Chapter IV

Indo-Japan Politico-Strategic Relations since the End of Cold War
CHAPTER-4
INDO-JAPAN POLITICO-STRATEGIC RELATIONS
SINCE THE END OF THE COLD WAR

Disintegration of Soviet Union and the end of The Cold War the world scenario has changed to a large extent. The Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narsimha Rao had sincerely introduced an external oriented economic policy with a view to integrate its economy to the global economy.

The era after 1990’s marked new changes when India started new policy in the wake, of economic reform and liberalization as India celebrated its 44 year of independence (till 1991). She wanted to play a dominant role in world politics as it had a large market and immense human resources as well as strong military power. Similarly Japan had begun to assert itself in the global arena and began to play a positive role in international affairs since the end of the Cold War. Japan has defined its new international role and was increasingly seeking an active and independent global political role.

The era of 1990s was very eventful as for as India Japan relations were concerned. Both the countries were keenly interested to develop close ties with each other. India had initiated a major decision to
liberalize its economy. The look East Policy was introduced by the Indian Government at that time with the aim to enhance economic cooperation with both East and South East Asian countries. Japan had also reached at the stage where it was necessary for it to review objectives of its foreign policy. The Gulf war of 1990-91 had taught-Japan some bitter lesson. Even Japan had contributed a huge amount of $13 billion towards the war but it was not appreciated by its allies. Japan’s ‘cheque book diplomacy’ was severely criticized by most of the countries. It was the time to seriously look and develops its ties with South Asian countries specially India. Hence the Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu decided to visit some of the countries in South Asia in 1990. He visited India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, & Bangladesh from 28 April-6May 1990.

The Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu was in New Delhi from 28-30 April 1990s. The visit had both political and economic aspect. India wanted to enhance political cooperation with Japan. She hoped to secure a better understating of her problems as she was facing from the terrorism and violence aided and encouraged by Pakistan in Kashmir. This was evident when Prime Minister V.P. Singh told his Japanese counterpart that any incitement for terrorism would be firmly rebuffed by Indian people. Kaifu had replied that he believe the bases of cooperation between India and Japan lay in friendships and that he had fullest
understanding of India’s commitment to peace in the region in particular and Asia in general. Later Japanese spokesman has clarified that Tokyo stand point was that India Pakistan should exercise restrain and settle their differences through negotiations in the letter and sprit of Shimla Agreement¹. So far Japan has continuously stressed on South Asian unity specially India and Pakistan. He also reminded that no one should remain in doubt about Japan’s strict neutrality on the issue. Japan wants to play an important role by solving regional or global issues. Japanese P.M. himself repeated the official stand while addressing a joint session of both house of the Indian Parliament.

In spite of Japan’s economic importance for India, there were both political and economic problems to be resolved between the two countries. Japanese economy was a booming economy requiring sound structural changes and adjustment and revival. Japan was granting aid and assistance to the number of Asian countries specially India. But Japan was experiencing economic slums for much of the nineties. Due to this Japanese Foreign Ministry has decided to cut foreign aid for fiscal year 1992. It affected India a lot in comparison to other countries. However, subsequently the External Affair Minister Madhav Singh Solanki in the first high level Indian visit since R.V’s trip in 1989 was assured by the Japanese Finance Minister of qualitative improvement and increased aid
to India’s development. But Japan pressed India to sign on Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As per Reuter Report from Tokyo quoting Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials they asserted that Solanki was urged by his Japanese counterpart, Michio Watanabe to sign the NPT and warned that countries with nuclear weapons or selling nuclear related material could be denied aid. Solanki had clearly said to the Japanese counterpart that in such prevailing global circumstances India could not sign the NPT because it would be discriminatory and put entirely unequal obligations on those haves or have not.

The India’s stand was very clear as for as the global circumstances was concerned. Because the major countries have already made bombs and these nuclear power countries pressurized the countries who were in process. Japan is an economic superpower follows U.S. policies and put pressures to the countries who were receiving aid.

As a consequence there was much better understanding of India’s stand on the NPT, Indian External Minister clarified at a press conference in Tokyo that the NPT would not affect Japanese aid to India. In spite of it both the Japanese Prime Minister and the Indian External Affair Minister agreed that there was an absolute need for the two countries to intensify their dialogue aimed at building as reliable foundation for cooperation. Miyazawa favoured India and Japan working together for a
structural motivation aimed at renovation of the United Nations to make its more representatives.

India often approached Japan officially or unofficially to attract Japanese corporate interest for the economic development and political stability and to raise Indo-Japanese relations to a new height.

The Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narsimha Rao visited Japan in June 1992. The visit had a major economic impact but it could not be concluded without political importance.

After leading a large business delegation by Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narsimha Rao the same problem of signing NPT came to occurred. The Japanese Prime Minister Keechi Miyazawa put pressure on Rao to sign Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). But Mr. PV Narsimha Rao gave reason to his Japanese counterpart, why India could not sign the treaty at this stage. According to a report Miyazawa, told Mr. Rao “Even if the NPT is not problem free, it is necessary to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons within the framework of the NPT”. Miyazawa was well aware about the prevailing circumstance because every country was in armament race. He strongly opposed the armament race as having a very disastrous experience. But India being a leading Asian country, wanted to maintain good status in International arena. He knew very well that his neighbouring country like China having the same technology and others
like Pakistan also doing the same, so it was the demand of the time and India did the same. Rao had already explained that this is discriminatory because some countries have nuclear weapons and some not.

P.V. Narasimha Rao has successfully explained their view on the issue of N.P.T. He convinced Japanese Prime Minister Miyazawa. In spite of it the Japanese Prime Minister also suggested and Rao accepted the proposal for setting up of working level consultations saying, “We wish to hold more substantial bilateral consultation than ever”. It also included “exploring together the elements of a new international consensus on non proliferation.” Apart from these differences, Mr. Rao succeeded in paving the way for boosting India-Japan political and cultural relations.

The Air India has operated 6 flights weekly between India and Japan. This was a positive sign for future relationship. The Japanese Air Lines (JAL) has also started twice a week direct services between New Delhi and Osaka from 3 October 1996 and twice weekly services between New Delhi and Osaka from 6 October, 1996. In fact JAL has suspended air services in August 1992, the airlines maintained a sales network within India.
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INDIA AND JAPAN ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

SERVICE ON THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL:

During 1996 Japan and India clashed on the matter of becoming the member of U.N Security Council. Both the countries competed for election but Japan won a two year term (it’s eight) over India (seeking its seventh term). Japan had won democratically over India. But both the countries had soft corner to each other as major countries of Asia. Although Japan being the economic superpower in the world while India as one of the largest democratic country in the world. Both resolved number of bilateral conflict in Asia as well as at global level.

Japan and India might better agitate for Security Council representation by teaming up. Each complements the other weakness, instead of merely appearing individually ambitious, as a team they can be seen as successful in bridging substantial differences.⁶

The end of the Cold War has changed the Japanese perception towards developing countries specially India. Japan has realized that the developing countries which form large number of membership of the United Nations General Assembly ought to have a voice in this global form in determining global issues.
The developing countries were dependent countries. The major exchange of view and decision related to U.N. were shared and hold by European and American participants. Keeping all this views Japanese security expert realized that India is the dominant country in Asia as well as among the developing countries. Meanwhile Japan wanted to have dialogue on security issue with India with a view to look global and regional issues in the Asian perspectives.

