

Significance of the Japan-India Partnership for East Asian Regionalism

Céline Pajon

“I believe the time has come for our two ancient civilizations to build a strong contemporary relationship involving strategic and global partnership that will have a great significance for Asia and I believe for the world as a whole”

Prime Minister of India Manmohan Singh, Address to the Joint Session of the Japanese Diet, December 15, 2006

Abstract

The construction of an integrated East Asia and an “East Asian community” is an important objective of the strategic partnership built by Tokyo and Delhi. Since the 1990s, India has indeed been keen on reintegrating East Asia for economic and political reasons. For its part, Japan is interested in getting closer to India, which shares its desire to build a multipolar Asia and counterbalance Chinese power. In this regard, Japan played an essential role in securing the participation of India in the East Asia Summit.

The regional project is underpinned by a discourse on shared democratic values, common interests, and cultural references. Since the late 19th century, Japan and India have indeed tried in their own way to theorize, promote and lead East Asia as a region. These efforts, along with the famous interactions between Japanese and Indian intellectuals and independence leaders, are used today to justify their rapprochement.

Despite the diplomatic discourse, it seems that the Japan-India partnership is mainly responding to neorealist concerns in East Asia dealing with the balance of power. This nascent partnership shall be closely considered as an interesting new element in the Great Game unfolding in East Asia, even if the Japan-India relationship is still shaped to a great extent by Chinese and US factors.

1. Introduction

The Japanese partnership with India is of particular significance regarding the construction of an East Asian Community. This nascent relationship between “the most developed and the largest Asian democracies,”¹ grounded on a rich historical legacy of contributions toward East Asian regionalism, hopes to play a central role in the current regional construction.

The rapprochement between Japan and India since 2000 mainly results from the evolution of the geopolitical context: the rise of China and the new strategic partnership between Delhi and Washington. The Indo-Japanese relationship also builds on Indian economic growth and the re-discovery of common values, interests and strategic objectives between the two nations.²

India has indeed been keen on reconnecting with East Asia since the 1990s for economic and political reasons, while Japan started a “re-asianization” process after the 1997 crisis. Japan takes interest in getting closer to India, which shares its desire to build a multipolar Asia and

counterbalance Chinese power. In this regard, Japan played an essential role in integrating India into the East Asia Summit. This “mutually beneficial” relationship is also very significant for this new wave of Asian regionalism, which seems to shift from an “Asia-Pacific” to a “broader East Asia” focus.

As Paul Evans³ has suggested, it is useful to distinguish between *regionalization* and *regionalism*, the latter dealing with the expression of an identity and a cultural bedrock that allows the construction of a regional organization based on economic and political convergence (*regionalization*). From a methodological perspective, this means that the Japan-India contribution shall be examined for these two dimensions of the East Asian regional construction. The complex reality of Asian international relations justifies an “analytic eclecticism”⁴ in order to grasp the most comprehensive image of the ongoing processes. While drawing from a broad realist perspective, I will test some constructivist and functionalist approaches when reviewing Japanese and Indian policy and discourse about the construction of an integrated Asia.

This paper aims to discuss the implications of Japan-India partnership for the regional project, the regional identity, and the regional balance of power. The importance of the nascent Japan-India relationship in Asia will be assessed, as well as its capacity to “make sense” for East Asia identity and current regionalism.

2. The Regional Project behind the Current Indo-Japanese Rapprochement

The conjunction of exogenous and endogenous factors explains the current Japan-India rapprochement. The rise of China transforming the power paradigm in Asia is an object of concern for both Delhi and Tokyo. The bilateral partnership is part of their effort to hedge against Chinese power. The about-face of the American administration toward India since the year 2000 is another important reason behind Tokyo’s new approach toward Delhi.

The rapprochement also builds on Indian economic growth. Prompted by liberalization reforms since 1991 and accompanied by a charm offensive toward East Asia, it is an important element that motivated Japan to reconsider India as an attractive economic partner. The two countries also share common values (democracy and market economy) and strategic interests (building a multipolar world, gaining a permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council).⁵

The historic visit of Prime Minister Mori to India in 2000 marked the turning point in the bilateral relationship; Japan and India decided to build a “global partnership for the 21st Century.”⁶ Most of the motives underpinning the Japan-India rapprochement directly or indirectly relate to the two countries’ ambitions in East Asia.

(1) Reinvesting the New Asia: Common Interests

Since the 1990s, the re-engagement in East Asia takes place in the context of the “Look East policy.” Aiming at reconnecting India with a dynamic, integrated East Asia, it is part of an overall strategy to become a regional power. Accordingly, the Indian national interest has been widened to embrace the greater Indian Ocean, “from the Persian Gulf to the strait of Malacca.”⁷ This new strategic orientation is accompanied by a build-up of maritime capacity.⁸

Japan adopted a more proactive role in Asia in the wake of the 1997 Asian fiscal crisis, when it provided a large amount of assistance for Asian countries and proposed the creation of an Asian Monetary Fund. Even though this initiative, opposed by the U.S. and China, eventually failed, Southeast Asian countries came to see Japan as the real economic leader of Asia, and asked Tokyo to take a greater political role in the region.⁹ Since then, Japan has been very active in promoting regional agreements in the economic, political, and security fields¹⁰ in an effort to refocus its diplomatic efforts toward Asia. This Japanese interest in East Asia also has to do with

the rise of China and Beijing's attempt to take the lead in the region.

India and Japan share the perception that Asia is the new development locomotive of the 21st Century. Asia represents half of the world's population, includes the world's second economic power, two giant nations that have grown at a fast pace (more than 7%), and a collection of new industrialized countries. Asia has a high potential for economic cooperation with a vertical specialization, dense regional networks for production, and more than 55% intra-zone trade. In this context, Tokyo and Delhi wish to support this "new Asian era" by defining ways to cope with the US-defined "arc of instability," building an "arc of advantage"¹¹ and contributing to the construction of an East Asian Community.

(2) The Diplomacy of the "Arcs"

In 2004, Manmohan Singh, the father of Indian liberal reforms in the 1990s, floated his vision of an "arc of advantage and prosperity"¹² across Asia, in the context of the failure of multi-lateral trade negotiations and the strengthening of regional groupings. Considered as an extension of the "Look East Policy," the "arc of advantage" is a new vision to promote a regional zone of shared prosperity. This expression emphasizes the importance of reconnecting India to East Asia through the multiplication of trade exchanges and development of reliable transportation routes.

This objective was to be reached by the completion of a Free Trade Agreement with ASEAN.¹³ Furthermore, an Asian Economic Community¹⁴ encompassing the ASEAN+3 "from the Himalayas to the Pacific Ocean" would be built. This integrated market would enable "large scale movement of people, capital, ideas, and creativity."¹⁵

Further elaborating on his vision, Singh proposed a Pan-Asia Free Trade Agreement in December 2005 based on an ASEAN+6 framework,¹⁶ taking the European Union as a model.¹⁷ This vision is mainly a project of economic reintegration in East Asia, for India to take part in the construction of a large pan-Asian free trade area, which could sustain the country's economic growth.

At the end of November 2006, Taro Aso, then Minister of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), introduced the expression "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity."¹⁸ It was one of the rare attempts to approach Japanese diplomacy in conceptual terms. Because this bold move provoked some negative reactions, especially from China and some Middle Eastern countries, the rhetoric soon disappeared from the political discourse. This vision holds that Japanese foreign policy is founded on a new pillar, "value-oriented diplomacy," based on universal values such as democracy, freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and the market economy. Accordingly, Japan shall assist the young democracies in the outer rim of the Eurasian continent in order to build an "arc of freedom and prosperity." As an Asian pace-setter in terms of democracy and economic development, Japan is presented as a legitimate leader in the region. In the same statement, Aso stated that Japan must also "make its ties even firmer with friendly nations that share the common views and interests." Comparing Japanese bilateral relations with China and India, Taro Aso also called for an improvement in the relationship with Delhi.

In contrast with the Indian "arc," which is mainly of an economic nature, the Japanese vision of the "arc" is much more political and deals with the promotion of democracy, to allow a more balanced economic freedom and shared prosperity. However, in March 2007, Minister of Foreign Affairs Aso and his Indian counterpart Mukherjee "reaffirmed that there exists common objectives and values between the idea of "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity" proposed by Japan and the idea of "Arc of Advantage and Prosperity" proposed by India, and that realisation [*sic*] of such common ideas would benefit not only Japan and India but also the whole of Asia."¹⁹

It must be added that in a recent speech on foreign policy given at the end of June 2009, Prime Minister Aso elaborated on the concept of "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity" as a basis for forming "a modern-day version of the Silk Road." This new vision, calling for connecting routes

“from the Pacific Ocean to Europe,” clearly meets the Indian version of the “arc.”²⁰

Japan and India used the “arc” metaphor in order to advance their vision of an integrated, multipolar East Asia, extended from India to Australia and New Zealand.

