CHAPTER-2
MILITARY SECURITY VS HUMAN SECURITY IN JAPAN

INTRODUCTION

The term “security” has been interpreted narrowly in international politics as security of ‘territory’ or ‘geographical boundary’ from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of a nuclear holocaust (HDR, 1994:22). This dimension of security aspect correlates the term security with merely “military security” or “national defense”. But, this dimension is not absolute and requires modification regarding the “referent object” and approaches to attempt security matter towards the ‘referent object’.

The UNDP Report 1994 started debate on the approaches, components and ‘referent object’ of security and put individual’s security in the center rather than security of the state. This dimension of security aspect is exclusively innovative and against the conventional notion of security whether individual’s security is prime than ‘state’. It happens because ‘referent object’ of security in this notion has shifted to ‘human beings’ from the state or nation state.

Shift in the referent object of security started the debate between the conservative notion of security and comparatively new dimension of security (Paris, 2001:87-102). In other words, the debate started in-between the notion of military security and human security. As such, scholars argued on a number of themes like; what is the prime intent of security; is it state or individual? Is it viable to focus on individual’s security rather than state? Does the concept of human security become feasible without proper military security? Are both military security and human security compatible in search of national interest? Is it possible that both security (military security and human security) should be the objectives of national policy? Do Japanese policies emphasize more on military security than human security in the light of Ministry of Defense (MoD) from Japan Defense Agency (JDA)? Are external actors also pushing Japan to think beyond military security with special reference to a “rogue state” like North Korea?
With these intention to focus on the exceeding themes, the second chapter of the thesis, "Military Security Vs Human Security in Japan" will discuss the instruments of security of its both dimensions i.e. military security and human security. Further, it will discuss the correlations and conflicts within and between the notion of military security and human security with special reference to Japan. This chapter will also emphasize on the pros and cons of paradigm shifts from military security to human security and vice versa. This chapter will further deal with needs and challenges of Article 9 of Japanese Constitution and US-Japan Security Treaty (1952), and correlate it with achieving human security in Japan.

**Military Security Vs Human Security**

Security in international politics is considered in Realists perspective that it is a state’s affairs especially after post war period. Most strategists consider this concept as a core component of state’s responsibility to secure its citizen from external aggression in militaristic terms. External aggressions also include threats from hypothetical enemies (Radtke, 2004). This notion of security understood in international politics since the beginning of “Westphalian State” till the end of “Cold War”. However, this notion completely ignores the security of other components except the state.

In the post cold war period, a new dimension of security debate started in 1994 when UNDP Report emphasized on the comparatively new dimension of security focused on individual’s security. These debate divided security issues in two different dimensions i.e. external and internal. The dimensions of security relates with military security and human security respectively. External dimension of security connotes the threats from external factors mainly focusing on any thing related to military, on the other hand internal dimension of security connotes to threat originated from inside the boundary mainly by own government’s wrong policies and a number of other factors (Jones, 1992: 53-64), (Walt, 1991: 211-39) and (Morgan, 1992: 264-79).
In the initial glimpses, one can argue that objectives of both dimensions are securing the broader aspects of ‘security’ i.e. state and human security together at the same time. In this aspect, both are fulfilling their prime motives. Since, state’s absolute responsibility is securing its citizen in any way, so absolute security can sustain in the successful completion of both the dimensions. However, major difference seen in the context that what is important for state either state/military security or human security? In more specific terms, what is important for individuals, military security or human security?

Before analyzing correlation between both the security dimensions, one should take care of the surroundings, legality, universality, significance, components, approaches and referent objects of both the security aspects. Correlation in-between military security and human security can be elaborated as follows:

**Diverse Concern**

[1] The first and foremost difference in-between the military security and human security can be reflecting in the terms of their “referent objects”. Military security focuses only on the security of the state or geographical boundary from external aggression and in that case “referent object” of military security in “state” or “nation state”. In a larger picture, military security also protects people, institutions and values (Wight, 1966: 101). However, again it happens only in the case of external threats.

