

Asian Studies (120 ECTS): Japanese Studies, Leiden University

**Norms, Resistance and Counter-Securitization
- Pacifism and Democracy in Japanese Security Debate -**

Christiaan Antonius Ludovicus Maria Raaijmakers,

s1117211

MA in Asian Studies (120 ECTS): Japanese Studies

Dr. B.A. Wakefield

July 1, 2016

Word Count: 14.913

Abstract

This essay builds on recent work on securitization theory by scholars such as Balzacq and Floyd, and explores the still underdeveloped field of resistance and counter-securitization. A successful securitization allows for a securitizing actor to deal with an existential threat with extraordinary measures outside the boundaries of normal politics. Resistance refers to the creation of a separate securitization move with its own existential threat and extraordinary measure in relation to the original securitization move. Counter-securitization is defined as an act to halt a securitization move, or to bring the issue back to the realm of ordinary politics. This essay further develops the concept of counter-securitization in comparison to resistance. It also strengthens Floyd's argument on a just securitization theory by examining the role of pacifism, democracy and constitutionalism using the Japanese security debate as a case study. Finally, it illustrates how norms such as democracy and rule of law have slowly become more significant within the Japanese security debate than the pacifist ideology. It first examines the case of Prime Minister Abe's ideology on Japanese security policy before taking a look at the political opposition in regards to Abe's security policies. The section argues that even though the political opposition has all fought against Abe's policies, there is a clear divide between an Old Left and a New Left. This essay then examines two grass-roots movements, the Article 9 Association and a student activist organization by the name of SEALDs. It shows how the political Old Left and the Article 9 Association have created their own securitization move to protect the pacifist constitution, while the political New Left and SEALDs have generated a counteract to bring the topic of security back to the realm of ordinary politics.

Contents

Introduction	3
Japan's Security Background and the Theoretical Framework	5
<i>Securitization, Resistance and Counter-Securitization</i>	7
<i>Legitimacy, Democracy & Rule of Law</i>	10
Mixing Process Tracing with Content Analysis and Discourse Analysis	14
Chapter 1: Abe's Securitization versus the Old Left & New Left.....	17
<i>Abe's securitization of the Japanese security environment</i>	18
Chapter 2: Old Left and New Left: Pacifism versus Democracy and Constitutionalism	21
Chapter 3: The Article 9 Association and the Pacifist Ideology	28
Chapter 4: SEALDs and the fight for Constitutionalism and Liberal Democracy	33
Conclusion.....	40
Bibliography.....	42

Introduction

On September the 17th 2015, a brawl broke out in the National Diet of Japan as members of the opposition successfully prevented the voting on a security bill proposed by the Abe Cabinet. Thousands of people gathered outside the parliament to protest against this new legislation that would allow Japanese troops to be sent abroad for combat under restricted conditions (The Guardian 2015b). However, two months later, the legislation was enacted into a law. While some commentators labeled the actions by the Abe Cabinet undemocratic (Kingston, 2014), Abe managed to create a discourse stressing the necessity of his security related policies and a ‘pro-active contribution to peace’ (Abe 2015b) to legitimize his actions and cope with the threat of Japan’s changing security environment. Nevertheless, his actions were met with resistance from both the political and the public side. What factors played a role within the discourses of resistance? When is it possible for a securitization move, such as that taken by Abe, to be met by “counter-securitization”, and what does that mean? Moreover, in the context of Japanese politics, has the emergence of new protest groups shifted the discourse on security in Japan from pacifism to democracy and rule of law?

This essay examines political and public opposition in Japanese security debate through the means of securitization theory to answer the question how norms and values play a role within resistance and counter-securitization. It will discuss three case studies consisting of opposition parties and two grass-roots movements; the “Article 9 Association” (hereafter: A9A), and “SEALDs,” a student activist organization. First, it strengthens Rita Floyd’s work on a just securitization within the field of securitization theory, by illustrating the indispensability of norms to human well-being in a liberal democracy, the moral rightness of securitization, and the legitimacy of a securitizing actor (Floyd 2011, 432). Secondly, it further explains how counter-securitization differs from ‘regular’ resistance. In short, this essay refers to ‘regular’ resistance as a form of opposition that contains its own securitization move, whereby an issue is presented as an existential threat that needs to be dealt with outside

of normal politics. On the other hand, counter-securitization implies a counteract against a securitization move to bring the issue back into the realm of ordinary politics. Thirdly, it explains how a new conceptualization of Japanese antimilitarism, which emphasizes norms such as the rule of law and proper procedure—what Izumikawa (2010, 130) has defined as “antitraditionalism” is slowly becoming more significant within Japanese security debate, surpassing more familiar “pacifist” orientations that stressed opposition to war as a product of Japan’s historical experience.

The thesis bases its argument on earlier research on the concept of resistance, as discussed by Thierry Balzacq and others, and counter-securitization, which has been extensively researched by researches such as Stritzel and Chang. The first section of this essay contains the theoretical framework of securitization theory and counter-securitization, Japanese security debate and pacifism, and democracy and legitimacy. This will be followed by the methodology section. The first chapter will examine the securitization by the Abe administration to provide a background to which the opposition can be researched. The second chapter will focus on the political opposition. The third chapter will deal with the resistance by the A9A. The fourth chapter will deal with the counter-securitization by SEALDs. This essay will end with a conclusion and a bibliography.

Japan's Security Background and the Theoretical Framework

Changes regarding security have long been a topic of discussion within Japanese politics and Abe was not the first prime minister to aim for change. Primarily members of the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan (LDP) have supported changes that would allow for the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) troops to be sent abroad to participate in combat missions, while initial ideas to change Japanese security were already implemented in the mid-1990s (Izumikawa 2010, 123). Abe, however, has been the most active in changing the Japanese security system, and he has had some measure of success. Nevertheless, his policies were met with heavy criticism, also due to the fact that Abe largely ignored the deteriorating economy. During his campaign in 2012, Abe again announced his desire to change Japanese security. Lind notes how news agencies such as CNN and the *Japan Times* spoke of the 2015 security legislation as “a significant departure from Japan’s postwar pacifism,” but, even though the legislation is a significant moment in Japanese history, Japan has moved away from pacifism since the period of former Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru (Lind 2016, 2-3). Nevertheless, while this might be true for Japan as a state, there is still a huge percentage amongst the Japanese public that holds on to this pacifist norm, and the development of a security policy in the post-war period was largely incremental.

For years, politicians attempting to alter Japanese security policy were met with heavy criticism, both domestically as internationally. China and South-Korea fear Japanese remilitarization and a return to imperialist times. However, one of the greatest problems Japanese politicians face in the case of security is public opposition and antimilitarist sentiment. This antimilitarist sentiment becomes clear once we consider the mass protests at the Japanese diet building that occurred in the summer of 2015 after the Legislation for Peace and Security was turned into a bill. According to constructivists Berger and Katzenstein, this sense of antimilitarism stems from the suffering defeat of Japan during the WWII and the fact that the Japanese people blamed their military leaders for bringing destruction to their nation

(Berger and Katzenstein in Izumikawa 2012, 126). Izumikawa examines Japanese security policy from the viewpoint of Japanese antimilitarism, noting, based on the recent increase in security policy decisions, that “one might conclude that Japanese antimilitarism is in decline” (Izumikawa 2010, 157). However, he argues otherwise and states that the situation evolving around Japanese antimilitarism is changing. He divides Japanese antimilitarism in three elements: 1) pacifism, which opposes any form of military organization, 2) antitraditionalism, in which the core mission is to protect and deepen Japanese democracy and 3) fear of entrapment between two other great powers (Ibid, 125-132). These factors prohibited the Japanese government from pursuing an active security policy.

Izumikawa then goes on to say that the greater the synergy between these three elements, the greater the sense of antimilitarism (Ibid, 129). Pacifists can be divided into two groups. One group includes left-leaning pacifist and labor unions, in addition to Japanese communists (Ibid, 130), which will be examined through parties such as the Social Democratic Party of Japan (SDP) and the Japanese Communist Party (JCP). The other group consists of peace activists, scholars and those who genuinely believe in the pacifist philosophy, which is covered in this essay through research on the A9A. In contrast, antitraditionalists do not oppose all military policies. Rather, they attempt to constrain the security policy in Japan under two conditions: “1) when Japanese public believes that policymakers, in attempting to develop a more active security policy, are taking measures that could undermine Japan’s democracy; and 2) when the public believes that policymakers who seek a more active security policy are traditionalists,” who seek to restore Japanese values by amending the constitution (Ibid 130-131). This essay will illustrate how the political party of the DPJ, which would become the Democratic Party (DP) from March 2016, and SEALDs fit this antitraditionalist category and how these voices have increasingly become more significant.

Securitization, Resistance and Counter-Securitization

Because Abe succeeded in pushing his security policy through the diet outside the realm of normal politics and was met with resistance, this essay makes use of securitization theory and counter-securitization. According to securitization theory, securitization is the framing of an existential threat (Pinto 2014, 165) that legitimizes extraordinary actions that break the rules (Buzan, Wæver & De Wilde 1998, 25). The representation of an existential threat by an actor is called a *securitization move*, which becomes successful when the issue is accepted as such among the public sphere or the wider policy making discourse (Buzan et al. 1998, 25; Taureck 2006, 57; Stone 2009, 8). Buzan, Wæver and De Wilde give three descriptions that define a securitization move: 1) a referent object: for example, the Japanese people, 2) an existential threat: for example, unstable environment with a rising China and North Korea, and 3) extraordinary measures: for example, constitutional revision or reinterpretation leading to a more pro-active security policy (Ibid, 23-26). Securitization theory stresses that all threats, no matter how serious they seem, are constructed, but that there needs to be some discourse of threat in addition to an objective material capability on the part of the enemy to “threaten” (Buzan et al. 1998, 5). For example, in the case of Abe’s securitization we find threats related to the growing military capabilities of China and the missile tests in North Korea.

Additionally, there are felicity conditions which aid in framing the issue in a manner that facilitates the process by which the audience comes to understand the ideas (Pinto 2014, 165). The conditions include: “1) the internal logic of the speech securitization act; 2) the securitizing actor must be considered to have the necessary authority to speak security on the matter; and 3) a connection between the existential threat and historical/cultural associations with danger and harm that may aid the audience in making these associations” (Peoples and Vaughn-Williams in Pinto 2014, 165). Two of these felicity conditions contain important aspects when it comes to resistance: audience and legitimacy. Balzacq and others have attempted to touch upon the topic of the audience, which has remained quite underdeveloped.