(3) Japan, India, and the Genesis of the East Asia Summit

Since the beginning of the 21st century, in the context of the failure of global trade mechanisms, numerous bilateral and multilateral Free Trade Agreements were tied up in East Asia. With more than 80 agreements, the question is now how to shift from a complex noodle bowl of overlapping FTAs to a meaningful pan-Asian framework. The idea of building an “East Asian community” eventually came up after a process of reflection led by the countries of ASEAN+3 (or APT for ASEAN Plus Three).

In 1998, APT established successively the East Asian Vision group (1999-2001) and the East Asia Study Group (EASG). The EASG report, issued in 2002, concluded that “the ASEAN+3 framework remains the only credible and realistic vehicle to advance the form and substance of regional cooperation in East Asia.”²¹ The report made no mention of India or Australia. However, intense diplomatic pressure from Singapore, Japan, Indonesia, and Vietnam succeeded in including India in the project, and in less than 3 years.²² The main reasons behind this change of heart were both *realpolitik* concerns and an economic rationale; ASEAN countries eventually agreed that the presence of two demographic and economic giants in the East Asia “Community” would be better than one. This concern matched perfectly with Japanese interest to balance China in the region.

In the meantime, Prime Minister Koizumi proposed an “East Asian community” in 2002, with ASEAN+3, Australia, and New Zealand as the core founding members, while remaining open to the U.S., India, and others.²³ India was later included as a full member in the Japanese vision of a regional project. This invitation resulted from the recognition that India is no longer “a local power” but “one of the three major powers of Asia.”²⁴ Also, the Japanese vision of Asia broadened from “East Asia” (APT) to “the entirety of Asia,” including South Asia. Three main reasons accounted for this new strategic horizon: economic globalization (linked with India’s economic growth), the regional security issue (especially the revelation of proliferation connections between North Korea and Pakistan) and Japan’s security interest (in particular, the safety of maritime routes and the JMSDF missions in the Indian Ocean after 2001).²⁵

In April 2005, a strategic orientation was outlined for the Japan-India partnership which included the realization of an East Asian Economic Community as an “Arc of Advantage and Prosperity.”²⁶ On this occasion, Tokyo conveyed its decision to support India’s membership in the East Asia Summit. Before the first EAS, Japan and India lobbied to have a Chair declaration in which EAS (and not APT) would be presented as the basis for an East Asian Community.²⁷

In addition, Tokyo proposed a CEPEA (Comprehensive Economic Partnership in East Asia or “Nikai initiative”) in April 2006. The CEPEA consists of a fund to start a comprehensive economic partnership (CEP) and a policy-oriented research institution based on the model of OECD: the ERIA (Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia). This consultative body will study the feasibility of a regional FTA, the ultimate end of the initiative.

The “Greater East Asian Community” would be organized around ASEAN at the core, with Japan, China, and South Korea as principal members and Australia, New Zealand, and India as the outer circle.²⁸ This larger framework allows Japan to counteract and contain China which had stolen a march on Japan in knotting up bilateral FTAs in the region. Enlarging the East Asia framework to embrace India also allows Japan to win U.S. approval for this new regional organization and thereby reconcile potentially contradictory interests: to become more actively involved in East Asian regionalism while maintaining a strong alliance with the U.S.²⁹

Despite the first mixed reactions to this ambitious project, Japan could count on India and

its Pan-Asia free trade proposition (see supra), inasmuch as this latest proposal made India a full, original member of a community founded on an ASEAN+4 concept, and could eventually extend to include Australia and New Zealand.

Both projects had two rival proposals: the East Asia Free Trade Area (EAFTA), promoted by China at the second EAS and based on ASEAN+3; and the Free Trade Area of Asia-Pacific (FTAAP) supported by the U.S. in late 2006 (partly in reaction to East Asian regionalization), and viewed as a revival of APEC (excluding India). Japan supported the U.S. proposal “as one of the multilayered efforts in the region,”³⁰ meaning that it does not compete with the CEPEA project, generally seen as more feasible than a broad FTAAP. At the Second EAS (January 2007), the Chair Statement eventually announced that the CEPEA proposal would be studied. A *modus vivendi* was found between Japan and China by stating that ASEAN would stand as the driving force.³¹ Although the legitimacy of the ASEAN+6 framework has been debated, especially by China and Malaysia, it was eventually endorsed by ASEAN; in the Chairman’s Statement of the 2006 and 2007 ASEAN Summits, the EAS is described as “an important component of the merging regional architecture [that] would help build an East Asian Community.” Besides, the ASEAN+6 framework makes sense economically; most economic assessments conclude that an ASEAN+6 Free-trade zone would be more efficient than an ASEAN+3 FTA.³²

(4) The East Asia Summit and the Question of Asian Identity

The EAS is generally presented as a larger, improved version of the East Asia Economic Caucus (EAEC) proposed by Malaysian President Mahathir in 1990. The EAEC proposal was designed to counter the ASEAN’s integration in APEC and create a purely “Asian” economic organization, without the Western nations. As such, it drew extensively from the discourse on the superiority of Asian values (mainly equated with Confucian values) that explain the success of the Asian model of development.

It was an early vision of the ASEAN+3—notwithstanding the discourse on Asian values—but the project failed because Japan did not want to commit to this organization that excluded the U.S. Also, the Asian countries lacked a common experience and common “others” to make their organization meaningful enough. The 1997 Asian crisis provided for both elements.³³ Moreover, in 1996, the constitution of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) confirmed that the EU equated Asia with “East Asia.” At that time, the candidacy to involve India in the forum was rejected.³⁴

Japan and India share a functionalist approach toward East Asian regionalization. Aiming at preserving peace and prosperity in Asia, they both support the construction of a free-trade area in order to sustain growth and connect the whole Asian region, from India to Australia.

According to a recent survey, 81% of the Asian strategic elite expresses support for building an “East Asian Community”; however, the membership is still debated.³⁵ This debate highlights the lack of a well-defined East Asian identity. In the EAS, “East Asia” is understood as a geopolitical, constructed concept, rather than a purely geographical expression. Actually, the origin of the idea of a “broader East-Asia” or “Greater Asia” community can be traced back to the prewar period, when, in the context of anti-imperialism and anti-westernism, Japanese and Indian intellectuals conducted a national discussion on the Asian identity.

3. Coming Back to the Roots: Significance of Past Interactions on Pan-Asianism

Historical and cultural references on bilateral connections regarding Asianism and Asian identity are extensively used in the Indian and Japanese diplomatic discourses. Most of the time, both Indian and Japanese diplomats or leaders elaborate on a “romantic vision” of the relationship, referring to early Buddhist connections (travel of the Indian monk Bodhisena to Japan in

the 8th Century), the friendship of Tagore and Okakura Tenshin (end of the 19th Century until 1913), the Japanese support of the revolutionary activities of Rash Behari Bose (1915-1945), and Chubas Chandra Bose (1943-1945), and the dissenting judgment of Justice Radhabinod Pal at the Tokyo war crimes trial in 1948.³⁶

These references are significant at the bilateral level, but also at the regional level. It is then important to look at the true history behind the recurrent clichés used by the politicians to understand their meaning. It is also a unique occasion to study the Indian and the Japanese vision of pan-Asianism and to think about the current significance of this ambivalent ideology for current Asian regionalism. Even if pan-Asianism is a rejected discourse today because it underpinned the Japanese violent militarism in the region, it is still an important part of the cultural and intellectual bedrock of Asian identity.

(1) Ambivalence of the Pan-Asianist Discourse in Japan and India

The discourse on “Asia” (labeled as “Asianism” or “pan-Asianism”) in Japan and India was designed in the context of both countries’ nationalist projects against Western domination at the turn of the 20th century. Asianism claims that despite their diversity, the Asian countries share common cultural values, especially a high degree of spirituality and aesthetic sensitivity, in opposition to the materialist and decadent West. The aim is to give the Asian countries a sense of unity based on a renewed pride in Asian identity, different from the Western vision of Asia as a backward region. Ultimately, “Asia” is a rallying cry for Asian nations to come together to escape or emancipate themselves from colonization.

As such, “Asia” is a malleable concept that was invested in by ambivalent, contradictory political projects. Koschmann successfully captured this idea in a nutshell: “Without the West there is no East. The very idea of Asia is ultimately empty and variously exploitable. The ideology of Asianism rejects that emptiness by attributing positive, essential meaning to Asia, however it might be conceived geographically.”³⁷ This analysis is shared by an important Japanese historian, Takeuchi Yoshimi, in his book *Nihon to Ajia* (1st edition 1966).

