese Security*, 263.
35. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 6–8.
36. Ibid., 8.
37. Yukiko Miyagi, "Foreign Policy Making under Koizumi: Norms and Japan's Role in the 2003 Iraq War," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5, no. 4 (2009): 351.
38. Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 6–8.
39. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 119.
40. Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 6–9. See also H. D. P. Envall, "Japan's Grand Strategy: Goldilocks and the Search for the Perfect Porridge," *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 10, no. 1 (2010), <[www.japanesestudies.org.uk/reviews/2010/Envall.html](http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/reviews/2010/Envall.html)>.
41. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 66. Singh argues that Japan was a "peace state" despite its extensive cooperation with the US and possession of defense forces. See Singh, *Japan's Security Identity*, 37.
42. For the difficulty in using normative factors to explain these changes, see Singh, *Japan's Security Identity*, 41–76.

43. Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 7. For these different groups, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 110–13.
44. Izumikawa, “Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism,” 125.
45. Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change,” *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 909, 910–11.
46. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 44; emphasis in original.
47. Izumikawa, “Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism,” 129–34; Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 45.
48. Tomohito Shinoda, *Leading Japan: The Role of the Prime Minister* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000), 46–60.
49. Cited in *Ibid.*, 46.
50. Tomohito Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan’s Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007), 19.
51. Bert Edström, *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 177–78.
52. *Ibid.*; see also Bert Edström, “Prime Ministerial Leadership in Japanese Foreign Policy,” in *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, ed. Ian Neary (Richmond, UK: Japan Library, 1996), 243–45.
53. Gerald L. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 13; Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 56–57.
54. On Yoshida’s negotiations with Shigemitsu, see Shigeru Yoshida, *The Yoshida Memoirs: The Story of Japan in Crisis*, trans. Kenichi Yoshida (London: Heinemann, 1961), 188–89. John W. Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878–1954*, paperback ed. (Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Affairs, Harvard University Press, 1988), 373–400; J. Patrick Boyd and Richard J. Samuels, “Nine Lives? The Politics of Constitutional Reform in Japan,” *Policy Studies* 19 (Washington, DC: East–West Center, 2005), 21.
55. Pyle, *Japan Rising*, 228–29; John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy* (London: Athlone Press, 1988), 91–92. See also Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 34–37.
56. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996), 21.
57. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 69.
58. Yoshida, *The Yoshida Memoirs*, 274.
59. Quoted in Sadō Akihiro, *Sengo Nihon no Bōei to Seiji* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2003), 16.
60. Sakamoto Kazuya, “Conditions of an Independent State: Japanese Diplomacy in the 1950s,” in *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, ed. Makoto Iokibe, trans. Robert D. Eldridge (London: Routledge, 2011), 64–65.
61. Quoted in Dan Kurzman, *Kishi and Japan: The Search for the Sun* (New York: Ivan Obolensky, 1960), 265. For Kishi’s strategic losses, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 32–34.

62. Robert E. Ward, "The Constitution and Current Japanese Politics," *Far Eastern Survey* 25, no. 4 (1956): 50; Dower, *Empire and Aftermath*, 465–66; Richard Sims, *Japanese Political History since the Meiji Renovation, 1868–2000* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 281–86.

63. Ellis S. Krauss and Robert Pekkanen, "Profiles in Discourage: Prime Ministerial Leadership in Post-War Japan," in *Poor Leadership and Bad Governance: Reassessing Presidents and Prime Ministers in North America, Europe and Japan*, ed. Ludger Helms (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012), 180.

64. Quoted in Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 20. The original is from Kishi Nobusuke, "Makoto no Dokuritsu Nihon no tame ni," *Fūsei*, January 1954, reproduced in Kishi Nobusuke, *Kishi Nobusuke Kaikoroku: Hoshu Gōdō to Anpo Kaitei* (Tokyo: Kōsaidō, 1983), 109.

65. Iokibe Makoto, "Introduction: Japanese Diplomacy from Prewar to Postwar," in Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 12. For Kishi's view on the alliance and Japanese independence, see Kitaoka Shin'ichi, "Kishi Nobusuke: Yashin to Zassetsu," in *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, ed. Watanabe Akio (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995), 133. Concerning the costs of achieving the security treaty, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 34.

66. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children*, 201. Yoshida's views regarding rearment are cited in Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 59. For the original, see Shigeru Yoshida, *Japan's Decisive Century, 1867–1967* (New York: Praeger, 1967), 106.

67. Nobumasa Akiyama, "The Socio-Political Roots of Japan's Non-Nuclear Posture," in *Japan's Nuclear Option: Security, Politics, and Policy in the 21st Century*, ed. Benjamin L. Self and Jeffrey W. Thompson (Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center, 2003), 83. On Satō's three non-nuclear principles, see Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 102–7; Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 43; Michael J. Green, "Balance of Power," in *US–Japan Relations in a Changing World*, ed. Steven K. Vogel (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2002), 17–18; Kitaoka Shin'ichi, "Sengo Nihon no Gaikō Shisō," in *Sengo Nihon Gaikō Ronshū*, ed. Kitaoka Shin'ichi (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995), 25.

68. Akiyama, "The Socio-Political Roots," 85; Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 218, n39.

69. Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 35.

70. Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 122; Joseph P. Keddell, Jr., *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993), 134; Kazuhiko Togo, *Japan's Foreign Policy, 1945–2003: The Quest for a Proactive Policy* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 73.

71. Edström, *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine*, 94.

72. Quoted in Sueo Sudo, *The Fukuda Doctrine and ASEAN: New Dimensions in Japanese Foreign Policy* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1992), 153.

73. Ibid., 153–80; Togo, *Japan's Foreign Policy*, 201; Iokibe Makoto, "Fukuda Takeo: Seisaku no Shōsha, Seisō no Haisha," in Watanabe, *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 291–92.

74. Edström, *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine*, 99.

75. Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 55.
76. Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 112–13.
77. Ichiro Ozawa, *Blueprint for a New Japan: The Rethinking of a Nation*, trans. Louisa Rubinfiel, ed. Eric Gower (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1994), 94–95.
78. Ibid., 120. See Oros, *Normalizing Japan*, 79–80.
79. On the “globalist” concept of this “normal nation-alism,” see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 124.
80. Regarding the effect of this thinking on Japan’s domestic security constraints, see Hook, *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan*, 77–84; Makoto Iokibe, “Japanese Diplomacy After the Cold War,” in Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 175–81; Christopher W. Hughes, *Japan’s Security Agenda: Military, Economic, and Environmental Dimensions* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2004), 159–65. For more on the rising strategic challenges of the 1990s, see Michael J. Green and Benjamin L. Self, “Japan’s Changing China Policy: From Commercial Liberalism to Reluctant Realism,” *Survival* 38, no. 2 (1996): 42–45; Hughes, *Japan’s Remilitarisation*, 32.
81. H. D. P. Envall, “Transforming Security Politics: Koizumi Jun’ichiro and the Gaullist Tradition in Japan,” *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 8, no. 2 (2008), <[www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2008/Envall.html](http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2008/Envall.html)>.
82. Christopher W. Hughes and Ellis S. Krauss, “Japan’s New Security Agenda,” *Survival* 49, no. 2 (2007): 157.
83. Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy*, 63–85.
84. Regarding Koizumi’s management of the CLB, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 75–79. On Koizumi’s initial response to terrorism, see Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy*, 86–98. On the attitudes in the JDA toward the use of the JSDF, see Miyagi, “Foreign Policy Making under Koizumi,” 355.
85. Boyd and Samuels, “Nine Lives?” 40; Rikki Kersten, “Japanese Security Policy Formation: Assessing the Koizumi Revolution,” *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 65, no. 1 (2011): 10–11. For more on Koizumi’s approach to the alliance, see Daniel Clausen, “Leadership, Strategy, and Policy Entrepreneurship in Japanese Security Politics,” *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 13, no. 1 (2013), <[www.japanesestudies.org.uk/ejcs/vol13/iss1/clausen.html](http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/ejcs/vol13/iss1/clausen.html)>.
86. Cabinet Secretariat, “Prime Minister Koizumi Encourages Japan Ground Self-Defense Force (JGSDF) to be Dispatched to Iraq,” *Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet*, February 1, 2004, <[www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/02/01asahikawa\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/02/01asahikawa_e.html)>; Cabinet Secretariat, “Prime Minister Delivers Address at the National Defense Academy Graduation Ceremony,” *Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet*, March 21, 2004, <[www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/21bouei\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/21bouei_e.html)>. See also Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 72. On the JSDF as a military, see *Sankei Shinbun*, “Jieitai o ‘Guntai ni’: Shushō, Shōrai no Kenpō Kaisei ni Kitai,” May 21, 2003; *Tōkyō Shinbun*, “‘Guntai da’: Honne no Koizumi Shushō, Fukuda Yasuo Kanbōchōkan wa Tatemaie ‘Jieitai wa jieitai,’” May 22, 2003.

87. Cabinet Secretariat, “‘Koizumi Sōri Intabyū,” *Shushō Kantei*, August 15, 2006, <[www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2006/08/15interview.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2006/08/15interview.html)>; *Japan Times*, “Defiant Koizumi Visits Yasukuni,” August 16, 2006.

88. Sneider, “The New Asianism,” 110.

89. Daniel Clausen, “Examining Japanese Defense Policy and Politics Through Failures of Leadership: The Case of Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio,” *Asian Politics & Policy* 4, no. 4 (2012).

90. On open regional cooperation, see Yukio Hatoyama, “A New Path for Japan,” *New York Times*, August 26, 2009; Yukio Hatoyama, “Sofu, Ichirō ni Manada ‘Yūai’ to iu Tatakai no Hatajirushi,” *Voice*, September 2009, <[voice-plus-php.jp/archive/detail.jsp?id=197](http://voice-plus-php.jp/archive/detail.jsp?id=197)>; Yukio Hatoyama, “Japan’s New Commitment to Asia: Toward the Realization of an East Asian Community,” address by H. E. Dr Yukio Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan, November 15, 2009, <[www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/200911/15singapore\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/200911/15singapore_e.html)>; Yukio Hatoyama, “Policy Speech by Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama at the 174th Session of the Diet,” January 29, 2010, <[www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/201001/29siseihousin\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/201001/29siseihousin_e.html)>; Linus Hagström, “The Democratic Party of Japan’s Security Policy and Japanese Politics of Constitutional Revision: A Cloud Over Article 9?” *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 64, no. 5 (2010): 519–20. Regarding the Asian multilateralism under the DPJ, see also Envall and Fujiwara, “Japan’s Misfiring Security Hedge,” 66–67.

91. On the basing problems in Okinawa, see H. D. P. Envall, “Underplaying the ‘Okinawa Card’: How Japan Negotiates its Alliance with the United States,” *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 67, no. 4 (2013): 391–94. On the Senkaku dispute, see also Satoshi Amako, “The Senkaku Islands Incident and Japan–China Relations,” *East Asia Forum*, October 25, 2010, <[www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/10/25/the-senkaku-islands-incident-and-japan-china-relations/](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/10/25/the-senkaku-islands-incident-and-japan-china-relations/)>.

92. See H. D. P. Envall, “Abe’s Fall: Leadership and Expectations in Japanese Politics,” *Asian Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 2 (2011): 158 on the public’s attitude toward constitutional revision during Abe’s first tenure as prime minister, and more generally for more on Abe’s first prime ministership. See also Krauss and Pekkanen, “Profiles in Discouragement,” 186–88.

93. *Economist*, “Japan and Abenomics: Taxing Times,” October 5, 2013. See also *Oriental Economist*, “How Many Arrows has Abe? MOF, BOJ Press Abe to Reverse Second Arrow,” 81, no. 4 (2013).

94. *Yomiuri Shinbun*, “Abe shi ‘Kenpō o Zenmen Kaisei’ Seiken Kōsō ni Sakuru Ikō Yokohama de Kōen,” August 22, 2006.

95. For Abe’s statements regarding the JSDF, see *Yomiuri Shinbun*, “Deepen Debate on Constitution to Build Consensus on Revision,” July 15, 2013. See also Aurelia George Mulgan, “Abe Rocks Japan’s Constitutional Boat,” *East Asia Forum*, May 21, 2013, <[www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/05/21/abe-rocks-japans-constitutional-boat/](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/05/21/abe-rocks-japans-constitutional-boat/)>; H. D. P. Envall, “Japan’s Strategic Challenges in Asia,” *AIIA Policy Commentary* 15 (2013): 38–39. On Abe’s role under Koizumi, see Samuels, *Securing Japan*, 99.

96. Abe Shinzō, *Utsukushii Kuni e* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2006), 18–19.

97. Concerning Abe's education reforms and historical activism, see Envall, "Abe's Fall," 156–57.

98. See Karl Gustafsson, "Japanese Prime Minister Abe's U-turn on the Murayama Statement," *East Asia Forum*, May 31, 2013, <www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/05/31/japanese-prime-minister-abes-u-turn-on-the-murayama-statement/>; *Oriental Economist*, "'Can't Help Myself': Abe Goes Way Off Message with 'Aggression' Retraction," 81, no. 5 (2013): 1–2, 13; *Asahi Shinbun*, "Shushō 'Shinryaku Teigi, Sadamatteinai' Murayama Danwa 'Aimai,'" April 23, 2013. On the regional implications of Abe's Yasukuni visit, see H. D. P. Envall, "Abe's Yasukuni Visit Escalates Tensions in Asia," *East Asia Forum*, January 3, 2014, <www.eastasiaforum.org/2014/01/03/abes-yasukuni-visit-escalates-tensions-in-asia/>.

## Chapter 4

1. Quoted in Kawauchi Issei, *Ōhira Seiken:554 Nichi: Mizukara no Seimei o kakete Hoshu o Mamotta* (Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1982), 143–44.

2. Fukunaga Fumio, *Ōhira Masayoshi* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2008), 15.

3. Quoted in Seizaburō Satō, Ken'ichi Koyama, and Shunpei Kumon, *Postwar Politician: The Life and Times of Former Prime Minister Masayoshi Ōhira*, trans. William R. Carter (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1990), 28, 31.

4. *Ibid.*, 79.

5. Saburo Okita, *Tightrope: Balancing Economics and Responsibility in Japanese Diplomacy 1979–1980* (Tokyo: Institute for Domestic and International Policy Studies, 1992), 145.

6. Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 31–59.

7. *Ibid.*, 9; J. A. A. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan* (London: Routledge, 2003), 196.

8. Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996), 69.

9. See Yuichiro Nagatomi, ed., *Masayoshi Ohira's Proposal: To Evolve the Global Society* (Tokyo: Foundation for Advanced Information and Research, 1988); Muramatsu Michio, "Ōhira Masayoshi: Sainyū Saishutsu Seiji Mondai Teikisha," in *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, ed. Watanabe Akio (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995), 305; J. W. M. Chapman, Reinhard Drifte, and I. T. M. Gow, *Japan's Quest for Comprehensive Security: Defence, Diplomacy, and Dependence* (London: Frances Pinter, 1983), 49–50.

10. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*, 155.

11. Minoru Shimizu, "Ohira's 'Politics of Waiting' and Summit," *Japan Times*, June 14, 1979.

12. See Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 174, 238, 284; and Junnosuke Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, trans. Lonny E. Carlile (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 129.
13. Muramatsu, "Ōhira Masayoshi," 309.
14. Shimizu, "Ōhira's 'Politics of Waiting.'"
15. Ibid.
16. Bert Edström, *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 101–2.
17. Ōhira Masayoshi, "Policy Speech," Official Ministry of Foreign Affairs translation of speech given to the 87th Diet (January 25, 1979), reproduced in *Brush Strokes: Moments from My Life*, by Masayoshi Ōhira, trans. Simul International, English ed. (Tokyo: Foreign Press Center, Japan, 1979), 175.
18. Quoted in Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 467; Ōhira, "Policy Speech," 175.
19. Ōhira, "Policy Speech," 175.
20. OECD, *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan* (Paris: OECD, July 1979), 5.
21. OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 32, December (1982): 154–55; I. M. Destler and Hideo Sato, "Introduction," in *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*, ed. I. M. Destler and Hideo Sato (Lexington, MD: Lexington Books, 1982), 9.
22. OECD, *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan* (1979), 16.
23. OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 30, December (1981): 140, annual rate not seasonally adjusted.
24. OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 32, December (1982): 165; *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan* (Paris: OECD, July 1980), 16.
25. For example, see Jacob M. Schlesinger, *Shadow Shoguns: The Rise and Fall of Japan's Postwar Political Machine* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 21–23; H. D. P. Envall, "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan," *Japanese Studies* 28, no. 2 (2008): 233–35.
26. J. A. A. Stockwin, *Governing Japan: Divided Politics in a Major Economy*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 59.
27. Takafusa Nakamura, *A History of Shōwa Japan, 1926–1989*, trans. Edwin Whemmouth (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1998), 120–26.
28. Chalmers Johnson, *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 185; Schlesinger, *Shadow Shoguns*, 21–23. See also Kent E. Calder, "Kanryō vs. Shomin: Contrasting Dynamics of Conservative Leadership in Postwar Japan," in *Political Leadership in Contemporary Japan*, ed. Terry Edward MacDougall, Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies 1 (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1982).
29. Gerald L. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 81.
30. The first two points were included in a written document, but the final agreement—that Fukuda would pass on the leadership baton—was made



and accepted verbally. See Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 184–85; Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 375–77.

31. Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 186, 193 quotes Kiyomiya Ryū, *Fukuda Seiken: 714 Nichi* (Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1984), 292.

32. Minoru Shimizu, “‘Abnormal’ Diet Leaves Some Questions,” *Japan Times*, June 21, 1979.

33. Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits* (London: Heinemann for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1984), 100.

34. Paul Kemezis, “The Permanent Crisis: Changes in the World Oil System,” *Orbis* 23, no. 4 (1980): 762.

35. Daizo Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy: Japan’s Seven Power Summit Diplomacy*, Country Study No. 6 (Toronto: Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, 1988), 33; Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 116–17.

36. See Kemezis, “The Permanent Crisis,” 763–74; Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 102.

37. Walter J. Levy, “Oil and the Decline of the West,” *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 5 (1980): 999; Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 116.

38. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 102.

39. *Ibid.*, 13.

40. Andrew Shonfield, “The World Economy 1979,” *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 3 (1980): 607–8.

41. OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 38, December (1985): 172, 181.

42. Elaine P. Adam, “Chronology 1979,” *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 3 (1980): 760; see also Barry Wain, “The Indochina Refugee Crisis,” *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 1 (1979).