According to the Copenhagen School, a ‘securitization move’ must be accepted by the ‘audience’ rendering this elusive group important in the process. However, Léonard and Kaunert argue that it “is unclear what the acceptance by the audience actually means and entails, which makes it hard to identify” (Léonard and Kaunert 2011, 58). This implies that “the nature and the status of the audience remain unaccounted for” (Balzacq 2005, 137). In other words, how significant is the acceptance by the audience regarding the success of a securitization move for securitization theory, when moves still succeed in the case of significant resistance? This question of acceptance by the audience links closely with the issue of legitimization and democracy, which will be discussed later.

Subsequently, Counter-securitization is a term that has been used since Buzan et al.’s first book on securitization theory, but had not been defined and explained in detail until recently. Stritzel and Chang conceptualize counter-securitization by looking at the interactive process of securitization and counter-securitization, or a “communicative struggle of adversary wills” (Luttwak in Stritzel and Chang 2015, 549), during the war in Afghanistan. They first examine the relationship between resistance and counter-securitization. In Balzacq’s edited volume, *Contesting Security*, resistance is defined as a “practice that challenges and potentially undermines existing dominance but that is simultaneously productive” (Vuori 2015, 30-32). Stritzel and Chang explicitly refer to an additional argument made by Balzacq (2015, 3-8); stating that resistance often closely follows a loss of legitimacy and authority on the part of the securitizing actor (Stritzel and Chang 2015, 552). As this essay will illustrate, when a securitizing actor discards norms and values that are important in the eyes of the referent object, it will lead to resistance, counteracts and a loss in legitimacy and authority. In other words, by the time a resisted securitization move has succeeded despite resistance, most of the actor’s legitimacy is lost.

Stritzel and Chang suggest the possibility to explicate counter-securitization “as the

linguistically regulated process of resistance against crucial elements of the securitization process (...) which typically involves processes of legitimization and delegitimization in relation to relevant audiences” (Ibid). The speech act of counter-securitization consists of a “structure of claim, warning and directive (typically demand) supported by the propositional content of proof and/or reasons for the claim/warning (Vuori 2008 in Stritzel and Chang 2015, 550). The actor in resistance can take on many forms, such as the securitized subject, elements with a securitizing actor or an outside actor. While the aim of resistance usually consists of the securitizing actor, it can also be aimed at the speech act or the referent object. Regarding method, Stritzel and Chang state that, through delegitimization, securitization or desecuritization, “counter-securitization may be explicated as a specific form of resistance against the securitization process that takes the linguistically regulated form of a securitizing speech act” (Ibid, 552). The main goal or result of counter-securitization is, if successful, to delay, prohibit/stop, or reverse the securitization process (Ibid, 553).

Stritzel and Chang look at the failure of securing an authorized speaker in the securitization process in the case of the War in Afghanistan, which is an interesting contemplation of how counter-securitization may occur in a highly fragmented society. In contrast, this essay will examine a counter-securitization by the audience in a stable democracy. This essay will extend on this part of resistance by illustrating a case with multiple forms of resistance, one creating its own securitization discourse, while the other engages in counter-securitization. Vuori (2015, 32) states: “Resistance is never in a position of complete exteriority in relation to power. There is no single locus of ‘great refusal,’ no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary. Just as there is a plurality of techniques of government, there is a plurality of resistances to them.” The case study of Japanese security debate provides an excellent example of differences in resistance between multiple actors. It thereby argues that values, traditions and norms play a significant role in a

movement of resistance against the legitimacy of the securitizing actor(s) or the policies. As will be shown in the case studies, the value of democracy and the pacifist norm act as the referent objects within a resisting discourse. However, while the significance of the pacifist norm within the long-standing security debate in Japan has been made clear, the problem of democracy is gradually becoming more significant. Therefore, we first need to examine the role of democracy within securitization theory and the role it plays from normal politics to extraordinary politics.

Legitimacy, Democracy & Rule of Law

As stated before, the questions regarding acceptance by the audience and the possibility of resistance link closely to legitimacy. Legitimacy plays an important role in order to get the audience to accept the extreme measures that are needed to counter these existential threats. As noted by Mata: "... the securitizing actor is socially constructed and recognized by a political community in a given period and space. Its nature is (...) inter-subjectively constructed and not independent of its social environment. The securitizing actor has to be accepted as such. In other words, it needs to hold legitimacy" (Mata 2008, 39). The texture of legitimacy consists of legality, justification and consent. Firstly, securitizing actors will promote their security practices to look legal, especially when they counter existing rules (Balzacq 2015, 6). Secondly, Balzacq argues that "justification is the mechanism that creates and sustains security practices. In other words, the support of the public is acquired precisely through justificatory processes and not exclusively from the legality of security practices" (Ibid). Finally, Balzacq argues that any action related to a security practices expresses a commitment and a public consent to said practice (Ibid, 7). Therefore, consent is important for the effectiveness and stability legitimization, as when consent is lost, the securitizing actor could end up with resistance or opposition (Ibid). The greater the capacity of a securitizing actor to gain and maintain legitimacy, the less resistance the actor will encounter (Ibid). When

the legitimacy of the securitizing actor is contested, resistance tends to be stronger.

A second influence on securitizing actor's legitimacy is the congruence between an actor's speech and his or her act. As Floyd (2011, 432) argues, "The moral rightness of securitization is in part a function of the legitimacy of the referent object, and legitimacy in turn is a function of the referent object being conducive to human well-being. Well-being is highest and most sustainably ensured in liberal democracies and when actors endorse human rights. The presence of liberal democracy and the honoring of human rights therefore serve as helpful indicators of human well-being in any given context." Put otherwise, a securitizing actor who acts morally right and takes into account the norms and values that are essential to the well-being of the referent object, will find beneficial results in terms of his (moral) legitimacy. Buzan et al. define securitization as framing an existential threat as such to allow extraordinary measures outside the boundaries of normal politics into the realm of extraordinary politics. As Vuori argues, due to the fact that securitization theory was originally conceived with regards to European politics, a securitization move is automatically posited as a move from ordinary politics to extraordinary politics, which equates to a move from a realm of issues that are dealt with through "democratic process of government," to a realm where those extraordinary measures are allowed (Vuori 2008, 69). This is what Vuori calls the "democratic bias' of theory" (Ibid, 66). As will be discussed later, this makes the case of Japanese security debate unique as Japan's democratic constitution is a vital aspect within the security debates.

Furthermore, while policy making process in ordinary politics within liberal democratic states coincided with debate and deliberation in an open environment where legislators and other bodies, both political and public, are able to scrutinize the actor (Roe 2015, 251). Securitization on the other hand, "calls for silence and speed (Ibid, 252), which may cause the suspension of the possibility of political and public interference (Aradau 2004,

392). Roe notes how extraordinary politics (or securitization) need not imply “an abandonment of legislative mechanisms.” The political process might be fast-tracked, but a degree of scrutiny and oversight will remain regardless of normal or extraordinary politics (Roe 2012, 260). This leaves Aradau with the question; do silence and speed characterize “the kind of politics that we want? Do we want politics of exceptional measures or do we want democratic politics of slow procedures which can be contested?” (Ibid, 393). Put otherwise, it is important to ask ourselves when examining a case study and securitization study, what state of politics is “a priori” desired? (Wæver 2011, 469; Roe 2012, 261).

Japan is considered a liberal democratic state, and Prime Minister Abe proclaims Japan as a nation that spreads the values of democracy, human rights and rule of law around the world (Abe, 2013). However, Abe acts with a double standard. While promoting these universal values abroad, the prime minister does not respect them at home, claiming “he alone is ultimately responsible for reinterpreting the constitution on behalf of the government” (Wakefield 2014, 6). Abe appears to stress Japan’s legality of the rule of law internationally, in an attempt to challenge the domestic antitraditionalist resistance on collective self-defense by extending the legal basis of the security reforms to the international arena, depicting them as created to help contribute to international legality (Calvo 2014). Blanc argues that resistance, as such, “can only be perceived as a strategic effort to circumvent and eventually limit the possibilities for the groups in power to claim a legitimate exception to the rule of law. Resistance (...) is the act of reframing, once again, the practice of power through the imposition of the rule of law” (Blanc 2015, 65). Disruption of the rule of law is what gives securitization theory its negative tone. Put otherwise, it is bad for democracy (Roe 2015, 252).

This is precisely what is happening within the Japanese security debate. The speed and fast-tracking of Abe’s security policies cause a need to re-examine whether a securitizing actor decides what is exceptional (Roe 2012, 254), or if there is an intersubjective

securitization process whereby the actor in power is subjected to the context of the securitization, which needs to be accepted by an audience (Stritzel 2007, 363) (Balzacq 2011a, 8-9). However, the case of Japanese security debate argues against Roe's argument that securitization and extraordinary politics does not need to imply abandonment of legislative principles of democracy, which has been the main reason for protests by SEALDs. In the case of Japan, we can refer to Floyd's argument that securitization is a "morally wrong outcome only if we value democratic decision-making above all else." The suspension of democratic politics only becomes morally permissible if human beings (or the securitized subject) are "the beneficiaries of security policies, and not the power holders and elites" (Floyd 2010, 4).

Mixing Process Tracing with Content Analysis and Discourse Analysis

Although process tracing is one of the least favorite routes of securitization analysis, Balzacq (2011b, 46-47) has shown how those “who are in the – difficult – business of designing a comprehensive theory of securitization have a great deal to learn from process-tracing,” because it enables a researcher of securitization theory to contribute to the foundation of a more comprehensive theory of securitization. Goldstone argues that the core of process tracing is to examine the aspects of the initial observed conditions with the *simple principles* that are present and combine those to be able to make sense of the sequence of events (Goldstone in Balzacq 2011b, 47; emphasis in original). Essentially, process tracing examines “social mechanisms which brought a social phenomenon into being” (Balzacq 2011b, 47). The method does so by operating with mainly qualitative data (newspapers, interviews, etc.), which are types of sources that will be used in this essay. Through this, process tracing seeks, under the strategy of condition-seeking, to answer the question under which conditions (counter-) securitization can occur. Insights by process tracing not only contribute to the development of securitization theory (Ibid), it also helps in strengthening counter-securitization. It allows us to identify the political and social phenomenon of resistance, having provided a conceptual framework based on prior knowledge on securitization and counter-securitization in the previous chapter in addition to a description of the situation in Japanese security debate in the following chapter on Prime Minister Abe’s own securitization (see Collier 2011, 824).