This was the second attempt on the security issue. The first one was held in February 1996 by Japan Institute for International Affairs in which several experts from the I.D.S.A participated. Japan and India exchanged dialogues on political and security issues along with it emphasized on role of UN, international peace, disarmament and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The two successful dialogues which were held between the two countries in 1996 had contributed for the future peace and prosperity of Asia.

The prevailing economic and political circumstances in Asia had affected Indo-Japanese relations in the coming year. Japan and India never had any direct politico- strategic clashes. But they had always some differences on certain issues like to eliminate and to delegitimize nuclear weapons at the global level.
Japan a candidate for permanent seat on United Nations Security Council, has decided to compete an election for a non permanent seat for the year 1997-98.

India and Philippines were also supposed to be a candidate from the Asian region for the United Nation Security Council (non permanent member).

Thus there was more than one candidate from Asia specially India and Japan infact both were the leading nations of Asia. In fact India was the founder member of the United Nations. Japan has urged the Asian nations specially India to come at one platform and decide one country unanimously for U.N.S.C. non permanent membership. All the Asian Countries had made a consensus and supported Japan to become the non permanent member of UN Security Council.

In a report on 21 February 1995 Japan, and India had discussed about the restructuring of United Nations Security Council. The director of the UN division in the Japanese Foreign Ministry Motohide Yoshikawa had joined the Japan’s Ambassador in India and expected that both India and Japan would be the candidate for permanent seat on a restructured U.N. Security Council. The Yomiuri Shimbun reported that ‘Yoshi Kawa’s trip to India was in line with the Japanese government’s
policy to support admission of India and other regional powers like Nigeria, Brazil, and Egypt to the Security Council.

POST-POKHRA-N-II: TURNING POINT BETWEEN INDIA JAPAN RELATIONS:

The relation between India and Japan continued to be free from conflict and these could be described as friendly and cooperative. However there were differences between the two countries on the issue of Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Japan under pressure from other countries specially U.S. pressurized India to sign the NPT. But Indian leaders were able to convince Japan that five permanent Security Council Members were availing and India could not sign this discriminatory treaty.

India maintains to continue its process and conducted a series of nuclear test on May 11 and 13, 1998. May, 1998s nuclear tests by India sent a shock wave to the world. On the other hand the Western Countries condemned the test and stopped economic aid to India. They tried to persuade Pakistan not to follow India in reaction.

The test came as a big surprise not only to Japan and other countries but also to Indians. The news of India’s first nuclear test with three explosions came as great shocked to the Japanese political leaders as well as foreign ministry. Japan had believed that India would be under
pressure as Japan granted one billion dollars in the form of ODA. Prime Minister Hashimoto strongly reacted by saying that Japan should review its aid policy toward India according to the ODA charter.

The first series of tests on 11 May led the government to suspend its grant, assistance and it withdrew to host the Indian Development Forum which was going to be held in Tokyo. The same measure was applied with China when China conducted nuclear test. The assistance which was three times that of what India received that day was only restored two years later when it decided to adhere to the CTBT.

When India conducted second series of test on 13 May 1998 Japan imposed another series of measures freezing or suspending yen loans (ODA) and took a cautious attitude towards future lending by financial institution and imposing of strict control over technology transfers.

The first reaction of the Japanese government to India’s nuclear test conducted on 11 May was quite sharp, and it was clearly stated by the chief cabinet secretary on 13\textsuperscript{th} May. Expressing the government’s “dismay”, the statement described the test as “a challenge to the efforts of the international society which seeks free from nuclear weapons”\textsuperscript{9}. Japan immediately imposed economic sanctions on India and described it as economic measures. These economic measures were carried on two stages. Humanitarian and grass root assistance was not covered by these
measures. It landed by Japanese EXIM Bank and trade insurance to India by MITI was not covered by these measures\textsuperscript{10}.

The Japanese ambassador to India was recalled temporarily for consultation. The Prime Minister Hashimoto emphasized his determination to G 8 to send a clear and strong message against India’s nuclear tests. Japan strongly criticized India’s nuclear test and described as an intolerable challenge to international society. The Diet on its part went further and described the tests as an act of destruction of the global environment and eco-system and constituting a threat to the survival of human beings. Japan also imposed the economic measure by canceling a number of official dialogues, snapping communication during the time when it was most needed\textsuperscript{11}. Japan was aware about the fact that India’s nuclear test would put pressure on Pakistan to retaliate. Hence Japan continuously alarmed both the countries about the nuclear race because these two countries would have made deeper implications for the rest of the world. They strongly criticize India’s nuclear test at the Birmingham summit held on 17-18 May. Hashimoto had said that countries that observed international agreement and regulations should be rewarded and those which did not should be punished. The summit was divided on the nuclear issue. Japan and U.S as close ally had already been enforced sanctions on India and wanted other member of the group to adopt similar
measure. But France, Britain Russia did not show much interest and they had said that these measure could not produce any result. Nevertheless, there was a strong opinion within the summit that more effort should be adopted to stop a further escalation of the situation in South Asia. The G 8 countries asked India to “adhere unconditionally to the NPT and CTBT and to enter in to negotiation on a global treaty to stop the production of fissile material for nuclear Weapons”. They urged Pakistan to, “Exercise maximum restrain in the face of these tests and adhere to international non proliferation norms”. In order to tolerate Pakistan from taking any retaliatory step, Hashimoto sent a special emissary Noboro Seiichiro to Islamabad from Birmingham for that purpose. Noboro met Pakistani leader including Prime Minster and Foreign Minister. Japan had said that it would increase its financial assistance if Pakistan did not conduct test. But Noboro was not able to convince Pakistani leaders as they complained that the G-8 countries “had not suggested any measures that could satisfy our legitimate security concerns. Finally when Pakistan conducted a series of test, Japan adopted measures similar to those taken against India.

Despite all the effort done by Japan to restrain Pakistan to conduct nuclear test had became useless. In fact Japan continuously warned Pakistan that we will cut ODA if Pakistan conducted the nuclear test. On
the country, Pakistan demonstrated its nuclear power by conducting the nuclear test on 26 May 1998.

Pakistan's case was even more severe because the suspension of yen was imposed from the beginning. Pakistan had to pay price for ignoring Japan's repeated warning. Japanese policy makers were also shocked by the act of Pakistan. In that way Japan's biggest weapon (ODA) was not effective to the economically weak, country like Pakistan then how it would become effective to the self sufficient country like India.

Japan the largest donor country to Pakistan with its ODA mounting to US $ 241.03 million ($781.1 million) grants and $ 162.92 million loans). Having imposing severe sanction on India, Japanese leaders were hoping, if not confident, that Pakistan could not afford to ignore Japan's warning. However Japanese, ODA diplomacy proved to be ineffective and futile.

JAPAN'S EFFORTS IN PEACEMAKING IN SOUTH ASIA IN THE AFTERMATH OF MAY 1998 NUCLEAR TESTS:

Japan has failed to prevent Pakistan to conduct the nuclear test. But Japan continued its effort to bring world opinion to condemn the nuclear test in the sub-continent, which materialized to some extent as a resolution of the UN Security Council on 6th June. The resolution condemned the nuclear test conducted by India and Pakistan. They urged
the two countries to stop further nuclear programmes and sought to deny
them the status as nuclear states. The resolution was initiated by Japan,
Costa Rica, Slovenia and Sweden and the Security Council voted it
unanimously. Japan has described it as bigger achievement than previous
years.

