

F → O

Date: 2020/06/10

(yyyy/mm/dd)

## Report on the Final Exam

Name of the Chair: Tomohito Shinoda

On behalf of the Thesis Examining Committee, I would like to report the result of the Final Exam as follows.

1. Student ID	1B7D01
2. Name	Michael MacArthur Bosack
3. Cluster	Internatioal Relations Cluster
4. Thesis Examining Committee	Chair: Tomohito Shinoda
	Referee: Umemoto Tetsuya
	Referee: Maung Aung Myoe
	Referee: Naoko Kumagai
5. Dissertation Title	Negotiating Alliance Change in the 1997 & 2015 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation: an Examination of Alliance Management Theory & Practice
6. Submission Date	Draft: April 19, 2020
	Final: June 9, 2020
7. Final Exam Date	May 20, 2020
8. Faculty Meeting Date	June 19, 2020
9. Degree Title	Ph.D. in International Relations
10. Result	Pass

## I. Dissertation Overview and Summary of the Presentation

This dissertation explores the negotiations over the 1997 and 2015 Defense Guidelines and presents what changed (and did not change) as a result. Inspired by Robert Putnam's 2-level game model, it analyzes both the alliance management level and the political level. In order to do so, it offers an extension of Putnam's model which offered only the negotiation and ratification process, by adding pre-negotiations, agreement to negotiate, implementation, and interpretation.

The presentation started with a research problem statement, which included the questions of what role did the guidelines play in shaping the alliance?; how they were negotiated?; did they meet the goals of the respected allies?; and can they be a model for other alliances. Next, the candidate presented the analytical framework of the six-phase model of intergovernmental negotiations.

Secondly, he presented the negotiation process and the key observations from each of the six phases of the 1997 and 2015 negotiations. The dissertation argues that Level 1 (alliance managers) is dominant at the pre-negotiation, agreement to negotiate, negotiation, and ratification phases. The influence of Level 2 (political actors) was influential at the interpretation phases, and was incorporated at the implementation phase.

Third, the presentation explained what changed and did not change in the 1997 and 2015 Defense Guidelines. In 1997, the defense cooperation in armed attack situations, situations in the areas surrounding Japan, and international operations were designed.

In addition, the expansion of roles, mission and capabilities (RMC), the bilateral coordination mechanism, the comprehensive mechanism, and tri-/multi-lateral cooperation were introduced. It was explained that due to the constitutional limitations some of the defense cooperative operations were blocked in the negotiation phase, and geographical limitations were introduced in the interpretation phase. In 2015, the defense cooperation schemes were expanded to include gray zones and collective self-defense and large-scale disaster. In addition, examples were given of the improved alliance coordination mechanism, the bilateral planning mechanism, the expanded RMC, the areas of space and cyberspace, the cooperation in defense technology, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. On the other hands, the cooperation with law enforcement entities, strike operations, and cooperation with US Forces in Korea were blocked in the negotiation phase, and the limitations on collective self-defense, maritime interdiction operations transfer of ammunition were introduced in the interpretation phase.

The presentation concluded that the two-level game analysis was useful, and that the six-phase cycle analysis was also useful to understand the process of the intergovernmental negotiations.

II. Notes from the Thesis Examining Committee (including the changes required to the dissertation by the committee)

Following are the main questions and comments from the committee during the final examination:

1. The dissertation is not clear how much influence the organizational and bureaucratic actors had in the Level 1.
2. The dissertation does not touch upon the role of the opposition parties. Specifically in the 2015 case, the strong public reaction was made in the process of constitutional reinterpretation to allow collective self-defense.
3. The dissertation is not clear how much the post-9/11 activities by Japan in Indian Oceans and Iraq impacted the 2015 negotiation process.
4. It was questioned why the dissertation used a very limited amount of Japanese-language secondary sources.
5. The dissertation does not provide analysis on how the Americans perceived the 2014 constitutional interpretation.
6. The dissertation classifies the White House and Kantei in the political actors along with other less influential political actors, and almost ignores their roles.
7. The committee asked for a clarification of the six-phase model, which expanded the coverage of different stages but weakened Putnam's model of the simultaneous interactive nature between the two levels.
8. The graphs of winsets at the 6 phases were very important and needed to be included in the dissertation which should be presented in the conclusion with item-by-item negotiation results.

III. Confirmation by the Chair that changes have been done to the satisfaction of the committee

The committee reviewed the revised version, and confirmed that the revised manuscript reflects the requests and questions during the final examination as listed in the previous section of this report.



#### IV. Overall Evaluation

The committee found that the dissertation was well researched, and the candidate's first-hand experience as a negotiator in the 2015 guidelines negotiation significantly provided merits to the dissertation.

First, the candidate introduced the modification of Putnam's 2-level game model with 6 phase analysis which will be useful for future academic study. The 6 phases were significantly supplemented with the pre- and post-negotiation phases which the original model did not cover. Second, the candidate introduced a detailed account of the 1997 and 2015 guideline negotiation process and the main points of negotiation in the process. Third, the dissertation also provided details on how the defense cooperation arrangement evolved in connection with the changes in the international environment surrounding the alliance.

The dissertation is definitely a valuable contribution to the academic circle.