Content analysis and discourse analysis are two methods that share a similarity and are often combined with satisfying results. Along with process tracing, content analysis is one of the routes researchers of securitization tend to travel the least likely (Balzacq 2011b, 46). Content analysis is primarily used to “capture the kind of cues to which an audience is likely to be responsive to...” (Herman in Balzacq 2011b, 50). Rather than analyzing entire documents, content analysis will allow us to focus on those words or phrases that are

reoccurring within the discourses by the political opposition parties and grass-roots movements. Discourse analysis is an often preferred methodology when examining a securitization move, as it holds impressive credentials as an enabler of establishing the meaning of a text shaped by distinct context (Balzacq 2011b, 40). In addition, said to fall within the field of social linguistic analysis, discourse analysis is able to help “investigate the production of specific phenomena such as identities, decision and norms” (Ibid). This essay will make use of a qualitative approach as the main goal of this essay is not to show the degree of which the counter-securitization affects Abe’s securitization, but to illustrate what the aspects of the counter-securitization are and how these affect securitization theory as a whole (Ibid, 51).

First, I will use speeches and statements related to security by Shinzô Abe to illustrate the securitization by those in favor of changing Article 9 of the constitution. Texts are available on the website by the Japanese Cabinet (Kantei). I will be using speeches and statements starting from the beginning of Prime Minister Abe’s second term in 2012. In order to show the difference between the old political and new political left, I will use party-programs and documents available on party-websites as well as interviews and newspaper articles. Next, I will be using documents and posts from the websites owned by the grass-roots movements and newspaper articles related to their protests or interviews for the chapters on A9A and SEALDs. This allows me to use both written language as well as images that convey the meaning and reason for their resistance. This essay will focus primarily on texts dating from 2013 onward. In particular, I will use some specific moments between 2013 and late 2015, such as the lifting of the ban on the export of weapons and the Legislation for Peace and Security. The news articles I will use will come from online news articles such as the Japan Times and the Asahi Shimbun, the latter being a newspaper that tends to be more left-wing. However, since this is an essay on the protest of the political left-wing and those who opposed

Abe's security policies, limiting ourselves to Asahi Shimbun and the Japan Times is not a problem.

In short, this essay makes use of any form of text that contains political or resisting language that justifies the position a protest group or political opposition takes in order to create a view on what is “useful-harmful, good-evil, just-unjust” (Chilton 2004, 199). This essay uses Japanese texts as much as possible to prevent any loss that might have happened during translation to English by third parties. There are three problems I may encounter: firstly, I am not native Japanese, and therefore I must be careful when coding statements in sources in a language which is not my mother tongue. Secondly, SEALDs is a very young organization that was founded in 2015, which limits the primary sources. Lastly, as this essay makes use of qualitative analysis, rather than a quantitative method, I may exclude an article that refers to security related topics, but does not focus on it. The resistances by both grass-roots movements allow us to demonstrate the importance of values and norms when performing securitization. In addition, it shows that “above politics” does not imply that a securitizing actor can move away from democratic procedures altogether, especially when the value of democracy and rule of law is exactly what the referent object of a securitization move sees as significant for its identity.

Chapter 1: Abe's Securitization versus the Old Left & New Left

This section examines Abe's securitization, and in particular references to norms and democracy within his securitization move. It builds on work by previous researchers such as Izumikawa (2010), Floyd (2011), and Kersten (2015). While Abe's securitization move can be traced back to his initial term as prime minister in 2006-2007, because Abe's securitization move is merely used to illustrate how norms and references to democracy and rule of law appear within the context of a securitization, this section will mainly limit itself to his second term and in particular the 2015 Legislation for Peace and Security in addition to his wish for reinterpretation or revision of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. It will provide a background that allows for a greater understanding regarding the purposes of, and reasons for, protests by political parties and grass-roots movements. As will become clear, Abe's movement on security has the Japanese left-wing divided into an Old Left and New Left, each constituting a different position towards the debate around Article 9.

As the next chapter will make clear, while the Old Left fundamentally opposes any form of revision of Article 9, the New Left is willing to engage in debates on revision, but oppose any form of procedure that could harm democracy, constitutionalism and rule of law. The Old Left resists Abe's securitization by creating their own securitization discourse in which their political ideal of constitutional preservation is threatened. This implies that Abe's security policies are interfering with the Old Lefts perception of the threat that is Japan's changing security environment to their own policy objectives of peaceful diplomacy and non-aggressiveness, giving need to an emergency measure that requires the preservation of Article 9 and prohibition of right to collective self-defense. On the other hand, the New Left has engaged in counter-securitization by criticizing Abe's undemocratic procedures, calling out to his disobedience of the rule of law, trying to bring the issue back into the realm of ordinary politics. However, before we can discuss the political opposition's side, it is first necessary to illustrate Abe's securitization.

Abe's securitization of the Japanese security environment

Buzan et al. argue that securitization consists of three steps; an existential threat, a referent object and emergency measures (Buzan et al. 1998, 23-26). If we examine Abe's securitization of Article 9 and the importance of his security policies by inspecting his speeches from his second term as prime minister, we find a clear structure of an existential threat, a referent object and a form of emergency action. The threats to the security environment of Japan are no mystery. Actions by North Korea have been the Japanese government for decades, including abductions of Japanese nationals, missile tests that flew over Japan or crashed into the Japanese Sea and the missile that was launched into space in early 2016. Additionally, there is the rise of world-wide terrorism, territorial disputes with rising China and South Korea and nuclear threats that provide the necessary evidence for Prime Minister Abe of existential threats. These threats, that endanger the referent object consisting of the Japanese nation and its citizens, are eminent in his speeches and statements (Abe 2015a). Prime Minister Abe's solution is clear; a more proactive Japan that contributes to peace and stability ("Japan is Back: A conversation with Abe" 2013). The answer to achieving this goal coincides with his personal ideology and desire of changing Article 9 of the constitution, whether it is through legislation, reinterpretation or revision, the latter being the ultimate goal for Abe.

In his securitization move, Prime Minister Abe justifies his actions by stating that after the war, Japan has created a country with the principles of democracy, that honors the fundamental human rights, obeys rule of law and that walks the path of peace (Ibid 2015b). He argues it is important that Japan contributes proactively to peace world-wide. It is here where the norms of pacifism and democracy/rule of law in his securitization move become clear. Put otherwise, as Berger argues, "through referencing the norms of liberal democracy, making an 'international contribution' and performing 'proactive pacifism', Abe's government has acknowledged and reinforced the necessity of framing security in primarily

normative terms in the Japanese context” (Berger in Kersten 2015, 7), which are the same norms that the political opposition and public resisting forces try to protect. As stated by Kersten, “there is a widespread conviction in Japan that the proposed laws incorporate normative dissonance and incoherence instead of congruence between security norms and security policies” (Kersten 2015, 7). The normative dissonance between Japanese pacifism and security policies affects the Japanese norm of antimilitarism, as explained through Izumikawa’s article discussed earlier. According to Prime Minister Abe, his own logic of pacifism justifies his security policies and coincided procedures, yet rather than justifying pacifism, the policies violated the norm of pacifism (Ibid, 14).

Besides the norm of pacifism, Abe violates the norm of democracy. Kersten (2015, 14) notes how Abe has appealed to his domestic constituency on the norm of pacifism, while appealing to the norm of liberal democracy to external constituencies. Buzan et al. do state that a successful securitization allows a securitizing actor to perform extreme measures outside the boundaries of normal politics, or, in other words, outside the realm of democratic process. There is a problem in this statement, especially in the case of opposition in Japan. One of the reasons for political and public opposition in Japan is the threat that Abe’s procedures with regards his security policies endanger the liberal democracy that the LDP advocates and is supported by the public. Wakefield notes how Abe is maintaining a double standard on democracy and rule of law, arguing that he does not respect these universal values at home (Wakefield 2014, 6). The threat to democratic procedures and rule of law can be linked to Floyd’s second criteria of a normative securitization, which relates to a referent object of security that is morally legitimate (Floyd 2011, 427). As the presence of liberal democracy and the honoring of human rights are important indicators of a normative securitization, violating these norms and rights could lead to resistance or a failure of the securitization move. In the case of Abe, his violation of liberal democracy denormalized his

securitization move, leading to resistance and protest against his undemocratic practices.

In short, even though Prime Minister Abe has proclaimed support to norms and rule of law, stark conflict remains. As Kersten puts it, this conflict emanates “from the anti-state impetus of the antimilitarist norm and the perceived democratic deficiencies of what appears to be a procedural coup (Kersten 2015, 13). The majority of the critique was aimed at the reinterpretation of collective self-defense, because it is tantamount to accepting the use of force and right to belligerency, which is not allowed under the constitution (Ibid). The procedure followed by the Abe administration in the course of changing Japanese security has “shattered the congruence between norms and security policy in Japan” (Ibid, 19.). This shattered congruence has resulted into protests against Japanese security that have occurred in post-war Japan from both the political and the public perspective, leaving popular perceptions of identity and the perspective of the Abe administration of that same identity in a state of conflict (Ibid). Abe and his political supporters’ ideals assault two out of the three factors that constitute Izumikawa’s concept of anti-militarism; pacifism and antitraditionalism. As stated earlier, the greater the synergy between the factors of anti-militarism, the greater the opposition. One is therefore able to argue that the Abe administration made it harder to pursue changes in Japanese security by not merely crossing pacifist ideals, but also by ignoring democratic procedures and rule of law. The next section will examine the political opposition of Abe’s security policy and examines changes in attitude and opposition towards Japanese security policy.