The international community was also aware about nuclear race
between the two neighboring countries. They were fearful about the
repercussion and put pressure to renounce the nuclear programme. The
economic pressure came from G-8 countries, regional pressure came from
ASEAN, which had adopted a nuclear free zone policy and moral
pressure from a forum of four countries, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa
and Ukraine which had discarded the once active nuclear weapons
project. The “Permanent five” countries of the Security Council were also
observing the root causes of hostile relations between India and Pakistan.
The important issues between them were the Kashmir dispute. Pakistan
was happy with them and welcomed the prospects of internationalizing
the Kashmir problem. But India rejected the “coercive and intrusive”
intervention of the Western states in the bilateral issue. Japan had already
applied the policy of disarmament towards India with United States and
some Western countries in relation of economic sanctions. Along with
United States, Japan had lifted its economic measure against Pakistan
because she argued that the Pakistan’s economy was in a perilous state and that the government was closer to signed the CTBT than India. She continues to maintain these measures against India\textsuperscript{15}. The prospect behind lifting sanction was that, the US was very much close to Pakistan. In fact India was close to former Soviet Union. Therefore, India suffered due to the personal rivalry of USA and former Soviet Union, Japan followed the US interest policy. She never initiated any issue without US concerned. But in this meter (nuclear test conducted by India and Pakistan) Japan initiated tough step against these two countries because Japan had a very disastrous experience. Though Japan being very close to India socially, emotionally or culturally. She wanted to maintain peace prosperity and political stability in South Asia, specially between India and Pakistan because these two countries were indulged in nuclear race.

On 12\textsuperscript{th} June an emergency meeting was held at London amongst the foreign ministers of G-8 countries to discuss further views on nuclear issue. The joint communiqué of the meeting, for maintaining and consolidating the international regime on the non proliferation of nuclear Weapons, urged India and Pakistan to join the C.T.B.T.

Besides imposing economic sanctions, the US spearheaded the Western effort to actively engage both countries in negotiation and
continuously demanded them to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (C.T.B.T.) immediately and unconditionally\textsuperscript{16}.

The increasing pressure, the Pakistani Prime Minister had said in his speech to the UN General Assembly in September 1998 that Pakistan was preparing itself to sign the C.T.B.T. within one year. Responding it the Indian Prime Minister also suggested the possibility of an early signing of CTBT.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore both countries resumed foreign secretary level talks on the line of controversial issues including Kashmir in October 1998. Thus two processes were in progression.

The Indo-U.S. and Pakistan U.S. nuclear non proliferation talks involving the US Deputy Secretary of state strobe Talbot, the Indian Foreign Minister, Jaswant Singh and the Pakistani Foreign Secretary, Shamshad Ahmad, started new live, Indo-Pakistani talk to address the root causes of the tension between the two countries and to come up with measures, which have been mostly conducted by Foreign Secretaries of both countries, K. Raghunath and Shamshad Ahmed with occasional meeting by Prime Ministers.

This process was progressively going well and in November 1998 the U.S. decided a partial lift of sanction in response to the announcement by countries of voluntary moratorium on further nuclear tests\textsuperscript{18}. Both Japan and U.S were very well aware about both the countries
determination. They wanted to prevent further nuclear test at any cost. Both Japan and U.S. also knew that Kashmir is the core issue between the two countries since independence.

So both the countries exposed their power potentiality by conducting nuclear test. Therefore Japan wanted to make always negotiation between India and Pakistan.

**JAPAN’S EFFORT IN PEACE KEEPING BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN ISSUE:**

Japan’s effort was not ended by imposing sanctions. He wanted to maintain peace and stability between India and Pakistan. Japan knew very well that the root cause of the Indo-Pak conflict was the Kashmir issue. Japan was interested to mediate between the two countries on Kashmir conflict. Japan was the only country which had experienced the devastation by nuclear weapons. Thus she strongly condemned the nuclear test conducted by India and Pakistan. Japan had imposed various economic measures against India and Pakistan for the sake of peace and prosperity and stressed on disarmament.

India and Pakistan are close neighbouring countries. They were deeply engaged in armament race. Even Japan was the largest ODA donor for both the countries. Keeping in mind Japan imposed economic measure against both the countries to prevent armament race. Japan has
realized that if both the countries would not be financial sound they
would not initiate further test. “Japan followed ODA Charter. It
immediately suspended new grants (excluding emergency and
humanitarian assistance and grass root grants) and new yen loans to both
countries and hinted at its intention to disapprove loan programmes to
India or Pakistan by international financial institutions19. Thus, Japan’s
yen loan to India fall from 132.7 billion yen (US$ 1.11 billion) in 1997 to
11.5 billion yen (US $ 96 million) in 1998, and Japan’s grant to India,
from 3.5 billion yen US $ 29.4 million) in 1997 to 398 million yen (US$
3.3 million) in 1998. Likewise Japan’s yen loan to Pakistan was reduced
from 32 billion yen (US$ 270 million) in 1997 to nil in 1998, and Japan’s
grants aid to Pakistan, from 5.7 billion yen (US$ 47.6 million) to 566
million yen (US $ 4.7 million) in 199820. Thus, both India and Pakistan
suffered from economic crisis imposed by Japan or world community but
the intention behind that was to maintain peace and to halt nuclear race.

When Pakistan conducted nuclear test it drew world wide attention.
It was a golden opportunity for Pakistan just after the second series of
nuclear test on 30\textsuperscript{th} May. Pakistan’s Prime Minister Nawab Sharif told the
reporters that the world community would not be able to stop nuclear arm
race in South Asia unless the Kashmir problem is resolved. With this
argument Pakistan’s Foreign Ministry invited Japanese Ambassador
Kubota and urged to Japan to mediate on Kashmir issue. Kubota himself realized that the international intervention was necessary as far as the circumstances were concerned to maintain peace in South Asia. Pakistan’s Prime Minister Nawab Sharif told Nihon Keizai Shimbun in Islamabad that Tokyo should play a dominant role in resolving the Kashmir problem.

With the view of Pakistan Prime Minister the Japanese Foreign Minister Obuchi realized that how India would react to it as they wanted to make Kashmir an international issue. Instead of it Japan offered to host an international conference in Tokyo on 1 June in which Japan has invited India and Pakistan and asked to reduce the tension, in South Asia in general and Kashmir in particular. Even U.S. discouraged and said that this was not a good time. But Obuchi was more interested to play an active role like sending a special envoy. On 11 June 1998, the House of Councilors, Committee on Foreign Relations and Defense conducted a meeting to discuss nuclear issue of Indo-Pakistan relationship. Four expert were invited there to give their view including Obuchi. They had said that it is impossible to mediate on the Kashmir issue. But Obuchi was very much interested and next day he went to London to attend the G-8 Foreign Ministers meeting and gave Japan’s opinion. He said that Japan might be able to play an important role and for the purpose wanted
to visit Delhi himself. But his idea had dropped due to foreign some of the member states of G-8 did not welcome such a move. But Obuchi submitted his opinion and showed interest his (to mediate India and Pakistan) to the Western power.

Consequently with the recommendation of Japan both the United Nations Security Council resolution and the G-8 joint communiqué has urged India and Pakistan to restart bilateral dialogue to resolve all outstanding issues including the Kashmir problem.

Japan has also initiated to send a special missions regarding CTBT to non-signatory states urging them to sign the treaty. He thinks that these measures may help in maintaining and strengthening the NPT regime and put extra pressure on India and Pakistan on the nuclear issues.

