

International Peace Cooperation Activities of Japan and the Republic of Korea between 2000 and 2010: A Comparative Analysis

Andrea Aumayr

Abstract

International peace cooperation plays an important role in international relations. National interests and power balances lead to situations in which national security, human security and peace are often threatened, and international cooperation is required. The desire for peace and security is a motivating factor for states to engage in cooperation and to foster a more stable and secure environment, which in turn will also facilitate further social, political and economic development in individual countries as well as worldwide. Due to globalisation, the interconnect- edness and interdependence of states in various contexts has significantly increased. This devel- opment has also led to a growing demand and need for cooperation between states to take collec- tive action and to commonly solve regional as well as global challenges, such as peace and relevant security issues but also issues of economic, social and political importance. The aim of this paper is to present a comparative analysis and to give an overview of Japan and the Republic of Korea's efforts and actions concerning peace cooperation in order to promote regional and global peace between 2000 and 2010—apart from the commonly known international peacekeep- ing operations. How do both states' global peace supporting activities compare to each other, and is it possible to identify differences in their approaches towards international peace cooperation?

Keywords: international cooperation, peace, security, stability, Japan, Republic of Korea



Aumayr, Andrea. "International Peace Cooperation Activities of Japan and the Republic of Korea between 2000 and 2010: A Comparative Analysis." In *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies*, Volume 7, eds. Rudiger Frank, Ina Hein, Lukas Pokorny, and Agnes Schick-Chen. Vienna: Praesens Verlag, 2015, pp. 31-66.

<https://doi.org/10.2478/vjeas-2015-0002>

Introduction

The field of international peace cooperation per se is not limited to the participation of states in the international peacekeeping operations of the United Nations, but also comprises a broader field of actions and activities. These actions and activities allow states to join international cooperation efforts, to take collective action to contribute to world peace, and to improve security, especially in conflict regions. The aim of this paper is to present a comparative analysis and overview of Japan and the Republic of Korea's (also in this paper referred to as South Korea) participation in efforts to promote and also to maintain regional and global peace and security between 2000 and 2010. What are their distinct approaches towards international peace cooperation? What similarities and differences can be identified?

The idea of international cooperation to maintain and preserve world peace and to further foster economic, political, and social development plays a dominant role in international relations. Throughout history, global peace and security have always been two major common concerns that also require the joint actions of states in order to counteract possible negative consequences for the economic, political, and social development of states, and also to decrease the risk of any deterioration in general. The foundation of the League of Nations in 1919—the first international, multilateral¹ organisation with its primary goal to preserve a state of peace—was influenced by mutual security and peace concerns after the outbreak of World War I. International cooperation was further promoted and strengthened by the ongoing process of globalisation which has led to growing interconnectedness as well as interdependence of states. States became more and more aware of the need to cooperate in order to commonly solve regional and global problems, including human security, peace, stability but also global economic, financial, and political issues that have an effect on individual states (see Weiss and Thakur 2010).

International cooperation and interaction have become important topics for theoretical consideration. The main focus of this paper is neo-liberal institutionalism, including relevant sub-theories that deal with the importance of cooperation, collaboration, and interaction as well as institutional instruments for collective action. The main proponents of liberal thinking are Keohane and Nye (1974 and 1977), Keohane (1982, 1984, 1988 and 1989), Nye (1994 and 2011), Krasner (1994 and 1995), Young (1982), and Mitrany (1943). Relevant information on international relations and the cooperation of states in various matters of global importance can also be found in specific encyclopaedias, such as Baylis and Smith (2004), Jackson and Sorensen (2007), and Carlsnaes et al. (2013). The concept of collective security plays an important role for international peace cooperation as it was also a determining element in the formation of the League of Nations. Moreover, it is a significant

1 Multilateral and multinational: involving two or more nations or parties.

component of the theory of liberal institutionalism. Prominent proponents include Woodrow Wilson, Lasswell and Kaplan (1952), Mearsheimer (1994/5), Kupchan and Kupchan (1995), and Baylis (2004).

This paper analyses the broader range of international peace cooperation activities which are not only limited to international peacekeeping missions but also comprise other relevant peace contributing and global peace supporting efforts of states, such as human resource management and its development, and the political dialogue on peace, security and overall stability. A rich literature already exists on UN peace missions and the participation of individual states. However, few comparative reports on the deeper issues of global peace and security cooperation can be found. In terms of international peacekeeping operations and peace support contributions of states, I examined a variety of works, including Leitenberg (1996), Bobrow and Boyer (1997), Heinrich Jr. (1999), Groves (2007), Gill and Huang (2009), Hong (2009), Hirono and Lanteigne (2011), Olbrich and Shim (2012), Hemmings (2012), Hwang (2012), and Snyder (2012). I also relied on official UN documents on peacekeeping and other relevant activities for further and more detailed information on peacekeeping. The goal of this paper is to raise awareness of this broader context of international peace cooperation by providing a comparative analysis of Japan and South Korea as two major regional powers as well as two internationally important states. In addition, this paper will also fill the gap in the existing literature and will present an insightful analysis of two states engaging in various areas of international peace cooperation.

The time frame of the analysis will encompass the years from 2000 to 2010. Although international cooperation on matters of global peace and security had started earlier—as mentioned above—the participation and efforts of states is also very much influenced by and dependent on national and international circumstances. In other words, in times of economic and political stability, states are more likely to join collective action and to contribute to matters of international importance—and therefore to provide adequate assistance and support—whereas in times of crisis and national instability, it is more likely that states will turn inwards to focus on their own recovery before joining efforts to solve global problems. The Asian financial crisis of 1997–98 was such a situation. Both Japan and South Korea were heavily affected by this financial crisis, which spread over many Asian countries as a consequence of the currency collapse of the Thai Bhat in 1997, and which led to decreasing GDP growth rates, high interest rates, decreasing export rates, and so on. The affected countries struggled with weak financial markets and many had to rely on bailout programmes administered by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The Asian financial crisis forced many states, including Japan and South Korea, to focus on domestically oriented policy-making in order to restore their national financial and economic situation and to generate overall stability. The whole process of recovery took its time and by 1999 most of the affected Asian countries had come

through the worst of the crisis. After the situation had ostensibly calmed down, states were again able to focus on international cooperation and to take collective action on matters of global importance. Therefore, the time frame from 2000 to 2010 provided a reasonable timescale for the comparative analysis of Japan and South Korea's efforts and action in the field of international peace cooperation activities towards mutually shared goals of global peace, security, and stability maintenance.

Theoretical Discussion on International Cooperation and Methodology for Analysis

The key elements of the theoretical foundation of the comparative analysis concerning the field of international peace cooperation activities are international cooperation, the idea of collective action and collective security to generate peace and stability, and the contribution and interaction of states in matters of global importance such as peace and security.

After World War I, the overall focus of global politics was directed towards creating the necessary conditions to secure world peace and to maintain global and regional stability and security, as mentioned before with the foundation of the League of Nations in 1919. The concept of international cooperation plays a significant role in the discipline of international relations (IR), which deals with the relationship between different states and their specific approach towards collaboration and the role of international institutions in generating a cooperative international environment to foster and accomplish mutual goals, such as global peace, world order, stability, and human security. International relations are dominated by two competing theoretical strands of thinking, namely realism and liberalism. The theoretical discussion in this paper is influenced by the theory of liberalism. Proponents of liberalism argue that cooperation and collaboration between states can mitigate the risks of disputes and conflicts, and thus generate a secure and stable international environment. States should not only focus on their relative gains and their own national security interests, but should also adopt a more outward-looking policy and turn towards collective security interests and especially collective action to achieve mutually shared objectives, interests, as well as absolute gains² in the greater context. The theory of liberalism fosters a much more cooperative atmosphere in which actions and objectives are mutually shared. Moreover, liberalism emphasises the importance of establishing international organisations to guarantee safety and stability within the international system and to foster the achievement of common goals.³ The idea of liberalism was further promoted with the League of

2 Relative gains consider the loss of others compared to one's own gains whereas absolute gains primarily focus on gain maximisation rather than considering the loss of others.

3 These ideas are also referred to as liberal institutionalism or liberal internationalism.

Nations in 1919, which also spread the ideas of cooperation, collective security, individualism, and national self-determination as important elements for maintaining a stable and secure international environment.

In order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations, by [...] the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments [...] (UN 2000: 3).

Further down the line, neo-liberalism developed, emphasising again cooperation and proposing the idea of institutions and organisations as tools for successful cooperation and interaction among states to achieve mutually shared objectives. Institutions should also promote interaction among states in order to strengthen their cooperative behaviour, to generate international stability, as well as to address global challenges which are imposing a threat to global peace and security. Neo-liberal institutionalism redesigned the idea of international community-building and also promoted it to a new scale (UN 2000; Dunne and Schmidt 2004; Lawson 2012).

The idea of collective security plays an important role in the field of international peace cooperation. In essence, collective security deals with the issue of how to generate and maintain global and regional peace and to enhance overall stability. In general, it concentrates on cooperation and interaction rather than the use of military force, mutual interests rather than only national interests as the driving force, as well as trust in and loyalty to other states. Given the nature of the international system and also due to the ongoing development of globalisation and growing interdependence and interconnectedness, there are various important but ambivalent processes going on, also bearing the risk of possible instability due to clashing national interests and initial mistrust and suspicion. In this context, the idea of international cooperation based on global security arrangements and, above all, collectively shared security concerns, seems very promising (Mearsheimer 1994/5; Kupchan and Kupchan 1995; Baylis 2004).

When talking about international peace cooperation and the role of international organisations promoting interaction and collaboration between states, the United Nations Organization (UNO, also referred to as UN) is the core player in the complexities of global peacekeeping governance. Since its inception in the 1940s,⁴ the UN has provided much assistance in terms of peacekeeping and global peace maintenance based on its primary goal of maintaining world peace and order. According to the UN Charter, the primary functions of the UN are peacemaking, peacekeeping,

4 After the League of Nations collapsed in the early twentieth century, the UN emerged as its successor. The declaration known as the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941 was the foundation for the establishment of the UN on October 24, 1945 with 51 member states in the beginning. Today, the UN has 193 officially recognised member states. The legal foundation document of the UN is the UN Charter, which determines the basic purpose of the UN and its work.

post-conflict peace-building, and preventive diplomacy measures. The main function of the UN is to establish a safe and stable international environment which requires the cooperation and contribution of states (Coate and Puchala 1994; UN 2000; Karns and Mingst 2004; Taylor and Curtis 2004; UNDPKO 2008; UNOV 2013).

