CHAPTER-3

DETERMINANTS OF JAPANESE POLICIES TOWARDS
HUMAN SECURITY

Introduction

Any concept generally is determined by a number of factors and basics. As such human security is also not an exception. The entire notion of human security is determined by a number of prominent factors and approaches. These approaches can play an exceptionally noteworthy character to shape human security anywhere across the globe including Japan as well.

Therefore, the third chapter of this thesis entitled, "Determinants of Japanese Policies Towards Human Security", describes various decisive and influential factors in all its dimensions. In such respects, it will discuss the operational areas of human security i.e. external and internal factors for determining needs and its prospects. Further, it will emphasize more on the formative structure of human security. Apart from human security, this chapter would deal with other institutions as determinants of concept. It will also give emphasis to policy-making process for successful achievement of human security. Lastly, it will consider human security as a tool of Japanese foreign policy.

Determinants of Human Security

It has already been mentioned that human security is determined by a number of approaches. However, for the purpose of convenience, these approaches can be broadly categorized in different stages as:

1. Conceptual Level
2. Constitutional Level
3. Organizational Level
4. Policy Level
5. Implementation Level
This categorization of determining factors of human security is extensive in nature and holds different theoretical aspect of human security as a whole in general and Japanese case in particular. This categorization can be broadly described in the following ways:

1. Conceptual Level

i. Freedom from Fear and Freedom from Want

Regarding the factors that determine the concept, the foremost determinants of human security in any nation is related to its two core approaches i.e. ‘Freedom from Fear’ and ‘Freedom from Want’. Although, UNDP Report 1994, argued that human security requires attention to both of its approaches, however, over a period of time these two approaches emerged as two different ‘schools of thought’.

Even if these two schools of thought are considered complementary to each rather than contradictory (Axworthy, 1997:183-96), however, it became major signpost to establish priority between them. The UNDP Report 1994 itself defined ‘Freedom from Fear’ and ‘Freedom from Want’ as safety from chronic threat such as hunger, disease and repression as well as protection from sudden and harmful disruption in the pattern of daily life” (HDR, 1994:22). In short, the first part of the definition provided by UNDP 1994, i.e. freedom from fear is a narrow ‘concept of human security’, and emphasize only violence related threats (Marie, 2008:81), (Krause, 1998:126), (Lodgaard, 2000: 1-25), (Tuchman, 1989:162-7) and (Thomas, 1987). Indirectly this dimension of security includes threats from landmines, small arms and inter or intra state conflict. This school of thought also recognizes that the violent threats are strongly related to poverty and social inequalities. Such threats are manageable through emergency assistance, conflict prevention, resolution and peace building.

On the other hand, the second part of the definition, ‘Freedom from Want’ is broader concept of human security and integrates more areas than freedom from fear. This school of thought advocates a holistic approach in achieving human security and includes
protection from threats of hunger, disease and natural disasters, because these are the root cause of human insecurity and also exterminate far more individual than warfare, genocide and terrorism combined. This approach of human security emphasizes threats beyond violence and also highlights that narrower concept of human security threats can be controlled through development and security with an appropriate mechanism. This is also very important that the ‘freedom from fear’ approach only denotes violence related threats, however, the freedom from want includes violence related threats and many more. UNDP 1994 Report itself identifies that these two approaches are equally imperative for the well being of individuals across the globe.

According to the nature and scope, almost all the countries chose their own path of development in between these two approaches. Canada, Norway and many more countries have chosen freedom from fear rather than freedom from want approaches for their development; while, Japan chooses freedom from want approach to human security.

Japan adopts a slightly different approach to human security than the Canadian and Norwegian one. The Government of Japan’s initial activism towards human security can be found in the speech of the then Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi. 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 (Akira, 1998:77). It was projected that human security became a key notion but finally was rejected due to opposition by some countries. However, Murayama Tomiichi supported human-centered social development (Murayama’s Speech 1995). After that Hashimoto Ryutaro’s concept of Global Human Security and especially emphasizes on environmental security was again related to freedom from want approach of human security. Obuchi Keizo and Koizumi Junichiro tried to establish freedom from want approach through bilateral relations. After that, Shinzo Abe and Yasuo Fukuda served as PM. Their terms were too short as such their personal interests and activities did not reflect in their policies rather than the legacies continued by their preceders.
Japanese policymakers considered human security as much broader a concept that sharply contrasts with Canadian formulations. Japanese Officials do not intend to view human security only as freedom from fear. In these sense, Japan sets its agenda in a similar way as UNDP approach. (Diplomatic Blue Book, Japan, 1999).

It is believed that freedom from want is no less critical than freedom from fear. Justifying, its point, Japanese Foreign Officials argue that so long as its objectives are to ensure the survival and dignity of individuals as human beings, it is also necessary to go beyond thinking of human security solely in terms of protecting human life in conflict situation.

Thus, human security for Japan comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity similar to UNDP approach of human security including all its aspects as far like; environmental degradation, violation of Human Rights, transnational Crimes, Illicit Drug Control, Refugees, Poverty and infectious disease like AIDS, including the aspects under the freedom from fear approach.

Other Conceptual Determining Factors

Apart from the core approaches of human security i.e. freedom from fear and freedom from want, there are other factors that also play crucial role in determining human security. Scholars argue that human security is primarily a phenomenon of economic development, institutional quality, geography or some other combination (Frankel, 1998) (Frankel and Romer: 1999) and (Marie, 2008:80). Although, the link between economic development and human security has not been formed, however, economic development is an important factor in enabling the state to influence elements of human security, such as law enforcement, education, and health care as well as national defense. Some scholars argue that correlation of these factors increase or sustain human security. In that statement, they put economy, institution, and geography of the state at the center for determining human security.
In this sequel, most of the scholars accept that geographical location of the country has an important role in shaping human security. Even Machiavelli (1519) and Montesquieu (1750) also postulate that climate and geography play cardinal role in economic development as well as in the development of cultures and institutions. (Sachs and Warner, 1995 and 1997) also find landlocked status has negative role in economic development and finally the status of human security. The importance of geographical location becomes clear in the North-South Debate. The countries located in northern hemisphere have more human security than these located in southern hemisphere. Further, all 44 landlocked countries in the world stand below in the average Human Security Index excluding Switzerland and Vatican City. This shows that how geographical location matters in determining factor of human security in any region and any country.

