Japan's global vision

Tokyo's evolving foresight practices, Indo-Pacific strategy and EU-partnership

SUMMARY
Since 1970, Japan has developed a world-leading capacity for foresight. At the outset, the focus was on technology and socio-economic development. Broader geopolitical and security aspects have become more pronounced in the past decade.

Concerns about global political changes have given rise to an enhanced strategic partnership between Japan and the European Union. Common challenges include shifts in global economic power, the emergence of China, and uncertainties around the United States' international engagement.

While Japan and the European Union have differing security policy perspectives and capabilities, joint efforts can have a positive impact in areas such as infrastructure, digital connectivity, overseas development assistance and energy sustainability.

A shared vision on common challenges and responses is at the heart of the partnership between the European Union and Japan. Joint strategic foresight activities, building on existing foresight capabilities on each side, could be considered as a means of updating and strengthening this shared vision.
Introduction

Japan has developed a strong foresight tradition, and this extends beyond technology to foreign and security policy. As a result, the country is keenly aware of emerging strategic uncertainties. This is the background to the recent conclusion of economic and strategic partnership agreements with the European Union (EU). Trade, investment and strategic political dialogue are central aspects of this bilateral relationship. Priority areas for joint activities include infrastructure, digital connectivity, overseas development assistance and sustainable energy. All of these areas have both economic and strategic significance; they are in part a response to China's ambitions to increase its regional and global influence.

This briefing first outlines Japan's long engagement with foresight, with an institutional framework centred on five-yearly foresight reports. It then considers more recent innovations, focusing on external policy, notably the creation of the National Security Council. The briefing then addresses the creation of a new economic and strategic partnership between Japan and the EU, a testament to the two partners' shared values and overlapping long-term priorities. The final section analyses areas where bilateral cooperation can have a strong impact, such as infrastructure, digital connectivity, development activities and sustainable energy.

Using foresight to set long-term priorities

Japan has a long tradition of engagement with what we now call strategic foresight. In 1857, the Shogunate set up the Institute to Study Western Books. In the following years, fact-finding missions to Europe and the United States of America (USA) identified technological and institutional factors underpinning Western power. In the Meiji era, Japan's rulers recognised the need for a grand strategy to protect and project Japan's interests vis-à-vis the growing strength of the West. This gave rise to a comprehensive reform programme. New economic and technological policies brought rapid industrialisation, making Japan the first industrial great power outside the western world. Later, Japan pursued an expansionist policy that copied Western imperialism, in part in order to counter Russian influence in Asia.¹

In the modern era, Japan was the first country to apply modern foresight techniques to policy-making.² Once again, the focus was on technological innovation. In 1971, Japan launched Delphi Forecasts, conducted by the foresight group of the National Institute of Science and Technology Policy (NISTEP). Since then, a comprehensive foresight report has been issued every five years (see Figure 1). The reports have become more sophisticated and more influential over time, and they have a good track record of anticipating developments.³ The work of Takeo Inouye, a pioneer of technological forecasting, and Hideo Shima, creator of the bullet train, is recognised as having paved the way for the NISTEP reports.⁴

Japan's foresight process looks 30 years ahead. It uses four complementary methodologies: Delphi surveys, scenarios, literature searches and societal searches (see Figure 2).⁵ The Delphi method is a structured survey of expert views. The most recent report consulted 4 309 experts, drawn from universities, the private and public sectors.⁶ The survey has multiple rounds, and participants can modify their answers based on the results of the previous round; this encourages convergence towards a consensus. The reports initially focused specifically on technology, but this changed with the ninth report in 2012. This edition addressed urgent social and global issues, including climate change, energy and the aging population.

The 2017 report forecasts the development of science and technology to 2050. It includes detailed predictions on a broad range of domains, from artificial intelligence (AI), cyber security, health and environment to energy, natural resources, infrastructure and space.