The Importance of Peace-building and Peacekeeping Activities: UN Peacekeeping Operations as Central Pillar

The idea of collective action towards the realisation of mutually shared goals, such as peace and security, has been the driving force for cooperation and interaction between states for a long time. The UN as an institution stands for peace mediation and peace-building efforts, and promotes dialogue and international understanding. To guarantee a secure and stable international environment, the broad range of UN actions in this context includes peacekeeping operations; economic sanctions; intervening actions to deliver humanitarian assistance and to secure human security; and the use of force based on the principle of self-defence against a possible security threat (which would pose a threat to international security).⁵ The complexities of the peacekeeping measures and security maintenance efforts of the UN are reflected in the broad range of actions and activities it undertakes, referred to as conflict prevention (i.e. preventive diplomatic measures),⁶ peacemaking,⁷ peacekeeping, peace enforcement,⁸ and peace-building.⁹ Within the field of international peace cooperation, UN peacekeeping operations (UNDPKO)—as the most widely recognised peacekeeping actions—are an essential and important element, with the traditional peacekeeping activities including securing and controlling borders, monitoring ceasefires as well as acting as ‘buffer forces’ (Howard 1990: 43) between two conflicting parties. Peacekeeping operations are implemented to solve international conflicts and, foremost, regional conflicts that may endanger global security. They are carried out in accordance with three principles: the consent of the parties involved is required, peacekeeping forces operate under the neutrality principle, and the use of force is restricted to actions of self-defence. For a better understanding,

5 The principle of self-defence is determined in Article 51 of the UN Charter as ‘the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations’ (Howard 1990: 37).

6 Such as mutually negotiated peace agreements to mitigate the risk of any further outbreak of conflicts between two parties.

7 To aim for conflict resolution in order to establish a peace agreement that ends the conflict, also with the support of various actors (i.e. governments, non-state actors etc.)

8 Also referred to as non-traditional peacekeeping; comprises coercive measures (i.e. use of military force) that are authorised by the UN Security Council based on Chapter VII of the UN Charter (‘Action with Respect for the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression’).

9 Peace-building actions aim to strengthen the overall national capacity in order to ensure its functioning after the conflict has been resolved.

the activities in the field of peacekeeping and peace-building can be summarised as conflict resolution, disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR), control of weapons, restoration of social order, security and stability maintenance, electoral observation, humanitarian assistance, and reconstruction of infrastructure, for example social infrastructure. The contingent of peacekeeping forces is usually made up of different (voluntary) national personnel contributions, working under UN command and for the common goal of peace and security (Howard 1990; Roberts and Kingsbury 1994a-b; UNDPKO 2008; HPC 2009).

There are various ways to dispatch peacekeeping personnel as part of their voluntary personnel contribution, such as military, uniformed, and civilian personnel. Another definition can be found in Hirono and Lanteigne (2011) where they differentiate between ‘combat force contribution’ (Hirono and Lanteigne 2011: 245)—comprising military peacekeeping forces such as military ground forces—and ‘force enablers’ (Hirono and Lanteigne 2011: 245), which include all relevant personnel responsible for logistical, medical, transport, and engineering assistance. Military peacekeeping personnel are primarily responsible for border controls, security surveillance, and public order management. They are also assigned to monitor peace development after conflict resolution, to provide assistance and training to national military forces and, foremost, to protect the civilian population. The military peacekeeping contingent consists of troops (i.e. infantry soldiers or ground forces) or military observers who often also work as staff officers or support troop members in ceasefire observation or border controls. Police forces are primarily responsible for security surveillance, public order management, or for the training of national police personnel. Apart from the military and police personnel, the civilian peacekeeping contingent is another essential element in peacekeeping operations. Civilian peacekeeping personnel comprises, for example, administrative personnel and senior officers for the management and coordination of peacekeeping activities, as well as electoral observers or civilians, who are dispatched to deliver humanitarian relief supplies.

Peacekeeping and peace supporting activities are not only ad-hoc actions for immediate conflict resolution, but are also designed to support and foster the process of long-term peace development and the post-conflict recovery of affected states after security and stability have been restored. Peacekeeping actions also play an essential role in post-conflict situations in order to lay the foundation for the state’s social, political, and economic recovery as well as to assist with the process (UNDPKO 2008).

Methodology: Relevant Components of the Field of International Peace Cooperation Activities

However, apart from the aforementioned traditional peacekeeping activities and the well-known international peacekeeping operations, the field of international peace cooperation activities also comprises a broad range of other possible actions and measures in order to ensure a stable and secure international environment. The aim of this paper is to present a comparative analysis of Japan and South Korea's activities in the broader field of peace cooperation between 2000 and 2010—in addition to their participation in international peacekeeping operations—and how they promoted overall stability and contributed to global peace. The works of Medeiros and Fravel (2003), Olson and Prestowitz (2011), Huang and Patman (2013) and especially Hirono and Lanteigne (2011) and Gill and Huang (2009) have provided important input for the establishment of the framework employed here.

The following three core criteria have been shortlisted from a greater framework dealing with international peace cooperation. However, this selection should provide an essential insight into the broader field of international peace cooperation—beyond the participation of states in international peacekeeping operations—as well as give an idea of how both states followed different approaches in their peace cooperation activities.

Criterion #1: The Evolution and Nature of International Peace Cooperation

Firstly it is necessary to establish a basic understanding of the nature of each state's peace support and cooperation. This criterion should answer all questions concerning the 'evolution of [...] [the state's] approach to peacekeeping' (Gill and Huang 2009: 2). Taking the UN peacekeeping operations as the central pillar in the complexities of international peace cooperation, it is pertinent to consider the following questions: When was the first time Japan and South Korea participated in an official peacekeeping operation? What is the legal framework for their peace cooperation activities? Are there any legal restrictions concerning their participation in global peace supporting activities and if so, how do these restrictions influence the actions of the states? Before going deeper into an analysis of the actions and measures of states which contribute to regional and global stability and security and which help to generate a secure environment, it is imperative that one must become familiar with the basics of each state's approach to international peace cooperation.

Criterion #2: Human Resource Development in the field of Peacekeeping

States' commitment to work together towards mutually shared objectives and goals can also be realised in terms of their so-called intellectual contributions. In this case, intellectual contribution refers to actions concerning human resource development in the field of peacekeeping and peace-building. In other words, actions in the field of human resource development include the establishment of training centres (see Hirono and Lanteigne 2011, Gill and Huang 2009 and Hwang 2012). Training facilities are an essential catalyst to further expand the skills of peacekeeping personnel and to enhance the effectiveness of their operational activities. Moreover, with the establishment of such centres and institutions, states can also provide a platform of cooperation; furthermore, it facilitates exchange opportunities with other states aimed at increasing the cooperative skills of their peacekeeping forces. Human resource development also includes the dispatch of peacekeeping instructors to other training centres for skill exchanges, as well as material and financial contributions to training centres. There is a broad range of opportunities for states to provide financial contributions to peacekeeping operations, but also to fund special courses or training seminars for peacekeeping personnel, administered at peacekeeping training centres within relevant programmes concerning peacekeeping and peace-building activities. In other words, financial contributions can also be used to foster the development of human resources within the field of international peace cooperation. Needless to say, well-trained peacekeeping personnel can greatly contribute to the effective and efficient implementation of peacekeeping operations and the realisation of the commonly shared goals of global peace and stability. The quality of peacekeeping operations is closely linked to the skills and capabilities of peacekeeping forces. For that matter, participation in joint training exercises for peacekeeping deployments also plays an essential part with regards to human resource development in the field of peacekeeping. By taking into account factors like these, it is possible to analyse the level of participation and contribution of states towards the achievements and success of international peacekeeping operations. What are the efforts and actions of Japan and South Korea in the field of human resource development between 2000 and 2010? It can be said that an increased level of participation in international peacekeeping activities and in all relevant fields of peace cooperation demonstrates a state's willingness and determination in its efforts and actions towards regional and global peace stability, and underlines the importance of joint peacekeeping actions.

Criterion #3: Peace and Security Related Cooperative Agreements: Political Dialogue on Global Security and Peace Cooperation

As already identified, participation of states in the field of international peace cooperation activities can be achieved via international peacekeeping operations and human resource development. That being said, peacekeeping operations are the most common form of peace cooperation in order to generate global peace and stability. But there are also other ways for states to strengthen their engagement in peacekeeping and peace-building activities and to intensify their security relationships with other states. These include for example the political dialogue concerning global peace and security issues, military cooperation, joint training activities or intensifying their military diplomacy (for example, see Gill and Huang 2009 and Hwang 2012).

Political dialogue with other states on peace and stability maintenance has become an integral part of a state's foreign policy approach and also part of its peace contribution within the field of regional and global security and peace cooperation. This includes various initiatives and campaigns to promote international security and peace cooperation. The focus of this criterion is set on initiatives, cooperative agreements and joint security declarations of both states in the field of global peace and security contribution, including the goals for closer cooperation in peacekeeping operations and other relevant peacekeeping and peace-building activities. Joint efforts towards non-proliferation and arms control are other important elements intended to promote global peace and stability. Needless to say, such security and peace related initiatives are primarily the results of multilateral agreements and arrangements between states in order to achieve the common goals of global peace and stability. Another form of such bilateral and multilateral security related cooperation is the establishment of various governmental forums between states to negotiate and discuss possible cooperation on joint peace and security initiatives apart from UN peacekeeping operations. This criterion focuses more on the diplomatic means to strengthen the cooperation between states in the form of bilateral and multilateral agreements and initiatives on international peace cooperation. It promotes international peace cooperation apart from the traditional participation in peacekeeping operations. How are both Japan and South Korea actually engaged in political dialogue on global peace and security maintenance? Did they establish bilateral security declarations between 2000 and 2010 for example? Apart from their participation in peacekeeping operations, are they aware of the importance of their contribution in other fields of peace cooperation, such as human resource development and cooperative agreements with the main focus on global peace and security?