43. Donald W. Klein, “Japan 1979: The Second Oil Crisis,” *Asian Survey* 20, no. 1 (1980): 42.

44. Yujiro Eguchi, “Japanese Energy Policy,” *International Affairs* 56, no. 2 (1980): 264.

45. Destler and Sato, “Introduction,” 3–4.

46. Ezra F. Vogel, *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979). See also Destler and Sato, “Introduction,” 8–10.

47. Yoshihide Soeya, “Japan’s Relations with China,” in *The Golden Age of the US–China–Japan Triangle, 1972–1989*, ed. Ezra F. Vogel, Yuan Ming, and Tanaka Akihiko (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 216–22.

48. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 100.

49. *Ibid.*, 117.

50. *Ibid.*, 102.

51. Andrew Shonfield, “The Politics of the Mixed Economy in the International System of the 1970s,” *International Affairs* 56, no. 1 (1980).

52. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 32.

53. I. M. Destler and Hisao Mitsuyu, "Locomotives on Different Tracks: Macroeconomic Diplomacy, 1977–1979," in Destler and Sato, *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*, 258–59.

54. On Ōhira abandoning Japan's growth commitment, see Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 464–65. On the Ōhira–Carter summit, see Destler and Mitsuyu, "Locomotives on Different Tracks," 260–61; "Joint Communique, Productive Partnership for the 1980's" (visit of Prime Minister Ohira of Japan), reproduced at The World and Japan Database Project, University of Tokyo, <[www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/JPUS/19790502.D1E.html](http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/JPUS/19790502.D1E.html)>.

55. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 34.

56. Quoted in *Japan Times*, "Seven Challenged to Prove Value of Economic Summit," June 8, 1979.

57. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 32.

58. Destler and Mitsuyu, "Locomotives on Different Tracks," 261; "Joint Communique, Productive Partnership for the 1980's."

59. See A. M. W. Battishill, "Memorandum: Note for Record," June 28, 1979, <[www.margarethatcher.org/document/3826C8D11A974D63A878DE92B17B563A.pdf](http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/3826C8D11A974D63A878DE92B17B563A.pdf)>.

60. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 34. See also Henry Owen, "Memorandum: For the President," Tokyo Summit (June 22, 1979), <[www.margarethatcher.org/document/9942B14F0E714127A8EABAD2690CCD95.pdf](http://www.margarethatcher.org/document/9942B14F0E714127A8EABAD2690CCD95.pdf)>.

61. Kawauchi, *Ōhira Seiken*, 138.

62. Ōhira, "Policy Speech," 180.

63. *Japan Times*, "Ohira to Push Int'l Unity at June Summit," June 6, 1979.

64. Yoshihiro Nishimura, "Ohira Seeks 'Long Range Viewpoint,'" *Japan Times*, June 26, 1979.

65. Masayoshi Ōhira, "Meeting Drawing Attention, Expectations of the World," *Japan Times*, June 28, 1979.

66. Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 174; Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 471.

67. *Japan Times*, "Ohira, Ministers to Push MTN Accords at Summit," June 8, 1979.

68. *Japan Times*, "Ohira to Present 5-Point Energy Program of Japan at Summit," June 23, 1979.

69. Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: Routledge-Curzon, 2004), 33, 35.

70. Owada Hisashi, "A Japanese Perspective on the Role and Future of the G-7," *The International Spectator* 29, no. 2 (1994), <[www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/owada1994/document.html](http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/owada1994/document.html)>.

71. Miyazaki Hiromichi, "Tōkyō Samitto no Shinsō to Nihon," *Sekai Keizai Hyōron* September (1979): 7.
72. *Japan Times*, "Inflation Vital Issue, Ohira Tells Summit," June 29, 1979.
73. Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*, paperback ed. (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1995), 118.
74. Funabashi Yōichi, *Samitto no Shisō* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, 1980), 19.
75. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 36.
76. Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 21; John Hunt and Henry Owen, "Stock of the Seven-Power Summits: Two Views," *International Affairs* 60, no. 4 (1984): 657.
77. Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 19; Claudio Loderer, "A Test of the OPEC Cartel Hypothesis: 1974–1983," *Journal of Finance* 40, no. 3 (1985): 995.
78. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 36.
79. Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 19.
80. Miyazaki, "Tōkyō Samitto no Shinsō to Nihon," 8.
81. Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 19, 25–26; Kawauchi, *Ōhira Seiken*, 140.
82. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 36.
83. See Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 25–26.
84. Quoted in *ibid.*, 19–22.
85. Quoted in *ibid.*, 23.
86. Quoted in *ibid.*, 19–23. See also Kawauchi, *Ōhira Seiken*, 141–44; Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 475.
87. Quoted in Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 24.
88. Quoted in *ibid.*, 26–27.
89. Satō, Koyama, and Kumon, *Postwar Politician*, 476; see also Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 19.
90. Miyazaki, "Tōkyō Samitto no Shinsō to Nihon," 9; Funabashi, *Samitto no Shisō*, 26.
91. Miyazaki, "Tōkyō Samitto no Shinsō to Nihon," 9. The words in italics were written in English in the original Japanese text.
92. Quotes taken from "Prime Minister Ohira's Concluding Statement at the Joint News Conference," Tokyo Summit (June 29, 1979), reproduced in *The Seven-Power Summit: Documents from the Summits of Industrialized Countries, 1975–1989*, ed. Peter I. Hajnal (Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1989), 72, 73.
93. "Declaration" (for the Tokyo Summit), June 29, 1979, reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven Power Summit*.
94. *Ibid.*, 67.
95. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Kibishii Keizai Jyōsei Kakugo: Kaisan no Ki, Shinchō ni Mosaku," June 30, 1979.
96. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 38.

97. Cited in Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 38.

98. *Asahi Shinbun*, “EC Kessoku, Bei mo Torikomu: ‘Ōhira Ryū’ Tsūyō sezu,” June 30, 1979.

99. *Asahi Shinbun*, “Sekiyu Igai no Hanashi: Sukunakute Zannen–Miki, Fukuda ga Kansō,” June 30, 1979.

## Chapter 5

1. Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 149.

2. Just over 100 years after Suzuki’s birth, Yamada and its residents suffered substantial damage as a result of the Tōhoku earthquake of March 2011. See *Mainichi Daily News*, “2 Elderly Women at Shelter who Formed Sister-Like Bond Fear Separation,” May 3, 2011.

3. Kageyama Noboru, *Seinen Suzuki Zenkō to Gyokyō Undō: Moto Sōri no Kiseki* (Tokyo: Naruyama Dōshoten, 1992), 20.

4. *Ibid.*, 11.

5. Suzuki Zenkō and Iwate Hōsō Kabushiki Gaisha, *Moto Sōri Suzuki Zenkō Gekidō no Nihon Seiji o Kataru: Sengo 40 Nen no Kenshō* (Morioka: Iwate Hōsō, 1991), 36; Kageyama, *Seinen Suzuki Zenkō to Gyokyō Undō*, 28–29.

6. Uji Toshihiko, *Suzuki Seiken: 863 Nichi* (Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1983), 457–58.

7. Suzuki and Iwate Hōsō, *Moto Sōri Suzuki Zenkō*, 38–39; Kageyama, *Seinen Suzuki Zenkō to Gyokyō Undō*, 44–49.

8. Suzuki and Iwate Hōsō, *Moto Sōri Suzuki Zenkō*, 70.

9. Michael J. Green, “The Search for an Active Security Partnership: Lessons from the 1980s,” in *Partnership: The United States and Japan, 1951–2001*, ed. Akira Iriye and Robert A. Wampler (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 2001), 141. On Suzuki’s international experience, see Bert Edström, *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 111.

10. Quoted in Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 141.

11. Karel van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power: People and Politics in a Stateless Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1989), 147–48. See also Tawara Kōtarō, *Seijika no Fūkei* (Tokyo: Gakushū Kenkyūsha, 1994), 169.

12. van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, 147.

13. *Ibid.*, 148.

14. Edström, *Japan’s Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine*, 111; Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 33–34.

15. For analysis of Suzuki’s popularity, see Lee W. Farnsworth, “Japan in 1980: The Conservative Resurgence,” *Asian Survey* 21, no. 1 (1981): 77–78; Lee W. Farnsworth, “Japan in 1981: Meeting the Challenges,” *Asian Survey* 22, no.

1 (1982): 66; Hans H. Baerwald and Akira Hashimoto, "Japan in 1982: Doing Nothing is Best?" *Asian Survey* 23, no. 1 (1983): 54.

16. Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 35–41.

17. Kosaku Yoshino, *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan* (London: Routledge, 1992), 17–20; Chie Nakane, *Japanese Society* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 52.

18. Quoted in Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 40–41.

19. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Kakuryō Aitsugi Yasukuni Sanpai," August 15, 1980.

20. Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 138–39.

21. Baerwald and Hashimoto, "Japan in 1982," 54.

22. Junnosuke Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, trans. Lonny E. Carlile (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 416.

23. Quoted in *ibid.*, 416.

24. Tanaka Zen'ichirō, "Suzuki Zenkō: Kenryoku ga Motometa Seijika," in *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, ed. Watanabe Akio (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995), 332–34.

25. Donald W. Klein, "Japan 1979: The Second Oil Crisis," *Asian Survey* 20, no. 1 (1980): 50.

26. Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 196–97.

27. *Ibid.*, 198–201.

28. *Ibid.*, 411; Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 42.

29. Hashimoto Gorō, "Nihonteki Riidaa no Shoruikei," in *Nihon Seiji no Kako, Genzai, Mirai*, ed. Kobayashi Yoshiaki (Tokyo: Keio University Press, 1999), 201.

30. Farnsworth, "Japan in 1981," 63.

31. United Nations Statistical Division, *UN Commodity Trade Statistics Database*, <comtrade.un.org/>.

32. Farnsworth, "Japan in 1981," 61, 63.

33. James Elliott, "The 1981 Administrative Reform in Japan," *Asian Survey* 23, no. 6 (1983): 773.

34. Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 413–14.

35. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Kakuryō Aitsugi Yasukuni Sanpai."

36. Quoted in Uji, *Suzuki Seiken*, 59.

37. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Kōshiki Sanpai wa Gōken," November 6, 1980.

38. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Seifu toshite wa Tsumenu: Yasukuni Kōshiki Sanpai no Gō/Iken," November 12, 1980; *Daily Yomiuri*, "Yasukuni: Behind the Torii," June 15, 2005.

39. Minoru Shimizu, "'Unstable' Suzuki Cabinet Enters Second Year," *Japan Times*, July 16, 1981.

40. Roger Buckley, *The United States in the Asia-Pacific Since 1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 160–61.

41. See Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 140–41.

42. Robert G. Kaiser, "US-Soviet Relations: Goodbye to Détente," *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 3 (1981): 510; Elaine P. Adam, "Chronology 1980," *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 3 (1981): 725.

43. Kaiser, "US-Soviet Relations," 512.

44. U.S. National Security Advisor William Clark, quoted in Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, rev. ed., 129.

45. Adam, "Chronology 1980," 723, 730.

46. Richard H. Solomon, "East Asia and the Great Power Coalitions," *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 694–98. See also Robert S. Ross, "US Relations with China," in *The Golden Age of the US–China–Japan Triangle, 1972–1989*, ed. Ezra F. Vogel, Yuan Ming, and Tanaka Akihiko (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 95–97.

47. Jonathan Haslam, *The Soviet Union and the Politics of Nuclear Weapons in Europe, 1969–87: The Problem of the SS-20* (London: Macmillan, 1989). See also Richard C. Eichenberg, "Dual Track and Double Trouble: The Two-Level Politics of INF," in *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, ed. Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993).

48. Flora Lewis, "Alarm Bells in the West," *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 553–55; Elaine P. Adam, "Chronology 1981," *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 729.

49. See (including on interest rate figures) Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, rev. ed., 127. For Delors, see Robert Solomon, "'The Elephant in the Boat?': The United States and the World Economy," *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 579.

50. Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits* (London: Heinemann for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1984), 126–27.

51. *Ibid.*, 157; Benjamin J. Cohen, "An Explosion in the Kitchen? Economic Relations with Other Advanced Industrial States," in *Eagle Defiant: United States Foreign Policy in the 1980s*, ed. Kenneth A. Oye, Robert J. Lieber, and Donald Rothchild (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1983), 123–24.

52. Concerning the domestic debate, see Taketsugu Tsurutani, "Old Habits, New Times: Challenges to Japanese–American Security Relations," *International Security* 7, no. 2 (1982): 175. On the defense guidelines, see Kōji Murata, "Do the New Guidelines Make the Japan–US Alliance More Effective?" in *The Japan–US Alliance: New Challenges for the Twenty-first Century*, ed. Nishihara Masashi (Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2000), 24–25; Solomon, "East Asia and the Great Power Coalitions," 703. Regarding Hatch's visit, see Farnsworth, "Japan in 1981," 57–58.

53. Ronald Reagan, "Joint Communiqué Following Discussions with Prime Minister Zenko Suzuki of Japan," (May 8, 1981), reproduced in *The American Presidency Project*, by John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, Santa Barbara, CA. <[www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43793](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43793)>, emphasis added. For Suzuki's warnings, see

Kōji Murata, "The Mission and Trials of an Emerging International State: Japanese Diplomacy in the 1980s," in *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, ed. Makoto Iokibe, trans. Robert D. Eldridge (London: Routledge, 2011), 147.

54. Suzuki Zenkō, "Nashonaru Puresu Kurabu ni okeru Enzetsu: Atarashii Nichibei Kankei to Ware ga Kuni no Yakuwari," (May 8, 1981), reproduced in *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, supplementary volume, by Suzuki Zenkō (Tokyo: Nihon Kōhō Kyōkai, 1983), 107.

55. Ibid., 107.

56. Euan Graham, *Japan's Sea Lane Security, 1940–2004: A Matter of Life and Death?* (London: Routledge, 2006), 135.

57. For Okazaki's comments, see Akihiko Tanaka, Makoto Iokibe, and Koji Murata, "Hisahiko Okazaki Oral History Interview," (December 18, 1995), <[www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/japan/okazaki/hinterview.htm](http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/japan/okazaki/hinterview.htm)>; Graham, *Japan's Sea Lane Security*, 123; Steven R. Weisman, "Japanese Premier Vows 'Even Greater Efforts' on Defense," *New York Times*, May 9, 1981; Green, "The Search for an Active Security Partnership," 141.

58. Green, "The Search for an Active Security Partnership," 141.

59. Quoted in Okazaki Institute, *United States–Japan Strategic Dialogue: Beyond the Defense Guidelines*, transcript of a public seminar, CGP International Conference Hall, Ark Mori Building, Tokyo (January 15, 2001), <[www.glocomnet.or.jp/okazaki-inst/e2juproje/e2juproje.opening.html](http://www.glocomnet.or.jp/okazaki-inst/e2juproje/e2juproje.opening.html)>.

60. Suzuki's retreat and subsequent claim on the alliance relationship is quoted in Sengo Nihon Seijishi Kenkyūkai, *Gendai Nihon Seijishi: Nenpyō, Kaisetsu* (Tokyo: Hōken Bunkasha, 1988), 219. Also on the "alliance" controversy, see Susanne Klien, *Rethinking Japan's Identity and International Role: An Intercultural Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2002), 85–86; Roger Buckley, *US–Japan Alliance Diplomacy, 1945–1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 142–43. Itō is cited in Murata, "The Mission and Trials of an Emerging International State," 148.

61. John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy* (London: Athlone Press, 1988), 144–45.

62. Farnsworth, "Japan in 1981," 59–61.

63. *Japan Times*, "Suzuki to Explain Gov't Position On Defense to Reagan in Ottawa," July 9, 1981; *Japan Times*, "Reagan, Suzuki to Meet Separately at Summit," July 12, 1981.

64. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 43.

65. Daizo Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy: Japan's Seven Power Summit Diplomacy*, Country Study No. 6 (Toronto: Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, 1988), 48.

66. *Japan Times*, "US Interest Rates, Japanese Exports to Be Topics at Summit," July 20, 1981; see also *Asahi Shinbun*, "Gunshuku Suishin o Uttae: Shushō, Samitto e Ikō," July 20, 1981.

67. Suzuki Zenkō, “‘Suzuki San Mattanashi’: Terebi Asahi ‘Sōri to Kataru,’” reproduced in Suzuki, *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, supplementary volume, 255.

68. *Japan Times*, “‘Consensus’ Main Purpose of Summit, Suzuki Says,” July 17, 1981; Suzuki, “‘Suzuki San Mattanashi.’”

69. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, rev. ed., 126.

70. Dominique Moïsi, “Mitterrand’s Foreign Policy: The Limits of Continuity,” *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 2 (1981): 355.

71. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 155; James Rusk, “PM Visits Reagan in Last-Minute Bid for Summit Unity,” *Globe and Mail*, July 10, 1981.

72. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 152. This was a focus of U.S. preparation in the lead-up to Ottawa. See Kikuchi Kiyooki, “Ottawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon,” *Sekai Keizai Hyōron* October (1981): 11.

73. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 154.

74. *Japan Times*, “West Must Adjust Basic Economic Setup: Suzuki,” July 22, 1981; Suzuki Zenkō, “Ottawa Samitto ni okeru Bōtō Hatsugen,” (July 20, 1981), reproduced in *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, main volume, by Suzuki Zenkō (Tokyo: Nihon Kōhō Kyōkai, 1983), 119–23; Kikuchi, “Ottawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon,” 7–8.

75. Kikuchi, “Ottawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon,” 8; Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 49; Suzuki, “Ottawa Samitto ni okeru Bōtō Hatsugen,” 123.

76. Suzuki, “Ottawa Samitto ni okeru Bōtō Hatsugen,” 122.

77. *Ibid.*, 120.

78. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 49. On the *wa* concept’s “spirit of harmony” meaning, see Gerald L. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 11. Regarding its “Japan” meaning, see Kenneth G. Henshall, *A Guide to Remembering Japanese Characters* (Tokyo: Charles Tuttle Co., 1988), 126.

79. Suzuki, “Ottawa Samitto ni okeru Bōtō Hatsugen,” 120.

80. Kikuchi, “Ottawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon,” 8.

81. *Ibid.*, 11.

82. See Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 51; Kikuchi, “Ottawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon,” 13.

83. “Declaration of the Ottawa Summit,” (July 21, 1981), reproduced in *The Seven-Power Summit: Documents from the Summits of Industrialized Countries, 1975–1989*, ed. Peter I. Hajnal (Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1989), 104–11.