In India and Japan, pan-Asianism was used both as a project of national emancipation and a project of domination in the region.

In Japan, Asianism could be characterised by three elements: (1) the resistance to western influence in the region; (2) the belief in a common identity in Asia; and (3) the claim of Japan to take the lead against Western imperialism.³⁸

Originally, Asianism was developed as a reaction to the westernization of Japan during the Meiji era (1868-1912). At that time, Japanese authorities, in order to protect national independence, decided to take a shortcut to modernization by rapidly adopting and mimicking Western institutions and cultural habits. At Fukuzawa Yukichi’s call in 1895, it was time to escape the fellow Asian countries, considered as backward, and to join the modern West (*datsuA nyûO*). As a reaction, several intellectuals and politicians began to advocate a return to Asian values and traditions. They claimed that Asia, not the Western club of Great Powers, should be the place for Japan’s national project.³⁹ While the “liberal” school called for Japanese solidarity with the oppressed nations of Asia, the “hardliners” asserted Japanese superiority and hegemony in the region.⁴⁰

On the other hand, the Indian elite had to get rid of the inferiority complex infused by the British colonizers in order to develop its own nationalism. This process involved a rediscovery of Indian traditional values and history reconsidered in a positive light.⁴¹ In this context, the concept of an Asian identity and unity was very appealing and supported the formation of an Indian national identity. Thus, the two processes worked in synergy. In India, the “universalist” school (Tagore, Gandhi, Nehru) called for an Asian Federation, that would serve to better advance the interest of Asian countries toward freedom and independence,⁴² while the “Greater India” school

advocated a new Indian supremacy within its cultural sphere of influence, “from Kerala to Indonesia.”⁴³ The “Greater India” ideology saw India as a benevolent hegemon that has spread its culture and spirituality (Buddhism and Hinduism) in South and Southeast Asia, making the region its cultural backyard.

(2) Japanese and Indian Contributions to Pan-Asianism Thinking

The early references in Japan to Asianism (*ajiashugi*), which first appeared in 1892, referred to a community of history and values among Japan, Korea, and China.⁴⁴ The stress put on the anti-westernism and anti-imperialism explains the later extension of the concept to embrace Southeast Asia, and eventually South Asia.⁴⁵

In India, meanwhile, the fascination with Japan’s modernization process and its victory over Russia in 1905 was huge, and several opinion leaders came to see Tokyo as an example and a valuable partner in the Indian fight for independence.

The interactions between Japan and India on pan-Asianism were mainly via individuals. India, of course, was under British colonial rule. On the other hand, the role of the Japanese state was ambivalent. Tied to its alliance with Great Britain from 1902, Tokyo was not supportive of the pan-Asianist trend until the 1920s. When Japan gained the status of quasi-great power, pan-Asianism emerged as a practical ideology that could be implemented to demonstrate Japan’s cultural and political might in Asia.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, growing Japanese differences with its British ally led to greater attention and protectiveness toward the Indian anti-colonial nationalists who sought Japanese support. Despite this involvement, one must keep in mind that support for Indian anti-colonialism actually “came from the margins of Japanese society.”⁴⁷

(3) Okakura and Tagore

The Japanese art critic Okakura Kakuzo (or Okakura Tenshin, 1862-1913) asserted in 1903 in the first sentence of his major work *The Ideals of the East* (1904): “Asia is one.” This book describes the striking spiritual values of the East and deems Japan to represent the quintessence of Asian culture. As such, Japan is presented as the central actor (but not hegemonic actor) in Asian modernization and emancipation from the western powers.⁴⁸

The strong friendship that united Okakura with the Bengali poet Tagore (1861-1941) is well known. Okakura met Tagore in India, where he traveled and lived for a while (1901-1902). Working on Asian art, he wrote in English and mostly for a foreign audience (two of his four masterworks were written in India), which made him an exception in the Japan of his day. Okakura developed a particular definition of Asia, similar to Tagore’s view, that evolved from a broad European-biased view to a Buddhist-tinged vision in which “Asia” equated with the Buddhist civilization “Buddhaland.”⁴⁹

Okakura was actually more famous abroad than in Japan, where the political and intellectual elite (including Okawa Shumei) rediscovered his work in the 1930s in their attempt to build the concept of a “Greater East Asia Sphere of Co-prosperity” (*Daitōa Kyōeiken*). Okakura is even regarded by some as one of those who inspired the Bengali revolutionaries of the Secret society Anushilam Samiti at the origin of the terrorist independence movement in Bengal (though others question his real influence).⁵⁰

Tagore also traveled to Japan, and in a 1916 message he expressed his admiration for an Asian nation that could embrace modernity and defeat a Western country in military combat. He called upon Japan to lead as a virtuous example of a benevolent, spiritual, alternative modernity.⁵¹ But Tagore also worried about the rising Japanese nationalism. In his lecture “Nationalism in Japan,” he stated: “What is dangerous for Japan is not the imitation of the outer features of the West but the acceptance of the motive force of the Western nationalism as her own.”⁵²

In 1938, in his correspondence with the poet Yone Noguchi, Tagore bemoaned Japan’s ag-

gressive expansionism and wrote that “the doctrine of ‘Asia for Asia’...as an instrument of political blackmail has all the virtues of the lesser Europe which I repudiate and nothing of the larger humanity that makes us one across the barriers of political labels and divisions.”⁵³

The friendship between Okakura and Tagore is idealized as being representative of India-Japan close interactions for pan-Asianism. However, upon closer inspection, we discover that Okakura’s liberal vision of Asianism was not heard in Japan, and that his work was distorted in the 1930s by expansionists. Also, this reference obscures Tagore’s critical evaluation of Japanese nationalism after the 1920s and Okakura’s passing.

(4) Imperialist Japan and Indian Revolutionaries

In the 1930s and 1940s, the pan-Asianist ideology was fully part of the Japanese state imperialist project. As the invasion in China advanced, most Asian leaders turned their backs on Japan. Tokyo then sought to legitimize its behavior by referring to an early, liberal pan-Asianism of the sort promoted during the pre-World War One era.⁵⁴

Even though Japan was harshly criticized⁵⁵ by the core leaders of the Congress Party like Gandhi and Nehru, its connections with some Indian revolutionaries were maintained as long as both parties saw a way to advance their respective interests.

Rash Bihari Bose, who had been living in Japan since 1915, married a Japanese woman and was given Japanese nationality. He used his network in ultra-nationalist circles⁵⁶ to gain access to Prime Minister Tojo Hideki, persuading him to support the Indian anti-colonial cause. As a result, two conferences gathering Indian expatriates in Asia were held in Tokyo and Bangkok in 1942 where it was decided to establish the Indian Independence League and the Indian National Army (INA).

Tokyo was actively involved in the formation of the INA in Singapore, initiated by the intelligence agency F-Kikan, composed of Indian prisoners of war captured in the Malaya and Burma fronts. But the constitution of the INA complicated the relationship between the Indian revolutionaries and the Japanese Central command who wanted to use the army as a bulwark for the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere on the Burmese front. However, the charismatic revolutionary Subhas Chandra Bose, who took command of the INA in 1943, reversed the situation and convinced the Japanese to attack Imphal in Northeast India. The operation turned out to be one of the most decisive early defeats for the Japanese Imperial Army.⁵⁷

In the wake of the war, the dissenting judgment by Indian Justice Radabhino Pal at International Military Tribunal for the Far East reflected the magnanimity of some Indian nationalists toward imperialist Japan. Justice Pal, who had studied in Kolkata, was well aware of the connections between independence-seeking Bengalis and Japanese nationalists. He had a great admiration for Japan.⁵⁸ He denounced the political bias of the Tokyo trial as “victors’ justice.” He considered that the Tokyo trial wrongly judged and condemned oriental civilization, identified as the cultural root of Japan’s militarism.⁵⁹ However, Pal’s opinion was his own, and was not representative of the Indian government.⁶⁰

(5) A Utilitarian Relationship

This short survey of Japan-India historical interactions regarding Asia reveals, first of all, the asymmetry of interest between the two countries; while Japan is clearly identified as a leader and key player in the region by Delhi, India is viewed as a country at the margin of East Asia and the Japanese strategic horizon. The Japanese interest in India at that time was a very contextual one and resulted more from an anti-western sentiment than a genuine interest in India’s situation. Anand Mohan Sahay,⁶¹ who spent almost twenty years (from 1923) in Kobe and was very disappointed to find no Indian or Japanese allies to support India’s independence, is illustrative of Indians who felt deceived by the Japanese position. Also, the interest in India nurtured by Okawa

Shumei, a major theorist of imperialist pan-Asianism in Japan, actually originated from his anti-westernism and racism; he never sought to travel to India and thus developed an exotic, romantic view of the country.⁶²

On the Indian side, it is important to recall that as Japan turned imperialist, the core leaders of the Congress Party became very critical and turned their attention to China. The emotional attractiveness of China stemmed from a belief in the spiritual unity of India and China and a common experience of oppression. Both countries were described by Nehru in 1938 as “sister nations.”⁶³ The reality is that only a minority of Indian anti-colonial nationalists placed their bet on Japan.