Being located in North Hemisphere, Japan has additional benefits in this sense. Japan is an island country and its territorial boundaries are open for free trade, so definitely, Japan has no such drawback on the geographical location as other landlocked countries are facing on this front. Geographical location of Japan provides her additional advantages for free trade and better connectivity through sea that finally boost Japanese economy by providing resources for education and health facilities that affect human security status.

Second determining factor in this sequel is related to the form of administration. As it is already clear that only government policies can enhance the status of human security; thus the type of administration in the concerned countries are more relevant in deciding human security status. Countries with democracy hold high rank in Human Security Index and low in such countries facing military coup, civil war and also run by communist perspectives. Even political instability can also create human security problems (Lonergan, 2000:69).

Japan has adopted parliamentary democracy with constitutional Monarchy after unconditional surrender in World War II. Although, Japanese present Constitution was not framed by Japanese themselves, nevertheless, democratic orientation of Japanese
Constitution played an essential role in establishing human security. Even in practice for the last more than half a century, a single political party ruled Japan. The political stability boosts economy and human security of the concerned countries.

Some scholars argue that linguistic and religious diversity also play a crucial role in determining human security. Marie emphasizes that Ethno-linguistic diversity or ethnic fractionalization has negative consequence on human security (Marie, 2008:94). Some scholars also argue that countries with larger Catholic population have lower human security while, Protestants score higher on the Human Security Index. Further, they mentioned that countries having large Muslim population have less human security than other states (Fearon and Laitin, 2003:1-6). They also argue that, the clash in between religious group in any country brings political instability that finally leads to low human security. Some times, nationality status and ethnicity also operate Human Security Index especially in the case of refugee and migrated skilled or unskilled workers.

A number of religions are practiced in Japan, but majority of followers are Shinto or Buddhism. Constitutionally, Japan allows religious freedom even for minority religions like Christianity and Islam in Japan.

Table No. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Followers in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shintoism</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total adherents exceeds 100% because many people belong to both Shintoism and Buddhism (World Fact book, 2005).

Majority of Japanese practice Shinto and Buddhism simultaneously but do not consider themselves as believers in any particular religion. In that case Japanese are not hardliners about their religious faith. They practice a fusion or blending of religious ideas that is commonly known as syncretism. Simply, religion does not play a significant role in
Japanese activities and life. This situation provides Japan an added advantage for her overall development without the clash on religious front inside the country. At least, Japan may not face political instability and clash or civil war on the issue of religious practices. Many Japanese are also turning to popular religions commonly called ‘New Religion’. These religions draw on the concept of Shinto, Buddhism and folk superstition and have developed in part to meet the social needs of elements of the population. The largest new religion is Soka Gakkai. After a period of time, this new religion also influenced Japanese politics with the formation of political party like New Komeito Party. However, on the concept of separation of church and state, the party’s connection with religion is often criticized in political sphere, media and also by among common Japanese.

On the other hand nationality or ethnic groups are not diverse in Japan. Most of them are Japanese nationals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality or Ethnic group in Japan</th>
<th>Population in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Foreigners or other ethnic groups are less in number. So there is no scope for clash between diverse ethnic groups within the country. Japan has plus point on religious and ethnic fractions that one sect is in full majority and others are like negligible. In such flexible circumstances related to religion in Japan, and with the over mentioned ratio of Japanese and other ethnic groups, no one can predict that a major clash can occur in near future. These situations also push political stability that finally leads path to economic development and high human security.
Apart from the above mentioned factors, scholars consider that Area, Climate, Terrain, Natural Resources, Agricultural land, Water Resources, Natural Disasters, Population, Population Growth Rate, Birth Rate, Death Rate, Urbanization, Sex Ratio, Literacy, Education Expenditure, Life Expectancy and Infant Mortality Rate are the leading factors for determining human security in any region or country.

2. Constitutional Level

Constitution of any country is a set of rules for government—often called written document—that limits the powers and function of political entity. These set of rules together constitute the fundamental political principles, establishing the structure, procedures, powers and duties of the government of the concerned country. Simply, constitution refers to a set of rules and principles that defines the nature and extent of the government of concerned country.

In this regard, constitution of any country is a foremost source of deriving and establishing any policy. That can affect internal and external policies of any country directly or indirectly. Human security is also not an exception. As it is already mentioned that the form of government is one of the key derivatives of human security. The form of government in any country is an interpretation about the nature of constitution.

In the case of Japan, the constitution became a prominent document in describing and establishing any policy related to human security because of its unique features. Although present constitution was forced on Japan by the allied power, however, the constitution’s exceptional features differentiate it from other constitutions in the world. Some of the features that are pushing-up human security are:

I. Preface of the Constitution.
II. Article 9 of the Constitution.
III. Article 14 of the Constitution.
I. Preface of the Constitution.

Related to constitutional level determining factors of human security in Japan, the first one is Preface of the Constitution. One can trace the roots of human security in Japanese Constitution’s Preface (See Appendix-VI) very easily in following way;

1. The Preface of Japanese constitution focusing on opposite to orthodox notion of security.
2. It also emphasizes that Japan will never again visit the horrors of war through the action of government.
3. Preface also rejects and revokes all kind of constitutions, laws ordinances and scripts emphasizing on military.
4. Preface also striving for the preservation of peace and the banishment of tyranny and slavery.
5. It also recognizes that people of the world have right to live in peace and free from fear and want.