Analysis

Criterion #1: The Evolution and Nature of International Peace Cooperation

In 1992, Japan adopted the *Law Concerning Cooperation for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and Other Operations* (also known as the PKO Act or the International Peace Cooperation Law) which allowed Japan to play a more active role in matters of international peace and security. The law also emphasised Japan's engagement in international peacekeeping activities under UN command. It determined three core areas for Japan's participation in UN activities concerning peacekeeping, peace-building, and preserving international security: participation in traditional peacekeeping operations including development assistance, contribution to international humanitarian relief operations as part of UNPKO, and contribution to international election observation operations. In the same year, Japan started its active participation in relevant peace cooperation activities when it deployed Japanese peacekeeping forces to observe the presidential and legislative election in Angola as part of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission II (UNAVEM II) (Mulgan 1995; MoFA Japan 2000; Secretariat of IPCH 2010).

However, Japan's contribution and participation in peacekeeping missions is, to a certain extent, limited to the deployment of non-armed peacekeeping military personnel in peacekeeping operations due to Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution,¹⁰ which determines that '[...] the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes' (Leitenberg 1996: 2). Strictly speaking, Japanese forces are restricted from participating in international military affairs and especially UN missions with military character, which basically refers to nontraditional peacekeeping activities, as uniformed peacekeeping personnel are included in these. Japanese personnel are not allowed to use any means of force, not even for the sake of regional and global peace (Mulgan 1995; Leitenberg 1996; MoFA Japan 2000; Secretariat of IPCH 2010; Prime Ministerial Office Japan 2013).

Nevertheless, and despite the official renouncement of military forces, Japan established its Self-Defense Forces (SDF) back in 1954, maintained under the claims of self-defence and international security.¹¹ Japan has 'successfully' chosen another approach towards the interpretation of Article 9 of its Constitution and thus enabled the formation of an army of this kind. However, against the backdrop of its national constitution, Japan's participation in peacekeeping missions has become an ongoing issue within the country. In 1991, new legislation (referred to as the Peacekeeping

¹⁰ The Japanese Constitution came into force in 1947 after Japan's defeat in the Second World War.

¹¹ In the beginning, the SDF forces were called the National Police Reserve.

Bill) was passed that allowed Japan to deploy a maximum of 2000 SDF personnel to UN peacekeeping operations as non-combat forces, i.e. primarily for certain operational activities, such as refugee assistance, medical care, transport assistance, etc. and only when ceasefire was maintained. With the enactment of the PKO Act, Japanese SDF personnel are now deployed as members of the so-called Japanese overseas relief force to provide peacekeeping and peace-building assistance and support when requested (Leitenberg 1996; Shibata and Soeya 1999).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a new policy approach by the South Korean government became the centre of focus: *segryehwa* 세계화, Korea's national strategy for globalisation. It became a prominent slogan during the period of Kim Young-sam (Kim Yŏng-sam 김영삼; b. 1927; president from 1993–1998). *Segryehwa* determined Korea's new diplomatic approach. It included top-down reforms in the areas of education, politics, legal and economic order, public administration, etc. in order to strengthen Korea for the international market. The concept of *segryehwa* also influenced South Korea's foreign policy orientation. Han Sŭng-ju 한승주 (b. 1940; 1993–1994), the first foreign minister under Kim Young-sam's administration, used the concept to announce and define Korea's new orientation towards global issues and furthermore to emphasise Korea's responsibility to take collective action to properly deal with global challenges. Han Sŭng-ju committed to increase South Korea's level of cooperation in the field of global and regional security and peace, especially including peacekeeping and peace-building operations. In 1993, Han promised that 'We [the Koreans] will contribute to UN Peace Keeping Operations and international peace and security, thereby also securing our place in the international community' (Koh 2000: 199). In the same year, South Korea deployed a unit of 252 engineering personnel (known as Sangroksu Unit—Evergreen Unit) to the United Nation Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II), which was the first time South Korea participated in a peacekeeping unit for an official UN peacekeeping operation. The Sangroksu Unit was primarily responsible for reconstruction and humanitarian assistance. From this point onwards, South Korea also focused primarily on the deployment of engineering military units to international peacekeeping operations as part of its personnel contribution (UN 1996; Kim 2000; Koh 2000; Hong 2009; Hwang 2012; MoFA South Korea 2013a).

Although South Korea had already participated for the first time in an official UNPKO in 1993, it took almost twenty years, namely until December 29, 2009, until the National Assembly¹² passed the *Law on Participation in the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*.¹³ It was enacted in January 2010 and came into effect in April 2010, regulating Korea's participation in and contribution to international

12 The legislative branch of the Korean government.

13 For more detailed information see Defense White Paper 2010, available at: http://www.nti.org/media/pdfs/2010WhitePaperAll_eng.pdf?_=1340662780.

peacekeeping and peace-building operations as well as other relevant peace supporting missions (Hwang 2012; Olbrich and Shim 2012).

The purpose of this Act is to allow the Republic of Korea to participate in UN Peacekeeping Operations more expediently and actively to contribute to creating and maintaining world peace by stipulating the matters concerning the dispatch and withdrawal of military units taking part of UN Peacekeeping Operations (Defense White Paper 2010: 384).

The Act distinguishes between military peacekeeping units (members of the Korean army) and uniformed personnel such as police personnel; other non-uniformed personnel are not mentioned. In general, the PKO Act has been primarily set up to facilitate the deployment of military standing units to international peace missions. These units comprise three subunits, each with a contingent of 1,000 members. The main unit is assigned for immediate overseas deployment (Omnuri Unit) that can be dispatched within a period of only one month. The second unit is maintained as a reserve unit whereas the third unit is a non-combat one and mainly consists of other military peacekeeping personnel i.e. medical, engineering and logistics personnel or military police. The peacekeeping law defines possible areas for South Korea's participation in international peacekeeping activities: traditional peacekeeping and peace-building activities (i.e. ceasefire observation, security and public order surveillance, monitoring compliance with peace agreement etc.), humanitarian relief activities, reconstruction and development assistance, and election observation and coordination assistance (Defense White Paper 2010; Sang-ho 2010; Hwang 2012).

Criterion #2: Human Resource Development in the Field of Peacekeeping

In terms of human resource development in the field of peacekeeping, Japan and South Korea have followed two different paths. After a report about Japan's overall contribution and efforts in peacekeeping and peace-building activities (published by an UN Advisory Group on International Cooperation for Peace—AGICP) was published in 2002, the results showed a strong demand for Japan to also focus more on its human resource training in order to improve the skills of Japanese peacekeeping personnel but also to strengthen its international cooperation with others in terms of human resource development. In 2005, Japan initiated the *International Peace Cooperation Program Advisors*, a two-year education programme for civilians who are participating in joint activities and operations concerning global peace and security, and who are employed as national government employees. Furthermore, in 2006, the *Pilot Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peace-building*, commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme, was presented. One year later, in 2007, the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre (HPC), a legally independent non-profit

and non-governmental institution, was established to conduct the aforementioned programme as well as to conduct peacekeeping research and provide intensive training for future—primarily civilian—peacekeeping personnel (from Japan as well as from other Asian countries). Human resources play an essential role in the field of peace-building, as it ‘[...] requires personnel skilled in these fields’ (HPC 2009: 2) because ‘[...] we as global citizens have the responsibility to [sic] find practical ways to help resolve conflicts and assisting people in need [sic]’ (HPC 2009: 2). With the establishment of the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre, Japan also wanted to strengthen its position as well as to demonstrate ‘[...] that we [the Japanese] are a peace-builders’ nation’ (MoFA Japan 2007a). Apart from theoretical training and coursework, there are also overseas, onsite training sessions, mainly in the field offices of relevant organisations such as UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF etc. (MoFA Japan 2007a-c; HPC 2009; HPC 2013).

In addition to the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre, the Ministry of National Defence also established the Japan Peacekeeping Training and Research Centre (JPC) in 2010, a state-run organisation that offers courses primarily for military peacekeeping personnel. Due to law regulating the deployment of SDF forces, the government saw the need to provide further training and education for military peacekeeping units as well as for those who are required to lead peacekeeping operations as command or staff officers. Another important output of the JPC is to conduct research in the field of peacekeeping. The JPC offers three different courses for military peacekeeping personnel, namely the Basic Course, the Staff Officers Courses (SOC) and the Contingent Commander Courses (CCC). The overall aim is to provide theoretical and practical training in relevant peacekeeping matters in order to prepare the participants for their peace deployment (JPC 2013a-e).

Japan has taken over an active role as global peace proponent and contributor as it is very engaged in supporting other peacekeeping training centres, especially on the African continent. Support is provided in order to strengthen the states’ peacekeeping capabilities and to improve the personnel’s ability to maintain an overall condition of stability and security within African states. Between 2008 and mid-2009, Japan supported five training centres in Africa—Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, and Rwanda—as well as one in Malaysia, providing financial as well as human resource assistance (i.e. regular dispatch of Japanese peacekeeping instructors and peacekeeping specialists to training centres). From 2008 until mid-2010 Japan provided a total of approximately USD 18.5 million to eight PKO training centers in Africa (Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Rwanda, Benin, Nigeria, and South Africa) for the reconstruction of facilities, for training materials and equipment, and for training courses. In addition, about a dozen Japanese personnel were sent to training centers as peacekeeping lecturers and instructors (MoFA Japan 2008a; MoFA Japan 2009; MoFA Japan 2010a-b; MoFA Japan 2013a).

In contrast to Japan, South Korea has only established one peacekeeping training centre so far, the Peacekeeping Operation (PKO) Centre, which is the primary institution in South Korea responsible for the training and education of peacekeeping forces for future deployments in peacekeeping missions. A similar institution was already established in 1995 and was headed by the Korean military institution Joint Staff College. Since 2006 however, discussion has taken place with regards to a new, state-run peacekeeping training centre designed to reform and improve the existing institution and to increase South Korea's national peacekeeping capacities, also based on the concept of *seggyehwa*. The establishment of the new centre was part of the 2008–2012 Action Plan of the Ministry of National Defence and the plan was actually realised in 2010. The PKO Centre is located in and also headed by the Korean National Defense University (KNDU) and provides theoretical and practical training primarily for military peacekeeping forces in various fields of peacekeeping, as well as conducting intensive research. Relevant topics are international politics, security diplomacy, peace security, defence management, and military science. In addition, English language classes are offered to mitigate the risk of possible language barriers during multinational peacekeeping operations. The PKO Centre also stays in close contact with military units and assists military officers during their overseas peacekeeping deployment. Compared to Japan, South Korea's engagement in providing assistance to other international training facilities only slowly started to increase, also due to its rather late reformation of its own training centre. With the reformed and restructured PKO Centre, the Korean government also agreed on plans to increase and to intensify multilateral cooperation with other training centres, along with improving Korea's own peacekeeping training and education sector as well as carrying out regular exchanges of professional peacekeeping instructors. This should not only improve the capabilities of Korea's own peacekeeping but also international peacekeeping forces, which in turn will positively affect future collaboration in peacekeeping operations (Jung 2008; Defense White Paper 2010; Hwang 2012; PKO Center 2013).