84. “Chairman’s Summary of Political Issues,” (July 21, 1981), reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 112–13, paras. 5, 7; “Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism,” (July 21, 1981), reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*.

85. “Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism,” para. 20.



86. "Declaration of the Ottawa Summit," 111, para. 38, emphasis added.
87. *Japan Times*, "Suzuki Lauds Summit Faith in Free Trade," July 23, 1981.
88. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Tainichi Hihan o Sakujo," July 22, 1981. For MITT's assessment, see *Japan Times*, "Officials Hail Ottawa Summit Communiqué over Free Trade," July 23, 1981. Miyazawa's claim is noted in *Japan Times*, "Cabinet Secretary Calls Summit Very Successful," July 23, 1981. For Fukuda's comment, see *Japan Times*, "Summit Leaders Fail to Persuade Reagan to Lower Interest Rates," July 22, 1981.
89. *Japan Times*, "Suzuki, Reagan Discuss Relations," July 22, 1981; *Japan Times*, "Suzuki Lauds Summit Faith in Free Trade"; *Asahi Shinbun*, "Reagan Beidaitōryō: Kaidan Tsukare ka Kuchi Omoku," July 22, 1981.
90. See Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 141–43; Shima Nobuhiko, *Shunō Gaikō: Senshinkoku Samitto no Rimenshi* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū Publishing, 2000), 47.
91. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 413–15.
92. Graham, *Japan's Sea Lane Security*, 137–38, 143–46.
93. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 56, 59–60; Shiro Saito, *Japan at the Summit: Its Role in the Western Alliance and in Asian Pacific Co-operation* (London: Routledge, 1990), 74; Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 152–53.

## Chapter 6

1. Nakasone Yasuhiro, *Tenchi Yūjō: Gojūnen no Sengo Seiji o Kataru*, interviewed by Itō Takahashi and Satō Seizaburō (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 1996), cited in Funabashi Yōichi, "Daisan no Kaikoku: Nakasone Yasuhiro 'Seij to Jinsei,'" *Foresight* January (2001): 58.
2. Yasuhiro Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan: Reclaiming the Political Mainstream*, trans. and annot. Lesley Connors (Surry: Curzon Press, 1999), 4, 6.
3. *Ibid.*, 18.
4. On Nakasone's learning, see Kusano Atsushi, "Nakasone Yasuhiro: Daitōryōteki Shushō no Menboku," in *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, ed. Watanabe Akio (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995), 343.
5. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 8.
6. The dates and ranks are taken from *ibid.*, 23, 26–27.
7. Yuki Tanaka, *Japan's Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery and Prostitution during World War II and the US Occupation* (London: Routledge, 2002), 78–79. Tanaka cites Nakasone Yasuhiro, "Nijūsan Sai de Sanzennin no Sōshikikan," in *Owarinaki Kaigun: Wakai Sedai e Tsutaetai Nokoshitai*, ed. Matsu'ura Takanori (Tokyo: Bunka Hōsō Kaihatsu Sentā Shuppanbu, 1978), 98.

8. Cited in Yoshimi Yoshiaki, *Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery in the Japanese Military during World War II*, trans. Suzanne O'Brien (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 87.

9. Quoted in Reiji Yoshida, "Nakasone Claims His 'Ian-jo' Was For R&R," *Japan Times*, March 24, 2007. For Nakasone's recounting of the war, see Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 44–52.

10. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 54–74; Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan, 1825–1995* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 438–39.

11. Junnosuke Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, trans. Lonny E. Carlile (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), 214.

12. J. A. A. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan* (London: Routledge, 2003), 182.

13. Joseph P. Keddell Jr, *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993), 47–48; Kenneth B. Pyle, *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996), 86.

14. Gerald L. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 74–75.

15. Stockwin, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*, 181–83; Richard Sims, *Japanese Political History since the Meiji Renovation, 1868–2000* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 326–27; *Economist*, "Japan's Election: Look Young Please," November 1, 2003.

16. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 222.

17. Ibid., 221. See also Michio Muramatsu, "In Search of National Identity: The Politics and Policies of the Nakasone Administration," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 13, no. 2 (1987): 311.

18. Gerald L. Curtis, *Election Campaigning Japanese Style*, 1st paperback ed. (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1983), 27.

19. For Inoguchi's explanation, see Takashi Inoguchi, *Japan's International Relations* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991), 68. See also J. A. A. Stockwin, *Governing Japan: Divided Politics in a Major Economy*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 62. Nakasone is also quoted in Inoguchi, *Japan's International Relations*, 69.

20. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 184.

21. Susan J. Pharr and Takako Kishima, "Japan in 1986: A Landmark Year for the LDP," *Asian Survey* 27, no. 1 (1987): 24.

22. Yasuhiro Nakasone, "Petition to General MacArthur," (January 1951), reproduced in Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 238.

23. John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy* (London: Athlone Press, 1988), 297.

24. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 53.

25. Roger Buckley, *Japan Today*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 40.
26. Inoguchi, *Japan's International Relations*, 78.
27. Stockwin, *Governing Japan*, 63.
28. Pyle, *The Japanese Question*, 101; Sims, *Japanese Political History*, 319.
29. Quoted in Hans H. Baerwald and Akira Hashimoto, "Japan in 1982: Doing Nothing is Best?" *Asian Survey* 23, no. 1 (1983): 54.
30. James Elliott, "The 1981 Administrative Reform in Japan," *Asian Survey* 23, no. 6 (1983): 777.
31. See, for example, Chalmers Johnson, *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 254–60.
32. *Asahi Shinbun*, "Suzuki Shushō no 'Yasukuni' Sanpai: Chūgoku ga Kansetsu Hihan 'Kōshi Hogashita' to Hōdō," August 16, 1982; *Asahi Shinbun*, "Kyōkasho, Shushō mo Shūsei Ikō," August 24, 1982.
33. *Guardian*, "Lockheed Verdicts Blow to Japan's PM," June 9, 1982; Sengo Nihon Seijishi Kenkyūkai, *Gendai Nihon Seijishi: Nenpyō, Kaisetsu* (Tokyo: Hōken Bunkasha, 1988), 226; Jacob M. Schlesinger, *Shadow Shoguns: The Rise and Fall of Japan's Postwar Political Machine* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 147–48.
34. Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 416.
35. See *ibid.*, 416–17; Gerald L. Curtis, *The Japanese Way of Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 103–4; Baerwald and Hashimoto, "Japan in 1982," 57.
36. Curtis, *The Logic of Japanese Politics*, 82; Ronald J. Hrebennar, *Japan's New Party System* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000), 108–9.
37. David Williams, "Ozawa Ichirō: The Making of a Japanese Kingmaker," in *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, ed. Ian Neary (Richmond, UK: Japan Library, 1996), 289.
38. Gotōda Masaharu, *Jō to Ri: Gotōda Masaharu Kaikoroku*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1998), 54. On the formation of the Nakasone Cabinet, see Masumi, *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, 417; Kenji Hayao, *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), 128; Maki Tarō, *Nakasone Seiken: 1806 Nichi*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Gyōken Shuppanyoku, 1988), 25–27.
39. Sims, *Japanese Political History*, 320.
40. Masato Kawahira, "Campaigning to Start Today for 126 Upper House Seats," *Japan Times*, June 3, 1983.
41. Strobe Talbott, "Buildup and Breakdown," *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 587.
42. OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 34, December (1983): 153; OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 35, July (1984): 162.
43. Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits* (London: Heinemann for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1984), 178–79.

44. See Sylvia Ostry, "The World Economy in 1983: Marking Time," *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 547; OECD, *OECD Economic Outlook* 38, December (1985): 184.

45. Elaine P. Adam, "Chronology 1981," *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 729; Janis Kreslins, "Chronology 1982," *Foreign Affairs* 61, no. 3 (1983): 721.

46. See Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 189; Talbott, "Buildup and Breakdown," 591–92.

47. United Nations Statistical Division, *UN Commodity Trade Statistics Database*, <comtrade.un.org/>.

48. Frank Langdon, "Japan–United States Trade Friction: The Reciprocity Issue," *Asian Survey* 23, no. 5 (1983): 657–59.

49. Michael J. Green, "The Search for an Active Security Partnership: Lessons from the 1980s," in *Partnership: The United States and Japan, 1951–2001*, ed. Akira Iriye and Robert A. Wampler (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 2001), 138–39.

50. Tsuneo Akaha, "Japan's Nonnuclear Policy," *Asian Survey* 24, no. 8 (1984): 864–65. On Soviet interceptions, see Masashi Nishihara, "Expanding Japan's Credible Defense Role," *International Security* 8, no. 3 (1983/1984): 186.

51. Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 189.

52. *Ibid.*

53. On the global recession, see Daizo Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy: Japan's Seven Power Summit Diplomacy*, Country Study No. 6 (Toronto: Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, 1988), 55. Regarding the summit conditions, see Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 47.

54. "Declaration of the Seven Heads of State and Government and Representatives of the European Communities," June 6, 1982, <www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1982versailles/communiqu.html>.

55. Quoted in Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 166–67.

56. *Ibid.*, 166.

57. On the depth of feelings, see *ibid.*, 168, 173–74.

58. *Ibid.*, 175.

59. *Ibid.*, 181.

60. On Suzuki's invisible profile at Versailles, see Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 57, 59. Regarding Nakasone's intention to be a more high-profile chief diplomat, see Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 181.

61. Chalmers Johnson, "East Asia: Another Year of Living Dangerously," *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 725.

62. On the initial debate over the term "unsinkable," see Sims, *Japanese Political History*, 319. For Nakasone's admission over using "unsinkable," see *Japan Times*, "Premier Admits Saying Japan Should Be 'Unsinkable Carrier,'" January 22, 1983. Nakasone's recollections of the event and his description of the translation

as “inappropriate” can be found in Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 211. On the term’s meaning and implications, see Maki Tarō, *Nakasone wa Nan Datta no ka* (Tokyo: Sōshisha, 1988), 66–67.

63. Quoted in Johnson, “East Asia,” 725.

64. Johnson, “East Asia,” 726.

65. Akaha, “Japan’s Nonnuclear Policy,” 860.

66. On trade and Nakasone’s U.S. visit, see *Japan Times*, “Reagan Expects Nakasone Meet Will Make Progress on Trade Issues,” January 19, 1983; *Japan Times*, “Nakasone-Reagan Summit Ends; Trade Steps Vowed,” January 21, 1983. Regarding Suzuki’s decision to cut tariffs, see Langdon, “Japan–United States Trade Friction,” 660. On the aftermath of the GATT ministerial meeting, see Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 62.

67. *Japan Times*, “Nakasone Calls for Greater Japan-ASEAN Cooperation,” May 10, 1983; *Japan Times*, “Nakasone Returns Home From ASEAN, Brunei Tour,” May 11, 1983. See also Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 52; and Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo, *Nakasone Naikakushi: Hibi no Chōsen* (Tokyo: Marunouchi Shuppan, 1996), 219–20. For the domestic front, see Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 64.

68. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 52.

69. *Japan Times*, “Nakasone Expresses Hope for US–USSR Summit,” May 29, 1983; Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo, *Nakasone Naikakushi: Shiryōhen* (Tokyo: Marunouchi Shuppan, 1995), 626.

70. Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 213.

71. *Japan Times*, “Nakasone Expresses Hope for US–USSR Summit”; Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo, *Nakasone Naikakushi: Shiryōhen*, 625–26.

72. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 53; *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, “Gunkan Māchi ga Kangei: Samitto Beigawa ‘Misu’ Shakumei,” May 30, 1983.

73. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 146.

74. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 65. See also Maki, *Nakasone Seiken*, 122.

75. *Japan Times*, “Japan Calls on West for Cooperation,” May 30, 1983; *Japan Times*, “‘Powerful Leadership’ Needed, Nakasone Says,” May 31, 1983; Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo, *Nakasone Naikakushi: Shiryōhen*, 627–28.

76. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 53; Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 190–91; Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo, *Nakasone Naikakushi: Shiryōhen*, 628–29.

77. *Japan Times*, “Japan Calls on West for Cooperation”; *Japan Times*, “‘Powerful Leadership’ Needed, Nakasone Says.”

78. *Japan Times*, “Williamsburg Summit Participants Display Unity on Nuclear Missiles,” May 31, 1983.

79. Quoted in Putnam and Bayne, *Hanging Together*, 191.

80. *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, “Zenchikyū Kibo de Suishin: INF Kōshō Seiji Seimei o Happyō,” May 30, 1983; Maki, *Nakasone Seiken*, 122–23; Robert D. Putnam and Nicholas Bayne, *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 181.

81. See "Statement at Williamsburg [Declaration on Security]," (May 29, 1983), reproduced in *The Seven-Power Summit: Documents from the Summits of Industrialized Countries, 1975–1989*, ed. Peter I. Hajnal (Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1989).

82. Ibid., 243.

83. Kazuhiko Togo, *Japan's Foreign Policy, 1945–2003: The Quest for a Proactive Policy* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 75; see also Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 66.

84. Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 54.

85. "Annex: Strengthening Economic Cooperation for Growth and Stability," (May 30, 1983), reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 238.

86. "Declaration on Economic Recovery," read by President Reagan (May 30, 1983), reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 234, 237.

87. *Japan Times*, "Japan Politically Bound with NATO," June 1, 1983.

88. Ibid.; *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, "NATO Gunji Kyōryoku Nai: Nakasone Shushō, Samitto Seiji Seimei de Setsumei," May 31, 1983.

89. Tomohito Shinoda, *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan's Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007), 32.

90. Robert D. Putnam, "Summit Sense," *Foreign Policy* 55, Summer (1984): 87; Sims, *Japanese Political History*, 320.

91. Sakurada, *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy*, 67.

## Conclusion

1. Richard J. Samuels, *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 344.

2. On this assumption, see Robert D. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 456.

3. Susanne Klien, *Rethinking Japan's Identity and International Role: An Intercultural Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2002), 85–86.

4. Andrew Shonfield, "The Politics of the Mixed Economy in the International System of the 1970s," *International Affairs* 56, no. 1 (1980).

5. Okazaki Institute, *United States–Japan Strategic Dialogue: Beyond the Defense Guidelines*, transcript of a public seminar, CGP International Conference Hall, Ark Mori Building, Tokyo (January 15, 2001), <[www.glocomnet.or.jp/okazaki-inst/e2juproje/e2juproje.opening.html](http://www.glocomnet.or.jp/okazaki-inst/e2juproje/e2juproje.opening.html)>; Euan Graham, *Japan's Sea Lane Security, 1940–2004: A Matter of Life and Death?* (London: Routledge, 2006), 137–38, 143–46.

6. See Hugo Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002* (London: Routledge-Curzon, 2004), 141–43; Nobuhiko Shima, *Shunō Gaikō: Senshinkoku Samitto no Rimenshi* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū Publishing, 2000), 47.

7. Hugh Dobson retells the diplomatic travails of Prime Minister Mori Yoshirō in 2000. See Dobson, *Japan and the G7/8*, 142. On the struggles of Japan's prime ministers as chief diplomats, see also Shima, *Shunō Gaikō*, 60.

8. Juliet Kaarbo, "Prime Minister Leadership Styles in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Framework for Research," *Political Psychology* 18, no. 3 (1997): 571–77; Fred I. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 40–57; Margaret G. Hermann, "When Leader Personality Will Affect Foreign Policy: Some Propositions," in *In Search of Global Patterns*, ed. James N. Rosenau (New York: The Free Press, 1976), 330.

9. Greenstein, *Personality and Politics*, 50–51.

10. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 434.

11. Andrew Moravcsik, "Introduction: Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining," in *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, ed. Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993), 30.

12. Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 5.

13. *Ibid.*, 12–13.

## Bibliography

- Abe, Shinzō. *Utsukushii Kuni e*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2006.
- Adam, Elaine P. "Chronology 1979." *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 3 (1980): 738–74.
- . "Chronology 1980." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 3 (1981): 714–42.
- . "Chronology 1981." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 719–52.
- Agence France Presse, "In Japan, Politics is a Family Affair." September 17, 2006.
- Akaha, Tsuneo. "Japan's Nonnuclear Policy." *Asian Survey* 24, no. 8 (1984): 852–77.
- Akiyama, Nobumasa. "The Socio-Political Roots of Japan's Non-Nuclear Posture." In *Japan's Nuclear Option: Security, Politics, and Policy in the 21st Century*, edited by Benjamin L. Self and Jeffrey W. Thompson, 64–91. Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center, 2003.
- Allison, Graham T. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: HarperCollins, 1971.
- Amako, Satoshi. "The Senkaku Islands Incident and Japan–China Relations." *East Asia Forum*, October 25, 2010, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/10/25/the-senkaku-islands-incident-and-japan-china-relations/>.
- "Annex: Strengthening Economic Cooperation for Growth and Stability." May 30, 1983. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 238–41.
- Armstrong, J. D. "The Group of Seven Summits." In Dunn, *Diplomacy at the Highest Level*, 41–52.
- Asahi Shinbun*. "EC Kessoku, Bei mo Torikomū: 'Ōhira Ryū' Tsūyō sezu." June 30, 1979.
- . "Gunshuku Suishin o Uttae: Shushō, Samitto e Ikō." July 20, 1981.
- . "Kakuryō Aitsugi Yasukuni Sanpai." August 15, 1980.
- . "Kibishii Keizai Jyōsei Kakugo: Kaisan no Ki, Shinchō ni Mosaku." June 30, 1979.
- . "Kōshiki Sanpai wa Gōken." November 6, 1980.
- . "Kyōkasho, Shushō mo Shūsei Ikō." August 24, 1982.
- . "Reegan Beidaitōryō: Kaidan Tsukare ka Kuchi Omoku." July 22, 1981.
- . "Seifu toshite wa Tsumenu: Yasukuni Kōshiki Sanpai no Gō/Iken." November 12, 1980.
- . "Sekiyu Igai no Hanashi: Sukunakute Zannen–Miki, Fukuda ga Kansō." June 30, 1979.