Above mentioned features of Japanese Constitution in the Preface reflect its deep concern about the notion of human security. The first feature emphasizes on apposite to the orthodox notion of security and provides space for the security of individuals. Same notion also applies in case of human security. Secondly, the Preface also focuses that Japan will go through the peaceful cooperation with other nations rather than war. This again criticizes the sovereign right of state and placing individual security in the center rather than the state security. Thirdly, it also argues that Japan would reject all kinds of laws and ordinance related to military, that directly paves the space for the elements of human security. Fourthly, the Preface also emphasizes that all persons have basic rights to do what ever they want in improvement and development of their status and personality. The banishment of tyranny and slavery clearly indicates that, the constitution is not going to put any restrain to its citizen like tyranny or slavery or other social evil. So that, every citizen can avail equal opportunity to shape individual life in a positive way. Last but not least, the fifth one undoubtedly argues about the peace i.e. the basic human
need for the development and also shows the elements of human security in Japanese written document. This one recognizes that people of the world have right to live in peace and also be free from want and fear. This notion appears in Japanese Constitution more than half a century ago than the term human security coined in the international sphere. It also reflects that the elements of human security are already become deciding factors in any policy (internal or external) related to Japan.

II. Article 9 of the Constitution

The second determining factor of human security is Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. Article 9 is more elaborated interpretation of the Preface of the Japanese Constitution that reads as:

Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

The above mentioned Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution is a clause that prohibits an act of war by the state. Formally, the first part of this Article renounces war as sovereign right and bans the settlement of international disputes through the use of force. Simply, the first part of the Article states that Japan will use negotiation and cooperation with other states to resolve international disputes rather than exercise of force or war.

The second part of the Article again emphasizes that Japan will never maintain Land, Sea and Air Force as well as other war potential. This part of the Article dramatically compelled Japan to think beyond anything related to military, war and warfare.
Again, the Japanese constitution not only renounces war and bans having war potential but also has attached a distinctive caveat in the form of Article 96. Article 96 of the Japanese Constitution stipulates that, "a two-third majority is needed in the Diet" and a "referendum" has to be held in order to amend any provision in the constitution. Clearly, this article became another exceptional attribute of the constitution that strongly accentuate beyond the orthodox notion of security.

Article 9 and Article 96 of the Japanese constitution (See Appendix-VI) together provide a matchless position and also provide outstanding nomenclature like "Pacifist Constitution" and article 9 commonly known as "No War Clause". Because, both the Articles create vacuum in Japanese military. There is absence of anything related to military in security perspectives placing the elements of human security in the center of Japanese Foreign Policy.

Apart from the internal dimension like military, Article 9 has also broad implication for Foreign Policy, the Institution of Judicial Review as exercised by Supreme Court, the status of Self-Defense Forces, the nature and tactics of opposition politics and also in the policymaking for its own citizens.

It is a general belief that countries are in high Human Development Index where there is no combat, coup or military conflict than the countries facing such menace. As constitution prohibits Japan to participate in war, maintain war potential or particular army even for self-defense, in that case there is no ambiguity that Japan will face internal nuisance.

In short, pacifist constitution constrained to pay no attention to anything related to military and perceive other concept related to the enhancement and up-gradation of the status of individuals in Japan. This motivation towards the individual has human security elements that determine any policy external or internal adequately.
III. Article 14 of the Constitution.

Article 14 of the Japanese Constitution relating to Rights and Duties of the People is another determining factor at the constitutional level regarding human security. Article 14 reads as follows;

All the people are equal under the law and there shall be no discrimination in political, economic or social relations because of race, creed, sex, social status or family origin.

Peers and peerage shall not be recognized.

No privilege shall accompany any award of honor, decoration or any distinction, nor shall any such award be valid beyond the lifetime of the individual who now holds or hereafter may receive it. (Article 14 of Japanese Constitution).

Article 14 itself offers political, economic and community security (from the human security components). In such circumstances, Japanese policy makers are bound to guarantee human security components through constitutional obligation in the light of Article 14.

Thus, the preface, Article 9 and Article 14 of the Japanese constitution play pivotal role in determining factors related to human security. They, obligate Japanese policymakers to pay attention only on those policies which have human face and can establish social harmony and secure human security.

3. Organizational Level

The third major determining factor towards human security in Japan is clubbing under the title “Organizational Level”. Organizations that determine the fate of human security in Japan have different faces including governmental legal and non-governmental organization and also organizations formed by two countries. In that sequel following organizations play fundamental role in determining human security in Japan.
i. Ministry of Defense (MOD)

ii. Self Defense Forces (SDF)

iii. The Commission on Human Security

i. Ministry of Defense.

Human security is the concept that usually shows a relationship with orthodox notion of security and its policy-making body commonly known as Ministry of Defense. Though human security is not neglecting the concept of military security however, this one already establishes that military security and human security are inversely related to each other. It indicates that if one is strengthened, it will negatively affect the other and vice versa. In that case, Ministry of Defense became the organizational level determining factor of human security in any country. In the case of Japan, the foremost determining factor under the organizational level is Ministry of Defense earlier known as Japan Defense Agency (JDA) from July 1, 1954 onwards (Tatsumi and Jimbo, 2007).

In view of the Article 9 of the constitution, Japan can not posses war potential including full fledge military. But, according to the Realist perspectives in international politics, Japan chose to establish Japan Defense Agency in 1954. Though, it is unconstitutional but legal. The organizational structure and operational activities of the Japan Defense Agency is not military as is the practice in other Ministry of Defense of other countries. Its activities are thoroughly humanizing the status of human security.