During the meeting which was held in Birmingham, New York and London, Obuchi Keizo, the then foreign minister of Japan was quoted as advocating an international conference for finding a solution to the Kashmir issue. He was also credited with a proposal to hold a peace party in Tokyo, if both India and Pakistan agreed.

Japan has engaged in a number of direct talks at high level with India and Pakistan signing the CTBT and under take other non proliferation measures.\textsuperscript{21}
Like the U.S under the Clinton administration, Japan has linked the desirable development in the nuclear policy of India and Pakistan to its consideration of lifting its economic sanctions (The Japanese Government prefers to use the term economic measures). Thus, in October 1998, in response to Pakistan pledge to join the CTBT by September 1999 and to put a more strict restriction on the export of nuclear and missile technologies and materials, Japan supported IMF’s emergency package to the country as an extensional measure. Other than that, Japan only hinted to consider lifting its economic sanctions against both the countries remains in place until it decided to lift them in October 2001 in order to facilitate the US war in Afghanistan.

From the above discussion Japan had not been successful in the light of India and Pakistan to make them sign the CTBT by administering aid sanction and other measures. It had looked for a new strategy in peace making in the Indo-Pakistan conflict. Japan, over the years had followed it assiduously, matching for example, every visit to India with one to Pakistan. The Pro Pakistan attitude of Japanese government during the Kargil conflict embittered the relations between the two countries. But later Japan justified its stand on Kargil by asserting that it had no independent means of ascertaining the nature of the extrusion into Kargil. Further, the presence of Japanese tourist on the hijacked Indian Airlines
aircraft which was taken to Kandhar (Afghanistan in December 1999 provided Japan a closer view of situation in the region and it openly condemned all terrorist acts) aggravated Japan’s concern.

JAPANESE POSSIBLE ROLE IN PEACE PROCESS BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN CONFLICT:

Japan can play very important role in maintaining peace in South Asia in general and between India and Pakistan in particular. The most dangerous issues between the two countries are:

a) Nuclear Non Proliferation issues, and

b) The Kashmir issue.

NUCLEAR NON PROLIFERATION ISSUE:

Japan had already played a dominant role in this regard at international level as well as at various UN conferences. It helped the 2000 NPT review conference adopt a final document in which the nuclear weapon states made an “unequivocal pledge” for the total elimination of nuclear weapons at the UN General Assembly in November 2000\(^4\). The resolution had stressed on world peace, prosperity and regional security by total elimination of arms. It was also expected that the idea of non proliferation will promote national security.
Japan raised the issue of nuclear testing by India and Pakistan in the UN Security Council and was instrumental in the UN resolution of June 6, 1998 that called for “maintaining and consolidating the international regime on the non proliferation of threat against the preservation of peace and security of Asia and other regions.”

On February 28, 2000 a seminar was organized by Jawahar Lal Nehru University at New Delhi on Japan South Asia Cooperation. On this historical seminar Japanese ambassador Mr. Hiroshi Hirabayashi welcomed the talk between Indian and Pakistani’s Prime Minister and termed it as symbolic step towards confidence building between India and Pakistan. In this speech Hirabayashi expressed that South Asia is located between the natural resource rich region of central Asia and the Persian Gulf. He has said that in the future policies of Asia, India and Japan could be strong and reliable partners because both the countries fundamentally share such common values like democracy, freedom of press, faith on Judiciary and market economy. Japan often tried to solve the dispute by peaceful means because both the countries India and Pakistan would be benefited from a peaceful and stable environment in Asia. Tokyo and New Delhi could strengthen political cooperation in and out of their countries. South Asia could no longer be politically neglected by Japan which was assuming more and more responsibility in international affairs.
Because of its large size and weight, South Asia in general India in particular assumes great importance in management of global issues. But Japan always stressed in signing CTBT as well as to solve bilateral issues of neighbouring countries.

The National Security Board of India released the draft of Indian Nuclear Doctrine aimed at preparing for nuclear arms adequate retaliatory capability. Japan expressed its concern that report can lead to further undertaking of the weaponisation and deployment of nuclear weapons in India. These nuclear race will promote tension and frustration among the neighbouring countries specially India and Pakistan. At that time Japan invited Jaswant Singh, the then Foreign Minster to keep the process of bilateral dialogue alive and impress India, the need to maintain and strengthen the nuclear non proliferation regime.

Japan always kept asking India to sign CTBT by making number of committees. Japan set up a joint committee on disarmament and agreed to revive the India-Japan parliamentary group and establish committees to find ways for increased collaboration on the socio-economic development.

Japan has seriously criticized Pakistan’s Military regime under General Parvez Musharaff and warned Pakistan that it would place Pakistan in a difficult situation not only at national level but also at
international level. In his meeting with President Rafik Tarar, with Vice Foreign Minister of Japan, Ichita Yamamoto told the Pakistan leader that Japan’s decision of not to lift the economic sanctions imposed on Pakistan until Islamabad gave a clear time table for a return to democracy and signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This message was again reinforced when Pakistan Foreign Minister, Shahabzada Yakub Khan met the Japanese Foreign Minister Yohu Kono in Tokyo on November 8, 1999.

Tokyo prepared a report regarding nuclear non proliferation and disarmament as the world was facing nuclear danger. In an action plan Japan urged India and Pakistan to maintain a moratorium in nuclear testing, sign and ratify the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The report also urged the two countries to implement nuclear risk-reduction measures, suspend missile flight tests, confirm pledges to restrain nuclear related exports and take immediate steps to resolve the Kashmir dispute.

**THE KASHMIR ISSUE:**

The independence of India and Pakistan gave birth such a region which has become a headache for both the countries till date. This region is known as Kashmir. Both the countries often fight to occupy the large part of Kashmir as well as claiming that it belongs to each of them. Both the countries spend a huge amount of national income since the past half
century. Several efforts have been made to solve this egoistic issue but no formula has become applicable.

There is always a condition of mistrust and suspicion between the two countries. In order to promote peace between the two countries there is an urgent need of international support but India totally opposed any kind of mediation afraid of internationalization of Kashmir issue. The United States of America has given more commitment in regard of Kashmir issue particularly in order to reward Pakistan’s cooperation with the U.S war effort in Afghanistan. In order to understand Japan’s role in promoting peace process between India and Pakistan on the issue of Kashmir, Japan may play two way roles.

Firstly, Japan can try quite diplomacy in supporting and guaranteeing the peace process. Japan may consider adopting a positive linked strategy in which more economic aid was linked to the progress of the peace talks. The international community has silently granted Japan the mandate to conduct such task. Thus Japan being an economic super power trying to implement its quit diplomacy to promote peace process by providing aid and assistance to both the countries. The presence of Japan with its command of huge economic resources and the quite diplomatic skills could have put international guarantee on the peace process without causing India’s concern about the internationalization of
the Kashmir issue. In prevailing circumstance it is necessary for Japan to closely follow the reality of change of reality within Kashmir. The Kashmir people have emerged as a collective actor in this issue since their uprising started in late 1980.

There are some organizations representing them such as the All Party Hurriyet Conference (APHC) and the Jammu & Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) had been engaged in political affairs. Therefore the peace process required to include three parties India, Pakistan and the representatives of the Kashmir people a task which required sensitivity, cooperation and stability.