- . “Shushō ‘Shinryaku Teigi, Sadamatteinai’ Murayama Danwa ‘Aimai.’” April 23, 2013.
- . “Suzuki Shushō no ‘Yasukuni’ Sanpai: Chūgoku ga Kansetsu Hihan ‘Kōshi Bokashita’ to Hōdō.” August 16, 1982.
- . “Tainichi Hihan o Sakujo.” July 22, 1981.
- Avolio, Bruce J., and Bernard M. Bass. “Individual Consideration Viewed at Multiple Levels of Analysis: A Multi-Level Framework for Examining the Diffusion of Transformational Leadership.” *Leadership Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (1995): 199–218.
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. “Two Faces of Power.” *American Political Science Review* 56, no. 4 (1962): 947–52.
- Baerwald, Hans H., and Akira Hashimoto. “Japan in 1982: Doing Nothing is Best?” *Asian Survey* 23, no. 1 (1983): 53–61.
- Bass, Bernard M. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press, 1985.
- Battishill, A. M. W. “Memorandum: Note for Record.” June 28, 1979. <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/3826C8D11A974D63A878DE92B17B563A.pdf>.
- Bayne, Nicholas. “Are the World Leaders Puppets or Puppeteers? The Sherpas and Decision Making within the G7/8 System.” In *Decision Making Within International Organizations*, edited by Bob Reinalda and Bertjan Verbeek, 139–53. London: Routledge, 2004.
- . *Staying Together: The G8 Summit Confronts the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Berger, Thomas U. *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- . “From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan’s Culture of Anti-Militarism.” *International Security* 17, no. 4 (1993): 119–50.
- . “The Pragmatic Liberalism of an Adaptive State.” In *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*, edited by Thomas U. Berger, Mike M. Mochizuki, and Jitsuo Tsuchiyama, 259–99. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007.
- Berridge, G. R. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. London: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Birt, Raymond. “Personality and Foreign Policy: The Case of Stalin.” *Political Psychology* 14, no. 4 (1993): 607–25.
- Blechinger-Talcott, Verena. “Shifting Incentives for Political Leadership.” In *Japan’s Politics and Economy: Perspectives on Change*, edited by Marie Söderberg and Patricia A. Nelson, 71–85. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Blondel, Jean. *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis*. London: Sage, 1987.
- Bowen, Roger W. *Japan’s Dysfunctional Democracy: The Liberal Democratic Party and Structural Corruption*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2003.
- Boyd, J. Patrick, and Richard J. Samuels. “Nine Lives? The Politics of Constitutional Reform in Japan.” *Policy Studies* 19. Washington, DC: East–West Center, 2005.

- Buckley, Roger. *Japan Today*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *The United States in the Asia-Pacific Since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *US-Japan Alliance Diplomacy, 1945–1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. 3rd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- . *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness*. New York: Grove, 2003.
- Byman, Daniel L., and Kenneth M. Pollack. "Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In." *International Security* 25, no. 4 (2001): 107–46.
- Cabinet Law, The* (of Japan). [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/constitution\\_and\\_government/frame\\_02.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/constitution_and_government/frame_02.html).
- Cabinet Secretariat. "'Koizumi Sōri Intabyū.'" *Shushō Kantei*, August 15, 2006, <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2006/08/15interview.html>.
- . "Prime Minister Delivers Address at the National Defense Academy Graduation Ceremony." *Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet*, March 21, 2004, [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/21bouei\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/21bouei_e.html).
- . "Prime Minister Koizumi Encourages Japan Ground Self-Defense Force (JGSDF) to be Dispatched to Iraq." *Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet*, February 1, 2004, [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/02/01asahikawa\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/02/01asahikawa_e.html).
- Calder, Kent E. "Kanryō vs. Shomin: Contrasting Dynamics of Conservative Leadership in Postwar Japan." In *Political Leadership in Contemporary Japan*, edited by Terry Edward MacDougall, 1–29, Michigan Papers in Japanese Studies 1. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1982.
- Campbell, John Creighton, and Ethan Scheiner. "Fragmentation and Power: Reconceptualizing Policy Making under Japan's 1955 System." *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 9, no. 1 (2008): 89–113.
- Carey, Michael R. "Transformational Leadership and the Fundamental Option for Self-Transcendence." *Leadership Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (1992): 217–36.
- Carlsnaes, Walter. "Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis." In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne, 85–100. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . "Foreign Policy." In Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, *Handbook of International Relations*, 331–49.
- . "The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis." *International Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (1992): 245–70.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, eds. *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage, 2002.

- Carlyle, Thomas. "The Leader as Hero." In Kellerman, *Political Leadership*, 5–9.
- Carter, Jimmy. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. Paperback ed. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1995.
- "Chairman's Summary of Political Issues." July 21, 1981. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 112–14.
- Chapman, J. W. M., Reinhard Drifte, and I. T. M. Gow. *Japan's Quest for Comprehensive Security: Defence, Diplomacy, and Dependence*. London: Frances Pinter, 1983.
- Clausen, Daniel. "Examining Japanese Defense Policy and Politics Through Failures of Leadership: The Case of Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio." *Asian Politics & Policy* 4, no. 4 (2012): 507–25.
- . "Leadership, Strategy, and Policy Entrepreneurship in Japanese Security Politics." *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 13, no. 1 (2013), <http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/ejcs/vol13/iss1/clausen.html>.
- Cohen, Benjamin J. "An Explosion in the Kitchen? Economic Relations with Other Advanced Industrial States." In *Eagle Defiant: United States Foreign Policy in the 1980s*, edited by Kenneth A. Oye, Robert J. Lieber, and Donald Rothchild, 105–30. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1983.
- Curtis, Gerald. "A Time of Drift: Can Japanese Politics be Saved?" *East Asia Forum Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (2012): 5–6.
- Curtis, Gerald L. *Election Campaigning Japanese Style*. 1st paperback ed. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1983.
- . "Japanese Security Policies and the United States." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 4 (1981): 852–74.
- . *The Japanese Way of Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- . *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." *Behavioral Science* 2, no. 3 (1957): 201–15.
- Daily Yomiuri*. "Yasukuni: Behind the Torii." June 15, 2005.
- Davies, Mathew. "ASEAN and Human Rights Norms: Constructivism, Rational Choice, and the Action-Identity Gap." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2013): 207–31.
- "Declaration" (for the Tokyo summit), June 29, 1979. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 64–70.
- "Declaration of the Ottawa Summit." July 21, 1981. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 104–11.
- "Declaration on Economic Recovery." Read by President Reagan, May 30, 1983. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 234–37.
- "Declaration of the Seven Heads of State and Government and Representatives of the European Communities." June 6, 1982, <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1982versailles/communiqué.html>.
- Destler, I. M., and Hideo Sato, eds. *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*. Lexington, MD: Lexington Books, 1982.

- Destler, I. M., and Hideo Sato. "Introduction." In Destler and Sato, *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*, 1–26.
- Destler, I. M., and Hisao Mitsuyu. "Locomotives on Different Tracks: Macroeconomic Diplomacy, 1977–1979." In Destler and Sato, *Coping with US-Japanese Economic Conflicts*, 243–70.
- Dobson, Hugo. "Japan and the Changing Global Balance of Power: The View from the Summit." *Politics* 31, no. 1 (2010): 33–42.
- . *Japan and the G7/8: 1975–2002*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.
- . "The 2008 Hokkaido–Toyako G8 Summit: Neither Summit nor Plummet." *Asia-Pacific Journal*, 48-5-08 (30 November 2008), [http://www.japanfocus.org/\\_Hugo\\_Dobson-The\\_2008\\_Hokkaido\\_Toyako\\_G8\\_Summit\\_neither\\_summit\\_nor\\_plummet](http://www.japanfocus.org/_Hugo_Dobson-The_2008_Hokkaido_Toyako_G8_Summit_neither_summit_nor_plummet).
- Doi, Takeo. *The Anatomy of Dependence*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1971.
- Dower, John W. *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1878–1954*. Paperback ed. Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Affairs, Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Downton, James V. *Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process*. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Dunn, David H., ed. *Diplomacy at the Highest Level: The Evolution of International Summitry*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Dunn, David H. "What is Summitry?" In Dunn, *Diplomacy at the Highest Level*, 3–22.
- Economist*. "A Modern Guide to G-ology." November 13, 2009.
- . "Japan and Abenomics: Taxing Times." October 5, 2013.
- . "Japan's Election: Look Young Please." November 1, 2003.
- Edinger, Lewis J. "The Comparative Analysis of Political Leadership." *Comparative Politics* 7, no. 2 (1975): 253–69.
- Edström, Bert. *Japan's Evolving Foreign Policy Doctrine: From Yoshida to Miyazawa*. London: Macmillan, 1999.
- . "Prime Ministerial Leadership in Japanese Foreign Policy." In Neary, *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, 243–64.
- Eguchi, Yujiro. "Japanese Energy Policy." *International Affairs* 56, no. 2 (1980): 263–79.
- Eichenberg, Richard C. "Dual Track and Double Trouble: The Two-Level Politics of INF." In Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 45–76.
- Elgie, Robert. *Political Leadership in Liberal Democracies*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Elliott, James. "The 1981 Administrative Reform in Japan." *Asian Survey* 23, no. 6 (1983): 765–79.
- Envall, H. D. P. "Abe's Fall: Leadership and Expectations in Japanese Politics." *Asian Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 2 (2011): 149–70.
- . "Abe's Yasukuni Visit Escalates Tensions in Asia." *East Asia Forum*, January 3, 2014, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2014/01/03/abes-yasukuni-visit-escalates-tensions-in-asia/>.

- . "Exceptions that Make the Rule? Koizumi Jun'ichirō and Political Leadership in Japan." *Japanese Studies* 28, no. 2 (2008): 227–42.
- . "Japan's Grand Strategy: Goldilocks and the Search for the Perfect Porridge." *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 10, no. 1 (2010), <http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/reviews/2010/Envall.html>.
- . "Japan's Strategic Challenges in Asia." *AIIA Policy Commentary* 15 (2013): 37–43.
- . "Transforming Security Politics: Koizumi Jun'ichiro and the Gaullist Tradition in Japan." *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies* 8, no. 2 (2008), <http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/2008/Envall.html>.
- . "Underplaying the 'Okinawa Card': How Japan Negotiates its Alliance with the United States." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 67, no. 4 (2013): 383–402.
- Envall, H. D. P., and Kiichi Fujiwara, "Japan's Misfiring Security Hedge: Discovering the Limits of Middle-Power Internationalism and Strategic Convergence." In *Bilateral Perspectives on Regional Security: Australia, Japan and the Asia-Pacific Region*, edited by William T. Tow and Rikki Kersten, 60–76. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Envall, H. D. P., and Kerri Ng. "Okinawa, the US–Japan Alliance, and Asia-Pacific Security," *ANU–MASI Policy Background Paper* 11 (2013), [http://asi.anu.edu.au/policy\\_background/ANU-MASI\\_Policy\\_Background\\_Paper\\_011.pdf](http://asi.anu.edu.au/policy_background/ANU-MASI_Policy_Background_Paper_011.pdf).
- Evans, Peter B. "Building an Integrative Approach to International and Domestic Politics: Reflections and Projections." In Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 397–430.
- Evans, Peter B., Harold K. Jacobson, and Robert D. Putnam, eds. *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.
- Farnham, Barbara. "Impact of the Political Context on Foreign Policy Decision-Making." *Political Psychology* 25, no. 3 (2004): 441–63.
- Farnsworth, Lee W. "Japan in 1980: The Conservative Resurgence." *Asian Survey* 21, no. 1 (1981): 70–83.
- . "Japan in 1981: Meeting the Challenges." *Asian Survey* 22, no. 1 (1982): 56–68.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 887–917.
- Forester, John. "Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review* 44, no. 1 (1984): 23–31.
- Foyle, Douglas C. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Elite Beliefs as a Mediating Variable." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1997): 141–69.
- Friedman, Gil, and Harvey Starr. *Agency, Structure, and International Politics: From Ontology to Empirical Inquiry*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Fujimura, Naofumi. "The Power Relationship Between the Prime Minister and Ruling Party Legislators: The Postal Service Privatization Act of 2005 in Japan." *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 2 (2007): 233–61.

- Fukai, Shigeko N. "The Missing Leader: The Structure and Traits of Political Leadership in Japan." In *Political Psychology in Japan: Behind the Nails that Sometimes Stick Out (and get Hammered Down)*, edited by Ofer Feldman, 171–92. Commack, NY: Nova Science, 1999.
- Fukunaga, Fumio. *Ōhira Masayoshi*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2008.
- Fukushima, Shingo. *Nihon no Seiji Shidō to Kadai*. Tokyo: Miraisha, 1992.
- Funabashi, Yōichi. "Daisan no Kaikoku: Nakasone Yasuhiro 'Seij to Jinsei.'" *Fore-sight* January (2001): 58–61.
- . *Samitto no Shisō*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, 1980.
- Gaunder, Alisa. *Political Reform in Japan: Leadership Looming Large*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- George Mulgan, Aurelia. "Abe Rocks Japan's Constitutional Boat." *East Asia Forum*, May 21, 2013, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/05/21/abe-rocks-japans-constitutional-boat/>.
- . *Japan's Failed Revolution: Koizumi and the Politics of Economic Reform*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, 2002.
- . "Japan's Political Leadership Deficit." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 2 (2000): 183–202.
- . "The Leadership Role of the Prime Minister and Party." *Policy and Society* 23, no. 1 (2004): 5–20.
- Gotōda, Masaharu. *Jō to Ri: Gotōda Masaharu Kaikoroku*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1998.
- Gourevitch, Peter. "Domestic Politics and International Relations." In Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, *Handbook of International Relations*, 309–28.
- . "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32, no. 4 (1978): 881–912.
- Graham, Euan. *Japan's Sea Lane Security, 1940–2004: A Matter of Life and Death?* London: Routledge, 2006.
- Green, Michael J. "Balance of Power." In *US–Japan Relations in a Changing World*, edited by Steven K. Vogel, 9–34. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2002.
- . *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- . "The Search for an Active Security Partnership: Lessons from the 1980s." In *Partnership: The United States and Japan, 1951–2001*, edited by Akira Iriye and Robert A. Wampler, 135–60. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 2001.
- Green, Michael J., and Benjamin L. Self. "Japan's Changing China Policy: From Commercial Liberalism to Reluctant Realism." *Survival* 38, no. 2 (1996): 35–58.
- Greenstein, Fred I. "Can Personality and Politics be Studied Systematically?" *Political Psychology* 13, no. 1 (1992): 105–28.
- . "The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to Clear Away Underbrush." *American Political Science Review* 61, no. 3 (1967): 629–41.
- . *Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

- Grove, Andrea K. *Political Leadership in Foreign Policy: Manipulating Support Across Borders*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Guardian. "Lockheed Verdicts Blow to Japan's PM." June 9, 1982.
- Gustafsson, Karl. "Japanese Prime Minister Abe's U-turn on the Murayama Statement." *East Asia Forum*, May 31, 2013, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/05/31/japanese-prime-minister-abes-u-turn-on-the-murayama-statement/>.
- Hagan, Joe D. "Does Decision Making Matter? Systemic Assumptions vs. Historical Reality in International Relations Theory." *International Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (2001): 5–46.
- Hagström, Linus. "The Democratic Party of Japan's Security Policy and Japanese Politics of Constitutional Revision: A Cloud Over Article 9?" *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 64, no. 5 (2010): 510–25.
- Hajnal, Peter I. *The G7/G8 System: Evolution, Role and Documentation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Hajnal, Peter I., ed. *The Seven-Power Summit: Documents from the Summits of Industrialized Countries, 1975–1989*. Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1989.
- Hajnal, Peter I., and John J. Kirton. "The Evolving Role and Agenda of the G7/G8: A North American Perspective." *NIRA Review* 7, no. 2 (2000): 5–10. <http://www.nira.or.jp/past/publ/review/2000spring/03hajnal.pdf>.
- Hall, Ian. "Still the English Patient? Closures and Inventions in the English School." *International Affairs* 77, no. 3 (2001): 931–42.
- Hashimoto, Gorō. "Nihonteki Riidaa no Shoruikei." In *Nihon Seiji no Kako, Genzai, Mirai*, edited by Kobayashi Yoshiaki, 177–206. Tokyo: Keio University Press, 1999.
- Haslam, Jonathan. *The Soviet Union and the Politics of Nuclear Weapons in Europe, 1969–87: The Problem of the SS-20*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Hatoyama, Yukio. "A New Path for Japan." *New York Times*, August 26, 2009.
- . "Japan's New Commitment to Asia: Toward the Realization of an East Asian Community." Address by H. E. Dr Yukio Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan, November 15, 2009, [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/200911/15singapore\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/200911/15singapore_e.html).
- . "Policy Speech by Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama at the 174th Session of the Diet." January 29, 2010, [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/201001/29siseihousin\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/hatoyama/statement/201001/29siseihousin_e.html).
- . "Sofu, Ichirō ni Manada 'Yūai' to iu Tatakai no Hatajirushi." *Voice*, September 2009, <http://voiceplus-php.jp/archive/detail.jsp?id=197>.
- Hayao, Kenji. *The Japanese Prime Minister and Public Policy*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993.
- Heginbotham, Eric, and Richard J. Samuels. "Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy." *International Security* 22, no. 4 (1998): 171–203.
- Henshall, Kenneth G. *A Guide to Remembering Japanese Characters*. Tokyo: Charles Tuttle Co., 1988.

- Hermann, Margaret G. "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders." *International Studies Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (1980): 7–46.
- . "When Leader Personality Will Affect Foreign Policy: Some Propositions." In *In Search of Global Patterns*, edited by James N. Rosenau, 326–33. New York: The Free Press, 1976.
- Hermann, Margaret G., and Joe D. Hagan. "International Decision Making: Leadership Matters." *Foreign Policy* 110, Spring (1998): 124–37.
- Hermann, Margaret G., and Charles F. Hermann. "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry." *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1989): 361–87.
- Hermann, Margaret G., and Charles W. Kegley Jr. "Rethinking Democracy and International Peace: Perspectives from Political Psychology." *International Studies Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (1995): 511–33.
- Hermann, Margaret G., Thomas Preston, Baghat Korany, and Timothy M. Shaw. "Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals." *International Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (2001): 83–131.
- Hollander, Edwin P. "Legitimacy, Power, and Influence: A Perspective on Relational Features of Leadership." In *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*, edited by Martin M. Chemers and Roya Ayman, 29–46. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1993.
- Honda, Masatoshi. *Gendai Nihon no Seiji to Gyōsei*. Tokyo: Hokuju Shuppan, 2001.
- Hook, Glenn D. *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hook, Glenn D., Julie Gilson, Christopher W. Hughes, and Hugo Dobson. *Japan's International Relations: Politics, Economics and Security*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Hopkin, Jonathan. "Comparative Methods." In *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, edited by David Marsh and Gerry Stoker, 249–67. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Hrebenar, Ronald J. *Japan's New Party System*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000.
- Hudson, Valerie M. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- Hudson, Valerie M., and Christopher S. Vore. "Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *Mershon International Studies Review* 39, no. 2 (1995): 209–38.
- Hughes, Christopher W. *Japan's Remilitarisation*, Adelphi series 403. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2009.
- . *Japan's Security Agenda: Military, Economic, and Environmental Dimensions*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2004.
- Hughes, Christopher W., and Ellis S. Krauss. "Japan's New Security Agenda." *Survival* 49, no. 2 (2007): 157–76.
- Hunt, John, and Henry Owen. "Stock of the Seven-Power Summits: Two Views." *International Affairs* 60, no. 4 (1984): 657–61.