Chapter 2: Old Left and New Left: Pacifism versus Democracy and Constitutionalism

Political opposition against Japanese security policies is nothing new. Ever since the start of debates on Article 9 and security during the post-war period, politicians, legislators and citizens have opposed any changes to the pacifist ideology of Article 9. The LDP has been in power for almost the entire period of post-war Japan, with only brief interruption in 1993 and a three year intermission when the DPJ came to power between 2009 and 2012. In 2012, Prime Minister Shinzô Abe took office once again after he stepped down during his first time due to health related issues and declining popularity in 2007. The deterioration of the security environment of Japan facilitated Abe's securitization move, but also had the effect of increasing opposition from the left, which had experienced Abe's campaigns on changing the Japanese pacifist ideology once before. This chapter examines political opposition during Prime Minister Abe's second term as Prime Minister. It shows how pacifist ideologies and rule of law split up the political left on Japanese security policies, creating an Old Left that securitized the protection of the pacifist constitution and a New Left that sought to bring the issue back within the boundaries of normal politics.

Firstly, when I refer to the Old Left and New Left, I do not refer to the political movement of the '60s and 70's.¹ Rather, with the term, I imply a shift between an old political left within the debate of security which opposes any policy that harms the pacifist ideology of Article 9 and a new political left, which is a more moderate opposition that arose in the late-1990s with the DPJ and is willing to go into debate on security policies as long as it would happen through democratic procedure (Hyde 2009, 79) (Wakefield 2014, 7). Secondly, it is not that straightforward to divide parties along the lines of Old Left and New Left, as even within parties itself there is a divide amongst those who support the pacifist principle and are reluctant to debate and those who are open for discussion.

¹ This political New Left movement broke free from parties such as the Japanese Communist Party and the Japanese Socialist Party, which at that time formed the left-wing side of Japanese politics, and adopted the radical political thought similar to the Western New Left. The existence of the New Left, which consisted on both a political and public level, led to terrorism and violence within Japan until their influence eventually died out (Steinhoff 2004, 123-126).

For this research, we have focused on three political parties in particular, as these are the most significant opposition parties, with more information available with which they are able to reach a larger audience. These parties include the largest opposition party, the aforementioned DPJ, in addition to the SDP and the JCP. In addition, at the end of March 2016, the Innovation Party (IP) merged with the DPJ to form the Democratic Party (DP). Therefore, DP will be examined as an extension of the DPJ. While some of these parties do not hold many seats, they can be considered the largest opposition parties within the political system of Japan. Additionally, parties like the DPJ can be considered center-left in the political spectrum and even within coalition parties, right-wing parties and their members, such as within the Komeitô or LDP, we find parties that oppose any alteration to Article 9 or its reinterpretation without proper democratic procedure. Lastly, the New Left does not imply that such politicians do not uphold the pacifist ideology of Article 9. Rather, it implies that they may be open to deliberation on security policies as long as they do not harm the pacifist norm and follow proper democratic procedure.

2013 seemed a relatively quiet year with regards to protests against Abe's security policies, as the prime minister limited speaking about security to those moments where he wants to pass a security related bill. And it is not until late that year that the first signs of his intentions become clear and protests start to arise. In December 2013, opposition parties found themselves screaming and throwing papers at a speaker during a session of the Japanese Parliament, when Abe "railroaded" a vague and hastily drafted secrets protection bill into a law (Craft 2013). The premises of the law include secrecy of security related topics such as military intelligence, defense and counterterrorism. Additionally, during these protests, we first notice how opposition parties point out or criticize Prime Minister Abe's political ways that do not fit a democratic society. The railroading of the secrets protection law pushed opposition parties to submit a motion of no-confidence. As former leader of the DPJ, Banri

Kaieda explains: “Prime Minister Abe has finally shown his true self. This is authoritarian politics that silences any inconvenient discussion as he (*Abe*) sees fit, does not take the voices of the people into consideration and tramples all over the others by using the number of seats in the Diet” (Democratic Party of Japan 2013). Kaieda goes on to say that Abe’s tactic of using an authoritarian Diet that relies on numbers endangers the nation’s parliamentary democracy (Ibid). On the same day, the SDP released a statement saying that the railroading of the secrecy law had destroyed democracy and opened the door for new security policies that could damage the pacifist ideology of the constitution (Social Democratic Party 2013).

While a motion of no-confidence was submitted, it did not succeed. By the end of 2014, the secrets protection law came into effect. Although it may have turned out to be ineffective, we do clearly see a difference regarding the construction of resistance between opposition parties. Both the DPJ and SDP call out to the audience that Prime Minister Abe threatens the very sort of liberal democracy he claims the nation to be. A difference here is that the DPJ does not point out the immediate threat to the pacifist ideology, while the SDP illustrates how the secret protection law paves the way for defense proposals on collective self-defense (Ibid). Comparing the manifestos of the DPJ and the SDP, we find that the DPJ demonstrates that the party is open to change in security policies as the party itself proclaims a deepening security alliance with the U.S. and even states that it is open to debate on the secret protection law under “strengthened supervision and intervention by the Diet or other third-party bodies” (DPJ 2014b, 7). On the other hand, while both parties oppose collective self-defense, the SDP claims it wants to weaken the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and limit the defense capabilities as much as possible (SDP 2015b, 54). In addition, it opposes any (form of) discussion on the secrets protection law (Ibid, 45).

In February 2014, Abe stated that, since the people elected him, he himself was the sole responsible person for constitutional reinterpretation, leading to heavy criticism by

political parties regarding Abe violating constitutionalist principles (Asahi Shimbun 2014e). Less than two months later, the Abe administration took the next major step in changing Japanese security as the three principles that severely limited weapons export were altered. Although still limited, the lifting of the ban would permit Japan to export weapons to partners under the condition they do not sell them to third countries without Japanese approval (Fackler 2014). The new guidelines were a clear indication of Abe's intention to change the course of Japanese security and reinterpret Article 9, enabling Japan to aid its allies. This led to a second wave of criticism and protest by the opposition parties. With the Abe administration as the threat, opposition parties attempted to show the harm the new export related guidelines could cause. Just like during the major protests on the secrets protection law, there was a division amongst parties on the referent object of the resistance. While the JCP and the SDP heavily proclaimed the danger to Japanese pacifism, opposing the new guidelines to weapons export in its entirety (Communist Party 2014a) (SDP 2014), the DPJ showed willingness to investigate the contents of the new guidelines if it would be through proper Diet debate, criticizing the procedure of these new principles (DPJ 2014a). However, despite public support for protest against the new guidelines, the opposition parties were unable to take measures or strengthen their public support sufficiently enough.

The Abe administration was forced to deal with another wave of critique in July 2014, when the government's stance on the right to collective self-defense was once again affirmed. The then DPJ President Kaieda spoke of backroom discussions between the ruling parties without proper debate, implying criticism on the government's democratic procedures (DPJ 2014c). The JCP and SDP criticized the Abe administration for ignoring constitutionalism and expressed anger over the stance on right to collective self-defense that would trample the pacifist ideology (Asahi Shimbun 2014d). Prime Minister Abe became more assertive when it came to his defense policies and in November 2014, he dissolved the Lower House and called

for a snap election for December of the same year to ensure and consolidate support over opposition parties in disarray. Regaining support, which had been in decline, would give him the opportunity to introduce some additional unpopular defense policies. The opposition parties had little time to prepare, but statements and political stances were made public. In an article by the Asahi Shimbun right before the election, opposition parties gave their statement on several topics. Their statements on security show the difference between an Old Left and New Left within the Japanese security debate. Both the SDP and the JCP warned for the danger of getting involved in wars together with the U.S. (Asahi Shimbun 2014a). On the other hand, the DPJ argued that the bills need to be repealed because they were passed without Diet debate, indicating willingness to debate the security related policies that may affect the pacifist constitution (Ibid.). While the DPJ does not necessarily agree with the legislation, their protest is aimed at the threat of democratic procedures and constitutionalism being ignored.

The summer of the following year would be crucial when, in July 2015, the Legislation for Peace and Security was passed through the Lower House that could allow Japanese troops to be sent to combat zones abroad. The Legislation for Peace and Security led to mass protests and brawls within and outside the government buildings. For the next days, the leaders of the opposition parties showed their protests to the Abe administration, calling out to the public for support. However, this tactic did not bear any fruit and in September, the bill was passed through the Upper House. The discourse on these security events by the JCP included a statement by JCP member Ichi Tadayoshi in the Asahi Shimbun, stating that in case of Japan killing people from other countries, it would be inevitable for Japanese citizens to become “hated targets” themselves (Asahi Shimbun 2015h). At the same time, the SDP called the Legislation for Peace and Security a “war bill,” which should not be allowed as it would overhaul the war-renouncing country of Japan (SDP 2015a). Both these statements

show fear of Japan becoming a country that engages in active wars. The anxiety that comes with changes to the constitution would end Japan's post-war pacifist ideology. On the other hand, Chief of the DPJ Katsuya Okada opposed the right to collective self-defense, but especially called out to the damage caused to Japan's democracy due to the steamrolling of this unconstitutional law (DPJ 2015.3). Upon the question how the DPJ would deal with the legislation, Okada answered: "We must return to the drawing board with regards to the section on right to collective self-defense" (Ibid).

Thus how does the resistance by the JCP and SDP differ from the counter-securitization by the DPJ? While the political parties are able to confront the LDP/Kômeitô coalition, the SDP and JCP created their own securitization, rather than countering Abe's securitization. Within their own securitization, the peaceful ideology of the constitution and the identity of Japan as a peaceful country are the referent objects. The threats are Japan ending up in conflicts or Japan becoming a country that (likes to) go to war. On the other hand, the DPJ has been showing its willingness to debate alterations to the constitution, albeit with proper Diet debate. This was strengthened in 2016. Right before the DPJ merged with the IP to become the DP, the two parties presented three alternative bills to cover "gray zones" situations that fall short of attacks (Nikkei 2016). Additionally, chief of the DP, Katsuya Okada stated that the Abe government needs to retract the law as the new interpretation of the constitution went without sufficient explanation (Ibid). The DP, JCP and other opposition parties proposed new bills to scrap the security laws and created a united front in the hope to put an end to Abe's power by winning the Upper House election of the summer of 2016. However, the cooperation between the opposition parties was frail because of political differences. For example, while the JCP aims to dissolve the SDF and scrap the Japan-U.S. security treaty, the DP sees no problem with the SDF and the treaty with the U.S., but opposes the particular law that allow for right to collective self-defense which the party deems

unconstitutional. It is clear that the DP, and the former DPJ, represent a new left in the security debate in Japan. One that moves away from Japan's post-war pacifism into a more realistic 21st century form of antitraditionalism that paves the way for liberal democratic debate over Japanese security.