On the other hand human security focuses on comparatively new components of security dimension. In that way the notion of human security places individual’s security at the center place. In such a way, ‘referents object’ of human security is individual ‘human beings’ (Buzan, 2000:1-15), (Khong, 2001:231-6), (Moran, 1990/91:74-90), (Thakur, 2000), (Mack, 2002:4-6), (Tehranian, 1999), (Tauris, 1999), (Robert, 1990:65-75), This dimension of security aspect deals with the well being of individuals. In that it deals with a number of security threats.
Responsibility of any security discourse is to shelter its ‘referent object’ from a number of security threats in any forms. In that framework, military security protects its referent object i.e. ‘state’ from threats generated by external players. In that way, state needs a deterrent strategy to maintain the integrity of state and protect from external aggression (Lippmann, 1943:51).

On the other hand, referent object of human security is individuals. Thus, human security protects its own referent object from a number of security threats. These security threats are mostly generated inside the geographical boundary, which includes a number of components like; Economic Security, Food Security, Health Security, Environment Security, Personal Security, Community Security and Political Security (HDR 1994).

There is only one actor to ensure the military security and i.e. ‘state’. Military security emphasized that a sovereign government is an exclusive actor in securing the state in militaristic terms. In that way, state does not require some sort of assistance from any other players, institutions or organizations. Even state can go for strategic alliances however, it depends upon the needs and circumstances.

While, human security prefers a number of other actors except involving government body. Human security comprehends that other different actors like; regional institutions (RI), International Organizations (IO), Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Non State Actors (NSAs) and Local Communities can play an extraordinary role in promoting human security worldwide.

Military security relies on the building-up of national power, military defense or any thing related to military (Chenoy, 2007:4). In that case this dimension of security clearly promote “Balance of Power”, “Arms Race”, especially “Nuclear Arms Race”, “Strategic Alliances” (like NATO and Warsaw Pact) and strategic boundaries. Means, military security is heavily influenced by realist perspectives and promote either “Offensive Realism” or “Defensive Realism”.
On the other hand, human security not only protects individuals from a number security threats but, also empower them for a permanent solution of these threats (Thakur, 2000:231).

[5] Differences in-between military security and human security can also be visible in the perception of “means” and “end” (Bellamy, 2002: 373-7), (Thomas, 2002:379-82), (Thomas and William, 2002: 177-92). Regarding the clarification of “means” and “end”, some scholars argued that human security is an “end” while military security is “means” to fulfill this “end” (Kerr, 2003:14).

‘Comprehensive security’ is the concept that interferes in each and every dimension of one’s life that covers more than military security and human security together. In simple terms, components of comprehensive security are combination of the components of military security and human security collectively. From this point of view, the notion of “means” and “end” became more visible that military security or human security is just one dimension of comprehensive security. It also becomes visible that military security is a medium to fulfill the ultimate goal i.e. human security.

Diverse concern of military security and human security can be simply explained in terms of their referent objects, nature of security threats and the debate of “means” and “ends”. Keeping in view of the notion of ‘Comprehensive Security’, one can clearly attains that Military security and human security both are necessary for security of individual human beings but, not sufficient (Kerr, 2003:4).

**Common Concern**

Even if diverse concerns exists in-between these dimensions of security, it does not mean that both notions of security are not interlinked. Though, both dimensions of security have differences in terms of referent object, nature of security threats and the “means” and “end” game, however, there are a number of common connection between them that exist in subsequent forms;
[1] The first and foremost correlation started with the origin of “means” and “end” game. If military security is just a “means” and human security is an “end”, then this notion itself establishes relations between them. Military security is just the beginning and human security is the ultimate goal that has to be secured.

[2] Prime accountability of the notion of security is to protect individuals from any kind of threats (Ullman, 1993). And “means” and “end” debate proved that military security and human security are just one part of the universal comprehensive security. Separately they cannot fulfill their ultimate goal.