Secondly, Japan can help to create a “Formula for a way out” for all the parties concerned on this matter. It would require a lot of exercise from Japan through diplomatic dialogues and other contacts so that it may not only acquire the holistic understanding of the Kashmir issue but also became sensitive to the vital needs of both countries. Japan had already appeared on the right track as the Japanese Ambassador to India said that Japan had deepened its understanding of the security concerns of both countries through bilateral dialogues on the CTBT. Japan may also be able to learn from the representatives of the Kashmir people, some of them have already proposed formula to solve the Kashmir problem by political means.
THE IMPACT OF 11 SEPTEMBER TERRORIST ATTACK BETWEEN INDIA-JAPAN RELATIONS:

The 11 September terrorist attack on America shocked whole world and humanity. This terrorist attack had changed the global circumstances and scenario and made aware all the countries about terrorist activities and movements.

Mori has seriously condemned the 11 September terrorist attacks on the US, as attack against freedom and democracy. The attack in Srinagar on 11 October 2001 was seen in the same aspect and condemned. After these attacks both India and Japan have came closer and cooperated each other in various aspect of security perimeter affecting central and South Asia. India has actively supported the anti terrorist stand taken by Japan and had praised Tokyo’s decision to send SDF (Self Defense Force) to the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean region. India also provided landing, refueling and docking facilities to Japanese Fighter Jets and ships.

Japan had taken a serious stand against terrorism as having a painful experience. Mori had said that Terrorism was a serious problem not only for America but also for whole world specially India. He condemns terrorism wherever, whenever, and for whatever reasons. Japan always stressed on peace and prosperity.
The India-Japan declaration of 10 December 2001 had the ways for bilateral relations to move in qualitative, multiple directions. The strong relationship between India and Japan was a good sign for stable and prosperous Asia.

During the visit of former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee to Japan in December 2001, Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi had said that Japan and India had never been at war and consistently followed the way for peace and prosperity. Both India and Japan approached to solve the dispute or conflict between or among the countries. Koizumi hoped that relationship between two countries would only strengthen through economic and security cooperation.

These factors would make the two countries get closer and shall promote global partner in future. During the visit of Japanese former Prime Minister Mori at New Delhi, Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee reiterated India’s determination to forge a global partnership in all aspects of India-Japan relationship. It may be economic, IT (Information Technology), defense or security related within the framework of “strategic convergence of interest”.

India’s participation in the ASEAN Regional Forum has paved the way for regional level cooperation in this area. The number of discussion has been made at non governmental level between the experts, academics
and decision makers of two countries on political and security issues; regional as well as global need to encourage with the hope that it would provide inputs that became useful to the two governments.

It is the responsibility of all people, organizations, associations, education institutions as well as nations to cooperate each other in promoting peace, prosperity and regional security. History is witness that no war can be won without cooperation among nations. Even a superpower can not win without support and cooperation of others. The US bombing of Afghanistan needs logistic support from others. Japan which adopted two bills to enable its self defense forces to participate in war in a non combatant role also needed logistic support from India. Japan lifted its economic sanction from India after 11 September attack to maintain smooth relationship with India with a hope to eradicate terrorism from the region. No doubt India consistently make an effort to remove terrorism from the root as India in past had worst experiences.

On 10 December 2001 Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee had said in a speech in Tokyo regarding terrorism that the alliance between India and Japan can not have further respective and mutual interests as its sole aim. Together with our relationship with other countries we should actively promote the universal goals of freedom from wants, freedom from fear and mutual understanding between the people of the world.\textsuperscript{29}
Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee emphasised this in 2002 that would mark the 50\textsuperscript{th} year of our diplomatic relations. He had said that to enhance content in our bilateral relations would promote a qualitative change and will be significant at this anniversary. Our recent high level interaction had reminded us the importance of our shared traditions, values, beliefs and political system. It was a journey to lead our two countries, people and societies to rediscover each other more fully.

In the changing world circumstances both India and Japan realized that promoting economic interest was no doubt very essential but at the same time it was essential to look beyond it. Economic development and regional prosperity is only possible in a peaceful and stable world.

Both India and Japan had confronted with a new world reality. We have a cooperative role in the search for multipolar world order which would be humane, peaceful and equitable. Both the countries shared values and complementarities, both can together make a major impact virtually every where, whether it was a campaign against international terrorism or a global dialogue for development. India-Japan has agreed to strengthen their joint efforts against terrorism. “We recognize that fight against international terrorism had to be comprehensive and sustained”\textsuperscript{30}. Both India and Japan agreed to hold a dialogue on counter terrorism in the framework of India-Japan comprehensive security dialogue. The
strategic partnership was expected to become a pillar of support for the promotion of peace and prosperity of Asia and the World in future.

Some important issues of this strategic partnership could be identified as:

1. Cooperation between India and Japan in the areas of security and defence for peace and stability in Asia and World.
3. Emergency security of the states.
5. Countering International Terrorism
6. Nuclear non-proliferation, arms control, Disarmament and Weapons of Mass Destructions (WMDS)
7. UN Reforms

The barbaric terrorist attack of September 11 emphasised a need for pluralistic democracy to protect a way of life against bigotry and intolerance. India and Japan were both wedded to ideal of a world without weapons of mass destruction. Both the countries support a cooperative and comprehensive approach to eradicate international
terrorism. Our cooperation in this area would be a positive, stabilizing factor in Asia and the World at large\textsuperscript{32}.

In past years both India and Japan agreed to exchange high level visits, commenced a comprehensive security dialogue, resumed defense exchanges and shared perception on regional and global issues including or eradicating terrorism\textsuperscript{33}.

Japan in Asia always tried to promote peace prosperity and regional integrity. He always initiated to solve bilateral dispute between or among the countries specially India and Pakistan. Japan sends Vice Foreign Minister Seiken Sugiura, to Pakistan and India for the purpose to reduce tension between the two South Asian countries in conjunction with other friendly nations on 28\textsuperscript{th} February 2002. at Singapore. In a separate development the Chinese Foreign Minister Tomg, Jianuan, Spoke to his American counterpart Colleen Powell and called for more balanced and fairer attitude from the international community to encourage a “direct dialogue” between India and Pakistan\textsuperscript{34}. The Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi during a telephonic conversation on May 29 2002 urged his Indian counterpart Atal Behari Vajpayee to prevent a war with Pakistan “by all means and exercise restrain. On May 31, 2002 the special Japanese envoy and senior Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Seiken Sugiura, speaking to press persons after rounding of his
interaction with senior Indian policy makers, advocated positioning of international monitors along with Indian and Pakistani observers to verify by reduction of infiltration across the LOC\textsuperscript{35}.

Japan expressed its view and hope that the prevailing tension between India and Pakistan would be resolved after the Local Assembly Election in Kashmir and the General Election in Pakistan. On 18\textsuperscript{th} October 2002 “The Japanese Foreign Minister, Yoriko Kawaguchi said the decision by India to pull its troops back from the international border with Pakistan and Pakistan reciprocal gesture constituted a positive step” towards the reduction of tension on the India Pakistan border\textsuperscript{36}.

On October 22, 2002 External Affair Minister Yashwant Sinha told in a press conference at New Delhi to Japanese Prime Ministers, special envoy Y’ Mori that India was disappointed at the international community’s inability to make Pakistan conform to its commitment to end cross border terrorism. Mori also met the Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani and conveyed to him that Japanese continued to pressure Pakistan on the issue of cross border terrorism\textsuperscript{37}.

Japan is a responsible as well as sufferer country and wanted to solve the conflict. She urged the world community to come forward and joined hands to resolve the tension between India and Pakistan.
The number of effort has been done by Japan as well as super powers like U.S, Britain, France etc but the problem still same. Both India and Pakistan had put allegation on each other for any types of disturbance within the country like terrorist attack, bomb blast etc.