- Hurd, Ian. "Constructivism." In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, 298–316. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Igarashi, Jin. "Nakasone Moto Shushō ni Okeru Riidaashippu no Kenkyū." *Reva-iasan* 5 (1989): 167–82.
- Iida, Keisuke. "When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, no. 3 (1993): 403–26.
- Inoguchi, Takashi. *Japan's International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991.
- . "Kanryōsei no Rekishi Kara Mita Nihon Seiji." *Revaiasan* 18 (1996): 7–28.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, and Paul Bacon. "Japan's Emerging Role as a 'Global Ordinary Power,'" *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 6, no. 1 (2006): 1–22.
- Inoguchi, Takashi, and Iwai Tomoaki. *Zokugiin no Kenkyū: Jimintō Seiken o Gyūjiru Shuyakutachi*. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha, 1987.
- Iokibe, Makoto. "Fukuda Takeo: Seisaku no Shōsha, Seisō no Haisha." In Watanabe, Sengo *Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 261–96.
- . "Introduction: Japanese Diplomacy from Prewar to Postwar." In Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 1–16.
- . "Japanese Diplomacy After the Cold War." In Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 173–209.
- Iokibe, Makoto, ed., and Robert D. Eldridge, trans. *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Iriye, Akira. *Japan and the Wider World: From Mid-Nineteenth Century to the Present*. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Izumikawa, Yasuhiro. "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan's Security Policy." *International Security* 35, no. 2 (2010): 123–60.
- Japan Times*. "Cabinet Secretary Calls Summit Very Successful." July 23, 1981.
- . "'Consensus' Main Purpose of Summit, Suzuki Says." July 17, 1981.
- . "Defiant Koizumi Visits Yasukuni." August 16, 2006.
- . "Inflation Vital Issue, Ohira Tells Summit." June 29, 1979.
- . "Japan Calls on West for Cooperation." May 30, 1983.
- . "Japan Politically Bound with NATO." June 1, 1983.
- . "Nakasone Calls for Greater Japan-ASEAN Cooperation." May 10, 1983.
- . "Nakasone Expresses Hope for US-USSR Summit." May 29, 1983.
- . "Nakasone-Reagan Summit Ends; Trade Steps Vowed." January 21, 1983.
- . "Nakasone Returns Home From ASEAN, Brunei Tour." May 11, 1983.
- . "Officials Hail Ottawa Summit Communiqué over Free Trade." July 23, 1981.
- . "Ohira, Ministers to Push MTN Accords at Summit." June 8, 1979.
- . "Ohira to Present 5-Point Energy Program of Japan at Summit." June 23, 1979.
- . "Ohira to Push Int'l Unity at June Summit." June 6, 1979.

- . “‘Powerful Leadership’ Needed, Nakasone Says.” May 31, 1983.
- . “Premier Admits Saying Japan Should Be ‘Unsinkable Carrier.’” January 22, 1983.
- . “Reagan Expects Nakasone Meet Will Make Progress on Trade Issues.” January 19, 1983.
- . “Reagan, Suzuki to Meet Separately at Summit.” July 12, 1981.
- . “Seven Challenged to Prove Value of Economic Summit.” June 8, 1979.
- . “Summit Leaders Fail to Persuade Reagan to Lower Interest Rates.” July 22, 1981.
- . “Suzuki Lauds Summit Faith in Free Trade.” July 23, 1981.
- . “Suzuki, Reagan Discuss Relations.” July 22, 1981.
- . “Suzuki to Explain Gov’t Position On Defense to Reagan in Ottawa.” July 9, 1981.
- . “US Interest Rates, Japanese Exports to Be Topics at Summit.” July 20, 1981.
- . “West Must Adjust Basic Economic Setup: Suzuki.” July 22, 1981.
- . “Williamsburg Summit Participants Display Unity on Nuclear Missiles.” May 31, 1983.
- Japan Times Online*. “Upper House Showdown.” July 30, 2007.
- Jervis, Robert. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Johnson, Chalmers. “East Asia: Another Year of Living Dangerously.” *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 721–45.
- . *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1995.
- . *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982.
- Johnston, Alastair Iain. “Thinking About Strategic Culture.” *International Security* 19, no. 4 (1995): 32–64.
- “Joint Communique, Productive Partnership for the 1980’s” (visit of Prime Minister Ohira of Japan). Reproduced at The World and Japan Database Project, University of Tokyo. <http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/JPUS/19790502.D1E.html>.
- Jones, Bryan D. “Causation, Constraint, and Political Leadership.” In *Leadership and Politics: New Perspectives in Political Science*, edited by Bryan D. Jones, 3–14. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1989.
- . *Politics and the Architecture of Choice: Bounded Rationality and Governance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Kaarbo, Juliet. “Prime Minister Leadership Styles in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Framework for Research.” *Political Psychology* 18, no. 3 (1997): 553–81.
- Kaarbo, Juliet, and Margaret G. Hermann. “Leadership Styles of Prime Ministers: How Individual Differences Affect the Foreign Policymaking Process.” *Leadership Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1998): 243–63.

- Kabashima, Ikuo, and Gill Steel. "How Junichiro Koizumi Seized the Leadership of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party." *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2007): 95–114.
- Kageyama, Noboru. *Seinen Suzuki Zenkō to Gyokuyō Undō: Moto Sōri no Kiseki*. Tokyo: Naruyama Dōshoten, 1992.
- Kaiser, Robert G. "US-Soviet Relations: Goodbye to Détente." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 3 (1981): 500–21.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
- Katzenstein, Peter J., ed. *Rethinking Japanese Security: Internal and External Dimensions*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., and Nobuo Okawara. "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism." In Katzenstein, *Rethinking Japanese Security*, 32–55.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., and Nobuo Okawara. "Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policies." *International Security* 17, no. 4 (1993): 84–118.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., and Rudra Sil. "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism." In Katzenstein, *Rethinking Japanese Security*, 249–85.
- Kawahira, Masato. "Campaigning to Start Today for 126 Upper House Seats." *Japan Times*, June 3, 1983.
- Kawasaki, Tsuyoshi. "Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy." *Pacific Review* 14, no. 2 (2001): 221–40.
- Kawauchi, Issei. *Ōhira Seiken: 554 Nichi: Mizukara no Seimei o kakete Hoshu o Mamotta*. Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1982.
- Keddell, Joseph P. Jr. *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1993.
- Keller, Jonathan W. "Leadership Style, Regime Type, and Foreign Policy Crisis Behavior: A Contingent Monadic Peace?" *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (2005): 205–31.
- Kellerman, Barbara, ed. *Political Leadership: A Source Book*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986.
- Kemezis, Paul. "The Permanent Crisis: Changes in the World Oil System." *Orbis* 23, no. 4 (1980): 761–84.
- Kennedy, Andrew Bingham. *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru: National Efficacy Beliefs and the Making of Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. *Power and Interdependence*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 2001.
- Kersten, Rikki. "Japanese Security Policy Formation: Assessing the Koizumi Revolution." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 65, no. 1 (2011): 5–23.
- Kikuchi, Kiyoaki. "Otawa Samitto no Seika to Nihon." *Sekai Keizai Hyōron* October (1981): 4–13.
- Kirton, John J. "The G7/8 and China: Toward a Closer Association." In *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by John J.

- Kirton, Joseph P. Daniels, and Andreas Freytag, 189–222. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- . “The G20 Takes Centre Stage.” In *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten*, edited by John Kirton and Madeline Koch, 16–17. London: Newsdesk Communications, 2008.
- Kishi, Nobusuke. “Makoto no Dokuritsu Nihon no tame ni.” *Fūsei*, January 1954, reproduced in Kishi Nobusuke. *Kishi Nobusuke Kaikoroku: Hoshu Gōdō to Anpo Kaitei*. Tokyo: Kōsaidō, 1983.
- Kitaoka, Shin’ichi. “Kishi Nobusuke: Yashin to Zassetsu.” In Watanabe, Sengo *Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 121–47.
- . “Sengo Nihon no Gaikō Shisō.” In *Sengo Nihon Gaikō Ronshū*, edited by Kitaoka Shin’ichi, 5–41. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995.
- Kiyomiya, Ryū. *Fukuda Seiken: 714 Nichi*. Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1984.
- Klein, Donald W. “Japan 1979: The Second Oil Crisis.” *Asian Survey* 20, no. 1 (1980): 42–52.
- Klien, Susanne. *Rethinking Japan’s Identity and International Role: An Intercultural Perspective*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Kliman, Daniel. *Japan’s Security Strategy in the Post-9/11 World: Embracing a New Realpolitik*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006.
- Kohno, Masaru. *Japan’s Postwar Party Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Krauss, Ellis S., and Benjamin Nyblade. “‘Presidentialization’ in Japan? The Prime Minister, Media and Elections in Japan.” *British Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 2 (2005): 357–68.
- Krauss, Ellis S., and Robert Pekkanen. “Profiles in Discourage: Prime Ministerial Leadership in Post-War Japan.” In *Poor Leadership and Bad Governance: Reassessing Presidents and Prime Ministers in North America, Europe and Japan*, edited by Ludger Helms, 173–94. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012.
- Kreslins, Janis. “Chronology 1982.” *Foreign Affairs* 61, no. 3 (1983): 714–44.
- Kusano, Atsushi. “Nakasone Yasuhiro: Daitōryōteki Shushō no Menboku.” In Watanabe, Sengo *Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 337–73.
- Kurzman, Dan. *Kishi and Japan: The Search for the Sun*. New York: Ivan Obolensky, 1960.
- Langdon, Frank. “Japan–United States Trade Friction: The Reciprocity Issue.” *Asian Survey* 23, no. 5 (1983): 653–66.
- Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” *International Security* 24, no. 2 (1999): 5–55.
- Levy, Jack S. “Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield.” *International Organization* 48, no. 2 (1994): 279–312.
- Levy, Walter J. “Oil and the Decline of the West.” *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 5 (1980): 999–1015.
- Lewis, Flora. “Alarm Bells in the West.” *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 551–72.

- Lind, Jennifer M. "Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy." *International Security* 29, no. 1 (2004): 92–121.
- Loderer, Claudio. "A Test of the OPEC Cartel Hypothesis: 1974–1983." *Journal of Finance* 40, no. 3 (1985): 991–1006.
- Lukes, Steven, ed. *Power*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Maeno, J. Rey. "Japan 1973: The End of an Era?" *Asian Survey* 14, no. 1 (1974): 52–64.
- Mainichi Daily News*. "2 Elderly Women at Shelter who Formed Sister-Like Bond Fear Separation." May 3, 2011.
- Maki, Tarō. *Nakasone Seiken: 1806 Nichi*, vols 1 and 2. Tokyo: Gyōken Shuppankyoku, 1988.
- . *Nakasone wa Nan Datta no ka*. Tokyo: Sōshisha, 1988.
- Masciulli, Joseph, and W. Andy Knight. "Conceptions of Global Leadership for Contextually Intelligent, Innovatively Adaptive Political Leaders." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Political Leadership*, edited by Joseph Masciulli, Mikhaila A. Molchanov, and W. Andy Knight, 89–122. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Masumi, Junnosuke. *Contemporary Politics in Japan*. Translated by Lonny E. Carlile, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995.
- Mayer, Jeremy D. "International Relations Theory and Japanese Pacifism: Why Didn't Tokyo Go Ballistic Over North Korean Nukes?" *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies* 15, no. 2 (1996): 50–62.
- McCormack, Gavan. *The Emptiness of Japanese Affluence*. Revised ed. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2001.
- McDougall, Derek. *Asia Pacific in World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007.
- Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001.
- Midford, Paul. "The Logic of Reassurance and Japan's Grand Strategy." *Security Studies* 11, no. 3 (2002): 1–43.
- Milner, Helen V. *Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Miyagi, Yukiko. "Foreign Policy Making under Koizumi: Norms and Japan's Role in the 2003 Iraq War." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5, no. 4 (2009): 349–66.
- Miyashita, Akitoshi. "Where Do Norms Come From? Foundations of Japan's Post-war Pacifism." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 1 (2007): 99–120.
- Miyazaki, Hiromichi. "Tōkyō Samitto no Shinsō to Nihon." *Sekai Keizai Hyōron* September (1979): 4–22.
- Mo, Jongryn. "The Logic of Two-Level Games with Endogenous Domestic Coalitions." *Journal of Conflict* 38, no. 39 (1994): 402–22.
- Moïsi, Dominique. "Mitterrand's Foreign Policy: The Limits of Continuity." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 2 (1981): 347–57.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. "Armaments Among Allies: European Weapons Collaboration, 1975–1985." In Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 128–67.

- . "Introduction: Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining." In Evans, Jacobson, and Putnam, *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, 3–42.
- Mochizuki, Mike, and Michael O'Hanlon. "A Liberal Vision for the US-Japanese Alliance." *Survival* 40, no. 2 (1998): 127–34.
- Muramatsu, Michio. "In Search of National Identity: The Politics and Policies of the Nakasone Administration." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 13, no. 2 (1987): 307–42.
- . "Ōhira Masayoshi: Sainyū Saishutsu Seiji Mondai Teikisha." In Watanabe, *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 297–313.
- . "Patterned Pluralism Under Challenge: The Policies of the 1980s." In *Political Dynamics in Contemporary Japan*, edited by Gary D. Allinson and Yasunori Sone, 50–71. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Muramatsu, Michio, and Ellis S. Krauss. "The Conservative Policy Line and the Development of Patterned Pluralism." In *The Political Economy of Japan Volume One: The Domestic Transformation*, edited by Kozo Yamamura and Yasukichi Yasuba, 516–54. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Murata, Kōji. "Do the New Guidelines Make the Japan-U.S. Alliance More Effective?" In *The Japan-US Alliance: New Challenges for the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Nishihara Masashi, 19–38. Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2000.
- . "The Mission and Trials of an Emerging International State: Japanese Diplomacy in the 1980s." In Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 143–72.
- Nagatomi, Yuichiro, ed. *Masayoshi Ohira's Proposal: To Evolve the Global Society*. Tokyo: Foundation for Advanced Information and Research, 1988.
- Nakamura, Takafusa. *A History of Shōwa Japan, 1926–1989*. Translated by Edwin Whemmouth, Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1998.
- Nakane, Chie. *Japanese Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- Nakasone, Yasuhiro. *The Making of the New Japan: Reclaiming the Political Mainstream*. Translated and annotated by Lesley Connors, Surry: Curzon Press, 1999.
- . "Nijūsan Sai de Sanzennin no Sōshikikan." In *Owarinaki Kaigun: Wakai Sedai e Tsutaetai Nokoshitai*, edited by Matsu'ura Takanori, 90–8. Tokyo: Bunka Hōsō Kaihatsu Sentā Shuppanbu, 1978.
- . "Petition to General MacArthur." January 1951. Reproduced in Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan*, 236–52.
- . *Tenchi Yūjō: Gojūnen no Sengo Seiji o Kataru*. Interviewed by Itō Takahashi and Satō Seizaburō. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 1996.
- Neary, Ian. "Leaders and Leadership in Japan." In Neary, *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, 1–13.
- Neary, Ian, ed. *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*. Richmond, UK: Japan Library, 1996.
- Nihon Keizai Shinbun*. "Gunkan Māchi ga Kangei: Samitto Beigawa 'Misu' Shakumei." May 30, 1983.

- . “NATO Gunji Kyōryoku Nai: Nakasone Shushō, Samitto Seiji Seimei de Setsumei.” May 31, 1983.
- . “Zenchikyū Kibo de Suishin: INF Kōshō Seiji Seimei o Happyō.” May 30, 1983.
- Nishihara, Masashi. “Expanding Japan’s Credible Defense Role.” *International Security* 8, no. 3 (1983/1984): 180–205.
- Nishimura, Yoshihiro. “Ohira Seeks ‘Long Range Viewpoint.’” *Japan Times*, June 26, 1979.
- Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2007.
- Nye, Joseph S. *The Powers to Lead*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). *OECD Economic Outlook* 30, December (1981).
- . *OECD Economic Outlook* 32, December (1982).
- . *OECD Economic Outlook* 34, December (1983).
- . *OECD Economic Outlook* 35, July (1984).
- . *OECD Economic Outlook* 38, December (1985).
- . *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan*. Paris: OECD, July 1979.
- . *OECD Economic Surveys: Japan*. Paris: OECD, July 1980.
- Ōhira, Masayoshi. “Meeting Drawing Attention, Expectations of the World.” *Japan Times*, June 28, 1979.
- . “Policy Speech.” Official Ministry of Foreign Affairs translation of speech given to the 87th Diet (January 25, 1979). Reproduced in *Brush Strokes: Moments from My Life*, by Masayoshi Ōhira, 173–87. Translated by Simul International, English ed. Tokyo: Foreign Press Center, Japan, 1979.
- Okazaki Institute. *United States–Japan Strategic Dialogue: Beyond the Defense Guidelines*. Transcript of a public seminar, CGP International Conference Hall, Ark Mori Building, Tokyo (January 15, 2001). <http://www.glocomnet.or.jp/okazaki-inst/e2juproje/e2juproje.opening.html>.
- Okita, Saburo. *Tightrope: Balancing Economics and Responsibility in Japanese Diplomacy 1979–1980*. Tokyo: Institute for Domestic and International Policy Studies, 1992.
- Oriental Economist*. “‘Can’t Help Myself’: Abe Goes Way Off Message with ‘Aggression’ Retraction.” 81, no. 5 (2013): 1–2, 13.
- . “How Many Arrows has Abe? MOF, BOJ Press Abe to Reverse Second Arrow.” 81, no. 4 (2013): 1–4.
- Oros, Andrew L. *Normalizing Japan: Politics, Identity and the Evolution of Security Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Ostry, Sylvia. “The World Economy in 1983: Marking Time.” *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 553–60.
- “Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism.” July 21, 1981. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 115–16.