Keeping in view of the above, one can conclude that though, military security and human security, both concepts denote different meaning about their concepts, they have certain common connection.

**Assorted Concern**

Both human security and military security are two separate concepts and have separate referent objects, scope and means. However, both bear some common connection. Differences and similarities act as “push and pull” factors in-between the two concepts. As such a new approach of security dimension emerged that, is military security and human security independently serving their prime goal? What should the state’s action in contradiction among both the security dimensions?

It can be clearly perceptible in the absence of another. What if, concept of human security is negligible in entire security discourse? And what if military security is absent in entire security discourse? Which one is more necessary for human beings?

Scholars and strategists argued that military security provides constructive surroundings that are conducive in pursuit of components of human security. Military security provides favorable environment to sustain long-term national developmental agenda without fear of being interrupted by any disruption (like; war and civil war). From this point of view,
military security is paramount. This security dimension emphasizes that military security is necessary condition for human security as a concept.

On the other hand some scholars argue that military security is obviously necessary for human survival but, not sufficient for each person's security (Kerr, 2003:5). They argued that only military security can not fulfill absolute security that includes the components of military security and human security both. This one can also be explained in the context that a very few inter state conflict took place in the post war period, but, people around the world are still not happy. It happened because the expanding nature of security threats. In the post war period, nature and scope of security threats go beyond the territory of military security. It includes a number of other threats apart from the military security.

Same thing also applies to the concept of human security. As military security provides surroundings for human security, human security in returns also provides a strong foundation for military security. In fact, strengthening of human security directly reduces the burden of military security. It happens because both human security and military security are inversely related to each other. For example, since the post war era indicated that wherever components of human security got strengthened across the globe, there are fewer pressures on military security.

As both securities are significant for survival and dignified human beings that also establishes in terms of “means” and “end” debate. It also becomes clear that both the security aspects are interrelated to each other to fulfill the notion of comprehensive security. In such circumstance, some scholars argued the idea of security as “dual concept of state security and human security” (Ladgaard, 1995:1-6). Some also argued that both security dimensions are not antagonistic but, complementing each other. (Anwar, 2003:565). Both have common responsibilities to fulfill i.e. security of individual human beings from a number of security threats.
Military Security Vs Human Security in Japan

Japan has been focusing more on its military security after the end of the Cold War as it found itself vulnerable.\(^1\) Japanese security planners were suspicious of the fact that US may throw out the security arrangements by following the Soviet disintegration. (Hypothetical enemy of Japan and US in the Far East). This sentiment also getting stronger and stronger in Japanese society, media, policymakers, bureaucrats, students, nationalists and in common Japanese people in the light of Article X of “US-Japan Security Treaty 1952).\(^2\) The debate among the Japanese security experts was that since the US has achieved its goal in terms of disintegration of Soviet Russia. US will move away from East Asian region or at least downsize its footprints in the region. In that worst scenario, Japan has to handle its security challenges form a ‘rogue state’- North Korea and rising China on its own. Situation became worse from nuclear holocaust that Japan is surrounded by two nuclear weapon states i.e. Soviet Russia and China “officially” and North Korea “unofficially”.

At the same time there was a greater debate that started in Japanese media, academia and Japanese society about Japanese involvement in UN Peace Keeping Operation (UNPKO) that, whether Japan should militarily participate in it or not because, it was crippled by Peace clause of its Constitution. The peace clause-Article 9 of Japanese Post war Constitution - prohibits Japan from “deployment of troops overseas” (See Appendix VI). A generational change in Japan was also pushing the country’s leadership to shun pacifist ideals of its constitution which they thought does not meet with the new security challenges and the regional realities. Therefore to overcome the existing gap, Japan initiated to revise the Constitution and revisited many of its security policies.

\(^1\) In the light of formation of “Ministry of Defense (MoD)” at the place of “Japan Defense Agency”. It is considered that formation of MoD became a landmark in the process of normalization of Japan militarily.