The links between Japanese nationalists and Indian revolutionaries were therefore marginal and fueled by self-interest. Each party used its contacts to further its own interests and agendas. This is revealed by the efforts made by Subhas Chandra Bose to find an alternative ally in China or the USSR to support the Indian liberation movement when the Japanese war effort began its slide toward eventual defeat by late 1944.⁶⁴ The initial common understanding centered on an Asian identity was soon corrupted by the Japanese imperialist project.

(6) What is the Significance of These References Today?

In the 1990s, India grounded its Look East Policy in a cultural discourse that harked back to the heritage of Tagore and Nehru. These references, coupled with a diplomacy focused on economic cooperation and exchange, were used to reassure East Asian investors for whom India was a turbulent, distant country. This strategy was particularly used vis-à-vis Japan.⁶⁵

The legacy of Tagore and Okakura served to establish common Asian values based on spirituality: Prime Minister Rao asserted in a speech in Japan in 1992: “Asia is one, the essence of this oneness being spirituality.”⁶⁶ At the same time, he asserted that Asia was based on syncretism, citing the Indian spiritual contribution to the Asian identity as the cradle of Buddhism and Hinduism in an attempt to integrate India into East Asia, at least culturally.

In Japan, the use of these references has several meanings. First, the reminders that India and Japan share only positive history are supposed to reassure the business community, scalded by the anti-Japanese demonstrations that took place in China in 2005 because of their historical disputes.

These references also portrayed India in a positive light, as an historically friendly nation to Japan, and a stable partner that shares its democratic values. This attempt to mold a positive perception of India in Japan complements Tokyo’s gradual softening of its stance toward India’s nuclear power status.

Finally, these references are particularly used by right-wing, nationalistic politicians and intellectuals. These elements that focus on positive Japanese attempts to unite Asia and assist Asian independence movements, and the mention of Justice Pal, can be used to present a prettier, sanitized vision of Japan’s wartime history.⁶⁷ By softening the perception of Japanese war crimes and questioning the legal validity of the Tokyo trial, the neo-nationalists are trying to “break away from the *postwar* regime,” instill a new sense of pride in the Japanese nation, and call for a strong Japanese political role in the region without dwelling on the details of the past. Former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who elaborated his nationalistic agenda for Japan in his book “Toward a Beautiful Country,”⁶⁸ is a striking example. He is also an Indophile. When he traveled to India in August 2007, he talked before the Indian Parliament about a “broader Asia” at the confluence of the Pacific and Indian Oceans,⁶⁹ he went to Kolkata to visit the house of Subhas Chandra Bose,⁷⁰ and he met with the son of Justice Pal.

Several Japanese scholars, like Takako Hirose,⁷¹ worry about the danger of such nationalist rhetoric that does not represent healthy ground on which to build the current relationship. Moreover, it lends itself to an old-fashioned and stereotypical view of India, still an exotic country in

the minds of many Japanese.

As the legacy of Japan's wartime imperialism prevented its postwar political influence and intimate involvement in the affairs of East Asia, India's engagement with Southeast Asian countries was similarly impeded by that nation's earlier rhetoric on an Indian cultural sphere ("Greater India"). This meant that both powers had to make creative efforts to involve themselves substantively in the evolving architecture of postwar relationships within East Asia. Since they had never fought or sought to dominate each other, and because they shared common values and perspectives arising from their status as democratic nations with market economies, Japan and India found a basis for joining together in an effort to raise their influence in the region.

Cultural and historical reference points are thus used to advance national interests in building ties and integrating into a region. But India and Japan are, above all, pragmatic nations; as such, they are also engaged in a classic diplomatic strategy of power balance.

4. Constructing an Integrated Asia or a Balanced Asia?

The China and United States factors are determining, to a great extent, the future shape of relationships within East Asia and between East Asia and the rest of the world. What is the position of the Japan-India partnership regarding these two powers? Are they participating in a new axis of democracies against China? Are they trying to balance U.S. power in Asia?

(1) The China Factor

Rising China is regarded with concern by both Japan and India. While both countries view Beijing's economic growth as an opportunity, they also worry about the military build-up and the growing diplomatic influence of Beijing in Asia and in the world. Their diplomatic rapprochement is thus a way for Tokyo and Delhi to hedge against China. This is particularly clear with respect to the Japanese side, as Tokyo is competing with Beijing to take the lead in shaping the new architecture for the region. Japan is now ready to assume a greater political role in the region as the most advanced Asian democratic power, and seeks to weaken Chinese influence by highlighting the authoritarian nature of their regime.

If the relationship between New Delhi and Beijing is any warmer since 2002, it is still characterized by suspicion and mistrust. Several contentious issues like Tibet, the territorial disputes (in Kashmir, Sikkim, and Arunachal Pradesh) and the competition for influence in the Indian Ocean still loom large in the relationship.⁷² The military-strategic community in India is thus very receptive to the adoption of a containment strategy toward China.

On the other hand, even as India is open to a discussion on values,⁷³ Delhi still sticks to its strategic autonomy rhetoric and refuses to get embroiled in any diplomatic or security arrangements that openly aim at containing China.⁷⁴ Despite official reluctance to use balance of power rhetoric, and its rhetorical commitment to a traditional non-alignment policy, India is *de facto* playing the realist game of balancing power in Asia in order to advance its national interests.⁷⁵

In this context, the East Asia Summit framework has been characterized as an "anti-region."⁷⁶ Shaun Breslin argues that the EAS is clearly not the most relevant and consistent framework to build the region, considering the diversity of the participants. He asserts that the EAS is actually advocated by the regional elite, in reaction to the nascent regional mechanisms that are taking shape within the APT framework "in an attempt to neutralize Chinese power."⁷⁷

(2) The U.S. Factor

While the goal of balancing China is clearly shared by Japan and India, both countries are also trying to find a balance in their relationships with the United States. The history of the quad-

ilateral initiative is telling with respect to Japanese and Indian expectations toward the U.S. and China.

Tokyo supports the rise of complementary and alternative poles of power in Asia and the creation of a network of like-minded partners. Highlighting the importance of drawing closer to India, Prime Minister Abe (September 2006-September 2007) suggested that Delhi be included in the ongoing strategic trilateral dialogue between Tokyo, Washington, and Canberra.⁷⁸ This proposal received the blessing of Vice President Cheney in February 2007. This strategic quadrilateral is underpinned by a unity of democratic values that implicitly aims to exclude China.

The strategic component of this “quadrilateral initiative” was seen in the MALABAR 07-2 naval exercises, when 20,000 military personnel, 28 ships, 150 airplanes, and 3 aircraft carriers assembled in the Bay of Bengal during October 2007.⁷⁹

So far, it has been the only naval gathering of the four countries. The Chinese authorities indeed voiced concerns about what they labeled as a foreshadowing of an “Asian NATO.”⁸⁰ As a result of that, plus related domestic sensitivities, the Rudd administration in Australia decided to withdraw from the quad, and the Indian communists put pressure on the Singh government to avoid it. As a result, the quadrilateral initiative is currently in abeyance.⁸¹

In this context, it seems unlikely that the rhetoric of a “coalition of democracies” will reappear in the short term. Moreover, this does not appear to be the diplomatic orientation of the new Obama administration,⁸² nor of the Hatoyama government in Tokyo since September 2009. Even so, it is worth noting that Japan participated twice in India-U.S. naval exercises in April 2007 and June 2009.

If multilateral initiatives centering around the U.S. seem difficult to pursue because of Chinese sensitivities, it would, however, be more acceptable to include Washington in certain forms of a multilateral regional framework.

