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1. 論文要旨  Thesis overview and summary of the presentation.

This research has tried to answer a basic research question: when, how and why did India and Japan perceive China as a traditional security threat? The reason why examining this question is important, is because:

- China, Japan and India are three major, regional powers in a rapidly changing Indo-Pacific region. How these countries perceive and behave towards each other will have significant impact on regional security and stability (empirical contribution).
- International relations theories (realism, liberalism, constructivism) tend to answer the posed research question based on implicit assumptions. This research has looked at how these theories are valid in explaining perceptions of threat (theoretical contribution).
- Japan and India have stepped up their security cooperation. This research aims to give policy input in how such cooperation could take shape in the future based on perceptual similarities (policy contribution).

Based on the literature on threats and perceptions, three variables have been identified that can explain change: (i.) military capabilities (material), (ii.) escalatory foreign policy acts (behavioral), and (ii.) identity-othering (ideational).

What this research has found, is that escalatory foreign policy acts can best explain changing perceptions of threat. In the case of Japan, we can see significant discursive changes in 1996 (Taiwan Straits Crisis), 2005 (the Senkaku Islands – conflict over oil and gas), and 2012 (the Senkaku Islands – conflict over sovereignty). In the case of India, “China threat” arguments peaked after incursions on the border (in particular 2009 and 2013), and as a result of the People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) inroads into the Indian Ocean Region (IOR).

Changes in capabilities create an “enabling environment” for policy change. It allows rising powers such as China to change the rules of the game. It thus raises a certain level of wariness and attention (in particular in the defense and security communities), or a latent threat. Such changes in capabilities are rationalized (and securitized) after aggressive actions in elite policy discourse.

In the case of Japan, identity-othering in official and non-official discourse have contributed to binary images and created expectations about a “belligerent” China. When such expectations became a reality it reinforced such belief systems
and contributed to a pervasive cognitive bias, the fundamental attribution error.\textsuperscript{1} In India, officials refrain from talking identity-politics. In the wider strategic discourse, China-othering happens in the context of the border dispute, and the lingering distrust that comes with it, as well as in the “India as a regional, great power” frame which sees China as its main strategic rival in the South Asian subcontinent.

2. 審査報告 Notes from the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee (including changes required to the thesis by the referees)

After the dissertation defense session, the Ph.D. degree committee was convened at 1120 hours. The committee was comprised of Prof. Narushige Michishita (main advisor), Prof. Takashi Shiraishi (sub advisor), Prof. Keiichi Tsunekawa (sub advisor), Prof. Chikako Ueki (sub advisor: Waseda University), Prof. Takako Hirose (external examiner: Senshu University), and Prof. Tetsushi Sonobe.

The Ph.D. degree committee members unanimously supported the evaluation decision to pass the presentation and the dissertation manuscript with the grade of 4.0 out of 5.0. At the same time, some of the committee members required minor revisions, which shall be checked by the primary advisor before the degree is conferred, based on their comments as indicated below.

- The author identified three independent variables and set out to explain relationships among the three. However, the author failed to explain their relationships and/or correlation.
- The author did not clarify how he measured the impact of three independent variables on the dependent variable.
- David Rousseau has published a study on identity, but the author did not use or acknowledge this study properly.
- The author must clearly indicate the fact that the conflict-prevention and conflict-management mechanism for land disputes is more advanced and sophisticated than that for maritime dispute.
- What made the establishment of the crisis management mechanism between China and India possible in the first place? Identity might have played an important role in the successful emergence of such a mechanism.

\textsuperscript{1} This bias explains someone else’s behavior mostly in terms of personality traits, and not as a reaction to an external situation.
• The author must elaborate on roles of the United States and Pakistan as determinants of India's and Japan's threat perception. In particular, when China provides aid to Pakistan, it does so to undermine India's strategic position. And India understands this.
• Modi's claim that his policy is about resolving the confrontation with China instead of simply managing it is for domestic political consumption. The author must be realistic and must not be misled by Modi's words.
• Some of the policy recommendations were not based on the result of this study and, therefore, not sufficiently persuasive.
• There are some grammatical errors and stylistic problems.
• Chapters/sections were not properly numbered sometimes.

3. 最終提出論文確認結果 Confirmation by the Main Referee that changes have been done to the satisfaction of the referees

最終提出論文を各審査委員に修正メモと共に送付し、確認した。

4. 最終審査結果 Final recommendation

審査報告にあるコメントに対して、著者は直ちに論文の修正を行い、修正稿を提出し、主査の最終確認を経た上で各審査委員の了解を得た後に博士論文最終版として提出した。審査委員全員は本論文が本学博士論文として妥当であると結論をつけた。