Chapter 3: The Article 9 Association and the Pacifist Ideology

While the previous chapter examined political opposition within Japanese security debate, chapter three and four will deal with two grass-roots movements, which each represent a different aspect of the debate. In addition, it shows that there is a shift within public opposition on the issue of security. This chapter deals with the topic of post-war Japanese pacifism in public opposition. This decade alone, over 7000 like-minded groups that support the war-renouncing Article 9 of the constitution have sprung up across Japan (Hirano 2014). The Article 9 Association (*Kujô no Kai*), launched in 2004, is considered one of the most relevant protest groups, consisting of several influential people, such as the recently deceased Nobel Prize-winning author Kenzaburo Ôe was a founding member. The group and its members travel around Japan to encourage people in helping to prevent the resurgence of militarism (Ibid). Their main mission is to protect Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution and its pacifist ideology. The current leader of the A9A, Yôichi Komori, has even gone so far as to support the appeal to nominate Article 9 for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2014. While the association contains members from younger generations, the nine inaugural members were all born in pre-war Japan and have experienced the devastation of the war first hand. It is worthy to note that not everyone within the A9A opposes the SDF in general. In fact, although some argue that the SDF should be dismantled eventually, the association states in an appeal that they do not consider a dispatch of the SDF to countries where they are not welcome a contribution to the international society (Article 9 Association, 2004). This would imply that dispatching in the name of humanitarian aid would be allowed, as happened during the 2010 earthquake in Haiti.

Even though protests already occurred before Abe came to power in 2012, this essay will limit the examined protests from late 2013 in order to get a comparative aspect between all three of the chapters. Furthermore, countless protests have occurred, and occur, all around the country, but because the discourse is the same within many protest rallies it is unnecessary

to examine every single protest or demonstration. The first period covers the secret protection law in the end of 2013. Around the period in which the secret protection law was railroaded by the Abe administration, the A9A organized several protests around the country to rally against it. On December 7th, the Akishima sector of the A9A held a protest meeting against the secret protection law in front of Akishima station in the Tokyo area. Representatives there protested on the account of Japan going to war as one unit with the U.S. while “the eyes, ears and mouths of the people are closed” due to the secrets protection law (Asahi Shimbun 2013b). A few days later, the A9A in the Saitama prefecture rallied against the law, arguing that it would lead the way to constitutional reinterpretation (Asahi Shimbun 2013a). It becomes clear from this that the A9A regards the pacifist clause within the constitution as being under threat with the secrets protection law and that the constraints Japan has previously imposed on itself as a security actor are still represented with the paramount pacifist norm amongst the Japanese public (Kersten 2015, 7).

Then, despite nation-wide protest meetings and demonstrations, it remains awfully quite in terms of published works by the A9A and newspapers on the lifting of the ban of defense weapon export in April 2014. The Asahi Shimbun did publish an article in their Fukui prefecture edition in which Toi Haruo (then 85), the town mayor of Matsuoka-chô and sponsor of the A9A, was interviewed for his memories regarding the war (Asahi Shimbun 2014b). This interview was published against the background of recent security-related activities such as the secrets protection law and the changes on the three principles on weapons export. However, even though protests continued on the topic of constitutional change and harm to the Article 9, the alteration of the three principles on weapon export did not lead to an exceptional increase of protest and demonstration directly aimed at the lifting of the ban. It must be noted that this does not imply that the A9A agreed with the lifting of the ban on weapons export, but that these changes were imbedded in their general counter-

securitization discourse on the threat to pacifism. As we see in works by the A9A and the Asahi Shimbun in and after July 2014, when Abe confirmed his assertiveness on constitutional reinterpretation once again, this discourse becomes apparent again.

On July 2nd, the Abe administration took the next step to constitutional reinterpretation. Representatives and participants opposed to the Abe administration's reckless behavior which had led to unconstitutional practices and a Cabinet decision that "turned a country that does not go to war 180 degrees into a country that engages in war activities" (Asahi Shimbun 2014c). A couple of days later, the A9A released a newsletter in which it called out to its members, stating that *now* was the time to strike against the Abe administration's destruction of constitutionalism (A9A 2014b, 1). The article argues how the Abe Cabinet silenced voices of opposition and is recklessly changing Japan into a war-loving country (Ibid). From this we can see the securitizing discourse in which the Abe Cabinet and the "war legislation" (Ibid) are being framed as a threat to the pacifist ideology of Article 9. The newsletter then calls out to all members of the A9A to express their grass-roots voices during October 2014 for a period of a month filled with protest rallies, meetings and parades with posters and leaflets to spread the message on the destruction of Article 9 by Prime Minister Abe on every level (Ibid, 2-3). By focusing on the possibilities of Japan becoming a war-loving country, the A9A securitized the protection of Article 9, which was created to ensure the lives, freedom and happiness of all citizens (Ibid. 1) and prevents Japan from the threat of becoming such a nation.

In December 2014, the A9A prepared themselves for the 2014 snap elections. In the Mie prefecture, members of the Association called out to the people to vote in order for the country "not to go to war" (Asahi Shimbun 2014f). Earlier, on the 24th of November, the A9A had organized a rally and parade in central Tokyo, where founders and representatives of the local A9A groups called out to the people in the street. Constitution researcher Yasuhiro

Okudaira urged everyone to resolutely confront the Abe Cabinet to prevent current and additional dangerous schemes that would destroy the pacifism that have been the basis of actions that have been undertaken together for the past 60 to 70 years (A9A 2014a, 2). He claimed that (Japanese) pacifism needs to become a universal form of pacifism to stand up against Abe's "proactive pacifism" (Ibid). However, nation-wide parades and rallies were to no avail. Abe won the snap election and concerns for the A9A on Japan becoming a war-engaging country increased. It was therefore not surprising that A9A organized and partook in many protests after Abe railroaded the Legislation for Peace and Security through the Lower House in July 2015. Demonstrations arose all over Japan and the A9A urged everyone to rise up against the illegality and unconstitutional bills to protect the pacifist ideology of the constitution. Signs used during the nation-wide demonstrations showed slogans such as "Stop the war bill" and "We will not allow Abe's politics" (Asahi Shimbun 2015c), the latter indicating a move in the securitization discourse from security policies to an inclusion of the Abe administration itself becoming such a threat to pacifism to which emergency measures are required.

In the following months, the A9A would continue its rallies to try to achieve the war bills being scrapped, including massive protests after the bills were railroaded through the Upper House in mid-September. Signs were held up in a protest rally in the Chiba prefecture showing similar slogans as before. However, different from the year before some showed slogans stating "Abe administration, resign!" (Asahi Shimbun 2015b), indicating that the Abe administration had become such a threat to pacifism that the members of the A9A demanded the Abe Cabinet to resign, and to create an opportunity to pave a way to reverse the cabinet decisions. Put otherwise, from our starting point in late 2013, we see that the securitization discourse has remained similar over the years. However, while Prime Minister Abe was regarded as harmful to the pacifist ideology before, it has been his recent actions that have

lifted him to threat level that increases the chances of Japan being a war-loving country, which needs to be protected by Article 9. The A9A's protests continue in the wake of the 2016 Upper House elections. The Association has expressed support for the united opposition parties, stating the necessity for realizing a united opposition front in order to prevent and stop constitutional revision and to put an end to the war bills (Asahi Shimbun 2016c). The explicit focus on (universal) pacifism and upholding of the original definition of Article 9 of the constitution implies that no security related policies are open to discussion in the eyes of the A9A.

In short, the discourse created within the securitization move by the many members of the A9A involves a world within which Japan remains the same peace-loving country as it has been since the end of WWII. To counter any security policy that could harm the pacifist ideology of Article 9, the A9A has created its own securitization move that attempts to stop security related legislations. The threats are obvious within the securitization move, in which the audience of Abe's securitization move, to which the A9A is part of, becomes an actor. The A9A recognizes the threat of the changing Japanese security environment, but fear that the Abe administration's securitization policies would increase that threat. By calling out to the rest of the public, the A9A attempts to reaffirm the legitimacy and indispensability of the pacifist article. With the exception of the involvement of the Abe administration, the securitizing discourse of the A9A has not changed since the founding in 2004 based on their written appeal stated on their website (A9A 2004). The harm to sovereignty of the people and their rights are recognized by the grass-roots movement, but based on the protests that were analyzed in this essay, the main worries of the A9A is Japan becoming a war-loving country rather than a country that honors pacifism.

Chapter 4: SEALDs and the fight for Constitutionalism and Liberal Democracy

The other side of the spectrum is a group that was officially founded on the 3rd of May 2015, after a group was created to protest against the secret protection law; the Students Against the Secret Protection Law (SASPL). Soon the students increased the aim of their protests. Rather than being founded by a generation that had directly experienced the war, SEALDs, or Students Emergency Action for Liberal Democracy (*Jiyû to minshushugi no tame no gakusei kinkyû kôdô*), was a student protest group consisting of members in their late teens and early twenties. Similar to the A9A, SEALDs opposed Abe's security policies and any other policy that could harm the peaceful lives of Japanese people. The student activist group's manifesto promoted values and norms such as constitutionalism, social security and peaceful diplomatic and national security (www.sealds.com), the first one being the most important. While SEALDs did promote peaceful diplomacy and pacifism, they did not necessarily oppose every security policy that could interfere with Article 9 as long as it would happen through democratic procedures and along the lines of constitutionalism. With their slogan "This is what democracy looks like," the students organized protests, made videos and used social media to spread their messages across Japan and the world.