- Owada, Hisashi. "A Japanese Perspective on the Role and Future of the G-7." *The International Spectator* 29, no. 2 (1994): 95–112. <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/owada1994/document.html>.
- Owen, Henry. "Memorandum: For the President." Tokyo Summit (June 22, 1979). <http://www.margareththatcher.org/document/9942B14F0E714127A8EABAD2690CCD95.pdf>.
- Ozawa, Ichiro. *Blueprint for a New Japan: The Rethinking of a Nation*. Translated by Louisa Rubinfiel and edited by Eric Gower. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1994.
- Paige, Glenn D. *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*. New York: Macmillan, 1977.
- Pempel, T. J. "The Bureaucratization of Policymaking in Postwar Japan." *American Journal of Political Science* 18, no. 4 (1974): 647–64.
- . "The Unbundling of 'Japan, Inc.': The Changing Dynamics of Japanese Policy Formation." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 13, no. 2 (1987): 271–306.
- Pereira, Derwin, and Kwan Weng Kin. "Will Abe Learn to Rock and Roll?" *Straits Times*, October 1, 2006.
- Pharr, Susan J., and Takako Kishima. "Japan in 1986: A Landmark Year for the LDP." *Asian Survey* 27, no. 1 (1987): 23–34.
- Post, Jerrold M. *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- "Prime Minister Ohira's Concluding Statement at the Joint News Conference." Tokyo Summit (June 29, 1979). Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 72–4.
- Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 427–69.
- . "Summit Sense." *Foreign Policy* 55, Summer (1984): 73–91.
- Putnam, Robert D., and Nicholas Bayne. *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits*. London: Heinemann for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1984.
- Putnam, Robert D., and Nicholas Bayne. *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits*. Revised ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Pyle, Kenneth B. *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose*. New York: Public Affairs, 2007.
- . *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: AEI Press, 1996.
- Ramseyer, J. Mark, and Frances McCall Rosenbluth. *Japan's Political Marketplace*. Paperback ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Joint Communique Following Discussions with Prime Minister Zenko Suzuki of Japan." May 8, 1981. Reproduced in *The American Presidency Project*, by John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, Santa Barbara, CA. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=43793>.



- Rejai, Mostafa, and Kay Phillips. *Loyalists and Revolutionaries: Political Leaders Compared*. New York: Praeger, 1988.
- Richardson, Bradley M. *The Political Culture of Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974.
- Richardson, Bradley M., and Scott C. Flanagan. *Politics in Japan*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1984.
- Rose, Gideon. "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy." *World Politics* 51, no. 1 (1998): 144–72.
- Rosenau, James N. "Introduction." In *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, edited by James N. Rosenau, 1–10. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- . "Followership and Discretion: Assessing the Dynamics of Modern Leadership." *Harvard International Review* 26, no. 3 (2004): 14–17.
- Rosenbluth, Frances McCall, and Michael F. Thies. *Japan Transformed: Political Change and Economic Restructuring*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Ross, Robert S. "US Relations with China." In Vogel, Ming, and Akihiko, *The Golden Age of the US–China–Japan Triangle, 1972–1989*, 79–108.
- Roth, Ariel Ilan. *Leadership in International Relations: The Balance of Power and the Origins of World War II*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ruscio, Kenneth P. *The Leadership Dilemma in Modern Democracy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2004.
- Rusk, James. "PM Visits Reagan in Last-Minute Bid for Summit Unity." *Globe and Mail*, July 10, 1981.
- Sadō, Akihiro. *Sengo Nihon no Bōei to Seiji*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2003.
- Saito, Shiro. *Japan at the Summit: Its Role in the Western Alliance and in Asian Pacific Co-operation*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Sakamoto, Kazuya. "Conditions of an Independent State: Japanese Diplomacy in the 1950s." In Iokibe and Eldridge, *The Diplomatic History of Postwar Japan*, 50–80.
- Sakurada, Daizo. *Japan and the Management of the International Political Economy: Japan's Seven Power Summit Diplomacy*, Country Study No. 6. Toronto: Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, 1988.
- Sankei Shinbun*. "Jieitai o 'Guntai ni': Shushō, Shōrai no Kenpō Kaisei ni Kitai." May 21, 2003.
- Satake, Tomohiko, and Yusuke Ishihara. "America's Rebalance to Asia and its Implications for Japan–US–Australia Security Cooperation." *Asia-Pacific Review* 19, no. 2 (2012): 6–25.
- Samuels, Richard J. *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and their Legacies in Italy and Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- . "Rich Nation, Strong Army": *National Security and the Technological Transformation of Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- . *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

- Satō, Seizaburō, Ken'ichi Koyama, and Shunpei Kumon. *Postwar Politician: The Life and Times of Former Prime Minister Masayoshi Ōhira*. Translated by William R. Carter. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1990.
- Schlesinger, Jacob M. *Shadow Shoguns: The Rise and Fall of Japan's Postwar Political Machine*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.
- Schoppa, Leonard J. "Zoku Power and LDP Power: A Case Study of the Zoku Role in Education Policy," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 17, no. 1 (1991): 79–106.
- Sekai Heiwa Kenkyūjo. *Nakasone Naikakushi: Hibi no Chōsen*. Tokyo: Marunouchi Shuppan, 1996.
- . *Nakasone Naikakushi: Shiryōhen*. Tokyo: Marunouchi Shuppan, 1995.
- Seligman, Lester G. "The Study of Political Leadership." *American Political Science Review* 44, no. 4 (1950): 904–15.
- Sengo Nihon Seijishi Kenkyūkai. *Gendai Nihon Seijishi: Nenpyō, Kaisetsu*. Tokyo: Hōken Bunkasha, 1988.
- Shima, Nobuhiko. *Shunō Gaikō: Senshinkoku Samitto no Rimenshi*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū Publishing, 2000.
- Shimizu, Minoru. "'Abnormal' Diet Leaves Some Questions." *Japan Times*, June 21, 1979.
- . "Ohira's 'Politics of Waiting' and Summit." *Japan Times*, June 14, 1979.
- . "'Unstable' Suzuki Cabinet Enters Second Year." *Japan Times*, July 16, 1981.
- Shimoyachi, Nao. "Koizumi's Iraq Pledge Signals New Chapter for SDF." *Japan Times Online*, June 11, 2004.
- Shinoda, Tomohito. *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan's Kantei Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007.
- . *Leading Japan: The Role of the Prime Minister*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- Shonfield, Andrew. "The Politics of the Mixed Economy in the International System of the 1970s." *International Affairs* 56, no. 1 (1980): 1–14.
- . "The World Economy 1979." *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 3 (1980): 596–621.
- Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Sims, Richard. *Japanese Political History since the Meiji Renovation, 1868–2000*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Singh, Bhubhindar. *Japan's Security Identity: From a Peace State to an International State*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Sneider, Daniel. "The New Asianism: Japanese Foreign Policy Under the Democratic Party of Japan." *Asia Policy* 12 (2011): 99–129.
- Soeya, Yoshihide. "Japan's Relations with China." In Vogel, Ming, and Akihiko, *The Golden Age of the US-China-Japan Triangle, 1972–1989*, 210–26.
- Solomon, Richard H. "East Asia and the Great Power Coalitions." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 686–718.
- Solomon, Robert. "'The Elephant in the Boat?': The United States and the World Economy." *Foreign Affairs* 60, no. 3 (1982): 573–92.

- Sorenson, Georgia. "An Intellectual History of Leadership Studies." In *Reflections on Leadership*, edited by Richard A. Couto, 19–29. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2007.
- Spencer, Herbert. "The Great Man Theory Breaks Down." In Kellerman, *Political Leadership*, 10–15.
- "Statement at Williamsburg [Declaration on Security]." May 29, 1983. Reproduced in Hajnal, *The Seven-Power Summit*, 242–43.
- Stockwin, J. A. A. *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Japan*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- . *Governing Japan: Divided Politics in a Major Economy*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Sudo, Sueo. *The Fukuda Doctrine and ASEAN: New Dimensions in Japanese Foreign Policy*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1992.
- Suzuki, Zenkō. "Nashonaru Puresu Kurabu ni okeru Enzetsu: Atarashii Nichibei Kankei to Ware ga Kuni no Yakuwari." May 8, 1981. Reproduced in Suzuki, *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, supplementary volume, 106–11.
- . "Otawa Samitto ni okeru Bōtō Hatsugen." (July 20, 1981). Reproduced in *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, main volume, by Suzuki Zenkō, 119–23. Tokyo: Nihon Kōhō Kyōkai, 1983.
- . *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, supplementary volume. Tokyo: Nihon Kōhō Kyōkai, 1983.
- . "'Suzuki San Mattanashi': Terebi Asahi 'Sōri to Kataru.'" Reproduced in Suzuki, *Suzuki Naikaku Sōridaijin Enzetsushū*, supplementary volume, 246–55.
- Suzuki, Zenkō, and Iwate Hōsō Kabushiki Gaisha. *Moto Sōri Suzuki Zenkō Gekidō no Nihon Seiji o Kataru: Sengo 40 Nen no Kenshō*. Morioka: Iwate Hōsō, 1991.
- Takayasu, Kensuke. "Prime-Ministerial Power in Japan: A Re-Examination." *Japan Forum* 17, no. 2 (2005): 163–84.
- Takenaka, Harukata. *Shushō Shihai: Nihon Seiji no Henbō*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2006.
- Talbott, Strobe. "Buildup and Breakdown." *Foreign Affairs* 62, no. 3 (1984): 587–615.
- Tanaka, Akihiko, Makoto Iokibe, and Koji Murata. "Hisahiko Okazaki Oral History Interview." (December 18, 1995). <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/japan/okazakiointerview.htm>.
- Tanaka, Yuki. *Japan's Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery and Prostitution during World War II and the US Occupation*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Tanaka, Zen'ichirō. "Suzuki Zenkō: Kenryoku ga Motometa Seijika." In Watanabe, *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*, 315–36.
- Tarar, Ahmer. "Constituencies and Preferences in International Bargaining." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (2005): 383–407.
- Tasker, Peter. *Insaido Japan*. Translated by Sasano Yōko. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1988.

- Tawara, Kōtarō. *Seijika no Fūkei*. Tokyo: Gakushū Kenkyūsha, 1994.
- Togo, Kazuhiko. *Japan's Foreign Policy, 1945–2003: The Quest for a Proactive Policy*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tokuyama, Jirō. "The Leaderless State." *Japan Echo* 18, no. 4 (1991): 35–41.
- Tōkyō Shinbun. "'Guntai da': Honne no Koizumi Shushō, Fukuda Yasuo Kanbōchōkan wa Tatemae 'Jieitai wa jieitai.'" May 22, 2003.
- Tsurutani, Taketsugu. "Old Habits, New Times: Challenges to Japanese–American Security Relations." *International Security* 7, no. 2 (1982): 175–87.
- Tsuzuki, Chushichi. *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan, 1825–1995*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Tucker, Robert C. *Politics as Leadership*. Columbia, MI: University of Missouri Press, 1981.
- Uchida, Kenzō. *Habatsu*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1983.
- Uchiyama, Yū. *Koizumi and Japanese Politics: Reform Strategies and Leadership Style*. Translated by Carl Freire. London: Routledge, 2010.
- . *Koizumi Seiken: "Patosu no Shushō" wa Nani o Kaeta no ka*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2007.
- Uji, Toshihiko. *Suzuki Seiken: 863 Nichi*. Tokyo: Gyōsei Mondai Kenkyūjo Shuppankyoku, 1983.
- United Nations Statistical Division. *UN Commodity Trade Statistics Database*. <http://comtrade.un.org/>.
- van Wolferen, Karel. *The Enigma of Japanese Power: People and Politics in a Stateless Nation*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Vogel, Ezra F. *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Vogel, Ezra F., Yuan Ming, and Tanaka Akihiko, eds. *The Golden Age of the US–China–Japan Triangle, 1972–1989*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Wain, Barry. "The Indochina Refugee Crisis." *Foreign Affairs* 58, no. 1 (1979): 160–80.
- Wakata, Kyōji. *Gendai Nihon no Seiji to Fūdo*. Tokyo: Mineruva Shobō, 1981.
- Walsh, Bryan. "The Abe Enigma." *Time Asia*, September 11, 2006.
- Walt, Stephen M. "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power." *International Security* 9, no. 4 (1985): 3–43.
- . *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics." *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993): 44–79.
- . *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- . "Structural Realism after the Cold War." *International Security* 25, no. 1 (2000): 5–41.
- . *Theory of International Politics*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- Ward, Robert E. "The Constitution and Current Japanese Politics." *Far Eastern Survey* 25, no. 4 (1956): 49–58.

- Watanabe, Akio, ed. *Sengo Nihon no Saishōtachi*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1995.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminster Press, 2 vols, 1968.
- . "Types of Authority." In Kellerman, *Political Leadership*, 232–44.
- Weilemann, Peter R. "The Summit Meeting: The Role and Agenda of Diplomacy at its Highest Level." *NIRA Review* 7, no. 2 (2000): 16–20.
- Weisman, Steven R. "Japanese Premier Vows 'Even Greater Efforts' on Defense." *New York Times*, May 9, 1981.
- Welfield, John. *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar American Alliance System: A Study in the Interaction of Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy*. London: Athlone Press, 1988.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391–425.
- . "The Agency-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory." *International Organization* 41, no. 3 (1987): 335–70.
- Wight, Colin. *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Williams, David. "Ozawa Ichirō: The Making of a Japanese Kingmaker." In Neary, *Leaders and Leadership in Japan*, 276–96.
- Willner, Ann Ruth. *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Yammarino, Francis J., and Bernard M. Bass. "Person and Situation Views of Leadership: A Multiple Levels of Analysis Approach." *Leadership Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1991): 121–39.
- Yammarino, Francis J., William D. Spangler, and Bernard M. Bass. "Transformational Leadership and Performance: A Longitudinal Investigation." *Leadership Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1993): 81–102.
- Yomiuri Shinbun*. "Abe shi 'Kenpō o Zenmen Kaisei' Seiken Kōsō ni Sakaru Ikō Yokohama de Kōen." August 22, 2006.
- . "Deepen Debate on Constitution to Build Consensus on Revision." July 15, 2013.
- Yoshiaki, Yoshimi. *Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery in the Japanese Military during World War II*. Translated by Suzanne O'Brien. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Yoshida, Reiji. "Nakasone Claims His 'Ian-jo' Was For R&R." *Japan Times*, March 24, 2007.
- Yoshida, Shigeru. *Japan's Decisive Century, 1867–1967*. New York: Praeger, 1967.
- . *The Yoshida Memoirs: The Story of Japan in Crisis*. Translated by Kenichi Yoshida. London: Heinemann, 1961.
- Yoshino, Kosaku. *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Yukl, Gary. *Leadership in Organizations*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2010.

# Index

- “1955” system. *See* Japanese politics
- Abe, Shintarō, 52, 145, 155–56
- Abe, Shinzō, 48–49, 52, 81–82, 109, 164; belief in *dokuritsu no kaifuku* (recovery of independence), 52; comfort women issue and, 82; constitutional revision and, 52, 81; economic policies of (*see* “Abenomics”); leadership style of, 48, 52, 81; nationalism and, 81–82
- “Abenomics,” 52, 81
- Afghanistan, 57, 87, 94, 111, 121–22, 132–33, 150
- amae* (dependency), 39
- analytical eclecticism, 67–69
- Andreotti, Giulio, 102
- anti-militarism, 66, 70, 77. *See also* pacifism; Japan’s strategic identity
- Arab-Israeli War, 57, 98
- Argentina, 151
- Article 9 of the Constitution of Japan, 73, 79, 81, 120; role of the CLB and (*see* Cabinet Legislation Bureau). *See also* Constitution of Japan.
- Asahi Shinbun*, 134
- ASEAN, 28, 58, 77, 114, 155
- ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), 58
- Asia Development Board, 86
- Asianism, 65, 82
- Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), 58
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations. *See* ASEAN
- Asukata, Ichio, 118
- Baldrige, Malcolm, 156
- Bass, Bernard, 17–18, 20
- Bayne, Nicholas, 94–95, 97, 123, 129, 148
- Berger, Thomas, 66
- Blechinger-Talcott, Verena, 37
- Blondel, Jean, 14–15, 20–23
- Blumenthal, Michael, 104
- Bowen, Roger, 43
- Britain. *See* United Kingdom.
- Brunei, 155
- Buckley, Roger, 143
- buck-passing, 64
- Bull, Hedley, 25
- bureaucracy. *See* Japanese bureaucracy
- Burns, James MacGregor, 4, 13–15, 17–20, 135
- Bush, George W., 56
- Byman, Daniel, 1, 26, 33
- Cabinet, Japanese, 43, 71, 87, 101, 113, 115–16, 118–20, 139–40, 142, 154; and executive power, 38; popularity of, 115, 118; resignations of, 105–6, 118; “Tanakasone Cabinet” (*see* “Tanakasone” Cabinet); visits to the Yasukuni Shrine by, 116, 120