However, a great shift occurred on January 9, 2007, when Japan Defense Agency (JDA) became the Ministry of Defense (MoD). That status compelled Japan to emphasize more on military aspects. Many Constitution experts and strategists opined that this status was long overdue, to make Japan a normal country with defense capabilities. Some contrary opinion also flashes that Japan only changed the name of JDA to MoD. However, a closer look towards the MoD says another story that MoD is the largest organ of the Japanese Government with nearly 300,000 troops. That number excludes the US Forces in Japan. Further, military budgets (See Appendix-VII) in a year also tell another story
about Japan’s MoD. A positive move towards strengthening military shows the decreasing status of human security.

ii. Self Defense Forces

Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF) occasionally called Self-Defense Forces (SDF) is unified military forces of Japan. JSDF personnel are technically civilians and called special civil servants in uniform. JSDF has no military secrets and military law. Offence committed by military personnel, whether on-base or off-base, on-duty or off-duty or a military or non-military in nature are adjudicated under normal procedure by civil courts. Further, JSDF has very limited capabilities to operate overseas and lack highly destructive weapons. Again JSDF has very low budget (1% of total GDP) (See Appendix-VII). In such a way, JSDF shows its real pacifist nature and also ideal as its name.

However, above mentioned information shows just one side of the coin and hides the actual picture. Constitutionally, Japan can not possess war potential including military capabilities. However, the actual military capabilities of Japan became an eye-opener for those, who considered Japan as a peaceful country without military capabilities.

Table No. 8
Military Capabilities of Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position in World</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Defense Budget</td>
<td>44,300,000,000 USD</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Active Military</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Land Base Weapon System</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Towed Artillery</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Navy ships</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Submarines</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Destroyer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Navy Frigate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Navy Mine Ware fare Craft</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Air Borne System</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above facts are from CIA Fact book, USA accessed through Internet as on April 1, 2010.
The above mentioned data are just expressing the existing Japanese military position and elaborating at least one fact that Japan has enough military capabilities and military arsenal even if, Japan is bound to be pacifist constitutionally. Further, it is also very clear that even Japan is spending a minimal (1% of total GDP) percentage of her budget on defense, however, that one percent of total GDP is enough amount of money that make Japan number sixth in the world in defense spending (See Appendix-VII). Again, constitutionally, Japan is bound to not deploy her Self Defense Personnel to overseas, however, nearly in the last two decades; Japan has sent her SDF to a number of countries like East Timor, Golan Height and Cambodia. However, Japan justified it on humanitarian ground that these deployments of SDF are not in combat zone and strictly according to the Japanese pacifist constitution.

Another landmark occurred in the deployment of SDF overseas in 2003 when the then Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro justified the decision to deploy the SDF in Iraq (in a combat zone) with the following three points;

1. To send the SDF to Iraq is to help Iraq people and support international cooperation.
2. The SDF would be offering humanitarian assistance and would not be using force.
3. It is important for Japan’s international relations with the US (Hashimoto, 2009:2).

All these points directly supported the deployment of SDF in Iraq that is against the Japanese constitution and also against the Japanese sentiments (as 31% of the respondents are against the deployment according to a survey conducted by Ashahi Shimbun in 2003). Further, Japan spends 1% of her total GDP on defense, however, also supported Iraq war through ‘Cheque Book Diplomacy’.

The above mentioned facts and arguments clearly emphasize Japan’s changing intention from pacifism to a normal country that again directly undermines the status of human security in Japan keeping in view that strengthening the military will negatively affect
human security. As SDF is official representation of military in Japan and strengthening or deployment of SDF overseas shows that now it is playing a crucial role in Japanese policy-making. This simply indicates that human security has been undermined in Japanese policy-making.

iii. Commission on Human Security

The next factor determining human security in Japan under the organizational level is the Commission on Human Security. For promoting human security across the globe, Japan took her first initiative in 2001 in the formation of Commission on Human Security (CHS). The Commission on Human Security was the product of Government of Japan in response to the then UN General Secretary-General’s call at the 2000 Millennium Summit for a world “free of want” and “free of fear” and this summit was co-chaired by former UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Mrs. Sadako Ogata and Nobel Laureate Prof. Amartya Sen with following three goals:

1. to promote public understanding, engagement and support of human security and its underlying imperatives;
2. to develop the concept of human security as an operational tool for policy formulation and implementation; and
3. to propose a concrete program of action to address critical and pervasive threats to human security (MOFA, 2001).

The Commission on human security became the most important signpost to show the keen interest and involvement of Japan in strengthening human security worldwide. Further, this Commission achieved its aim to draw attention of policy-makers through its certain achievements. Those achievements were the other determining factors in the process of formation of the Commission on Human Security like:

1. Advisory Board on Human Security (ABHS) formed on 31 May 2003 to carry forward the recommendation of CHS to the other members of the Board and advise UN Secretary-General on;
2. Human Security Unit (HSU) formed in September 2004 to facilitate a UN unit named Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and major objective of HSU to integrate human security in all UN activities. The HSU is also responsible for managing the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security.

3. In the whole process, CHS held five meetings in New York, Tokyo, Stockholm, Bangkok and in Tokyo.


5. Finally, this Commission presented its Report on May 1, 2003 by Co-Chairs of the Commission Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen under the title, "Human Security Now," to the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan with the following main proposals:

   • Protecting people in violent conflict
   • Protecting people from the proliferation of arms
   • Supporting the security of the people on the move
   • Establishing human security transition funds for the post-conflict situations
   • Encouraging fair trade and markets to benefit the extreme poor
   • Working to provide minimum living standards everywhere
   • According higher priority to ensuring universal access healthcare
   • Developing an efficient and equitable global system for patent rights
   • Empowering all people with universal basic education
   • Clarifying the need for a global human identity while respecting the freedom of individuals to have diverse identities and affiliations (Human Security Now, 2003).
Even if Japan possesses enough military capabilities by going against the basics of its constitution and provide more than enough budget to sustain those capabilities, however, the Japanese role in the international conference and media about the recognition of the Commission of Human Security was another landmark in the establishment of human security. And Japanese initiatives were appreciable.