As stated in the methodology section, the fact that SEALDs was a very young organization limits the primary sources we are able to use. However, in order to examine where SEALDs came from, there is a necessity to examine its predecessor SASPL, which former members are largely responsible for SEALDs, first. SASPL (*Tokutei himitsu hogo-hô ni hantai suru gakusei yûshi no kai*) was founded in late 2013 after the announcement by the Abe administration of the secrets protection law. While young people previously refrained from talking about politics because of the fact you might be regarded as crazy (SASPL and SEALDs' core member Aki Okuda in Osaki 2014), many young students now started to take to the streets, shouting phrases such as "This is what democracy looks like!" (Ibid). Their protests were designed to be aesthetically appealing and "cool" to appeal to younger

generations and open them up to politics and being critical towards it. The aim of SASPL was to end Abe's days as prime minister (Ibid.), stop the secrets protection law and bring democracy back to the people by motivating Japanese citizens, to stand up against the Abe administration's undemocratic processes. It is here that we can see the beginning of a new generation of public opposition that stands for true liberal democracy. While students' interest in politics did increase, SASPL disbanded after the enforcement of the secrets protection law in December 2014. However, SEALDs was founded around half a year later.

After its foundation, SEALDs became active in their protests and the group, which originated in the Tokyo area, quickly expanded to branches in Kansai, Tohoku and Okinawa (SEALDs 2015, 114-119). Established right before the period of the Legislation for Peace and Security, SEALDs took to the streets in Shibuya, Tokyo on June 14 to call for the end of this legislation (Ibid, 76). Peacefully bringing hip-hop rhythm and music to the protests, SEALDs took a largely different approach than the radical approach of Marxist students used in protests during the '60s. During a protest on July 10 2015 in Tokyo and Kyoto, members of SEALDs stated on the topic of the procedure on security legislation how they were "unwilling to live in a democratic country where you are not allowed to say anything" and how these protests were a way to get youngsters affiliated with politics (Asahi Shimbun 2015i). The students held up flashy signs with texts such as "Protect the Constitution," "Stop steamrolling" (Ibid) and "Peace not War" (SEALDs 2015, 76). Based on the signs and statements, we find clear indications of a mixed form of pacifism and antitraditionalism, going past the mainly pacifist focus of the A9A. The fact that Abe had silenced the people with steamrolling the Legislation for Peace and Security, had led to the result of the Abe administration standing accused of "alienating security policy from democratic practice, and thereby alienating norms from political outcomes" (Kersten 2015, 19), disrupting any ethical foundation of the proposed security laws (Ibid, 14).

That SEALDs could pose a problem for the security policy supporting side of the LDP was confirmed in early August when then 36 year old LDP member Takaya Muto posted a tweet calling the activities and statements of not wanting to go to war by SEALDs “egoistic” and “extreme selfish” (Asahi Shimbun 2015g). SEALDs responded stating that it is not just about themselves not wanting to go to war, but that indeed they would not allow others to be send to war, objecting against killing and being killed (Ibid). Additionally, they feared the comment by Muto as a warning sign of the possibility of conscription making its return (Ibid). While this may be considered a minor incident, it does indicate that the political supporters of the security legislation were aware of the possible influence SEALDs could have on legislative outcome and the voter turnout of the Upper House election in the summer of 2016. Naturally, this did not stop SEALDs and protests continued in August on the abolishment of the security legislation in addition to weekly protests on Friday. On August the 21st, SEALDs organized a giant protest rally in front of the Diet building, shouting slogans demanding Abe’s resignation as prime minister (Sieg and Kasai 2015). Signs and shirts with the words “Destroy Fascism” (Ibid.) showed their critique towards Abe ignoring the rule of law and democratic process.

By the end of August and September, facing the voting of the Upper House on the Legislation for Peace and Security, protests continued. Taking to the streets all around Tohoku, Kansai and Tokyo, SEALDs members and participants rhythmically called out to Abe, asking “What is democracy?” and “What is constitutionalism?,” opposing Abe’s authoritarian democracy (Asahi Shimbun 2015a). During a protest parade against the Legislation for Peace and Security in front of Kyoto station, core member of SEALDs Kansai, Jun Shiota spoke, while reflecting on events such as the secrets protection law and the bill that would allow the right to collective self-defense, of one form of democracy and the need along with possibilities to raise your voice when you feel something is odd during an election, rather

than thinking it is fine to merely do something (Asahi Shimbun 2015f). In other words, from these paragraphs, it becomes clear that the chants, signs and slogans contain both pacifist and antitraditionalist elements. SEALDs still maintained a pacifist agenda based on peaceful diplomacy and international cooperation but did not necessarily oppose any change to the constitution (www.sealds.com). Rather, the disregard on rule of law, constitutionalism and democracy towards constitutional reinterpretation and revision by Prime Minister Abe was what SEALDs objected to.

Mid-September, Abe disregarded SEALDs weekly protests in front of the Diet building and pushed the Legislation for Peace and Security through the Diet. This did not stop SEALDs and an estimated 40,000 people participated in a protest in front of the Diet building the following day (HuffPost 2015). SEALDs core member Aki Okuda spoke in front of the countless protesters, stating that this was not the end of democracy, but that the public should believe in the sovereignty of the people and fight back against Abe (Ibid). The crowd chanted for Abe's resignation and absolute rejection of the war bill, but meanwhile criticized the opposition parties for moving too slow (Ibid). SEALDs presented the gathered crowds as an example of people attempted to get their sovereignty back to show what democracy looks like (Ibid) in order to fight the threat of the Abe administration against their referent object of democracy and constitutionalism. In addition to Abe's securitization not being normatively righteous considering Abe's disregard of the Japanese support of its pacifist ideology, it is not conducive to the human well-being by destroying liberal democratic practices. The securitization move can thus be considered morally illegitimate (see Floyd 2011, 432). This illegitimacy created a counter-securitization discourse that attempted to desecuritize and delegitimize the securitizing actor, reverse the undemocratic Cabinet decision and stop the extraordinary measure that is the legislation.

However, Abe did not resign. On the contrary, with the Upper House elections of the

summer of 2016, Abe focused on acquiring enough seats to take additional steps towards constitutional reinterpretation and its eventual revision. While opposition parties took and are taking the necessary steps to prevent Abe from achieving his goal, SEALDs continued their activities with forums, public lectures and protests. The grass-roots movement continued to advocate a democracy where Japan would never again engage in war activities (Asahi Shimbun 2015e). While SEALDs did announce that the grass-roots movement would disband after the Upper House elections, it continued to protest and raise awareness amongst the public. In addition, the student protest group, key member Aki Okuda in particular, launched a new think tank, called ReDEMOS, which would allow for people to speak out to Abe's undemocratic practices together with lawyers and professors (Asahi Shimbun 2015d). Within ReDEMOS' proposal, we find that pacifism is no longer a special segment within the counter-security discourse. While peace is still advocated, the pacifist ideology falls subjected to the peoples sovereignty and rights to individual choices and peaceful futures (www.redemos.com). In other words, the main focus of ReDEMOS is to restore constitutional and liberal democracy within Japan and return the right of the people to speak up on their pacifist ideology. Simply put, ReDEMOS states that in case the public calls for pacifism and objects to the government's propositions that could harm that pacifist ideology, the government should listen and act on it.

In the first half year of 2016, SEALDs had taken additional steps towards the Upper House elections. In the first place, with the voting age lowered from the age of 20 to 18, SEALDS had been given a chance to weaken Abe's grip on power with the summer elections. Secondly, while protest rallies and parades still occurred, SEALDs published a documentary on their activities and started promoting the initiative of opposition parties to work together during the election in attempt to put a stop on Abe's railroading of security legislations (Asahi Shimbun 2016b). This is interesting to note, because SEALDs arose as a movement not

affiliated with any left-wing or right-wing political party or organization (Kingston 2015, 3), but tended to feel more left-wing “because the establishment has become more right wing” (Gill in Kingston 2015, 4). Political parties did call out to SEALDs on occasion (Mataichi 2016), but near the end of 2015, we find SEALDs cooperating more and more with the political left to counter the right. Their protest included chants such as “The opposition is united!” and “Opposition, give it all you got!,” while the members of SEALDs ensured the participants that their victory is guaranteed (Asahi Shimbun 2016a). Through SEALDs’ ability to awaken political interest amongst the younger generations of Japan and cooperation with the political left-wing, the movement provided an opportunity to delegitimize Abe’s political power that could have stopped and reversed the security policies and, more importantly, potentially end Prime Minister Abe’s assault on democracy and constitutionalism. However, despite SEALDs best efforts, only 45.45% of the eligible teenage voters and a mere 33.37% of the voters between the ages of 20 and 30 turned up to vote (Japan Times 2016).

Nevertheless, SEALDs represents a change in Japanese security debate. While a form of the pacifist ideology is still very much evident amongst younger generations, focus of protests has shifted towards peaceful lives, constitutionalism and sovereignty to the people within a liberal democratic society, which the Japanese political powers claim to be. With reference to Izumikawa’s article, we find a strong rise of antitraditionalism as a factor in Japanese antimilitarism. Abe’s practices on Japanese security have created a counter-securitization discourse in which the Abe administration’s procedure on security policies is regarded as a threat to the referent object that consists of constitutionalism, liberal democracy and sovereignty of the Japanese people. Whereas the A9A and similar protest groups are trying to securitize the constitution to prevent change, SEALDs attempted to delegitimize Abe’s power and desecuritize the need for change in Japanese security. Through this undemocratic security policies should be either delayed or stopped. As Kersten (2015, 10)

correctly argued: “The only democratic means through which security norms can be embraced by a contemporary Japanese populace is if antimilitarism is purged of democratic doubt, and newly constituted norms are produced through a democratic process.” By applying “cool” and aesthetic aspects to protesting, SEALDs created a platform for younger generations to gain interest in politics and make them aware of their political environment. Despite SEALDs’ disbandment after the Upper House election, ReDEMOS provides a new possibility to allow the public to raise their voice against assaults on democracy and constitutionalism.

Conclusion

The Japanese security debate provides a new view within securitization theory and vice versa.

The norms Abe encountered in his securitization move ultimately make him unable to win sufficient public support for a “proactive security posture,” despite the LDP winning the Upper House election of 2016. “His attempt to shape new norms to underpin his new security policy failed because his tactics violated the democratic tenets of antimilitarism, leading to the creation of policies without normative foundations” (Kersten 2015, 19). His security policies received critique and resistance by political parties in general, but the railroading of policies increased political opposition from parties such as the DPJ, SDP and JCP. The SDP and JCP, desiring to protect Article 9 and the Japanese pacifist ideology, focused their objections on the threat of Japan going to war. DPJ, representing a New Left within the Japanese political spectrum, saw a threat to liberal democracy in Japan in Abe’s security policies and showed resistance to any procedure that would harm the democratic process. The A9A and SEALDs were both heavily criticizing Abe’s security policies, but while the former focused on Japanese pacifism, SEALDs represented Izumikawa’s antitraditionalist norm for making Japan a true liberal democracy. Although a young organization, SEALDs grew fast and gained political support from parties such as the SDP, illustrating how the antitraditionalist norm is growing and slowly becoming significantly more important than the gradually deteriorating post-war pacifist norm.

