

JFIR Commentary

No.165

April 09,2026 |

The Day Deterrence Fails in the Indo Pacific

Stephen NAGY

Professor of Politics and International Studies,
International Christian University

The morning after deterrence fails will shatter the illusions of an entire generation.

It is 0330 Tokyo time on a winter Tuesday when the first reports hit the screens in the crisis management center beneath the Prime Minister Office. Unidentified missiles launched from the Chinese mainland (here after) are tracking toward Taiwan. Minutes later, radar feeds confirm Chinese aircraft and drones crossing the median line en masse. Within an hour, Taipei declares a state of emergency. The United States Indo-Pacific Command announces it is executing pre-planned operations to assist the self-defense of Taiwan (Harold, 2020). Japan's NHK and other domestic media interrupt regular programming to broadcast missile trajectories and panicked social media footage from Taipei and Kaohsiung.

In Nagatacho and Ichigaya, the questions are immediate and unforgiving. Are United States forces in Japan already targets under attack plans drawn up in Beijing by the Central Military Commission (CMC)? Will the first salvos hit Kadena, Yokota, Futenma, Yokosuka, and Sasebo, or will China attempt to keep strikes limited to Taiwan while threatening Japan with cyber and economic coercion instead? In that gray hour before dawn, one question hangs over everything. Is this the contingency Japan has been preparing for since it revised its National Security Strategy, or is it something infinitely harder (Ministry of Defense of Japan, 2022)?

For more than a decade, Japanese policymakers, scholars, and military planners have repeated a comforting mantra. Peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait are indispensable to the security of Japan. They have invested in counter-strike capabilities such as Tomahawk missiles, increased defense spending to 2% of GDP, deepened ties with Washington, Canberra, and Manila, and rewritten operational plans. Yet much of the public debate still assumes that deterrence will hold and that Japan's Pacifist Constitution, embodied in Article 9 will limit Japan's legal ability to be involved in a Taiwan contingency offering some kind of protection against China. They cling to the belief that Beijing will be dissuaded by allied capabilities and by the catastrophic economic costs of war. They are accustomed to everything turning out well in the end. But what if it does not?

If deterrence fails, Japan must confront choices it has only sketched in polite public debate. Tokyo must decide whether to be a spearhead, an enabler, a sanctuary, or a broker in a limited war fought next door. The middle-power role of Japan in a Taiwan conflict is not pre-ordained by alliance obligations or geography alone. It will be chosen under extreme time pressure, within a narrow corridor defined by logistics, domestic politics, international law, and the behavior of other middle powers. Thinking clearly now about these roles is the only way Japan can shape, rather than merely endure, the next war.

The Illusion of Perpetual Peace

To understand the strategic menu available to Japan, we must discard outdated models of great power binary competition. The post-Cold War era lulled democracies into a false sense of security, built on the assumption that economic interdependence would inevitably prevent major armed conflict. This was a fundamental misreading of authoritarian risk calculus (Yan, 2013). Revisionist powers do not always weigh economic prosperity above historical grievances and territorial ambitions. When deterrence is eroded and alliances fail to act decisively, the unthinkable becomes policy.

In the Indo-Pacific, this dynamic is magnified by the sheer scale of the military buildup. The People Liberation Army (PLA) has transformed from a massive but technologically inferior force into a peer competitor capable of contesting American dominance within the first island chain (Yoshihara, 2020). The assumption that Washington can unilaterally dictate the security architecture of East Asia is dead. Japan recognizes this reality, which is why Tokyo has embarked on its most significant military modernization since the end of the Second World War (Oros, 2017).

However, hardware alone does not constitute a strategy. The Japanese public remains deeply ambivalent about the prospect of fighting a war. Decades of institutionalized pacifism have created a political culture that instinctively recoils from the use of force (Lind, 2004; Kitaoka, 1999). Even as the

Gathering

International

Exchanges

International

Frameworks

PR and

Enlightenment

Japanese

Creating

JAPANESE

An Introduction to JFIR

Organization

Chronology

HOME

About us

Activities

Policy

Recommendations

Research

Programs

Information

the tools for a high-intensity conflict while implicitly promising the public that those tools will never actually have to be used. When the missiles fly, that dissonance will collapse, leaving a political vacuum that could paralyze decision-making at the worst possible moment.