\(^2\) The Article X of the Treaty shall remain in force until in the opinion of the governments of the United States of America and Japan-there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance of international peace and security in Japan area. However, after the Treaty has been in force for ten years, either party may give notice to the other party of its intention to terminate the Treaty, in which case the Treaty shall terminate one year after such notice has been given.
While, on the other hand a number of crisis in external and internal front also compelling Japan to think beyond military security or anything related to military and stick with her ‘no military posture’. In such a way, rising unemployment, ageing population and natural disasters such as Kobe earthquake, pandemics such a SARS and other diseases forced Japan to think beyond military Security. All these together, unquestionably push Japan to think beyond military security.

On the human security front, Japan has done considerably remarkable about the defining, promoting, establishing and sustaining of human security worldwide. Japanese initiatives towards “Trust Fund for Human Security” alone can prove her initiatives. In such scenario a number of question arose that what is important for Japan either military security or human security.

Military Security in Japan

Prior to emphasizing that what is more significant for Japan either military security or human security, one must emphasize on military security and human security separately.

After unconditional surrender and nuclear devastation, Japan had less to deal with military after the WWII. Even after getting sovereignty in 1952, Japanese government had less meaning with anything related to military especially in the light of Article 9 (See Appendix-VI) of the post war Japanese constitution. After a period of time, Japan enjoyed “Free Ride” of US security arrangements under the provisions of US-Japan Security Treaty and “US Nuclear Umbrella”.

Since getting sovereignty in 1952 to till end of cold war, Japan had maintain status quo and only concentrated on economic development. With the end cold war, entire world began to take a deep breath and over through tension of nearly half a century ideological rivalry. That was the time when policymakers, academia, and strategist began to think beyond traditional notion of security. In that phase, a new security perception emerged at international platform with human face.
Apart from keeping herself away from anything related to military, Japan began to taking part in military aspects. In that phase, Japan started to participate in UNKPO ignoring the provisions of Japanese Constitution (See Appendix-VI).

The end of Cold War pressured and beginning of Gulf War placed Japan in a complicated condition. The US pushed Japan to play its role by committing troop’s deployment in Iraq. For Japan, deploying troops to combat or non-combat zone is clear violation of the ‘Article 9’ of its constitution (See Appendix-VI). The policy makers in Japan were also worried that its troop deployment overseas might affect its good relations with the Arab world and will also be a disturbing factor to its Asian neighbors. It was in this regard that the ruling Liberal Democratic Party’s (LDP) effort to send Japan’s Self Defense Forces (SDF) by enacting UN Peace Cooperation Bill in October 1990 failed to gain Diet’s Majority Approval. The central point of the opposition parties questioning the Law was whether the dispatch of SDF violates the principle of Article 9. The Japanese government was not able to defend its decision, given the fact that it already had taken a position in 1980 ‘that the SDF’s participation in the UN-led forces would be against Article 9 as it would include the use of weapons’ (Go Ito 2007:81).

Japan’s participation in the UNPKO for the first time in 1992 started Japanese intention of military security. Even when JSDF troops were deployed in Cambodia, whether it was militarization or not was an issue of debate but it was a great departure from its earlier position on Peace Keeping Operations (PKO) participation. At least the people and leadership in the neighboring countries viewed this move a step towards militarization.

In October 1990, when Japan was still amid the debate in the domestic front, China was first to voice its annoyance saying:

“the People of China and some other Asian countries can not but be concerned over the Japanese government’s plan to dispatch members of its SDF to [the] UN peace cooperation corps abroad as that unfortunate part of the history remains fresh in our minds...It is our hope that the Japanese government will deal with this matter prudently.”
The then Chinese President Yang Shang Kun, went as far as to say that dispatch would cause 'severe and emotional repulsion' among the Chinese people. (Dobson 2003)

When Japan was sending its Self Defense Forces (SDF) on a PKO in Cambodia first time ever after its defeat in World War II, Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore’s former Prime Minister, termed it as offering whisky chocolate to an alcoholic. He criticized the SDF dispatch saying-

“call it a PKO if you like, the overseas dispatch of the Self Defense Forces are like offering whiskey bon-bon to an alcoholic”.