This essay examined the Japanese security debate from the viewpoint of the opposition parties and protest groups to investigate what drove them to resist the security policies by the Abe administration. By doing so, this essay was able to show more clearly what defines counter-securitization theory within the framework of resistance. It strengthened Floyd’s argument on a normative and just securitization theory by showing how norms such as pacifism and democracy stimulate resistance and how these delegitimize the initial securitizing actor. In other words, a securitization move that lacks the case-specific norms or

values can expect resistance or counter-securitization moves that will delegitimize or desecuritize. Moreover, as in the case of Japan, when such norms include democracy, a securitization move that moves *outside the boundaries of ordinary politics* is more likely to experience resistance and counter-securitization moves when extraordinary measures do go above the ordinary democratic process. Therefore, I argue that it is necessary for future research to further investigate on what is defined by securitization theory as a move that goes above ordinary politics. Thirdly, it shows how the Abe administration's undemocratic process has strengthened Japan's antitraditionalism and how it is slowly becoming more significant than the pacifist ideology.

Several questions for future research arise from this. Why were there no initial forms of cooperation and interaction between protest groups and politicians between the people and the politicians in the case of Japanese security debate? Does a difference in security policies, then, lead to potential disharmony on the left, and disrupt a coordinated attempt to bring down Abe? Why did the political opposition and grass-roots movements not succeed in defeating the ruling parties during the Upper House election of 2016? And why, despite SEALDs best efforts, is the voter turnout among younger generations in Japan so low? Although there is a lot to learn from securitization theory, there is still room for improvement. As we see in Japan, even proclaimed liberal democracies do not always fit within the framework of securitization theory. Even though securitization moves advocate extraordinary measures, they should not break the norms of a specific securitizing case, even when the norm includes democracy itself.

Bibliography

- Abe, Shinzô. “*Abe naikaku sôridaijin heisei 25 nen nentô shokan* [New Year’s Reflection by Prime Minister Shinzô Abe].” *Prime Minister and His Cabinet*, January 1, 2013.
http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/96_abe/statement/2013/0101nentou.html.
- . “*Abe naikaku sôridaijin kisha kaiken* [Press Conference by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe Following the Cabinet Decision on the ‘Legislation for Peace and Security].” *Prime Minister and His Cabinet*, May 14, 2015a.
http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/97_abe/statement/2015/0514kaiken.html.
- . “*Naigai kisha kaiken* [Press Conference by Prime Minister Abe during his Visit to the Middle East].” *Prime Minister and His Cabinet*, January 20, 2015b.
http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/97_abe/statement/2015/0120naigai.html.
- “*Anpohôan ga seiritsu – SEALDs Okuda Aki-san ‘Minshushugi ha owaranai, zettai akiramenee zo!’* [The completion of the war bill – SEALDs lid Aki Okuda: ‘Democracy is not over! We will never give up!’].” *The Huffington Post*, September 19, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.jp/2015/09/18/security-bills_n_8158068.html.
- Aradau, Claudia. “Security and the democratic scene: desecuritization and emancipation” in *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7(3): 388-413. Palgrave: 2004. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800030.
- Article 9 Association. “‘*Ku-Jô mamore’ no seron moriage e shûkai & pareedo* [‘Defend Article 9 Rally and Parade’ rock Tokyo].” December 1, 2014a.
<http://www.9-jo.jp/news/9jouNews/141201news196.pdf>.
- . “‘*Ku-Jô no kai’ Apîru*’ [An appeal from the Article 9 Association].” June 10, 2004.
<http://www.9-jo.jp/appeal.html>.
- . “‘*Sensô suru kuni’ yurusanu koe – Zenkoku no kusa no ne kara* [Raise grass roots voice: ‘Do not make Japan war-waging country!’].” July 7, 2014b.
<http://www.9-jo.jp/news/9jouNews/140707news186.pdf>.
- Asahi Shimbun. “‘*Abe-san, minshushugi-tte nan desu ka?*’ *Anpohôsei hantai, 10-mannin kokkai demo e* [‘Abe, what is democracy? – 10.000 people demonstrating at the Diet building against the security bill].” September 11, 2015a.
- . “*Anpohôan, tokubetsui kaketsu – Kashiwaeki-mae, 200-nin ga hantai apiiru – Tateyama deha shizukana kôgi / Chiba-ken* [Peaceful protest at Takeyama - opposition against the approval by the special committee on the security bill attracts 200 people in front of Kashiwa station in Chiba].” September 18, 2015b.
- . “*Anpohôsei hantai, yatô nado shûkai – Takahashi, gakusei shûdan ‘SEALDs’ mo sanko / Gunma-ken* [Assembly of opposition parties together with student organization ‘SEALDs’ opposing against the security bill in Gunma].” April 3, 2016a.
- . “*Anpohôsei ni hantai, munakata de shimin shûkai – Koga shigira mo gaitô enzetsu / Fukuoka-ken* [Assembly of Munakata’s town people opposing security bill including a street oratory by city councilor Koga in Fukuoka].” July 19, 2015c.
- . “*(furonto rannaa) SEALDs membaa · meiji gakuin daigaku 4-nen, Okuda Aki-san – demo o kae, shakai o kaeru* [(Frontrunner) Aki Okuda, SEALDs member • 4th year student at Meiji University: Change demonstrations, change society].” December 19, 2015d.
- . “*Himetsu-hô hantai uttae kyanpeen – Koshigaya Ku-jô no kai / Saitama-ken* [Campaign to call for opposition against the Secrecy Law by the Koshigaya Article 9 Association in

- Saitama].” December 17, 2013a.
- . “(Kakutô no kôyaku tenken: Jô) Ippyô takuseru kôyaku wa keizai seisaku / gaikô · anpo / genpatsu · ene – 2014 shûinsen [Editorial: examining the promises by all the parties] the promises for the 2014 Lower House election to which you are able to entrust your vote regarding economic policies, foreign diplomacy, security, nuclear power and energy].” December 3, 2014a.
 - . “Kenpô meguru wakamono no ishiki henka, minshushugi no kanôsei ni kitai – Kanagawa-ku de kenmin shûkai / Kanagawa-ken [Prefectural assembly at Kanagawa on the expectations of changing awareness amongst young people on the constitution and the potentiality of democracy].” November 4, 2015e.
 - . “(Kô · minshushugi wa ima) min'i, demo no omomi wa anpohôan meguri kakuchi de kôgi {Ôsaka} [(Thoughts: democracy is now) Emphasis of demonstrations and popular will during protests on the security law all over the place {Ôsaka}].” September 5, 2015f.
 - . “(Koe) Mutô gi'in tsuïto shinjirarenai [(Voice) We cannot believe the tweet by Diet member Mutô].” August 7, 2015g.
 - . “(Kono hito ni kiku) 'Eiheiji Ku-Jô no Kai' no sewanin daihyô · Toi Haruo – san / Fukui-ken [(Hear the people) Toi Haruo, representative and agent of the Eiheiji Article 9 Association in Fukui].” April 7, 2014b.
 - . “Me to mimi to kuchi fusagareru · Akuhô o yurusanai – himetsuhogo-hô, tachi de hantai no koe / Kyôto-to [To have your eyes, ears and mouth shut being blocked · do not allow this bad law - Opposing voices from all over Kyôto the secrecy law].” December 7, 2013b.
 - . “Nakama ja nai hito to taiwa o tsuneru – 'SEALDs-go' ni nani wo sureba ii no ka [Repeatedly interact with people outside your circle of friends – What to do ‘after SEALDs’].” January 4, 2016b.
 - . “San'in shingi, shôten wa anpohôan [Security will be the focus of the deliberation by the House of Councilors].” July 28, 2015h.
 - . “'Seiken hôsô' okori no koe – Sendai de shiminra shûkai – Shûdanteki jieiken, kakugikettei / Miyagi-ken [Angry voices on the ‘political power rampage’ – Assembly by the people from Sendai on right to collective self-defense and the Cabinet decision in Miyagi].” July 2, 2014c.
 - . “(Shûdanteki jieiken) 'Sensôsuru kuni ni sasenu' kakugi kettei, shimin shûdan nado kôgi / Toyama-ken [(Right to collective self-defense) protest by citizen's group on the Cabinet decision: “Do not be a country that goes to war].” July 2, 2014d.
 - . “Shushô hatsugen, tsuyomaru hihan: kenpô kaishaku 'saikou sekininsha wa watashi' yatô hanpatsu, kantei tsuyoki [Critique on the Prime Minister's statement regarding constitutional reinterpretation and him being the sole responsible person strengthens – resistance by political opposition against a strong Kantei].” February 15, 2014e.
 - . “Tôhoku shichôson, Ku-Jô no Kai de uttae – Kinkyû apiiru saishaku / Yamagata-ken [Call for an emergency appeal by the heads of the Tohoku cities and Article 9 Association at Yamagata].” May 15, 2016c.
 - . “Tokutei himitsu hogo-hô, 10-nichi shikô haishi uttae, nebarizuyoku demo ya gaitô katsudô, ken'nai mo / Mie-ken [Persistent calls for the abolition of the Secrecy Law