The evolution of Japanese security policy has been characterized by incrementalism. For decades, Tokyo relied on a strict interpretation of Article 9 of the Constitution, which renounced war as a sovereign right. The Yoshida Doctrine prioritized economic growth while relying on the United States for security guarantees. This framework served Japan well during the Cold War, but it has become increasingly untenable in the face of a rising China and a nuclear-armed North Korea. The 2015 Peace and Security Legislation marked a watershed moment, allowing for limited collective self-defense (Smith, 2019). Yet, the legal thresholds for military action remain complex and politically fraught. The Japanese government must navigate a labyrinth of legal definitions, distinguishing between situations that merely threaten peace and those that pose an existential threat to the survival of the Japanese state (Tatsumi, 2017).

Neo Middle Power Diplomacy in a Shattered Order

To navigate this nightmare, Japan must leverage its unique position in the international system. Traditional middle power theory focused heavily on normative behavior, multilateralism, and niche diplomacy in a relatively stable liberal order (Easley, 2017). That order is gone (Hosoya, 2012). States like Japan are now engaging in neo-middle power diplomacy. This approach is defined by proactive rule-making, the construction of overlapping minilateral networks, and the aggressive use of economic statecraft to resist coercion and shape the regional architecture, what Nagy coined as neo-middle power diplomacy (Nagy, 2022).

Japan is not a superpower, but it is far from helpless. Middle power statecraft in the contemporary Indo-Pacific requires highly adaptable hybrid strategies. These states leverage their economic and diplomatic weight to influence global outcomes, balancing the necessity of alliance cohesion with the imperative of national survival. Japan is an active architect of the Free and Open Indo-Pacific vision, seeking to uphold a rules-based order through partnerships with like-minded democracies. Yet, as a neo-middle power, it remains structurally constrained. It cannot unilaterally deter China, nor can it fully decouple from the Chinese economy (Liu, 2016). In a Taiwan contingency, the choices made by Tokyo will reflect the ultimate test of neo-middle power statecraft.

The concept of middle power diplomacy has evolved significantly. Originally associated with states like Canada and Australia, which sought to mediate conflicts and promote international institutions, the modern iteration is far more muscular. Japan has embraced this role, spearheading initiatives like the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership after the United States withdrew. Tokyo has also expanded its security partnerships beyond Washington, signing reciprocal access agreements with Australia and the United Kingdom, and deepening dialogues with France (Pajon, 2018). These moves are designed to create a web of overlapping alignments that complicate Beijing strategic calculus (Nagy, 2022). However, in the event of a hot war, diplomatic networks will not stop hypersonic missiles. Japan must translate its middle power influence into tangible operational support and crisis management.

The Four Tyrannies of Geography and Law

Any serious discussion of the choices Japan faces the day after deterrence fails must start from four hard constraints. Tokyo cannot wish these away.

First, alliance dependence and operational reality dictate the tempo of the crisis. The Self-Defense Forces can do more than in the past, but they still rely heavily on United States forces for strategic lift, long-range intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, missile defense integration, and offensive strike packages (Hughes, 2015; Patalano, 2014). United States forces in Japan are not just supporting assets. They are the absolute center of gravity for any American response in and around Taiwan (Hornung, 2020). That makes Japanese territory a likely target in Chinese planning. Beijing may strike early to disorganize allied operations, or later to coerce Japan into limiting its support. Japanese military planners know this intimately. The Japanese public does not.

Second, legal and political constraints remain a labyrinth. The security legislation passed in 2015 and subsequent reinterpretations expanded what Japan can do under survival-threatening situations and collective self-defense. But these laws still require the government to make politically contentious determinations and to manage Diet debate while missiles are flying. The boundary between important influence situations, which allow logistical support, and survival-threatening situations, which authorize the use of force, is not merely legal. It is highly political, and it will be fiercely contested amid partisan competition, media frenzy, and public terror.

Third, logistical geography is a tyrant. Okinawa, the Nansei Islands, and key ports and airfields are exposed not only to kinetic missile and air attacks but also to persistent cyber, space, and information operations. The ability to sustain prolonged, high-tempo operations in and around the first island chain depends entirely on munitions stocks, hardened infrastructure, pre-positioned fuel and parts, and rapid damage repair capabilities (Jimbo, 2018). Japan has begun to invest in these areas, but the current stockpiles and infrastructure hardening are nowhere near the level commensurate with a protracted,

Gathering

International

Exchanges

International

Frameworks

PR and

Enlightenment

Japanese

JAPANESE

HOME

About us

Activities

Policy

Recommendations

Research

Programs

Information

Gathering
International
Exchanges
International
Frameworks
PR and
Enlightenment
Japanese
JAPANESE

Fourth, the middle-power environment will shape the risk appetite of Tokyo. Japan will not act in a vacuum. Australia, South Korea, the Philippines, and European middle powers like France and the United Kingdom will all be making their own frantic calculations about risk, distance, alliance expectations, and domestic politics (Saint-Mézard, 2021). Some will move quickly toward support. Others will try to slow-roll their involvement. The role of Japan will partly be determined by how successfully it can mobilize other middle powers to share the risks and costs.