In response of all such types of events the Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee told the visiting Japanese Foreign Minister Yoshiro Kawaguchi on January 8, 2003 at New Delhi that those who were saying to India to hold talk with Pakistan, they should told Islamabad to end terrorism directed against New Delhi. Ms Kawaguchi said Tokyo had called upon Islamabad to dismantle the terrorist base on its territory “Terrorism for whatever reason was not acceptable”.

The Japanese Foreign Minister deeply shocked by the brutal terrorist attack in Mumbai in August 2003. The Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao said he was “shocked” to hear about blasts. The German chancellor, Gerhard Schroeder, said that in this “Tragic” hour his government stood by India. The French Foreign Minister said, “No reason nothing can be justify the attack”. The Russian Foreign Minister in a statement “resolutely” condemned the Mumbai terrorist strike and noted “Striking similarities” between the Mumbai blast and the second terrorist attacks in Chechanya and Iraq where also car Bombs were used.
The advancement of technology made the human life more luxurious and comfortable in one hand. But it had become a serious threat for the human being in the form of nuclear and chemical weapons which is generally used by terrorist or during the war. It has occupied the center position in international relations. The message of peace, non-violence and harmony was spread by India and Japan. The former Prime Minister I.K. Gujral inaugurated the Seminar in Delhi and emphasised the relevance of Gandhism and Buddhism in a joint symposium of Indo-Japan Relations.

Both India and Japan are responsible country of Asia. They convinced each other for political stability and regional integrity by reducing the tension between the countries.

In a press conference in Washington on October 23, 2003 announcement made by the External Affairs Minister Yashwant Sinha developed the relations with Pakistan.

A French Foreign Ministry spokesperson described the Indian announcement as a “positive development”.

The Bush Administration welcomed India's latest proposal to improve relations with Pakistan. The State Department Deputy Spokesman Adam Ereli, said “They represent a major step toward establishing normal link between these two important neighbours.
The British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw warmly welcomed the statement by External Affair Minister Yashwant Sinha. In Moscow the Russian Foreign Ministry welcomed India's, new peace proposal to Pakistan and expressed the hope that Islamabad would accept it then. Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, Zhang Qiyue in Beijing welcomed India's peace proposal to Pakistan. Again in a press conference at Beijing on November 26, 2003 China said “Better relations” between India and Pakistan would not only serve the interest of the two South Asian Countries and their people but also be “conducive to regional peace and development”.

In Tokyo the Japanese Foreign Ministry Press Secretary welcomed India’s “positive response” to the Pakistan Prime Minister, latest announcement on a complete ceasefire along the LOC in Kashmir and in the Siachen Glacier”.

Kashmir is the main factor in India-Pakistan conflict since the independence. There is always a situation like war, terror, cross-border tension between India and Pakistan due to Kashmir. All the countries of the World appreciated the step of the India-Pakistan which promote peace and prosperity of two neighbours. The peace and mutual understanding of these two countries will not only promote economic development and
political stability in the region but also eradicate terrorism and armament race.

On December 2, 2003 in a press conference at Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Minister said that, “it highly evaluated a series of confidence building measure” that the two South Asian neighbours had recently taken. Japan expected that this positive development would develop further the India-Pakistan relations and promote mutual understanding and cooperation between people of two countries.

India and Pakistan were responsible as well as powerful country of Asia. Both the countries want to develop good relations with Japan. But Japan is very much clever as far as their needs and requirement is concerned. Japan seriously concentrated on Security and Strategic perspective.

In 2003, India's External Affairs Minister, Natwar Singh in a Joint press conference with Japan’s Foreign Minister, Yoriko Kawagunchi emphasised that how to strengthen India-Japan global partnership from a strategic perspective. They pointed out to enhance a dialogue and cooperation on security issues. The representative of both the countries emphasised that our long term security concerns and objectives and cooperation in this area would be stabilizing factor in Asia and the world at large.
DIPLOMATIC INTERACTION BETWEEN INDIA AND JAPAN:

One of the noblest qualities of a country is to maintain a good diplomatic interaction. India and Japan maintained a good diplomatic interaction after the declaration of the strategic partnership. The leaders of both the countries were very happy due to new relationship. Japanese Foreign Minister, Yoriko Kawaguchi, in her speech to the Japanese Diet on 4 February 2002, said our relations with India, the foremost Asian country were based on the India-Japan joint declaration issued during the visit of Prime Minister Vajpayee. India and Japan as global partner wanted to maintain cooperation in the political and security areas. The Foreign Minister of both the countries constantly interacted with each other. They met at the Asia cooperation Dialogue in Thailand in June 2002, in Brunaie on the side line of the ASEAN Regional Forum in July 2002 and on the sidelines of the second ministerial conference of the community of democracies in November 2002. In October 2002, the former Japanese Prime Minister, Yoshiro Mori, visited India to attend the Japan week organized by the Japanese Embassy. Prime Minister Vajpayee and Koizumi met on 12 September 2002 during their visit to New York to attend the 57th session of the UN Assembly. Both agreed to promote further bilateral relations in accordance with the India-Japan joint declaration issued on 10 December 2001. This declaration clearly
indicated that India and Japan indeed hopeful of a new spring in bilateral ties in the wake of, so called nuclear winter that had gone by\textsuperscript{42}.

The joint declaration was basically intended bilateral exchange at the echelons of ministries for foreign affairs, finance and defense on continue basis. When we look on broad perspective the security dialogue was to cover counter terrorism issue as well as maritime security for the sake of energy supplies to Japan from West Asia. Although Japans prime concern in formulating the catch all proposition was to engage India in a sustainable fashion on global issues of disarmament, non proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction technology and the like\textsuperscript{43}.

In a joint press interaction at, New Delhi on August 12, 2004, Japanese Foreign Minister emphasised to improve the existing relationship between India and Japan.

He told Indian External Affair Minister Shri Natwar Singh that Japan identified India as a major power in Asia and the World for maintaining international peace, stability and prosperity around the World. He said to Mr. Singh that we agree to cooperate each others on UN reform. We shared the common understanding for the membership of both permanent and non permanent seat in Security Council. We shared the recognition that both countries were legitimate candidate for the permanent membership of the Security Council.
Indian External Affair Minister Natwar Singh agreed with the view of Japanese Foreign Minister and said that "Japan and India shared the understanding that it was of great importance to enhance the effectiveness and credibility of the Security Council, particularly through expanding the membership of the Security Council both the non permanent and permanent seats. Japan and India, based on the firmly-shared recognition that both countries were legitimate candidates for the permanent membership of the Security Council in the light of the current realities of the international community, and make almost efforts and closely work together towards realizing the reform of the Security Council." 

The External Affair Minister Natwar Singh had said that the main focus of our discussion had been on how to strengthen the India-Japan global partnership, proceeding from strategic perspectives. They emphasised to exchange the useful ideas on further development of our multi-faceted cooperation centering on broadening and deepening of bilateral relations and cooperation with each other in meeting global challenges.

Both countries view were similar for the sake of establishing relations with the aim to cooperate each other in emerging global circumstances. They wanted to enhance their dialogue and cooperation on
security issues. They said our cooperation in security area would be a positive stabilizing factor in Asia and the World at large.

On October 25, 2004 Indian Ambassador Mani Lal Tripathi at Japan in a conference at the inauguration of the second Tokyo-New Delhi peace in Asia shared some thoughts on India-Japan relations. They are as follows.