The framework for the five-yearly exercise is set down in law. The legal basis stipulates that insights from the reports are to be integrated into national five-year plans for science and technology. Each sector thus has an overarching strategic vision. Each five-year plan is expected to advance
innovation, competitiveness, security and wellbeing. The budget for the five-year cycle is set at four percent of Japan’s GDP. This amounted to US$200 billion for the 1996 plan and US$300 billion for the 2005 plan.7

The substance of each report is directly communicated to policy-makers.8 The Prime Minister chairs the Council for Science and Technology Policy, whose members are drawn from the ministries and industry. The reports guide and inform ministers and industry, and are discussed with regional and local actors. The reports also have a high public profile, prompting wide-ranging discussions. The media plays its part in disseminating foresight knowledge, including through easy-to-read publications. To reach younger age groups, scenarios from the reports have been developed into Manga comics. The Japanese recipe for long-running successful foresight includes three key factors:

- direct engagement with decision-makers;
- bringing together a wide range of informed and influential figures; and
- substantial budget provisions.

While the NISTEP foresight reports are pre- eminent, Japan has other foresight initiatives. In 2005, the Science Council of Japan published its ‘Japan Vision 2050’. This outlines their strategy to maintain Japan’s prestige and position in the face of global environmental and economic challenges.9 10 In 2012, Keidanren, Japan’s leading business federation, sponsored a report with detailed simulations of the Japanese and global economies up to 2050.11 Keidanren’s think-tank, the 21st Century Public Policy Institute, warned of national decline due to slow economic growth and
rising government debt, accompanied by population decline. The institute organised discussions on the economy, industry, governance, foreign policy and national security, to develop ‘simulations’ or scenarios for 2050, with a view to encouraging policies for a ‘strong Japan’. The report urges Japan to ‘be more actively engaged in shaping the global order’ and to ‘play an active role in promoting stability and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region’. It suggests that ‘Japan will find itself sandwiched between two superpowers – the United States and China’, both with economies massively outweighing Japan’s.¹²

Figure 2 – Process for NISTEP’s 2015 Science and Technology Foresight Report


In 2020, the Japan Centre for Economic Research issued five short reports offering 40-year projections for the global economy (see Figure 3). The reports address whether China or the USA will be the world’s hegemonic power by 2060; prospects for US-China conflict; the increased prominence of India, Southeast Asia and Africa; the emergence of AI and robotics; and future Japanese development according to two different scenarios – baseline versus reform.¹³

Taken together, recent Japanese foresight reports show a degree of pessimism about the implications for the country of a stagnating economy and an aging population, combined with China’s growth. They share a sense of urgency in favour of internal reform and a more ambitious regional foreign policy, and for security and economic strategies to respond and to protect Japan’s status as a major power. While Japan’s foresight focus has traditionally been on science and innovation, these recent reports reflect the growing importance of geopolitical developments.

In 2013, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe set up a National Security Council (NSC), modelled on the US National Security Council.¹⁴ This is seen as the most ambitious reform of Japan’s foreign and security policy apparatus since World War II.¹⁵ The Council includes the Prime Minister, the Ministers of Defence and Foreign Affairs, and the Chief Cabinet Secretary, and is supported by an extensive National Security Secretariat. It is charged with developing a national security strategy.

Japan’s national security is affected by issues including the risk of American isolationism, growing Chinese power and North Korea’s pursuit of long-range nuclear missiles. The National Security Council (NSC) carries the country’s tradition of strategic foresight forward by taking a whole-of-government approach. This ranges beyond the classical military and defence sphere, to matters such as cyber, space, economics and finance. The NSC enhances Japan’s capacity for long-term and strategic thinking about its place in the world, and is considered to have improved strategic planning, coordination and information sharing.
Adapting to new strategic challenges