The question of U.S. integration into an Asian regional organization is central. The U.S. is a *de facto* Asian power. It still maintains 80,000 soldiers in the Asia Pacific theatre and it is a major trading partner for East Asian countries; the current crisis has shown how dependent the ASEAN+3 countries are on U.S. economic growth. From a realist point of view, it therefore seems inconceivable to build a viable regional economic and security structure without including the U.S. Accordingly, 80% of APT experts strongly support the inclusion of the U.S. in EAS; the same percentage supports the inclusion of India.⁸³

Neither Japan nor China nor India really opposes the inclusion of the U.S. in the EAS, and there is a broad consensus on an “open and inclusive” regional institution. The Obama administration is currently studying the possibility of signing the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation with ASEAN,⁸⁴ required to take part in the EAS. This signature could mean a greater U.S. commitment to the East Asia regional process in the next few years. In terms of balance of powers, this scenario would enhance the weight of Japan and India in the region. However, a revival of FTAAP, based on APEC, is also foreseen.⁸⁵ In this perspective, India, which is not part of APEC, would be marginalized. In terms of membership, the Rudd proposal on an Asia Pacific Community (EAS + United States) could be a compromise solution.⁸⁶

The APEC Summit held in Singapore in November 2009 featured the new U.S. political will to get back to Asia. Few days before the summit, in Tokyo, U.S. President Obama, reaffirming the strong ties binding the U.S. and Asia, stated: “As an Asia Pacific nation, the United States expects to be involved in the discussions that shape the future of this region, and to participate fully in appropriate organizations as they are established and evolve.”⁸⁷ More importantly, U.S. Trade representative Ron Kirk announced that the U.S. will take part in the negotiations toward a Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement, to be built on the Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership (P4) between Chile, New Zealand, Singapore, and Brunei. These negotiations, involving Australia, Brunei, Chile, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the U.S., and Vietnam, aims to build a

high-quality FTA that would form the basis for a future FTAAP.⁸⁸

On the other hand, the new Japanese Prime Minister Hatoyama, who took power after the historic victory of the Democratic Party of Japan in late August, is a strong advocate of an “East Asian Community” gathering the ASEAN+6 countries, inspired by the European Union model. Although Hatoyama repeatedly emphasized the importance of the U.S.-Japan partnership in East Asia after Obama’s visit to Tokyo, the Japanese prime minister never formally listed the U.S. as a core member of the East Asian community.⁸⁹

Examining these declarations, it seems that the Japanese and U.S. approaches to Asian regional architecture are increasingly diverging, which could cause additional friction within the alliance as the Hatoyama government is trying to adjust and balance its relationship with Washington.

What about India? By hosting his first state dinner in Indian Prime Minister Singh’s honor, Obama tried to reassure him about the solidity of the U.S.-India partnership. However, Obama did not elaborate on India’s role in Asian regional integration. New Delhi still hopes to be allowed to join APEC next year, as the moratorium on new members will expire. The Australian government recently reiterated that it would back India’s bid,⁹⁰ while Japan has remained mute thus far. The DPJ government will have to make up its mind, as Yokohama will host the 2010 APEC summit. However, India’s accession will raise many questions, such as the geographical limits and the regional balance within the Asia Pacific Forum, and the issue of Pakistan’s place.

While Prime Minister Hatoyama has been devoting most of his energy to managing Japan’s relationship with China and the United States, he has also attempted to reassure India about his government’s interest in developing their bilateral relations by visiting Delhi toward the end of 2009. Hatoyama and Singh agreed to establish a 2-plus-2 high level dialogue involving senior foreign and defence ministry officials of the two countries, to strengthen their political partnership.⁹¹ Hatoyama also expressed his resolve for an early conclusion of the bilateral FTA negotiations.

(3) Values in the East Asian Community

The debate between Peter Drysdale and Hugh White posted on the East Asia Forum website is representative of the arguments on the role of values in the context of East Asian regionalism.⁹² While White argues that a regional political and security organization needs to be built on a common set of principles, Drysdale retorts that his vision is hopeless, considering the diversity of the actors. He calls for a “rule-based, not a principle-based Asia Pacific Community”⁹³ to secure the cooperation of all the regional players.

What about Japan? While the Japanese government favors the construction of an Asian Community in principle, different approaches coexist and contend; some favor APT over EAS (for the Ministry of Finance), or the opposite (for the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry), while the mainstream supports a multilayered architecture with both APT and EAS (as MOFA). Within the Japanese expert community, the realists tend to be against the EAS framework, deeming it to be romantic and unrealistic regarding the clash of interests between Japan and China, and the importance of the United States in the region. Proponents of the East Asian community argue that this common project would slowly engage all of the powers in the region and complement the respective nationalisms with a regional identity sentiment.⁹⁴ While Tokyo supports a functionalist approach toward East Asian regionalism, it also increasingly emphasizes the role of values. But while the Japanese discussion of values and the “arc” does not necessarily reflect an idealist vision of international relations, it does have the merit of offering an alternative vision in opposition to regional domination by a rising China, and that could become the strategic platform for a coalition.⁹⁵

India still maintains an ambiguous posture regarding support for “values” diplomacy. Sev-

eral opinion leaders are calling for a greater emphasis in the country's foreign policy on Indian democratic values and the Indian political model.⁹⁶ Delhi will have to redefine its diplomacy in the years to come. For the moment, India will avoid emphasizing liberal values so as to launch an overt contest aimed at marginalizing or countering China, and it will probably seek to employ Asian cultural norms so as to promote its own profile and influence within the broad Asian region.

A third set of conceptual visions has recently emerged, following the prewar concept of a united Asia; based on anti-westernism and the cultural characteristics of the region, it also heeds the 1990s emphasis on "Asian values" aimed at assigning priority to economic development—hence the Asian economic miracle—over so-called (implicitly "western") universal human rights. While it recognizes the originality of Asian culture and values, this new concept also includes universal values and norms like democracy, that are deemed suitable for Asia.⁹⁷ This third wave of regionalist values is called "Neo-Asian Values."⁹⁸ This new approach is consistent with the Japanese and Indian visions of East Asian regionalism.

Governments emphasize the conceptual ideal of "community" while they are hedging one against another in Asia. The fluid balance of power in Asia dictates that mutual suspicion and pragmatic behaviour will remain characteristic features of the region's political landscape. While India and Japan share interests, they do not assign a high priority to their bilateral relationship, compared to their partnerships with China and the U.S. The Japan-India partnership is an interesting element in the current evolution of the Great Game in Asia, especially when there may be some prospects for a future concert of powers. However, it is not yet strong enough to significantly shape the course of international relations in Asia, and it is still very much dependent upon the U.S. and China factors.⁹⁹

5. Conclusion

Japan and India adopt a functionalist approach toward East Asian regionalism: their aim is to preserve peace and prosperity in the region and build a free-trade zone in order to sustain economic growth and promote Asian stability. At the same time, they support a broader vision of East Asia, from India to Australia, in order to encourage multipolarity in the region and create a favorable context in which they may advance their national interests. From a constructivist point of view, the Japan-India vision of a Greater Asia, which draws upon a common pre-war reflection on Asian identity, could be persuasive and relevant for current regionalism, especially in the context of a blurred or unarticulated Chinese vision.¹⁰⁰ Finally, from a realist point of view, Japan-India rapprochement cannot feasibly represent a new axis against China, even if the balancing motive is present.

However, this nascent partnership is still dependent upon the international context and is not yet in a position to shape the system to any significant degree. Also, the relationship suffers from the gap between Indian's political will to draw nearer to Japan as part of a strategy to become a central player on the Asian scene, and Japan's interest in engaging with India, although this position is consistent with its strategic priority of balancing against China.

Despite these limitations, the Japan-India partnership is significant in that it strengthens the third leg of the China-Japan-India triangle in Asia. Their historical experience in dealing with the themes of Asian identity and regionalism in the prewar period could form the basis for allowing the two countries to make a significant contribution to the construction of a new East Asian identity and community.