Choosing a Role in the Crucible of War

These constraints do not eliminate the freedom of action for Japan. They narrow it to a set of strategic roles that are politically and operationally feasible. In a limited war over Taiwan, Japan will oscillate among four basic roles. None is pure. Each comes with distinct benefits, costs, and massive escalatory risks.

The Spearhead

In the spearhead role, Japan behaves as a front-line combatant whose own forces are central to allied warfighting. This means conducting integrated air and missile defense and counter-strike operations against Chinese launch platforms threatening Japan or American forces. It means engaging People Liberation Navy and maritime militia vessels in and around the Nansei Islands. It means providing forward bases for American and possibly Australian or European air and naval units operating near Taiwan (Bondaz, 2020).

The advantage of the spearhead role is absolute clarity. It signals to Washington, Taipei, and Beijing that Japan will not accept a decoupled war at its doorstep. It maximizes alliance cohesion and deterrence by demonstrating raw political will and operational commitment (Liff, 2021). The cost is equally absolute. It maximizes the exposure of Japan to Chinese retaliation, guaranteeing cyberattacks on civilian infrastructure, kinetic strikes on bases and ports, and total economic coercion.

To function as a spearhead, Japan would need to fully operationalize its newly acquired counter-strike capabilities (Ministry of Defense of Japan, 2022). Executing offensive strikes against targets on the Asian mainland would cross a psychological and political Rubicon for the Japanese public. It would require real-time targeting data from the United States, further integrating the two militaries and erasing any lingering ambiguity about Japanese combatant status.

The Enabler

As an enabler, Japan focuses on making allied operations possible without always being in the direct line of fire. This includes providing bases, logistics, and fuel for American and other allied operations (Hornung, 2020). It requires offering robust intelligence sharing, space and cyber support, and rear-area protection (Samuels, 2007). It involves intensifying economic and diplomatic pressure on China and support to Taiwan without always crossing the specific thresholds that Beijing would treat as direct Japanese combat involvement.

The advantage here is political survival. This role is often more palatable domestically and easier to explain to a terrified public as support rather than war. It can still be strategically decisive if the enabler functions are well-designed. But the distinction between enabling and spearheading is razor-thin. From the perspective of Beijing, a Japan that provides indispensable bases and logistics for American bombers is still making war against China.

The enabler role relies heavily on the 2015 legislation regarding important influence situations. Under this framework, the Self-Defense Forces can provide logistical support to United States and other foreign forces responding to a crisis that threatens Japanese peace and security. However, this support must be provided in areas where combat is not currently taking place. In the confined geography of the East China Sea, distinguishing between combat and non-combat zones will be nearly impossible.

The Sanctuary

As a sanctuary, Japan emphasizes its role as a secure rear area for evacuation, humanitarian support, and economic resilience. This means hosting tens of thousands of evacuees from Taiwan and potentially parts of Okinawa. It involves providing medical care, logistics hubs, and safe havens for allied forces rotating through the theater. Crucially, it means acting as an anchor for regional economies trying to absorb catastrophic supply-chain shocks.

This role is vital but frequently undervalued by military planners. A war over Taiwan would generate massive humanitarian and economic spillovers. Japan is uniquely positioned to act as a stabilizer for the region if it invests now in resilience. This requires hardening ports, securing energy grids, expanding health capacity, and drafting legal frameworks for mass evacuation and refugee management. The risk is that sanctuary becomes a polite label for strategic passivity. If Tokyo uses it as an excuse to avoid hard choices about combat support, the alliance will fracture.

HOME
About us
Activities
Policy
Recommendations
Research
Programs
Information

- Gathering
- International
- Exchanges
- International
- Frameworks
- PR and
- Enlightenment
- Japanese
- JAPANESE

local authorities, and the self-defense forces. Furthermore, Japan has historically maintained strict refugee policies. A sudden influx of displaced persons from Taiwan would test the social and administrative capacity of the state.

The Broker

Finally, in the broker role, Japan leverages its diplomatic network and neo-middle power identity to manage the international fallout (Nagy, 2022). This requires coordinating other middle-power responses across Australia, Korea, the Philippines, India, and European states. It involves shaping global sanctions regimes and economic statecraft. It demands keeping channels open to Beijing for de-escalation and post-conflict arrangements, even while actively supporting Taiwan and the United States.