Same story also repeated at the time of dispatching Japanese troops to Iraq. Chinese Communist League criticized that large scale military action has fundamentally undermined the Peace Constitution and pushed Japan a large step forward towards becoming a major military power” (BBC News).

North Korea too harshly criticized Japan’s moves. The ruling party’s newspaper, Nodong Sinmun stated that the talk in Tokyo of a revamp of Japan’s defense posture “reveals the aggressive nature of Japan turning to the right and heading for its militarization”.

The resentment expressed by the East Asian countries indicates that they are not worried about Japan’s participation in the UN; rather they fear that the momentum generated by the developments that started with Japan’s participation in UNPKO will continue with the unshackling of measures put in place to prevent it from becoming a military power. These statements suggest that Asian countries, which still bear the scars of Japanese aggression, view these developments as resurgence of Japan’s militarism.

But Japan’s expanding international security role necessarily created a financial burden on the country and it found certain difficulty to bear the cost to meet the need of health related problems of its ageing society.
Even “US-Japan Security Treaty 1952” and “US-Nuclear Umbrella” provide strong base for Japan to avoid anything related to military and concentrate on economic development, however, Japan has been focused greatly on military and decided to go for full fledge “Ministry of Defense” at the place of earlier “Japan Defense Agency”. This move becomes a landmark in the Japanese Defense policy that not only decides the future of military security but also decide the destiny of Japan.

It is well accepted fact that, military security and human security are inversely related with each other. Meaning, strengthening of military security decide the fate of human security and vice versa. In other words, strengthening of one will downsize the condition of others.

In due respect, Japan has been concentrated more on military security in the post cold war period that also indicated that concentrated less on human security front. At the first instance, it looks very charming that Japan initiated towards her normalization process. But it shows Japanese intention towards militarization.

**Human Security in Japan**

Japan is a unique case where Human Security and Military security debate started after the end of Cold War. When at the international level it was being debated that more than inter-state conflicts, intra-state violence and human suffering causes insecurity to a state, Japan was debating to augment its security profile by remilitarization and expanding its role in international Security. But one section of Japanese policy makers as well as security analysts were debating how to balance human security and military security. They took the argument of human security from the United Nations which defined human security as:

> “Human security means protecting vital freedoms. It means protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations, building on their strengths and aspirations. It also means creating systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood. Human security
connects different types of freedoms - freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to take action on one's own behalf. To do this, it offers two general strategies: protection and empowerment. Protection shields people from dangers. It requires concerted effort to develop norms, processes and institutions that systematically address insecurities. Empowerment enables people to develop their potential and become full participants in decision-making. Protection and empowerment are mutually reinforcing, and both are required in most situations” (UNDP:1994).

The same report argued that:

“Human security complements state security, furthers human development and enhances human rights. It complements state security by being people-centered and addressing insecurities that have not been considered as state security threats.”

The Japanese Policy wonks also adopted this definition and argued that:

“the traditional concept of “state security” alone, whose objective is to protect the boundaries and the people, is no longer sufficient. Indeed, the importance of state security will not and should not shrink at all, but additional responses are necessary to address diverse threats comprehensively, capturing the interlinkages among them from a human perspective. States, international institutions, civil society and NGOs must combine their efforts to respond effectively to these diverse and interconnected challenges”.

Keeping in view of the above, it became clear that human security was becoming a central pillar of Japanese foreign domestically and internationally. It also reflects in speeches a number of initiatives by contemporary Japanese policymakers.

In such circumstances, Murayama Tomiichi became the pioneer for introducing human security in Japan. The first step in that direction was taken by him at the UN Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen in March 1995. In this summit, the representatives from 118 countries discussed how to eliminate poverty and endorse employment and integration of society at large (Akira, 1998:77).
Murayama also emphasized that UN should also play an important role for world peace and prosperity. Individual human being was accorded the centre point in Murayama’s speech. And according to him, human being can be endangered by the threats like poverty, diseases and violence (Murayama Policy Speech, 1995).