Notes

- 1 To borrow the Indian terminology: Prime Minister Singh, Speech to the Japanese Diet, December 15, 2006. See the Appendix.
- 2 N.S. Sisodia and G.V.C. Naidu, *India-Japan Relations, Partnership for Peace and Security in Asia*, New Delhi: Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, 2006.
- 3 Paul Evans, "Between Regionalism and Regionalization: Policy Networks and the Nascent East Asian Institutional Identity," in T.J. Pempel, ed., *Remapping East Asia: The Construction of a Region*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- 4 Peter Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism," *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Winter 2001/02), pp. 153-185.
- 5 In 2004, Japan, India, Brazil, and Germany formed the G4 in order to gather their claim to get a permanent seat in the UN Security Council.
- 6 See the Summary of Japan-India Summit Meeting (August 23, 2000), www.mofa.go.jp (accessed May 15, 2009).
- 7 David Scott, "India's 'Grand Strategy' for the Indian Ocean: Mahanian Visions," *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2006), pp. 97-129.
- 8 This is a revival of Mahan and Panikkar doctrine (K.M. Panikkar, *India and the Indian Ocean: An Essay on the Influence of Sea Power on Indian History*, London: Macmillan, 1945). See Indian Navy, Strategic Defence Review: The Maritime Dimension-A Naval View, May 20, 1998.
- 9 Dirk Nabers, "China, Japan, and the Quest for Leadership in East Asia," *GIGA Working Papers* No. 67, February 2008, p. 19.
- 10 For example, Tokyo is the origin of ReCAAP (Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia).
- 11 Japan-India Summit Meeting-Summary, November 29, 2004.
- 12 Inaugural Address by Dr. Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, Third India-ASEAN Business Summit, October 19, 2004, New Delhi.
- 13 The agreement is still not finalized, one of the main obstacles being the liberalization of the Indian agriculture sector.
- 14 This expression was first used in the Indian context by Prime Minister Vajpayee at the 2nd India-ASEAN Summit in 2003.
- 15 Inaugural Address by Dr. Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, Third India-ASEAN Business Summit, October 19, 2004, New Delhi.
- 16 ASEAN+ China, Japan, Korea, India, Australia, and New Zealand.
- 17 Amit Baruah, "Manmohan Calls for Creation of Pan-Asian Free Trade Area," *The Hindu*, December 13, 2005.
- 18 Taro Aso, Minister of Foreign Affairs on the occasion of the Japan Institute of International Affairs Seminar, "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity: Japan's Expanding Diplomatic Horizons," November 30, 2006.
- 19 Joint Press release-Visit of External Affairs Minister of India to Japan, March 2007.
- 20 "Japan's Diplomacy: Ensuring Security and Prosperity," June 30, 2009, at JIIA. However, the Japanese concept includes a larger group of countries, among them Central and Middle East Asian countries.
- 21 *Final Report of the East Asia Study Group*, ASEAN+3 Summit, November 4, 2002, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, p. 5
- 22 G. V. C. Naidu, "India and the East Asian Summit," *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Oct-Dec 2005), p. 716.
- 23 Speech by Prime Minister of Japan Junichiro Koizumi, "Japan and ASEAN in East Asia - A Sincere and Open Partnership," Singapore, January 14, 2002.
- 24 Ambassador Yasukuni Enoki, "The Japan-India Partnership," Lecture at USI, May 28, 2004.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Japan-India Partnership in the New Asian Era: Strategic Orientation of Japan-India Global Partnership, April 28, 2005.
- 27 Bruce Vaughn, "East Asian Summit: Issues for Congress," *CRS Report for Congress*, December 9, 2005, p. 3.
- 28 Shinji Shigematsu, "CEPEA: Is It Possible to Organize Asia-Oceanic Community?" *The Otemon Jour-*

- nal of Australian Studies*, Otemon Gakuin University, Vol. 32 (2006), p. 22.
- 29 David Camroux, "Asia... Whose Asia? A 'Return to the Future' of a Sino-India Asian Community," *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (December 2007), p. 561.
- 30 Junichi Sugawara, "The FTAAP and Economic Integration in East Asia: Japan's Approach to Regionalism and US Engagement in East Asia," *Mizuho Research Paper 12*, Tokyo, February 2007.
- 31 Mohan Malik, "The East Asia Summit: More Discord than Accord," *YaleGlobal*, December 20, 2005.
- 32 Nagesh Kumar, "Relevance and Challenges of Broader Regionalism in Asia," *India Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 2, pp. 79-105; Masahiro Kawai and Ganeshan Wignaraja, "EAFTA or DEPEA. Which Way Forward?" *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (2008), pp. 113-139.
- 33 East Asian countries' solidarity grew up out of the crisis difficulties. Japan acted as a leader by assisting the affected countries and proposing an Asian monetary fund. The IFM and the U.S., who opposed Tokyo's AMF, played the role of the "others." Takashi Terada, "Constructing an 'East Asian' Concept and Growing Regional Identity: From EAEC to ASEAN+3," *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (2003), pp. 251-277.
- 34 However, in 2007, India (along with Pakistan and Mongolia) was integrated as a regular member in the ASEM summit.
- 35 Bates Gill, Michael Green, Kiyoto Tsuji, and William Watts, *Strategic Views on Asian Regionalism, Survey Results and Analysis*, CSIS, February 2009, p. 8.
- 36 For details, see the quotations of the discourses in the Appendix.
- 37 Victor Koschmann, "Asianism's Ambivalent Legacy," in Peter J. Katzenstein and Takashi Shiraiishi eds., *Network Power; Japan, and Asia*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997, p. 83.
- 38 Yves Bougon, "Le Japon et le discours asiatiste," pp. 241-253, in Philippe Pelletier dir., *Identités territoriales en Asie orientale (NORAO)*, Les Indes Savantes, 2004, p. 243.
- 39 Sven Saaler, "Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History – Overcoming the Nation, Creating a Region, Forging an Empire," in Sven Saaler and Victor Koschman, eds., *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History, Colonialism, Regionalism, and Borders*, London: Routledge, 2007, pp. 2-3.
- 40 The pan-Asianism discourse cannot be identified entirely with the Japanese imperialist approach, as some intellectuals did not support the Japanese invasion of Asia; conversely, the imperialist school mainly did use this pan-Asianism approach as a pretext for military expansion. See Cemil Aydin, "Japan's Pan-Asianism and the Legitimacy of Imperial World Order, 1931-1945," *Japan Focus*, March 12, 2008.
- 41 Christophe Jaffrelot, "L'émergence des nationalismes en Inde. Perspectives théoriques," *Revue Française de Science Politique*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 1988, pp. 555-575.
- 42 T. A. Keenleyside, "Nationalist Indian Attitudes Towards Asia: A Troublesome Legacy for Post-Independence Indian Foreign Policy," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Summer 1982), p. 216.
- 43 Ibid., p. 230.
- 44 Bougon, "Le Japon et le discours asiatiste," p. 241.
- 45 In 1917, Okawa Shūmei established the "All-Asian Association" (*Zen Ajia Kai*) that included India and Western Asia.
- 46 Saaler, pp. 5-7.
- 47 Grant K. Goodman, "Anand Mohan Sahay (1898-1991)-Indian Revolutionary in Japan," *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*, January 26, 2008.
- 48 "It has been, however, the great privilege of Japan to realise [*sic*] this unity-in-complexity with a special clearness. The Indo-Tartaric blood of this race was in itself a heritage which qualified it to imbibe from the two sources, and so mirror the whole of Asiatic consciousness. The unique blessing of unbroken sovereignty, the proud self-reliance of an unconquered race, and the insular isolation which protected ancestral ideas and instincts at the cost of expansion, made Japan the real repository of the trust of Asiatic thought and culture... It is in Japan alone that the historic wealth of Asiatic culture can be consecutively studied through its treasured specimens... Thus Japan is a museum of Asiatic civilization," Okakura Kakuzo, *The Ideals of the East with Special References to the Art of Japan*, London: John Murray, 1903, pp. 4-5.
- 49 He then revived the old, traditional Buddhist vision of the world organized around the three poles of Honchō (Japan), Tenjiku (India) and (Shintan) China. Pekka Korhonen, "The Geography of Okakura Tenshin," *Japan Review*, Vol. 13 (2001), pp. 107-128.
- 50 Peter Heehs, "Foreign Influences on Bengali Revolutionary Terrorism 1902-1908," *Modern Asian Stud-*