1. Indian Ambassador Mani Lal Tripathi has given their non-neighbourhood experience, our Japanese friends would no doubt have understood our position, if they had imagined themselves in our position, if they had seen the tests in the context of our geographic situation, our security of our region.

2. In a given call for Japan-India Global partnership in the 21st Century, she showed great sagacity in visualizing that our differences on single issue must not stand on the way of constructive engagement in vast areas of convergence.

3. In fact, even a passing look at the emerging post Cold War world makes it obvious that there is now a broad convergence of our enlightened interest and aspiration, our strategic objectives and our security concerns.
4. We have a role to play in imparting momentum to the emergence of rule based, multi polar, democratic and equitable world order that alone can ensure long term peace, stability and equilibrium on our planet.

5. We can work together in persuading all our common friends to recognize that polarity and unilateralism are not sustainable proposition in the long run.

6. The U.N system and both our countries will benefit from Japan and India working together for making this international body more representative of present day realities more effective and more credible.

7. The decision of Japan, India, Germany and Brazil to support one another, candidature for permanent membership of the Security Council was an important step in this direction. The mutual acknowledgement that the claim of each of us stands on its own merit and that we are not in competition here was long our due.

8. Both support a cooperative and, comprehensive approach to combating international terrorism. Both were against double standards in fighting this scourge. Both have a common stake in working together in this regard.
9. Both were vitally interested in insuring the safety and protection of common sea lanes of communication,

10. Since Asia was the focus of this seminar please permit me to say a few words on the importance of Japan-India collaboration in emerging Asia.

11. It was wildly believed that the 21st century will belong to Asia and for good reasons.

12. Asia was the largest continent in the world, both in terms of population as well as Territory.

13. It encompasses extraordinary diversity in terms of religion, race, ethnicity and culture. Several of great ancient civilizations originated in this continent. Almost all major religions were born and continue to thrive in our continent.

14. By 2025 Asia is likely to account for 55 percent of the world population and 57 percent of global GDP.

15. This continent would account for the world largest energy resources.

16. By the year 2010, 60 percent of the world population in the 20-35 age group will be in Asia, contributing a vast pool of producers of goods and services and driving global demands.
17. Speaking at the Asian relation conference in New Delhi in March 1947, Prime Minister Nehru has said, and I quote "We live in an age of tremendous transition and already the next stage takes shape when Asia assumes her rightful place.

18. Asia is on the threshold of realizing that vision.

19. An atmosphere of peace and stability in our region and sustained trust and cooperation among leading Asian nations like Japan, China and India, will be essential to ensure that Asia fulfills its destiny.

20. Mutual acknowledgement on pragmatic bases of the complementary roles that great Asian nations have to play in this regard will facilitate the process.

21. Japan and India as two independent nations and mature democracies, have different perspectives in same areas. However, our common interests far out weigh our differences.

22. Our desire for close, cordial and cooperative relations with Japan was based on national consensus and was above domestic politics.

23. Our new government under Dr. Man Mohan Singh has in numerous pronouncements since taking office, reaffirmed India's
intention to pursue a close strategic and economic engagement with Japan.

24. We were looking to the future of Japan India relation with confidence enthusiasm and anticipation.

25. We want to work with Japanese friends on the basis of equality.

26. We believe that the floret of our global partnership will be positive for our two peoples, it will be positive for Asia and it will be positive for the world as a whole.

Indian ambassador Mani Lal Tripathi had given a friendly speech at Nippon Foundation by Keeping in mind the India's Geo-Political and security environment. He wants to aware, Japan the prevailing circumstances in India and had said that our differences on one single issue must not stand in the way of constructive engagement in vast area of development.

He criticized the unipolarity of world order. He appreciate the emergence of rule based, multi polar, democracies and equitable world order which can promote long term peace, stability and balance of power on our planet.
Mani Lal gave their opinion to Germany, Japan and Brazil to support one another candidatures for permanent membership of Security Council.

Both India and Japan was trying to combating international terrorism and ensuring the safety and protection of common sea lane of communication.

In the last he has said that both India and Japan should perform our friendship on the basis of equality mutual respect, mutual benefit and confidence with each other for economic development and political stability.

An Indian parliamentary delegation led by Somnath Chaterjee, speaker of Lok Sabha, along with the presiding officers of the upper house, visited Japan in November 2004. The delegation met the Japanese Prime Minister and other political leaders on 2 November 2004. They expressed satisfaction regarding Tokyo’s relationship with New Delhi and hoped for further consolidation and expansion of areas of friendship. Due to the political circumstances in which the relationship develops in the context of global partnership, both countries expressed their willingness to support each others candidature for permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The
delegation also met former Prime Minister; Yoshiro Mori who visited India in 2000 helped fashion the global partnership.

Mr. Mori expressed appreciation of India's democratic system and noted that, the visit by the parliamentary delegation from India after a gap, of 15 years would regenerate links between the two democracies. The Indian delegation and the Japanese Foreign Minister, Nobutaka Machimura, express their satisfaction over the present level of bilateral cooperation on the issue of U.N.S.C. reforms.

PERMANENT SEAT IN THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL:

India and Japan as the dominant countries of only Asia but also in world had claimed for the permanent membership of Security Council. In connection of this Kawaguchi had said that India-Japan had shared the recognition and both countries were legitimate candidate for permanent membership of Security Council. Kawaguchi had said that both he and India's Foreign Minister agreed to support each others candidature for permanent membership.

In a joint press statement issued by India, Brazil, Germany and Japan on the need for UN, reforms at New York on September 21, 2004 had said that the Security Council must reflect the realities of the international community in the 21st century. It must be representative,
legitimate and effective. It was essential that the Security Council to include, on a permanent basis, countries will and capacity to take on major representatives, with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security. There has been nearly four fold increase in the membership of the United Nations since its inception in 1945, including a sharp increase in the number of developing countries. Thus Security Council must be expanded in both the permanent and non permanent categories, including developing and developed countries as new permanent members.

The countries like Brazil, Germany, India and Japan are well recognized countries as well as legitimate candidate for permanent membership in an expanded Security Council support each others candidature. Africa must be represented in the permanent membership in the Security Council.

India's Foreign Minister highlighted India's approach on UN reforms. He said that India and Japan shared common understanding to enhance the effectiveness and credibility of the Security Council through expending its membership, both in permanent and non permanent seats.

The expansion of both categories of Security Council membership, permanent and non permanent and the inclusion of developing countries in both will be remedy for today's structural shortcoming. This figure in
the enter alia, in the high level power report and will enable the Security Council to reflect today's realities
51.

India and Japan generally recognized as the legitimate candidates for permanent membership. In prevailing current circumstances in the international community, would support each others candidature, make the great effort and work closely together toward realizing the reform of Security Council. In order to maintain coordination in this direction, both countries agreed to institute a dialogue on UN reforms for exchange of views and coordination of positions on the key issues at the level of Director General
52.

In a press interview on December 1, 2004 at New Delhi Brazil, Germany, India and Japan welcomed the report of high level panel and thank the Secretary General as well as the panel for having created new momentum in the debate about reforms needed to face tomorrows interconnected threats. They said we supported the call for comprehensive approach. The interconnection of threats to international peace and security was more evident than before. They supported and initiated the multilateral system which was essential to cope with the emerging challenges of the world. No single state can protect itself from global threats lets alone find sustainable solution. Therefore a common understating was needed on the future of collective security and the
necessary institutional reforms. Institutional reforms were essential, if the UN had to perform in a way that would generate the need, support and trust among the membership. This applies generally to several bodies but particularly to the Security Council.