4. Policy Level

The fourth determining factor of human security in Japan continued under the title “Policy Level”. These are the policies accepted by Japanese Government over a period that affect the actual status of human security in Japan directly or indirectly. Policy level determining factors contains a numbers of sub-titles like

1. Japan’s Defense Policy
2. The Three Non-Nuclear Principals
3. US-Japan Security treaty
4. Japan’s ODA Charter
5. MOFA
6. JICA
7. Human Security Trust Fund
8. Budget

1. Japan’s Defense Policy

It is already established that realist perspective of security is perversely related to the status of human security. In fact, the goals of the national defense fix the exact place for the human security and military security. In that circumstance, the defense policy of any country shows the actual situation of human security in the concerned country. In this sequel, the factors determining human security in Japan at next level is Japan’s Defense Policy. Japan also adopted her defense policy to attain two goals:
i. Defense of Japan
ii. Prevention of emergence of threats by improving regional and international security environment (Ministry of Defense, Japan)

Keeping in view the above mentioned two goals, Japan adopted her Basic Policy on Defense in May 1957 emphasizing on;

i. Support the United Nations activities and promote international cooperation to achieve world peace;
ii. Stabilize the people’s livelihood and establish the foundations for national security;
iii. Establish effective defense capabilities;

Apart from the basic defense policy adopted in 1957 Japan also adopted other policies from time to time that became the major landmark in establishing the appropriate military and human security both:

i. Exclusively defense oriented policies
ii. Not becoming a military power posing a threat to other countries
iii. Three non-nuclear principals
iv. Ensuring civilian control (Ministry of Defense, Japan)

The National Basic Policy on Defense and other policies are only to justify and satisfy the national goals that are mentioned earlier. Japan also tried to achieve these goals with three different approaches:
Table No. 9

Japanese Approaches and Activities Towards Human Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | Japan’s own Efforts | • Prevention of any threat from reaching the country directly by utilizing all available means.  
• Integrated response by swiftly appropriate decision and bringing together all relevant organizations such as SDF, Police and Coast Guard.  
• Improvement of the international security to prevent the emergence of threats through diplomatic and other activities.  
• Development of multi-functional, flexible and effective Defense Force. |
| 2.   | Cooperation with Alliance Partner | • The Japan-US Security Arrangements are indispensable in ensuring Japan’s security and critically important to peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region.  
• Close cooperative relationship between Japan and the US plays an important role in preventing new threats and diverse contingencies.  
• Proactive engagement in strategic dialogue with the US  
• Efforts to strengthen the Japan-US Security Arrangement |
| 3.   | Cooperation International Community | • Active engagement in diplomatic efforts including the strategic use of ODA  
• Proactive participation in international peace cooperation activities  
• Making efforts to stabilize the region from the Middle East to East Asia through various cooperatives efforts in conjugation with other countries sharing common security interest  
• Active efforts for the reform of the UN  
• Promoting the development of a multilateral regional framework for security such as ARF |

*The approaches and activities are from MOD, Japan accessed on 04-04-2010 through its website.

The above mentioned Japanese Defense Policies, goals of the defense, approaches and their activities to fulfill the defense objectives evidently and undoubtedly indicate that Japan has no intention to be an offensive nation, however, her intention to sort out the international conflict through the engagement of international community and through
dialogue rather than war like situation. Japanese defense policy is heavily based upon the theory of complex interdependence rather than Offensive or Defensive Realism. In that case one easily can say that if defense policy is not compelling Japan to be a military superpower and that situation indirectly states an environment towards establishing and strengthening the status of human security.

ii. Japan's Nuclear Policy

Japan is the only country in the human history that faced nuclear catastrophe twice during the World War II. Those devastations lead strong antinuclear sentiments in Japanese culture, society, politics and in their policies. All these together compelled Japan to keep herself unaligned anything related to nuclear. In that circumstance, Japan kept herself out of the picture in nuclear race or nuclear arms race and joined International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in July 1957 and signed Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1970.

For need and steady supply of energy, Japan also opted for nuclear energy under the title “Atoms for Peace” with heavy self restrictions formulated her nuclear policies. Japan adopted the nuclear policies in 1967-68 under the then Prime Minister Eisako Sato to attain (1) the peaceful use of nuclear energy, (2) three non-nuclear principles i.e. not to posses, not to manufacture and not to introduce nuclear weapons on the Japanese ground, (3) the promotion of nuclear disarmament and (4) the reliance on the U.S. nuclear deterrent against international nuclear threats.

Even if Japan chose to go nuclear, however, her nuclear policies are heavily based on active use of nuclear energy rather than passive use of nuclear energy. Japan’s non-nuclear principals clearly indicate her anti-nuclear sentiments. The third and fourth nuclear polices again documented Japan’s keen anti-nuclear sentiments. Further, Japan’s nuclear policies again directly established human security.
US-Japan Security Treaty

In the post war period, when Japan was in the process to achieve her sovereignty, US also tried to counter China and Soviet Union as both the nations emerged stronger after the WWII. While allaying with Japan US tried to maintain a balance of power in the world politics especially in the Asia Pacific region. In that process, US and Japan signed a mutual security treaty on September 8, 1951- also called San Francisco Treaty-again both the countries signed Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement on 8 March 1954 that brought Japan under the US Security Umbrella (MOFA’s Press release about Treaty signed by Japan).

Article I and VIII of the US-Japan Security Treaty again concentrating upon common security, promoting international security and also focusing on economic stability i.e. essential for world peace are also the determining factors of human security. Actually, the US-Japan Security Treaty provides Japan a more secure place internally as well as externally. This was essential for the establishment and endorsement of human security in the Japanese policy.