- Cabinet Law and foreign affairs, 71  
 Cabinet Legislation Bureau (CLB), 79, 81  
 Cabinet Secretariat, Japanese, 79  
 Cambodia, 95, 96, 127, 132, 150  
 Campbell, John Creighton, 38  
 Canada, 29, 99, 102–3, 105, 127–29, 132, 147, 156  
 “cartelization” school, 41  
 Carter, Jimmy, 98, 100–3, 106, 121–22, 124, 128, 150  
 charisma. *See* leadership, transformational  
 China, 30, 50, 54, 59, 76, 82, 87, 97, 115, history textbook disputes and, 143–44; Japanese grand strategy and, 57–58, 62–63, 65–66, 69; United States and, 121–22  
 Chuō Suisan Kai (Central Fisheries Association), 112  
 Clark, Joe, 102  
 Cold War, 7, 26, 56, 82–83, 116, 125, 127, 140, 155, 167, 173; before the Ottawa summit, 120–23; Japan’s strategy identity during (*see* Japan’s strategic identity); Japanese leadership in the, 49–51 (*see also* Japanese leadership); U.S. use of sanctions during, 121, 136, 151; missile deployments during (*see* missile deployments and negotiations)  
 collective self-defense, 79, 81  
 comfort women, 82  
 Constitution of Japan, 24, 38, 49, 71, 120, 124, 137, 141, 144, 168; revision of, 49, 52, 73–74, 79, 81, 167. *See also* Article 9  
 constructivism, 65–67, 175. *See also* norms  
 contingent reinforcement (*see* leadership, transactional)  
 Curtis, Gerald, 40, 42, 51, 72, 93  
 Dai Nihon Suisan Kai (Japan Fishery Association), 112  
 Delors, Jacques, 123  
 Democratic Liberal Party (DLP), 113  
 Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), 53, 65, 79–80, 82  
 Democratic Socialist Party, 108  
 détente, 56, 121, 128  
 developmentalism, 42  
 Diet (parliament), Japanese, 38, 71, 73, 90, 94, 118, 125, 144, 146  
 diplomacy: failures of, 151–52; and leadership, 4–5, 13–36, 163, 176; and misperceptions, 31–32; photograph, 167 (*see also* Williamsburg summit); summit, 3. *See also* Japanese diplomacy  
 Dobson, Hugo, 7, 54, 156  
 domestic environment. *See* leadership environments  
 East Asia Summit, 28, 58  
 East Germany, 122  
 East–West relations, 128, trade and economics, 121, 123, 127, 132–33, 136, 147–48, 151–53, 158, 160  
 Edström, Bert, 6–7, 53, 71, 75, 77, 90, 115  
 Esaki, Masumi, 105, 106  
 European Economic Community (EEC), 119, 147  
 European Union, 28  
 factions (*habatsu*). *See* Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)  
 Fanfani, Amintore, 156  
 Finnemore, Martha, 70  
 followership. *See* leadership environments  
 foreign policy analysis (FPA), 1–2, 5–6, 25, 33, 175–76  
 France, 29, 99, 101–6, 109, 121, 123, 128–29, 132, 147–48, 151–53,

- 156–158, 160; leadership style of, 42, 45
- Fukuda Doctrine, 76–77
- Fukuda, Hiromu, 134
- Fukuda, Takeo, 48, 87, 99, 102, 114, 140, 155–56, 167; Japanese strategic thinking and, 75–77; and the Kaku–Fuku War (*see* Kaku–Fuku War); political activities of, 89, 92–94, 108, 144–45; summitry and, 54–55, 58, 99
- fukuko kyōhei* (rich nation, strong army), 69
- Funabashi, Yōichi, 104–5
- futsū no kuni*. *See* normal nation
- G7/8/20 (Group of Seven/Eight/Twenty) summits, 3, 7, 14, 22, 29–30, 53, 59, 85, 111, 137, 163, 159, 169; background of, 29–30; Bonn summit, 54, 95, 99, 103, 107; and Japan (*see* Japanese G7/8 diplomacy); Library Group and, 29; London summit, 99; Okinawa summit, 55; Ottawa summit (*see* Ottawa summit); Puerto Rico summit, 99; Rambouillet summit, 29, 91, 98, 99; Venice summit, 114. *See also individual summit entries:* Ottawa, Tokyo, Versailles, and Williamsburg summits
- GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), 96, 130, 149
- Gauder, Alisa, 47, 61
- George Mulgan, Aurelia, 7, 21, 41, 45, 47
- Getsuyōkai (Monday Club), 92
- Giraud, André, 104–7
- giri* (obligation), 39
- Giscard d'Estaing, Valéry, 102–7
- Gotōda, Masaharu, 142, 145–46
- Gourevitch, Peter, 2–3, 7, 175
- Great Britain. *See* United Kingdom
- Green, Michael, 58, 64, 125–26, 131, 171
- Greenstein, Fred, 34, 35
- Guidelines for Japan–U.S. Defense Cooperation*, 76, 124
- Gulf War, 7, 45, 47, 55, 78
- habatsu* (factions). *See* Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)
- Hashimoto, Riichi, 106
- Hashimoto, Ryūtarō, 46, 54–55
- Hatoyama, Ichirō, 73, 74, 139–40
- Hatoyama, Yukio, 48, 63, 65, 79–82, 109
- Hayao, Kenji, 41, 44–46
- Heginbotham, Eric, 64–65
- Hermann, Margaret, 33–34
- Hook, Glenn, 6, 55
- Hosokawa, Morihiro, 55
- Hudson, Valerie, 3, 33, 70, 176
- Hughes, Christopher, 63, 78
- Ikeda, Hayato, 50, 77, 87, 89
- India, 59
- indispensability. *See* leadership indispensability
- Indochina, 77, 96, 122
- inflation, 58, 92, 96, 100, 102, 122–23, 129, 147, 157, 160; oil and, 56, 95, 99, 103, 107
- institutions, 23, 59, 174; and leadership (*see* leadership, and institutions); summits as, 28, 30, 57, 60, 152. *See also* Japanese institutions.
- intellectual stimulation (*see* leadership, transactional *or* leadership, transformational)
- Intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), negotiations. *See* missile deployments and negotiations
- International Energy Agency (IEA), 96, 98, 101–2



- international environment. *See* leadership environments
- International Monetary Fund (IMF), 160
- international relations (IR), 1, 2–7, 24–27, 31, 33, 62–69, 111, 169, 174–76; “idiosyncratic first image factors” and, 4, 8, 32, 175; Japan’s (*see* Japanese diplomacy); and Japanese leadership, 174–76; and leadership, 2–3; “second image reversed,” 2, 7, 27, 175; three images of, 25
- international summits. *See* summits
- Iokibe, Makoto, 74
- Iran, 94; Iranian revolution, 57, 95
- Iraq, 44, 56, 77
- Israel, 151; Arab-Israeli War (*see* Arab-Israeli War)
- Italy, 29, 96, 99, 102, 128, 147, 156–58; and political leadership, 52–53
- Japan Defense Agency (JDA), 75, 79, 125, 126, 140. *See also* Ministry of Defense (MOD)
- Japan Democratic Party (Nihon Minshutō), 113
- Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF), 78–79, 81, 135
- Japan Socialist Party (JSP), 113, 118
- Japanese bureaucracy, 1, 38–41, 44, 46, 53, 59, 71, 86–88, 90, 100, 119, 135, 139, 152; administrative guidance and, 40; as the dominant political actor, 1, 39–40; relative decline in power of, 41
- Japanese Coast Guard, 80
- Japanese Constitution. *See* Constitution of Japan
- Japanese diplomacy, 9, 11, 80; as Asia’s representative (*ajia no daihyō*), 58, 127, 155; as “checkbook diplomacy,” 77; deflective, 169; and international relations, 56–59, 62–69, 75, 77, 111, 169; and leadership (*see* Japanese leadership); multilateralism in, 77; Southeast Asia in, 76–77, 114; strategic reassurance and, 64; unreliability of, 45. *See also* Japanese G7/8 diplomacy and individual Japanese leaders
- Japanese G7/8 diplomacy, 9, 54–60, 164, 170, 172–73, 175. *See also* individual summits
- Japanese institutions, 38, 42–44, 53; and security, 52, 64, 66, 68, 74, 78–80; and the structure of resources, 38; *See also* Japanese politics
- Japanese leadership: and the Cold War, 49–51; and diplomacy, 6–8, 10–12, 53–56, 170–73; and domestic politics, 53–56; and international relations, 174–76; processes and outcomes, 37, 43, 45–46, 48–53, 61, 83, 165–76; role of, 11, 163; since 2000, 51–53; stereotypes of, 2, 53, 55, 60, 91, 166–67; and strategic identity, 61–83; strategies of, 48, 52, 79, 164, 171; strong, 49, 51–52, 64, 81, 109, 139, 141, 162, 166, 168; weak, 37–38, 42–47, 60, 114, 143, 171. *See also* entries for individual leaders
- Japanese leadership styles and visions, 11, 48, 50–52, 60–61, 76, 82, 165–68, 90, 170; charismatic, 1, 49, 51; diversity in, 50, 60–61, 164–65; laissez-faire (non-leadership), 44, 46–47, 111, 114, 116, 127, 131, 135, 164–66, 169–72; transactional, 44–46, 48, 50–52, 108–9, 114, 135, 161, 164–66, 168, 170–71; transformational, 44–48, 50–52, 116, 153, 161, 164–67, 171; types: grandstander, kamikaze fighter, peace lover, political,

- political insider, reactive, reform, technocratic, 44–47;
- Japanese national elections, 44, 52, 81, 87, 113, 117–18, 140, 146, 161; role of prime minister in (*see* Japanese prime ministers)
- Japanese politics: “1955” system, 38–41; the “iron” triangle of, 39; centralization of, 39–41; cultural influences on, 39; fragmentation of, 41–42; as a leadership environment, 37–39; and Nakasone (*see* Nakasone, Yasuhiro); and Ōhira (*see* Ōhira, Masayoshi); power of bureaucracy in (*see* Japanese bureaucracy); power of political parties in, 40–41 (*see also* *entries for individual political parties*); and Suzuki (*see under* Suzuki, Zenkō); the “ways” of, 37–44, 59; and weak leaders, 42–44
- Japanese prime ministers, 44–56; characterizing styles of, 8, 37, 44, 48, 54–55, 60–61 (*see also* Japanese leadership styles and visions); as chief diplomats, 60, 94, 114, 127, 132, 163–64, 171; and diplomacy (*see* Japanese leadership); and elections, 44–45, 52, 81, 87, 89, 92–94, 105, 113, 115, 117–18, 140, 144–46, 161, 166; leadership strategies of, 11, 48, 163, 172; powers of, 6, 38, 43, 46–47, 53, 55, 71, 141; presidentialization of, 44; and security (*see* Japan’s strategic identity); and summitry, 11, 22, 165, 169, 175. *See also* *entries for individual prime ministers and summits*
- Japan’s strategic identity, 6–7, 9–11, 61–83, 164, 173–75; autonomy and (*see* *jishu bōei*, autonomous defense); and the Cold War, 62–77; formation of, 72–74; *fuan* (vulnerability) in, 63; Japanese leadership and (*see under* Japanese leadership); and the post-Cold War period, 77–82; realism in, 65, 82; rearmament and, 72–74, 76; remilitarization and, 49, 57, 66; revisionism and, 78–82; Yoshida Doctrine and (*see* Yoshida Doctrine)
- Jenkins, Roy, 102
- Jervis, Robert, 31
- jishu bōei* (autonomous defense), 75, 140
- Johnson, Chalmers, 38–40, 154
- Jones, Brian, 16
- Kaarbo, Juliet, 34
- Kaifu, Toshiki, 43, 45, 55
- Kaku–Fuku War, 117–119, 144; Tanaka Kakuei’s role in, 92–93
- Kan, Naoto, 82
- Kaneko, Ippei, 102
- kantei* (the prime minister’s office), 44
- karōshi* (death by overwork), 87
- Katzenstein, Peter, 66, 67
- Kawasaki, Tsuyoshi, 64
- Kennedy, Andrew, 32
- Keohane, Robert, 25
- Keynesianism, 96–100, 169
- Kikuchi, Kiyoaki, 128, 132
- Kishi, Nobusuke, 48–50, 52, 73–76, 81, 140, 143, 145, 155
- Kliman, Daniel, 64
- Knight, W. Andy, 8
- Kōchikai (Ōhira faction from 1971), 87, 113
- Kohl, Helmut, 153, 156, 157
- Koizumi, Jun’ichirō, 2, 6–8, 81, 140, 164; and Bush, George W., 56; and defense reforms, 63, 78–80; and destruction of the LDP, 51; at the G8 summits, 55–56; leadership style of, 44, 46–48, 51–52, 61; and postal reform, 52

- kokusaika* and *kokusaishugi*  
 (internationalization and  
 internationalism), 42, 90, 167
- Kōmoto, Toshio, 93, 118, 145
- Kōno, Ichirō, 139, 140
- Korean War, 73
- Koyama, Ken'ichi, 86, 87
- Krauss, Ellis, 78
- Kumon, Shunpei, 86, 87
- kuromaku* (political fixer), 39
- Kuwait, 77
- Lambsdorff, Otto, 106
- leaders, individual, 1, 4–6, 8, 25,  
 172–73; as agents, 4–5, 31–32, 70,  
 83, 164, 176; as chief diplomats, 1,  
 3, 14, 30–31, 60, 176; as circuit-  
 breakers, 5, 16; and environments  
 (see leadership environments); as  
 utility maximizers, 4, 31. *See also*  
 leadership
- leadership, laissez-faire (non-  
 leadership), 18, 22, 33, 174. *See*  
*also* Japanese leadership styles and  
 visions
- leadership, political, 3–4, 6, 8–9,  
 13–17, 20, 22–23, 35
- leadership, transactional, 17–21. *See*  
*also* Japanese leadership styles and  
 visions
- leadership, transformational, 6, 17–21,  
 44–48, 50, 172; individualized  
 consideration, 18–19, 46, 48;  
 inspirational motivation, 18, 45,  
 51, 116; charisma or idealized  
 influence, 15–16, 18; weak and  
 strong, 1, 6, 13, 21, 32, 42–45. *See*  
*also* Japanese leadership styles and  
 visions
- leadership: acceptability continuum  
 and, 34; agency versus structure  
 and, 16–17, 53; assigned, 16, 23;  
 authority, 13–16, 38, 41, 46, 51, 73,  
 79, 168; definitions of, 3–4, 13–15;  
 emergent, 16; environments (see  
 leadership environments); goals, 6,  
 9, 14, 22, 24, 28, 77; great men of  
 history and, 16; and institutions,  
 4, 14, 23–24, 53, 68; as intended  
 change, 5, 20, 22, 135, 174;  
 interactive, 5–6, 17, 22, 36–37, 163,  
 174–75; as leaders and followers  
 (see leadership environments); and  
 Japanese diplomacy (see Japanese  
 leadership); legitimacy, 13–15,  
 43–44, 46; motivations, 9, 14–15,  
 22, 32, 168; and power, 3–4, 13–16,  
 19, 22–24, 33; and reelection, 4,  
 32, 168; strategy (see leadership  
 strategy); strong, 6, 13, 21, 42–45  
 (see also Japanese leadership); style  
 (see leadership strategy); tactics:  
 agenda setting, cutting slack, side-  
 payments, tying hands, 32, 38, 44,  
 78–79; transactional (see leadership,  
 transactional); transformational  
 (see leadership, transformational);  
 values, 9, 13–17, 19, 32, 42, 46,  
 62; vision (see leadership strategy);  
 weak, 1, 21 (see also Japanese  
 leadership)
- leadership categories (trait, behavior,  
 influence, situational, and  
 integrative), 9, 16–17, 22, 25, 33,  
 51, 168, 172–74;
- leadership environments, 2–4, 8–9,  
 14, 20, 22–30, 163–64, 168–69,  
 172–76; domestic, 8–9, 23–24,  
 31–33, 164, 168; domestic-  
 international linkages, 26–28;  
 followers and, 4, 14–15, 17–21, 23,  
 27, 35, 39, 42, 174; expectations  
 in, 4, 14, 18, 22–25, 27, 32, 35, 52,  
 59, 81, 101, 145, 173; institutional  
 factors and, 4, 14 23–24, 28, 30  
 (see also Japanese institutions);  
 international, 3, 9, 24–26, 169, 171;  
 as organizational context, 3, 23;

- leaders and, 5, 10–11, 21, 31–35, 42–44, 171–73; overdetermined, 171 (*see also* Ottawa summit); multiple, 3, 9, 36; summit, 9, 28–29 (*see also* G7/8/20) summits). *See also* Japanese leadership; Japanese politics; Japanese diplomacy; *entries for individual summits*
- leadership indispensability and dispensability (actor and action), 9–10, 33–36, 42–43, 45, 48, 70–71, 76, 82, 109, 164–65, 170–73
- leadership and international relations. *See* international relations
- leadership perceptions and misperceptions, 1, 9, 26, 31–34, 63, 65, 98, 164, 166, 175;
- leadership personality, 9, 16, 33–34, 49, 72–73, 87–88, 128, 141–42;
- leadership preferences, 3–5, 9–11, 15, 25–27, 31–34, 42, 47, 61–63, 70, 73, 109, 164, 166–68
- leadership rationality, 4–5, 10–11, 16–19, 31–33, 48, 109, 135, 162–64, 166–68
- leadership strategy, 5–6, 8–9, 13, 20–22, 35, 85, 108, 114, 129, 135, 137, 162–64, 166, 171, 174; coherence in, 10, 52, 163, 172; degree and scope of change, 6, 21–23, 45, 52, 167, 172; processes and outcomes, 5–6, 8–11, 13, 15–17, 19–23, 27, 33–36, 46, 168; strategies: conservational, innovative, managerial, paternalistic, reassuring, redefinitional, reformist, repositional, revolutionary, 22–23, 45, 48–52, 76, 80, 108, 114, 135–36, 162, 165, 167, 170–72; styles and visions, 5, 9–11, 13, 15, 17–23, 32–35, 37, 42, 44–46, 48, 163–68, 172. *See also* Japanese leadership
- Lebanon, 151
- Legro, Jeffrey, 66
- Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), 38, 40–41, 44, 46–47, 50–52, 74, 76, 78–79, 85, 87–88, 92–93, 100, 108–9, 111, 113–16, 126–28, 140–41, 155, 161, 168, 171; factions (*habatsu*) in, 41–42, 50–53, 85, 87, 89–90, 92–94, 108, 111, 113, 117–20, 139–42, 144–46, 166, 171; presidential elections for, 89, 92–93, 118, 144–46; *zoku, seisaku* (policy tribe) and *zokugijin* (tribe members) in, 41, 53, 119, 126
- Liberal Party (Jiyūtō), 87, 89, 113
- liberalism, 25, 64–67
- Lockheed scandal, 51, 88–89, 93, 142, 144
- MacArthur, Douglas, 142
- management-by-exception (*see* leadership, transactional)
- Mansfield, Mike, 126–27
- Mao, Zedong, 32–33
- Masciulli, John, 8
- Mearsheimer, John, 2, 25
- Mercantilism, 77, 149. *See also* realism, mercantile
- Middle East, 26, 76, 87, 95, 108, 121, 132, 146
- Midford, Paul, 64
- Milner, Helen, 27, 31, 32
- Ministry of Education, 143
- Ministry of Finance (MOF), 53, 54, 86, 87, 90
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), 53, 71, 79, 102, 104, 105, 114, 115, 126, 131, 134
- Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI), 90, 104–6, 134, 156
- missile deployments and negotiations, 56–57, 121, 122, 137, 156–60, 175; INF (Intermediate-range nuclear forces) negotiations, 147–49; MX missiles, 148; Pershing-2