- ies, Vol. 28, No. 3. (July 1994), pp. 533-556.
- 51 Rabindranath Tagore, *The Message of India to Japan*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
 - 52 Rabindranath Tagore, "Nationalism in Japan," in *English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore*, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2007, p. 281. The same warning was made by Sun Yat Sen in his speech "Pan-Asianism" in Kobe (1924).
 - 53 See the reproduction of the letters in Zeljko Cipris, "Seduced by Nationalism: Yone Noguchi's 'Terrible Mistake.' Debating the China-Japan War with Tagore," *Japan Focus*, November 17, 2007.
 - 54 Cemil Aydin, op cit.
 - 55 When Japan began to invade China, the sympathy of the Congress Party toward Tokyo faded and turned to the destiny of China. This caused concern for Indian activists in Japan, mainly because they feared that it would diminish Japanese support for Indian independence. In 1938 the Congress Party ordered a boycott of Japanese goods. Goodman, op. cit.
 - 56 He had close contact with Toyama Mitsuru and the Black Dragon Society.
 - 57 The battle lasted from March to July 1944, and the Japanese army was driven back to Burma with heavy losses. This was the turning point of the Burma campaign, signaling the end of the Japanese offensive on this front. See the work of Joyce C. Lebra, particularly: *Jungle Alliance: Japan and the Indian National Army*, Singapore: Asia Pacific Press, 1971.
 - 58 Ashis Nandy, "The Other Within: The Strange Case of Radhabinod Pal's Judgment on Culpability," *New Literary History*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Winter 1992), p. 53.
 - 59 Kei Ushimura, *Beyond the "Judgment of Civilization": The Intellectual legacy of the Japanese War Crimes Trials, 1946-1949*, LTCB International Library Trust, Tokyo, 2003, pp. 168-169.
 - 60 *Pal Hanji, Tokyo Saiban Hihan to Zettai Heiwa-Shugi* (Justice Pal: His Criticism of the Tokyo Trial and His Absolute Pacifism) by Takeshi Nakajima, Hakusui-sha, 2007, p. 308. Review by Fumiko Halloran, *The Japan Society Review*, Issue 14, Volume 3 Number 2 (2008).
 - 61 Goodman, op. cit.
 - 62 Yukiko Sumi Barnett, "India in Asia: Okawa Shumei's Pan-Asian Thought and His Idea of India in Early Twentieth-Century Japan," *Journal of the Oxford University History Society*, Issue 1, 2004.
 - 63 Keenleyside, pp. 212-213.
 - 64 Goodman, op. cit.
 - 65 Isabelle Saint-Mézard, *Eastward Bound, India's New Positioning in Asia*, Manohar, Delhi: Centre de sciences Humaines, 2006, pp. 200, 202.
 - 66 *Ibid.*, p. 197.
 - 67 "Decades after War Trials, Japan still Honors a Dissenting Judge," *The New York Times*, August 31, 2007.
 - 68 Shinzo Abe, *Utsukushii Kuni e*, Tokyo: Bungei Shunju, 2006. See Tsuneo Akaha, "The Nationalist Discourse in Contemporary Japan: The Role of China and Korea in the Last Decade," *Pacific Focus*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (August 2008), p. 160.
 - 69 Shinzo Abe, "Confluence of the Two Seas," Speech at the Parliament of the Republic of India, August 22, 2007.
 - 70 The ashes of Chandra Bose, who allegedly died in a plane crash off Taiwan in 1945, are actually kept in the Rentokuji temple in Tokyo, Suginami ward.
 - 71 Personal interview, February 6, 2009.
 - 72 China is assisting the construction of ports at Sittwe in Myanmar, Chittagong in Bangladesh, Hambantota in Sri Lanka, and Gwadar in Pakistan. This forms a "string of pearls," Lisa Curtis, "US-India Relations: The China Factor," *Backgrounders, Heritage Foundation*, No. 2209, November 25, 2008.
 - 73 Voir C. Raja Mohan, "Balancing Interests and Values: India's Struggle with Democracy Promotion," *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer 2007, pp. 99-115.
 - 74 During his visit to China in January 2008, Prime Minister Singh insisted he would have no part in any alliance with the United States, Australia, and Japan aimed at "containing China," "Singh Rules Out Containment Factor," *China Daily*, January 15, 2008; Purnendra Jain, "From Condemnation to Strategic Partnership: Japan's Changing View of India (1998-2007)," *ISAS Working Paper*, No. 41, March 10, 2008, pp. 13-14.
 - 75 C. Raja Mohan, "The Asian Balance of Power," *Seminar*, No. 487 (2000); Christophe Jaffrelot, "Les quatre points cardinaux de la diplomatie indienne: le régional et le global, l'idéalisme et le réalisme," in Christophe Jaffrelot dir., *New Delhi et le monde: Une puissance émergente entre Realpolitik et Soft*

- Power*, Paris : Editions Autrement, 2008, pp. 7-31.
- 76 Shaun Breslin, "Supplying Demand or Demanding Supply? An Alternative Look at the Forces Driving East Asian Community Building," *Policy Analysis Brief*, The Stanley Foundation, November 2007.
- 77 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- 78 Abe, *op. cit.*, p.160.
- 79 *East Asian Strategic Review 2008*, Tokyo: NIDS, 2008, p. 222.
- 80 A diplomatic meeting was held before the naval exercises, in May 2007 at the ARF summit (ASEAN Regional Forum). The Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman reacted: "China believes that to enhance mutual trust, expand cooperation for mutual benefit and win-win, be open and inclusive is the global trend." "China Slams India, US, Japan Alliance," *Express India.com*, June 27, 2007.
- 81 Emma Chanlett-Avery and Bruce Vaughn, "Emerging Trends in the Security Architecture in Asia: Bilateral and Multilateral Ties Among the United States, Japan, Australia, and India," *CRS Report for Congress*, January 7, 2008, p. 15.
- 82 Hillary Clinton stated on the U.S. strategy in Asia that "Washington will work with historic allies and emerging nations." "US-Asia Relations. Indispensable to Our Future," *Remarks at the Asia Society*, New York, February 13, 2009.
- 83 Bates Gill, Michael Green, Kiyoto Tsuji, and William Watts, *Strategic Views on Asian Regionalism, Survey Results and Analysis*, Washington, DC: CSIS, February 2009, p. 8.
- 84 Mark E. Manyin, Michael John Garcia, and Wayne M. Morrison, *U.S. Accession to ASEAN's Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC)*, Congressional Research Service, May 5, 2009.
- 85 Interview with Takashi Terada, June 2009.
- 86 Statement at the Shangri-La Dialogue, May 29, 2009, <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/the-shangri-la-dialogue/shangri-la-dialogue-2009/> (accessed July 15, 2009).
- 87 Remarks of President Barack Obama, Suntory Hall, Tokyo, Japan, November 14, 2009.
- 88 Ann Capling, "The Trans-Pacific Partnership," *East Asia Forum*, November 23, 2009; Deborah Elms, "U.S. Trade Policy in Asia: Going for the Trans-Pacific Partnership?" *East Asia Forum*, November 26, 2009.
- 89 This spurred concerns among the conservatives in Japan, as reflected in the editorial of *Yomiuri Shimbun* on October 26, 2009, entitled "East Asian Community Shouldn't Exclude U.S."
- 90 "Rudd Backs India's APEC Bid," AAP, November 23, 2009.
- 91 *Action Plan to Advance Security Cooperation based on the Joint Declaration on Security Cooperation between Japan and India*, December 29, 2009.
- 92 East Asia Forum, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/> (accessed December, 2009).
- 93 Peter Drysdale, "The Asia Pacific Community, Processes, Not Principles: The Base for Regional Architecture," *East Asia Forum*, June 19, 2008.
- 94 Akiko Fukushima, "Japan's Perspective on Asian Regionalism," pp. 103-127, in Michael J. Green and Bates Gill, eds., *Asia's New Multilateralism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009, pp. 113-114.
- 95 Aurelia George Mulgan, "Breaking the Mould: Japan's Subtle Shift from Exclusive Bilateralism to Modest Minilateralism," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (2008), p. 64.
- 96 For example, C. Raja Mohan, "India's Great power Burdens," *Seminar*, January 2008; Interview with Jabin Jacob from IPCS on June 24, 2009. Jacob has been identified by the French MOFA as a "personnalité d'avenir (young leader)."
- 97 Fumitaka Furuoka, Beatrice Lim Fui Yee, and Roslinah Mahmud, "Japan and Asian Values: A Challenge for Japan's East Asian Policy in the New Century," *eastasia.at*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (September 2006); and Kazuo Ogura, "Toward a New Concept of Asia – Asia Should Contribute to Global Values," *Internationale Politik*, Winter 2007.
- 98 *Ibid.*
- 99 A loss of interest on the part of the Obama administration toward India and warmer relations with China could lead Tokyo to push its partnership with India into the background.
- 100 David Camroux, p. 563. For details of the Chinese vision, Wu Xinbo, "Chinese Perspectives on Building an East Asian Community in the Twenty-First Century," in Michael J. Green and Bates Gill, eds., *Asia's New Multilateralism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009, pp. 55-77.

Appendix

**ANALYSIS OF JAPAN-INDIA JOINT STATEMENTS AND (SOME) JAPANESE AND INDIAN DIPLOMATIC SPEECHES
ON BILATERAL RELATIONS**

Quotations of references to “Asia,” regional organization in Asia, cultural and historical references to bilateral relations, the ultimate objectives of Japan and India in the region, and the common values of the partners.