Japan’s ODA Charter

Due to the high growth period, Japan managed to be the first nation in Asia to become a developed country. It also leads to Japanese Official Development Assistance (ODA) disbursal to developing countries. Japan obtained approval of ODA Charter by the cabinet in 1992 which became the foundation of Japan’s foreign aid policy for more than a decade. Japan approved and adopted her aid policies with the objectives that ODA can contribute to peace and development of the international community, and thereby to help ensure Japan’s own security and prosperity (Togo, 2005).

Japan has utilized its ODA to actively support economic and social infrastructure development, human resource development, and institution building in developing economies. Further, it also plays key role in humanitarian problems like extreme poverty,
famine, refugee crisis, natural disaster, environment and water related issues. Additionally, Japanese ODA also prevented conflicts and terrorism and became an efforts to build peace as well as efforts to foster democratization, protect human rights and dignity of individuals.

In that regard, Japan accepted the revised ODA Charter to meet human security guidelines in 2003 with certain policies like:

1. Supporting self-help efforts of developing countries by good governance, cooperation for their human resource development, institution building including development of legal system and economic and social infrastructure building that are essential to pursue peace, democratization and protection of human rights.

2. Japanese ODA is not only focusing on direct individual threats like conflicts, disasters, infectious diseases, but also emphasizes that ODA will strengthen the capacity of local communities through human resource development. Thus Japanese ODA is also working on human security perspectives.

3. Japan provided assistance in sectors like education, health care and welfare, water and sanitation, agriculture that supports human and social development in the developing countries which are the basis of improving human security in any country.

4. Japanese ODA also addressing issues like global warming, environmental problems, infectious disease, population, food energy, natural disaster, terrorism, drug and international organized crime. Those are again great threat to human security.

5. Japan also focused on the region according to the need of that particular region. In that circumstance, Japan chooses according to priority like East Asia, ASEAN region, Central Asia, Caucasus region, Africa, Middle East and Latin America (MOFA, 2003)
In the light of the Japanese ODA Charter and ODA Policies, one can easily conclude that Japan had fully adopted the human security elements in her ODA policies even if the term human security was not coined in the international sphere. Certainly, from the last more than a decade became a fair example of Japan’s keen interest in promoting human security in almost all part of the world especially underdeveloped region like Central Asia, Sub-Saharan Region, Latin American Region, and Middle East.

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)**

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Japan is a key ministry related in deciding the fate of human security in Japan. It became prominent in promoting human security in and outside Japan. Japan incorporated human security into her foreign policy by MOFA which reflects in many ways:

**Diplomatic Blue Book:** Japan focuses on human security for strengthening its program to prevent threats to human lives, livelihood and dignity as poverty, education, environmental degradation, stop illicit drugs, prevent transnational organized crime, infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, the outflow of refugee and anti-personnel landmines are the initiatives taken in this context.

Further, Diplomatic Blue Book of Japan also ensures human freedom and potential with the perspectives of human security focused on the cooperation among the various actors including international community, government body, international organization and civil society.

Japanese initiatives also include participation in conference, symposia and delivering speeches towards facilitating the establishment of the UN Trust Fund for human security. The establishment of Human Security Fund (HSF) is not only the determining factor of Japan but, it became the determining factors of human security in the entire globe.
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Japan International Cooperation Agency commonly known as ‘JICA’ is an independent governmental agency that monitors ODA implementation in recipient countries on behalf of the Government of Japan. Before 2003, JICA was the semi governmental organization under the jurisdiction of MOFA.

JICA is now part of Japanese Official Development Assistance efforts, with a role in providing technical cooperation, capital grants and Yen loans. Core development programs of JICA are Technical Assistance Programs or Projects for capacity and institutional development, feasibility studies and master plans. Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV), JICA Senior Volunteers and Japan Disaster Relief Team Groups (JDRTG) of JICA are better known face around the world in relief efforts after natural disaster. These are also the institutions that promoting human security around the world.

Human Security Fund

Human Security Trust Fund (HSTF) is one of the most imperative milestones in Japanese policy-making that determines destiny of human security inside and/or outside Japan. HSTF is very influential and played fundamental role in Japanese policy-making that all other governmental bodies had not influenced international community together.

The entire concept got started in December 1998 in Hanoi, Vietnam when the then Prime Minister Obuchi in his speech announced that a Trust Fund for Human Security would be established in the UN (Obuchi Speech about Trust fund, 1998). Further, Government of Japan fulfilled her dedication and finally, Government of Japan and the UN Secretariat launched the Trust Fund for the human security in March 1999 i.e. officially known as United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS).
The UNTFHS was initiative of Government of Japan and UN with certain objectives and goals. The major objective of the UNTFHS is to transform the concept of human security into reality and implement it through UN Agencies projects around the world that address diverse threats—which are mentioned in the 1994 HDR—and also include poverty, environmental degradation, conflicts, landmines, refugee problems, illicit drugs and infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS to secure individual’s life, livelihood and dignity. Apart from the protection of individuals from those threats, the Fund also focuses to empower individuals to enhance their own lives according to their desirable extent. Further, Government of Japan (GOJ) and UN Secretariat also clarified that UNTFHS will only look after the situation and follow the guiding principals in subsequent ways;

1. Guidelines provided by GOJ and UN are to help UNTFHS in selecting the projects based on the recommendations of the report and translate the human security concept into practical action.

2. Trust Fund also keeps provision for other countries to be a donor according to United Nations Financial Regulations and Rules.

3. The UNTFHS will support collaborative organizations and priority will be given to countries and regions where the insecurities of people are most critical and pervasive, means least developed countries (LDCs) and countries in conflict are in top priority.