The field of human resource development not only includes peacekeeping training centres, but also operational training exercises that are regarded as an important instrument for states to enhance their own national peacekeeping capabilities but also to increase their level of cooperation with others. A very important multinational peacekeeping training exercise is Khaan Quest in Mongolia, which was established in 2003 by the United States and Mongolia as an annual peace supporting training programme. The main goal behind Khaan Quest is to improve the overall quality and efficiency of UN peacekeeping operations and to improve the cooperation between participating multinational peacekeeping forces. Since 2006, participation in Khaan Quest is also possible for other states. Khaan Quest involves a variety of peacekeeping operational activities, such as field exercises and engineering and medical civic action programmes; special attention is also given to humani-

tarian and reconstruction assistance. In 2009, Japan sent its own military peacekeeping forces for the first time to participate in this multinational peacekeeping exercise. Since then, Japan has become a regular participant which strengthens and enhances Japan's own national military personnel skills for future contribution to peacekeeping operations and other relevant peace supporting activities. This is also accompanied by Japan's growing awareness of the need to expand its peace contribution to various other areas of action, such as human resource development to improve its operation work (Rozoff 2010; Main 2011; Nyamdorj 2012; Miller 2013; Ministry of Defense 2013).

Soon after the establishment of Khaan Quest training exercises, South Korea seized the opportunities provided by this multilateral peacekeeping training exercise to pursue its global status as active contributor to international peace and to increase its international appearance. Three years before Japan, in 2006, South Korea participated in Khaan Quest as an observer nation for the first time. In 2009 then, the Korean government decided to dispatch a military naval unit to take active part in the training for the first time. Since then, Korea has become an active participant, providing various units of military peacekeeping personnel to foster its peacekeeping contacts and to improve its national skills for future contribution to international peace cooperation activities (Defense White Paper 2010; Hwang 2012).

Other joint exercises for the training of human resources in the field of peacekeeping are the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) Capstone Exercises. GPOI is a security and peace programme, led and funded by the United States, which was established in 2004 to improve international skills in the field of UN peacekeeping operations. The aim is to increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of multilateral peacekeeping and peace-building cooperation between uniformed and civilian peacekeeping forces. The GPOI Capstone Exercises have been established as part of the training and education plan. They are annual, multinational peacekeeping exercises to provide training for peacekeeping forces especially in the field of humanitarian assistance and relief operations, including strategic and field exercises, usually held in one Asian country (former exercises were held in Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Cambodia etc.). In 2008, South Korea decided to dispatch a unit of its own military forces to participate in the GPOI Capstone Exercise that was held in Bangladesh that year. With this decision, the South Korean government acknowledged the importance of collective peacekeeping training to improve its own national capacities and its military skills in peacekeeping and other relevant peace supporting exercises. Two years later, in 2010, Japan dispatched a contingent of its own SDF forces to participate in staff and field training exercises in order to enhance its own national personnel skills and to train for future collaboration with other states in peacekeeping missions. For both states, participation in these GPOI funded joint training exercises provided essential and relevant training and collaboration with other peacekeeping forces, also in terms of new equipment

and materials (Sambath and Strangio 2009; Defense White Paper 2010; Hwang 2012; Bhuiyan 2012; U.S. State Department 2013a-b; Ministry of Defense 2013).

Criterion #3: Peace and Security related Cooperative Agreements: Political Dialogue on Global Security and Peace Cooperation

Besides active participation in peacekeeping operations and actions in the field of human resource development, states can also engage in political dialogue on global peace and security in order to establish peace and security related agreements which, in turn, foster and strengthen international peace cooperation.

Institutionalised Forms of Cooperation in the Field of Global Security and Peace

As already mentioned, Japan strongly increased its assistance to and support for peacekeeping training centers on the African continent, including financial assistance as well as the dispatch of Japanese peacekeeping instructors. For Japan though, it is also important to develop a strong cooperative network for conducting security and peace related dialogue with the aim of maintaining and strengthening regional peace and stability. In the period between 2000 and 2010 the Japanese-African security and peace cooperative relationship has been significantly improved and intensified. Already in 1993, the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD) was established to further promote and increase Japan's assistance in African economic, political, and social development.¹⁴ Economic growth, environmental protection, human security, and foremost, peace maintenance, have been depicted as the main focus areas of the work of TICAD and its participating actors, and various action plans have followed. Over time TICAD has become an important mechanism of cooperation between Asia and Africa and a collaborative relationship especially in the field of development and peace assistance. The overall goal of TICAD is to strengthen the policy dialogue on matters of regional security, peace and stability and its influence on global stability, humanitarian issues, and economic development. Meetings and conferences have been initiated and are held in Japan on a regular basis. Peace consolidation and promoting good governance in order to strengthen and maintain social security and overall national stability have been selected as key guiding issues to be acted upon in the next years (MoFA Japan 2006; NEPAD 2010-2012; TICAD 2012a-c).

¹⁴ TICAD was the result of a joint initiative between the Japanese government and the United Nations to strengthen cooperation to foster African growth and the development process. Today, other relevant partners are the World Bank, the United Nations Office of the Special Advisors on Africa (UN-OSAA), the African Union (AU), the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and the city of Yokohama.

In response to the growing demand for regional cooperation to generate and maintain a stable and secure environment as well as to further promote regional and global peace, Japan established the Multinational Cooperation Program for the Asia Pacific (MCAP) in 2002. Since then, this multilateral conference is held every year in Tōkyō and is headed by the Japanese Ground Self-Defence Forces. Military representatives from various states and also international non-governmental organisations are invited to take part as active participants or observers. The three main focus areas of the work of MCAP are international cooperation and collaboration in peace supporting and peacekeeping activities, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief assistance. Japan has provided a significant and important international platform for joint discussions based on the common interests of global and regional peace and security. The programme should not only foster cooperation between military units but also between military and civilian peacekeeping personnel as well as with respective governments and relevant non-governmental organisations. Regional peace, stability, and security have been selected as the key content of all discussions. The conferences focus on the primary elements of information sharing, strengthening of cooperative capacities, and human resource development. One of the main objectives is to find proper solutions and ways to facilitate the collaboration between different units especially in the field of peacekeeping and other peace related actions. By establishing this cooperation programme, Japan has again demonstrated its commitment to foster regional and global peace and security as well as to take responsibility for global issues (Ministry of Defense 2012; Kasamatsu 2013; Ministry of Defense 2013).

Peace supporting activities may not only include traditional peacekeeping operations, but also efforts towards arms control and non-proliferation to contribute to a safe and secure regional and global environment. The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) was established in 2003 as a multinational voluntary agreement to take responsible joint action in the field of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and other related material. This initiative has developed into an important multinational instrument for joint action to counter proliferation activities that pose a threat to international peace and stability. Furthermore, it should facilitate the coordination of cooperation between the participating states in joint activities to combat the illegal distribution and spread of weapons. This can also be regarded as an important element in the field of international peace cooperation and efforts to collectively respond to the growing threat of illegal weapons. Japan is among the founding member states, alongside the United Kingdom, Italy, the Netherlands, Australia, France, Germany, Spain, Poland, and Portugal. These states also form the original body of the Operational Experts Group, the leading organ of the PSI. Despite its dark past, Japan has strengthened its efforts to become a leading peacekeeping and global peace supporting nation as it has expanded its peace contribution to various fields. Since Japan joined in 2003 it has implemented various PSI exercises

in its own country (in 2004 and 2007 for example) and has participated in training exercises (in 2008 and 2009). In 2010, Japan hosted the Operational Experts Group Meeting with a total of 21 states. South Korea, however, participated as observer nation in an exercise in 2007 and joined the PSI in 2009. One year later, it had already hosted two PSI activities twice. In the same year and also due to Korea's engagement and efforts, it became a member of the PSI leading Operational Expert Group (MoFA Japan 2004; Belcher 2011; Snyder 2012; MoFA Japan 2013b; PSI 2013a-c; U.S. State Department 2013c; NTI 2013).

In response to international joint efforts in global peace supporting activities such as disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons, the Republic of Korea not only supports the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), but also plays a significant role in implementing an important international event concerning non-proliferation and disarmament, and thus, emphasising the importance of global stability and peace. Together with the United Nations, Korea co-hosts the annual UN-ROK Joint Conference on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues. Over the past two decades international terrorism, the spread of WMDs, and the growing illegal distribution and financing of other weapons have become major challenges for today's global peace and stability. For these reasons the conference was established in 2002 in cooperation between the Republic of Korea (represented by the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and the United Nations (represented by the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs—UNODA) to provide an international forum for joint discussion on counter-measures against this growing security risk. Since then it has developed into an important platform for government officials, experts, researchers, and other relevant individuals to discuss regional security concerns and the states' responsibilities and obligations to take concrete action to generate peace and stability, and to discuss how to improve multinational cooperation in terms of peacekeeping and peace-building. The conference is held on an annual basis and the topics of regional and global peace take centre stage. It deals with the question of how states can properly respond to the aforementioned growing security threats. As co-host of this conference South Korea has committed itself—similar to Japan with TICAD and MCAP—to strongly support the international joint efforts towards disarmament and arms control in order to generate a peaceful international environment. Moreover, South Korea wants to foster cooperation and collaboration with others in this field (KOCIS 2013; Shin 2013; UNODA 2013; MoFA South Korea 2013b).