- missile deployments and negotiations  
(*continued*)  
missiles, 122, 157; Soviet missile  
deployments to Barnaul, 150; SS-20  
missiles, 148, 150; “year of the  
missile,” 147
- Mitterrand, François, 128–29, 132,  
151, 153, 156–58, 160
- Miyagi, Yukiko, 68, 82
- Miyashita, Akitoshi, 67
- Miyazaki, Hiromichi, 100, 102, 104,  
106
- Miyazawa, Ki'ichi, 55, 118, 120, 127,  
134
- Mongolian Border Regional Liaison  
Department, 86
- Moravcsik, Andrew, 4, 66
- Mori, Yoshirō, 51, 55
- Moscow Olympic Games, 121
- Motono, Moriyuki, 156
- multilateralism, 7, 58, 80
- Nakagawa, Ichirō, 145
- Nakane, Chie, 43
- Nakasone, Yasuhiro, 10, 12, 51, 63,  
93, 114, 118, 137–62, 164–68, 171,  
174; and administrative reform,  
119; becoming prime minister,  
144–46; and comfort stations,  
139; diplomacy of, 153–55; and  
Douglas MacArthur, 142; and  
defense policy, 75–76, 136; early  
life, 138–39; factional role of, 89,  
94, 140; indispensability (high)  
of, 165, 171–72, 174; leadership  
style and vision of, 46, 79, 137,  
140–43, 145, 154, 161–62, 164–68,  
171; military service of, 138–39;  
ministerial appointments, 139–40;  
nationalism of, 42, 137, 140,  
167–68, 171–72; nicknames of  
(hawk and weathercock), 138,  
141–42, 161, 167; resignation and  
retirement, 140; and Ronald Reagan  
(*see* “Ron–Yasu” relationship);  
student life of, 138; summit style  
of, 55; Tanakasone cabinet and  
(*see* “Tanakasone” Cabinet); and  
“unsinkable aircraft carrier” (*fuchin  
kūbo*) controversy, 153–54
- nationalism, 33, 42, 76, 81–82, 91,  
112, 116, 140, 171
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, 32–33
- nemawashi* (laying the groundwork),  
39
- neoclassical realism. *See* realism
- New Liberal Club, 108
- nihonjinron* (theory of Japanese  
uniqueness), 116
- Nikaidō, Susumu, 142
- ninjō* (personal feeling), 39
- Nishida, Kitarō, 138
- Nixon “shocks,” 57, 149
- Noda, Yoshihiko, 82
- non-nuclear principles, 50, 75–76,  
126–27, 137
- norm entrepreneurs. *See*  
constructivism
- normal nation (*futsū no kuni*), 7, 70, 78
- norms, 23, 25, 28, 32, 43, 53, 62,  
65–68, 71, 75, 76, 79, 82, 175;  
Japanese cultural, 39; and norm  
entrepreneurs, 11, 70–72, 77, 82,  
83, 173, 174
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization  
(NATO), 122, 137, 149, 150, 157,  
161, 168, 169
- North Korea, 58, 69
- Northern Territories, 116
- Northouse, Peter, 14, 18
- North–South relations, 102, 107–8,  
123, 129, 132, 155; Japan's role as a  
bridge (*kakehashi*) between, 155
- Nye, Joseph, 15, 20–21, 25
- OECD (Organisation for Economic  
Co-operation and Development),  
91, 95, 96, 152
- Ōhira, Masayoshi, 10, 12, 42, 85–109,  
111–15, 117–18, 135, 137, 140,

- 162, 170–71, 173; becoming prime minister, 93–94; *bunka no jidai* and *kokusaika no jidai* (age of culture and age of internationalization), 90; bureaucratic career of, 86–87; death of, 87, 92, 113, 115, 118; diplomacy of, 99–102; dissolution of the lower house by, 118; early life of, 85–88; establishment of the Policy Research Association, 88; factional role of, 88–94, 117–18; indispensability (low) of, 170; intellectual approach of, 88, 90, 109, 166; leadership style and vision of, 87–91, 108–9, 164–67; philosophical and pragmatic sides of, 88, 90; pre-summit challenges faced by, 99–100; religious influences on, 88; senior political appointments, 87; *shinrai* and *gōi* (trust and consensus), 90; student life of, 86; approach to summits, 55, 91, 94; and Tanaka Kakuei, 87, 89–90
- oil shocks, 8, 29, 43, 56–57, 87, 91–92, 94–96, 98–100, 123, 129, 169, 172, 176
- Okawara, Nobuo, 66, 67
- Okazaki, Hisahiko, 125, 126, 171
- Okinawa, 29, 50, 55, 75–76, 80
- Okita, Saburo, 87–88
- Okuno, Seisuke, 120
- omote* (visible surface), 39
- OPEC (Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries), 98, 104, 107
- organizational context. *See* leadership environments
- Oros, Andrew, 63, 68–70, 72
- Ōrui, Noburu, 138
- Ottawa summit, 12, 111–36, 148, 152, 154, 156, 162, 165, 167, 171; aftermath to, 134; and the “alliance” statement controversy (*see* Suzuki, Zenkō); Chairman’s Summary of Political Issues, 133; comprehensive security, 131–32; communiqué summitry, 132–34; Declaration, 133–34; East–West relations prior to, 121–22; economic background to, 119, 122–23; energy issues and, 123, 133; international environment of, 120–23; Japanese conduct at, 129–32; Japanese politics and, 117–23, 134; Japanese preparation for, 127–28; and North–South relations, 123, 129, 132; opening address made by Suzuki Zenkō, 129–30; Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism, 133; participants at, 128; and the “sea-lane” commitment, 124–26, 135–36, 154, 171; summit environment of, 123–29; trade discussions at, 130, 132–34, 136; U.S.–Japan relations and, 124–27, 134–35; *wa no seiji* and *wa no seishin* (*see wa no seiji*)
- Owada, Hisashi, 102
- Owen, Henry, 100, 106
- Ozawa Ichirō, 47, 78–82
- Pacifism, 42, 67, 154. *See also* Japan’s strategic identity
- Pempel, T. J., 40
- Philippines, 125, 154, 155
- Poland, 122
- Policy Affairs Research Council (Seimu Chōsa Kai), 89, 113
- political environments. *See* leadership environments
- political leadership. *See* leadership, political *and* leadership
- Pollack, Kenneth, 1, 26, 33
- post–Cold War period, 67, 69, 77, 79–80, 83, 173
- Provisional Commission on Administrative Reform (Rinji Gyōsei Chōsakai or Rinchō), 119, 143
- Putnam, Robert, 26, 31, 33, 94–95, 97, 111, 123, 129, 148

- Pyle, Kenneth, 8, 42, 56, 57, 63, 65, 72, 143
- Reagan, Ronald, 55, 57, 114, 121–22, 124–32, 134–37, 150–60, 162, 167; attitude toward Williamsburg summit, 153; and Nakasone Yasuhiro (*see* Ron–Yasu relationship); and Mitterrand, François, 128–29, 151, 153, 158, 160; and Suzuki Zenkō (*see* Suzuki, Zenkō); and U.S. relations with the Soviet Union, 121–22, 129, 132, 136, 148, 151
- realism, 24–25, 62–68, 174; in Japanese strategic thinking (*see* Japan's strategic identity)
- rearmament. *See* Japan's strategic identity
- “Recruit” scandal, 140
- Reischauer, Edwin O., 126
- remilitarization, Japanese. *See* Japan's strategic identity
- revisionism. *See* Japan's strategic identity.
- “Ron–Yasu” relationship, 55–56, 137, 154–56, 159, 162
- Rose, Gideon, 65
- Rosenau, James, 2, 4, 23
- Russia, 58, 59, 116, 125. *See also* Soviet Union.
- Sakurada, Daizo, 99, 101, 131
- Samuels, Richard, 2, 49, 50, 52, 61, 63–65, 68–71, 75, 163
- Satō, Eisaku, 48, 50, 75–77, 87, 89–90, 92
- Satō, Sadakichi, 88
- Satō, Seizaburō, 86, 87
- Scheiner, Ethan, 38
- Schlesinger, James, 104, 106
- Schmidt, Helmut, 101, 102, 106, 128, 129, 132, 152
- Second World War, 56, 113, 143, 156, 160; prime ministers since, 6, 47, 61; strategic identity since, 7, 10, 12, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68–69, 71, 82, 164, 173
- security identity. *See* strategic identity
- seikei bunri* (separating economics and politics), 76
- Seisaku Kenkyūkai (Policy Research Association), 88
- Senkaku/Diaoyu dispute, 80
- senpai-kōhai* (senior-junior) relationships, 39
- senshinkoku* (advanced nation), 8, 42, 56
- September 11 terrorist attacks, 69, 78
- sherpas, 53, 100, 102, 106, 128, 129, 152, 156
- Shigemitsu, Mamoru, 72–74
- Shinoda, Tomohito, 7, 38, 46, 71
- Sikkink, Kathryn, 70
- Singh, Bhubhindar, 63
- Sonoda, Sunao, 102, 127, 128
- South America, 146, 147
- South Korea, 80, 144, 153
- Soviet Union, 62–63, 73, 76, 97, 114, 129, 133–34, 150–51, 158–59; and Afghanistan 94, 122 (*see also* Afghanistan); and détente, 121–22 (*see also* détente); and missile deployments 122, 147–48 (*see also* missile deployments and negotiations); and the Northern Territories, 116; trade and economic relations with, 127–28, 136, 147, 151. *See also* East–West relations
- Spadolini, Giovanni, 128
- stagflation, 95, 98
- Stockwin, J. A. A., 143
- Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), 159
- strategic identity (*see* Japan's strategic identity)
- style, leadership (*see* leadership strategy)

- summit environment. *See* leadership environments *and* summits
- summits, 3, 7, 9, 11, 14, 22, 29–30, 33, 53–56, 163–73, 176; communication at, 28–29; definitions of, 28; East Asia Summit (*see* East Asia Summit); goals of, 28–29; G7/8/20 summits (*see* G7/8/20 summits); history of, 28; as international negotiations, 26–28; Japanese summit diplomacy (*see* Japanese G7/8 diplomacy); as leadership environments, 28–29; types: “getting-to-know-you” summits, 171, 173; types: orientation, serial, ad hoc, and exchange-of-views summits, 29. *See also* individual entries for G7/8 summits
- Suzuki, Zenkō, 10, 12, 37, 111–36, 140, 143–45, 150, 153–54, 156, 162, 164–67, 170–71, 174; and the “alliance” statement controversy, 124–26, 153; becoming prime minister, 118–19, 166; diplomacy of, 167, 170–71; early life, 112–13; factional role of, 118–20, 144–45, 166; family of, 112; fishery industry career, 112; indispensability (high) of, 10, 165, 171; leadership style and vision of, 37, 113–17, 131, 135, 143, 164–67, 170–71; nickname of (“prodigy”), 112; nickname of (“tape recorder”), 114; resignation of, 116–17, 140, 143–45; and Ronald Reagan, 114, 124–25, 127–28, 130–31, 134–36, 150, 167; sea-lane commitment made by, 124–26, 135–36, 154; senior political appointments of, 113; *wa* (harmony), *wa no seiji* (politics of harmony), and *wa no seishin* (spirit of harmony), 111, 116–17, 128, 130–33, 135, 144, 153, 167; Yasukuni Shrine visit of, 116, 120, 144
- Taiwan, 75, 78, 97, 122, 138
- Taiwan Strait crisis, 78
- Takenaka, Harukata, 47
- Takeshita, Noboru, 55, 140, 145, 155, 156
- Tanaka, Kakuei, 39, 48, 87–89, 92, 114, 140; *Bungei Shunjū* scandal, 93; as a “computerized bulldozer,” 51; factional influence of, 89–90, 118–19, 137, 142, 144–46; leadership style of, 50–51; Lockheed scandal and (*see* Lockheed scandal); trial of, 93, 161; as “shadow shogun,” 93. *See also* Kaku–Fuku War
- Tanaka, Rokusuke, 105
- Tanaka, Yuki, 139
- “Tanakasone” Cabinet, 142–46
- technoeconomic foreign policy, 64
- Thailand, 155
- Thatcher, Margaret, 55, 98, 102, 128, 129, 133, 153, 156–57
- theoretical degeneration, 66–67
- Thorn, Gaston, 128, 133, 156–57
- Togo, Kazuhiko, 159
- Tokuyama, Jirō, 43, 45
- Tokyo summit, 12, 29, 85–109, 117, 119, 120, 123, 135, 146, 162, 165, 170, 173; aftermath to, 107–8; “breakfast” meeting at, 104, 109; communiqué, 107; concluding remarks made by Ōhira Masayoshi, 107; Declaration, 105; diplomatic bargaining at, 103–7; economic background to, 94–97; and Indochinese refugees, 94, 96; international environment of, 94–97; Japanese conduct at, 102–7; Japanese politics and, 91–94, 99–100, 107–8; Japanese preparation for, 101–2; and



- Tokyo summit (*continued*)  
 Keynesianism, 96–99, 169; Ōhira–Carter summit and, 100–1; oil imports and, 98, 100–6, 108–9; oil markets and, 95–96; oil shocks and (*see* oil shocks); opening address made by Ōhira Masayoshi, 103; participants at, 102; summit environment of, 97–100
- Trudeau, Pierre Elliott, 128–29, 156–57
- Tsushima, Juichi, 87
- Tucker, Robert C., 13
- two-level games, 4, 26–28, 31;  
 domestic ratification in, 27, 32, 53, 173; domestic preferences in, 11, 27, 164, 168; win-sets and, 27; tactics in (*see* leadership tactics)
- U.S.–Japan relations, 65, 76, 124, 126, 134–35, 150, 155, 168, 171; alliance relations, 63–65, 69, 73–74, 76, 80, 126, 135, 150, 153, 156, 168, 171; Japanese autonomy and (*see also jishu bōei*), 73–74, 80; and Koizumi–Bush relationship (*see* Koizumi, Jun'ichirō); non-nuclear issue and (*see* non-nuclear principles); and the security treaty, 43, 73–74, 126; trade issues in, 57, 97, 119, 124, 134, 149, 154–56; U.S. military bases and, 76, 80, 127; U.S. pressure for greater “burden sharing” and, 73, 75, 124–26; U.S. Occupation and, 49, 72, 142
- Uji, Toshihiko, 115
- unemployment, 92, 95–96, 119, 123, 157
- United Kingdom, 29, 99, 101, 104–5, 147–48
- United Nations, 58, 67, 80
- United States, 6, 14, 29, 49–50, 53, 56–59, 62–66, 69, 72–80, 93–95, 97–101, 103–6, 114–15, 119, 124–30, 132–35, 139, 142, 152–59, 166, 168–69, 171–72; and China, 50, 97, 121–22; and economic relations with Europe, 122–23; and missile deployments (*see* missile deployments); and the Soviet Union, 121–22, 132–33, 147–51, 158; trade and economic issues of, 122–23, 147, 151, 158; *see also* U.S.–Japan relations
- unsinkable aircraft carrier (*fuchin kūbo*) controversy. *See* Nakasone, Yasuhiro
- ura* (hidden), 39
- USSR. *See* Soviet Union
- van Wolferen, Karel, 41, 43, 114
- Versailles summit, 136, 147, 151–54, 160
- Vietnam, 95–96, 121, 149–50
- vision, leadership (*see* leadership strategy)
- Vore, Christopher, 3
- wa*, harmony, *wa no seiji*, politics of harmony, and *wa no seishin*, spirit of harmony (*see* Suzuki, Zenkō)
- Walt, Stephen, 26
- Waltz, Kenneth, 2, 24–25, 62
- Watanabe, Michio, 128
- Weber, Max, 15, 18
- Weilemann, Peter, 28, 29
- West Germany, 29, 101–2, 122, 128, 133, 156–57
- Williamsburg summit, 12, 29, 137–62, 165, 167, 171–72; aftermath to, 160–61; diplomatic bargaining at, 155–61; economic background to, 149; economic declaration at, 160; international environment of, 146–50; Japanese conduct at, 155–57, 159–61; Japanese politics and, 143–46; Japanese preparation for, 153–55; participants at, 156;

- “photograph” diplomacy (*hishatai gaikō*) at, 156, 162, 167; press conference at, 160–61; Ron–Yasu relationship at (*see* “Ron–Yasu” relationship); Statement at Williamsburg (Declaration on Security), 158–60; summit declaration, 160–61; summit environment of, 151–53
- Yabe, Teiji, 138
- Yamanaka, Sadanori, 155, 156
- Yasukuni Shrine, 79, 82, 116, 120, 144, 146
- Yomiuri Shinbun*, 108
- Yoshida Doctrine (consensus), 6–7, 49, 57, 66–67, 69, 71–82
- Yoshida, Shigeru, 6, 48–50, 52, 71–75, 89–90, 139–40, 164
- yūai* (fraternity), 80
- zenhōi gaikō* (omni-directional diplomacy), 76. *See also* Japanese diplomacy
- Zenkoku Gyogyō Kumiai Kyōkai (National Union of Fishery Associations), 112
- Zenkoku Gyogyō Kumiai Rengō Kai (National Federation of Fishery Associations), 112
- zoku, seisaku* (policy tribe) and *zokugiin* (tribe members). *See* Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)



A political leader is most often a nation's most high-profile foreign policy figure, its chief diplomat. But how do individual leadership styles, personalities, perceptions, or beliefs shape diplomacy? In *Japanese Diplomacy*, the question of what role leadership plays in diplomacy is applied to Japan, a country where the individual is often viewed as being at the mercy of the group and where prime ministers have been largely thought of as reactive and weak. In challenging earlier, simplified ideas of Japanese political leadership, H. D. P. Envall argues that Japan's leaders, from early Cold War figures such as Yoshida Shigeru to the charismatic and innovative Koizumi Jun'ichirō to the present leadership of Abe Shinzō, have pursued leadership strategies of varying coherence and rationality, often independent of their political environment. He also finds that different Japanese leaders have shaped Japanese diplomacy in some important and underappreciated ways. In certain environments, individual difference has played a significant role in determining Japan's diplomacy, both in terms of the country's strategic identity and summit diplomacy. What emerges from *Japanese Diplomacy*, therefore, is a more nuanced overall picture of Japanese leadership in foreign affairs.

**H. D. P. Envall** is Research Fellow in the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University.

A volume in the SUNY series, James N. Rosenau series in Global Politics  
David C. Earnest, editor

**SUNY**  
P R E S S  
State University of  
New York Press  
[www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu)

ISBN: 978-1-4384-5497-9