4. As human security comprehensively protects both ‘freedom from fear’ and ‘freedom from want’ means this concept will protect and empower individuals. It will not only shield people from critical and pervasive threats but also empower them to take charge of their own lives.

5. The UNTFHS will focus on protecting and empowering people who are uncovered to physical violence, discrimination and exclusion.

6. It will also support and empower refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and economic migrants.

7. It will protect and empower people in conflict situation and in transition from war to peace through integration of humanitarian and development assistance,
disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and other activities that can prevent recurrence of conflicts.

8. Try to ensure minimum living standards against poverty, sudden economic downturns and natural disasters.

9. Will focus on healthcare system.

10. Will try to improve educational opportunities especially girl emphasizing universal primary education.

11. UNTFHS may also support projects to promote the concept of human security to deepen its understanding and acceptance worldwide through research-oriented proposals and action-oriented initiatives. That will also address specific human security challenges (UNTFHS, 1999).

UNTFHS under the guidance of GOJ and UN also fixed its parameter for funding the projects worldwide in following ways:

1. Providing concrete and sustainable benefits to people and communities threatened in their survival, livelihood and dignity.

2. Implementing the protection and empowerment framework by comprehensively including both top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment measures.

3. Promoting partnership with civil society groups, NGOs and other local entities and encouraging implementation by these entities.

4. Advancing integrated approaches and addressing the broad range of interconnected issues that take into an account the multi-sectoral demands of human security.

5. Concentration on those areas of human security that are currently neglected and avoiding duplication with existing programs and activities (Commission for Human Security, 2009)

For achieving the above mentioned goals and objectives, the GOJ also contributed to UNTFHS financially. For the smooth running of the UNTFHS, Japan initially contributed about ¥ 500 million in March 1999. From the establishment of UNTFHS till the FY2009
Japan has contributed total amount of 39 billion JPY to the Trust Fund. This was one of the largest of its kind established in the UN. After that Japanese contribution became a regular practice to strengthen the UNTFHS in following ways:

Table No. 10
Japanese Contribution to UNTFHS from the establishment to FY2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution in JPY</th>
<th>Contribution in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Establishment of the fund</td>
<td>500 million</td>
<td>4.63 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>For Kosovo Reconstruction and the repatriation of refugees and East Timor reconstruction</td>
<td>6.6 billion</td>
<td>55.05 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>2.5 billion</td>
<td>23.81 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>1.5 billion</td>
<td>14.48 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>7.7 billion</td>
<td>72.16 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>4.0 billion</td>
<td>32.79 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>3.0 billion</td>
<td>24.59 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>3.0 billion</td>
<td>27.27 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>2.7 billion</td>
<td>24.95 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>2.0 billion</td>
<td>18.01 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>1.9 billion</td>
<td>16.55 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>1.8 billion</td>
<td>16.14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Additional contribution</td>
<td>1.7 billion</td>
<td>16.14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Approx 39 billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


UNTFHS funded a number of projects to secure the twin goal of human security i.e. “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want”. From the very beginning of UNTFHS, it funded numerous projects and provided huge budget for the successful completion of these projects.
Table No. 11
Projects Funded by UNTFHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Budgets (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,132,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52,480,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25,501,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22,700,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24,476,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23,728,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46,306,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36,198,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38,838,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,063,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>303,428,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Even, UNTFHS did not discriminate either within or between the regions and funded its projects to empower people of the specific region and for the sustainable development. Thus it funded its projects in subsequent ways:

Table no.12
Region wise Projects Run by UNTFHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Budgets in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75,876,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,660,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19,747,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,986,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71,633,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,984,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101,457,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Regional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,929,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,152,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>303,428,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above mentioned formation, goals, objectives of UNTFHS, parameters of funding a total of 191 projects worldwide and providing approximately 39 billion Yen for successful completion of these projects clearly indicates the dedicated intention of Japanese policy-makers regarding human security. Simply, Japanese policy-making is seriously influenced by the notion of human security and human security itself is also derived in the way of UNTFHS activities in Japan and/or outside Japan. Simply, UNTFHS became the major determinant of human security in Japan and Japanese policy-making.

**Budget**

The next determining factor of human security in Japan is country’s budget that makes handsome allocations on social security, education and science, public works, economic assistance, promotion of SMEs, energy, food supply, and others rather than military expenditure or military personnel pension and expenditure (See Appendix-VII) like other states or nation states.

In fact, Japan had never spent more than 1% of her total GDP on national defense and emphasize more on other human centric issues (See Appendix-VII) that has human security elements.

**5. Implementation Level**

The next set of factors determining level of human security in Japan comes under the subtitle ‘implementation level’. Determining factors of human security in Japan is influenced by the approaches and sometimes eagerness of the policy-makers as well. It happens because only policy-makers those who can decide the fate of human security by participation in decision-making ways make easy path for the implementation of human security elements either inside or outside Japan.
From the origin of the term human security, Japan has been considered the leading players to established, promote and implement human security in policy-making. In that way, Japan implemented human security worldwide through her three implementing agencies:

1. Japanese ODA Charter allows Japan to assist other less developed countries financially or technically or both.
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) became the other implementing body that also initiated in the formation of Commission on Human Security (CHS) and United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) and;
3. JICA became the next in that line that suggests MOFA regarding the ODA distribution throughout the world. It is based on JICA recommendation that MOFA consider the distribution of ODA to the other underdeveloped country.

These are the three implementing agencies that really guide Japan in the policy-making related to the human security as well as implementing it. Apart from the above mentioned three agencies, the Japanese leadership also determines the implementation of human security according to Japanese policies. As Japanese politics is generally stable as such and human security has become prominent in policy-making, however, it also faces ups and downs in this period.