Bilateral Declarations on Security and PKO Cooperation Signed Between 2000 and 2010

For both states, the United States plays an important role as security partner. The *Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security Alliance for the 21st Century* was signed

in 1996, determining the need to cooperate in order to generate peace, stability and security for the future. Since then, Japan and the United States are closely working together and strengthening their assistance in international peacekeeping and peace-building operations, humanitarian relief assistance, arms control, and disarmament missions. Their declaration also determined close cooperation in the areas of information sharing, medical services, transportation and human resources, also especially in the field of international peace and security cooperation (MoFA Japan 1996; Ministry of Defense 1997).

Apart from the security declaration with the United States, Japan is also strongly committed to increasing its cooperation with other states on matters of global peace and security and to increasing the level of political dialogue. The *Canada-Japan Declaration on Political Peace and Security Cooperation* is another great example of Japan's efforts. The first bilateral declaration was signed back in 1998 between the Canadian and Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Research Institute for Peace and Security (RIPS), the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The main objective was to examine and discuss possible ways for closer and more efficient cooperation in security matters such as post-conflict consolidation, disarmament, arms control, and non-proliferation as well as peace maintenance overall. Moreover, both countries agreed to explore the issue of peace-building projects and workshops as well as human resource development, joint peacekeeping trainings, and personnel exchanges in the field of peacekeeping. In order to intensify their cooperation and to improve their efforts, a conference on peace and security cooperation is held every five years, based on their mutual decision in 2005. Japan and Canada introduced regular security and peace related dialogues and talks to enhance their cooperation in the fields of international conflict resolution and peacekeeping. Both governments have agreed to provide sufficient assistance to each other and to other states in implementing international rules and regulations on matters of arms control and non-proliferation. Furthermore, they decided to support and promote the establishment of comprehensive and more coherent legal frameworks for arms control and disarmament. In 2010, during the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in Yokohama, both Japan and Canada renewed their commitment to strengthening their security and peace support cooperation and signed the *2010 Canada-Japan Joint Declaration on Political Peace and Security Cooperation*. The declaration includes the establishment of an effective framework and cooperation mechanism for coordinating effective security and peace cooperation, with special focus on the following areas: peacekeeping and peace supporting activities, conflict resolution and post-conflict reconstruction, arms control, disarmament, humanitarian assistance, the fight against terrorism and organised crime, environment protection, cybersecurity, etc. (JICA 2001; Kantei 2005; RIPS 2005; Prime Ministerial Office Canada 2010a-b; Kantei 2010).

The Canada-Japan declaration is also regarded as ‘[...] strategic partnership so as to facilitate peace and security policy coordination and operational cooperation’ (Kantei 2010: 1). Around 2004, the bilateral strategic partnership on matters of security and peace between Australia and Japan started to emerge and to develop—both states have already worked together in several peacekeeping operations in Timor-Leste, Iraq, and Pakistan. In 2007 both prime ministers signed the *Japan-Australia Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation* (JDSC) based on their shared interests in global and regional peace and stability. The declaration determined a broad framework for close cooperation on security, defence, and peace related issues, such as disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, border controls, peace-building and peacekeeping activities, humanitarian relief operations, and counter-terrorism actions. They established regular annual bilateral meetings (so-called 2+2 talks) as well as joint action plans and ministerial consultations to increase their cooperation and to consult on commonly shared strategic interests and objectives in the Asia-Pacific region as well as in the international context. Both states also committed themselves to strengthening the security dialogue with the United States as part of their peace and security cooperation agreement. In 2010, the *Japan-Australia Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreement* (ACSA) was signed which should facilitate cooperation between the Japanese SDF and the Australian Defence Force (ADF) in terms of mutual assistance and material provisions in future peacekeeping operations. This agreement is decisive insofar as it will also guarantee a more effective and efficient cooperation in peace and security related actions and their implementation. Over the coming years, cooperation in the field of information sharing, joint military training exercises and training as well as human resource development should also be strengthened and increased (Australian Government 2007; MoFA Japan 2007d; MoFA Japan 2010c; Cook and Wilkins 2011; Wilkins 2011; Australian Government 2013).

In 2000 a bilateral defence agreement between Japan and India was set up to strengthen their cooperation on various issues of relevance concerning defence, security, stability, and peace. In addition, they decided to expand their collaboration in terms of security exercises as well as to consider cultural promotion and cultural exchanges. The main idea behind this commitment towards increased peace and security cooperation was to enhance both states’ capabilities in order to collectively respond to future global challenges, especially concerning regional peace. In 2001 the *Japan-India Joint Declaration* was established based on their commonly shared ideas of global and regional peace and security. Japan and India agreed to strengthen their cooperation in peacekeeping, peace-building activities, and humanitarian relief operations, also with special focus on maritime security issues. Regular bilateral defence and security dialogues between the governments have been initiated to constantly push forward their cooperation, also based on annual summits and consultations. Compared to Japan’s security declarations with Canada and Australia,

peacekeeping cooperation is not of such high importance compared to their cooperation concerning maritime security issues in the region (MoFA Japan 2001; MoFA Japan 2008b; Baruah 2010; Gupta 2013).

As already discussed, bilateral agreements on peace and security related issues play an important role in the field of international peace cooperation. South Korea's security relationship with the United States is no different. It also focuses on conflict resolution and stabilisation efforts as well as close cooperation peacekeeping activities. Their alliance has always been shaped and defined by their mutual interests in global and, foremost, regional security and peace, especially in the aftermath of the Korean War (1950–1953). South Korea and the United States aim to '[...] continue to enhance close Alliance cooperation to address wide-ranging global security challenges of mutual interest, including through peacekeeping activities, stabilization and reconstruction efforts, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief' (Defense White Paper 2010: 389). Having a strong security partner such as the United States in the background has helped Korea to develop itself and to strengthen its international role in the field of global security and peace cooperation, also has helped to further realise its *segyehwa* strategy (Global Korea strategy) (Defense White Paper 2010; Hwang 2012).

In step with Japan, South Korea has also initiated a security cooperation agreement with Australia in order to strengthen their partnership in the region. After intensive preparation, Korea and Australia signed the *Joint Statement for Enhanced Global and Security Cooperation*, determining their joint vision for commonly shared peace and security interests. For South Korea, this was the first bilateral security declaration with a country other than the United States so far. Their goal is to increase their cooperation so as to promote and ensure a secure and safe regional and global environment.

They committed to

continue to expand cooperation on global disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction [...] [and to] build on the established good level of strategic dialogue and cooperation [...] by exploring opportunities [...] in areas such as peacekeeping, civil military cooperation, defense management, joint exercises, training and exchange programs [...] (Prime Ministerial Office Australia 2009: 1).

In addition, they also established action plans to coordinate and regulate their cooperation, based on regular meetings and consultations. Important elements of their security relationship are civil-military cooperation activities, bilateral training exercises to share expertise and know-how, and military personnel exchanges to prepare and train their military forces for future deployment to peacekeeping operations in order to foster global peace and, foremost, to maintain regional stability (Australian Government 2009; Prime Ministerial Office Australia 2009).

Conclusive summary

Having analysed the wide range of international peace cooperation activities of Japan and the Republic of Korea between 2000 and 2010—besides the traditional participation of states in the commonly known international peacekeeping operations carried out by the United Nations as the central pillar in the complexities of peace cooperation—it is now possible to paint a clearer picture of their overall approach and efforts to promote and maintain regional and global peace and security after the troublesome years of the Asian Financial Crisis from 1997/1998.

Concerning their first official contribution to international peacekeeping operations, both Japan and South Korea have defined their own area of focus when participating in such operations. Japan deployed an election observation team to the UN mission in Angola in 1992, whereas South Korea deployed a military engineering unit to the UN mission in Somalia in 1993. Due to the obstacles posed by Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, Japan's military participation in matters of international affairs is very limited, which somewhat restricts the scope of Japan's overall contribution to international peacekeeping operations in terms of military peacekeeping personnel. The PKO Act, passed in 1992, defines the three main areas for Japan's peacekeeping cooperation as participation in traditional peacekeeping activities (but only when ceasefire is maintained, and Japanese personnel can only be deployed to non-combat areas); international election observation operations; and humanitarian relief operations. South Korea on the other hand strongly focuses on the deployment of military peacekeeping personnel as part of its peacekeeping operations contribution. The South Korea peacekeeping law, only passed in 2009, was primarily established to facilitate the deployment of Korean military units of peacekeepers. In contrast to Japan, there are no legal restraints on South Korea's peacekeeping contribution and peace support cooperation in peacekeeping operations.

As dealt with in more details in the empirical part of this paper, human resource development in the field of international peace cooperation plays a significant role, also for the future development of each state's contribution. Japan is very engaged in educating and training peacekeeping personnel. It established one non-governmental institution, the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre (HPC) in 2007 for the training of civilian peacekeeping forces, which also serves as Japan's most important contribution in terms of personnel for international peacekeeping operations. Due to the growing demand for a higher presence of uniformed peacekeeping personnel at least in non-combat areas, Japan also established a state-run training institution, the Japan Peacekeeping Training and Research Centre (JPC) in 2010 that was primarily designed for the training of military peacekeeping forces, from Japan's Self Defence Forces. Japan has started to reconsider the importance of its military peacekeeping presence, and also contemplates the possibility of Japanese military personnel taking

leading positions in any international peace operation. This development also correlates with Japan's wish to gain a permanent seat in the Security Council of the UN as a sign of its important international role. With the establishment of two training centres Japan has demonstrated its engagement in becoming an internationally important training country for future peace-builders. Between 2000 and 2010 Japan was also very active with regards to the exchange of peacekeeping instructors from its own training centres to other training facilities worldwide. Japan has also provided substantial financial contributions to support other training centres, especially on the African continent. Its financial aid was primarily used for new equipment, material, instructors, and also for the reconstruction of existing training facilities.

The Republic of Korea on the other hand seemed only to slowly start making efforts to establish an international reputation as an important 'peace-builder nation'. Although a similar peacekeeping training institution was already established back in 1995, it was only brought to new heights during the Ministry of Defence's 2008–2010 action plan. The institution was reformed and restructured in 2010, and named the Peacekeeping Operations Training Centre (PKO Training Centre). It is run as a state institution headed by the Korean National Defence University. The main focus of the Korean training centre is the education and training of its military forces for future deployments to international peace missions. In contrast to Japan it was not possible to find any data or information about personnel exchanges or financial contributions from Korea to other peacekeeping training centres worldwide. However, this can also be explained insofar as the new PKO Training Centre in South Korea was only established in 2010. Within the aforementioned action plan, the importance of future exchanges between training instructors is highly emphasised, which leaves room for further observation in this area from 2010 onwards.