In the modern era, economics have been at the heart of Japan's external affairs. The development of globally competitive business and finance, informed by foresight-based policies, brought prosperity at home and influence abroad. This outward focus made Japan a strong proponent of international economic governance based on multilateral norms, working on the global stage to protect its economic interests and those of its globalised corporations.\(^{16}\)

Changing circumstances have posed challenges for this approach. China's pursuit of territorial claims, especially in the South-China Sea, opens the possibility of Chinese control of transport routes which are critical for Japan, such as the Straits of Malacca. This is a potential threat both to oil supplies and commercial shipping. In response, Japan has channelled public investment into infrastructure throughout the Indo-Pacific, in direct competition with China.\(^{17}\) Japan's foreign direct investment (FDI), both worldwide and in Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries, is nearly double that of China. Japanese banks play a major role in this.\(^{18}\)

Japan's engagement in south-east Asia also extends to regional security cooperation. Japan does not take a military or cybersecurity lead in the region, but it participates in the ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting Plus and has given material support to the Philippines' navy and coast guard.

In recent years, Japan has developed a new vision of regional economic integration, set out in the Free and Open Indo-Pacific (FOIP) programme. This has three pillars. The first covers the rule of law, freedom of navigation and free trade: clear and agreed rules form the basis of secure cooperation. The second concerns infrastructure for connectivity, which can deliver lasting prosperity. The third pillar involves capacity-building, humanitarian assistance, disaster relief and anti-piracy operations, in the interests of securing peace.\(^{19}\)

The FOIP programme links Japan's strategic engagement in east Asia to a broader context, including Australia, India, the USA and Africa. It builds on the 'Japan and India Vision 2025' adopted in 2015. In Africa, Japan sponsors major construction projects in Kenya, Mozambique, Uganda, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Madagascar, notably for port infrastructure.\(^{20}\)
Foreign policy has both security and economic dimensions. For Japan, the two aspects have become more closely integrated in recent times. One sign of this is the creation of an economic division within the National Security Secretariat. Another is the adoption of measures to cordon off certain economic sectors from undue Chinese influence. Export controls have been reviewed, and new conditions have been imposed on FDI in AI and other critical technologies. Huawei and other Chinese telecom firms were designated as a cybersecurity risk and excluded from government 5G contracts. In 2017, Japan warned the financially troubled Toshiba not to sell its semiconductor business to a Chinese corporation, on the grounds of national security. Japan has worked with the EU and the USA to counter market-distorting practices and forced technological transfers by China, notably at the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The rebalancing of security and economic considerations is illustrated by 2019 legislation on investment screening. The threshold above which foreign investors need prior approval for stock acquisitions in designated sectors was reduced from 10% to 1%. Exemptions can be granted to foreign investors who forego board positions or access to critical technology. This was a controversial measure, opposed by some as harmful to innovation and investment.

Japan faces a growing threat of malicious cyber-attacks. There have been several high-profile attacks on both government services and industries, and new policies and laws have been adopted to improve cybersecurity. This trend underlines the connection between technology and security in Japan and elsewhere.

In modern times, Japan has successfully built strategic partnerships and overcome the wartime legacy of suspicion and concerns about its political intentions and economic influence. It re-established major power status while achieving high trust among its regional partners. In contrast, trust in China is low. To consolidate its position, Japan has sought closer ties with India and Australia, with regular Trilateral Dialogues on infrastructure cooperation and maritime security, and through joint military exercises. It has also increased its defence budget, enhancing maritime and aerial defence capacities, and has eased constitutional limitations on overseas military activities.

Friendship diplomacy has long been part of Japan’s foreign policy strategy. This seems to have evolved into a strategy of counterbalancing against China. Friendship diplomacy has long been part of Japan's foreign policy strategy. This seems to have evolved into a strategy of counterbalancing against China. 21 There have also been steps to reduce
dependence on the US military bases, a cornerstone of Japan's national security. This is partly a response to US pressure on Japan to take more responsibility for its own defence. It also reflects concerns about the reliability of the US that grew during the Trump Presidency.