Japan cannot mediate in the classic neutral sense if it is also a treaty ally engaged in hostilities. But it can still act as a norm-setter and coordinator among states that want to avoid either capitulation or total war (Envall, 2015). The risk here is credibility. If Japan is seen as too cautious, it will not be trusted by Taiwan and Washington. If it is seen as too committed to the American line, Beijing and some middle powers will treat it as just another combatant, not a broker.

To succeed as a broker, Japan must utilize forums like the G7 and the Quad to build a unified diplomatic front (Gilson, 2000). Tokyo has already demonstrated its capacity to lead on economic sanctions following the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In a Taiwan scenario, Japan would need to orchestrate a similar economic response against China. This would require navigating the divergent interests of Southeast Asian nations.

The Economic and Domestic Fallout

War is not merely a military endeavor. It is a supreme test of societal resilience. If deterrence fails, the economic shockwaves will hit Tokyo long before the first kinetic strikes land on Okinawa. The Taiwan Strait is the central artery of global commerce. A blockade or active combat zone will instantly sever supply chains for semiconductors, energy, and manufactured goods. The Japanese economy will face an immediate crisis.

In this environment, neo-middle power diplomacy will be tested to its absolute limits. Japan will need to weaponize its economic networks, coordinating with Europe and other Asian middle powers to implement sanctions while desperately trying to secure alternative supply lines (Pajon, 2018). The passage of the Economic Security Promotion Act in 2022 was a crucial first step. However, the sheer scale of economic disruption caused by a Sino-American war would overwhelm these preliminary measures.

The domestic political fallout will be equally severe. The Japanese public, suddenly thrust into a wartime economy with the looming threat of missile strikes, will demand answers that the government may not have. The pacifist consensus will not die quietly. It will fracture loudly, leading to intense political polarization and potential instability within the Diet.

Managing this domestic crisis is just as critical as managing the military one. The government must prepare the psychological groundwork now. It must build a narrative of national resilience that transcends partisan divides. If the home front collapses, the military front will inevitably follow.

The Path Forward

Japan does not have the luxury of deciding its role in a Taiwan contingency on the day deterrence fails. It must pre-decide and pre-signal a mix of spearhead, enabler, sanctuary, and broker functions, and then prepare accordingly. Three priorities follow immediately.

First, Tokyo must align its capabilities with a realistic role mix. If Tokyo wants to be a credible spearhead and enabler, it must invest far more heavily in munitions stockpiles and sustainment for long campaigns (Liff, 2021). It needs hardened, dispersed basing and rapid runway repair capabilities. If it wants to be a serious sanctuary and broker, it must similarly invest in civil defense, critical-infrastructure resilience, and evacuation planning.

Second, the government must socialize the Japanese public and its allies to these brutal choices. The government should be explicit with its own citizens and with allies about what roles Japan is preparing to play. That means public communication that does not sugarcoat the risks of a Taiwan contingency for Japanese territory and society. The era of strategic ambiguity regarding the defense of Taiwan must end.

Third, Japan must organize a middle-power coalition now, not during the opening salvos. If Japan wants to be a broker for middle powers, it needs to institutionalize regular consultations with Australia, Canada, key European states, and perhaps Korea and India on crisis responses, sanctions planning, and military support options (Nagy, 2022; Bondaz, 2020). It must develop common playbooks for economic statecraft and gray-zone responses before a crisis breaks out.

Deterrence could still work. A mix of credible military capabilities, economic interdependence, and political caution in Beijing may keep the Taiwan Strait below the threshold of overt war. Japan is right to invest in deterrence first.

- HOME
- About us
- Activities
- Policy
- Recommendations
- Research
- Programs
- Information

- Gathering
- International
- Exchanges
- International
- Frameworks
- PR and
- Enlightenment