A number of measures have been suggested to implement human security like; promotion of democracy and economic reforms, economic cooperation, humanitarian assistance, preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping operations, arms control and disarmament with regard to both nuclear weapons and conventional weapons such as anti-personnel landmines and small arms. Murayama’s endorsement of human security was in line with Japan’s UN policy.

Hashimoto Ryutaro replaced the then Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi, whose views were opposite of Murayama in various front however, he was also one of the great supporters of human security. Hashimoto’s speech in United Nations (UN) in June 23, 1997 emphasized environmental security (one of the seven security components identified in HDR 1994). His environmental aspects of security represented a non-traditional security aspect. His vision was to make Japan an advanced country in protecting the environment (Hashimoto Speech, 1997).

The key figure in Japan for the quest of human security is no doubt Prime Minister Obuchi Keizo. He declared that human security was going to be a key element in Japanese policy making in general and foreign policy in particular (Hiroshi, 2004:50). He ‘took it as his baby, since the concept was consonant with his ideas’ (Yamamoto Speech, 2004).

Obuchi emphasized human security on a various front like campaign against landmines, health care, environmental issues, economic front and many more. Regarding this, he became pioneer in early ratification of the Treaty Against Landmines, suggested formation of “A Trust Fund for Human Security” also emphasized on the importance of paying attention to “Social Safety Nets” in International Cooperation (MOFA, ODA and
the Asian Currency and Financial Crisis, 1998). This approach became a key element in
Japanese human security policy. It became clear from Obuchi’s speeches that human
security revolves very much around one of the core values that is human security is not a
concern with weapons but is a concern with human life and dignity. Due to
extraordinary efforts and commitment to human security and establishment of a Human
Security Fund by Obuchi, Koffi Annan said, Japan would undoubtedly have a lifetime
seat if there were such a thing as a ‘Human Security Council’ (Annan, 1999).

Soon after Obuchi resigned, Mori Yoshihiro became the Prime Minister of Japan. He was
also an activist in human security aspects. According to Ministry of Foreign Affairs
(MOFA), Mori had indulged in a number of activities related to human security like:

After the Mori reign, Koizumi Jun’ichiro became the PM of Japan. But, Koizumi did not
pay much attention like earlier Prime Ministers (PMs). However, Koizumi started human
security process in the Commission on human security.

After that, Shinzo Abe, Yasuo Fukuda and Yukio Hatoyama served as PM. Their terms
of office were too short that their personal interests and activities did not reflect in their
policies as the legacies continued by their descendent. Further, what the present PM Kan
Naoto would achieve would be known only after a while.

Balancing Military Security and Human Security Japan

From the very beginning, Japan has shown her keen interests in the elements of human
security. For that instance, Japanese government has done noticeable in promoting human
security worldwide. Japanese government was one of the first members to adopt human
security as her policy tool. For that one, Japanese government has adopts, “Freedom from
want” as her policy tool rather than “Freedom from fear” as her Canadian counterpart has
adopted. Japanese initiatives and eagerness towards human security also became visible
in a number of contemporary prime ministers policies. Japanese prime ministers has took
a number of initiatives to promote and stabilize human security world wide and due to
their endless efforts, human security became a policy tool of many countries globally. Japanese initiatives towards anti personal landmines, healthcare system, financial and technical support to other underdeveloped country became a parameter to show the Japanese efforts towards establishing human security. The formation of “Trust Fund for Human Security” became a milestone of Japanese initiatives to promote human security.

Japan has stick with human security from very beginning and has less meaning with anything related to military security. After getting sovereignty in 1952, Japan only emphasized on economic development and not military or anything related to military. In that period, Japan was enjoying ‘free ride’ of the provision of “US-Japan Security Treaty” and “US Nuclear Umbrella”.