Over the past two decades, Japan has become a more 'normal' power. It combines realism in engaging with the USA to balance China's rise, pragmatism in using economic policy to reposition Japan in Southeast Asia, and liberalism in enhancing global rules through multilateral institutions. Japan will continue to balance China's growing power by consolidating its economic network through trade and investment, and its security architecture through cooperation with Southeast Asian countries, the USA, Australia and India.

**Japan and the EU as economic and strategic partners**

Both Japan and the EU have long been strong supporters of multilateral bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and the WTO, without ever concluding a formal bilateral framework agreement. Trade relations have been difficult at times, notably when Japanese car and consumer electronics companies competed strongly with European rivals in the 1980s. Japan's evolving perception of strategic and economic challenges have encouraged closer cooperation. This enabled the conclusion of bilateral agreements. A Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA) has been provisionally applied since early 2019, and an Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) came into effect in early 2019.

The EPA is the largest free trade agreement ever concluded, covering around 40% of world trade and one third of global GDP. Projections suggest the EPA will add 0.76% to EU GDP, and 1% to Japan's. Japanese research also suggests a slight negative impact on the GDP of the USA, China and South-Korea. The European Union hopes in particular for gains in textiles and dairy exports to Japan. Bilateral trade rose by almost 6% in the first year of the agreement.

Changing global conditions contributed to the decision to move beyond joint statements and action plans to a cooperation agreement. A key factor was the US withdrawal from both transatlantic trade negotiations and the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This fed concerns about the USA turning inwards and embracing protectionism. Regional issues may have played a part on both sides. The EU was dealing with the impact of Brexit, while Japan was embroiled in a trade conflict with South Korea, based in part on unresolved issues from the wartime occupation of Korea.

As a new-generation free trade agreement, the EPA has an economic significance beyond trade in the classical sense. It ranges beyond market access to regulation, intellectual property rights and corporate governance, as well as environmental protection and sustainable development. It is the first trade agreement to include commitments to the Paris Agreement. It contains clauses on labour rights, state-owned enterprises, public procurement, market access, and data protection. This signals that major players have joined together to uphold the multilateral rule-based trade order, in the face of protectionist impulses, scepticism about globalisation and the growing urgency of a shift to sustainability.

The conclusion of the SPA reflected broader concerns about the global political landscape, going beyond economic issues. The apparent abdication of leadership during the Trump Presidency was one incentive for closer bilateral links; another was increasing assertiveness by both China and Russia. The preservation of open and secure maritime routes through the Indo-Pacific is a high priority for both, this being critical for both partners' security and prosperity.

The SPA lists no fewer than 40 areas of cooperation. These include crisis and conflict management, counter-terrorism, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and disarmament, transfer control of conventional weapons, disaster management, chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear risk mitigation, climate change, maritime security, corruption and organised crime, money laundering and financing of terrorism, cybersecurity, energy and energy security.
The SPA does not name countries at the heart of specific concerns, but a joint statement in April 2019 did mention: North Korea and weapons proliferation, the USA and climate change, China and maritime threats, and Russia and cyber-threats.31

Both sides see the Agreement as a means to enhance their profile as global players.32 The EU perspective is set out in an action plan, 'EU security cooperation in and with Asia.' This identifies Japan as a natural ally of the EU in the practical promotion of security cooperation in Asia. The SPA is in line with commitments in the EU Global Strategy to Asian security. The first EU bilateral summit following the onset of the pandemic was an online meeting with Prime Minister Abe, underlining the importance the EU attaches to its enhanced relationship with Japan.33

The SPA is part of Japan’s reorientation for a ‘multipolar age’. Its relationship with Europe is not only conducted at EU level. Despite the EPA and SPA, the most recent Japanese Diplomatic Blue Book (the Foreign Ministry's annual activity report) gives more space to bilateral relations with large EU Member States than to the EU itself.34

There are obstacles to the implementation of EPA and SPA commitments and the realisation of ‘untapped potential’ so often discussed in recent decades.35 Practical cooperation in the defence of shared values is harder to achieve than well-intended declarations of solidarity.