Although South Korea is a very active participator in international peacekeeping operations, the field of human resource development for peacekeeping activities did not gain as much attention as it did in the case of Japan, for example. For the period between 2000 and 2010 it can be said that there is still a need to catch up if South Korea further intends to promote its Global Korea strategy and to strengthen its international reputation and position, including in the field of international peace cooperation—which is not only limited to participation in PKOs, but comprises a broad range of actions and activities.

In terms of joint military exercises for the purpose of improved cooperation in international peacekeeping activities, it was challenging to find precise information about Japan's participation. Based on the literature reviewed and other resources it can be determined that Japan was not highly engaged in such exercises between 2000 and 2010—which may also be explained by the legal restraints on its international military presence in general and its limited deployment of military peacekeeping personnel specifically. However, with its growing awareness of the importance of increasing the contribution of its military peacekeeping personnel and enhance-

ment of its military peacekeeper contingent Japan might also start to acknowledge the need for joint military exercises and take this into consideration. Being an active supporting and also founding member of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and its Operational Expert Group (OEG), Japan has shown strong interest in global and regional peace and stability as well as in fostering multilateral cooperation. It participates regularly in PSI exercises and also hosts such exercises in its own country to strengthen national capacities. Korea did not join the PSI until 2009 and became a member of the OEG in 2010. However, in 2007 South Korea participated as an observer nation in a PSI training exercise, and since 2009 also takes part as an active member, also becoming an important hosting country. Other important events for such joint training exercises of peacekeeping personnel as well as the overall improvement of human resources are the Global Peace Operation Initiative (GPOI) Capstone Exercises. These are annual, multinational military exercises to expand the skills of peacekeeper contingents for future deployments in PKOs. Since 2008 Korea has been an active participant, foremost to strengthen its cooperation with others. Japan participated for the first time in 2010, which again correlates with Japan only slowly becoming aware of the importance of such exercises. Both South Korea and Japan also participate in the Khaan Quest exercises—annual multinational military training sessions to improve the quality and efficiency of UN peacekeeping operations in particular. South Korea started as an observer nation in 2006, followed by active participation in 2009, the same year in which Japan participated for the first time.

In summary, it can be said that Japan has a reserved approach towards active cooperation in military peacekeeping exercises. Nonetheless, through their participation in such multinational and multilateral training programmes in general—regardless of when they started and how their participation appears—both Japan and South Korea show their interest and more importantly, their support in terms of regional and global security. Japan's growing orientation towards the enhancement of its military personnel capacities and skills as well as the strengthening of multilateral security and peace related cooperation may also be a result of growing demand and its own wish for a higher international reputation in matters such as global peace, stability, and security, together with its wish for a permanent seat in the Security Council as previously mentioned. In general, Japan has to consider making further amendments to improve and foremost expand its military peacekeeping presence in international peacekeeping operations and other relevant fields of peacekeeping and peace-building activities, especially in accordance with the challenges imposed by Article 9.

As previously argued, peace and security related cooperative agreements also play an important role in the field of international peace cooperation in order to promote regional and global peace and stability as part of the political dialogue. Therefore the goal was to examine whether Japan and Korea have undertaken any

relevant bilateral security declarations or other forms of institutionalised security and peace related cooperation. In addition to the agreement to further strengthen the U.S.-Japan security alliance, Japan established important security declarations with three countries between 2000 and 2010, with particular emphasis on improved cooperation in the field of global peacekeeping and peace-building. These agreements include the *Japan-Australia Security Declaration* in 2007, the *Japan-India Security Declaration* in 2001 and again in 2008 and the *Canada-Japan Declaration on Political Peace and Security Cooperation* in 2010. Compared to Japan, South Korea has only established one new bilateral security agreement, the second in total apart from its existing security alliance with the United States. This security agreement was the *Australia-ROK Security Declaration* in 2009. The aim of all above mentioned security declarations of both Japan and South Korea was primarily to improve and strengthen the states' cooperation in peacekeeping missions and disarmament efforts, and to expand bilateral training exercises for the sake of regional and global peace and stability. However, seen from another perspective, both Japan and South Korea's security declarations with Australia as a regional neighbour can also be explained by their shared strategic and security interests in the Asia-Pacific region. The national interests of all three countries are also very much shaped by their wish to increase their own influence while decreasing China's influence in the region, and to counterbalance China's regional dominance. Smaller and medium sized powers have to join together to properly respond to such situations in which one regional power (such as China) is dominant. Due to the increasing international and regional demand for international peace cooperation, it plays an essential role in their bilateral security declarations with Australia. However, their shared strategic interests lie in the issues of security and peace cooperation and foremost, in strengthening their regional position vis-à-vis China. Peace cooperation is, therefore, a possible way to cover their shared strategic interests with a 'nice' humanitarian wrapping as well.

The broad range of possible ways to conduct political dialogue on global peace and security cooperation also includes the establishment of 'institutionalised' forms of cooperation, such as regular conferences and symposiums etc. In the case of Japan this already happened with the formation of the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD) back in 1993. During the examined period between 2000 and 2010 Japan has conducted several TICAD conferences, with special focus on the following areas: human security, peace maintenance, peace cooperation, economic growth, and environmental protection as important global issue. In general it can be said that Japan has become an important partner in and supporter of African development as well as a promoter of regional stability and peace on the African continent. Prior to the establishment of the security declaration with Australia, Japan was also very engaged in the Canada-Japan Symposium on Peace and Security Cooperation to further strengthen their cooperation in regional

and global peacekeeping activities, disarmament efforts, conflict resolution etc.—all based on regular multilateral meetings (symposiums). The symposiums as well as the established action plans have played a decisive role for the final establishment of the security declaration between the two countries. Japan also initiated the Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia-Pacific (MCAP) in 2002, with particular focus on international cooperation in peacekeeping and peace-building activities, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief assistance. Headed by the Japanese Ground Self-Defence Force, this has become an important element in regional peace and security related cooperation. Japan has clearly demonstrated strong interest in supporting and further promoting regional cooperation for peace, stability and security.

In the case of Korea such institutionalised forms of peace and security cooperation initiated by South Korea itself took place to a lesser extent during the examined period between 2000 and 2010. Since 2002 Korea has co-hosted the annual UN-ROK Joint Conference on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues together with the UN. Over time the conference has become an important platform and international forum to discuss security matters and disarmament actions as well as to develop strategies to enhance international cooperation to stop the spread of WMD and to generate a secure international environment. As co-host Korea has significantly contributed to the development and international importance of this conference, which demonstrates South Korea's determination to make the world a safer place. However, compared to Japan, it seems that between 2000 and 2010 South Korea focused more on the deployment of peacekeeping personnel to PKOs but somehow neglected the increasing demand for other forms of international peace cooperation and peace support contributions.

The aim of this paper was to draw attention to the broader field of international peace cooperation activities, which are not exclusively limited to international peacekeeping operations. There is so much more that requires the efforts and contribution of states in order to generate peace and to maintain a state of stability and security, in the regional as well as in the global context. On examination of other areas of international peace cooperation it becomes clear that states can follow different approaches and can be active in different ways. Legal restraints, prioritisation, and national capacities play an important role in that they shape and define the engagement of a state and influence how a state's contribution to international peace cooperation activities can be realised. This paper should help provide an insight into the approaches of Japan and the Republic of Korea towards their international peace cooperation actions between 2000 and 2010, set against the backdrop of global peace cooperation activities.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACSA	Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreement
ADF	Australian Defence Force
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
AU	African Union
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CCC	Contingent Commander Courses , as part of military peace-keeping training courses in Japan
GPD	Gross Domestic Product, used to measure a country's economic performance within its own borders
GPOI	Global Peace Operations Initiative
HPC	Hiroshima Peacebuilders Center
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IR	International Relations
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JPC	Japan Peacekeeping Training and Research Center
KNDU	Korean National Defense University
MCAP	Multinational Cooperation Program for the Asia Pacific
OEG	Operational Expert Group, leading group of PSI
PKO Act	Japan's Law Concerning Cooperation for United Nations Peace-keeping Operations and Other Operations, adopted in 1992 (also known as International Peace Cooperation Law)
PKO Center	Peacekeeping Operation Center in South Korea
PSI	Proliferation Security Initiative
RIPS	Research Institute for Peace and Security
ROK	Republic of Korea
SDF	Self-Defense Forces, established by Japan in 1954
SOC	Staff Officers Courses, as part of military peacekeeping training courses in Japan
TICAD	Tokyo International Conference on African Development
UN or UNO	United Nations or United Nations Organizations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDPKO	United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODA	United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs
UN-OSAA	United Nations Office of the Special Advisors on Africa
UNOSOM II	United Nations Operation in Somalia II
UNPKO	United Nations Peacekeeping Operations
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
US	United States (of America)
WMD	Weapons of mass destruction