Japanese

JAPANESE

- Bonzard, A. (2022). *La stratégie de la France dans l'Indo Pacifique* (Note de la FRS, n° 37). Fondation pour la recherche stratégique.
- <https://www.frstrategie.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/notes/2022/202237.pdf>
- Easley, L. E. (2017). Middle power national identity and status maximization: The case of South Korea's deceptive middle power diplomacy. *International Relations of the Asia Pacific*, 17(3), 415–441. <https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcw017>.
- Envall, H. D. P. (2015). *Japanese diplomacy: The role of leadership in foreign policy*. State University of New York Press.
- Gilson, J. (2000). *Japan and the European Union: A partnership for the twenty first century?* Macmillan.
- Hornung, J. W. (2020). *Japan's potential contributions in an East China Sea contingency*. RAND Corporation.
- Hosoya, Y. (細谷雄一). (2012). 国際秩序: 18世紀ヨーロッパから21世紀アジアへ [International order: From 18th century Europe to 21st century Asia]. 中央公論新社. <https://www.kinokuniya.co.jp/f/dsg-01-9784121021908>
- Hughes, C. W. (2015). *Japan's foreign and security policy under the "Abe doctrine"*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jimbo, K. (2018). "Indo taiheiyō koso no shatei to kadai. *Indo-Pacific vision: concepts and challenges*], *Kokusai anzenhoshō*, 3-7.
- Kitaoka, S. (北岡伸一). (1999). 日本近代 5: 政党から軍部へ 1924～1941 [A history of modern Japan 5: From party politics to the military, 1924–1941]. 中央公論新社. <https://www.chuko.co.jp/bunko/2013/06/205807.html>.
- Liff, A. P. (2022). The U.S.–Japan alliance and Taiwan. *Asia Policy*, 17(3), 125–160. https://adampliff.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/liiff2022_asiapolicy_us-japan-alliance-taiwan.pdf
- Lind, J. (2004). Pacifism or passing the buck? Testing theories of Japanese security policy. *International Security*, 29(1), 92–121.
- Liu, J. [刘江永]. (2016). 日本国家安全保障局の戦略動向 [Strategic trends of Japan's National Security Secretariat]. *Contemporary International Relations*, 3, 22–29.
- Ministry of Defense of Japan [防衛省]. (2022). 国家防衛戦略 [National Defense Strategy]. Tokyo: Ministry of Defense.
- Nagy, S. R. (2022). Middle power alignment in the Free and Open Indo Pacific: Securing agency through neo middle power diplomacy. *Asia Policy*, 17(1), 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1353/asp.2022.0007>.
- Oros, A. L. (2017). *Japan's security renaissance: New policies and politics for the twenty-first century*. Columbia University Press.
- Pajon, C. (2018). Le Japon et la sécurité en Asie: Vers une normalisation? *Politique étrangère*, 83(2), 345–357.
- Patalano, A. (2014). Seapower and Sino-Japanese relations in the East China sea. *Asian Affairs*, 45(1), 34–54.
- Saint-Mézard, I. (2021). 'Indo-Pacifique: un concept géopolitique en débat. *Revue Internationale et Stratégique*, 121(1), 45–55.
- Samuels, R. J. (2007). *Securing Japan: Tokyo's grand strategy and the future of East Asia*. Cornell University Press. <https://ssp.mit.edu/publications/2007/securing-japan>.
- Smith, S. A. (2019). *Japan rearmed: The politics of military power*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674987647>
- Takahashi, S. (Sugio). (2006). Dealing with the ballistic missile threat: Whether Japan should have a ballistic missile defense? *NIDS Security Reports*, 7, 1–24. https://www.nids.mod.go.jp/english/publication/kiyo/pdf/bulletin_e2006_4_takahashi.pdf.
- Tatsumi, Y. (2008). *Japan's national security policy infrastructure: Can Tokyo meet Washington's expectation?* Stimson Center. https://www.stimson.org/wp-content/files-file-attachments/Tatsumi.%20Japan's_Security_Policy_Infrastructure_Final_Version.pdf
- Yan, X. (2013). *Inertia of history: China and the world in the next ten years* [历史的惯性: 未来十年的中国与世界]. Beijing, China: CITIC Press.
- Yoshihara, T. (2020). *Dragon against the sun: Chinese views of Japanese seapower*. Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. <https://csbaonline.org/research/publications/dragon-against-the-sun-chinese-views-of-japanese-seapower>
- Zhang, T. [张浚生]. (2019). 中日安全关系: 挑战与前景 [Sino-Japanese Security Relations: Challenges and Prospects]. *World Economics and Politics*, 5, 45–62.

[HOME](#)

About us

Activities

Policy

Recommendations

Research

Programs

Information

		Gathering
		International
About us		Exchanges
Activities		International
Policy Recommendations		Frameworks
Research Programs		PR and
Information Gathering		Enlightenment
International Exchanges	Japanese	
International Frameworks		JAPANESE
PR and Enlightenment		
Contact us		
Map to JFIR		
Sitemap		
Internship		
Free subscription JFIR E-Letter		
JFIR E-Letter		
Email address		Sign up
The Japan Forum on International Relations(JFIR)		
Address	2-17-12-1301, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 107-0052	
T E L	+813-3584-2190	
F A X	+813-3589-5120	

Copyright © JFIR All Rights Reserved.