Japanese and EU interests diverge in some respects. Their approaches to China and the USA can differ, partly as a result of geographical location and different defence policy parameters. Trade and financial interests, allied to the absence of sovereign military capacity, can act as an incentive for the EU to take a softer line on China’s maritime aggressiveness in the East and South China Seas. Japan also worries that European strategic autonomy could weaken the EU’s interest in a coalition-based approach in the Indo-Pacific. Japan was disappointed by the EU’s signing of a Comprehensive Agreement on Investment with China, which it sees as an example of economic interests being prioritised over values.36

On the EU side, the priority Japan gives to its alliance with the USA can be seen to conflict with the EU’s preference for multilateralism. Prime Minister Abe organised several top-level exchanges with Russia and the USA, in an effort to improve bilateral relations, without consulting the EU. Japan has remained outside the China-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), whereas EU countries have joined in.

Both the EU and Japan prioritise security in the context of a working relationship with a powerful immediate neighbour – Russia and China respectively. While Japan wants the EU to take a tougher stance on China, the EU attaches higher priority to maintaining the US security commitment to Europe, and to fighting instability in Africa and the Middle East.37 Despite these divergences, the SPA’s clear support for democracy, the rule of law and other shared values is more than just symbolic, considering that both partners must cope with an assertive authoritarian neighbour.38

While Japan remains a major contributor to UN peacekeeping operations, together with several EU Member States, it is not clear how far the SPA can progress in the area of peace and security. Both the EU and Japan have engaged in joint measures on maritime security, such as joint port calls in the Horn of Africa and capacity-building initiatives in south-east Asia.39 The partners conducted joint naval exercises in January 2020 and May 2021, off the coast of Somalia and Djibouti, following the adoption of the EU strategy for cooperation in the Indo-Pacific.40 Japan’s EU delegation to the EU now includes a military attaché. That said, both sides lack global military capabilities, Japan due to constitutional constraints, and the EU as a result of limited defence integration.

An EU-Japan framework partnership agreement has been the subject of bilateral discussions in recent years. If realised, such an agreement could institutionalise joint missions and Japanese troop contributions in the future.41 Security cooperation with Japan is also part of the EU action plan for ‘security cooperation in and with Asia’, alongside cooperation with India, Indonesia and Vietnam on a wide variety of shared concerns.
Figure 5 – Discussions at the 2019 EU-Japan Summit, the most recent in-person summit

Source: Prime Minister’s Office of Japan, ‘Visit to Belgium’ (translated), 2019.

Priority areas for EU-Japan cooperation

The need for practical results demands clear prioritisation among the 40 areas for cooperation named in the Strategic Partnership Agreement. Infrastructure and digital connectivity, development cooperation and sustainable energy are promising areas for joint action.42

The Partnership on Sustainable Connectivity and Quality Infrastructure, signed in September 2019, provides a €60 billion EU guarantee fund to attract investment in infrastructure.43 An emphasis on environmental and financial sustainability of projects distinguishes this partnership from the ‘China model’, and is presented as a more responsible alternative to China’s belt and road initiative (BRI). Africa and the Indo-Pacific feature strongly, while Japan is also eager to work on connectivity in the Western Balkans.