From the origin of the term human security, different Prime Ministers of Japan have initiated and implemented different aspects of human security in their foreign policies. In that sequel, first document that indicated the implementation of human security concept came into light in 1995 when, the then prime minister of Japan Murayama Tomiichi supported human security in his speech (Edström 2008: 77-78). He mentioned that, human security is a concept that can comprehensively resolve the menaces that threaten the survival, daily life and dignity of human beings. The additional unambiguous assimilation of human security in Japanese foreign policy occurred in 1998 when the then Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi used the concept in an attempt to cooperate with the Asian financial crisis (Obuchi, 1998)) Obuchi endowed USD 30 billion to assist those countries hit by the financial crunch. After Obuchi, Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori prolonged the
ongoing practice and initiated towards the establishment of UNTFHS under the UN Secretariat. This UNTFHS has funded nearly 191 projects worldwide and endowed Approx USD 39 billion by the FY2008 (MOFA, 2008 for Trust Fund for Human Security) for the successful completion of the projects conducted by UNTFHS.

UNTFHS projects focus only on the least developed countries for humanitarian and development assistance. Continuation of that, Japan also helped out in the formation of Commission of Human Security (CHS) in 2001.

After the Mori reign, Koizumi Junichiro became the PM of Japan. But, Koizumi did not pay much attention like earlier PMs. However, Koizumi started human security process in the Commission on Human Security. He also made it clear that human security has now became a matter of Official Development Assistance (ODA) policy than general foreign policy in the way Obuchi and Mori had presented it.

After that, Shinzo Abe and Yasuo Fukuda served as PMs. Their terms were too short and as such their personal interests and activities did not reflect their policies rather than the legacies continued by their predecessors.

Apart from these, Japanese engagement across the globe especially in Cambodia, Zaire, Mozambique, Golan Height and East Timor became leading occurrence in the humanitarian assistance in these countries. Together they show the actual picture of the implementation level of human security in Japan.

**Conclusion**

The determinants of human security undoubtedly include those particulars and understanding that influenced it in general and Japan in particular. Further it is also evident since 1994 that elements of human security determine Japanese policy-making. In that case, this chapter of the thesis makes a distinction of determinants of human security at five diverse levels.
The first level entitled ‘Conceptual Level’ highlights the conceptual clarity and Japanese way of understanding and assistance to provide human security. This level emphasized on the dilemma of the push and pull factors in between the two dimensions of human security commonly known as ‘Freedom from Fear’ and ‘Freedom from Want’. These two views of human security construct two schools of thought which influenced almost many countries that are serious about the implementation of the elements of human security in policy-making that can affect externally or internally. Actually, these two schools of thought are the prime determining factors of the human security in any country’s policy.

HDR Report 1994 accentuate both the dimensions of human security, while, Japan adopts different line of thought from other countries like Canada and Norway. Japan chooses to emphasize on ‘Freedom from Want’. This approach of human security emphasizes beyond violence related threats and highlights that narrower concept of human security. These type threats can be managed through development and security with an appropriate mechanism. This is also very important that the ‘freedom from fear’ approach only denotes violence related threats, however, the freedom from want includes violence related threats and many more including protection from threats of hunger, disease and natural disasters. It is because these are the root causes of human insecurity and exterminate far more individual than warfare, genocide and terrorism combined.

Geographical Location, Form of Administration, Linguistic and Religious diversity, Area, Climate, Terrain, Natural Resources, Agricultural Land, Water Resources, Natural Disasters, Population, Population Growth Rate, Birth Rate, Death Rate, Urbanization, Sex Ratio, Literacy, Education Expenditure, Life Expectancy and Infant Mortality Rate are the most important determinants of human security in any region or country.

The second level determinant of human security in Japan is entitled “Constitutional Level”. As it is previously understood that the policies of any country are derived legal documents. In this situation, the constitution became the next level determinants of human security. In the case of Japan Preface, Article 9 and Article 14 of the constitution are the significant determinants in favor of promoting human security both directly and
indirectly. Preface and Article 14 of the Japanese constitution promotes human centric elements in the policy-making while Article 9 prohibits Japan to keep herself away from military or anything related to military and together they compelled Japan to adopt, establish and promote human security in true sense.

The third level of determinants of human security identified as ‘Organization Level’. This category includes those organizations that positively or negatively affect the ways and goals of the notion. In that sense, Ministry of Defense and Self Defense Forces are the major organizations in Japan that positively and negatively determine the fate of human security. Both are interrelated and very effective to promote human security globally however, the formation of Ministry of Defense at the place of Japan Defense Agency and deployment of SDF in non-combat zone became key draw backs in Japanese efforts to promoting human security. However, the initiative by the government of Japan in the formation of Commission on Human Security became a milestone in the constructive way of determinants of human security.

The fourth level determinants are recognized as ‘Policy Level’ based on the policies and treaties accepted by policy-makers that affect any notion including human security. In case of Japan, Defense Policy, three Non-nuclear Principles, US-Japan Security Treaty, ODA Charter, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Government’s General Budget, Human Security fund are the leading determinants of human security. All of them are optimistically placing the notion of human security in the world arena and empower the least advantage individuals’ globally.

The last determinant of human security came under the title ‘Implementation Level’. In that tag, any notion can be characterized by policies, leaderships and issues that positively or negatively affect the implementation of the concept in policy-making.

Lastly one can conclude that Japan’s initiatives were appreciable in accepting, establishing, promoting, funding financially or technically to the least advantaged people or least developed country. However, formation of Ministry of Defense in place of Japan
Defense Agency and deployment of SDF in non-combat zone created some certain dilemma for running contrast to Japanese constitutionally established norms. On the other hand, formation of Commission on Human Security and United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) became the noteworthy determinants of human security that not only affect the policy of Japan but also affects the entire world, especially the underdeveloped countries or region where the projects funded by UNTFHS were running.