But after the end of cold war, Japan again started its move towards militarization. In reality, a number of factors decide Japanese movement towards her remilitarization process. Some of them are internal and more are external in nature.

As US now wants a strategic partner rather than dependent in East Asia, thus US started pushing Japan for pacifist constitutional amendment and provisions for SDF deployment overseas. East Asian Security arrangements also provoke Japan to think again and again about this. As Japan is surrounded by three nuclear state, two of them USSR and China are officially nuclear power while North Korea is an unofficial nuclear power. Historically, Japan had island disputes with all of its neighbors. Recently, North Korean Missile Tests in Sea of Japan again made the entire thing really worse and compelled Japan to think about military security in the case of “Article 10” of “US-Japan Security Treaty”. In such circumstances, Japan has nothing but to go for constitutional amendment. Japanese defense expenditure also creating nuisance in East Asia. Though, Japanese government almost always follows the guidelines regarding defense expenditure of the ceiling of 1% (of total GDP) however, that one percent is also huge amount of money that places Japan a rank holder in defense expanding. Formation of “Ministry of Defense” at the place of “Japan Defense Agency” also shows Japanese intention towards normalization and remilitarization.
Conclusion

From the beginning of Westphalian state system, security in international politics was hijacked by Realists and interpreted in Realists way. In that scenario, security generally denoted security of state or in simple terms, military security. But, that security discourse does not interprets overall security. For filling the gap in between traditional military security and providing more security to individuals, a new security dimension has emerged in the post cold war era named “human security”.

From the very beginning, it is considered that the term human security is not feasible in any condition and may be able to manipulate entire security discourse. A number of strategists, academicians and policymakers also emphasize that both military security and human security have different connotations and there is nothing common between them. They also criticized that human security become override hard core security matter if it adopted as nation’s policy.

However, after a micro level analysis of both the notions, one can conclude that military security and human security bears some diverse, common and assorted substance in between them. As of now, most of the strategist and pro human security factions agreed that human security and military security, both are essential for human beings. They also emphasized that human security and military security are inversely related to each other. In that case strengthening of military security will negatively affect human security and vice versa. In that case, maintaining balance between human security and military security is state’s responsibility because both are necessary for human development.

As military security provides favorable environment to sustain long-term national developmental agenda without fear of being interrupted by any disruption. On the other hand human security in returns also provides a strong foundation for military security. In fact, strengthening of human security directly reduces the burden of military security. In such case military security and human security both are complementing not confronting each other.
The Japanese who had experienced firsthand devastation during World War II have driven with a strong sense of pacifism that has characterized Japan’s local and international policies for the last half a century. But, in the post cold war period, Japan emphasized more on military security. A number of factors pushed Japan to think about her non-military postures. Due to less internal and more external pressure, Japan structured her own “Ministry of Defense” at the place of “Japan Defense Agency”. Apart from the “Ministry of Defense”, Japanese deployment of SDF overseas also indicates Japanese eagerness towards militarization even if constitution prohibit for the same.

On the other hand, Japan has done noticeable in human security front for defining, promoting, and establishing worldwide. Promoting “Freedom from Want” aspect of human security directly indicates that Japan is also keen towards promoting human security. Formation of “Trust Fund for Human Security” was another signpost of Japan in that direction.

After the occupational period, Japan emphasized more on the elements of human security. It happens because, the policymakers and common Japanese has experienced first hand nuclear devastation. That menace regulated entire policies in post war Japan. But, as the generation of people whose pacifism is based on such experience is nearly gone, Japan needs to develop a new motivation for pacifism. At the same time, Japan is trying to secure its position in an ever-changing world and finding that human security offers a framework for a future-oriented pragmatic pacifism in Japanese politics. The evolution of the human security concept into a pillar of Japanese foreign policy thus reflects Japan’s quest to solidify its position in the international community as a “global civilian power” and it is hoped that the present DPJ government will shift the clock back to human security as it is not seriously considering military security on its agendas.