Digital connectivity, notably in 5G, is a promising area for cooperation.44 The EU-Japan Data Adequacy Decision, adopted in January 2019, facilitates the flow of personal data between the two regions on the basis of protection guarantees and privacy standards. It created the world’s largest zone for the free and safe flow of data, potentially boosting digital trade between the two sides.45 Japan adopted new measures to ensure that its use of data from the EU complied with EU standards. These include standards on privacy for the use of the data by corporations and the government, the protection of sensitive data, and conditions governing which data can be transferred to third countries.46 Japan’s reforms showed the EU’s influence on international standard setting. Both parties expect the January 2019 decision to lead to further partnerships in the future.47

The EU and Japan together account for 60 % of global official development assistance (ODA).48 An example of cooperation is the Japanese contribution to civilian EU common security and defence policy (CSDP) missions in Mali, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Niger.49 Japan provided financial and technical assistance for EU missions in Niger for security-related capacity-building, and in Mali to support police training; the country previously assisted EU work in Bosnia, Iraq and Afghanistan. The European Investment Bank (EIB) and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) cooperate in co-financing micro-finance projects in Africa.50

Environmental concerns have been a central focus of foresight work in both Japan and the EU for some time. This is reflected in the fact that EU and Japan each aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 % by 2050.51 It follows that sustainable energy and decarbonisation is a promising
field for cooperation. For reasons both of sustainability and of energy security, the EU and Japan seek to develop renewable energy sources and to reduce dependence on fossil fuels. Cooperation on sustainable energy is included both in the SPA and in the connectivity partnership agreement. Japan has made rapid progress in hydrogen fuel in recent years, and the EIB and JICA are committed to jointly develop sustainable hydrogen energy. In previous decades, EU countries learned much from Japan's solar panel industry. Today, Japan can draw on European experience in modernising and integrating national electrical grids. The SPA also provides for enhanced dialogue between the European Parliament and the Japanese Parliament. The European Parliament’s Science and Technology Options Assessment (STOA) Panel has for many years taken part in the annual forum of the Science and Technology in Society (STS) in Kyoto, a high-profile event that addresses challenges and opportunities arising from technological innovation.

The interrelated areas of infrastructure and digital connectivity, development assistance, and sustainable energy all offer potential dividends from closer cooperation between Japan and the EU, stretching from Europe and Africa to the Indo-Pacific.

Shinzo Abe stepped down as Prime Minister in September 2020, for health reasons. He was succeeded for one year by a close ally, Yoshihide Suga, who maintained Japan's openness to cooperation with the EU. At the EU-Japan summit of 27 May 2021, European Council President Charles Michel, Commission President Ursula von der Leyen and Prime Minister Suga launched the EU-Japan Green Alliance for coordinated climate action. They welcomed the positive results of the EPA and committed themselves to strengthening and reforming the WTO, promoting global digital standards, and expanding technological cooperation, possibly also through Japanese affiliation to the Horizon Europe research programme. On foreign and security policy, the two sides agreed to work with ASEAN, South Asian and Pacific Island countries for a free and open Indo-Pacific. They expressed concern about the situation in the South and East China Seas, and agreed to continue dialogue on countering disinformation. Long-term perspectives were also reflected in the priorities identified in September 2021 for the EU strategy for cooperation in the Indo-Pacific: the connectivity partnership with Japan, and the possibility of associating Japan with Horizon Europe.

Outlook

Japan's strong tradition of using foresight to develop a strategic vision has served it well in the post-war era, notably in the harnessing of new technology and in the creation of a globally competitive industrial base.

It should not come as a surprise that priority areas for cooperation between Japan and the EU have both an economic and a geopolitical dimension. For example, overseas development assistance to strengthen democracy, respect for human rights, and sustainability – including environmental resilience – can help counteract growing Chinese influence in developing countries.

The global impact of closer partnership between Japan and the EU has limitations. For all their economic strength, neither is a frontline actor in military and security policy. Much will depend on how China interprets its role as a regional and global great power; and how the USA will respond to this.

In recent decades Japan's foresight has become more strategic in nature, while the EU's strategic foresight activities are developing rapidly, including under the framework of the European Strategy and Policy Analysis System (ESPAS). Closer links between the foresight activities of the two sides could bring dividends, to reinforce awareness of common challenges and to enhance the long-term perspective of mutual cooperation.
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