- that goes into effect on the 10th during demonstrations and street activities in Mie].” December 7, 2014f.
- . “(Wocchi anzen kokkai) tsunagaru, koeageru – ‘Wakai hito, seiji ni kanshin o’ {Ôsaka} [(Watch: National Diet and security) Young people linked together and raising their voice because of interest in politics {Ôsaka}].” July 11, 2015i.
- Balzacq, Thierry. “A theory of securitization – Origins, core assumptions, and variants” in *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. Routledge: New York, 2011a.
- . “Enquiries into methods – a new framework for Securitization analysis” in *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. Routledge: New York, 2011b.
- . “Legitimacy and the ‘logic’ of security” in *Contesting Security: Strategies and Logics* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. Routledge: New York, 2015.
- Blanc, Florent. “Poking holes and spreading cracks in the wall” in *Contesting Security: Strategies and Logics* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. Routledge: New York, 2015.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver & Jaap de Wilde. “Security: A New Framework for Analysis.” Lynne Rienner Publishers: London 1998.
- Calvo, Alex. “Shinzo Abe and the ‘Rule of Law’.” *SNA Japan*, June 9, 2014. <http://shingetsunewsagency.com/tokyo/?p=704>. Accessed on: July 8, 2016.
- Chilton, Paul. “Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.” Routledge: London, 2004.
- Collier, David. “Understanding Process Tracing” in *Political Science and Politics* 44(4): 823-830. 2011. <http://polisci.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/people/u3827/Understanding%20Process%20Tracing.pdf>.
- Craft, Lucy. “Japan’s State Secrets Law: Hailed By U.S., Denounced By Japanese.” *NPR*, December 13, 2013. <http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2013/12/31/258655342/japans-state-secrets-law-hailed-by-u-s-denounced-by-japanese>.
- Democratic Party of Japan. “(Danwa) ‘Bôei sôbi iten san-gensoku’ no kakugi kettei ni tsuite [Statement regarding the Cabinet approval of ‘Three principles regarding defense equipment transfer’].” April 1, 2014c. <https://www.dpj.or.jp/article/104181/>.
- . “Manifesto 2014.” 2014a. <https://www.dpj.or.jp/manifesto>.
- . “Seifu no kakugi kettei ‘tôzen yôindekiru mono deha nai’ kasha kaiken de Kaieda daihyô [Kaieda comments on Cabinet decision, states ‘naturally this is something we cannot accept’].” July 1, 2014b. <https://www.dpj.or.jp/article/104649/>.
- . “‘Seiken totte shûdanteki jieiken bubun o hakushi ni. Mokuhyô ga dekita’ anzenhōan seiritsu uke Okada daihyô [Okada states ‘DPJ must take back the reins of government’ and ‘return to the drawing board with regard to the portion concerning the right to collective self-defense’].” September 19, 2015. <https://www.dpj.or.jp/article/107668/>.
- . “(Shûin honkaigi) Kaieda daihyô ga naikaku fushin ‘nin ketsugian no shushi setsumeï [Kaieda explains intent of no-confidence motion in Diet].” December 6, 2013. <https://www.dpj.or.jp/article/103675>.
- Fackler, Martin. “Japan Ends Decades-Long Ban on Export of Weapons.” *The New York Times*, April 1, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/02/world/asia/japan-ends-half->

- century-ban-on-weapons-exports.html?_r=0.
- Floyd, Rita. "Can Securitization theory be used in normative analysis? Towards a just securitization theory," in *Security Dialogue* 42: 427-439. Sage, October 21, 2011. DOI:10.1177/0967010611418712.
- . "Security and the Environment: Securitisation Theory and the US Environmental Security Policy." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hirano, Keiji. "Group battles to preserve achievements of Article 9." *Japan Times*, May 25, 2014. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2014/05/25/national/group-battles-preserve-achievements-article-9/#.VyirE4RcSko>.
- Hyde, Sarah. "The Transformation of the Japanese Left: From Old Socialists to New Democrats." Routledge: New York, 2009.
- Izumikawa, Yasuhiro. "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan's Security Policy," *International Security* 35(2): 123-160. Project Muse: fall 2010. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v035/35.2.izumikawa.pdf.
- "Japan is back: A Conversation with Shinzô Abe." *Foreign Affairs*, 00157120 Vol. 92 (4): 2-8. July/August 2013. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?sid=ed2cc5ac-3757-49bb-be37e5a1b86a8b78%40sessionmgr110&vid=0&hid=101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=bah&AN=88213861>. Accessed on: November 12, 2014.
- "Japan opposition parties ready to bounce on security laws." *Nikkei Asian Review*. March 29, 2015. <http://asia.nikkei.com/Politics-Economy/Policy-Politics/Japan-opposition-parties-ready-to-pounce-on-security-laws>.
- Japanese Communist Party. "Lifting arms embargo is integral to Abe's attempt to build war-fighting Japan: Yamashita." April 2, 2014a. http://www.jcp.or.jp/english/jps_2014/2014_0402_i3.html.
- "Japanese opposition caught out in chaotic vote on security bills" in *The Guardian*, September 17, 2015a. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/17/japan-chaotic-vote-security-bills>.
- "Japanese politicians brawl in parliament over bill to allow troops to fight abroad." *The Guardian*, September 17, 2015b. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/17/japanese-politicians-brawl-in-parliament-over-bill-to-allow-troops-to-fight-abroad>.
- Kersten, Rikki. "Contextualising Australia-Japan security cooperation: the normative framing of Japanese security policy" in *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 70(1): 6-23. DOI: 10.1080/10357718.2015.1087965.
- Kingston, Jeff. "Abe hijacks democracy, undermines Constitution." *The Japan Times*, June 21, 2014. http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2014/06/21/commentary/japan-commentary/abe-hijacks-democracy-undermines-constitution/#.VL6_BkeG_IY.
- . "Japan's Controversial Militarization and National Security Legislation: Student Movement Slaps Prime Minister Abe's Assault on Constitution – The Student Emergency Action for Liberal Democracy (SEALDs)." *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 13(36). September 7, 2015. <http://apjjf.org/-Jeff-Kingston/4371/article.pdf>.
- Léonard, Sarah and Christian Kaunert. "Reconceptualizing the audience in securitization

- theory” in *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. New York: Routledge 2011.
- Lind, Jennifer. “Japan’s Security Evolution” in *Policy Analysis* 788. CATO: February 25, 2016. <http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/japans-security-evolution>.
- Mataichi, Seiji. “*iken no ‘sensôhō’ no shikō ni danko kōgisuru (danwa)* [On firm opposition regarding the unconstitutionality of the enforcement of the ‘War Bill’].” *Social Democratic of Japan*, March 29, 2016. <http://www5.sdp.or.jp/comment/2016/03/29>.
- Osaki, Tomohiro. “Young protesters rap state secrets law as movement gains rhythm.” *The Japan Times*, October 28, 2014. http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2014/10/28/national/young-protesters-rap-state-secrets-law-movement-gains-rhythm/#.Vz7B0_197IV.
- Pinto, Vânia Carvalho. “Exploring the interplay between Farming and Securitization theory: the case of the Arab Spring protests in Bahrain,” in *Brazil Political Science Review* 57 (1): 162-176. Artigo, 2014. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201400109>.
- Redemos. “Proposal.” <http://redemos.com/>.
- Roe, Paul. “Is securitization a ‘negative’ concept? Revisiting the normative debate over normal versus extraordinary politics” in *Security Dialogue* 43(3): 249-266. SAGE: 2012. DOI: 10.1177/0967010612443723.
- SEALDs. “Opinion.” www.sealds.com.
- . “*SEALD^s: Minshushugi-tte kore da!* [SEALD^s: This is what Democracy looks like!]” Tokyo: Otsuki Shoten, October 20, 2015.
- Sieg, Linda and Teppei Kasai. “SEALDs student group reinvigorates Japan’s anti-war protest movement.” *The Japan Times*, August 29, 2015. http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/08/29/national/politics-diplomacy/sealds-student-group-reinvigorates-japans-anti-war-protest-movement/#.Vz7UW_197IV.
- Social Democratic Party. “*Abe naikaku no ‘Bōei sōbi iten san-genzoku’ ni hantai suru (danwa)* [On opposing the Abe Cabinet’s three principles of the transfer of weapons].” April 1, 2014. <http://www5.sdp.or.jp/comment/2014/04/01/>.
- . “*Kokumin no kenri o ubai minshushugi wo hakaisuru tokutei himitsu hogohō ha mitomerarenai (seimei)* [We cannot allow the secrecy law that takes away the rights of the people and destroys democracy].” December 6, 2013. <http://www5.sdp.or.jp/comment/2013/12/07/>.
- . “*‘Sensōhōan’ no kakugi kettei ni kōgisuru (seimei)* [Opposing against the Cabinet decision on the ‘War Bill’].” May 14, 2015a. <http://www5.sdp.or.jp/comment/2015/05/14/>.
- . “*Tōitsu jichitai – senkyo 2015 senkyo seisakushū* [2015 Unified Local Elections Policies].” 2015b. <http://www5.sdp.or.jp/policy/policy/local/2015manifest.pdf>.
- Steinhoff, Patricia G. “Kidnapped Japanese in North Korea: The New Left Connection” in *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 30(1): 123-142. Project MUSE: 2004. DOI:10.1353/jjs.2004.0035.
- Stritel, Holger. “Towards a theory of securitization theory: Copenhagen and beyond” in *European Journal of International Relations* 13(3): 357-383. SAGE: September 2007. DOI: 10.1177/1354066107080128.
- Stritzel, Holger and Sean C. Chang. “Securitization and counter-securitization in Afghanistan.”

- Security Dialogue* 46(6): 548-567. SAGE: 2005. DOI: 10.1177/0967010615588725.
- Taureck, Rita. "Securitization Theory and securitization studies," in *Journal of International Relations and Development* 9: 53-61. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. DOI:10.1057/palgrave.jird.18000072.
- "Turnout rate among new teen voters was a meager 45%, survey shows." *The Japan Times*, July 12, 2016. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2016/07/12/national/politics-diplomacy/turnout-rate-among-new-teen-voters-meager-45-survey-shows/#.V4TxjeJ9670>.
- Vuori, Juha A. "Contesting and resisting security in post-Mao China" in *Contesting Security: Strategies and Logics* ed. by Thierry Balzacq. Routledge: New York, 2015.
- . "Illocutionary Logic and Strands of Securitization: Applying the Theory of Securitization to the Study of Non-Democratic Political Orders" in *European Journal of International Relation* 14(1):65-99. March 2008. DOI: 10.1177/1354066107087767.
- Wakefield, Bryce. "Abe's Law: Domestic Dimensions of Japan's Collective Self-Defense Debate." *Conference at Woodrow Wilson Center for scholars*. Washington D.C., March 5, 2014. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/WakefieldEssay.pdf>.