“Asia”	Regional organization	Historical and cultural references	Ultimate objective in the region	Common values
JOINT DECLARATIONS				
Japan-India Joint Declaration, December 10, 2001				
Asia		Tradition of profound interchanges from time immemorial; the wisdom to benefit from the distinctive characteristics of their civilizations and cultures.	Contribute towards the stability and prosperity of Asia.	Democracy and market economy, spirit of tolerance, receptivity to diversity.
Japan-India Summit Meeting (Summary), November 29, 2004				
	To find a way to cope with the “arc of instability” and cooperate to realize an “arc of advantage,” referred to by Prime Minister Singh.		Stability and economic development; invigorate current dynamism in Asia	
Japan-India Partnership in a New Asian Era: Strategic Orientation of Japan-India Global Partnership, April 29, 2005				
The New Asian era: emerging as the leading growth center of the global economy.	A new surge: strengthening of economic linkages, initiatives for greater regional integration as well as multilateral trade liberalization. Need concerted efforts to translate these developments into an “Arc of Advantage and Prosperity.”		To realize an East Asian Community and work together to promote the vision of an Asian Economic Community as an “Arc of Advantage and Prosperity.” The Japanese side conveyed its decision to support India’s membership in the East Asian Summit.	Nations sharing common values and principles
Joint Statement, Towards Japan-India Strategic and Global Partnership, December 15, 2006				

	<p>While acknowledging the ASEAN as the driving force [...], they reaffirm the need for all 16 EAS countries to fully participate and actively contribute to the objective of closer cooperation and community building in the region. Promote regional economic integration further: recall their respective proposals for a Pan Asian Free Trade Area and for a Comprehensive economic Partnership in East Asia.</p> <p>The two leaders share the view on the usefulness of having dialogue among Japan, India, and other like-minded countries in the Asia-Pacific region on themes of mutual interest.</p>	<p>Japan and India share ancient bonds and a proud civilizational heritage. Relation unencumbered by any historical differences.</p>	<p>The progressive realization of an East Asian community in the EAS framework.</p> <p>To pursue a comprehensive partnership [...] in open and cooperative regional frameworks.</p>	<p>India-Japan relation is rooted in similar perception of the international environment, converging long-term interests and common commitment to democracy, open society, human rights, rule of law, and free market economy.</p> <p>They are natural partners as the largest and most developed democracies of Asia.</p>
Joint Press Release, Visit of External Affairs Minister of India to Japan, March 22, 2007				
			<p>To foster the EAS as a pillar of East Asian community building in the future.</p>	<p>The Ministers reaffirm that there exist common objectives and values between the idea of “Arc of Freedom and Prosperity” proposed by Japan and the idea of “Arc of Advantage and Prosperity” proposed by India.</p>
Joint Statement on the Roadmap for New Dimensions to the Strategic and Global Partnership between Japan and India, August 22, 2007				
	<p>The partnership between Japan and India [...] is an essential pillar for the future architecture of the entire region.</p> <p>Japan and India should actively cooperate to promote multi-layered frameworks and dialogues for regional cooperation in Asia.</p> <p>They shared the view on the usefulness of having dialogues among Japan, India, and other like-minded countries in the Asia-Pacific region on themes of mutual interest.</p>		<p>Establishing an East Asian community in the future.</p> <p>The EAS can essentially contribute in the process of community building based on universally recognized values, and in enhancing the role of the region at the global level.</p>	<p>Japan and India share universal values of democracy, open society, human rights, rule of law, and market economy; they share interests in promoting peace, stability, and prosperity in Asia and in the world.</p>

Joint Statement on the Advancement of the Strategic and Global Partnership between Japan and India, October 22, 2008			
	Support to the EAS as an open, inclusive, transparent and Leaders' led forum [...] to deepen regional economic integration towards the progressive realization of an East Asia Community.		Promoting peace, stability, and prosperity in Asia and the world.
	India and Japan share common values and interests.		
Joint declaration on Security Cooperation between Japan and India, October 22, 2008			
			Bilateral cooperation within multilateral frameworks in Asia, in particular the East Asia Summit, ASEAN Regional Forum, and ReCAAP processes.
			Common commitment to democracy, open society, human rights, rule of law.
JAPAN AND INDIAN DIPLOMATIC SPEECHES ON BILATERAL RELATIONS			
Ambassador Yasukuni Enoki, "The Japan-India Partnership," Lecture at USI, May 28, 2004			
It is time for Japan to position India from "a local power" to "one of the three major powers of Asia." The scope of Asia for Japan has also undergone a change: from East Asia (up Arakan mountains in Myanmar) to "entire Asia" (including South Asia and India). Due to: economic globalization, regional security issue (proliferation from DPRK to Pakistan), and Japan's security interest (maritime route, intervention in Indian ocean).	A network of FTA, with ASEAN as the hub in the region. Japan's Asia policy should be structured around two vectors, namely: North to South "East Asia cooperation" and East to West "cooperation among Japan, China, and India." Three great Asian powers to foster stability and peace in the region. Bad historical memories are counter-balanced by good historic relations between Japan and India. --> Tripartite dialogue between Japan, China, and India.	No negative history. Only positive historic memories: interchange between Tagore and Okakura Tenshin, Subhas Chandra Bose, the great anecdote of Justice Pal.	Tripartite dialogue between Japan, China, and India.

Manmohan Singh's Banquet Speech in Honour of Japanese Prime Minister, April 29, 2005			
New Asian era.	Age-old spiritual, cultural, and civilizational ties; India refused to attend San Francisco peace conference in 1951; separate peace treaty with Japan in 1952; India waived all reparation claims; dissenting judgement of Pal (affection and regard); quotation of Okakura Tenshin.	To renew and reinvigorate our Asian identity, building on the commonalities of our interests, aspirations, and values.	Shared commitments to the ideals of democracy, peace, and freedom. India hopes to incorporate Japanese values of maintaining harmony and balance between social traditions and economic modernization.
Prime Minister Singh, Speech to the Japanese Diet, December 15, 2006.			
	Civilizational neighbours; heritage of Buddhism, Bodhisena, Tagore, Okakura Tenshin; judgement of Pal.	"Arc of advantage and prosperity"; Asian economic community.	As the largest and most developed democracies of Asia.
Shri Shyam Saran, Special Envoy of the Prime Minister in JIIA, January 15, 2007			
			We are democracies, we have respect for the same human values and history of a very benign and very positive relationship.
Address by the External Affairs Minister Sri Pranab Mukherjee, at JIIA, March 23, 2007			
	Heritage of Buddhism.	A pan-Asian free trade area or comprehensive economic partnership in Asia.	Common values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

Ambassador Ronen Sen's Address at the CIIS-JIIA Conference "Building Strategic Asia – The United States, Japan, and India," June 28, 2007.			
<p>The old links between India and the Asia-Pacific region are now being revived and revitalized.</p>		<p>Trilateral cooperation: India, the U.S., and Japan have shared values and aspirations of democracies based on the rule of law. Also recognize that democracy and development are not just compatible but inextricably linked.</p> <p>It is thus evident that the trilateral interaction of India, the United States, and Japan did not emerge from a decision to forge a new grouping or alliance.</p>	
"Confluence of the Two Seas," Speech by Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan, at the Parliament of the Republic of India, August 22, 2007			
<p>"The Pacific and the Indian Oceans are now bringing about a dynamic coupling as seas of freedom and of prosperity. A "broader Asia": an immense network spanning the entirety of the Pacific Ocean, incorporating the United States of America and Australia.</p>	<p>He began his speech with a quotation of Vivekananda. Okakura, Pal, Chandra Bose, Tagore. Ashoka, Gandhi. Kishi, first Japanese PM who visited India.</p>	<p>A broader Asia takes shape at the confluence of the two seas of the Indian and Pacific Oceans; Open and transparent, this network will allow people, goods, capital, and knowledge to flow freely.</p>	<p>A discovery of India as a partner that shares the same values and interests. Spirit of tolerance in India; sacredness of nature.</p>

When the Pacific Ocean Becomes an "Inland Sea," Yasuo Fukuda, Prime Minister, May 22, 2008			
<p>Pacific Ocean as an Inland Sea for: Japan, ASEAN, North and South America and Russia. China and Australia, and new Zealand. "And in my view this sea also continues beyond India to connect to the nations of Middle East" New Japan-China, Japan-ROK Relations.</p>		<p>India will become one of the pillars supporting the future of Asia.</p>	
Japan's New Commitment to Asia – Toward the Realization of an East Asian Community – Yukio Hatoyama, Prime Minister, Singapore, November 15, 2009			
<p>Consensual statement: "Who will be the members of my initiative for an East Asian community. To that, my answer is - people who share these ideals and dreams." First of all, we need to cooperate to prosper together. Second, we must cooperate to save a "Green Asia." Third, we need to cooperate to protect human lives. Fourth, we need to cooperate in building a "sea of fraternity."</p>	<p>"The new government of Japan has declared that it attaches great importance to Asian diplomacy. The main pillar of this policy is the initiative for an "East Asian community." "In my initiative, I propose that countries sharing a common vision promote cooperation in various fields. This would be based on the principle of "open regional cooperation."</p>	<p>"The concept behind my initiative for an East Asian community stems from the philosophy of " <i>yū-ai</i>." "The central idea of my "East Asian community" initiative is based upon reconciliation and cooperation in Europe."</p>	<p>Only a brief mention of India: "Going forward, we will accelerate EPA negotiations with the Republic of Korea, India, and Australia and pursue the possibilities of EPA negotiations with other countries as well." "Through this, our region would develop a multi-layered network of functional communities."</p>