REFERENCES

- Australian Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Japan-Australia Joint Foreign and Defence Ministerial Consultations. Joint Statement 2007." Media Release, June 6, 2007, http://www.foreignminister.gov.au/releases/2007/fa064_07.html, accessed November 2014
- Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. "Joint Statement on Enhanced Global and Security Cooperation between Australia and the Republic of Korea." 2009, http://www.dfat.gov.au/fta/akfta/090305_joint_statement.html, accessed November 2013
- Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. "Bilateral Relationships." Japan Country Brief, 2013, http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/japan/japan_brief.html, accessed November 2014
- Baruah, Pranmita. "Changing Contours of the Japan-India Defense Relations." In *Global Politician* [Online], April 3, 2010, <http://www.globalpolitician.com/default.asp?26267-japan-india>, accessed November 2013
- Baylis, John. "International and Global Security in the Post-cold War Era." In *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp.297-324
- Baylis, John and Steve Smith. *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004
- Belcher, Emma. "The Proliferation Security Initiative: Lessons for Using Nonbinding Agreements. Working Paper." Council on Foreign Relations, International Institutions and Global Governance Program, July 2011, <http://www.ceecolombia.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/security%20nuclear.pdf>, accessed November 2014
- Bhuiyan, Anisuzzaman. "Brief on GPOI Capstone: Exercise 'Shanti Doot – 3'." International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (IAPTC) Annual Conference 2012, Helsinki, Finland, 2012, [http://www.cmcfinland.fi/pelastus/cmc/images.nsf/files/0CCAC09B2236A3B0C2257AC500647813/\\$file/IAPTC%202012%20-%20GPOI%20Capstone%20Exercise%20BG%20Anisuzzaman.pdf](http://www.cmcfinland.fi/pelastus/cmc/images.nsf/files/0CCAC09B2236A3B0C2257AC500647813/$file/IAPTC%202012%20-%20GPOI%20Capstone%20Exercise%20BG%20Anisuzzaman.pdf), accessed November 2013
- Bobrow, Davis B. and Mark A. Boyer. "Maintaining System Stability: Contributions to Peacekeeping Operations." In *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41/6, 1997, pp. 723-748
- Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons. *Handbook of International Relations*. Second Edition. Los Angeles: Sage Publication, 2013
- Coate, Roger A. and Donald J. Puchala. "Global Policies and the United Nations System." In *International Organization: A Reader*, edited by Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1994, pp. 257-270
- Cook, Malcom and Thomas S. Wilkins. "The Quiet Achiever: Australia-Japan Security Relations. Analysis." Sydney: Lowy Institute for International Policy, January 2011, http://repository.australia.or.jp/ajtf/files/Cook_and_Wilkins_The_quiet_achiever_web.pdf, accessed November 2014
- Defense White Paper, Ministry of National Defense of ROK. "2010 White Paper." 2010, http://www.nti.org/media/pdfs/2010WhitePaperAll_eng.pdf?_=1340662780, accessed November 2014
- Dunne, Tim and Brian C. Schmidt. "Realism." In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 161-183
- Gill, Bates and Chin-Hao Huang. "China's Expanding Role in Peacekeeping: Prospects and Policy Implications." Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI Policy Paper No. 25, 2009, <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRI25.pdf>, accessed October 2014

- Groves, Brian. "Republic of Korea Peacekeeping Operations – Ensuring Peace and Stability Around the World." In *Army Magazine*, 57/9, 2007, pp. 42-48
- Gupta, Sourabh. "Time for Japan, India to Go Beyond Words." In *Asia Times* [Online], June 7, 2013, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/JAP-01-070613.html>, accessed November 2014
- Heinrich Jr., L. William. "The Decision-making Process." In *United Nations Peace-keeping Operations: A Guide to Japanese Policies*, edited by L. William Heinrich Jr., Akiho Shibata, and Yoshihide Soeya. New York and Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 1999, pp. 33-42
- Hemmings, John. "The ROK Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan." In *Global Korea: South Korea's Contribution to International Security*, edited by Scott Bruce, John Hemmings, Balbina Y. Hwang, Terence Roehrig, and Scott A. Snyder. New York: Report for Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2012, pp. 45-60
- Hirono, Miwa and Marc Lanteigne. "Introduction: China and UN Peacekeeping Introduction: China and UN Peacekeeping." In *International Peacekeeping*, 18/3, 2011, pp. 243-256
- Hong, Kyudok. "South Korean Experiences in Peacekeeping and Plan for the Future." In *Advances in Military Sociology: Essays in Honor of Charles C. Moskos, Part A*, edited by Giuseppe Caforio. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2009, pp. 173-187
- Howard, Michael. "The United Nations and International Security." In *United Nations, Divided World*, edited by Adam Roberts and Benedict Kingsbury. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 31-45
- HPC, Hiroshima Peacebuilders Center. "Pamphlet: The Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peacebuilding Commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in Fiscal Year 2009." 2009, http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pko/hrd/peace_b2009.html, accessed November 2014
- HPC, Hiroshima Peacebuilders Center. "What is the Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peacebuilding?" 2013, http://www.peacebuilderscenter.jp/eng/e_about2011.html, accessed November 2013
- Huang, Xiaoming and Robert G. Patman. *China and the International System: Becoming a World Power*. New York: Routledge, 2013
- Hwang, Balbina Y. "Korea and PKO: Is Korea Contributing to Global Peace?" In *Global Korea: South Korea's Contribution to International Security*, edited by Scott Bruce, John Hemmings, Balbina Y. Hwang, Terence Roehrig, and Scott A. Snyder. New York: Report for Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2012, pp. 13-27
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorensen. *Introduction to International Relations. Theories and Approaches*. Third Edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007
- JICA, Japan International Cooperation Agency. "Summary of the Evaluation Survey Canada-Japan Joint Peace-building Learning Project: Field mission to Cambodia." 2001, http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/program/thematic/pdf/2001_7.pdf, accessed November 2014
- JPC, Japan Peacekeeping Training & Research Center. "Principle and History." 2013a, <http://www.mod.go.jp/js/jpc/english/about/index.html>, accessed December 2014
- JPC, Japan Peacekeeping Training & Research Center. "Organization." 2013b, <http://www.mod.go.jp/js/jpc/english/about/organization.html>, accessed December 2014
- JPC, Japan Peacekeeping Training & Research Center. "Missions of JPC." 2013c, <http://www.mod.go.jp/js/jpc/english/about/operation.html>, accessed December 2014
- JPC, Japan Peacekeeping Training & Research Center. "Course Curricula." 2013d, <http://www.mod.go.jp/js/jpc/english/education/index.html>, accessed December 2014
- JPC, Japan Peacekeeping Training & Research Center. "Seminars and Symposiums." 2013e, <http://www.mod.go.jp/js/jpc/english/event/index.html>, accessed December 2014

- Jung, Sung-ki. "Seoul to Launch PKO Center by 2009." In *The Korea Times* [Online], February 27, 2008, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/09/116_19745.html, accessed November 2014
- Kantei, Prime Minister of Japan and his Cabinet. "2005 Canada-Japan Agenda for Peace and Security Cooperation." 2005, http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumispeech/2005/01/19_cooperation_e.html, accessed November 2014
- Kantei, Prime Minister of Japan and his Cabinet. "Canada-Japan Joint Declaration on Political, Peace and Security Cooperation." 2010, http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/kan/statement/201011/14canada_japan_e.pdf, accessed November 2014
- Karns, Margaret P. and Karen A. Mingst. "The United Nations: Centerpiece of Global Governance." In *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*, edited by Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004, pp. 97-144
- Kasamatsu, Makotu. "Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia Pacific 2013 (MCAP 2013) Aug 28 – Sep 1, 2013. Chairman's Summary." 2013, https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/ROAP/Webstory/2013_29102013/MCAP13%20Chairman's%20Summary.pdf, accessed December 2014
- Keohane, Robert O. "The Demand for International Regimes." In *International Organization*, 36/2, 1982, pp. 325-355
- Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984
- Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Two Approaches." In *International Studies Quarterly*, 32/4, 1988, pp. 379-396
- Keohane, Robert O. *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1989
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. "Transgovernmental Relations and International Organizations." In *World Politics*, 27/1, 1974, pp. 39-62
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977
- Kim, Samuel S. "East Asia and Globalization: Challenges and Responses." In *East Asia and Globalization*, edited by Samuel S. Kim. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 2000, pp. 1-30
- KOCIS, Korean Culture and Information Service. "Korea, UN discuss disarmament, non-proliferation in Jeju." 19 November 2013, <http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/Policies/view?articleId=115151>, accessed December 2014
- Koh, B.C. "Segyehwa, the Republic of Korea and the United Nations." In *Korea's Globalization*, edited by Samuel S. Kim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 195-216
- Krasner, Stephen D. "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables." In *International Organization: A Reader*, edited by Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1994, pp. 97-109
- Krasner, Stephen D. *International Regimes*. Eighth Edition. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 1995
- Kupchan, Charles A. and Clifford A. Kupchan. "The Promise of Collective Security." In *International Security*, 20/1, 1995, pp. 52-61
- Lasswell, Harold D. and Abraham Kaplan. *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952
- Lawson, Stephanie. "Theorizing International Relations." In *International Relations*, edited by Stephanie Lawson. Second Edition. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press, 2012, pp. 38-60

- Leitenberg, Milton. *The Participation of Japanese Military Forces in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*. Stockholm: Center for Pacific Asia Studies at Stockholm University, 1996
- Main, Tyler. "News: Khaan Quest 2011 Kicks Off with Multinational Opening Ceremony." In *Defense Video & Imagery Distribution System (DIVIDS)* [Online], August 2, 2011, <http://www.dvidshub.net/news/74662/khaan-quest-2011-kicks-off-with-multinational-opening-ceremony#.VIG3LjGG-So>, accessed December 2014
- Mearsheimer, John. "The False Promise of International Institutions." In *International Security*, 19/3, 1994/5, pp. 5-49
- Medeiros, Evan S. and M. Taylor Fravel. "China's New Diplomacy." In *Foreign Affairs*, 82/6, 2003, pp. 22-35
- Miller, Jonathan B. "UN Peacekeeping Exercise 'Khaan Quest' Marks 10 Year Anniversary." In *Forbes* [Online], August 16, 2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jonathanmiller/2013/08/16/khaan-quest-wraps-up-first-decade/>, accessed November 2014
- Ministry of Defense, Japan. "Japan-U.S. Security Consultative Committee (two-plus-two) and Alliance." 1997, http://www.mod.go.jp/e/d_act/us/dp04.html, accessed November 2014
- Ministry of Defense, Japan. "Multinational Cooperation Program in the Asia Pacific (MCAP 12)." In *Japan Defense Focus* [Online], Nr. 34, November 2012, <http://www.mod.go.jp/e/jdf/no34/activities02.html>, accessed December 2014
- Ministry of Defense, Japan. "Promoting Multilateral Security Cooperation and Dialogue in Areas Including the Asia-Pacific Region." In *Defense of Japan 2013*, Part III, Chapter 2, Section 1, 2013, pp. 222-232, http://www.mod.go.jp/e/publ/w_paper/pdf/2013/37_Part3_Chapter2_Sec1.pdf, accessed December 2014
- Mitrany, David. *A Working Peace System*. London: RIIA, 1943
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Japan-U.S. Joint Declaration on Security-Alliance for the 21st Century." 1996, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/security.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "UN Peacekeeping Operations." 2000, http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pamph2000_archive/pko.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Japan-India Joint Declaration." 2001, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/india/joint0112.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Japan to host the Proliferation Security Initiative Maritime Interdiction Exercise." 2004, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/disarmament/arms/psi/exercise.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Emergency Grant Aid for the Electoral Process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo." 2006, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2006/9/0922.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Hoisting a New Banner of Japan as a Nation of Peace". Opening Speech by H.E. Foreign Minister Taro Aso at HiPeC International Peace Building Conference at International Conference Hall, Hiroshima, March 8, 2007, 2007a, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pko/speech0703.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Launching of the Pilot Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peacebuilding." 2007b, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2007/6/1174166_828.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Start of the Pilot Program for Human Resource Development in Asia for Peacebuilding." 2007c, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2007/9/1175495_834.html, accessed November 2014

- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Japan-Australia Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation." 2007d, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/australia/joint0703.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Dispatch of Japanese Instructors to PKO Centers in Egypt and Ghana." 2008a, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2008/11/1184954_1070.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation between Japan and India." 2008b, http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/india/pmv0810/joint_d.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Dispatch of Self-Defense Force Instructors to the École de Maintien de la Paix in the Republic of Mali." 2009, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2009/8/1194508_1140.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Additional Assistance to Peacekeeping Training Centers in Africa." 2010a, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2010/8/0816_01.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Dispatch of an Instructor to the Cairo Center for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping." 2010b, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2010/4/0408_02.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "The Signing of the Japan-Australia Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreement (ACSA)." 2010c, http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/announce/2010/5/0519_02.html, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "GoJ: Financial support through Japan-UNDP Partnership Fund." 2013a, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/africa/ticad/ticadfollow-up/report/status/PR000195.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)." 2013b, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/disarmament/arms/psi/psi.html>, accessed November 2014
- MoFA South Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Middle East and Africa." 2013a, http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/countries/middleeast/countries/20070824/1_24467.jsp?menu=m_30_50, accessed November 2014
- MoFA South Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Press releases." 2013b, http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/press/pressreleases/index.jsp?menu=m_10_20&sp=/webmodule/htsboard/template/read/engreadboard.jsp%3FtypeID=12%26boardid=302%26seqno=313059, accessed December 2014
- Mulgan, Aurelia George. "International Peacekeeping and Japan's Role: Catalyst or Cautionary Tale?" In *Asian Survey*, 35/12, 1995, pp. 1102-1117
- NEPAD, New Partnership on African Development. "About." 2010–2012, <http://www.nepad.org/about>, accessed November 2014
- NTI, Nuclear Threat Initiative. "Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)." 2013, <http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/proliferation-security-initiative-psi/>, accessed November 2014
- Nyamdorj, G. "Khaan Quest 2011." In *Asia Pacific Defense Forum* [Online], 4 January 2012, http://apdforum.com/en_GB/article/rmiap/articles/print/features/2012/04/01/feature-pr-16, accessed November 2014
- Nye, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. Eighth Edition. New York: Basic Book, 1994
- Nye, Joseph S. *The Future of Power*. New York: Public Affairs, 2011

- Olbrich, Philipp and David Shim. "South Korea as a Global Actor: International Contributions to Development and Security." In *GIGA Focus, German Institute for Global and Area Studies. Leibniz-Institute für Globale und Regionale Studien*, Nr. 2, 2012, pp.1-8
- Olson, Stephen and Clyde Prestowitz. *The Evolving Role of China in International Institutions: Research Report*. Prepared for The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. The Economic Strategy Institute. Washington D.C., 2011, <http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/TheEvolvingRoleofChinainInternationalInstitutions.pdf>, accessed 20 July 2014
- PKO Center, Peacekeeping Operations Center in the Republic of Korea. "Vision." 2013, <https://www.kndu.ac.kr/pkoeng/index.jsp?mid1=00000171&mid2=00000835>, accessed November 2014
- Prime Ministerial Office Australia. "Australia – Republic of Korea Joint Statement on Enhanced Global and Security Cooperation by the Prime Minister of Australia, Kevin Rudd and the President of the Republic of Korea, Lee Myung-bak." Media Release, 2009, http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/media/pressrel/KWZS6/upload_binary/kwzs60.pdf;fileType=application%2Fpdf#search=%22media/pressrel/KWZS6%22, accessed November 2014
- Prime Ministerial Office Canada. "Canada and Japan Strengthen Political, Peace and Security Cooperation." 2010a, <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2010/11/14/canada-and-japan-strengthen-political-peace-and-security-cooperation>, accessed November 2014
- Prime Ministerial Office Canada. "2010 Canada-Japan Joint Declaration on Political, Peace and Security Cooperation." 2010b, <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2010/11/14/2010-canada-japan-joint-declaration-political-peace-and-security-cooperation>, accessed November 2014
- Prime Ministerial Office Japan. "The Constitution of Japan." 2013, http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html, accessed October 2014
- PSI, Proliferation Security Initiative. "The Proliferation Security Initiative." 2013a, <http://www.psi-online.info/Vertretung/psi/en/01-about-psi/0-about-us.html>, accessed November 2014
- PSI, Proliferation Security Initiative. "Proliferation Security Initiative: Statement of Interdiction Principles." 2013b, <http://www.psi-online.info/Vertretung/psi/en/07-statement/Interdiction-Principles.html>, accessed November 2014
- PSI, Proliferation Security Initiative. "Operational Experts Group." 2013c, <http://www.psi-online.info/Vertretung/psi/en/04-Operational-Experts-Group/0-operational-experts-group.html>, accessed November 2014
- RIPS, Research Institute for Peace and Security. "The 4th Canada-Japan Symposium on Peace and Security Cooperation." 2005, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/canada/symposium0506.pdf>, accessed November 2014
- Roberts, Adam and Benedict Kingsbury. "A Short Description of the United Nations System." In *Presiding Over a Divided World: Changing UN Roles, 1945–1993*, edited by Adam Roberts and Benedict Kingsbury. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994a, pp.15-22
- Roberts, Adam and Benedict Kingsbury. "Coercion and Peacekeeping Under UN Auspices." In *Presiding Over a Divided World: Changing UN Roles, 1945–1993*, edited by Adam Roberts and Benedict Kingsbury. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994b, pp. 38-51
- Rozoff, Rick. "Mongolia: The Pentagon's Trojan Horse. US-NATO Partner Wedged Between China and Russia." In *Global Research* [Online], March 31, 2010, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/mongolia-the-pentagon-s-trojan-horse-us-nato-partner-wedged-between-china-and-russia/?print=1>, accessed December 2014

- Sambath, Thet and Sebastian Strangio. "Cambodia to Host Annual Peacekeeping Training Operations." In *The Phnom Penh Post* [Online], March 5, 2009, <http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/cambodia-host-annual-peacekeeping-training-operations>, accessed November 2014
- Sang-ho, Song. "Military Launches Unit for Overseas Deployment." In *The Korea Herald* [Online], July 1, 2010, http://www.koreaherald.com/common_prog/newsprint.php?ud=20100701000625&dt=2, accessed November 2014
- Secretariat of IPCH, International Peace Coordination Headquarters, Cabinet Office. "Paths to Peace. History of Japan's International Peace Cooperation." 2010, http://www.pko.go.jp/pko_e/data/michi_e2010/michi-e.pdf, accessed October 2014
- Shibata, Akiho and Yoshihide Soeya. "Legal Framework." In *United Nations Peace-keeping Operations: A Guide to Japanese Policies*, edited by L. William Heinrich Jr., Akiho Shibata, and Yoshihide Soeya. New York and Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 1999, pp. 45-78
- Shin, Dong-ik. "Keynote Speech by Ambassador Dong-ik SHIN, Deputy Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea. The 12th ROK-UN Joint Conference on Disarmament and Non-proliferation Issues, November 14, 2013." 2013, <http://unrcpd.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Jeju-Amb-Shins-keynote-speech.pdf>, accessed December 2014
- Snyder, Scott A. "Overview." In *Global Korea: South Korea's Contribution to International Security*, edited by Scott Bruce, John Hemmings, Balbina Y. Hwang, Terence Roehrig, and Scott A. Snyder. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2012, pp. 1-12
- Taylor, Paul and Devon Curtis. "The United Nations." In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 405-424
- TICAD, Tokyo International Conference on African Development. "About TICAD." 2012a, <http://www.ticad.net/about/index.html>, accessed November 2013
- TICAD, Tokyo International Conference on African Development. "5th Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD V)." 2012b, <http://www.ticad.net/ticadv/index.html>, accessed November 2013
- TICAD, Tokyo International Conference on African Development. "Co-Organizers and Contributors." 2012c, <http://www.ticad.net/organizer/index.html>, accessed November 2013
- UN, United Nations. "Somalia – UNOSOM II." 1996, <http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unosom2p.htm>, accessed November 2014
- UN, United Nations. "The United Nations: An Introduction for Students." 2000, <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/unintro/unintro3.htm>, accessed October 2013
- UNDPKO, United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. Principles and Guidelines." 2008, http://pbpu.unlb.org/pbps/library/capstone_doctrine_eNg.pdf, accessed November 2014
- UNODA, United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. "Tenth UN-ROK Joint Conference on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues." 2013, <http://www.un.org/disarmament/special/meetings/jeju/2011/>, accessed December 2014
- UNOV, United Nations Office Vienna. "Membership in the United Nations." 2013, <http://www.unvienna.org/unov/en/faq.html>, accessed October 2014
- U.S. State Department. "Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)." 2013a, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/gpoi/>, accessed November 2014
- U.S. State Department. "Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) "Phase I" (Fiscal Years 2005-2009)." 2013b, <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/gpoi/c47007.htm>, accessed November 2014

- U.S. State Department. "Proliferation Security Initiative." 2013c, <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c10390.htm>, accessed November 2014
- Weiss, Thomas G. and Ramesh Thakur. "The Problématique of Global Governance." In *Global Governance and the UN: An Unfinished Journey. The United Nations Intellectual History Project*, edited by Thomas G. Weiss and Ramesh Thakur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010, pp. 1-27
- Wilkins, Thomas. "Australia and Japan: Allies in the Making." In *East Asia Forum* [Online], July 30, 2011, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/07/30/australia-and-japan-allies-in-the-making/>, accessed November 2014
- Young, O. R. "Regime Dynamics: The Rise and Fall of International Regimes." In *International Organization*, 36/2, 1982, pp. 279-297