It is the responsibility of the international community to bring a change and reform in the Security Council to make the world a multilateral and prosperous world in which all the aspect of human being should be determined.

The India, Japan, Brazil and Germany believed that the panel had put focus on the right issues. Economic and social threat, including poverty and infectious diseases and environmental degradation, interstate conflict, internal conflict, including civil war genocide and other large scale atrocities, radiological, chemical and biological, chemical and biological weapons, terrorism as well as transnational organized crime. Most of these factors largely based on poverty, illiteracy, deprivation, extreme nationalism as well as underdevelopment. The development issues directly linked to the global security and development. Perception of injustice due to extreme poverty and lack of opportunity to improve living condition often provide fertile breeding grounds for terrorism civil unrest and intra state conflict. Therefore we should make a joint effort with the cooperation of developed and developing countries for the
effective development. We should effectively realize the United Nations, should realized the world realities by increasing the number of seats in United Nations Security Council.

The question was raised in Rajya Sabha regarding the increasing of permanent seats in Security Council at New Delhi on December 2, 2004.

In response to this question the minister of state in the Ministry of External Affairs Mr. Ehamed had said that the issue of the reforms and the restructuring of United Nation Security Council had been under discussion at the United Nations for several years. But there was not any decision been taken in this regard. In fact there was an increasing momentum in support of India's candidature for permanent membership in UNSC. Several countries permanent members as well as others have clearly expressed their view in support for India's candidature either in the UN or in the context of bilateral exchanges.

The question was also raised, "Japan's support to get permanent seat in UN Security Council" on December 2, 2001. In reply both the countries Foreign Ministers have said that the legitimate candidate to become a permanent member of Security Council and would support each other to become permanent member of United Nations Security Council.

At the United Nation (UN) India and Japan were together trying to ensure permanent membership of the U.N. Security Council.
(UNSC). The Group 4 drafted resolution on 6 July 2005, which generated very wide support in the general membership in the 59th Session of the General Assembly, which was submitted by Brazil, Germany and India on 5 January, 2006. It was widely recognized that no other module for the reforms and the expansion of the United Nations Security Council can became a substitute. The objective of resubmitting the G-4 resolution was to instill positive dynamics in the process of Security Council reform, which had been emphasized in the outcome Document of the world summit held in September 2005^56.

India, Brazil, Germany and Japan were making a tremendous effort to restructure the United Nations Security Council. The aim of resubmitting G-4 draft resolution was not to call for a vote in the near future. But to further explore the potential of joining hands with all member states supporting structural reform of the Security Council. The African Union had also made an encouraging effort in this context. The main aim of all these initiative was G-4 draft resolution. At that time it was hoped that the President of General Assembly has realize the need for modernizing the Security Council. It was hoped that the tabling of G-4 draft resolution would create a fantastic environment to the Security Council Reform, without which the overall reform of United Nation would be useless and incomplete^57.
On 7 March Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Aso called the African Nations to support Japan's effort to reform the United Nations Security Council. He invited our African friends to cooperate with us in achieving a concrete outcome by the end of the 60th session of the General Assembly of the UN in September 2006. Japan told Germany that their plans to reform the UNSC (United Nation Security Council) must gain the support of the United States and Germany. Both agreed to cooperate on UNSC reform despite differences.

All G-4 members Brazil, India, Germany and Japan has said we will work together toward realizing a meaningful reform of the United Nations including that of Security Council together with other member states.

The US Secretary of states Condoleezza Rice said on 3 March 2006 "We understand India's aspirations for a Security Council seat and we support enlarged, more representations in Security Council that looks like 2005- not 1945". India will continue work together with Japan on this prestigious matter. Both India and Japan have a desire to strengthen a global mechanism for ensuring peace, prosperity and political stability in the world at large. They encourage the concept of sustainable development which protects the environment of this planet which is our common home.
It is a prime responsibility of each individual as well as nation to protect environment by eradicating all means of pollution. Today's world has become an industrial world in which the process of development is rapid. This rapid industrialization development some times creating problem for all living beings in the form of various kinds of disease, disasters, natural climate and ozone layers etc.

To remove all these problems India and Japan talked about sustainable development at the world level. They said development is prime important but it should not such a cost that it may harm nature.

India and Japan were agreed to strengthen their energy and environment cooperation with environmentally sound technologies. In this task they stressed on increased focus on energy security-energy efficiency, conservation and pollution free fuels. They have also talked to cooperate in the hydrocarbons sector areas such as exploration and production and downstream projects including those in third world countries as wells as on improving Asian oil markets and increasing investment in Asian energy infrastructure.

India and Japan was decided to work as partners against proliferation. Expressing their view towards the goal of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, the two governments affirmed that they will seek to promote commonalities and identify areas of convergence for
mutual cooperation between them in a constructive manner. The government of India and Japan consolidate their existing cooperation, both bilaterally and in various international fora\textsuperscript{62}.

Both India and Japan worked together on the issues such as nuclear power, weapons of mass destruction and environmental protection. Both the countries kept this issue as a goal to maintain peace in the world.

On 26\textsuperscript{th} May 2006 India and Japan expressed their opinion in a press conference at Singapore to pursue cooperation in defence and security domain to promote "Stability and Prosperity as well as peace in Asia and the world at large". Describing as "Partner in peace" the two countries identified "mechanism" for such cooperation\textsuperscript{63}.

Both the countries are responsible and powerful countries in Asia. They were aware about the various regional as well as global problems. All these problems could be solved to become a permanent member of the Security Council.

The leaders of India and Japan acknowledged the vital importance of the role of the United Nations in World peace stability and prosperity. They intentionally work together for the early realization of UN reform particularly Security Council. The two leaders also emphasised the revitalization of the General Assembly as it represented the General will of all member states, as well as the importance of enhancing the
efficiency of UN agencies and organs in the social and economic fields in order to effectively address urgent challenges\textsuperscript{64}.

Both India and Japan wanted to make the United Nations and its agencies more influential in the light of global forum. They do not like that the U.N and its agencies should work like a puppet in the hands of few. They wanted representation of all in making the U.N policies and programmes as U.N and its agencies belonged to all member states.

The leader of both the countries working together on regional as well as global issues as they are both associated religiously and culturally.

On August 20, 2007 Prime Minister of Japan Shinzo Abe visited India. He had said in a press interview that we should not be say anything orally, but we should implement the way which is going for the development prosperity and regional integrity. He had said to cover the entire range of political issues. “There are issues where we have worked together very closely, such as in the G-4 when we work for the UN Security Council reform. There were also Asian Integration Issues, Formation of East Asian Summit (EAS) and other work for an open economic architecture in our own region, and also some defense and security issues which affect both sides\textsuperscript{55}.

The Prime Minister Abe had given a comprehensive lecture on India-Japan relations. He had emphasized all the fields which promote
good relations between two and made the task easy which they kept in mind as a goal. Both India and Japan were very much passionate to became a responsible super power like other five permanent members by enhancing- the membership of the United Nations Security Council.

Both the countries hoped that the days are not far when the deserving member states specially India and Japan will become the permanent member of Security Council. They constantly made efforts as well as supported each other for achieving the goal. It has been expected in future that there will not be any conference, at regional as well as international level in which the issue of the expansion of membership of United Nations Security Council will not be discussed.
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